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**Investigative Scope and Process**
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Organizational Structure, JDAI

Organizational Structure, Juvenile Probation Department

Policies and Procedures, Probation Services Division, January 2004
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Resumes of Juvenile Probation Commissioners
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SFPD General Order 7.01 Juvenile Policies and Procedures
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“New chief of juvenile probation from Chicago,” SF Chronicle, February 23, 2005

“Outrage at state of boys camp DA tours center for troubled youth, demands changes,” Chronicle, December 14, 2004


“Supes eye overcrowding,” SF Examiner, March 7, 2005
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Community-Based Organizations

Community Assessment and Referral Center

Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative
Juvenile Probation Commission
Juvenile Probation Department
Mayor's Office of Criminal Justice
San Francisco Police Department
Superior Court
## JPD Referrals and Detentions - Sorted Most to Least Serious Crimes

**Using Department of Justice Summary Codes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81.82%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>85.44%</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>93.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>72.65%</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>75.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidnapping</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>63.30%</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>57.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>42.24%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Theft</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>99.31%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>73.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forger</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73.66%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcotics</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>90.10%</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>79.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana-Felony</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>81.33%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangerous Drugs</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>76.19%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Molest-Felony</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Law Violation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>77.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons-Felony</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52.38%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hit &amp; Run - Felony</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Felony</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>44.83%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault Battery</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>28.76%</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Felonies</strong></td>
<td><strong>2643</strong></td>
<td><strong>1619</strong></td>
<td><strong>68.82%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1578</strong></td>
<td><strong>1029</strong></td>
<td><strong>65.29%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent Felonies</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.38%</strong></td>
<td><strong>53.99%</strong></td>
<td><strong>49.48%</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.24%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Theft</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>20.17%</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defrauding Innkeeper</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check, Access Cards</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.39%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana-Misdemeanor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annoying Children</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewd Conduct-Mis</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>78.95%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>81.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunk</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Laws</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly Conduct</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbing Peace</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48.08%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33.87%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malicious Mischief</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trespassing</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.07%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons-Mis</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>72.73%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hit &amp; Run-Mis</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected Traffic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy Riding</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambling</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Mis</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38.05%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary Tools</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson-Mis</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Status Offense</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Violation</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>88.89%</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>52.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Traffic</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.44%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Drugs-Mis</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45.16%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Misc Codes</td>
<td>1251</td>
<td>1177</td>
<td>94.08%</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>95.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Misdemeanors</strong></td>
<td><strong>2503</strong></td>
<td><strong>1550</strong></td>
<td><strong>59.55%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1609</strong></td>
<td><strong>1019</strong></td>
<td><strong>63.33%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent Misdemeanors</strong></td>
<td><strong>49.62%</strong></td>
<td><strong>46.01%</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.52%</strong></td>
<td><strong>49.76%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Referrals</strong></td>
<td><strong>5246</strong></td>
<td><strong>3369</strong></td>
<td><strong>64.22%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3185</strong></td>
<td><strong>2048</strong></td>
<td><strong>64.30%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: JPD Annual Reports*
San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department
DETENTION RISK ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT (4/3/03)

Name __________________________ DOB: _______________ PFN: ____________

Arrest date _______________ Arrest time _______________ Ethnicity _______________ Sex: M  F

Zip Code: _______________ School: _____________________ Primary Language: _______________

Primary referral offense: _____________________________________________

A. OFFENSE (Score only the most serious instant offense)
   WIC Section 707 (b) offenses .................................................. 11
   Note: 707(b) referrals of minors 14 and older cannot be mitigated
   Other violent or sex felonies against persons .............................. 9
   Sale of narcotics/ drugs ............................................................. 7
   Possession of narcotics/drugs for sale ........................................... 5
   Felony possession of narcotics/drugs ............................................. 3
   Possession of firearm.................................................................. 11
   Felony property crimes including auto ........................................... 5
   All misdemeanors ........................................................................ 3
   All infractions and non-criminal probation violations ....................... 0

B. PRIOR OFFENSE HISTORY (Score only one of the following)
   Felony petition pending ............................................................... 6
   Prior felony adjudication within the last six months, OR two or
   more adjudications including one felony within last 12 months ........ 5
   Prior felony adjudication within the last three years ...................... 3
   Documented escape from secure custody, last 18 months ................. 5

C. AGGRAVATING FACTORS (Add all that apply, up to 3 points)
   Multiple offenses are alleged for this referral .................................. 1
   Crime or behavior alleged was particularly vicious or violent ............. 1
   Home situation is unstable, increasing risk of flight, FTA or misconduct.. 1
   Minor has willfully failed to appear one or more times in last 12 months .. 1

D. MITIGATING FACTORS (Subtract all that apply, up to 3 points)
   Involvement in offense was remote, indirect or otherwise mitigated ...... 1
   Family member or caretaker able to assume responsibility for minor ..... 1
   No arrests or citations within the last year ..................................... 1
   Minor demonstrates stability in school or employment ..................... 1

TOTAL SCORE (A + B + C – D) ..............................................

DECISION SCALE: 0-7 RELEASE, 8-10 RESTRICTED RELEASE, 11+ DETAIN

SPECIAL DETENTION CASES (Check as applicable)
   WIC 707 (b) age 14 or older (WIC Sec. 625.3).
   Bench warrant, minor not authorized for release by probation officer
   Arrest warrant, minor not authorized for release by probation officer
   Placement return or failure—non-secure option not available
   Inter-county transfer, minor not authorized for release by probation officer
   Court-ordered detention including weekend custody

DETENTION OVERRIDES
   Parent, guardian or responsible relative cannot be located
   Parent, guardian or responsible relative refuses to take custody of minor
   Youth refuses to return home
   Home supervision not appropriate or available
   Other— The minor is detained because:

RELEASE OVERRIDES
   The minor is released because:

OVERRIDE APPROVAL by ________________________________, Supervisor

Minor released to: _____________________________ (specify relation); Release time & Date: _______________

Survey instrument completed by: ________________________________
SAN FRANCISCO JUVENILE PROBATION DEPARTMENT
DETENTION RISK INSTRUMENT TRAINING
DUTY P.O. (INTAKE STAFF ) SESSION - January 8, 2003

Training session outline

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW (Jesse Williams) 5 min

RISK SCREENING OBJECTIVES AND BEST PRACTICES:
National, state and San Francisco overview  (David Steinhart) 10 min

PROCESS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF THE “NEW” RAI (Garry Bieringer) 5 min
  o Stakeholder design, JDAI context, Testing, Exec Committee

RISK SCREENING BASIC PROCEDURE: Review (Steinhart/ B. Johnston) 15 min
  o Who gets screening
  o Who does the screening
  o When does screening occur
  o Information sources for screening: police information, computer records, interview of minor
  o Detention decision making: Risk score in relation to PO discretion
    o Overrides: Basis for. Supervisor approval needed (nights/weekends)
    o Release procedures: parental contact efforts
  o Final form completion and processing
  o Duplicating and transmitting the RAI

LIABILITY OF PROBATION OFFICERS FOR RELEASE DECISIONS (Steinhart) 5 min

HOW TO COMPLETE THE RISK INSTRUMENT- line by line 30 min
  o Offense scoring
  o Prior History scoring
  o Aggravation and Mitigation Factors
  o Total score and detention decision
  o Home detention in lieu of secure detention
  o Special Detention cases
  o Detention Overrides
  o Release Overrides
  o Special situations

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION 15 min
SAN FRANCISCO JUVENILE PROBATION DEPARTMENT


The San Francisco Juvenile Detention Risk Assessment Instrument (RAI) has been updated and approved for implementation in January, 2003. Below are basic instructions on how to complete the revised RAI and to implement the detention screening process in specific cases. These guidelines are to be followed by intake personnel unless countermanded by a supervisor or by the Juvenile Court.

OFFENSE SCORING

1. *Score only the most serious instant offense.* Do not compound scores for multiple charges.

2. *WIC 707 (b) offenses.* Due to the change in WIC Section 625.3 (Proposition 21), minors 14 or older charged with any WIC 707 (b) offense must be detained until the case is reviewed by a court officer. Normally, this means that such a minor must be detained until the detention hearing. The case may not be mitigated or over-ridden to effectuate release without judicial approval. In these cases, please check the first box under “Special Detention Cases”, for WIC 707 minors 14 and older. Minors younger than 14 who are charged with a WIC 707 (b) crime may be mitigated and released at intake based on their total score. Since the mandatory detention provision of Proposition 21 now requires the secure detention of minors 14 or older charged with lesser forms of robbery (added to the 707 (b) list by Proposition 21), a new process is being designed to accelerate judicial review and possible release for these lower level robbery cases. This accelerated review process would be triggered by a probation officer seeking to release the minor in question, but the process is not yet finalized.

3. *“Other violent or sex felonies against persons”.* These are non-707 (b) felonies against persons, where the offense involves violence or is a sex crime. An example would be P.C. 288.5, “continuous sexual abuse of a child”.

4. *Drug offenses.* Assign 9, 7 or 5 points for sale, possession for sale or felony possession of narcotics or drugs. Prior to district attorney charging, some cases will require you to make a judgment call based on the facts offered by police and based on your experience (e.g., discriminating between possession and possession for sale). Misdemeanor possession (e.g., less than one ounce of marijuana) is scored under “All misdemeanors” (3 points).

5. *Possession of a firearm.* It is City and County policy to presume that these minors possessing firearms (loaded or unloaded) should earn 11 points and be detained. However, these cases are also subject to mitigation or over-ride, depending on all the facts of the individual case. Toy guns, knives and other non-firearm weapons do not earn 11 points in this category.

6. *Felony property crimes including auto.* Only felony property crimes earn 5 points.

7. *Misdemeanors* earn 3 points

8. *Probation violations.* Probation violations, without a new crime, earn zero points on the risk instrument. These minors should be cited or referred to a non-detention alternative. Additional “graduated sanctions” for probation violators are being reviewed and are likely to be developed in the context of the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative.
PRIOR OFFENSE HISTORY

Score only one of the “prior history” situations listed in this section. For example, if the minor has a felony petition pending, assign 6 points and move on to the next section. The information source is the minor’s computer record.

AGGRAVATING AND MITIGATING FACTORS

THESE SECTIONS ARE NEW in San Francisco. The risk instrument being replaced did not have aggravating or mitigating factors. Some of these factors require a judgment call by the intake officer, and for some factors listed there may be insufficient information on file or available at intake to make that judgment call. Below are guidelines for rating aggravation or mitigation; strategies to improve the level of information available at intake are still under review.

TIMING OF RATING AGGRAVATING AND MITIGATING FACTORS: Risk scoring must not be delayed to obtain aggravating or mitigating score information. If you lack information you feel is needed to make a reasonable judgment on any aggravating or mitigating factor, skip that factor (no points either way) and move on to complete the intake form and process.

Aggravating factors: You may add up to three points to the score in aggravation.

1. Multiple offenses are alleged. This means the minor is charged with more than one new criminal event—e.g., multiple burglaries or robberies. Do not count lesser included offenses that may be charged as part of the same criminal event; for example, assault with a firearm and illegal possession of a firearm in the same event are not to be treated as multiple offenses; same with sale and possession for sale or burglary/possession of stolen property.

2. Crime was particularly vicious or violent. You may use your own judgment here.

3. Home situation is unstable increasing risk of flight, FTA or misconduct. Information on this point at intake may be limited or nonexistent. If you have child welfare documentation or other reliable information about the home that leads you to believe reasonably that the minor is a flight risk, you may aggravate here. You may interview the minor and use information he or she provides in the interview to supplement your evaluation.

4. Minor has willfully failed to appear one or times in the last 12 months. The FTA should appear in the case file. The minor should be allowed to explain the FTA so you can confirm that it is not a mistake on the record or completely excusable for some legitimate reason.

Mitigating factors: You may subtract up to three points from the score in mitigation.
(Note again that arrests of minors 14 or older on WIC 707(b) charges may not be mitigated).

1. Involvement in the offense was remote or otherwise mitigated. This provides you with a flexible opportunity to lower the score of minors whose behavior is not fully reflected by the offense charged. Some examples:

   o Assault is charged but the minor was essentially standing around watching
Drug possession is charged but this minor was riding in the car and there is no evidence that he personally possessed the substance.

The minor is 11 or 12 years old and did not appear to fully appreciate the seriousness or criminality of the act.

The minor has a clean record, the offense is not serious and the parents are eager and available to take custody.

2. Family member or caretaker able to assume responsibility for the minor. Minors will earn mitigation points if they have a family member who is reliable and immediately available to take custody of the minor. The mitigation point is earned if you believe that the family is not only willing but is also able to take custody and to supervise their child, thus lowering the risk of reoffending before a court appearance. Ordinarily, some contact with a responsive family member is necessary to trigger this point in mitigation.

3. No arrests or citations within the last year. This must appear on the minor’s record. A probation violation that has been validated in court counts as an arrest or citation.

4. Minor demonstrates stability in school or employment. This is perhaps the most difficult factor to rate, because school and employment records are not normally available at intake. Nevertheless, for a variety of reasons the JDAI committees designing the new RAI nevertheless elected to keep this mitigating factor, while also endorsing strategies to improve the quality of information available at intake. To evaluate this mitigating factor, you may use information self-reported by the minor. You should use your judgment to decide whether the self-report is reliable, and you may inform the minor that if the mitigation results in release and the information turns out to be inaccurate, he or she will be re-detained. Information given by the minor, which results in reducing the minor’s score here, should be verified to the extent possible within 24 hours.

TOTAL SCORE AND DETENTION SCALE

Add scores for all four main factors and write the total in the box for “total score”. The detention decision scale tells you what should then happen: 11 or more points would normally result in detention. A score between 8 and 10 points means that you should release the minor, either outright to parents or on “restricted release” such as home detention (see inset below). A score of 7 or fewer points would indicate release pending court without special restrictions.

Home Detention. The detention scale indicates “release on restriction” for minors who score between 8 and 10 points. In San Francisco, the primary restrictive release option is home detention, or as it is described in the Welfare and Institutions Code, “home supervision”. California Welfare and Institutions Code Sections 840 and 628.1 require the probation department to maintain a home supervision program for release to parents on specific conditions with enriched probation supervision (1:10 caseload). Currently, San Francisco does not meet this code requirement. The Juvenile Court makes referrals to a contract home supervision agency, but the probation department does not directly refer to home supervision. This will change. Until the home supervision program is developed for immediate utilization at intake, minors scoring 8 to 10 points should be released to the custody of their parents, if available.
SPECIAL DETENTION CASES

This section lists cases that are subject to secure detention regardless of their detention score. It includes WIC 707(b) mandatory detention for minors 14 and older. It also documents secure detention outcomes for minors who score less than 11 risk points but for whom a specific program, placement or case processing alternative to detention is not presently available. New alternatives are under discussion or development for certain types of warrant cases, placement failures and inter-county transfers. Until these alternatives are in place, the case should be treated as a special detention case. Mark the appropriate box.

NOTE THAT: Special detention minors must be risk scored (by offense, prior history and aggravating or mitigating factors) even if they are subsequently detained as a special detention case.

NOTE THAT: Probation violations are not automatic special detention cases; probation violators must be risk scored to qualify for secure detention.

DETENTION OVER-RIDES

The probation officer retains discretion to detain a minor, even though the minor scores less than 11 points (the detention cutoff) on the risk instrument. At the same time, it is the policy of the San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department to limit these over-rides to exceptional situations in which the probation officer reasonably believes that the minor presents some risk of criminality or flight that can justify secure detention in spite of the low risk score.

All minors with scores of 0-10 points, who are securely detained beyond 24 hours, must be accounted for in this section as a detention override, with supervisor sign-off. For purposes of completing the risk instrument at intake, you should mark the case as an over-ride if you reasonably expect that the minor will be detained for 24 hours under one of the circumstances listed in the detention over-ride section. Specific situations for detention override are as follows:

- **Parents cannot be located.** The Welfare and Institutions Code (Section 628) provides for release of a minor to a “parent, legal guardian or responsible relative”. If no such person can be located, the minor may be detained as an over-ride. To justify this type of detention, a diligent and extended effort must be made to locate a parent, guardian or responsible relative. This level of effort should include: ask minor to provide contact information; minor’s records are searched to determine the location of family members; multiple and periodic phone calls or other contact attempts are made while the minor is in custody. Calls that go unanswered in night-time hours should be tried again the next day. Attempts to contact family members should be documented by the probation officer.

- **Parents refuse to take custody.** A parental refusal to come to the Youth Guidance Center to retrieve a minor should be carefully handled. Though some latitude may be given to working parents who cannot leave their job without losing it, every effort should be made to convince parents of seriousness of the situation and to establish a time-certain when the retrieval will be made. Refusals based on “I don’t want him/her back” should be countered with specific strategies unless it is clear that the minor will lack supervision or be endangered if returned home. Strategies to encourage parental pickup may include pointing out the liability of parents for the costs of probation custody under WIC Section 903.25. Persistent refusals or refusals
signifying child endangerment will justify a detention over-ride. The refusal circumstances should be documented by the probation officer.

- **Youth refuses to return home.** A refusal to return home may be taken as both a sign that the minor is at higher risk than indicated by the score and also as consent to detention. The reasons why a minor refuses to return home should be documented by the probation officer.

- **Home detention not available.** This is a temporary over-ride circumstance that is included on the form until the home supervision program is ready for utilization at intake. Normally, minors who score 8-10 points, for whom no home supervision program is currently available, should be returned home. However, the probation officer has the option of detaining the minor if special risks can be identified justifying secure detention in a particular case.

- **Other.** The RAI is a basic triage device that cannot capture every situation presented at intake. The “other” category gives the intake officer a means of justifying secure detention in unusual and high-risk situations. It may be that a serious and unusual offense, not listed in the offense section, has been charged (e.g., bomb-making). It may be that the minor has threatened to injure or kill some person in retaliation, or that you have evidence the minor may be at serious risk of gang retaliation. It may be that the minor has made a terrorism threat that requires further investigation for the protection of others. It may be that the minor has severe mental health problems or drug-intoxication problems requiring further evaluation or treatment. This form of detention over-ride should be used only when the probation officer has reason to believe that there is a special need to detain the minor as a matter of immediate necessity to protect the minor or another from harm, or to prevent a specific flight risk. **WHEN THE “OTHER” CATEGORY IS USED, YOU SHOULD DESCRIBE SUCCINCTLY YOUR REASON FOR OVER-RIDE, USING ADDITIONAL SPACE AS NEEDED.**

**RELEASE OVERRIDES**

A detention score of 11 or higher can be over-ridden in favor of release, if there are reasonable grounds for release despite the higher score. Examples might include: very young minors whose parents demonstrate and immediate ability to supervise and protect the minor; minors whose involvement in the offense was extremely remote but whose mitigation score is not high enough; or cases where the probation officer learns that the arrest is a case of mistaken identity. **THE REASONS FOR A RELEASE OVER-RIDE MUST BE STATED IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.**

**OVERRIDE APPROVAL BY A SUPERVISOR**

The signature of a Supervising Probation Officer is required to confirm any over-ride—detain or release. In late night or weekend situations, where a supervisor is not immediately available, you should contact a supervisor by phone for over-ride approval. One question that arises is whether a minor, qualified and scheduled for release, should be detained until a supervisor is successfully contacted, if parents are ready, willing and able to take the minor home. This question has not yet been answered; protocols for the method and timing of supervisor approval in these cases will be announced.
MONITORING (RELEASE) INFORMATION

The release information (date, time, released to) should be entered on the form for monitoring purposes at the time of release. Where release is not immediate, a post-release data entry process must be followed to complete the form. The method for accomplishing this is still being developed. For minors not immediately released, the duty officer completing the form should leave these lines blank.

SIGNING THE FORM

The intake officer completing the risk assessment form must sign it at intake.

SPECIFIC CASE SITUATIONS

Prostitution cases. Concern has been expressed, by probation officers and other JDAI stakeholders, about girls arrested for prostitution in “turnstile” situations, where boyfriends or other adults representing themselves as family members try to obtain custody and the girls go immediately back to work on the street. Probation officers are justified in taking special steps to verify the identity of persons representing themselves as family members in prostitution cases. At the same time, if the young woman qualifies for release and has a legitimate family member able to take custody, then the release should proceed. Under discussion within the JDAI in San Francisco is the establishment of a temporary shelter facility or “safe house” which could, in lieu of juvenile hall, serve as a place of custody for these young women—helping them connect with legitimate family members and offering services that may deter resumption of illegal activities on the streets.

Terrorism charges. In the post 9/11 environment there is growing social anxiety about terrorism, and we have seen increases in the number of minors referred for terrorism threats under Penal Code Section 422. This offense can be charged either as a misdemeanor or as a felony, and there is no convenient place at present on the RAI to score PC 422 offenses. The RAI working group considered adding a special offense category for terrorism but decided against this—mainly because the offense covers such a wide range of possible behaviors, from schoolyard horseplay to focused and malicious threats backed by a present ability to produce serious harm. Instead of trying to lump all terrorism threats and behaviors into one category, the JDAI working group has suggested that probation officers, guided by police information, make their best judgment calls using the RAI as drafted and using override provisions if necessary for public protection.

Minors 12 and under. Presently, very young minors get no special treatment on the RAI. Even with juvenile hall classification criteria designed to protect younger detainees, there is always concern about predatory or bullying behavior when they are in the same institution with older youth. Santa Clara County has adapted to the special risks of detaining young minors by requiring a judge’s order to confirm continued detention of any minor 12 or younger. The JDAI/RAI working group reviewed eight cases of minors 12 and under referred to YGC during the April-May RAI test period. It found that the charges were mainly felony level and that petitions were filed in all cases. There is no recent evidence of abuse of younger minors at YGC. The working group therefore recommended that the decision to treat younger youth appropriately should be left to the discretion of the intake probation officer. When minors 12 or under are presented at intake, the probation officer should include in his or her evaluation a consideration of whether the highest levels of personal and public protection will be achieved in the detention center or in the family home.
Probation violations. Minors with technical (non-criminal) violations of conditions of probation earn zero points under the offense section. They are not special detention cases. They may be detained only if they earn 11 or more points when properly scored, or as an over-ride under in special situations where the probation officer can identify a specific public safety risk. Sanctions for probation violators are currently under review in the JDAI, and there is great interest in creating new and intermediate sanctions that will be made available to the probation department and the juvenile court for the enforcement of orders of probation. A special screening instrument, rating minors for probation violator risk, is also being considered. These reviews may produce new risk screening procedures and new sanctions for probation violations, based on the severity of the violation. Meanwhile, probation violations should be properly scored on the updated risk instrument, and scoring will be monitored to assure compliance.

Warrant cases. Arrest and bench warrant cases are presently special detention situations in which the probation officer lacks authority to release the minor. Minors presented at intake on warrants are universally detained in deference to the authority of the court issuing the warrant. However, it is recognized that some behaviors leading to a warrant are more serious than others, with higher associated public safety risks. Similarly, some failures to appear which cause a warrant to issue may be excusable for various reasons—for example, the minor or the family never received notice of an altered court date. Under JDAI, stakeholders are reviewing ways to provide the probation department with additional tools in warrant cases that may be low-grade or excusable for various reasons. There is no change in warrant policy as yet, and any future change that comes about will require Juvenile Court approval. In the meantime, warrants will continue to be handled as special detention cases.

Placement failures. Minors returned from private placements are almost always detained, pending resolution of the problem with the placement or placement in a new facility. Like the “old” RAI, the new RAI treats these as special detention cases. However, it is clear that there are many kinds of placement failures—some which are clearly due to the misbehavior of the minor and some which are not (an example of the latter would be a minor who leaves a placement after being beaten or sexually assaulted). Minors returned to the juvenile hall as placement failures should be scored on the RAI prior to being detained as special detention cases. With the help of a Placement Coordinator in the Public Defenders Office, additional efforts have been made to accelerate the movement minors with placement problems to appropriate facilities, and their numbers in detention have declined. Further efforts will be made under JDAI to develop options for minors returned from private placements.
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TO:    Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) Stakeholders
FROM: David Steinhart
RE:    LIABILITY OF PROBATION OFFICERS FOR INJURIES BY JUVENILES
       RELEASED FROM CUSTODY

QUESTION PRESENTED

Are probation officers, or city or county governments in California, liable for injury caused by an 
arrested juvenile who is released from the custody of the Probation Department?

CONCLUSIONS

Based on a review of California and United States statutes and court cases, here are key 
conclusions on the question presented:

1. Under California law, government agencies and probation employees are immune from 
   liability for injuries related to decisions to release arrested juveniles from custody. This 
   immunity is derived principally from two statutes. Calif.Government Code Section 820.2 
   immunizes public agencies and employees from liability for any act or omission resulting from 
   845.8 immunizes public agencies and employees from liability for decisions involving the 
   release of a prisoner. These immunities have been specifically confirmed by the California 
   Supreme Court for probation officers who release juvenile offenders (Thompson v. Alameda 
   County, 27 Cal.3d 741, 167 Cal.Rptr.70, 1980). The constitutionality of California’s immunity 
   statute in released prisoner cases has been upheld by the United States Supreme Court 

2. Federal courts have recognized and generally accepted the doctrine of immunity for probation 
   and parole entities and individuals from liability for injuries related to the release of an 
   arrested person or prisoner, in cases brought under the Federal Civil Rights Act (42 U.S.C. 
   1983).

3. There may, nevertheless, be a duty to warn potential victims of imminent harm likely to be 
   caused by a released juvenile. This duty to warn, arising under California case law, would 
   apply only when the probation officer has reason to believe that an injury is likely to be caused 
   by a released juvenile to a specifically known individual. Normally, a juvenile making such a 
   threat or posing such a known risk would not be released in the first place.

4. Probation officers who exercise their discretion under California law to release arrested 
   juveniles are broadly protected from liability for the actions of released minors. Any case filed 
   against the probation department or one of its officers in such a situation would be highly 
   unlikely to survive demurrer or a motion for summary judgment in the case. There is no basis 
   in case law or statutory law for suggesting that probation agencies or their employees have 
   significant exposure to liability under these circumstances.

David Steinhart is a California attorney experienced in the design, application and analysis of juvenile 
detention criteria; he serves as a consultant for the Annie E. Casey Foundation’s Juvenile Detention 
Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) project in San Francisco.
The following procedure, regarding the arrest of juveniles, goes into effect on June 5, 2004. This procedure will be followed for any arrest except for minor traffic infractions.

Members who arrest a juvenile, regardless of the day or time of the arrest, shall phone the Community Assessment and Referral Center (CARC) at (415) 567-8078. This number will reach CARC staff during operating hours (0900-2400) or a Youth Guidance Center (YGC) juvenile probation officer when CARC is closed. In either case, a juvenile probation officer will, using available information regarding the arrest and the juvenile, make a determination as to whether the juvenile should be booked at YGC, brought to CARC, cited to CARC, or cited to Juvenile Court.

The member completing the police arrest report shall indicate the name of the official (at CARC or YGC) who authorizes the action taken with the arrested juvenile.

HEATHER J. FONG
Chief of Police
III. **Review of Available Funding Sources**

At the outset of this process, four funding sources were identified for review. Funding cuts for FY 05-06, and even more severe funding cuts proposed for FY 06-07, were highlighted. The four funding sources are highlighted below:

- **Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA)**
  These are state funds that are allocated by the state Board of Corrections to each county based on its population. Funds are to be used for services that are “based on programs and approaches that have been demonstrated to be effective in reducing delinquency and addressing juvenile crime.” San Francisco has been allocated $2,187,092 in these funds for FY 05-06. These funds may be cut significantly in FY 06-07 – the Governor’s recently released proposed budget slates JJCPA for a 75% cut state-wide in FY 06-07. In order to receive JJCPA funds, a county must engage in the extensive planning process described in this document. The Mayor’s Office of Criminal Justice administers these funds.

- **Juvenile Accountability Block Grant (JABG)**
  These are federal funds that pass through the state Board of Corrections and on to the counties, based on each counties’ crime index and law enforcement expenditures. The goal of this grant is to hold juvenile offenders accountable for their criminal activities. These funds were cut by 70% for FY 05-06 – San Francisco will receive $116,941 in FY 05-06, compared to $386,423 in FY 04-05. In addition, the President has proposed eliminating JABG funds altogether for FY 06-07. The Mayor’s Office of Criminal Justice administers these funds.

- **Title V Community Prevention Grant**
  These are federal funds that pass through the state Board of Corrections, which then competitively bids out the funds. This is a new grant opportunity for San Francisco. The state is giving out a total of $1.9 million state-wide, and there is no guarantee that San Francisco will receive any of these funds. Funds must be used for prevention services and a Delinquency Prevention Plan must be prepared and approved by the JJCC as part of the grant proposal. The Mayor’s Office on Criminal Justice is applying for these funds on San Francisco’s behalf. The application is due on March 21.

- **TANF Federal Funds or “TANF-Substitute” State Funds**
  Prior to 2004-2005, federal TANF (Temporary Aid to Needy Families) funds were passed from the state to county departments of human services and then on to county probation departments. In 2004, TANF funds were no longer directed to probation departments. Instead, the legislature created state “TANF-substitute” funds is the same amount, administered by the state Board of Corrections. In FY 04-05, this funding was for $3,232,706. The Governor’s recently released budget proposes folding these funds back into TANF for FY 05-06, and funding counties at the same level as FY 04-05. The Juvenile Probation Department administers these funds.
## Exhibit 2-3
Probation Officers' Feedback
Satisfaction with Programs Funded by the SFJPD/CPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Program</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>% Who Are &quot;Satisfied&quot; or &quot;Very Satisfied&quot; With Services Provided</th>
<th>% Who Would Refer Youth to This Program Again</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case Management</strong></td>
<td>Mission Neighborhood Center</td>
<td>Home Detention Program</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CARECEN</td>
<td>Second Change Tattoo Removal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center</td>
<td>OMCSN*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life Skills, Education, and Employment</strong></td>
<td>Special Services for Groups</td>
<td>Ida B. Wells OTTP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Guidance Center Improvement</td>
<td>GED Plus</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Guidance Center Improvement Committee</td>
<td>Focus II</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Guidance Center Improvement Committee</td>
<td>Focus I</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SLUG/Department of Public Works</td>
<td>Saturday Community Service</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of San Francisco</td>
<td>Street Law</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AARS/Straight Forward Club</td>
<td>Straight Forward Club*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ella Hill Hutch Community Center</td>
<td>UJIIMA Co-Ed Mentorship Program</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performing Arts Workshop</td>
<td>Impact High School</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Life Skills</td>
<td>Family Restoration House*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potrero Hill Neighborhood House</td>
<td>Peer Counseling Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Support</strong></td>
<td>Edgewood Children's Center</td>
<td>Kinship Support Network</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parenting Skills</td>
<td>Parenting Skills Program</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Works</td>
<td>ROOTS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Program</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>% Who Are “Satisfied” or “Very Satisfied” With Services Provided</td>
<td>% Who Would Refer Youth to This Program Again</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Services</td>
<td>Center for Young Women’s Development</td>
<td>Sister Circle (n=4)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Works</td>
<td>Young Women's Internship Program (n=3)</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls 2000</td>
<td>Family Services Project (n=2)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mission Neighborhood Center</td>
<td>Young Queens on the Rise (n=6)</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAGE Project, Inc.</td>
<td>SAGE Project (n=8)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solutions Program</td>
<td>Solutions Program* (n=2)</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YWCA</td>
<td>Girls Mentorship Program (n=4)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YWCA</td>
<td>FITS Girls Program* (n=3)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive Home-Based Supervision</td>
<td>Morrisania West, Inc.</td>
<td>IHBS (n=14)</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instituto Familiar de la Raza</td>
<td>IHBS (n=13)</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brothers Against Guns</td>
<td>IHBS (n=8)</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese Youth Development Center</td>
<td>IHBS (n=7)</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potrero Hill Neighborhood House</td>
<td>IHBS (n=11)</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office of Samoan Affairs</td>
<td>IHBS (n=9)</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bayview Hunter’s Point Foundation</td>
<td>IHBS (n=14)</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Youth Center</td>
<td>IHBS (n=4)</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Detention Alternatives</td>
<td>Instituto Familiar de la Raza</td>
<td>Intensive Case Management* (n=14)</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Accountability Boards</td>
<td>California Community Dispute Services* (n=4)</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Detention Diversion Advocacy Project* (n=18)</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>The San Francisco Boys and Girls Home</td>
<td>Pre-Placement Shelter (n=14)</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huckleberry Youth Programs</td>
<td>Status Offender (n=7)</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>