Mission Statement:
Across Douglas County, our vision is a comprehensive, coordinated, and community-wide approach to juvenile services that eliminates the need for youth involvement with our justice system while maintaining public safety.

For all youth who do enter our justice system, our goals are to provide effective, compassionate and individualized support that empowers youth and their families to succeed and to build an environment of mutual trust and accountability.
Staff secure discussion –

- Accredited facility. Passed inspection in the fall (2016).
- Need for staff secure vs. an alternative. No alternative is available right now.
- Not mandated to have a staff secure facility.
- If the County did not have one, what would be the ideal alternative?
  - Must be local, youth continue to earn credits through home school district, proximity - family has ability to visit. Must meet stringent inspection standards.
- If can only secure them with staff, means more staff engagement.
- Seen as a distinction without a difference.
- From a rehabilitation perspective, how do we imagine the best option and figure a way to get there?
- How do we imagine best-practice – and find a way to get there?
  - Meets legal obligations & at the same time ensures the best outcomes for kids.
- Residential setting, secured by staff
- Some runners are placed in shelter - locally
  - When beds are not available, staff secure can sometimes become utilized as a default or “overflow”
  - These options do exist locally, we just may not have the beds available
  - Need varies, fluctuates daily
  - Local facilities provide the same level of care
  - Youth links – concern - paying for beds which are not occupied
  - Youth Links, Boys Town, CSI, Uta Halee
  - JJS is not the only customer – can also be utilized by DHHS
- If staff secure is eliminated, what is the County’s obligation?
  - Previously – youth have sent youth to Sarpy County
  - Is it the County’s obligation to pay for that
- Are the youth in staff secure low risk, medium risk?
  - Not generally a risk to community safety
    - Generally run away, truancy (status offenses)
- County run vs. Community run facility
  - Reimagine – on DCYC campus, rename
- Often, when things do not work at a shelter – return to staff secure
  - Staff secure not refuse to serve
- Becomes a default
- Status offenders cannot be detained
  - Shelter, Foster Care, or staff secure
  - Staff secure becomes the default
  - Youth are not running from staff secure
- Non-runaway, low-risk offender response
- The staff secure unit at DCYC meets the legal definition of staff secure –
  - Structure design –
  - For all intents and purposes – seems as though it is another secure unit
  - Classification decision
  - In some ways have more limitations than those youth in secure
- Should have better alternatives for better outcomes for kids
- Data of youth detained in staff secure – mapping
- Simply moving to shelter does not mean improvement –
  - Key is the programming available within a redesigned concept
- Addressing mental health within the population involved
- Detention (even in a staff secure form) for truancy or mental health problems is not solving the problem
- Status Offenders as JJS population –
  - NE handles it differently
- Working with ATD committee to increase bed hold time to 48 hours (placement)
  - Youth running from placement – most located within 48 hours
    - Current: 24 hour bed hold contractually
    - If placement will allow the youth to return, would this reduce the problem
- Data
- Legal Implications – what is the County responsible for doing
- A small committee was formed to continue to work on this item
EPIC Program discussion

- Moved from DCYC to Blackburn (BAP)/North Omaha Boys and Girls Club (BGC)
  - Adding BAP students
    - Probation youth in need of services
  - Have access to educators and MH services
  - Access to Boys and Girls Club
  - Those who remain with the BGC are eligible for college scholarships at time of graduation
- Next steps – DCYC submitted grant for continued funding for next year
  - Students who need help during the day
  - Expelled students added to grant application
  - Would make a difference for students leaving DCYC who are not immediately able to return to school
  - BGC would like to assist expelled students during the day
- How to run the program during the summer?
  - Run at DCYC during the evening over the summer?
- Population is more likely youth suspended, not expelled
- If youth have been expelled, how will they attend EPIC if it is located at Blackburn?
- If we discussed a Campus environment (re: staff secure), EPIC should be included in that conversation.
- Not opposed to the county running EPIC
- Not opposed to county funding programs – reducing the number of youth in secure detention – cost savings
- Voluntary or court-ordered participation?
  - Can JAC refer kids?
    - Have not previously – when located in DCYC
    - Previously - contracts with other community-based youth service organizations
    - Would be an option at this time
  - Can Probation refer kids?
    - Registered provider – verification
- Should the County be providing services that are available in the community?
o (Public Question) Mental Health Evaluation for Runaways – thought was voluntary
  ▪ Clarification – Evaluations occur when Court Ordered

Run Away task force update
  o TerraLuna assisting with formation/planning process
  o Principled-based perspective – Youth-centered & Principle-driven
  o Decided to invite YES House and School District to next meeting
  o Grounded in mutual philosophy & common vision

Legislative Update – Voices For Children at the session today (no report)
  o Douglas County is likely to get a 6th judge, possibly a 7th – unfunded
    ▪ Emergency clause on the bill
    ▪ Best case – phased in
    ▪ Locating court rooms
  o Many bills remain in committee

Public Comment
  o Citizen Comment:
    ▪ Legislative update
    ▪ System does not work very well for the youth – associated family members
    ▪ Misapplication of the intent of privacy laws
    ▪ Never want to listen to what people want to say because fear lawsuit
      • RE: Privacy Laws
    ▪ Reexamine the application, by all agencies and staff, of privacy laws
  o Citizen Comment:
    ▪ Diversity
    ▪ Very disappointed in how few of the community participate
    ▪ Demystify issues
    ▪ Welcome the least among us
    ▪ Transparency
    ▪ Seek out input from those who have survived the system

Next Meeting: March 27, 2017 @ 8:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m. at the UNO CEC room 127