

**AGENDA****ASSEMBLY BUDGET SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5 ON PUBLIC SAFETY****ASSEMBLYMEMBER GIL CEDILLO, CHAIR****Wednesday, March 28, 2012  
1:30 P.M. - STATE CAPITOL ROOM 437**

<b>CONSENT CALENDAR</b>	
<b>ITEM</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>
<b>0690</b>	<b>CALIFORNIA EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY</b>
ISSUE 1	WORKFORCE CAP PLAN
ISSUE 2	REAPPROPRIATION OF BONDS
ISSUE 3	FEDERAL JUSTICE ASSISTANCE GRANT STIMULUS
<b>5225</b>	<b>CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION</b>
ISSUE 1	WORKFORCE CAP PLAN
ISSUE 2	OFFICE OF FISCAL SERVICES REDUCTION
ISSUE 3	FEDERATED DATA CENTER STAFFING TRANSFER

<b>ITEMS TO BE HEARD</b>		
<b>ITEM</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	
<b>0690</b>	<b>CALIFORNIA EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY</b>	<b>1</b>
ISSUE 1	CALIFORNIA SPECIALIZED TRAINING INSTITUTE	<b>1</b>
ISSUE 2	EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS GRANTS	<b>4</b>
<b>5225</b>	<b>CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION</b>	<b>7</b>
ISSUE 1	DIVISION OF JUVENILE JUSTICE REALIGNMENT	<b>8</b>
<b>5227</b>	<b>BOARD OF STATE AND COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS</b>	<b>11</b>
ISSUE 1	ESTABLISHMENT OF THE BOARD OF STATE AND COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS	<b>12</b>

## 0690 CALIFORNIA EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

The principal objective of the California Emergency Management Agency (Cal EMA) is to reduce vulnerability to hazards and crimes through emergency management and criminal justice to ensure a safe and resilient California. The Cal EMA coordinates emergency activities to save lives and reduce property loss during disasters and to expedite recovery from the effects of disasters. Cal EMA provides leadership, assistance, and support to state and local agencies in planning and preparing for the most effective use of federal, state, local, and private sector resources in emergencies. This emergency planning is based upon a system of mutual aid whereby a jurisdiction relies first on its own resources, and then requests assistance from its neighbors. The Cal EMA's plans and programs are coordinated with those of the federal government, other states, and state and local agencies within California.

During an emergency, the Cal EMA functions as the Governor's immediate staff to coordinate the state's responsibilities under the Emergency Services Act and applicable federal statutes. It also acts as the conduit for federal assistance through natural disaster grants and federal agency support. Additionally, the Cal EMA is responsible for the development and coordination of a comprehensive state strategy related to all hazards that includes prevention, preparedness, and response and recovery.

The Governor's Budget proposes \$1.3 billion (\$113.1 million General Fund) and 545.2 positions. This reflects a decrease of \$85 million (\$2.5 million General Fund) and 26.1 positions as compared to the 2011-12 budget.

Fund Source (000s)	2010-11 Actual	2011-12 Projected	2012-13 Proposed	BY to CY Change	% Change
<b>General Fund</b>	\$144,450	\$115,575	\$113,107	\$(2,468)	(2)%
<b>Other Funds</b>	1,203,280	1,224,920	1,141,947	(82,973)	(7)
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	\$1,347,730	\$1,340,495	\$1,255,054	\$(85,441)	(6)%
<b>Positions</b>	561.7	571.3	545.2	(26.1)	(5)

### ISSUE 1: CALIFORNIA SPECIALIZED TRAINING INSTITUTE

The Subcommittees will consider the Governor's proposal to eliminate the California Specialized Training Institute in San Luis Obispo and move program oversight to Mather while also establishing two regional training facilities in northern and southern California.

**BACKGROUND**

Pursuant to Government Code Section 8588.3, the Cal EMA is responsible for overseeing the functions of the California Specialized Training Institute (CSTI). The CSTI is responsible for coordinating a significant portion of the state's emergency management training programs. More specifically, the CSTI provides training to state, local, federal, private sector, and foreign partners. The curriculum at the current facility includes the state's standardized emergency management system, hazardous material response, and contingency planning amongst a variety of other disaster mitigation related activities. Approximately 30 percent of training is provided by state instructors on-site at the CSTI training center in San Luis Obispo, often utilizing the center's specialty facilities and equipment (including prop tanker railcars, big-rig trucks, a firing range, and a mock courtroom). Most of the courses (about 70 percent) are taught by instructors who travel to trainees' local areas. According to the administration, funding for CSTI comes from a combination of federal grant funds (\$2.1 million), reimbursements from local authorities (\$3.8 million), and the state General Fund (\$1 million) and supports 26 authorized positions. Local authorities are currently responsible for the costs associated with their employees traveling to the San Luis Obispo center to receive training, including overtime, subsistence, and backfilling necessary positions while trainees are away.

**PROPOSAL**

The Administration is proposing to close the CSTI training center by January 1, 2013. The CSTI would retain responsibility for development of a curriculum, certifying local agencies, and providing some emergency management training on-location, but many responsibilities for training would shift to locally governed training centers operated by Joint Powers Authorities (JPA). The CSTI staff would be reduced by 20 positions over two years, and federal funds would be diverted to the JPAs. In total, the proposal would reduce the Cal EMA budget by \$2 million in 2012-13 and \$4.2 million in 2013-14. Of these amounts, \$187,000 in 2012-13 and \$377,000 in 2013-14 are from the General Fund.

**PANEL**

- ❖ California Emergency Management Agency – Please be prepared to address the following in your testimony:
  - Have moving costs been identified and included in the proposal?
  - What is your assessment of the need for environmental cleanup at the existing CSTI site?
  - Have specific Joint Powers Authorities, capable of taking on this workload, been identified?
- ❖ Legislative Analyst's Office
- ❖ Department of Finance
- ❖ Public Comment

**STAFF COMMENT**

The Administration has cited financial burdens in addition to local input and access as the primary drivers of this proposal. While this proposal warrants discussion based on its potential to address the aforementioned issues, staff is concerned that the proposal does not clearly address numerous other issues including:

- costs associated with properly evacuating the San Luis Obispo facility;
- costs associated with the establishment of new regional sites;
- specific locations for regional sites, and;
- which training curricula will be retained and/or discontinued.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Hold item open pending further discussions.

**ISSUE 2: EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS GRANTS FOR 2012 (INFORMATIONAL ITEM)**

The Subcommittees will review the Cal EMA's plan for attaining and utilizing Federal Emergency Preparedness Grant funds.

**BACKGROUND**

On February 17, 2012, Secretary of Homeland Security Janet Napolitano announced the release of the 2012 grant guidance and application kits for seven preparedness grant programs totaling over \$1.3 billion to assist states, urban areas, tribal and territorial governments, non-profit agencies, and the private sector in strengthening our nation's ability to prevent, protect, respond to, and recover from terrorist attacks, major disasters and other emergencies in support of the National Preparedness Goal.

The total amount of grant funds available in 2012 represents a reduction of nearly \$1 billion from the 2011 level. Taking this significant reduction into account, Secretary Napolitano identified streamlined goals for this year's program. These goals include focusing on the areas that face the greatest risk, mitigating and responding to evolving threats, and building and sustaining the core capabilities outlined in the National Preparedness Goal.

The 2012 grants are also intended to focus on the Nation's highest risk areas, including urban areas that continue to face the most significant threats. Dedicated funding is provided for law enforcement and terrorism prevention activities throughout the country to prepare for and prevent and respond to pre-operational activity and other crimes that are precursors or indicators of terrorist activity.

The 2012 grant guidance incorporates input from the Department of Homeland Security's (DHS) state, local, tribal, territorial and private sector partners and details specific steps undertaken by DHS to improve the ability of state and local partners to apply for and utilize grant funding. On February 13, 2012, the DHS released the guidance to state administrative agencies to expedite the expenditure of Certain DHS/FEMA Grant Funding, which provides a series of initiatives to help accelerate the drawdown of grant funding, enabling grantees to put previously awarded grant funding to work now in order to build and sustain core capabilities and address evolving threats.

**Preparedness Grant Program Allocations for Fiscal Year 2012**

**Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP)** — Provides more than \$830 million for states and urban areas to prevent, protect against, mitigate, respond to, and recover from acts of terrorism and other threats.

- **State Homeland Security Program (SHSP)** — Provides **\$294 million** to support the implementation of state homeland security strategies to build and strengthen preparedness capabilities at all levels. The 9/11 Act requires states to dedicate 25 percent of SHSP funds to law enforcement terrorism prevention activities.

- **Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI)** — Provides more than **\$490 million** to enhance regional preparedness and capabilities in 31 high-threat, high-density areas. The 9/11 Act requires states to dedicate 25 percent of UASI funds to law enforcement terrorism prevention activities.
- **Operation Stonegarden (OPSG)** — Provides more than **\$46 million** to enhance cooperation and coordination among federal, state, territorial, tribal and local law enforcement agencies to jointly enhance security along the United States land and water borders.

**Emergency Management Performance Grants (EMPG) Program** — Provides more than **\$339 million** to assist state and local governments in enhancing and sustaining all-hazards emergency management capabilities.

**Tribal Homeland Security Grant Program (THSGP)** — Provides **\$6 million** to eligible tribal applicants to implement preparedness initiatives to help strengthen the nation against risk associated with potential terrorist attacks and other hazards.

**Nonprofit Security Grant Program (NSGP)** — Provides **\$10 million** to support target hardening and other physical security enhancements for nonprofit organizations determined to be at high risk of a terrorist attack and located within one of the fiscal year 2012 UASI-eligible urban areas.

**Intercity Passenger Rail (Amtrak) Program** — Provides **\$10 million** to protect critical surface transportation infrastructure and the traveling public from terrorism and increase the resilience of the Amtrak rail system.

**Port Security Grant Program (PSGP)** — Provides more than **\$97 million** to help protect critical port infrastructure from terrorism, enhance maritime domain awareness and strengthen risk management capabilities in order to protect against improvised explosive devices and other non-conventional weapons.

**Transit Security Grant Program (TSGP)** — Provides more than **\$87 million** to owners and operators of transit systems to protect critical surface transportation and the traveling public from acts of terrorism and to increase the resilience of transit infrastructure.

**PANEL**

- ❖ California Emergency Management Agency – Please be prepared to address the following in your testimony:
  - Does the Administration have an estimate on what California's share of the 2012 grant funding will be?
  - What is the state's strategy for attaining these funds?
  - What are the allowable uses of these funds?
- ❖ Legislative Analyst's Office
- ❖ Department of Finance

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Informational Item.

---

**5225 CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION**

---

The mission of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) is to enhance public safety through safe and secure incarceration of offenders, effective parole supervision, and rehabilitative strategies to successfully reintegrate offenders into our communities. The CDCR is organized into the following Adult and Juvenile programs:

- ❖ Corrections and Rehabilitation Administration;
- ❖ Corrections Standards Authority;
- ❖ Adult Corrections and Rehabilitation Operations: Security; Inmate Support; Contracted Facilities; Institution Administration;
- ❖ Parole Operations: Adult Supervision; Adult Community Based Programs; Administration;
- ❖ Board of Parole Hearings: Adult Hearings; Administration;
- ❖ Adult: Education, Vocation, and Offender Programs: Education; Substance Abuse Program; Inmate Activities; Administration;
- ❖ Adult Health Care Services; and,
- ❖ Juvenile: Operations and Offender Programs; Academic and Vocational Education; Parole Operations; Health Care Services.

As one of the largest departments in state government, the CDCR operates 36 youth and adult correctional facilities and 44 youth and adult camps. In addition, the CDCR contracts for multiple adult parolee service centers and community correctional facilities. The CDCR also operates family foundation facilities, adult prisoner/mother facilities, youth and adult parole units and sub-units, parole outpatient clinics, licensed general acute care hospitals, regional parole headquarters, licensed correctional treatment centers, hemodialysis clinics, outpatient housing units, a correctional training center, a licensed skilled nursing facility, and a hospice program for the terminally ill. In addition, the CDCR has six regional accounting offices and leases more than two million square feet of office space. The CDCR's infrastructure includes more than 40 million square feet of building space on more than 26,000 acres of land (40 square miles) statewide.

The Governor's Budget proposes \$8.9 billion (\$8.7 billion General Fund) and 58,528.2 positions for CDCR operations in 2012-13. This reflects a decrease of \$364.2 million (\$316.1 million General Fund) and 2,621.9 positions from the 2011-12 Budget Act. The Governor is also proposing \$1.3 billion (\$52 million General Fund) for infrastructure needs. This reflects a decrease of \$1 billion (\$28 million General Fund) from the 2011-12 Budget Act.



Fund Source (000s)	2010-11 Actual	2011-12 Projected	2012-13 Proposed	BY to CY Change	% Change
<b>General Fund</b>	\$ 9,481,820	\$ 8,980,824	\$ 8,664,771	\$ (316,053)	(4)%
<b>General Fund, Proposition 98</b>	24,510	23,623	21,229	(2,394)	(-10)
<b>Other Funds</b>	214,963	247,604	201,832	(45,772)	(-18)
<b>Infrastructure Funding</b>	564,616	2,272,277	1,262,102	(1,010,175)	(44)
<b>Infrastructure Funding General Fund (Non-add)</b>	20,436	23,852	51,835	27,983	117
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	\$10,285,909	\$11,524,328	\$10,149,934	\$ (1,374,394)	(12)%
<b>Positions</b>	57,620.6	61,150.1	58,528.2	(2,621.9)	(4)

#### ISSUE 1: DIVISION OF JUVENILE JUSTICE REALIGNMENT

The issue before the Subcommittee is the Governor's proposal to realign the Division of Juvenile Justice.

#### BACKGROUND

The Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ), originally known as the California Youth Authority (CYA), was created by statute in 1941 and began operating in 1943, providing training and parole supervision for juvenile and young adult offenders.

In a reorganization of the California corrections agencies in 2005, the CYA became the DJJ within the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. Currently, the DJJ receives its youthful offender population from both juvenile and adult court referrals.

The DJJ carries out its responsibilities through three divisions: the Division of Juvenile Facilities, the Division of Juvenile Programs, and the Division of Juvenile Parole Operations. The Juvenile Parole Board, an administrative body separate from DJJ, determines a youth's parole readiness.

Youthful offenders committed directly to the DJJ do not receive determinate sentences. A youthful offender's length of stay is determined by the severity of the committing offense and

their progress toward parole readiness; however, the DJJ is authorized to house youths until age 21 or 25, depending upon their commitment offense.

The DJJ also provides housing for youths under the age of 18 who have been sentenced to state prison. Youths sentenced to state prison may remain at DJJ until age 18, or if the youth can complete his or her sentence prior to age 21, the DJJ may house him or her until released to parole.

The vast majority of youthful offenders are now directed to county programs, enabling direct access and closer proximity to their homes, families, social programs and services, and other support systems. Those youths directed to the DJJ have been convicted of the most serious and violent crimes and/or are most in need of the specialized treatment services necessary for their success. DJJ youth represent approximately one percent of the 225,000 youth arrests each year.

In 2007, the DJJ underwent a realignment which limited DJJ commitments to juveniles who are violent, serious, and/or sex offenders, pursuant to SB 81. As a result, the state's fifty-eight counties developed county-specific approaches to address the needs of their local juvenile populations including housing, rehabilitation, and prevention programs.

In the 2012-13 Governor's Budget, the Governor is proposing to further realign juvenile justice activities by stopping the commitment of new juvenile offenders to the DJJ, effective January 1, 2013. The assumption is that remaining population counts will eventually erode through attrition.

In order to prepare counties for this change, the Governor's Budget includes the suspension of a current year budget trigger reduction requiring counties to pay an annual fee of \$125,000 per ward housed with the DJJ. The Governor is also proposing a \$10 million General Fund augmentation to support local planning and transition efforts.

## PANELS

### Panel 1

- ❖ California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation
- ❖ Legislative Analyst's Office
- ❖ Department of Finance

### Panel 2

- ❖ Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice
- ❖ Books Not Bars
- ❖ Chief Probation Officers of California
- ❖ Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office

**STAFF COMMENT**

Although the Administration has not yet provided a comprehensive proposal, stakeholders have identified a number of issues that should be addressed in any final proposal. These issues include 1) creating a funding formula for the payments to counties, 2) identifying whether counties have or could develop sufficient capacity to house additional serious juvenile offenders, 3) developing incentives for increased efficiency and improved outcomes (such as reduced recidivism of these juvenile offenders); and, 4) assessing potential unintended consequences of this proposal (such as a possible increase in the number of juveniles tried as adults and sentenced to state prison).

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

No Action. The Administration is expected to update the proposal in May.

## 5227 BOARD OF STATE AND COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

The mission of the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) is to provide statewide leadership, coordination, and technical assistance to promote effective state and local efforts and partnerships in California's adult and juvenile criminal justice system, including providing technical assistance and coordination to local governments related to realignment. This mission reflects the principle of aligning fiscal policy and correctional practices, including prevention, intervention, suppression, supervision, and incapacitation. The goal is to promote a justice investment strategy that fits each county and is consistent with the integrated statewide goal of improved public safety through cost-effective, promising, and evidence-based strategies for managing criminal justice populations.

The BSCC is organized into the following programs:

- BSCC Administration and Program Support;
- Corrections Planning and Grant Programs;
- Local Facility Standards and Operations; and,
- Standards and Training for Local Corrections.

SB 92 (Budget and Fiscal Review Committee), Chapter 36, Statutes of 2011 as amended by AB 116 (Budget Committee), Chapter 136, Statutes of 2011, abolished the Corrections Standards Authority (CSA) within the CDCR and established the BSCC as an independent entity, effective July 1, 2012. The BSCC will absorb the previous functions of the CSA as well as various other public safety programs previously administered by the California Emergency Management Agency.

The Governor's Budget proposes \$109.1 million (\$16.9 million General Fund) and 70.3 positions for the establishment of the BSCC through the transfer of position and expenditure authority from CDCR and the California Emergency Management Agency.

<b>Fund Source (000s)</b>	<b>2010-11 Actual</b>	<b>2011-12 Projected</b>	<b>2012-13 Proposed</b>	<b>BY to CY Change</b>	<b>% Change</b>
<b>General Fund</b>	\$0	\$0	\$16,923	\$16,923	100%
<b>Other Funds</b>	0	0	92,238	92,238	100
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	\$0	\$0	\$109,161	\$109,161	100%
<b>Positions</b>	0	0	70.3	70.3	100

Effective July 1, 2012, the BSCC will be responsible for providing statewide leadership, coordination, and technical assistance to promote effective state and local efforts and partnerships in California's adult and juvenile criminal justice system. Of specific importance will be the BSCC's role in coordinating with and assisting local governments as they continue with implementation of the 2011 Public safety Realignment over the next several years.

A primary goal of the BSCC will be to guide statewide public safety policies and ensure that all available resources are maximized and directed to programs that are proven to reduce crime and recidivism among all offenders.

#### ISSUE 1: ESTABLISHMENT OF THE BOARD OF STATE AND COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

The issue before the Subcommittee is the Governor's proposal to provide funding and staffing for the Board of State and Community Corrections.

#### BACKGROUND

Originally, the Board of Corrections (BOC) was established in 1944 as part of the state prison system. Effective July 1, 2005, as part of the corrections agency consolidation, the Corrections Standards Authority (CSA) was created within CDCR by bringing together the BOC and the Correctional Peace Officers Standards and Training (CPOST) commission. The reorganization consolidated the duties and functions of the BOC and CPOST and entrusted the CSA with new responsibilities. The CSA works in partnership with city and county officials to develop and maintain standards for the construction and operation of local jails and juvenile detention facilities and for the employment and training of local corrections and probation personnel. The CSA also inspects local adult and juvenile detention facilities, administers funding programs for local facility construction, administers grant programs that address crime and delinquency, and conducts special studies relative to the public safety of California's communities.

The CSA currently operates using a four divisional structure:

- **Facilities Standards and Operations Division.** The Facilities Standards and Operations Division works in collaboration with local corrections agencies to maintain and enhance the safety, security, and efficiency of local jails and juvenile detention facilities.
- **Corrections Planning and Programs Division.** The Corrections Planning and Programs Division plans, develops, and administers programs in collaboration with local and State corrections agencies to enhance the effectiveness of correctional systems and improve public safety.
- **Standards and Training for Corrections Division.** The Standards and Training for Corrections Division works in collaboration with State and local corrections and public/private training providers in developing and administering programs designed to ensure the competency of State and local corrections professionals.
- **County Facilities Construction Division.** The County Facilities Construction Division works in collaboration with State and local government agencies in administering funding for county detention facility construction projects, for the purpose of enhancing public safety and conditions of confinement.

Legislation associated with the 2011 Budget Act abolished the CSA and established the new BSCC as an independent entity, effective July 1, 2012. The BSCC will absorb the previous functions of the CSA as well as other public safety programs previously administered by Cal EMA. Specific statutory changes include:

- Abolish the CSA within CDCR and established the BSCC as an independent entity.
- Transfer the powers and duties of the CSA to the BSCC.
- Transfer certain powers and duties that currently reside with Cal EMA to the BSCC.
- Eliminate the California Council on Criminal Justice and assigned its powers and duties to the BSCC.
- Reestablish CPOST within CDCR.

Programs that will transfer from Cal EMA include:

- Edward Byrne Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program - The U.S. Congress established the JAG program in the 2005 Omnibus Appropriations package. California's JAG program recipients include local criminal justice agencies, which utilize the grant to address apprehension, prosecution, adjudication, detention, and rehabilitation of offenders who violate state and local laws. California's JAG program also funds the California Counter Drug Procurement Program.
- Residential Substance Abuse Treatment (RSAT) Program - The RSAT Program is designed to assist state and local government agencies in developing and implementing substance abuse treatment programs in correctional and detention facilities and to provide community-based aftercare services for offenders.
- California Gang Reduction, Intervention, and Prevention (CalGRIP) Initiative - The CalGRIP Initiative provides Restitution Fund grants to cities using a local collaborative effort for anti-gang activities.

CSA and Cal EMA also provided grants directly to local public safety agencies, including: Citizen's Option for Public Safety (COPS); Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act Grants; Booking Fees, Small and Rural Sheriffs Grants; Juvenile Probation Funding; California Multi-Jurisdictional Methamphetamine Enforcement Team; California Gang Violence Suppression Program; Multi-Agency Enforcement Consortium; Rural Crime Prevention; Sexual Assault Felony Enforcement; and the High Technology Theft Apprehension and Prosecution Program. Funding for these programs was realigned to locals as part of the 2011 public safety realignment. However, if it is determined that state level administration requirements remain for any of these programs, the BSCC would fulfill those responsibilities.

The BSCC will be an entity independent from Cal EMA and CDCR. The BSCC will be chaired by the Secretary of CDCR, and its vice-chair will be a local law enforcement representative. The BSCC will have 12 members, streamlined from both its immediate predecessor (CSA), with 19 members, and its former predecessor (BOC), which had 15 members. Members will reflect state, local, judicial, and public stakeholders.

**PROPOSAL**

The Governor's Budget proposes \$109.2 million (\$16.9 million General Fund and \$92.2 million other funds) for the state operations and local assistance programs included under the BSCC. The funding is comprised of resources transferred from the CSA and Cal EMA and will allow the BSCC to operate as an independent entity. Below is a chart that summarizes the levels of resources being transferred from CDCR and Cal EMA.

	<b>Funding</b>	<b>Positions</b>
Program 10 - Board Administration and Program Support	\$1.99	19.00
Program 15 - Corrections Planning and Grant Programs	\$81.26	23.50
Program 20 - Local Facilities Standards and Operations	\$3.81	20.00
Program 25 - Standards and Training for Local Corrections	\$22.19	13.00
<b>BSCC Total</b>	<b>\$109.16</b>	<b>75.50</b>
<b>From CDCR</b>	<b>-\$63.19</b>	<b>-68.50</b>
<b>From Cal EMA</b>	<b>-\$45.97</b>	<b>-8.50</b>
<b>Net impact of proposal</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>-1.50</b>

The Governor's Budget also includes trailer bill language to clarify the BSCC's authority for administration of certain federal funds.

**PANEL**

- ❖ California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation
- ❖ Legislative Analyst's Office
- ❖ Department of Finance
- ❖ California State Association of Counties

**STAFF COMMENT**

As the primary state/local entity charged with promoting the continued success of the 2011 public safety realignment and facilitating best practices in law enforcement throughout the state, the BSCC will be the backbone of California's public safety continuum. In order to facilitate state/local success, per statute, the BSCC will be charged with "providing statewide leadership, coordination, and technical assistance to promote effective state and local efforts and partnerships in California's adult and juvenile criminal justice system, including addressing gang problems. This mission shall reflect the principle of aligning fiscal policy and correctional

practices, including, but not limited to prevention, intervention, suppression, supervision, and incapacitation, to promote a justice investment strategy that fits each county and is consistent with the integrated statewide goal of improved public safety through cost effective, promising, and evidence-based strategies for managing criminal justice populations.”

The BSCC will also be charged with the duty to “collect and maintain available information and data about state and community correctional policies, practices, capacities, and needs, including, but not limited to, prevention, intervention, suppression, supervision, and incapacitation, as they relate to both adult corrections, juvenile justice, and gang problems. The BSCC shall seek to collect and make publicly available up-to-date data and information reflecting the impact of state and community correctional, juvenile justice, and gang-related policies and practices enacted in the state, as well as information and data concerning promising and evidence-based practices from other jurisdictions.”

The leadership and networking opportunities provided by the BSCC coupled with the collection of pertinent data will be critical in understanding the most effective ways to allocate limited resources in order to ensure statewide success.

<b>STAFF RECOMMENDATION</b>
-----------------------------

Hold open, pending additional details.