



Chairman Phil Mendelson

AN AMENDMENT

Bill 25-826, "Recidivism Reduction at DYRS Amendment Act of 2024"

(Engrossed Version)

December 3, 2024

Amendment 1: Lines 65 through 67 of Section 2 are amended to read as follows:

“(2) Monitor and **publicly** report on the ~~implementation completeness and timeliness, based on a prima facie review,~~ of individualized rehabilitation plans developed by the Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services pursuant to section 16-2319 of the District of Columbia Official Code.”.

Rationale: This amendment addresses the Auditor’s objection that Bill 25-826 will require her office to hire and retain experts in psychology or child behavior to assess the validity of each rehabilitation plan. This amendment narrows the scope of oversight that the Auditor’s Office would have to conduct on the implementation of individualized rehabilitation plans by the Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services. Rather than focus on all aspects of the individualized rehabilitation plans, which could be incredibly time consuming, the Auditor’s Office would monitor and report on how complete the plans are and whether the plans were developed and implemented timely based on first impression.

Amendment 2: Lines 221 through 228 of Section 4(c) are amended to read as follows:

“(i) A child ~~who has been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision and who is~~ committed to the Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services shall ~~not be continued in a secure placement that does not provide~~ **receive** the services ~~specified in~~ **consistent with** the child’s individualized rehabilitation plan ~~in excess of~~ **within** 30 days after entry of a dispositional order pursuant to this section or a change in placement pursuant to Chapter 12 of Title 29 of the District of Columbia Municipal Regulations or any other provision of law, except for good cause shown. ~~If a child is continued in a secure placement, the child may petition the Division for a post-disposition hearing to review whether there is good cause for the continued placement.~~”.

Rationale: This amendment makes technical and clarifying edits, and removes a provision that would allow a child to petition for a post disposition hearing if the child isn’t receiving services consistent with their individualized rehabilitation plan. Given other provisions in the law that allow the child, the child parents, guardian, or custodian to petition the Courts if they are not receiving appropriate services, the provision struck by this amendment is unnecessary.

Amendment 3: Lines 250 through 252 of Section 4(d) are amended to read as follows:

“(h)(1) Not more than once in a ~~3-month~~ 4-month period, the child, or the child’s parent, guardian, or custodian may petition the Division to modify a dispositional order, issued pursuant to section 16-2320, on the grounds that the child is not receiving appropriate services or level of placement.”.

Rationale: In the Committee Print, the Committee of the Whole changed the petition period—that is, the time at which the child, or the child’s parent, guardian, or custodian may petition the Court if the child is not receiving appropriate services or level of placement—to not more than once in a 3-month period based on the fact that the Department holds team decision making meetings every 90 days. This amendment reverts back to the Attorney General’s original proposal of once in a 4-month period, as discussions with the Department suggest that once in a 3-month period may be too burdensome and not appropriately align with the team decision making meeting process.