



Administration of Justice Policy Committee
122nd CSAC Annual Meeting
Thursday, December 1, 2016 - 9:00 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.
Madera Room - Renaissance Palm Springs Hotel
Palm Springs - Riverside County

Supervisor John Viegas, Glenn County, Chair
Supervisor Virginia Bass, Humboldt County, Vice Chair

- 9:00 a.m. I. **Welcome and Introductions**
Supervisor John Viegas, Glenn County, Chair
Supervisor Virginia Bass, Humboldt County, Vice Chair
- 9:05 a.m. II. **Responding to Inmate Advocacy Groups and Preventing Jail Lawsuits**
Paul Mello, Partner, Hanson Bridgett Law Firm
Samantha Wolff, Senior Counsel, Hanson Bridgett Law Firm
Ben Rice, General Counsel, Correctional Medical Group Companies
Kimberly M. Pearson, Deputy Agency Director, Correctional Health Services
- 10:00 a.m. III. **Proposition 57: What's Next and How Will It Impact Counties**
Diane Cummins, Special Advisor to Governor Jerry Brown
- 10:30 a.m. IV. **What Impact Could the Election Have on Criminal Justice Funding**
Joe Krahn, President, Waterman & Associates
- 10:45 a.m. V. **ACTION ITEM: CSAC 2016-17 Platform Update Process**
Stanicia Boatner, CSAC Legislative Analyst
Attachment: Administration of Justice Platform Chapter
Attachment: Realignment Platform Chapter
- 10:50 a.m. VI. **Looking Ahead: CSAC Administration of Justice 2017 Priorities**
Supervisor John Viegas, Glenn County, Chair
Supervisor Virginia Bass, Humboldt County, Vice Chair
- 11:00 a.m. VII. **Adjournment**

ATTACHMENTS

Proposition 57: What's Next and How Will It Impact Counties?

Attachment One Memo: Proposition 57 – Next Steps

CSAC 2016-17 Administration of Justice Platform Update Process

Attachment Two Memo: Administration of Justice Platform Updates

Attachment Three Administration of Justice Platform Chapter

Attachment Four Realignment Platform Chapter

Administration of Justice Year in Review and 2017 Legislative Priorities

Attachment Five Memo: AOJ Year in Review and 2017 Legislative Priorities

Proposition 57: What's Next and How Will It Impact Counties
Attachment One
Memo: Proposition 57 – Next Steps



November 17, 2016

1100 K Street
Suite 101
Sacramento
California
95814

Telephone
916.327.7500

Facsimile
916.441.5507

To: CSAC Administration of Justice Policy Committee

From: Darby Kernan, Legislative Representative
Stanicia Boatner, Legislative Analyst

Re: **Next Steps: Proposition 57 - What is the Impact on Counties**

On November 8, 2016, California voters approved Proposition 57, which amends the California Constitution to give parole consideration to individuals sent to prison for a non-violent felony once they have completed the full term of their primary offense. The Initiative defines primary offense as the longest term imposed excluding any additional terms that are added to an offender's sentence such as enhancements, consecutive sentences, or alternative sentences.

In addition, Proposition 57 amends the California Constitution to specify the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) has the authority to award credits to inmates for good behavior and approved rehabilitative and educational achievements. CDCR will develop and approve regulations that will help in the implementation of Proposition 57 and meeting the requirement that the Secretary of CDCR to certify that regulations protect and enhance public safety. The proponent's intent is to give offenders an incentive to participate in rehabilitative programs in prison and earn an opportunity to go before the Board of Parole Hearings (BPH).

Proposition 57 also makes statutory amendments to the 2000 initiative, Proposition 21, that increased a variety of criminal penalties committed by youth and resulted in an increase of youth offenders in the adult criminal justice system. Proposition 57 eliminates the ability for a district attorney to direct file to adult court on juvenile cases. Juveniles alleged to have committed a felony can be tried in adult court only if the court, after a hearing, determines the minor should be tried in adult court. All presumptions are removed and the court must weigh the factors and decide whether the youth should be charged as an adult or juvenile. The initiative also limits the ability to charge minors 14 and 15 years-of-age in adult court for certain serious/violent offenses.

Fiscal Impact: The Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) fiscal assessment of Proposition 57 suggests that there could be savings to the state depending on how specific provisions in Proposition 57 are implemented and costs to county governments. For state savings it would depend on the extent to which BPH grants parole and CDCR awards additional credits. To the extent that credits expedite the release of inmates who would be supervised by probation on Post-Release Community Supervision (PRCS), this would temporarily increase county costs to supervise these individuals in the community following their release. The LAO estimates that these costs could range from minor to the tens of millions of dollars annually for a period of years.

The changes to the process for juveniles could increase county costs primarily because counties are responsible for paying a portion of the costs of housing juvenile offenders in the state Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ). Some savings may be recognized through youth serving shorter periods of time in juvenile hall awaiting trial in adult court. There are additional

costs for probation departments which are responsible for supervising these youthful offenders upon their release from DJJ.

Update/Key Issues: CDCR will begin to draft regulations to implement the credit earning portion of Proposition 57 immediately. The Administration and CDCR have been communicating with CSAC and other county partners on the regulatory process.

CSAC 2016-17 Administration of Justice Platform Update Process
Attachment Two
Memo: Administration of Justice Platform Update Process



November 17, 2016

1100 K Street
Suite 101
Sacramento
California
95814

Telephone
916.327.7500

Facsimile
916.441.5507

To: Administration of Justice Policy Committee Members

From: Darby Kernan, Legislative Representative
Stanicia Boatner, Legislative Analyst

Re: **CSAC Administration of Justice Platform Review – ACTION ITEM**

Recommendation. Staff recommends that the Administration of Justice Policy Committee approve the recommended changes to the CSAC policy platform as drafted and forward to the CSAC Board of Directors.

Background. The California County Platform is a statement of basic policies on issues of concern and interest to California’s counties. CSAC’s policy committees and Board of Directors review the platform regularly, amending and updating when necessary. In addition, the CSAC policy committees recommend updates to their relevant platform chapters every two years, with action taken at the Annual Meeting by the respective committee and Board of Directors.

As part of this biannual process, the Administration of Justice staff in late October suggested edits and invited committee members to provide additional suggestions. This memo provides a brief summary of proposed changes to two chapters under the purview of the Administration of Justice Policy Committee. The attached documents reflect the suggested markups to the platform changes themselves.

Chapter 2 – Administration of Justice

Section 2: Legislative and Executive Matters: Pre Sentence Detention – Addition of bail language.

Section 2: Legislative and Executive Matters: General Principles for Local Corrections – Addition of language previously in CSAC Corrections Reform County Policy Principles and Guidelines attachment.

Section 3: Sex Offender Management – Addition of language previously stated in Sex Offender Management Policy Principles and Guidelines attachment.

Section 5: Family Violence – Addition of batterer intervention language.

Chapter 16 – Realignment

To increase user-friendliness, the 2010 CSAC Realignment Principles have been incorporated into the Realignment Chapter. Previously, the 2010 Realignment Principles were an attachment to the Platform. Further edits were made to reformat the chapter in a more reader-friendly manner.

CSAC 2016-17 Administration of Justice Platform Update Process
Attachment Three
Administration of Justice Platform Chapter

Chapter Two

Administration of Justice

Section 1: General Principles

This chapter is intended to provide a policy framework to direct needed and inevitable change in our justice system without compromising our commitment to both public protection and the preservation of individual rights. CSAC supports improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the California justice systems without compromising the quality of justice.

The Role of Counties

The unit of local government that is responsible for the administration of the justice system must be close enough to the people to allow direct contact, but large enough to achieve economies of scale. While acknowledging that the state has a constitutional responsibility to enact laws and set standards, California counties are uniquely suited to continue to have major responsibilities in the administration of justice. However, the state must recognize differences arising from variations in population, geography, industry, and other demographics and permit responses to statewide problems to be tailored to the needs of individual counties.

We believe that delegation of the responsibility to provide a justice system is meaningless without provision of adequate sources of funding.

Section 2: Legislative and Executive Matters

Board of Supervisors Responsibilities

It is recognized that the state, and not the counties, is responsible for trial court operations costs and any growth in those costs in the future. Nevertheless, counties continue to be responsible for justice-related services, such as, but not limited to, probation, prosecutorial and defense services, as well as the provision of local juvenile and adult detention facilities. Therefore, county board of supervisors should have budget control over all executive and administrative elements of local justice programs for which we continue to have primary responsibility.

Law Enforcement Services

While continuing to provide the full range of police services, county sheriffs should move in the direction of providing less costly specialized services, which can most effectively be managed on a countywide basis. Cities should provide for patrol and emergency services within their limits or spheres of influence. However, where deemed mutually beneficial to counties and cities, it may be appropriate to establish contractual arrangements whereby a county would provide law enforcement services within incorporated areas. Counties should maintain maximum flexibility in their ability to contract with municipalities to provide public safety services.

District Attorney Services

The independent, locally-elected nature of the district attorney must be protected. This office must have the capability and authority to review suspected violations of law and bring its conclusions to the proper court.

Victim Indemnification

Government should be responsive to the needs of victims. Victim indemnification should be a state responsibility, and the state should adopt a program to facilitate receipt of available funds by victims, wherever possible, from the perpetrators of the crime who have a present or future ability to pay, through means that may include, but are not limited to, long-term liens of property and/or long-term payment schedules.

Witness Assistance

Witnesses should be encouraged to become more involved in the justice system by reporting crime, cooperating with law enforcement, and participating in the judicial process. A cooperative anonymous witness program funded jointly by local government and the state should be encouraged, where appropriate, in local areas.

Grand Juries

Every grand jury should continue to have the authority to report on the needs of county offices, but no such office should be investigated more than once in any two-year period, unless unusual circumstances exist. Grand juries should be authorized to investigate all local government agencies, not just counties. Local government agencies should have input into grand jury reports on non-criminal matters prior to public release. County officials should have the ability to call the grand jury foreman and his or her representative before the board of supervisors, for the purpose of gaining clarification on any matter contained in a final grand jury report. Counties and courts should work together to ensure that grand jurors are properly trained and that the jury is provided with an adequate facility within the resources of the county and the court.

Public Defense Services

Adequate legal representation must be provided for indigent persons as required by constitutional, statutory, and case law. Such representation includes both criminal and mental health conservatorship proceedings. The mechanism for meeting this responsibility should be left to the discretion of individual counties.

Counsel should be appointed for indigent juveniles involved in serious offenses and child dependency procedures. The court-appointed or -selected attorney in these procedures should be trained specifically to work with juveniles.

Adult defendants and parents of represented juveniles who have a present and/or future ability to pay part of the costs of defense should continue to be required to do so as determined by the court. The establishment of procedures to place the responsibility for the cost of juvenile defense rightfully upon the parents should be encouraged. The state should increase its participation in sharing the costs of public defense services.

Coroner Services

The independent and investigative function of the coroner must be assured. State policy should encourage the application of competent pathological techniques in the determination of the cause of death.

The decision as to whether this responsibility should be fulfilled by an independent coroner, sheriff-coroner combination, or a medical examiner must be left to the individual boards of supervisors. In rural counties, the use of contract medical examiners shall be encouraged on a case-by-case basis where local coroner judgment is likely to be challenged in court. A list of expert and highly qualified medical examiners, where available, should be circulated to local sheriff-coroners.

Pre-Sentence Detention

Adults

1) Facility Standards

The state's responsibility to adopt reasonable, humane, and constitutional standards for local detention facilities must be acknowledged.

Recognizing that adequate standards are dynamic and subject to constant review, local governments must be assured of an opportunity to participate in the development and modification of standards.

It must be recognized that the cost of upgrading detention facilities presents a nearly insurmountable financial burden to most counties. Consequently, enforcement of minimum standards must depend upon state financial assistance, and local costs can be further mitigated by shared architectural plans and design.

2) Pre-sentence Release

Counties' discretion to utilize the least restrictive alternatives to pre-sentence incarceration that are acceptable, in light of legal requirements and counties' responsibility to protect the public, should be unfettered.

3) Bail

We support a bail system that would validate the release of pre-sentence persons using risk assessment tools as a criteria for release. We also believe that public protection should be a criterion considered when setting bail.

Any continuing county responsibility in the administration or operation of the bail system must include a mechanism to finance the costs of such a system.

Juveniles

1) General

We view the juvenile justice system as being caught between changing societal attitudes calling for harsher treatment of serious offenders and its traditional orientation toward assistance and rehabilitation. Therefore, we believe a thorough review of state juvenile laws is necessary. Any changes to the juvenile justice system should fully involve and draw upon the experience of county officials and personnel responsible for the administration of the present system. CSAC must be involved in

state-level discussions and decision-making processes regarding changes to the juvenile justice system that will have a local impact. There must also be recognition that changes do not take place overnight and that an incremental approach to change may be most appropriate.

Counties must be given the opportunity to analyze the impact, assess the feasibility, and determine the acceptability of any juvenile justice proposal that would realign services from the state to the local level. As with any realignment, responsibility and authority must be connected, and sufficient resources — with a built-in growth factor adjustment — must be provided. Any shift in juvenile detention or incarceration from large state-run facilities to local facilities — if determined to be appropriate — must be pre-planned and funded by the state. However, counties believe that a class of juvenile offenders exists that is best treated by the state. These juvenile offenders are primarily those offenders whose behavioral problems, treatment needs, or criminogenic profile are so severe as to outstrip the local ability to properly treat.

We support a juvenile justice system that is adapted to local circumstances and increased state and federal funding support for local programs that are effective.

2) Facility Standards

The state's responsibility to adopt reasonable, humane, and constitutional standards for juvenile detention facilities is recognized. The adoption of any standards should include an opportunity for local government to participate. The state must recognize that local government requires financial assistance in order to effectively implement state standards, particularly in light of the need for separating less serious offenders from more serious offenders.

3) Treatment and Rehabilitation

As with adult defendants, counties should have broad discretion in developing programs for juveniles.

To reduce overcrowding of juvenile institutions and to improve the chances for treatment and rehabilitation of more serious offenders, it is necessary that lesser offenders be diverted from the formal juvenile justice system to their families and appropriate community-based programs. Each juvenile should receive individual consideration and, where feasible, a risk assessment.

Counties should pursue efficiency measures that enable better use of resources and should pursue additional funding from federal, state, and private sources to establish appropriate programs at the county level.

Prevention and diversion programs should be developed by each county or regionally to meet the local needs and circumstances, which vary greatly among urban, suburban, and rural areas of the state. Programs should be monitored and evaluated on an ongoing basis to ensure their ability to protect public safety and to ensure compliance with applicable state and federal regulations. Nevertheless, counties believe that the state must continue to offer a commitment option for

those juvenile offenders with the most serious criminogenic profile and most severe treatment needs.

- 4) **Bail**
Unless transferred to adult court, juveniles should not be entitled to bail. Release on their own recognizance should be held pending the outcome of the proceedings.
- 5) **Separation of Offenders**
We support the separation of juveniles into classes of sophistication. Separation should be based upon case-by-case determinations, taking into account age, maturity, need for secure custody among other factors, since separation by age or offense alone can place very unsophisticated offenders among the more mature, sophisticated offenders.

In view of the high cost of constructing separate juvenile hall facilities, emphasis should be placed on establishment of facilities and programs that facilitate separation.
- 6) **Removal of Serious Offenders to Adult Court**
To the greatest extent possible, determinations regarding the fitness of serious offenders should be made by the juvenile court on a case-by-case basis.
- 7) **Jury Trial for Serious Offenders**
Except when transferred to adult court, juveniles should not be afforded the right to a jury trial — even when charged with a serious offense.

General Principles for Local Corrections

Definition

Local corrections include maximum, medium and minimum security incarceration, work furlough programs, home detention, county parole, probation, Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS) and community-based programs for convicted persons.

Purpose

We believe that swift and certain arrest, conviction, and punishment is a major deterrent to crime. Pragmatic experience justifies the continuation of rehabilitative programs for those convicted persons whom a court determines must be incarcerated and/or placed on local supervision.

In light of the state's recent efforts on corrections reform — primarily on recidivism and overcrowding in state detention facilities, counties feel it is essential to articulate their values and objectives as vital participants in the overall corrections continuum. Further, counties understand that they must be active participants in any successful effort to improve the corrections system in our state. Given that local and state corrections systems are interconnected, true reform must consider the advantage — if not necessity — of investing in local programs and services to help the state reduce the rate of growth in the prison population. Front-end investment in local programs and initiatives will enrich the changes currently being contemplated to the state system and, more importantly, will yield greater economic and social dividends that benefit communities across the state.

An optimum corrections strategy must feature a strong and committed partnership between the state and local governments. State and local authorities must focus on making productive use of offenders' time while in custody or under state or local supervision. A shared commitment to rehabilitation can help address the inextricably linked challenges of recidivism and facility overcrowding. The most effective method of rehabilitation is one that maintains ties to an offender's community.

Programs and services must be adequately funded to enable counties to accomplish their functions in the corrections system and to ensure successful outcomes for offenders. To the extent that new programs or services are contemplated, or proposed for realignment, support must be in the form of a dedicated, new and sustained funding source specific to the program and/or service rather than a redirection of existing resources, and adequate to achieve specific outcomes. In addition, any realignment must be examined in relation to how it affects the entire corrections continuum and in context of sound, evidence based practices. Any proposed realignment of programs and responsibility from the state to counties must be guided by CSAC's existing Realignment Principles.

System and process changes must recognize that the 58 California counties have unique characteristics, differing capacities, and diverse environments. Programs should be designed to promote innovation at the local level and to permit maximum flexibility, so that services can best target individual community needs and capacities.

Comment [SB1]: This section was previously stated in the CSAC Corrections Reform County Policy Principles and Guidelines attachment.

Equal Treatment

Conditions, treatment and correctional opportunities that are equal for all detainees, regardless of gender, are strongly supported. State policy must allow recognition of the individual's right to privacy and the differing programmatic needs of individuals.

Community-Based Corrections

The most cost-effective method of rehabilitating convicted persons is the least restrictive alternative that is close to the individual's community and should be encouraged where possible.

State policy must recognize that correctional programs must always be balanced against the need for public protection and that community-based corrections programs are only successful to the extent that they are sufficiently funded.

Relationship to Human Services Systems

State policy toward corrections should reflect a holistic philosophy, which recognizes that most persons entering the correctional system should be provided welfare, medical, mental health, vocational and educational services. Efforts to rehabilitate persons entering the correctional system should involve these other services, based on the needs — and, when possible, a risk assessment — of the individual.

Relationship to Mental Health System: Mentally Ill Diversion Programs

Adequate mental health services can reduce criminal justice costs and utilization. Appropriate diagnosis and treatment services, as well as increased use of diversion programs, will result in positive outcomes for offenders with a mental illness. Ultimately, appropriate mental health services will benefit the public safety system. Counties continue to work across disciplines to achieve good outcomes for persons with mental illness and/or co-occurring substance use disorder issues.

Inmate Medical Services

CSAC supports efforts at the federal level to permit local governments to access third-party payments for health care provided in detention facilities, including medical services provided for those who are accused, but not yet convicted. CSAC also supports efforts to ensure continuity of benefits for those detained in county detention facilities – adult and juvenile – and for swift reenrollment in the appropriate benefits program upon a detainee’s release.

Private Programs

Private correctional programs should be encouraged for those categories of offenders that can most effectively be rehabilitated in this manner.

Investment in Local Programs and Facilities

The state’s investment in local programs and facilities returns an overall benefit to the state corrections system and community safety. State support of local programs and facilities will aid materially in addressing the “revolving door” problem in state and local detention facilities.

The state should invest in improving, expanding and renovating local detention facilities to address overcrowding, early releases, and improved delivery of inmate health care. Incentives should be included to encourage in-custody treatment programs and other services.

The state should invest in adult probation services — using as a potential model the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) — to build a continuum of intervention, prevention, and supervision services for adult offenders.

The state should continue to fully support the successful JJCPA initiative, which provides a range of juvenile crime prevention and intervention programs and which represents a critical component of an overall crime reduction and public safety improvement strategy. Diverting juveniles from a life of offending will help to reduce pressure on the adult system.

The state should invest in mentally ill in-custody treatment and jail diversion programs, where treatment and services can help promote long-term stability in mentally ill offenders or those with co-occurring disorders, decrease recidivism, and divert appropriate offenders out of the criminal justice system.

The state should continue to invest in alcohol and drug treatment and diversion programs, including but not limited to outpatient treatment facilities, given that the vast majority of inmates in state and local systems struggle with addiction, which is a primary factor in their criminality.

Inmate Reentry Programs

Reentry programs represent a promising means for addressing recidivism by providing a continuum of care that facilitates early risk assessment, prevention, and transition of inmates back into the community through appropriate treatment, life skills training, job placement, and other services and supports. The state should consider further investment in multiagency programs authorized under SB 618¹, which are built on proven, evidence-based strategies including comprehensive pre-sentence assessments, in-custody treatment, targeted case management, and the development of an individualized life plan. These programs promote a permanent shift in the way nonviolent felony

Comment [SB2]: This section was previously stated in the CSAC Corrections Reform County Policy Principles and Guidelines attachment.

¹Chapter 603, Statutes of 2005.

offenders are managed, treated and released into their respective communities. Examples of program elements that have been demonstrated to improve offenders' chances for a successful reintegration into their communities upon release from custody include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a. Early risks and needs assessment that incorporates assessments of the need for treatment of alcohol and other drug abuse, and the degree of need for literacy, vocational and mental health services;
- b. In-custody treatment that is appropriate to each individual's needs — no one-size-fits-all programming;
- c. After care and relapse prevention services to maintain a "clean and sober" lifestyle;
- d. Strong linkages to treatment, vocational training, and support services in the community;
- e. Prearranged housing and employment (or vocational training) for offenders before release into their communities of residence;
- f. Completion of a reentry plan prior to the offenders' transition back into the community that addresses the following, but is not limited to: an offender's housing, employment, medical, dental, and rehabilitative service needs;
- g. Preparation of the community and offenders' families to receive and support each offender's new law-respecting and productive lifestyle before release through counseling and public education that recognize and address the inter-generational impact and cycles of criminal justice system involvement.
- h. Long-term mentorship and support from faith-based and other community and cultural support organizations that will last a lifetime, not just the duration of the parole period; and
- i. Community-based treatment options and sanctions.
- j. Counties believe that such reentry programs should include incentives for inmate participation.

Siting of New Facilities

Counties acknowledge that placement of correctional facilities is controversial. However, the state must be sensitive to community response to changing the use of, expanding, or siting new correctional facilities (prisons, community correctional facilities, or reentry facilities). Counties and other affected municipalities must be involved as active participants in planning and decision-making processes regarding site selection. Providing for security and appropriate mitigations to the local community are essential.

Impact on Local Treatment Capacity

Counties and the state must be aware of the impact on local communities' existing treatment capacity (e.g., mental health, drug treatment, vocational services, sex offender treatment, indigent healthcare, developmental services, and services for special needs populations) if the correction reforms contemplate a major new demand on services as part of development of community correctional facilities, reentry programs, or other locally based programs. Specialized treatment services that are not widely available are likely the first to be overtaxed. To prevent adverse impacts upon existing alcohol and drug and mental health treatment programs for primarily non-criminal justice system participants, treatment capacity shall be increased to accommodate criminal justice participants. In addition, treatment capacity shall be separately developed and funded.

Comment [SB3]: This section was previously stated in the CSAC Corrections Reform County Policy Principles and Guidelines attachment.

Impact on Local Criminal Justice Systems

Proposals must adequately assess the impact on local criminal justice systems (courts, prosecution and defense, probation, detention systems and local law enforcement).

Emerging and Best Practices

Counties support the development and implementation of a mechanism for collecting and sharing of best practices that can help advance correction reform efforts.

Comment [SB4]: This section was previously stated in the CSAC Corrections Reform County Policy Principles and Guidelines attachment.

Adult Correctional Institutions

Counties should continue to administer adult correctional institutions for those whose conviction(s) require and/or results in local incarceration.

The state and counties should establish a collaborative planning process to review the relationship of local and state corrections programs.

Counties should continue to have flexibility to build and operate facilities that meet local needs. Specific methods of administering facilities and programs should not be mandated by statute.

Adult Probation

Counties should continue to provide adult probation services as a cost-effective alternative to post-sentence incarceration and to provide services—as determined appropriate—to persons released from local correctional facilities. Counties should be given flexibility to allocate resources at the local level according to the specific needs of their probation population and consideration should be granted to programs that allow such discretion. State programs that provide fiscal incentives to counties for keeping convicted offenders out of state institutions should be discouraged unless such programs – on balance – result in system improvements. State funding should be based upon a state-county partnership effort that seeks to protect the public and to address the needs of individuals who come into contact with the justice system. Such a partnership would acknowledge that final decisions on commitments to state institutions are made by the courts, a separate branch of government, and are beyond the control of counties. Some integration of county probation and state parole services should be considered. Utilization of electronic monitoring for probationers and parolees should be considered where cost-effective and appropriate for local needs.

General Principles for Juvenile Corrections

We believe that efforts to curtail the criminal behavior of young people are of the highest priority need within the correctional area. The long-term costs resulting from young offenders who continue their criminal activities justifies extraordinary efforts to rehabilitate them.

Efforts should be made to force parents to assume greater responsibility for the actions of their children, including fines and sanctions, if necessary. Counties should be given flexibility to allocate resources at the local level according to the specific needs of their probation population and consideration should be granted to programs that allow such discretion. State programs that provide fiscal incentives to counties for keeping convicted offenders out of state institutions should be discouraged unless such programs – on balance – result in system improvements. Any program should recognize that final decisions on commitments to state institutions are made by the courts, a separate branch of government, and are beyond the control of counties.

Juvenile Correctional Institutions

Counties should continue to administer juvenile correctional institutions and programs for the majority of youths requiring institutionalization. Retention of youths at the local level benefits the state by reducing demands on programs and institutions operated by the California Division of Juvenile Justice.

While counties believe that a state-operated rehabilitation and detention system is a necessary component of the continuum of services for juvenile offenders, CSAC opposes efforts that would require any additional county subsidy of that system. The state should provide subvention for these activities at a reasonable level, with provisions for escalation so that actual expenses will be met.

Juvenile Probation

Counties should continue to provide juvenile probation services as a cost-effective alternative to post-adjudication and to provide juvenile probation services to individual youths and their families after the youth's release from a local correctional facility.

Truants, run-a-ways, and youths who are beyond the control of their parents should continue to be removed from the justice system except in unusual circumstances. These youths should be the responsibility of their parents and the community, not the government. Imposing fines and/or sanctions on parents to prompt their participation in their children's lives and involvement in the process should remain an option.

Gang Violence Prevention

Counties recognize the devastating societal impacts of gang violence – not only on the victims of gang-related crimes, but also on the lives of gang members and their families. Counties are committed to working with allied agencies, municipalities, and community-based organizations to address gang violence and to promote healthy and safe communities. These efforts require the support of federal and state governments and should employ regional strategies and partnerships, where appropriate.

Human Services System Referral of Juveniles

State policy toward juvenile corrections must be built on the realization that a juvenile offender may be more appropriately served in the human services system. Considering the high suicide potential of youths held in detention facilities and, acknowledging the fact that juvenile offenses are more often impulse activities than are adult offenses, juvenile cases and placement decisions should be reviewed more closely under this light.

Federal Criminal Justice Assistance

The federal government should continue to provide funding for projects that improve the operation and efficiency of the justice system and that improve the quality of justice. Such programs should provide for maximum local discretion in designing programs that are consistent with local needs and objectives.

Section 3: Sex Offender Management

For the safety and well-being of California's citizens, especially those most vulnerable to sexual assault, it is essential for counties and the state to manage known sex offenders living in our communities in ways that most effectively reduce the likelihood that they will commit another offense, whether such reoffending occurs while they are under the formal supervision of the criminal justice system or takes place after that period of supervision comes to an end.

In light of this counties need to develop strategies to 1) educate county residents, 2) effectively manage the sex offender population, which may or may not coincide with existing state policy, 3) assess which sex offenders are at the highest risk to re-offend and thus in need of monitoring and 4) partner with other state and local organizations that assist in supervision of sex offenders.

To that end, CSAC has adopted the following principles and policy on sex offender management.

Any effective sex offender management policy should contain restriction clauses that do not focus on where a sex offender lives but rather on the offender's movements. Counties believe an offender's activities and whereabouts pose a greater danger than his or her residence. Therefore, any strategy should consider the specific offense of the sex offender and prohibit his/her travel to areas that relate to their specific offense.

Each county, when taking actions to address and/or improve sex offender management within its boundaries, should do so in a manner that does not create difficulties for other counties to manage the sex offender population within their jurisdiction.

There are many community misconceptions about how to best monitor the sex offender population, how sex offenders are currently monitored and the threats sex offenders do and do not pose to communities. Any comprehensive sex offender management program must contain a community education component for it to be successful.

Supervision programs administered at the local level will require stable and adequate funding from the State to ensure that the programs are appropriately staffed, accessible to local law enforcement departments, and effective.

Global Positioning Systems (GPS) devices are but one of a multitude of tools that can be used simultaneously to monitor and supervise sex offenders. California counties believe that if the State is to adopt the use of GPS to monitor sex offenders a common system should be developed. This system should be portable and accessible no matter where an offender travels within California.

Counties and the state should rely more heavily on the use of risk and needs assessments to determine how to allocate resources. These assessments will allow an agency at the local level to determine who is most at risk to reoffend and in need of monitoring.

Regional collaboration should be encouraged as a means to address sex offender management.

The level of government with jurisdiction to supervise a sex offender (state parole or county probation) should be responsible and be given the authority for managing that offender.

Counties believe that for any policy to work, local governments and the State must work collaboratively to manage this population of offenders. The passage of Jessica's Law (Proposition 83, November 2006) intensified discussions regarding sex offender management and the public's perception about effective sex offender management policies. Accordingly, state and local governments should reexamine sex offender management policies.

Comment [SB5]: This section was previously stated in the Sex Offender Management County Principles and Policies attachment.

Section 4: Judicial Branch Matters

Trial Court Management

The recognized need for greater uniformity and efficiency in the trial courts must be balanced against the need for a court system that is responsive and adaptable to unique local circumstances. Any statewide administrative structure must provide a mechanism for consideration of local needs.

Trial Court Structure

We support a unified consolidated trial court system of general jurisdiction that maintains the accessibility provided by existing trial courts. The state shall continue to accept financial responsibility for any increased costs resulting from a unified system.

Trial Court Financing

Sole responsibility for the costs of trial court operations should reside with the state, not the counties. Nevertheless, counties continue to bear the fiscal responsibility for several local judicial services that are driven by state policy decision over which counties have little or no control. We strongly believe that it is appropriate for the state to assume greater fiscal responsibility for other justice services related to trial courts, including collaborative courts. Further, we urge that the definition of court operations financed by the state should include the district attorney, the public defender, court appointed counsel, and probation.

Trial Court Facilities

The court facility transfers process that concluded in 2009 places responsibility for trial court facility maintenance, construction, planning, design, rehabilitation, replacement, leasing, and acquisition squarely with the state judicial branch. Counties remain committed to working in partnership with the courts to fulfill the terms of the transfer agreements and to address transitional issues as they arise.

Court Services

Although court operation services are the responsibility of the state, certain county services provided by probation and sheriff departments are directly supportive of the trial courts. Bail and own recognizance investigations, as well as pre-sentence reports, should be provided by probation, sheriff, and other county departments to avoid duplication of functions, but their costs should be recognized as part of the cost of operating trial courts.

Jurors and Juries

Counties should be encouraged to support programs that maximize use of potential jurors and minimize unproductive waiting time. These programs can save money, while encouraging citizens to serve as jurors. These efforts must consider local needs and circumstances. To further promote efficiency, counties support the use of fewer than twelve person juries in civil cases.

Collaborative Courts

Counties support collaborative courts that address the needs and unique circumstances of specified populations such as the mentally ill, those with substance use disorders, and veterans. Given that the provision of county services is vital to the success of collaborative courts, these initiatives must be developed locally and entered into collaboratively with the joint commitment of the court and county. This decision making process must include advance identification of county resources – including, but not limited to, mental health treatment and alcohol and drug treatment programs and services,

prosecution and defense, and probations services – available to support the collaborative court in achieving its objectives.

Court and County Collection Efforts

Improving the collection of court-ordered debt is a shared commitment of counties and courts. An appropriately aggressive and successful collection effort yields important benefits for both courts and counties. Counties support local determination of both the governance and operational structure of the court-ordered debt collection program and remain committed to jointly pursuing with the courts strategies and options to maximize recovery of court-ordered debt.

Section 5: Family Violence

CSAC remains committed to raising awareness of the toll of family violence on families and communities by supporting efforts that target family violence prevention, intervention and treatment. Specific strategies for early intervention and success should be developed through cooperation between state and local governments, as well as community, and private organizations addressing family violence issues.

Since counties have specific responsibilities in certifying domestic violence batterer intervention programs, it is in the best interest of the state and counties that these programs provide treatment that addresses the criminogenic needs of offenders and looks at evidence-based or promising practices as the most effective standard for certifying batterer intervention programs.

Section 6: Government Liability

The current government liability system is out of balance. It functions almost exclusively as a source of compensation for injured parties. Other objectives of this system, such as the deterrence of wrongful conduct and protection of governmental decision-making, have been largely ignored. Moreover, as a compensatory system of ever-increasing proportions, it is unplanned, unpredictable and fiscally unsound – both for the legitimate claimant and for the taxpayers who fund public agencies.

Among the principal causes of these problems is the philosophy – expressed in statutes and decisions narrowing governmental immunities under the Tort Claims Act – that private loss should be shifted to society where possible on the basis of shared risk, irrespective of fault or responsibility in the traditional tort law sense.

The expansion of government liability over recent years has had the salutary effect of forcing public agencies to evaluate their activities in terms of risk and to adopt risk management practices. However, liability consciousness is eroding the independent judgment of public decision-makers. In many instances, mandated services are being performed at lower levels and non-mandated services are being reduced or eliminated altogether. Increasingly, funds and efforts are being diverted from programs serving the public to the insurance and legal judicial systems.

Until recently, there appeared to be no end to expansion of government liability costs. Now, however, the "deep pocket" has been cut off. Insurance is either unavailable or cost prohibitive and tax revenues are severely limited. Moreover, restricted revenue authority not only curtails the ability of public entities to pay, but also increases exposure to liability by reducing funding for maintenance and repair programs. As a result, public entities and ultimately, the Legislature, face difficult fiscal decisions when trying to

balance between the provision of governmental service and the continued expansion of government liability.

There is a need for data on the actual cost impacts of government tort liability. As a result of previous CSAC efforts, insurance costs for counties are fairly well documented. However, more information is needed about the cost of settlements and awards and about the very heavy "transactional costs" of administering and defending claims. We also need more information about the programmatic decisions being forced upon public entities: e.g., what activities are being dropped because of high liability? CSAC and its member counties must attempt to fill this information gap.

CSAC should advocate for the establishment of reasonable limits upon government liability and the balancing of compensatory function of the present system with the public interests in efficient, fiscally sound government. This does not imply a return to "sovereign immunity" concepts or a general turning away of injured parties. It simply recognizes, as did the original Tort Claims Act, that: (1) government should not be more liable than private parties, and (2) that in some cases there is reason for government to be less liable than private parties. It must be remembered that government exists to provide essential services to people and most of these services could not be provided otherwise. A private party faced with risks that are inherent in many government services would drop the activity and take up another line of work. Government does not have that option.

In attempting to limit government liability, CSAC's efforts should bring governmental liability into balance with the degree of fault and need for governmental service.

In advocating an "era of limits" in government liability, CSAC should take the view of the taxpayer rather than that of counties per se. At all governmental levels, it is the taxpayer who carries the real burden of government liability and has most at stake in bringing the present system into better balance. In this regard, it should be remembered that the insurance industry is not a shield, real or imagined, between the claimant and the taxpayer.

CSAC 2016-17 Administration of Justice Platform Update Process
Attachment Four
Realignment Platform Chapter

~~1-18-13~~

~~PROPOSED NEW PLATFORM CHAPTER/LANGUAGE: REALIGNMENT~~

~~Proposed for adoption by the CSAC Health and Human Service Policy Committee.
Approved by the Administration of Justice and Government Finance and
Operations Policy Committees November 2012.~~

~~Proposed Chapter:~~

DRAFT November 2016

Chapter 16

Realignment

In 2011, an array of law enforcement and health and human services programs – grouped under a broad definition of “public safety services” – was transferred to counties along with a defined revenue source. The 2011 Realignment package was a negotiated agreement with the Brown Administration and came with a promise, realized with the November 2012 passage of Proposition 30, of constitutional funding guarantees and protections against costs associated with future programmatic changes, including state and federal law changes as well as court decisions. Counties will oppose proposals to change the constitutional fiscal structure of 2011 Realignment, including proposals to change or redirect growth funding that does not follow the intent of the law.

Comment [CSAC1]: Edit made in response to concerns from Santa Clara County about growth funds being redirected.

CSAC will oppose efforts that limit county flexibility in implementing programs and services realigned in 2011 or infringe upon our individual and collective ability to innovate locally. Counties resolve to remain accountable to our local constituents in delivering high-quality programs that efficiently and effectively respond to local needs. Further, we support counties’ development of appropriate measures of local outcomes and dissemination of best practices.

These statements are intended to be read in conjunction with previously adopted and refined Realignment Principles, already incorporated in the CSAC Platform. ~~These below. These~~ principles, along with the protections enacted under Proposition 1A (2004), ~~would will~~ guide ~~counties’ our~~ response to any future proposal to shift additional state responsibilities to counties.

~~Attachment: 2010 CSAC Realignment Principles: Approved by the CSAC Board of Directors~~

~~Facing the most challenging fiscal environment in the California since the 1930s, counties are examining ways in which the state-local relationship can be restructured and improved to ensure safe and healthy communities. This effort, which will emphasize both fiscal adequacy and stability, does not seek to~~

Formatted: Footer

reopen the 1991 state-local Realignment framework. However, that framework will help illustrate and guide counties as we embark on a conversation about the risks and opportunities of any state-local realignment.

With the passage of Proposition 1A the state and counties entered into a new relationship whereby local property taxes, sales and use taxes, and Vehicle License Fees are constitutionally dedicated to local governments. Proposition 1A also provides that the Legislature must fund state-mandated programs; if not, the Legislature must suspend those state-mandated programs. Any effort to realign additional programs must occur in the context of these constitutional provisions.

Counties have agreed that any proposed realignment of programs should be subject to the following principles:

- 1) **Revenue Adequacy.** The revenues provided in the base year for each program must recognize existing levels of funding in relation to program need in light of recent reductions and the Human Services Funding Deficit. Revenues must also be at least as great as the expenditures for each program transferred and as great as expenditures would have been absent realignment. Revenues in the base year and future years must cover both direct and indirect costs. A county's share of costs for a realigned program or for services to a population that is a new county responsibility must not exceed the amount of realigned and federal revenue that it receives for the program or service. The state shall bear the financial responsibility for any costs in excess of realigned and federal revenues into the future. There must be a mechanism to protect against entitlement program costs consuming non-entitlement program funding.
 - a. The Human Services Funding Deficit is a result of the state funding its share of social services programs based on 2001 costs instead of the actual costs to counties to provide mandated services on behalf of the state. Realignment must recognize existing and potential future shortfalls in state responsibility that have resulted in an effective increase in the county share of program costs. In doing so, realignment must protect counties from de facto cost shifts from the state's failure to appropriately fund its share of programs.
- 2) **Revenue Source.** The designated revenue sources provided for program transfers must be levied statewide and allocated on the basis of programs and/or populations transferred; the designated revenue source(s) should not require a local vote. The state must not divert any federal revenue that it currently allocates to realigned programs.
- 3) **Transfer of Existing Realigned Programs to the State.** Any proposed swap of programs must be revenue neutral. If the state takes responsibility for a realigned program, the revenues transferred cannot be more than the counties received for that program or service in the last year for which the program was a county responsibility.
- 4) **Mandate Reimbursement.** Counties, the Administration, and the Legislature must work together to improve the process by which mandates are reviewed by the Legislature and its fiscal committees, claims made by local governments, and costs reimbursed by the State. Counties believe a more accurate and timely process is necessary for efficient provision of programs and services at the local level.

Formatted: Footer

- 5) **Local Control and Flexibility.** For discretionary programs, counties must have the maximum flexibility to manage the realigned programs and to design services for new populations transferred to county responsibility within the revenue base made available, including flexibility to transfer funds between programs. For entitlement programs, counties must have maximum flexibility over the design of service delivery and administration, to the extent allowable under federal law. Again, there must be a mechanism to protect against entitlement program costs consuming non-entitlement program funding.
- 6) **Federal Maintenance of Effort and Penalties.** Federal maintenance of effort requirements (the amount of funds the state puts up to receive federal funds, such as IV-E and TANF), as well as federal penalties and sanctions, must remain the responsibility of the state.

Administration of Justice Year in Review and 2017 Legislative Priorities
Attachment Five
Memo: AOJ Year in Review & 2017 Legislative Priorities



November 17, 2016

1100 K Street
Suite 101
Sacramento
California
95814

Telephone
916.327.7500

Facsimile
916.441.5507

To: CSAC Administration of Justice Policy Committee

From: Darby Kernan, Legislative Representative
Stanicia Boatner, Legislative Analyst

Re: **Administration of Justice Year in Review and 2017 Legislative Priorities**

The 2015-16 legislative session presented many high-priority bills with significant impacts to counties. In this memo, please find a review of 2016 highlights as well as priorities for the coming 2017 session.

2016 Legislation

SB 1157, by Senator Holly Mitchell, would have required local detention facilities that elect to use video or other types of electronic visitation to provide a specified number of in-person visits at the facility. For existing correctional facilities that do not provide in-person visitation, these facilities would have had to comply with these requirements by January 1, 2022. CSAC opposed this bill. (Vetoed)

AB 920, by Assembly Member Mike Gipson, extends the timeframe for the Inmate Welfare Fund (IWF) pilot program which funds re-entry services for indigent offenders. The use of the IWF for post-release indigent inmates helps with work placement programs, counseling, education, housing and helps pay for California identification cards and birth certificates. CSAC supported this measure. (Chaptered)

AB 1597, by Assembly Member Mark Stone, reduces recidivism and jail overcrowding by providing milestone credits for eligible prisoners to participate in education and life skills programs as they earn modest time reductions off their sentences. CSAC supported this measure. (Chaptered)

AB 1705, by Assembly Member Freddie Rodriguez, streamlines the detainee jail booking search process by giving peace officers the option of using a body scanner, clarifies that officers avoid knowingly performing a body scanner search on a pregnant woman and requires that the officer performing the search is of the same sex as the offender. CSAC supported this measure. (Chaptered)

AB 1854, by Assembly Member Richard Bloom, restores the ability for prosecutorial agencies and county counsel offices to recover their costs incurred in successfully opposing a motion to vacate the forfeiture of bail. CSAC co-sponsored this bill with the Los Angeles District Attorney's Office. (Chaptered)

AB 2012, by Assembly Member Frank Bigelow, allows Board of Supervisors in specified counties to authorize the Sheriff to create a Jail Industry Authority program. Jail Industry Authority programs that are linked to formal education and adult literacy training can significantly reduce recidivism, the rising costs of corrections, and criminal activities. CSAC supported this measure. (Chaptered)

AB 2765, by Assembly Member Shirley Weber, amends Proposition 47 to extend the petition process for a reduction of sentence to November 2022, or at a later date upon a showing of good cause. This provides more time for both counties and offenders to petition the court for resentencing. CSAC supported this measure. (Chaptered)

SB 266, by Senator Marty Block, authorizes county probation departments to use “flash incarceration” for a person on probation or mandatory supervision. CSAC supported this measure. (Chaptered)

SB 807, by Senator Ted Gaines, provides civil immunity to any emergency responder who damages a drone in the course of firefighting, air ambulance, or search-and-rescue operations. CSAC supported this measure. (Chaptered)

SB 872, by Senator Isadore Hall, allows a city council or county board of supervisors to offer a contract for law enforcement services to a private school, college or university, if that private school, college or university requests it. CSAC supported this measure. (Chaptered)

SB 881, by Senator Robert Hertzberg, is a bill that started off eliminating a county and courts ability to suspend an individual’s license for failure to appear. CSAC opposed this bill and was successful in having it amended to only make technical changes to the traffic amnesty program. SB 881 requires the courts to process applications in a timely manner and require all applications prior to March 2017 be processed for the traffic amnesty program. CSAC removed its opposition to SB 881. (Chaptered)

SB 885, by Senator Lois Wolk, would have eliminated the ability of a public agency to contract with engineers and architects, known as design professionals, for upfront legal defense costs against claims related to a project’s design work. CSAC actively opposed this bill and was successful in stopping this bill in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

SB 1064, by Senator Loni Hancock, extends the operation of Alameda County’s H.E.A.T. Watch pilot program indefinitely and expands the definition of commercially sexually exploited minors. The program is a comprehensive guide to help communities in their efforts to combat and prevent the proliferation of human trafficking as a criminal enterprise. CSAC supported this measure. (Chaptered)

SB 1289, by Senator Ricardo Lara, would have prohibited local law enforcement agencies and local governments from contracting with for-profit entities to detain immigrants. SB 1289 would limit counties ability to contract with specific providers the state currently contracts with for holding inmates in and out-of-state. CSAC opposed this bill. (Vetoed)

SB 1385, by Senator Connie Leyva, would have allowed the December 2, 2015 San Bernardino County terrorist attack to be eligible for a 100 percent reimbursement of costs through the California Disaster Assistance Act (CDAA). Unfortunately the Governor vetoed this measure because of long term implications on the General Fund. CSAC supported this measure. (Vetoed)

2017 Legislative Priorities

Domestic Violence Batterer Intervention Programs. In 2016, CSAC convened a comprehensive task force to review and reform California’s Batterer Intervention Program

statute. California's statute lays out a 52 week mandatory program for all domestic violence batterers, but does not provide structure or guidance to what cognitive behavioral treatments need to be provided to reduce recidivism among this population. The task force has convened several experts to discuss the length required for batterer intervention programs, guidance needed in the statute to address the criminogenic needs of offenders, improve outcomes of domestic violence batterers and reduce victimization. CSAC plans to sponsor legislation in the 2017-18 legislative session that will reflect the work of the task force.

Bail Reform. The nationwide movement for bail reform is advancing in California with several legislators already declaring legislation in 2017. CSAC will engage in the bail reform conversation to ensure that any reforms include a system that uses evidence-based risk assessment tools that create a uniform bail decision process and has public safety as its highest priority.

Electronic Visiting. Last year the Legislature passed and the Governor vetoed legislation that would mandate counties to provide in-person visiting for all offenders in county jail. While CSAC supports the importance of in-person visiting, there were clear issues with SB 1157 by Senator Holly Mitchell. Governor Brown vetoed the legislation stating that it did not provide adequate flexibility to counties and created a strict mandate. CSAC will actively work with the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) and our local partners on policies that protect counties' flexibility without imposing mandates.

Proposition 57. On November 8, 2016 California voters approved Proposition 57 which amended the California Constitution to give parole consideration to individuals sent to prison for a non-violent felony once they have completed the full term of their primary offense. The Initiative defines primary offense as the longest term imposed excluding any additional terms that are added to an offender's sentence such as enhancements, consecutive sentences, or alternative sentences. In addition, Proposition 57 amends the California Constitution to specify that the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) have the authority to award credits to inmates for good behavior and approved rehabilitative and educational achievements. Both of these provisions require the Secretary of CDCR to certify that they protect and enhance public safety. Proposition 57's intent is to give offenders an incentive to participate in rehabilitative programs in prison and earn an opportunity to go before the Board of Parole Hearings (BPH). CSAC will engage in the development of regulations and the implementation of the initiative with the Administration and the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR).

Homelessness and Poverty. Homelessness issues will remain at the top of the Legislature's agenda. California's poverty and homelessness rates remain among the highest in the nation, affecting all Californians, including children, adults, persons with mental illness, veterans, and seniors. CSAC will continue our collaboration with the League of California Cities on the joint City-County task force to examine issues and solutions for housing and homelessness. The task force is compiled of policy experts from health and human services, housing and land use, and administration of justice policy committees and staff. CSAC will offer a comprehensive solution that will help local jurisdictions address the issue at the root of the problem.

Court Security Funding. CSAC will continue to advocate for trial court security funding for new court facilities, built by the state and opened after October 9, 2011. After the passage of the 2011 Public Safety Realignment, court security costs became a state responsibility. As these new court facilities come online many require additional security staffing. CSAC will

remain engaged on this issue and work with the Administration to approve the appropriate ongoing funding levels for new court security costs.

Federal Priorities

State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (SCAAP). CSAC will continue to serve as a lead advocate in efforts to protect, as well as enhance, the SCAAP program, which is a key source of federal funding for a significant number of California's counties. CSAC will fight to restrict statutory language that authorizes the U.S. Department of Justice to transfer a significant percentage of SCAAP funding to other justice accounts. CSAC also will continue to advocate for a long-term reauthorization of SCAAP and will continue to seek several key changes to the program.

Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) Funding. The Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) Fund is supported by federal criminal fines and penalties. While dollars from fines/penalties comprise the entirety of the fund, congressional appropriators can adjust the cap. While most of the funding is allocated in the form of competitive grants, Cal OES recently established a \$40 million County Victim Services (XC) Program for fiscal years 2016/2017 and 2017/2018, with funds going directly to all 58 counties based on population and violent crime statistics. CSAC will continue to advocate for increased VOCA funding, which helps support domestic violence shelters, services for victims of human trafficking, and other services for victims of violent crimes.

Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). Federal VAWA grants fund direct services to women who are the victims of violent crime. Counties depend on VAWA funds for the community-based organizations that provide services, which include housing, treatment, and other direct-victim services. CSAC supports the highest possible funding level for VAWA grants.