

# Juvenile Justice Public Safety Improvement Act Oversight Council

October 8, 2019

Sioux Falls, South Dakota

## *Action Items*

- **Action Items**

1. Determine which areas of the state file petitions in lieu of juvenile citations;
2. Provide the DSS map of current services available statewide.

## *Meeting Documents*

- [2<sup>nd</sup> Circuit Deep Dive](#)
- [2<sup>nd</sup> Circuit Evidence-Based Service Report](#)
- [Agenda](#)
- [Bed Utilization Trends](#)
- [Citations Powerpoint](#)
- [Draft Annual Report](#)
- [JJPSIA Budget and Clients Served](#)
- [JJPSIA SDAYCP](#)
- [Services Description Handbook](#)
- [What's Next for JJRI Funded Services?](#)

## Call to Order

Chairman Greg Sattizahn called the meeting to order shortly after 10am.

## **Present**

- Andrew Robertson
- Bryan Harberts
- Kristi Bunkers
- Kelly Marnette
- Tom Hart
- Judge Scott Myren
- Senator Craig Kennedy
- Senator Alan Solano
- Tiffany Wolfgang
- Representative Kevin Jensen
- Justice Janine Kern
- Justice Steven Jensen
- Angela Shute (by phone)

## **Absent**

- Dr. Kelly Glodt
- Lindsey Riter-Rapp
- Neil Von Eschen
- Representative Kelly Sullivan
- Secretary David Flute
- Charles Frieberg

In addition to the Oversight Council members, there were judges, juvenile corrections agents (JCA), court service officers (UJS), service providers, members from law enforcement, legislators, school representatives, and prosecutors in the audience.

## Follow-Up Items from Rapid City Meeting

### *Juvenile Citations*

Mr. Sattizahn opened the meeting by reviewing data regarding [juvenile citation usage](#), which had been requested at the August meeting. The data shows that between FY 2016 and FY 2019, 50 percent of the youth (2166 juveniles) only received one citation and never received a citation or went to court again. 14 percent (596 youth) received a petition in lieu of a citation. Senator Kennedy inquired if there were certain areas of the state that favored petitions in lieu of citations. Mr. Sattizahn said that data was available, and would be presented at the next meeting (**Action Item 1**).

### *PRTF/IRT Discussion*

Bryan Harberts, from the South Dakota Youth Care Providers Association, walked the council through the [SDAYCP handout](#) that covered capacity and occupancy of group care, PRTF, and IRT beds. Senator Solano noted that he thought the movement over the past few years was a good thing. Keeping youth in custody of their parents, not the state, had benefits. Mr. Harberts noted that he appreciated that, but it could cause difficulties as a provider because parents can pull their child out of services at any time. It can be helpful to have a 3rd party objectively making decisions about the wellbeing of a child. However, he added that providers would say they do appreciate the family work. Justice Kern inquired if it were possible to break down what the other referral sources were (58 percent) in FY 2019 for PRTF. Mr. Harberts indicated that breaking down that number is difficult across each agency, and accurately gathering that information is something that the association is discussing. He said that most of youth are probably in the custody of their parents. There may be some school placements, but most are in parental custody. Justice Kern inquired if the DSS placements were mostly abuse and neglect cases, which Mr. Harberts answered in the affirmative.

Justice Jensen asked if Mr. Harberts felt that the treatment today was just as effective as it was five years ago when the youth would stay for a set amount of time instead of today when the parents have a greater ability of stopping treatment. Mr. Harberts replied that he thought it was better today. While there are some parents who may initially fight against it, there are many youths who are completely engaged. Also, he noted that if the youth was coming through DSS, there would probably be a parental difficulty regardless. When a child is placed in DOC, it is easier for the parent to just let DOC handle it. However, to place a child in PRTF, there is a process. The youth must first be qualified, and then the programs must sit down with each family individually to determine the problem. Finally, there is the accountability. No matter the process, it will be frustrating—but the overall treatment is better.

Kristi Bunkers from DOC added additional information about [bed utilization trends](#) in the state. Mr. Sattizahn inquired how it was assessed if enough beds were available. Ms. Bunkers answered that Child Protection at DSS evaluates and licenses the beds. They work with the SDYCPA to evaluate the need. Mr. Harberts added that at the group care level, there were enough beds from his perspective. In the last fiscal years, it has been an 83 percent and 73 percent occupancy. Senator Solano asked if there was a national metric that determined how

many beds should be available, like the metrics available that show at a certain population level, X number of hospital beds, jail beds, et cetera, should be available. He had attempted some research himself, but was unable to uncover such information.

Mr. Sattizahn asked Ms. Bunkers if it would be preferable to serve DOC youth in state, and what was missing to accomplish that goal. Ms. Bunkers indicated that yes, it was preferable to sending children out-of-state. The cost and numbers were the biggest challenge, because a program cannot be created for such small numbers. Judge Myren asked for the main reasons why youth were being served out-of-state. Ms. Bunkers said that the main reasons were related to behavioral issues and occupancy. Justice Kern recalled the Aberdeen meeting and the comments that were made about stabilization beds and the need for therapeutic foster beds. She inquired if any progress had been made. Mr. Harberts responded that as far as progress goes, there has not been movement in that area. There are a lot of challenges to establishing therapeutic foster beds, and the funding discussion is significant. Mr. Sattizahn said that if a youth is placed somewhere for a certain time period, it triggers regulatory oversight. He asked if there was a way the state could limit the regulatory oversight aspect by focusing on the short-term holds. Ms. Bunkers added that McCrossen and Wellfully fill some of that need for respite and transition beds. Tiffany Wolfgang said that Ms. Bunker's comments about the economy of scale was particularly important. Ms. Bunkers pointed out Abbott House has a successful therapeutic foster home. Mr. Harberts added that with group care, it is less formal than it used to be and all programs have a willingness to do a 1-3 day stay if there is a specific instance requiring attention. Senator Solano said that the state needed to look to see if the state is willing to pursue this endeavor.

Senator Jensen recalled that when STAR Academy closed, there were significant savings. He questioned what happened with the savings—if they were reinvested, or reallocated to different state priorities. Senator Solano answered that both things occurred—there were significant reinvestments on the youth side—4.5 million dollars. He assumed that the remaining money went elsewhere, but noted that 4.5 million dollars is still significant. There is still more that can be done to keep children in the community, but a lot of investing has already occurred. Ms. Wolfgang agreed, and pointed out that all the juvenile justice changes have been a massive system change. Building capacity has, and will continue to be, a difficulty. Judge Myren agreed that it was a large ship to turn, but there must be reinvestment into the services. Justice Kern added that the state must find the will and incentives to find the right types of services. To fully contribute to the discussion, it must be a data driven approach, similar to the past several oversight council meetings.

### *AG Data Follow-Up*

Mr. Sattizahn introduced the AG Data Follow-Up portion of the agenda by outlining what occurred after the Rapid City meeting. At that last meeting, the Council reviewed the Attorney General's arrest data concerning juvenile arrests related to drug-related incidents. After the meeting, the Rapid City police department reached out to the UJS because their internal numbers did not match the AG's crime statistics numbers. Kelly Marnette invited Erin Baumgart, a crime statistician, to explain the process. Ms. Baumgart explained how the

National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) can become complicated when discussing offenders and arrests. NIBRS is an incident reporting system, not a charge or arrest record. For example, when there is more than one offense in an incident, only one incident will be recorded for that incident, per FBI rules. The second discrepancy between the offender and arrest number is when the officer completes the case report, the officer is tasked with checking boxes as to what is applicable to each incident. The officer must say if the person is an offender, was arrested, et cetera. Officers may not completely click the arrestee data; therefore, the AG's office will not be receiving the complete data. Pursuing clean and complete datasets from the reporting agencies is a process that the AG's office is currently pursuing via training and awareness.

Mr. Sattizahn asked Ms. Baumgart if she thought arrest or offense data would be most helpful for the juvenile justice data tracking. Ms. Baumgart said that if the council wanted to look at trends, then offender data would provide a more accurate picture. Senator Solano referenced the document used in Rapid City that showed that the drug arrests were trending down. He noted that Ms. Baumgart identified a handful of items that could skew the data, and wondered if something had changed in FY 15-16 that would cause the data to be skewed differently. If the same challenges were skewing the data several years ago the same way it is skewing it today, it does not change the trend because the skewing would always be present in the data. Ms. Baumgart noted that turnover in police departments and training can have an impact on the numbers. She also added that she was not working for the state in FY 15-16 so she could not comment on the earlier processes. Senator Solano replied that he realizes training will always be a hit and miss; however, the trends seem indicative of something. Ms. Marnette added that the timeframe for when information comes to the office also varies by each entity. Ms. Baumgart explained that there is no timeframe when the office "locks" in data or no longer accepts data. Therefore, Attorney General crime statistics are only good for the day that the report is run.

Representative Jensen felt that the numbers were not accurate and did not match up with what he was hearing from the Lincoln County State's Attorney. He wondered if a child who was from Minnehaha county got picked up in Lincoln county, then the numbers would be placed in the Minnehaha county dataset. Ms. Baumgart said it was determined by whichever agency had jurisdiction over the incident. For example, if Lincoln county responds in Sioux Falls, then Lincoln county will take ownership of the numbers but if Sioux Falls PD responded it would not appear in Lincoln County.

Mr. Sattizahn clarified the reporting process. If four juveniles were arrested for possession at the same instance, then it would show up once in the arrest data. However, the offender data will show it as four separate entries. Ms. Baumgart agreed.

Senator Kennedy suggested having the prosecutors report the number of cases that are referred, not petitioned, to UJS to provide more information about how cases are being handled. That dataset would provide some of the numbers where gaps may exist in all the datasets. Judge Myren added that much of that information would be available with the

diversion data that is now collected by DOC. Representative Jensen responded that what is coming out of the court system does not reflect what the streets and law enforcement are seeing on the streets. Senator Kennedy replied that when he was a prosecutor, there were many times when an officer thinks a crime has been committed when there is actually nothing to prosecute. Ms. Baumgart added that NIBRS counts those incidents where an officer makes an arrest but the prosecutor cannot move forward with charges. Justice Jensen asked how difficult it would be to look at one fiscal year's drug arrests and diverted cases. A juvenile prosecutor from Minnehaha county indicated that it may be difficult--there are several discretionary points throughout that process, and an office may decide to do diversion in the field. However, the office does keep track of diversion data for submission to the state for reimbursement. Mr. Sattizahn added that offender-based data is probably preferable, supplemented with diversion data. The court data could be overlaid on top of it and pieced together to obtain the best picture possible. Judge Myren agreed—the council should not focus explicitly on specific numbers, but on trends. If the UJS data, AG data, and diversion data all show similar trends, then it could help provide the best picture possible.

### *Rapid City Youth Case Studies*

After the previous meeting, law enforcement was concerned about a handful of youth in the Rapid City community. UJS compiled non-identifying information about the youth's time on probation, whether the youth received services, and diversion opportunities offered to and completed by the youth. In broad terms, Mr. Sattizahn described the youth. One of the individuals had turned 18 before SB 73 was implemented, so none of the changes would have impacted that youth's handling. All were high risk/high needs, except for one medium risk youth. Three had been offered a diversion opportunity, and three were Abuse and Neglect cases. Four out of the five were already at DOC, so it does not appear that SB 73 was preventing the youth from being committed. Judge Myren asked if these youths should have been committed earlier. Ms. Bunkers informed the committee that her recollection was that all the youths came to DOC on findings—meaning that the youth was not placed in DOC for the reasons outlined in law, but that the judge found other aggravating reasons as to why DOC was the most suitable placement. Mr. Sattizahn added that all had been on probation, but the youth continued to engage in criminal matters, which resulted in several violations. Representative Jensen wondered if the charges shared by Mr. Sattizahn were the original charges, or if what the youth plead down to during the court process. Mr. Sattizahn answered that the charges he shared were what the youths were adjudicated on and agreed to by the court. Judge Myren explained that one of the original concepts of SB 73 was the truth in sentencing concept. If the prosecutor believes that the child should go to DOC, then the prosecutor will pursue the higher charge. Representative Jensen asked how frequently pleading down occurs. Mr. Sattizahn said that it sometimes occurs in cases where the prosecutor wants to avoid labeling a child—for example, avoid labeling a juvenile as a sex offender. Senator Solano added that this is something that has not changed because of SB 73—if the data is skewed in this manner because of charging decisions, then it was also skewed prior to SB 73. Representative Jensen felt that to a certain degree, the data is a result of subjective decisions. He asked if there was a way to have objective numbers. Judge Myren responded that judicial discretion has always been part of the judicial process and is not new for SB 73. Senator Kennedy also added that it is

not just the judges that are using discretion—it occurs in the field by law officers, and by the prosecutors, as well. Discretion has always been part of the juvenile and criminal justice system. Judge Myren also indicated that, if anything, the truth in sentencing concept has probably helped increase the objectivity in the numbers and made them more accurate. Justice Jensen noted that subjectivity cannot be removed from this process, and every step requires discretion. Therefore, it is impossible to see the actual hard numbers for what happened in the streets.

### *FFT/ART/MRT Outcomes*

#### *Reasons for Non-Completers*

At the previous meeting, members requested information about the reasons why youth do not complete services. Tiffany Glaser from DSS reported that a youth is considered a non-completer if the youth is incarcerated, runaway, placed out-of-home, or quits after at least one session. A CSO added that, in that final circumstance, the courts try to reengage if a youth is not participating in treatment. Filing a violation against the youth is the last resort. A different CSO indicated that they will re-refer several times if the first few attempts do not work. A JCA said that they follow-up with the families, which can be the biggest barriers. It often requires hand-holding, pushing, and prodding. Several providers described how a team approach is used to engage families, as well as offering incentives to the family and/or youth. If a family still cannot be reached, then the youth is referred back to services. The providers agreed that families are some of the biggest challenges.

#### *Recidivism Data*

Sadie Stevens from the UJS informed the council about the next efforts to determine recidivism rates for youth who had completed services. In order to paint the full picture and create objective standards, the study would compare the recidivism rates of three groups of youth: those that had completed services, those that had not completed services for a treatment related reason, and youth on probation that had not been referred to services. The study would use the UJS definition of recidivism, but also include CHINS violations as a recidivism event. Mr. Sattizahn added that this addition was an important consideration. For example, if a youth went to FFT and was truant, it would still show up in the study under the additional parameters even though the youth did not recidivate under the legal definition. Representative Jensen felt that the diversions, treatments, and citations allowed a youth to repeat lower level cases continually and allowed the youth to create a criminal mind because the court offered no consequences. The youth would grow up and commit more serious offenses. Senator Kennedy recalled the earlier discussion related to citations, and pointed out that 50 percent of the youth who had a citation never reentered the system. The purpose of the recidivism study would be to see how treatment impacted youth outcomes. Mr. Sattizahn felt this was valuable information, but was not something that could have been pursued sooner because it requires several years of data to analyze. The reforms have been in effect long enough now that the study can be more accurate. It will help add additional information to point to where and how the reforms may need additional work.

## 2<sup>nd</sup> Circuit Deep Dive

Mr. Sattizahn walked the group through the [2<sup>nd</sup> Circuit Deep Dive Document](#).

A provider noted during the portion about services that when MRT, ART, and FFT was added, there were already programs paid for by the federal government. So, if a youth finishes a service, there are other opportunities to roll that youth into another service upon completion. She felt that there was a good match in the Sioux Falls area, and their therapists were trained in cognitive behavioral therapy, acceptance-based behavioral treatment, and are prepared for trauma-induced situations. There are over 40 counselors in the Sioux Falls schools who are providing assessments, chemical dependency screenings, and can help facilitate out-patient treatments. Another provider added that sometimes there are other needs that make it hard for a family to engage. For example, if the family is struggling to provide food, clothing, and shelter. A different provider added that efforts were being made to offer full cradle to grave services, and to increase cross-referrals across the system. Ms. Bunkers noted that poverty can create a lot of barriers for youth and the family. She wondered if this was something the group should pursue. The provider responded that a family's base-level needs must be met to make progress, but reaching the families in that capacity can be a challenge. Ms. Glaser added that DSS has programs to help support families. While not every need can be addressed, there is funding available to help meet the basic needs—especially those impacting outcomes for youth. A provider noted that it is not uncommon for families who have finished services to call back and talk to the therapist when there is a problem. Families appreciate knowing that they can always call back for help.

Ms. Glaser presented the [2<sup>nd</sup> Circuit Evidence-Based Service Report](#), the [Services Description Handout](#), and the [What's Next for JJRI Funded Services](#) handout. Judge Myren asked why Systems of Care (SOC) was not available everywhere, and asked what the intention is for the future of that service. Ms. Wolfgang indicated that expansion was the ultimate goal. For example, there are areas not covered in the 4th circuit. Since DSS did not see full utilization of the JJRI budget for direct treatment, DSS looked at other ways to reach the youth earlier. There are a few positions and funding streams available to add additional counties. DSS is currently setting up meetings in those areas to discuss. Judge Myren noted that it looks like it has been good for outcomes, and that there should be statewide expansion. He referenced the maps in the annual report for the other services available, and inquired about FFT availability in Hughes county. Ms. Glaser replied that it was available in Hughes county during FY 19, but availability changed so FY20's map would reflect that change. Judge Myren asked what a judge should do in a county that does not have services. Ms. Wolfgang replied that the judge should still make the referral because other options are available. Judge Myren commented that some judges may be frustrated because the system was built with the expectation of services, but that is not the case and some services are not always available. Ms. Wolfgang replied that the services can be brought back if there are enough referrals. Mr. Sattizahn said that he did not see an increase of referrals on the horizon. The UJS tried mandatory referrals to see if that would help increase the numbers, but that did not seem to help increase the numbers. During a previous discussion between UJS and DSS, there were fewer counties that did not have FFT, but Mr. Sattizahn did

not know how to increase the referrals to bring back the service. Judge Myren felt that considering all this, SOC made a lot of sense. A provider noted that he believed it was better to start off with SOC. FFT can be hard to maintain from a provider perspective because it is a rigorous process for the counselors, who are paid less than teachers. However, a SOC team that is community supportive can help mitigate those challenges. DSS agreed to provide an updated map of services currently available. Action Item 2.

## Public Input

Mr. Sattizahn opened the floor for public comment.

Judge Joni Clark informed the group that a diversion coordinator had recently started in the county. While there were no numbers to report yet, the referrals have been made within two days, and the referrals and assessments have been made in two weeks—a sizable decrease from previous numbers. She also noted that it would be helpful to Minnehaha if the diversion fund was fully funded, instead of the current \$250,000 limit that is prorated. Judge Clark also added that truancy is one of the biggest issues, and has some of the saddest circumstances. In many ways, the court will operate like a problem-solving court. The judge added that the school resource officers have been very effective and she is still looking for culturally-based treatments. Overall, collaboration has been effective.

Several JCAs from DOC spoke about their experiences with referrals and outcomes, as well as the partnerships between the stakeholders and availability of services. Judge Myren pointed out that he was not surprised to hear that the most resource rich place was where the most success occurred. It gave him hope that some of the frustrations heard from other counties could dissipate if this model is followed.

Senator Solano was concerned that there were not enough court service officers to cover the state's juvenile population, and that the current CSOs were being stretched too thin. Chad Clark, the 2<sup>nd</sup> circuit's chief CSO, replied that high caseloads were a problem. CSOs have been shifted from the juvenile side to the adult side to compensate for the increased number of adult probationers. Senator Solano wondered if there were national benchmarks to indicate how large a caseload should be for a population. Justice Kern said that the numbers were available for the adult side. Mr. Sattizahn said this conversation was a common theme—pressure on the adult system means less resources for the juvenile side, and it is not unique to just the 2<sup>nd</sup> circuit. Judge Myren felt that high caseloads had the potential of undermining the whole intention, because a CSO needs to have sufficient time to supervise the caseload.

Judge Myren asked the CSOs if there were youth that they felt should have gone to DOC but could not solely based on the criteria. One CSO indicated that there were only a handful of youth she felt fell into this category and the system can usually get the youth to DOC when the youth needs to be at DOC. Judge Clark added that there are sometimes when she cannot commit a child to DOC due to the criteria. Justice Jensen asked Judge Clark if she could identify a category of children that are not covered in the legislation that should be covered. Judge



Clark reported that the cases often have numerous offenses involved, with serious drug activity. It is felony level activity, and often includes drug distribution. There is a lot of gang activity in Sioux Falls that involve youth. The legislation does not specifically mention youth with weapons in cars, or drugs for distribution. The RAI (Risk Assessment Instrument used for JDAI) does not have a point category for some of the offenses. Judge Clark added that if there is a gun present but it is not specifically the child's gun, she does not believe she can send the youth to DOC. As a judge, it is important to strictly follow the policy and law to find a DOC commitment with the original findings.

Representative Jensen said that these were the cases he was concerned about and hearing about on the street. He said that he heard that the youth are in the system too long, and commit felony after felony after felony.

A provider from Lutheran Social Services asked Judge Clark if she had a number of youth that fell into this category. The provider recalled the discussion in Rapid City that had resulted in the Youth Deep Dive. Judge Clark replied that she did not want to be an alarmist or escalate this—it is a small number of youth that she would classify as an issue, not a problem. Mr. Sattizahn noted that one of the challenges the Oversight Council has faced has been identifying the missing youth. Each part of the state has X number of youth who do not fit in a certain category, but uncovering that category has not been an easy endeavor. Judge Clark agreed that it is difficult to describe—not all have prior system involvement. However, drug involvement and distribution are a common theme. She sees drug trafficking at the direction of adult gang members as an issue. Adult gang members are exploiting youth to carry and deal drugs for the gang's benefit. Also, the presence of guns is common. Andrew Robertson agreed that it is not uncommon to see adults using children to carry out illegal gang activities. Judge Clark felt that the number was around 30 youth across two gangs. She thought that the most of them were probably already in DOC. Kristi Bunkers added that she would not be surprised—there had been a great influx over the past month or so. Judge Clark agreed and reiterated that while it can be frustrating as a judge, this only impacts a small number of youth.

A CSO added that he understands the frustration, especially as it relates to drugs and guns. The youth are coming from bad families, and oftentimes the families are not involved. Many of these youths are going to treatment 2-3 times. CSOs do their best to keep them in the community, but there are tough situations. Senator Solano asked if a 2<sup>nd</sup> Circuit CRT Team existed. He recalled an earlier conversation about whether CRT Teams should be statewide, and if the multi-systemic team approach could be helpful. A provider felt that the CRT concept really helped integrate information quicker and helped the systems cooperate better. Mr. Clark noted that when CRT Teams are used, it is at the end of the process and used to see what could be used to divert before DOC. He felt that there would be more benefit if the process was used in the beginning of the process, or earlier in the system.

Representative Jensen said that there were youth who will look a counselor in the eye and tell the counselor that nothing will make a difference. He asked what could be done to be more proactive.

Judge Clark said she felt as though a more intense and structured DOC commitment criterion would be helpful. Unless the offense was listed in the statute, or there was significant risk of harm to another person, then she could not commit a youth to the DOC. Senator Solano wondered if it would be helpful to allow that a judge, through findings through the CRT team, to be able to send a youth to DOC. Judge Clark said there would be pros and cons to that approach. Justice Kern asked if adding distribution of narcotics and presence of a weapon to the list would capture the described youth. Judge Clark felt that the presence of a weapon would be helpful. Judge Myren added that he felt that the presence of a firearm would fit, and while distribution is not a committable offense it could easily fall into one of the other categories if the policymakers pursued that route. Ms. Bunkers replied that she is already receiving youth like that through judicial findings. In fact, 45 percent of DOC youth in the last fiscal year were due to findings, not committable offenses.

#### DSS Budget Discussion

Tiffany Wolfgang from DSS walked through the [JJRI Initiative Budget and Client Served](#) handout.

In FY20, the Division of Behavioral Health projects to spend about 4.4 million in JJRI services. The department anticipates implementing Intensive Family Services to begin family services while a youth is placed out of the home, supporting a full year of evidence-based substance use disorder treatment for adolescents, adding 13 Systems of Care Coordinators, and expanding Family Support Programs with SOC expansion. Mr. Sattizahn inquired how many FTEs the division used for JJRI planning. Ms. Wolfgang indicated that there were four.

#### Annual Report

Mr. Sattizahn informed that the [annual report](#) was similar to previous annual reports and did not feel it necessary to walk through the report page by page. He asked members to submit edits to him in the next few weeks. Ms. Wolfgang compared the SD report to a juvenile justice annual report she had seen from Kansas, and appreciated how data-driven the SD report was. The Kansas report contained more narration and fewer numbers. Ms. Bunkers agreed, and said she thought it was good for South Dakota to continue focusing on the data—it can help the data remain objective.

#### Crossover Youth

During the final discussion item on the agenda, Mr. Sattizahn discussed the youth that have contact with DSS and with the courts. In the past few years, several other states have begun to coordinate between social services and the courts to see if that had a positive impact on the child. For example, Nebraska has created a workgroup between probation, DSS, and CPS to better serve these youths and their families. CPS has indicated that they are committed in this process, and the UJS and CPS will create a workgroup to address how they can better work together.

Speaker Steven Haugaard wondered what was being done to engage the community. He felt that there were people from churches who could serve as valuable mentors to youth. A member from LSS responded that there is a robust volunteer mentorship program for youth in Sioux Falls with 1,200 volunteers. Speaker Haugaard also added that he thought it was important to be more proactive, and that there should be more CSOs available to the courts. Senator Margaret Sutton informed the council that, as an appropriator, she wanted to see data and statistics related to proposals, programs, and initiatives.

#### Next Steps

Mr. Sattizahn informed the council that the UJS would work on legislation to try to meet the criterion described during today's meeting, and then bring a draft to the council via an ITV meeting in November.

Senator Solano asked Ms. Bunkers about the plan to fully fund the diversion program. Ms. Bunkers informed him that the DOC budget had already been submitted, but there were drafts for a bill to address this issue. Speaker Haugaard told the council that the legislature could deviate from the governor's budget. Representative Jensen agreed, and added that there is an appetite in the legislature to work on juvenile justice.

Mr. Sattizahn also informed the council that it would sunset in September unless the legislature extended the life of the body. Judge Myren indicated that he felt that there was a lot of work to do.

#### Adjourn

Mr. Sattizahn adjourned the meeting at 4pm. The next meeting will be in November via ITV.