

## **JUVENILE HALL: SAFE, SECURE AND SUPPORTIVE ... BUT DOES IT HAVE SURPLUS SPACE?**

### **SUMMARY**

In 2016 San Luis Obispo County (County) completed a \$20 million expansion of its Juvenile Hall (Hall), increasing it from 18,000 to 42,000 square feet and from 45 to 65 beds. The project was many years in the making. While 15, 10 or even 5 years ago, no one would have questioned the need for a larger Hall, a look through the rear-view mirror suggests it may have been overbuilt. When a facility has excess space, there is the potential for unnecessary cost.

The County's Probation Department (Probation) is implementing a program that will make use of some of this excess space. In fact, repurposing some of this space was one of the County's objectives in building the larger Hall. Adding more space to the Hall has allowed Probation to realize a long-term goal: converting part of the Hall to an in-custody treatment program.

Probation is repurposing an old 15-bed unit and using some of the Hall's new space to treat youthful offenders in a secure setting. The treatment program adds 7 juvenile services officers to the Hall's staff of 36. The program is expected to pay for itself by saving the County money it would otherwise spend placing these youthful offenders elsewhere.

Potential for underuse remains even with the inclusion of the treatment program. Unless staffing can flex with the Hall's daily census, other uses may need to be made of the Hall's excess space to make the facility cost-effective.

### **ORIGIN**

The Grand Jury initiated this report of its own volition and not from a complaint.

## **AUTHORITY**

*California Penal Code section 919(b)* requires the Grand Jury to “inquire into the condition and management of the public prisons within the county.”

## **METHOD/PROCEDURE**

The Grand Jury gathered information for this report through:

- Interviewing Probation, the District Attorney’s Office (DA), Department of Social Services and County Office of Education relevant staff
- Holding discussions with other juvenile justice stakeholders
- Studying reports listed in the bibliography, including Marin and San Mateo county civil grand jury reports that expressed similar concerns about juvenile detention facility excess space
- Reviewing relevant County Board of Supervisors (Board) meeting materials, budget reports, juvenile detention needs assessment reports and information requested from County officials
- Analyzing County juvenile population growth estimates prepared by California’s Department of Finance
- Researching issues and trends related to juvenile offenders, juvenile justice and repurposing of juvenile detention facilities
- Visiting the Hall, once in September 2016, before the expansion was occupied and again in March 2017, after the transition occurred and the treatment program was underway

## **INTRODUCTION**

San Luis Obispo County has a population of about 22,600 youths age 10 to 17 and a Juvenile Hall with beds for 65 youths. Before its recent expansion, it had 45 beds. Juvenile arrests, booking into the Hall, and the Hall’s average daily population have declined significantly since fiscal year 2010-11 when planning for the expanded Hall was well underway. Juvenile crime is

down and the growth of the County’s youth population has stagnated. Unless trends reverse, the larger Hall will have underutilized space.

Probation is using a portion of the expanded Hall’s excess space—an old 15-bed housing unit—for an in-custody treatment program which has long been identified by the County as a gap in its youth services. Operating costs for this repurposed space are expected to be offset by revenues and cost-savings in other areas so the program can pay for itself rather than adding more cost to running the larger Hall.

Even with the repurposing of some of its old detention beds, the Hall may still be too big to operate cost-effectively. Other repurposing may be needed, or cost-reduction measures put in place, to operate the expanded Hall in a more cost-effective manner.

## **NARRATIVE**

The Hall is the detention arm of the County’s juvenile services center. It is located at 1067 Kansas Avenue, about five miles west of the city of San Luis Obispo. The original Hall was completed in 1981. Before its expansion, it had 45 beds.

The expansion provides higher-security beds and space to better serve youths’ therapeutic, educational and recreational needs. It also improves working conditions for staff. The State paid \$13.1 million toward the cost of the expansion. County general fund dollars paid the remaining \$6.9 million. California is selling bonds to finance its share of the expansion’s cost. Until these bonds have been paid, the State has a say in how the new space can be used<sup>1</sup>.

## **THE ORIGINAL HALL—WHAT WAS LACKING**

---

<sup>1</sup> The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, in conjunction with the State of California Public Works Board, is providing long-term financing for the State’s funding of the expansion through the sale of lease revenue bonds. The State is subleasing the new space back to the County so that the County can operate the new space over the term the bonds are paid back to the State. The new space represents the security for the bonds.

Reports to the Board indicate Probation considered the old facility inadequate in many ways.

Concerns included:

- No adequate administrative or staff space. The juvenile hall's superintendent and assistant superintendent were housed in space with no privacy to conduct personnel matters. Staff lockers were located inside the facility's staff meeting room which created access problems when the room was in use.
- No showers or changing facilities for staff. Staff had to be sent home to change when contaminated by bodily fluids or pepper spray.
- No private counseling space for therapists to conduct individual or group therapy for youth with mental health issues.
- No designated classrooms. Education was conducted in the housing units and was subject to disruption by youth confined to their sleeping rooms.
- No adequate indoor space for legally-required large muscle activity.
- No high-security rooms. The facility lacked higher security housing for youth posing a greater security risk and requiring greater separation from the rest of the youth population.

### **WHAT THE BUILD-OUT PROVIDED**

The expansion built three separate structures, including:

- A single-story 8600 square foot building with 20 sleeping rooms, day room space and counseling rooms, and an adjacent outdoor recreation yard
- A two-story 9800 square foot building with three classrooms on the first floor and staff showers, lockers and administrative offices on the second floor
- A 5000 square foot multipurpose gymnasium

In all, the expansion added 24,000 square feet to the original 18,000 square foot facility along with 20 more beds. Ten additional beds were included in the design but were not built.

### **OPERATING THE HALL – WHAT IT COSTS**

Hall operating costs were \$5.9 million during fiscal year 2015-16, the year before the expansion came on line. General fund costs were \$4.7 million; \$1.2 million was paid from other sources. See Table 1 in the Appendix.

Most of the costs to operate the Hall are due to required staffing which, because of California's Title 15 requirements, cannot easily flex based on the daily census. These costs are generally fixed. So, as the number of youth decreases, the cost per youth increases. The fiscal year 2015-16 cost was \$702 per day per youth based on the average daily population of 23 youth. Had the Hall been at capacity, the cost would have been \$359 per day per youth.

Staffing requirements aside, the larger infrastructure will require additional custodial and maintenance services. The County's fiscal year 2016-17 budget reported that facility services costs are projected to increase going forward due to the Hall's expansion. The new square footage will also increase the Hall's utility bills. Therefore, in future years, the annual cost to operate the Hall will be greater than before the expansion occurred.

## **THE ELEPHANT IN THE ROOM**

The expansion made the Hall more modern and spacious, with improved facilities to better meet the needs of youth and staff. The opportunity to add 24,000 square feet to the Hall and pay just one-third of the cost probably will not come again. But the question is whether, as of today, the need exists for this substantial increase in beds. Like other juvenile halls throughout California,<sup>2</sup> the Hall includes beds that have been going empty.

### ***Hall Population Trends – Up, Then Way Down***

Things looked different in 2002 when consultants prepared a needs assessment to help the County look out to the year 2030. The assessment projected County juvenile justice and delinquency trends including the number of youth likely to spend time in the Hall. The study noted the Hall had suffered from overcrowding during the 1990s, peaking in 1995 when the

---

<sup>2</sup> In 2015, California county juvenile detention facilities had capacity for 13,007 youth, an average daily population of 6,926 youth, and space available for 6,081 youth.

Hall's average daily population of 44 youth exceeded the 40-bed capacity the Hall had at the time.

Use of the Hall moderated after 1995. The Hall's average daily population declined for a time; by 2000 the average daily population was 33. By 2001 bed capacity had increased to 45 and, the report noted, overcrowding had been largely eliminated. Nevertheless, the study concluded the Hall's average daily population would to grow to at least 71 by 2030 driven largely by expected growth in the County's youth population.

The County commissioned another needs assessment in 2007 to support its request for State funds to help build a bigger Hall. Consultants found the Hall significantly crowded—the Hall's average daily population was 48 that year. The study recommended 30 more beds but noted that County growth and juvenile crime trends did not support adding more than 30 beds.

The County was successful in its request for \$13.1 million in State funding. But by fiscal year 2010-11, when the Board directed staff to move ahead with the expansion project, trends were starting to go in the other direction.

Bookings into the Hall decreased 47 percent between fiscal years 2010-11 and 2015-16. The Hall's average daily population decreased 38 percent. Filings by the DA's office charging juveniles with a criminal offense decreased 64 percent. See Table 2 in the Appendix.

An in-depth discussion regarding the reasons for fewer bookings, more empty beds and fewer juvenile criminal charges is beyond the scope of this report. However, no research the Grand Jury has reviewed suggests these trends will reverse within the foreseeable future. A dramatic slowing in the County's juvenile population growth rate<sup>3</sup>, declining juvenile crime rate<sup>4</sup>,

---

<sup>3</sup> The County's juvenile population, age 10 to 17 years, is expected to grow, on average, only one-quarter of one percent each year during the next 40 years. See Table 3 in the Appendix.

<sup>4</sup> The Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act requires all California counties to report on the annual county arrest rate per 100,000 juveniles age 10 to 17. These reports indicate the County's juvenile arrest rate dropped 55% between 2010 and 2014.

increased emphasis on prevention and early intervention, and reluctance to use incarceration when other less-restrictive sanctions are available—all of this suggests the Hall's underutilization could be a long-term truth.

***Could the Trend Reverse?***

This is not to say the Grand Jury has a crystal ball. It is possible the pendulum will swing the other way at some point and, should it do so, it is good the County has a juvenile hall ready to house a larger youth population.

- The County's youth population could grow significantly more than the State of California Department of Finance has estimated. A larger youth population could cause youth crime to go up even if the overall youth crime rate remained the same or went down.
- More youth crime could occur even without significant growth in the County's youth population. Gangs pushing through the County's borders could cause youth gang-related criminal behavior to increase. The economy could plunge again and motivate more youth to commit property theft. Laws that de-criminalized certain youth behavior or reduced felonies to misdemeanors could be repealed.
- The County's juvenile court could change its current philosophy which is oriented toward rehabilitation, and order more youth locked up.
- The charging pattern of the DA's office could change. More youth could be charged with a crime enhancement that would require incarceration.
- Probation's philosophy could change when a successor replaces the department's current chief. A new chief could be less interested in using early intervention and diversion with youthful offenders and more inclined to recommend detention in the Hall.

And, although outside the scope of this report, new legislation including AB 403 and Proposition 57 could cause Hall usage to increase. AB 403 reduces reliance on group homes for long-term placement of youthful offenders. Proposition 57 requires that, before youth can be transferred to adult court, they must have a hearing in juvenile court to determine whether they should be transferred.

**REPURPOSING PART OF THE HALL – THE ACADEMY**

***Not a New Idea***

At the same time adding 20 beds was being planned, so was repurposing one of the old facility's three 15-bed units. It was not a new idea. Repurposing part of the Hall had been on Probation's radar for years.

In fact, in 1999, the Board gave Probation the go-ahead to apply for a license to run a group home within the Hall in one of the 15-bed units, seeing the lack of a residential treatment program as a gap in youth services. The Board was told detention staff would maintain a population of up to 30 youth in the other two units of the Hall and that staffing needs in the Hall would remain the same. (The average daily population during fiscal years 1997 and 1998 had been 28, so freeing up 15 of the facility's 45 beds was not seen as an issue.) The group home was ultimately not developed. The average daily detention population increased and took up the housing Probation had hoped to use for the group home program.

***Trying it Again***

Once the expansion was done, Probation told the Board, one of the Hall's existing housing pods would be used as a treatment center. Part of the justification for the build-out was that adding 20 high-security detention beds, with room to add 10 more beds in the future, would free up 15 beds in the Hall's east unit for a treatment center. The lack of a treatment center was identified as a service weakness in the County's Comprehensive Multi-Agency Juvenile Case Plan. The term "repurposed" was used to describe the treatment center. The Board was told the Hall's expansion would allow "*existing space to be repurposed to provide treatment programs that keep juveniles in County and out of group homes.*"

Probation would recommend the youth who would be suitable, but program participation would be court-ordered. The program would treat offenders in the 14 to 17 age range with behavioral, mental health or addiction problems. Its treatment models would target identified at-risk factors to rehabilitate participants in a secure setting. It would reduce the number of youthful offenders sent to group homes located largely outside the County. Probation would be able to house and

treat offenders within the local community and closer to their families rather than transporting them to facilities far away.

Probation did extensive preparation for the program's implementation by:

- Creating a workgroup to design the program
- Employing the University of Cincinnati Corrections Institute to develop the program's substance abuse treatment and cognitive behavioral therapy curriculum
- Researching in-custody treatment program best practices and principles
- Visiting in-custody treatment programs in Santa Barbara, Ventura, and Orange counties and a program in Portland, Oregon
- Consulting and coordinating with Family Care Network, the outside treatment provider under contract to provide most of the program's therapeutic services

Probation has not finalized the written operational manual for the treatment program. According to the County's 2015-16 budget, the manual was scheduled to have been completed in September 2016. As of mid-April 2017, the Grand Jury was informed the manual was not yet finished.

The rehabilitative benefits of an in-custody treatment program that keeps youthful offenders close to home and enables family involvement are outside the scope of this report. The Grand Jury was told outcomes are expected to be better. Participants who successfully complete the program are expected to pose a lower re-offending risk. Although located inside the Hall the treatment unit has a different look and feel. Clothing for youth is less institutional; furnishings and décor are more home-like. Participants have a dedicated classroom, special education credentialed teacher and para-educator for educational instruction. Youth who make good progress can participate in off-site community activities and work service projects and receive home passes. Probation has named the program Coastal Valley Academy (CVA).

The Grand Jury observed youth participating in the CVA in March 2017, shortly after the program opened. The Grand Jury was impressed with the enthusiasm for the program exhibited by the youth, as well as Probation management and the Hall's custody, educational and

administrative staff. It is clear all involved have a strong desire for the program to succeed. Five youth were enrolled on the day the Grand Jury visited.

A partial repurposing already underway—the conversion of detention beds into treatment beds—will make use of some of the excess space. In the Grand Jury’s view, this repurposing is appropriate and has been well-planned. But what will this alternative use cost?

***The Cost Question***

The County’s fiscal year 2016-17 budget reported the treatment program would have a net zero impact to its general fund. Revenues and general fund savings from fewer group home placements are expected to equal general fund program costs. The County budgeted \$880,091 to run the program this year, including costs for seven additional staff, but expects offsets in group home savings and Public Safety Realignment revenues to equal the \$880,091 it plans to spend:

*“When fully operational the Juvenile Hall expansion will require seven additional positions to staff the expanded facility. Annual staffing and operating costs are estimated to be \$660,665. First year expenses for the treatment program mainly due to one-time purchases are estimated to be \$69,426. Annual counseling services for the treatment program are estimated to be \$150,000. The Probation Department intends to offset this expense by annual savings in group home placements which are estimated to be \$670,689 and with additional annual revenues from Public Safety Realignment estimated to be \$209,402.”<sup>5</sup>*

The net zero impact will not be achieved if anticipated savings in group home placements are not realized, unless the County makes cuts in other budget areas. General fund savings will depend on the number of youth the County can avoid placing in group home settings.

***The Reporting Dilemma***

Probation produces comprehensive annual statistical reports and posts them on its website for use by researchers and other members of the public with an interest in knowing more about the

---

<sup>5</sup> Source: County’s fiscal year 2016-17 final budget, page C-413.

offenders under Probation's supervision. These reports include trend data, including the Hall's average daily population. With a dual-purpose facility, serving both treatment needs and detention needs, the Hall's average daily population could trend up even if significant underuse remains.

The dilemma is how to calculate the numbers. If the Hall's average daily population is calculated based on all youth residing in the Hall, this will decrease transparency and mask the extent of underuse. For example, if all 15 beds in the treatment unit are occupied on average, and 23 out of 50 beds in the detention units are occupied on average, the Hall's overall average daily population would be 38, which is 58 percent of its overall 65-bed capacity.

If the numbers are calculated separately for the treatment side and the detention side, transparency increases regarding utilization but complicates statistical reporting. In the above example, the treatment side would be at 100 percent of its 15-bed capacity and the detention side at 46 percent of its 50-bed capacity.

Average and median length of stay statistics could also trend up depending upon how the data is reported since the treatment program is expected to involve a stay of up to 180 days or longer. Average length of stay in the Hall was 23.5 days in fiscal year 2015-16; median length of stay, 13 days.

### **OTHER POTENTIAL ALTERNATIVE USES**

Through interviews with County staff and research on what other counties have done to repurpose underused juvenile detention space, several suggestions surfaced. The Grand Jury has not evaluated the feasibility of implementing these suggestions; their potential to make the Hall's infrastructure more cost-effective and require less general fund support; or the retrofitting that would be required. And, while the State has no say in alternative uses involving the old facility, the Grand Jury has not evaluated how the State might react to any repurposing involving the new facility. With these caveats in mind, the Grand Jury offers several suggestions for consideration in the event of the Hall's sustained underuse.

- Lease treatment beds to other counties which lack an in-custody treatment program for youthful offenders who would benefit from a secure-setting rehabilitative program.
- Lease space to the County Sheriff for day uses benefiting inmates at the nearby County Jail, including therapeutic programming, vocational training, and/or reentry center providing job training and life skills (including basic finance) to inmates nearing the end of their sentences.
- Move young adult offenders (age 18-20) from the Jail to the Hall to separate them from older, more criminally sophisticated inmates and provide them with rehabilitative services the Jail lacks. Sleeping rooms in the Hall are not the required size for adult offenders but would meet required size minimums for offenders in the 18-20 age group.
- Mothball a portion of the old facility and dedicate a portion of the estimated yearly savings in staffing and other costs to fund additional or enhanced intensive community supervision, therapeutic services, crisis intervention and diversion programs.
- Work out a leasing arrangement for the new multipurpose gymnasium with organizations willing to run a sports boot camp or other programs for at-risk youth when the gym is not in use and contribute to the gym's upkeep expense.
- Contract with an outside organization to run programs benefiting the community in underused space.
- Hold a community forum. Ask County citizens to give their input on how underutilized space at the Hall could be repurposed.

## CONCLUSIONS

The expanded Hall has 65 beds, although the Hall's average daily population <sup>6</sup> was 23 during the fiscal year before the expansion opened. In hindsight, the Hall was likely overbuilt, although excess space allows Probation the opportunity to open an in-custody treatment program within the hall to treat high-needs youthful offenders. Probation is repurposing one of the Hall's old units to run this treatment program but the program's net zero impact to the County's general

---

<sup>6</sup> The Grand Jury understands bed needs are not the same as average daily population and that the Hall needs to be able to handle days when the population is higher than average and provide for the flexibility to separate youth by gender, age, seriousness of offense, etc. However, average daily population is a standard statistic used and reported by counties as a measure of occupancy versus capacity.

fund has yet to be seen. Even with this repurposing, the Hall's underuse could be significant and prolonged, although the Hall's reported average daily population could mask underuse if Probation does not separate out statistics for the treatment side versus the detention side of the Hall. Underuse has cost implications for County taxpayers. Alternative uses may provide solutions.

## **FINDINGS**

F1. Juvenile Hall staff members demonstrate an impressive level of care and concern for the safety, security, well-being and rehabilitation of the youth under their care.

F2. With its new expansion, Juvenile Hall has more space than it is likely to need.

F3. It has been 10 years since the last Juvenile Hall needs analysis was prepared.

F4. The treatment program's repurposing of 15 beds is not expected to impact the County budget, but this depends on expected group home cost-savings or cuts in other budget areas to make the program cost-neutral. If the treatment program does not pay for itself, it adds to the expense of running a larger Juvenile Hall instead of staffing and using its infrastructure more cost-effectively.

F5. The treatment program is operating without a written operational manual.

F6. A dual-purpose facility creates a statistical reporting dilemma. Occupancy trends may be harder to discern depending on how data is reported. Data such as average daily population and average length of stay are used by researchers and members of the public interested in understanding juvenile justice trends. If the numbers from both the treatment unit and the detention units are aggregated in developing this data, trends will become more difficult to discern. If the numbers are separated out, transparency will increase but reporting the data will become more complicated.

F7. Even assuming the treatment program increases the Juvenile Hall's usage and cost-effectiveness, the larger Hall may still cost too much for the overall use it is likely to get. Additional repurposing could reduce overall operating costs.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

R1. The Board should commission a new needs analysis for completion no later than June 30, 2019, to help the County understand if 50 detention beds are too many and if the Juvenile Hall being too big adds unnecessarily to the County's general fund expense.

*The last needs analysis was in 2007. While the Grand Jury believes it is time for a new needs analysis to be done, waiting until fiscal year 2018-19 to do so will give the County time to experience the effects of new legislation (AB 403 and Proposition 57) and the impact on Juvenile Hall usage.*

R2. The Board should request a report on program costs versus group home savings as part of its annual budget hearings, starting with the budget hearings for fiscal year 2017-18. If expected savings are not achieved, the Board should decide if cuts in other areas of the County's budget are needed to allow this important program to continue.

*The benefits of a treatment program in the Juvenile Hall need to be weighed against the costs. Probation has suggested it would make cuts in other areas of its budget if expected group home cost savings are not realized. Probation's desire to do what is in the best interest of County youth is important. Transparency in the program's net impact to the County budget is important as well.*

R3. Probation should separately report statistical data for Juvenile Hall's treatment population versus its detention population for improved transparency.

R4. If the results of the needs analysis in R1 indicate a sustained underuse, the County should determine no later than June 30, 2020, whether the repurposing suggestions in this report or other alternative uses would benefit the community and improve Juvenile Hall’s cost effectiveness, would be feasible to implement, and would be consistent with the County’s lease agreement with the State.

*As an alternative to repurposing, a staffing pattern that flexes based on the number of youth occupants—that is, based on usage—would improve cost-effectiveness.*

## **COMMENDATIONS**

The Grand Jury commends the Probation Department, the District Attorney’s office, the Juvenile Court, the Department of Social Services, the County Office of Education, the Juvenile Justice Commission and the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Commission for their compassionate and caring attitude toward the County’s youth and the determined efforts they make in their ongoing mission to keep youth out of the juvenile justice system and help those who do offend rehabilitate and mature into responsible adults.

The Grand Jury also commends Probation for posting comprehensive annual statistical reports on its website for use by researchers and members of the public interested in knowing more about the offenders Probation supervises.

## **REQUIRED RESPONSES**

The Board of Supervisors is required to respond to Findings 2, 3, 4 and 7 and Recommendations 1, 2 and 4.

The Probation Department is required to respond to Findings 2-7 and Recommendation 3.

The responses shall be submitted to the Presiding Judge of the San Luis Obispo County Superior Court by July 5, 2017. Please provide a paper copy and an electronic version of all responses to the Grand Jury.

Presiding Judge	Grand Jury
Presiding Judge Barry T. LaBarbera Superior Court of California 1035 Palm Street Room 355 San Luis Obispo, CA 93408	San Luis Obispo County Grand Jury P.O. Box 4910 San Luis Obispo, CA 93403

**APPENDIX**

**TABLE 1**

Juvenile Hall Operating Costs, Fiscal Year 2015-16\*

Agency	FY 2015-16 General Fund	FY 2015-16 Other Funding	FY 2015-16 Combined
Probation	\$4,710,771	\$93,242	\$4,804,013
Law Enforcement Medical Care	\$0	\$537,061	\$537,061
County Office of Education	\$0	\$552,888	\$552,888
Total FY 2015-16 Cost	\$4,710,771 (80%)	\$1,183,191 (20%)	<b>\$5,893,962</b>

\*Source: County Auditor-Controller and County Office of Education

**TABLE 2**

Juvenile Hall Bookings, Juvenile Hall Average Daily Population and DA’s Office Filings of Juvenile Criminal Charges: Fiscal Year 2010-11 through 2015-16\*:

FISCAL YEAR	NUMBER OF JUVENILE HALL BOOKINGS	JUVENILE HALL AVERAGE DAILY POPULATION	FILINGS OF JUVENILE CRIMINAL CHARGES
2010-11	677	36.9	702
2011-12	633	30.7	658
2012-13	638	34.0	726
2013-14	520	26.6	298
2014-15	433	27.8	274
2015-16	355	23.0	257

\*Source: Probation for Hall bookings and average daily population; County final budgets for filings of juvenile criminal charges

**TABLE 3**

San Luis Obispo County Estimated Youth Population Aged 10 to 17 \*:

YEAR	ESTIMATED YOUTH POPULATION	PERCENT CHANGE FROM PRIOR ESTIMATE	PERCENT CHANGE FROM 2017
2017	22,682		
2027	24,487	8%	8%
2037	23,959	-2%	6%
2047	23,521	-2%	4%
2057	24,953	6%	10%

\*Source: State of California Department of Finance County Population Projections:

<http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/projections/>.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 2014-15 Marin County Civil Grand Jury Final Reports, *Marin County Juvenile Hall: A Time for a Change*, June 25, 2015. <http://www.marincounty.org/depts/gj/reports-and-responses/reports-responses/2014-15/juvenile-hall>.
- 2015-16 San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury Final Reports, *Juvenile Services Division's Youth Detention Facilities: Underutilized and Overpriced?* July 20, 2016. [http://www.sanmateocourt.org/documents/grand\\_jury/2015/youth\\_detention\\_facilities.pdf](http://www.sanmateocourt.org/documents/grand_jury/2015/youth_detention_facilities.pdf)
- California – Child and Family Services Review, System Improvement Plan 2015-2020, County of San Luis Obispo, approved by Board of Supervisors November 3, 2015. <http://www.slocounty.ca.gov/Assets/DSS/Reports/2015+SLO+SIP+Report.pdf>
- California – Child and Family Services Review, Annual SIP Progress Report, 2015-2016, June 10, 2015-June 10, 2016, County of San Luis Obispo. <http://www.childsworld.ca.gov/res/SIPs/2016/SanLuisObispoSIP.pdf>
- California Sentencing Institute, A Project of the Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice, interactive map for San Luis Obispo County showing population-adjusted rates of juvenile arrests and incarcerations, 2009-2015. <http://casi.cjcj.org/Juvenile/San-Luis-Obispo>
- Kidsdata.org, A Program of Lucile Packard Foundation for Children's Health, County of San Luis Obispo Under-18 Population 1995 – 2016. <http://www.kidsdata.org/topic/32/childpopulation/trend#fmt=139&loc=2,361&tf=13,88>.
- Males, Mike. "California's Radical Youth Trends," Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice, San Francisco, July 29, 2014. <http://www.cjcj.org/news/7994>
- San Luis Obispo County Probation Department Annual Statistical Report Fiscal Year 2013-14, Amended January 2017. <http://www.slocounty.ca.gov/Assets/PR/Annual+Statistical+Report+FY+13-14.pdf>
- San Luis Obispo County Probation Department Annual Statistical Report Fiscal Year 2014-15, Amended January 2017. <http://www.slocounty.ca.gov/Assets/PR/Annual+Statistical+Report+FY14-15.pdf>

San Luis Obispo County Probation Department Annual Statistical Report Fiscal Year 2015-16,  
Amended January 2017.

<http://www.slocounty.ca.gov/Assets/PR/Annual+Statistical+Report+FY15-16.pdf>

U.S. Department of Justice Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Statistical  
Briefing Book, Law Enforcement & Juvenile Crime, Juvenile Arrest Rate Trends.

[https://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/crime/JAR\\_Display.asp?ID=qa05201](https://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/crime/JAR_Display.asp?ID=qa05201)