

Oregon - Correctional Feasibility Study - )

# REPORT OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

UMATILLA COUNTY  
JUVENILE DEPARTMENT CASES,  
1970

OREGON STATE CORRECTIONS DIVISION  
STATE REGIONAL PROGRAM MODEL DEVELOPMENT FEASIBILITY STUDY

Duane C. Lemley, Project Director  
Lester E. Belleque, Asst. Proj. Director  
Jerry R. Hawley, Program Specialist  
Evelyn L. Meeks, Project Secretary

PREPARED BY: D. R. Rinehart, Consultant  
to the Feasibility Study

April 14, 1972

18712

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
FINDINGS . . . . .	1
Introduction . . . . .	1
Table 1 - Arrest Charges . . . . .	3
Detained vs Nondetained	
Characteristics of Detained Youngsters . . . . .	4
Table 2 - Age & Sex . . . . .	4
Ethnic Group . . . . .	5
Hours in Detention . . . . .	5
Table 3 . . . . .	6
Arresting Agency . . . . .	6
Table 4 . . . . .	7
Prior Arrest Records . . . . .	8
Table 5 . . . . .	8
Prior Arrests & Prior Detention	
Table 6 . . . . .	9
No. of Prior Arrests	
Arrest Charges and Residence . . . . .	9
Table 7 - Arrest Charges and . . . . .	10
Residence	
Remand Status . . . . .	12
Conclusions . . . . .	12
RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	14
EXHIBIT 1 - Response to Questions Printed in the Jail Survey - 1970	
EXHIBIT 2 - Umatilla County Juvenile Study - Sample Survey	

THE 1970 UMATILLA COUNTY JUVENILE DEPARTMENT CASES

FINDINGS

Introduction

In January 1971 a major disturbance occurred in the Umatilla County Jail. The Umatilla County Commissioners requested that the Oregon State Corrections Division study and make recommendations relative to the physical facilities at the Umatilla County Jail. A study team headed by Les Belleque, Assistant Project Director of the State Regional Program Model Development Feasibility Study, conducted the study. It was completed and presented to the Umatilla County Commissioners in February 1971. A major recommendation was that juveniles not be detained in the county jail.

The acceptable criteria for detaining youngsters comes from an interpretation of ORS 419.575 which states that: "The Juvenile Court of each County shall designate the place or places in the County or at a reasonably short distance outside the County in which children are to be placed in detention or shelter care when taken into temporary custody. Except where inconsistent with the safety and welfare of the child or of others, a child taken into temporary custody shall be placed in shelter care rather than detention." An interpretation is that detention is the temporary care of children for whom secure custody is required for their own protection or that of the community, pending disposition or transfer to another agency or jurisdiction. Detention is used to control the overt, inappropriate, acting out behavior of a child, by placing them in secure, short-term custody.

The foundation for the use of detention is, that detention is used as a last resort, to protect both the child and the community. The basic guidelines provided for operationalizing this premise are:

1. A child will be placed in secure custody where that child's freedom is a definite threat to the communities inherent right to protection from encroachment on individuals rights;
2. Where the child's behavior demonstrates that they are a definite destructive threat to themselves;
3. Where it appears that the child's behavior indicates a very high potential for running away, and if they are not placed in secure custody they will in fact run away immediately.

At a meeting held on November 5, 1971, at the Oregon State Corrections Division in Salem<sup>/1</sup> it was agreed that the Feasibility Study would conduct a study and make recommendations for the handling of juveniles who are currently being detained in the Umatilla County Jail. This study is divided into five parts:

- I. Collection and analysis of data on youngsters detained by the Umatilla County Juvenile Department in 1970, which includes interviews with Umatilla County Juvenile Department Director Jim Epley.
- II. Meeting with the local Law Enforcement Council and others for further interpretation of the findings and the development of tentative recommendations.
- III. Developing a report of recommendations.
- IV. Reaching consensus on the recommendations.
- V. Assistance in implementing plan, including working with state and federal agencies for funding purposes.

<sup>/1</sup> In attendance were: Jim Epley, Director, Umatilla County Juvenile Department; Jack Schut, Union County Juvenile Department; Judge Lassen Keith Stubblefield, LEC; D. R. Rinehart, Consultant; Duane Lemley, Children's Services Division; Don Dill, State LEC; Jerry Hawley, Melinda Woodward and Les Belleque, Feasibility Study.

Part I of the study began during the months of November and December, 1971. Data were collected by data collectors under the supervision of John Rowley, District Law Enforcement Planning Coordinator. During January 1972, the data were processed by the Feasibility Study staff. During the latter part of January and early February 1972, data were analyzed by D. R. Rinehart, Consultant to the Feasibility Study.

The following report represents the completion of Part I and was presented to the Administrative Planning District No. 12 Law Enforcement Council for further interpretation (Part II).

As Table 1 shows, the majority of cases do not involve detention. Of a total of 1,758 youngsters, 1,282 were not detained and 476 were detained. Thus, approximately twenty-seven percent of youths referred to the Umatilla County Juvenile Department were detained and seventy-three percent were not detained.

TABLE 1  
ARREST CHARGES AND DETAINED YOUNGSTERS COMPARED WITH NONDETAINED YOUNGSTERS

Arrest Charges	Detained		Not Detained		Total Cases	
Assault	3	( 1%)	2	( ..%)	5	( ..%)
Burglary	16	( 3%)	43	( 3%)	59	( 3%)
Auto Theft	4	( 1%)	26	( 2%)	30	( 2%)
Larceny	27	( 6%)	150	( 12%)	177	( 10%)
Narcotic & Other Drugs	5	( 1%)	16	( 1%)	21	( 1%)
Drunkenness	13	( 3%)	--	( ..%)	13	( ..%)
Disorderly Conduct	1	( ..%)	46	( 4%)	47	( 3%)
Vandalism	4	( 1%)	87	( 7%)	91	( 5%)
Running Away	198	( 42%)	152	( 12%)	350	( 20%)
Truancy	7	( 2%)	47	( 4%)	54	( 3%)
Curfew	18	( 4%)	67	( 5%)	85	( 5%)
Ungovernable Behavior	35	( 7%)	61	( 5%)	96	( 5%)
Minor in Possession	72	( 15%)	273	( 21%)	345	( 20%)
Traffic Offenses	6	( 1%)	166	( 13%)	172	( 10%)
Other	67	( 14%)	146	( 11%)	218	( 12%)
TOTAL	476	(100%)	1282	(100%)	1758	(100%)

.. Percentages less than one percent are not reported.

The most common arrest charges for detained youngsters were Running Away (forty-two percent) and Minor in Possession (fifteen percent). When nondetained youth are examined, however, these two arrest charges were also most frequent, though the percentages move down to twelve percent for Running Away and twenty-one percent for Minor in Possession.

*QUESTION: Could alternatives be considered for a large percentage of these youngsters detained, i.e., would it be possible to adjust at intake and/or expand shelter care to accommodate many of these youngsters?*

The remainder of this report is limited to a discussion of characteristics and treatment of detained youngsters only.

Characteristics of Detained Youngsters

Age and Sex

Table 2 shows the age and sex of the 476 detained youngsters. Only a negligible proportion are twelve years of age or younger (one percent).

TABLE 2

AGE AND SEX OF DETAINED YOUNGSTERS

Years of Age	Female		SEX Male		Total	
	Twelve or Younger	0	(.%)	5	( 2%)	5
Thirteen	11	( 7%)	6	( 2%)	17	( 4%)
Fourteen	14	( 9%)	38	( 12%)	52	( 11%)
Fifteen	20	(13%)	60	( 18%)	80	( 17%)
Sixteen	42	(28%)	83	( 25%)	125	( 26%)
Seventeen	45	(30%)	95	( 29%)	140	( 29%)
Unknown	17	(11%)	40	( 12%)	57	( 12%)
TOTAL	149	(98%)	327	(100%)	476	(100%)

.. Percentages less than one percent are not reported.

As age increases from thirteen to seventeen the proportion of youngsters increases with four percent or 17 age fourteen and twenty-nine percent or 140 age seventeen. Twelve percent are eighteen years of age or older. Over one-half of both boys and girls are between sixteen and seventeen years of age.

*QUESTION. (1) Should facility planning be geared for a specific age group?*

#### Ethnic Group

Eighty-two percent or 391 of the 476 detained youngsters are Caucasian; sixteen percent or 76 are Indian; and two percent or 9 youngsters are neither Caucasian nor Indian. In comparing the "All Indians Referred", which is 167 cases, the detention rate of 76 is forty-six percent.

*QUESTIONS: (1) Why do forty-six percent of all Indians referred to the Umatilla Juvenile Department require detention?*

*(2) Could Alternatives be examined for Indian youngsters, perhaps shelter care?*

#### Hours in Detention

As Table 3 shows, thirty-seven percent or 178 of the youngsters are detained for less than one twenty-four hour period. Thirty-three percent or 160 are detained for between twenty-four and seventy-two hours. Twenty-one percent or 100 youngsters are detained at least seventy-two hours.

Approximately one-third stay less than one-day. One-third stay from one to three days and the remaining stay at least four days or for an unreported length of time.

TABLE 3  
HOURS IN DETENTION FOR 476 YOUTH

Hours in Detention		
Seven or less	57	(12%)
Eight to twenty-three	121	(25%)
Twenty-five to forty-seven	92	(19%)
Forty-eight to seventy-one	68	(14%)
Seventy-two to ninety-five	35	( 8%)
Ninety-six to one-hundred nineteen	21	( 4%)
One-hundred twenty or more	44	( 9%)
Unknown	38	( 8%)
TOTAL	476	(99%)

- QUESTIONS: (1) *Noting that fifty-six percent of all youngsters detained are released within two days, should special programming be available for them?*
- (2) *What type of facility and/or programs should be available for youngsters who stay less than one day?*
- (3) *Should special facilities and/or programs be provided for youngsters who stay for more than four days?*

Arresting Agency

As Table 4 shows, the police agency arresting by far the largest number of detained youngsters is the Pendleton Police Department (196 or forty-one percent).

TABLE 4  
ARRESTING AGENCY FOR DETAINED YOUNGSTERS

Arresting Agency	Number	Percent
Pendleton Police Department	196	( 41%)
Oregon State Police	91	( 19%)
Unknown	55	( 12%)
Hermiston Police Department	43	( 9%)
Umatilla Sheriff's Department	33	( 7%)
Other - Shelter Home, Parent, Counselor, etc.	22	( 5%)
Milton-Freewater Police Department	20	( 4%)
Pilot Rock Police Department	11	( 2%)
Stanfield Police Department	2	( ..%)
Helix Police	1	( ..%)
Athena Police Department	1	( ..%)
Weston Police Department	1	( ..%)
TOTAL	476	( 99%)

.. Percentages less than one percent are not reported.

Approximately one-fifth of the youngsters are arrested by the Oregon State Police (91 or nineteen percent). Percentages ranging from nine to two are contributed by the Hermiston and Umatilla Sheriff's Departments, nonpolice departments and by the Milton-Freewater and Pilot Rock Police Departments. Stanfield, Helix, Athena and Weston Police Departments each arrested at least one youngster who was detained. The arresting agency is not given for 55 or twelve percent of the cases.

*QUESTIONS: (1) Where are the majority of Oregon State Police referrals apprehended?*

- (2) Do different law enforcement agencies have different policies regarding adjusting cases in the field or referring cases to the Juvenile Department?
- (3) Should Law Enforcement agencies exercise discretion in referring youngsters to the Juvenile Department?
- (4) Does distance from detention facility affect the rate of referral to the Juvenile Department?

Prior Arrest Records

Tables 5 and 6 show, respectively, prior arrests by prior detention and number of prior arrests for youngsters previously arrested. Table 5 shows of the 476 youngsters detained, 279 have had prior arrests and prior detention. Fifty-nine or twelve percent have had neither prior arrests nor prior detention.

TABLE 5  
PRIOR ARRESTS AND PRIOR DETENTION OF 476 DETAINED YOUNGSTERS

Prior Arrests	Prior Detention				Total
	Yes	No	Unknown		
Yes	279				279 ( 59%)
No		59			59 ( 12%)
Unknown			138		138 ( 29%)
TOTAL	279	59	138		476 (100%)

It appears that the existence of a prior arrest implies detention. Problematically neither arrest nor detention information is available on 138 or twenty-nine percent of the cases.

- QUESTIONS: (1) Does prior arrest place youngsters in situations where they are more likely to be detained than youngsters who have no prior arrest record?
- (2) What could be the reason for twenty-nine percent of the cases having no information regarding prior arrest records?

The largest single arrest number shown in Table 6 is that for two to three arrests..

TABLE 6  
NUMBER OF PRIOR ARRESTS FOR 279 PREVIOUSLY ARRESTED YOUNGSTERS

Number of Previous Arrests		
One	51	( 18%)
Two to three	82	( 29%)
Four to five	48	( 18%)
Six to seven	39	( 14%)
Eight to nine	23	( 8%)
Ten or more	36	( 13%)
TOTAL	279	(100%)

Eighty-two or twenty-nine percent of the 279 previously arrested youngsters have had two and three arrests. Approximately as many youngsters have had four to five arrests (48) as have had one arrest (51). The remaining categories each contain fourteen percent or fewer persons. If planning is made for first versus multiple arrests persons, the breakdown is, of course, 51 or eighteen percent first arrests compared with 228 persons with previous arrests.

Arrest Charges and Residence

As shown in Table 7 the vast majority of detained youngsters are local residents (sixty-five percent). Eighteen percent, or 85, are from out of the State of Oregon and thirteen percent, or 64, of the youngsters are from Oregon counties other than Umatilla.

TABLE 7

## ARREST CHARGES AND RESIDENCE

Arrest Charge	Local (Umatilla County)	In-State Not Local	Out-of-State	Unknown	Total
Assault	3 ( 1%)				3 ( 1%)
Burglary	14 ( 5%)	2 ( 3%)			16 ( 3%)
Auto Theft	4 ( 1%)	( )			4 ( 1%)
Larceny	20 ( 6%)	4 ( 6%)	2 ( 2%)	1 ( 6%)	27 ( 6%)
Narcotic & Other Drug	1 ( ..%)	2 ( 3%)	2 ( 2%)	( )	5 ( 1%)
Drunkenness	10 ( 3%)	1 ( 2%)	2 ( 2%)	( )	13 ( 3%)
Disorderly Conduct	1 ( ..%)	( )	( )	( )	1 ( ..%)
Vandalism	4 ( 1%)	( )	( )	( )	4 ( 1%)
Running Away	100 ( 33%)	38 ( 60%)	55 (65%)	5 ( 31%)	198 ( 42%)
Truancy	7 ( 2%)				7 ( 2%)
Curfew	17 ( 6%)	1 ( 2%)			18 ( 4%)
Ungovernable Behavior	34 ( 11%)	1 ( 2%)			35 ( 7%)
Minor in Possession	59 ( 19%)	8 ( 13%)	5 ( 6%)		72 ( 15%)
Traffic Offenses	5 ( 2%)	( )	1 (( 1%)		6 ( 1%)
Other	32 ( 10%)	7 ( 11%)	18 (21%)	10 ( 63%)	67 ( 14%)
TOTAL	311 (100%)	64 ( 100%)	85 (99%)	16 (100%)	476 (100%)

.. Percentages less than one percent are not reported.

Information on residence is lacking for 16 youngsters. Regardless of residence, the most common arrest charges for detained youngsters are Running Away (forty-two percent) and Minor in Possession (fifteen percent). One percent or fewer youngsters have been arrested for Assault, Auto Theft, Drugs, Disorderly Conduct, Vandalism or Traffic Offenses.

When local youngsters are examined separately, the pattern is similar though the magnitude is slightly different with thirty-three percent arrested for Running Away and nineteen percent arrested for Minor in Possession.

In-State but not local youngsters are most likely to be arrested for similar offenses, though Running Away is even more significant at sixty percent and Minor in Possession is somewhat less important with thirteen percent of the arrest charges.

Youngsters from States other than Oregon are even more likely to be arrested for Running Away (sixty-five percent), though Minor in Possession is less important (six percent).

By and large, then, most youngsters are held in detention as a result of Running Away from home and facilities may need to be designed primarily for this offense category with attention given to the problem of Minors in Possession of alcohol. Even though more serious offenses are committed by only a minimum of youngsters, however, detention facilities may be needed for them also.

- QUESTIONS: (1) *Could runaways be handled through other than maximum security detention?*
- (2) *How large a problem is runaway for (a) out-of-county residents, and (b) out-of-state residents?*

#### Remand Status

Of 476 detained youngsters, 442 or ninety-three percent were not remanded. Thirty-four or seven percent of the clients were remanded. The remands listed in frequency of occurrence included the following arrest charges: Minor in Possession, Drunkenness, Assault, Burglary and Narcotic and Other Drug Offenses. Alcohol related offenses seem to make up about two-thirds of all remanded cases.

Nonremand cases are most frequently made up of the following arrest charges: Running Away, Minor in Possession, Ungovernable Behavior, Larceny and Burglary. In general, well over one-half of nonremand cases involve either Running Away or Ungovernable Behavior.

*QUESTION: Would it be possible to handle remands without detention?*

#### Conclusions (Based on Tables 1 - 7)

- Twenty-seven percent of the youngsters coming to the court's attention are detained. This involved 476 youngsters in 1970.
- Running Away and Minor in Possession are the most common arrest charges for both detained and nondetained youngsters.
- Most detained youngsters are between sixteen and seventeen years of age and over twice as many boys are involved as girls.
- Four-fifths of the youngsters are Caucasian, with a sizeable minority being Indian and very few having other ethnic backgrounds.
- About one-third of detained youngsters stay less than one day; one-third stay from two to three days; and the remaining one-third stay four days or for an unreported length of time.
- Most detained youngsters are arrested by the Pendleton Police Department or the Oregon State Police.

- Prior arrest data are limited to youngsters who have had prior detention; neither prior arrests nor detention data are available for over one-fifth of the cases.
- Most previously arrested youngsters have at least two previous arrests, the mode being between two and three.
- Most frequently, youngsters are held in detention as a result of running away from home though being a minor in possession of alcohol is a second frequent arrest category.
- Sixty-five percent of detained youngsters are local, thirteen percent are from other Oregon Counties, and eighteen percent are from out-of-state.
- Seven percent of detained youngsters are remanded. Their offenses are primarily alcohol related.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The current County Jail detention facility is totally inadequate for the detention of youngsters. The question to be addressed is: What facilities and programs need to be provided for youngsters who are in need of detention care? After a study and review of the data, interviews with court directors, inspection of facilities and meetings with the Umatilla County Juvenile Court Advisory Committee and the local Law Enforcement Council, it is clear that an alternative to County Jail detention must be provided.

No doubt some of the youngsters coming before the Umatilla Juvenile Court need a security detention facility; however, not all.

The following recommendations are based on:

1. Data collected and analyzed on 476 youngsters who were detained in 1970 (contained in Report of Findings);
2. Response to questions in the Report of Findings prepared by Jim Epley, Director of Umatilla County Juvenile Department (see Exhibit 1);
3. A random sample of 50 cases which provides detailed narrative on the events leading to detention (see Exhibit 2);
4. Inspection of the current detention facilities in the Umatilla County Jail;
5. Tour of shelter home in Pendleton;
6. A meeting with the Juvenile Advisory Council;
7. A meeting with local Law Enforcement Council and other interested persons.

On April 13, 1972, the Feasibility Study staff met with Umatilla County officials and other interested people to discuss the Recommendations portion of this report. Full concensus was reached concerning the recommendations.

*It is respectfully recommended:*

1. *That a series of facilities be planned which would provide a range of alternatives from an "open setting" to a "secure facility". Although there is already existing a foster home - shelter care program, increased use of this type of resource is recommended.*

*That the range in programs and facilities would include:*

- a. *Detention facilities - This program and facility would provide the necessary controls and security for those youngsters whose problems require close supervision. It is envisioned that this might be a facility to handle ten to fifteen youngsters.*
- b. *Foster homes, operated by foster parents, for youngsters who are able to function in an "open setting" and maintain themselves in school and utilize other community resources.*
- c. *Shelter care operated by husband and wife who would provide care for youngsters who are not in need of close substitute parent relationships but require more diluted group relationship.*
- d. *Shelter care operated by the county, staffed by three shifts of child care workers for the older youngsters whose care and supervision needs are based on a less personal mother and father relationship; however, they do not require the security afforded by a detention home.*

*In both shelter care facilities the emphasis would be to provide security through programs, not locked doors.*

2. *That the Umatilla County Juvenile Department work out a uniform detention policy with law enforcement agencies which would include a written policy on who is "eligible" for detention.*

An example of such an arrangement is in Whatcom County Juvenile Court, Bellingham, Washington (a community of approximately 40,000 population) where a policy and procedural manual was developed in cooperation with law enforcement agencies which in turn lowered the detention rate.

3. That an intake policy be developed which will provide a classification of youngsters for placement in facilities which have a range from minimum to maximum security, e.g., foster homes to detention homes.

This, no doubt, will require a continuation, expansion and possible modification of the current policy by which the arresting agency telephones Jim Epley or a counselor to clear a youngster for admission to detention.

4. That the Umatilla County Juvenile Department and Umatilla Indian Agency continue to work together with an emphasis to review the large percentage of Indian youngsters detained and to determine if alternatives to detention could be arranged, such as foster, shelter or group homes.

This action would provide an in-depth assessment of the program and facility needs for the Indian youngsters who require something other than their own home prior to court action. There also should be an exploration of what financial and staff resources could be provided by the Umatilla Indian Agency and other sources.

5. That the problem of runaways which make up a large percentage of cases currently detained be reviewed for possible alternatives to detention.

6. *That the Umatilla Juvenile Department locate its offices and courtroom in a building other than the Courthouse.*
7. *That contractual arrangements be made with Union, Morrow, Wallowa and other adjacent counties to provide regional foster, shelter and detention care for youngsters from these counties.*

To implement these recommendations, it is suggested that the Feasibility Study coordinate the plan with the Umatilla County Commissioners and the Umatilla Juvenile Department. The implementation should include:

1. Contacting Children's Services Division for assistance, both financial and in programs. They have the responsibility to assist counties in development and operation of shelter care programs.
2. Contacting Law Enforcement Assistance Administration through the local Law Enforcement District Coordinator John Rowley, Districts 12, 13 and 14.
3. Contacting John Downey, Regional Representative, Social Rehabilitation Services, Region 10, Seattle, Washington, for consultation on programs and facilities.
4. Contacting Mrs. Reda Albright, Chief Probation Officer, Whatcom County Courthouse, Bellingham, Washington, for assistance in developing law enforcement screening, including a copy of their procedural manual.

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS PRINTED IN THE JAIL STUDY - 1970

Question 1, Page 3:

This question relates to runaways and minors in possession of alcohol cases. We have in the past placed runaway youngsters at the shelter home, only to have them run from there. Our experience is that until such time as the runaway and his family are united through a counselling session or plans are made for the final disposition, a secure custody situation will continue to be necessary.

Our policy in this department concerning minors in possession of alcohol cases is not to detain the youngster unless he would be a danger to himself to release or might commit a violation of law. In some instances where a responsible guardian cannot be located, it is felt in the best interest of the child and the community detention is necessary. In re-examining the minor in possession cases lodged for 1970, 13 were actual runaway cases determined only after they were lodged. Four were parole violators, and ten were boys being brought in for continuance drinking and law violations. This actually left 45 cases where youngsters were detained when the responsible guardian could not be found. The 1971 statistics indicate this figure considerably lower with a total of 51 cases encompassing 7 runaways, 7 parole violators, and a recidivism of 11. Every effort is made to release minor in possession cases to parents but in some cases, particularly with the Indian youngsters, detention is the only alternative.

Question 2, Page 4:

(1) The detention facilities should still be geared to the age group 12 to 18 years. This complies with the law and program planning can be adjusted to any age group received.

(2) The data collection must have been an error because we have no jurisdiction to retain youth over the age of 18.

Question 3, Page 4:

(1) Most of the Indian referrals to the Umatilla County Juvenile Department were drinking referrals and the aggressive acts on the part of a few Indian youngsters. The brothers caused two to ten drinking referrals as well as many other referrals. It is very difficult when an Indian youngster is picked up on a serious charge to insure protection from the community by releasing him as often the instability of the home itself would lead to further violations pending court contacts.

(2) An Indian group home or shelter home might be an alternative after the Indian youngster has been detained but certainly not before. The attitude of the Indians in this area is against the white man and many feel no remorse for their behavior while under the influence of alcohol. This is one area where the protection of society must be maintained and where no responsible adult can be located the youngster is placed in detention.

Question 4, Page 5:

(1) Many of the youngsters we release within two days are runaways returned to their own homes only after family counselling with the court counselor. Many of these youngsters are returned before they are ready simply because of the negative aspects of the present jail situation. Any detention program would be better than the present lack of a detention program.

(2) A facility constructed to minimize the negative aspects of the jail situation would be of advantage to any youngster regardless of their length of stay. Their first contact with counselors and detention staff in a facility where the needs of the child is considered most, might be a tremendous benefit in the rehabilitation of that child.

(3) A facility which combines tutoring or school facilities should be provided for youngsters who stay more than four days as well as further detention programming. This would be a built-in part of the total program for detention.

Question 5, Page 6:

(1) The majority of the Oregon State Police referrals are runaways picked up on our highways in Umatilla County. Generally, all runaways are detained until a court counselor can determine with the child and his family the advisability of having that child returned home.

(2) Most of the departments in the county realize we do not lodge minor cases and that they must receive approval from a court counselor before any youngster is detained. In the smaller communities there may be a tendency to handle youngsters without referring them to the Juvenile Department on minor law violations. However, none of these youngsters would be detained in any event even if they were referred.

(3) The answer to this question is an obvious "yes" and is practiced in this county. Our total referrals to the Juvenile Department certainly does not reflect the total number of youngsters picked up for law violations in the county, as many were handled by the police agency.

(4) Milton-Freewater may very well adjust some cases without referring them to the Juvenile Department because of the distance involved. However, in serious cases, where detention should be necessary they have not shaken that responsibility. All departments try to keep the needs of the child and the community in mind when making a referral for detention.

Question 6, Page 7:

(1) A youngster having a prior arrest record may be detained if the referral is also a violation of his probation, formal or informal. However, the circumstances dictate the advisability of detention.

(2) The major reason 29 percent of the cases have no information listed regarding prior arrest records would be because of the fact that they are out of county runaway referrals. We do not have information concerning their background listed in our files.

Question 7, Page 10:

(1) Our experience has shown that maximum security detention is needed for runaway youngsters. They must be held and learn to face the problem and deal with it rather than running away. We have found that shelter care does not work for these youngsters as they tend to disrupt the shelter home and often leave, taking other shelter care youngsters with them.

(2) The runaway problem is becoming more serious every year and many of the runaways are committing delinquent acts. They have no money and steal for food and transportation. Many of the youngsters apprehended become depressed and some attempt suicide in the present jail facility.

Question 8, Page 11:

Most often the decision to remand is not made prior to detention and in fact is only reached after a conference with the child and parents is held to determine what would be in the child's best interest as well as the interest of the community. In some instances the seriousness of the offense warrants release only on bail after the remand and a cooperation between the Juvenile Department and the District Attorney's office may result in the child remaining in detention after the remand order has been entered. I would not see this practice being eliminated as the decision to detain is made at the time of apprehension and based on, again, the needs of the child, the possibility of further delinquency acts being committed, the protection of the community, and the possibility of the child running away if released.

Conclusion and Recommendation:

In general the report indicates that most youngsters are not detained for committing delinquencies and that the minor in possession cases detained may actually reflect other violations. We are at present attempting to correct the book-in procedure in the jail so that it accurately reflects the actual violation. Even though our total delinquency intake increased 143 cases in 1971 we actually detained 7 less youngsters. We actually only detained 51 minor in possession of alcohol cases in 1971 compared with 72 cases in 1970. However, the 51 figure reflects 7 run-aways and 7 parole violators as well as a recidivism of 11.

It still remains necessary for the referring police agency to contact one of the court counselors before a child is detained and shelter care is used in those cases where detention may not appear necessary. We have experienced in 1970 and 1971 a misuse of shelter care by trying to decrease the number of youngsters placed in the jail situation, which has resulted in a partial breakdown in our shelter care program. Unless something is done immediately to correct the negative aspects of the jail we will not be able to expand the shelter care in this county, and in fact may lose what shelter homes we presently have.

Once again, keeping in mind the need for an adequate detention facility and program as well as the overcrowding of the Courthouse, the present sharing of the Juvenile Court Room, and the need for a regional detention center in this area, would indicate that the facility as originally proposed should be constructed as soon as money is available. Eastern Oregon does not have a facility for detention for youngsters located anywhere, where as Western Oregon has several. The needs of the youth in Eastern Oregon cannot be considered any less than those in Western Oregon and every effort should be made to secure the proposed facility.

Jim Epley  
Director  
Umatilla County Juvenile Department

UMATILLA COUNTY JUVENILE STUDY

Sample Survey

174 - Pendleton (Byford Shelter Home)--This child was picked up 05/18/70 and was taken into temporary custody for truancy and was lodged in Juvenile Detention. Release date is 05/19/70.

93 - Pendleton--On 03/8/70 child was taken into temporary custody; he had been sniffing glue and gas fumes. Later found that child had also been drinking wine. Child struggled and resisted and had to be handcuffed. Child used very abusive language and attempted to escape from officers at station. Child was lodged in Juvenile Detention. Parents were informed. Picked up child 03/22/70.

194 - Milton-Freewater--Milton-Freewater put out a bulletin on subject as runaway. Pendleton police picked up; lodged into Juvenile Detention same day.

441 - Pendleton--Subject was brought in by his mother who was worried about her son's behavior, i.e. He refused to bathe, was growing a strange plant (Marijuana) in his room, was saving and storing his urine, was missing a lot of school, fighting with his siblings and associating with individuals his parents didn't approve of. Subject consented to come in for counseling two times a week but only showed up once and told a lie as to why he hadn't come in. His mother also found he was saving his urine again, and rebelling physically against her. He then ran away and was subsequently picked up by police and committed to the Eastern Oregon State Hospital by his mother.

128 - Pendleton--Ran away on 04/15/70; P.E.P. picked up on 04/15/70; placed in Juvenile Detention; returned to shelter care on 04/16/70.

232 - Pendleton--Subject was taken into temporary custody on 07/11/70 at S. W. 10th and Court for violation of curfew - brought to station and lodged in Umatilla County Juvenile Detention under direction of counselor. Released to parents 07/13/70.

366 - Pendleton--Subject was reported as a runaway by her father; she was picked up 10/09/70 with another female friend and held for her father. She stated that her parents did not care for her and hit her with a yard stick which caused bruises.

44 - Idaho Falls, Idaho--Subject was chased from Highway 11 up Wildhorse Road at high rate of speed w/red light flashing. Subject was already in violation of VBR and running a stop sign. Subject ran stop sign at Junction of Wildhorse and Helix Highway, ending up in ditch in front of the officer. On placing subject under arrest, he (subject) chose to remain silent - not giving his name or address. The car was later found to be stolen.

Umatilla County Juvenile Study  
Sample Survey

62 - Portland--Picked up as runaway on 02-19-70 - referred to Multnomah County 02-20-70.

340 - Pendleton--Child taken into custody in Pendleton. Found condition and circumstances such as to endanger her own welfare. Child found to be runaway. Taken to Umatilla County Juvenile Dept.

383 - Pendleton--Subject was taken into custody for curfew violation - the vehicle subject was driving was found to have been involved in a larceny of gas from gas station a few minutes prior. Subject was also cited for no operator's license. Subject was in the vehicle when an unidentified subject took \$5.85 worth of gas without paying and drove off. Subject claims he did not know this subject's name. Was referred to Walla Walla Juvenile Dept. and released to sister 10-20-70.

201 - Milton-Freewater--No information available, other than that the child was reported as a runaway - was apprehended, placed in Juvenile Detention and then released to shelter care.

375 - Hermiston--Subject was lodged as runaway by direction of counselor, Umatilla Juvenile Dept.

5 - North Hollywood, California--Subject came into the station and advised that he was a runaway from Hollywood, California and that he had no money and nothing to eat. Officer took subject into custody and placed him in detention by order of counselor.

35 - Pendleton--No information-subject has since come of age. Records destroyed.

359 - Pilot Rock--Child was found to be beyond parental control and a truant from the Pilot Rock High School.

100 - The Dalles--No information-subject is no longer juvenile. Records have been destroyed.

165 - Hermiston--Child ran away from home - picked up by P.E.P.; returned to parents following day.

321 - Pendleton--The child was picked up Sept. 17, 1970. She was taken into temporary custody for being beyond parental control and lodged in Juvenile Detention. She was released Sept. 19, 1970 to her parents.

196 - Pendleton--Placed in temporary custody of Juvenile Dept. because of B.P.C.; released to parents same day - no further information.

Umatilla County Juvenile Study  
Sample Survey

361 - Umatilla--Subject was referred to Juvenile Dept. because of his involvement in an M.I.P. His mother was contacted as a result of this incident. She was found to be an alcoholic and many of the subject's problems seemed to stem from the fact that she consumed as much as five (5) fifths of hard liquor a week, and had no control over the son's behavior (he skipped school often). The officer who talked to her said she was drunk at the time of said interview. When the subject was questioned, he stated that he did not want to live with his mother because of her drinking problems and that he also did not want to live with his aunt in Walla Walla. The Juvenile Dept. advised the aunt in Walla Walla that it would not be advisable for the boy to return to his mother's home under the existing circumstances. The aunt was glad to accept the boy until such time when the mother would try to change the conditions of herself and home atmosphere.

20 - Hermiston--01-25-70-The assistant manager of Starrets came down to the store to pick up a rug shampoo machine. Upon entering the building, he caught subject going through the cash register. Assistant manager held the subject till officers arrived, and then told them he thought there had been another one. As he heard a basement door slam. Building was searched without results. Later subject confessed to breaking in through a window with his friend. Subjects had then removed 5 cases of beer, 3 partial fifths of whiskey and 1 quart and 7 bottles of beer to a near-by shed. After this, they had gone upstairs and subject was taking money from cash register when the Assistant manager came. Other subject fled through basement door. Subject was released through counselor the following day.

125 - Pendleton--The Juvenile Dept. requested this department pick up and lodge for truancy from school. Picked up by officer and lodged in detention overnight.

353 - Prosser, Washington--Runaway picked up 09-29-70 and returned to Benton County Washington 09-30-70.

346 - Milton-Freewater--Runaway - This child was picked up 09-24-70 and was taken into temporary custody and lodged in Juvenile Detention. She was released 09-24-70.

235 - Milton-Freewater--Subject was picked up and held for curfew violation along with 3 other juveniles (07-11-70). Released to parents through counselor 07-14-70.

13 - Milton-Freewater--Advised by the Juvenile Dept. to pick up and hold subject. Picked up 01-17-70; released to parents 01-20-70.

Umatilla County Juvenile Study  
Sample Survey

154 - Stanfield--Subject left home 05-01-70 and was returned by friend<sup>1</sup> 05-03-70. Subject then went to ball game and left with another friend<sup>2</sup> then left him and started walking. Subject was given ride to the Dalles with two unidentified females. Subject called Friend #2 and friends #1 and #2 drove to Condon and picked up girl, returning her to home. Subject then brought to the Hermiston P.D. and transported to Pendleton to be placed in Juvenile Detention.

460 - Pendleton--Subject was picked up outside Payless Drug Store with record album he had not paid for; officer took child home, notified parents and then took child into temporary custody.

398 - Pendleton--Child ran away from Boys' Ranch. Was picked up 10-20-70 and was sent back to the ranch.

264 - Ft. Lewis, Washington--No information available--subject has since turned 18. Records have been destroyed.

451 - Paris, Texas--No information--subject has since turned 18. Records have been destroyed.

248 - Hermiston--Officer was asked to pick up subject at 630 W. Hemlock by counselor. She was known to be a runaway placed in protective custody, then released to shelter care.

177 - Everett, Washington--05-20-70 brought into station as a runaway from Everett, Washington by Arlington Office, Oregon State Police. Was turned over to Sheriff of Morrow County 05-21-70.

269 - Hermiston--Ran away from home, held in custody, then turned over to shelter care while awaiting foster home placement.

454 - Pendleton--Child was picked up 12-07-70. Was beyond parental control. No further information given. (Released 12-16-70).

111 - Sweet Home--Subject was found hitch-hiking east on 180 N. He gave officer a false story upon questioning. A check with La Grande State Police revealed that the subject and his family had just moved to Sweet Home and subject was listed as a runaway. Parents were notified and picked him up the following day.

268 - Hermiston--Picked up as runaway 08-11-70. Sent to shelter care 08-13-70. No further information.

84 - Milton-Freewater--The subject and her female friend were attempting to cash a check made out to another person (female) and endorsed by another man; the checking account had been closed. The girls were found to be runaways from the shelter care out of Pendleton. The girls also amended of forging the checks.

Umatilla County Juvenile Study  
Sample Survey

195 - Pendleton --On 06-07-70 Woman flagged officer down and said she thought someone was peeping in her window. Officer shined his spotlight down along side of house; The subject was crouched down at the basement window trying to look in. Subject ran when light spotted him. A citizen stopped the subject. Officer took child into custody and he was lodged in Juvenile Detention. The child had a strong odor of alcohol on his breath. Was released to parents the following day.

358 - Pendleton--He was taken into temporary custody for riding a motorcycle without headgear on 10-07-70. It was then discovered that the bike had been stolen from another individual's front lawn. This individual had already made a complaint to the Police Department. At the time of above arrest, the officer asked the subject if the bike were his or if it was stolen; subject replied he had found the bike along the roadside. Subject resisted further questioning. Above charges eventually dropped. Later on another larceny charge, he was sent to Boys' Ranch.

17 - Pilot Rock--No information; subject has since come of age. Records have been destroyed.

53 - Pendleton--Officer received phone call from subject who stated that he had gotten drunk and stolen a pick-up from a party at Pend-Air Hights and then later wrecked the vehicle on the old highway. He stated that he wanted to turn himself in. Officer went and picked him up. Grandparents were with boy at the time of pick up by officers.

455 - Stanfield--This child stole a lady's wallet and \$50.00 from White's Floral Shop. Was picked up 12-08-70; Hearing date set for 12-16-70. Was charged with larceny and sent to MacLaren 12-17-70.

98 - Pendleton--Subject was taken into custody 03-21-70 after another juvenile had broken into paper racks at Albertson's, Cindy's Pancake House, and the Oregonian. Officers searched subject's room and found \$2.30 in nickels, \$12.50 in dimes and \$12.25 in quarters. Subject was lodged in Umatilla County Juvenile Detention. Released to counselor 03-23-70. Following hearing, restitution was to be made, and child was placed on official probation.

310 - Hermiston--Subject ran away from home 09-08-70 and was found to be beyond parental control. He was lodged in Juvenile Detention and later referred to State Mental Hospital.

Remand to Adult Court--Juveniles

424 - Pendleton--Subject taken into temporary custody when found parked on the theater road and in possession of beer. Also was in violation of curfew. She was lodged in Juvenile Detention by order of counselor. Remanded to District Court 11-17-70. Found guilty; fined \$25.00.

Umatilla County Juvenile Study  
Sample Survey

Remand to Adult Court

118 - Pendleton--Subject was found in back of Armory; drunk. Was taken to the station for questioning; was too intoxicated to give information as to where parents could be notified at that time.

142 - Hermiston--Subject was driving car at high speed leaving Hermiston. Just missed semi-truck. Officer stopped vehicle. Subject and 3 companions smelled strongly of liquor. All transported to Hermiston Police Dept. More liquor found in trunk of car. All charged with M. I. P.'s.

149 - Hermiston--Subject was a passenger in car with 3 other juveniles when officer spotted car leaving Hermiston at high speed. Car just barely missed semi-truck. Officer stopped car and inspected. All four smelled of liquor. Subjects were taken to Hermiston Police Station where the trunk of car (juvenile's) was opened and 2 cases of beer were stored. Booked with M. I. P.'s Subject was remanded to Municipal Court on 04-27-70.

**END**