

149540

JUVENILE DETENTION STANDARDS STUDY

Governor's Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee

149540

**U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice**

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by
M M Bell, Inc.

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

M M Bell, Inc
December 15, 1991

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE
Executive Summary	1
Project Approach	8
Historical perspective	8
Approach of current study	10
Findings by Chapter	14
Intake	14
Medical and Health Care	20
Communication, Correspondence, and Visiting	24
Security and Control	26
Sanitation and Hygiene	29
Juvenile Rights	31
Rules and Discipline	33
Juvenile Records	37
Safety and Emergency Procedures	38
Program	40
Discharge and Inter-jurisdictional Movement	44
Administration, Organization and Management	45
Personnel	47
Training and Staff Development	50
Physical Plant	55
Food Service	64
Findings by County	67
Benton/Franklin	67
Chelan	68
Clallam	69
Clark	70
Cowlitz	71
Grant	72
Grays Harbor	73
King	74
Kitsap	75
Lewis	77
Okanogan	78
Pierce	79
Skagit	80
Snohomish	81
Spokane	82
Thurston	84
Whatcom	85
Yakima	86

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendices

Self Assessment Form
Detention Facilities

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The State of Washington has taken several steps toward adoption of standards for the operation of county juvenile detention facilities. In 1987, the Juvenile Disposition Standards Commission published draft standards. In 1990, the Governor's Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee (GJJAC) funded an assessment of the cost of compliance with the proposed draft standards and selected American Correctional Association, Commission on Accreditation (ACACA) standards. This report is the result of that assessment.

The standards proposed by the Juvenile Disposition Standards Commission addressed: intake; medical and health care; communication, correspondence, and visiting; security and control; sanitation and hygiene; juvenile rights; rules and discipline; juvenile records; safety and emergency procedures; programs; discharge and inter-jurisdictional movement. The standards selected from the American Correctional Association, Commission on Accreditation, added the following: administration, organization and management; fiscal management; personnel; training; physical plant; food service.

The administrators and managers of the eighteen Washington State juvenile detention facilities are well acquainted with the standards. They made their own assessment of compliance with the standards. The study team reviewed those assessments and in collaboration added cost estimates.

The efforts of administrators and managers to bring their facilities into compliance with good operating practice are apparent. Facilities are well run. Staff are committed and concerned. Each facility has areas in which they are doing unusually well. Some are doing well despite serious handicaps, particularly of space.

There are deficiencies, however, and some of these are serious. Direct operational deficiencies in the areas of medical care and program can be corrected with relatively modest sums. Indirect operational deficiencies in training, personnel, and management can be more costly to correct. Physical plant deficiencies can be the most expensive to remedy.

Two sections of the proposed Washington State standards should be re-examined before their adoption: the chapter on intake and the chapter on rules and discipline.

Intake criteria were loosely defined. Intake is a two stage process, but is not recognized as such. Staff assigned to perform intake functions cannot be delegated useful levels of

responsibility without clarifying both the criteria and the stages.

The disciplinary process as currently set out rests on the due process protection developed for adults who face further loss of liberty, due to forfeiture of good time. This process does not mesh well with existing programming in most detention facilities. The case law around disciplinary actions is evolving. Its application to juvenile detention is imperfect. This area should be reviewed carefully before adoption.

Medical care is the most critical operational deficiency. Several counties do not have a health care provider making routine visits to the facility to conduct sick call, health assessments, or health education. Others provide basic health services, but perform health assessments for juveniles held more than 30 days only when the youth is held for the Division of Juvenile Rehabilitation. Deficiencies in health care were found in all but one facility.

A model for basic health care was developed. Facility medical services were compared to the model. The cost of providing care sufficient to meet the model is estimated at \$219,000. This assumes that all medical staff can be paid a common rate, which is an unlikely prospect. Sixty-five percent of the added cost is necessary to meet the requirement of the proposed Washington State standards; 35 percent is necessary to meet discretionary ACA standards regarding health assessments. (See Table 1 for a display of costs by section.)

Programming is another critical deficiency. Rather than lock youth in their room or have them watch television, good practice involves them in programs during their waking hours: that is, at least 14 hours a day. This is a requirement of the ACA discretionary standards.

School attendance is a requirement but this occupies only five hours each day. Most facilities do not have enough staff to keep youth in programs for the remainder of the day. This is complicated by the use of levels to assign youth to program time. If all youth were out of their rooms 14 hours a day, it would take more staff, and in some facilities, more space. To add sufficient staff at current pay scales is estimated to cost \$312,000.

Detention staff function with standard operating policy and procedures (SOPs) that are in varying stages of review and revision. Word processing makes the process of keeping SOPs up to date much easier. To bring manuals into compliance with these standards can be made easier now that GJJAC has a model manual prepared by the ACA available on disk. Even so, staff time and effort are required to review policies and procedures and adapt the model to local situations. The cost of doing so in the

specific areas identified by the facilities is estimated to have the one time cost of \$25,000. This cost is located under discretionary ACA standards but includes large numbers of proposed Washington standards which need revising.

Washington statutes require correctional staff, including those working in juvenile detention, to receive training in preparation for that employment. Discretionary ACA standards speak to the desirability of annual training for corrections staff. If all permanent detention staff received initial training and subsequent year training not yet received this year, it could cost an additional \$196,000.

Sound management suggests that staff in similar positions should receive similar pay. Although comparability can be defined differently and must be adjusted for location, county jail staff come closest locally. They are typically paid more than detention staff, and this pay gap widens with seniority. If detention staff had comparability with jail staff after five years of employment, it could cost an additional \$1,302,000.

Two juvenile detention facilities are under construction. Two more have the funds committed and the planning well under way for major construction. Another facility meets physical plant standards as is. The remainder cannot meet the plant standards. The degree of divergence from standards is variable. Four should be replaced. Critical standards of safety, space for housing and program, cannot be met. Minor remodeling will not suffice given the constraints imposed by their locations or buildings. Replacing nothing but the beds and program spaces needed by these facilities could cost 4.7 million. This does not account for changes in operating costs.

Nine other facilities have plant deficiencies which require less drastic remedy. They also have too little program space, lack safety features, and have no room for medical services. The changes necessary to meet the various plant standards in these facilities could cost another 2.8 million. There are no operating costs here either.

Bringing all facilities into compliance with the Washington proposed standards, including statutory requirements for training, could cost as much as \$251,000. Compliance with mandatory ACA standards could add another \$55,000. Compliance with discretionary ACA standards, including training, compensation, and program, could cost 1.8 million. Compliance with physical plant standards would exceed 7.9 million.

Some counties could comply with standards with little additional funding, less than \$50,000. Those needing new physical plants would have much higher costs. The costs break the counties into three groups. The four counties needing new facilities have

estimated new costs over \$60,000 per bed. The five with major additions to their space, with significant salary disparities or with major training costs fall between \$5,000 and \$35,000 per bed. Those with primarily minor changes in operations have estimated new costs less than \$5,000 a bed.

JUVENILE DETENTION STANDARDS: COST OF IMPLEMENTATION
TOTAL COSTS BY CHAPTER

CHAPTER	PROPOSED WA. STANDARDS	MANDATORY ACA STANDARDS	DISCRETIONARY ACA STANDARDS
INTAKE	17 - \$ 2,975	1	
HEALTH CARE	38 - \$ 142,838		3 - \$ 76,320
COMMUNICATION, CORR, VISIT	14 - \$ 693		
SECURITY AND CONTROL	29 - \$ 0	1 - \$ 0	1 - \$ 0
SANITATION AND HYGIENE	13 - \$ 4,640	1 - \$ 0	
JUVENILE RIGHTS	14 - \$ 54,746		1 - \$ 0
RULES AND DIS- CIPLINE	26 - \$ 8,964		
JUVENILE RE- CORDS	4 - \$ 0		1 - \$ 4,050
SAFETY PROCE- DURES	4 - \$ 18,952	9 - \$ 55,366	
PROGRAM	10 -		\$ 311,532 ¹
DISCHARGE	2		1
ADMINISTRATION ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT			2 - \$ 24,736
FISCAL MANAGE- MENT			3
PERSONNEL			2 - \$1,302,131
TRAINING	3 - \$ 19,956		2 - \$ 175,937
PHYSICAL PLANT		3	16- \$7,470,928
FOOD SERVICE		3 - \$ 720	6 - \$ 6,190
TOTAL	171 - \$253,764	20 - \$ 56,086	41- \$9,371,824

¹ The standard requiring youth be out of their rooms 14 hours a day is an ACA Standard in the section on physical plant. It has such a profound impact on program that the cost has been placed here.

JUVENILE DETENTION STANDARDS: COST OF IMPLEMENTATION
ONE TIME COSTS BY CHAPTER

CHAPTER	PROPOSED WA. STANDARDS	MANDATORY ACA STANDARDS	DISCRETIONARY ACA STANDARDS
INTAKE	17 - \$ 2,975	1	
HEALTH CARE	38 - \$ 28,060		3 - \$ 0
COMMUNICATION, CORR, VISIT	14 - \$ 0		
SECURITY AND CONTROL	29 - \$ 0	1 - \$ 0	1 - \$ 0
SANITATION AND HYGIENE	13 - \$ 540	1 - \$ 0	
JUVENILE RIGHTS	14 - \$ 54,746		1 - \$ 0
RULES AND DIS- CIPLINE	26 - \$ 1,056		
JUVENILE RE- CORDS	4 - \$ 0		1 - \$ 4,050
SAFETY PROCE- DURES	4 - \$ 0	9 - \$ 55,366	
PROGRAM	10 -		\$ 0
DISCHARGE	2		1
ADMINISTRATION ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT			2 - \$ 24,736
FISCAL MANAGE- MENT			3
PERSONNEL			2 - \$ 0
TRAINING	3 - \$ 19,956		2 - \$ 0
PHYSICAL PLANT		3	16- \$7,470,928
FOOD SERVICE		3	6
TOTAL	171 - \$107,333	20 - \$ 55,366	41- \$7,499,714

JUVENILE DETENTION STANDARDS: COST OF IMPLEMENTATION
ON-GOING COSTS BY CHAPTER

CHAPTER	PROPOSED WA. STANDARDS	MANDATORY ACA STANDARDS	DISCRETIONARY ACA STANDARDS
INTAKE	17 - \$ 0	1	
HEALTH CARE	38 - \$ 114,778		3 - \$ 76,320
COMMUNICATION, CORR, VISIT	14 - \$ 693		
SECURITY AND CONTROL	29 - \$ 0	1 - \$ 0	1 - \$ 0
SANITATION AND HYGIENE	13 - \$ 4,100	1 - \$ 0	
JUVENILE RIGHTS	14 - \$ 0		1 - \$ 0
RULES AND DIS- CIPLINE	26 - \$ 7,908		
JUVENILE RE- CORDS	4 - \$ 0		1 - \$ 0
SAFETY PROCE- DURES	4 - \$ 18,952	9 - \$ 0	
PROGRAM	10 -		\$ 311,532 ²
DISCHARGE	2		1
ADMINISTRATION ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT			2 - \$ 0
FISCAL MANAGE- MENT			3
PERSONNEL			2 - \$1,302,131
TRAINING	3 - \$ 0		2 - \$ 175,937
PHYSICAL PLANT		3	16- \$ 0
FOOD SERVICE		3 - \$ 720	6 - \$ 6,190
TOTAL	171 - \$146,431	20 - \$ 720	41- \$1,872,110

² The standard requiring youth be out of their rooms 14 hours a day is an ACA Standard in the section on physical plant. It has such a profound impact on program that the cost has been placed here.

PROJECT PURPOSE AND APPROACH

Historical perspective

Since the mid-80s the Governor's Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee (GJJAC)³ has encouraged the development of comprehensive operating standards for detention facilities in Washington State.

In 1985, they commissioned a study of the intake and release practices used in the state's eighteen⁴ juvenile detention facilities. Results from this study helped enact legislation which directed the Juvenile Disposition Standards Commission (JDSC) to develop draft detention standards. These draft standards were published in October 1987.

While JDSC was working on draft standards, the GJJAC sponsored an evaluation of county detention facilities. They contracted with Charles J. Kehoe and Joseph R. Rowan to evaluate fifteen⁵ of the state's eighteen juvenile detention facilities in relation to American Correctional Association (ACA) Standards for Juvenile Detention Facilities, Second Edition.

In 1986 and 1987, Kehoe and Rowan found significant deficiencies in areas such as detention intake practices, health care, staffing, salary disparity, training, and programming. They commented on the amount of time juveniles spent in their rooms in some detention centers. ACA standards, Second Edition, require detainees to be out of their rooms 14 hours a day. They encouraged expanded use of Citizen Advisory councils to enhance pro-

³ In 1982, the Governor's Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee (GJJAC) was established by Executive Order as the State Advisory Group authorized under the Federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974. This body (GJJAC) is composed of professionals in the juvenile justice system and knowledgeable private citizens who represent all sectors of the juvenile justice system and all geographic areas of Washington.

The committee was given the responsibility to: select innovative juvenile justice demonstration projects to receive funds from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and make recommendations to the secretary of the Department of Social and Health Services, the governor, and the legislature for improvements in the juvenile justice system.

⁴ Benton/Franklin, Chelan, Clallam, Clark, Cowlitz, Grant, Grays Harbor, King, Kitsap, Lewis, Okanogan, Pierce, Skagit, Snohomish, Spokane, Thurston, Whatcom, and Yakima Counties.

⁵ Benton/Franklin, Clark, Cowlitz, Grant, Grays Harbor, Lewis, King, Okanogan, Pierce, Skagit, Snohomish, Spokane, Thurston, Whatcom, and Yakima Counties.

gramming and of volunteers to assist staff with specific programs was noted. They also found that a higher percentage of arrested youth (30%) were detained in Washington's juvenile detention centers than would be under the proposed national standard of 10% of juveniles arrested.⁶

Since 1987, efforts to implement the detention standards proposed by the JDSC or those advocated by the ACA have been delayed by concerns over the costs, to local jurisdictions, of compliance.

In 1988, GJJAC asked the Juvenile Court Administrators (JCA) to assess the costs for their detention centers to comply with the proposed Washington standards. Sixteen JCAs responded with estimated costs for health care, physical examinations, training, translation services.⁷ These costs did not include any physical plant deficiencies.

The GJJAC has stated its commitment to the implementation of statewide detention standards that cover all areas addressed by the American Correctional Association Standards, and re-affirmed that commitment in its 1989 Juvenile Justice Report.

To address the costs of compliance with proposed standards the GJJAC, with the cooperation of the Juvenile Court Administrators, issued a request for proposal to perform an independent assessment of the costs required to bring the eighteen county detention facilities into compliance with standards.

The GJJAC requested an assessment of the eighteen detention facilities to determine their current level of compliance, the changes or additions needed to come into compliance with the ACA mandatory standards and the standards established by the JDSC, and the cost of reaching this level of compliance. GJJAC also requested the detention facilities' cost of meeting selected discretionary standards developed by ACA.

M M Bell, Inc. was chosen to conduct the assessment. Dr. Donna Schram and Lee Fish joined Merlyn Bell, the principal of M M Bell, Inc. The three team members were skilled in assessing juvenile justice issues and brought different perspectives to the study.

⁶ "National organizations including the National Council on Crime and Delinquency and the U.S. Children's Bureau feel that no more than 10 percent of juveniles arrested need secure detention pending a court hearing." Juvenile Justice Report, Governor's Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee, 1989.

⁷ Benton/Franklin, Clallam, Clark, Cowlitz, Grant, Grays Harbor, King, Kitsap, Lewis, Okanogan, Pierce, Skagit, Snohomish, Spokane, Thurston, and Whatcom Counties.

Bell had experience with standards and inspections issues as a former member of the Corrections Standards Board (which periodically inspected local adult correctional facilities). She had done several inspections herself. She was experienced as an administrator of an adult correctional facility (King County Jail). She was also the principal in a recent study of organizational placement options for the Division of Juvenile Rehabilitation, which supervises the state juvenile correctional facilities.

Schram had experience with legal issues concerning juvenile offenders as one of the evaluators of the 1977 reform of the juvenile code. She had experience as the independent assessor for some 70 juvenile justice programs. She had worked closely with the Juvenile Court Administrators and the GJJAC on other issues.

Fish had the hands-on experience of running a juvenile detention center. For 20 years he had been juvenile court administrator for Spokane County, charged with running one of the larger juvenile detention centers in Washington. In 1987, Kehoe and Rowan had commented that Spokane County's detention facility could easily meet the ACA standards and become an nationally accredited juvenile detention center. In the past year Fish had been working as an independent contractor to the Division of Juvenile Rehabilitation charged with examining the relationship between DJR and community corrections programs across Washington.

Approach of current study

Three assumptions guided this effort. One, the project was a joint effort of the GJJAC, the JCAs, and the team. Two, the local detention staff were the group best equipped initially to point out deficiencies and to describe local budget practices. Three, the assessment team would provide another check on the assessments, bring consistency to both the assessments and the costing, and compile the findings.

The project was divided into tasks:

1. To review applicable standards (ACA, proposed Washington State) and other regulatory requirements.
2. To develop a self-assessment instrument for use by the detention managers.
3. To review the self-assessment results submitted by local Juvenile Court Administrators and other county staff.
4. To visit each detention facility site.

5. To compile and report the results of the self-assessments and team observations.
6. To profile the deficiencies in each juvenile detention facility.
7. To design a strategy for establishing costs of compliance and assessing intake decisions.
8. To prepare recommendations.
9. To present findings of the study.

The bill (SB4738) calling for the drafting of juvenile detention standards specified seven subjects be addressed: intake/release, use of punishment, security and control mechanisms, health care, resident's property, access to counsel, communication, and monitoring of compliance. Two areas not addressed were physical plant and training. In their request for proposals, the GJJAC included assessment of costs of implementing the 171 standards proposed by the Juvenile Disposition Standards Commission and the 18 additional mandatory ACA Standards.⁸

The Bell team met with the GJJAC and its staff, the Juvenile Justice Section of DSHS, to review the approach and to determine which, if any, standards, other than the proposed Washington standards and the mandatory ACA standards, should be included. Another 38 discretionary ACA standards were added.

Almost half addressed physical plant issues. The others addressed a cross section of other areas where ACA standards were more specific than the Washington standards. The Washington statutory requirements for training were also added.

The ACA Field Test Version of Standards for Small Juvenile Detention Facilities were reviewed for variations important to Washington's smaller juvenile detention standards. The standards selected for assessment in this study were such using standards for small facilities would have altered only disciplinary and health care standards. Those sections were already being reviewed by the team with an awareness of the effect of facility size.

When the ACA Standards, Third Edition was issued, the new or substantially modified standards were reviewed. Two of the 227 standards being assessed in this study were modified by the ACA.

⁸ All but 19 of the 171 proposed Washington State standards were closely related to the ACA Standards.

Five new standards, two mandatory and three discretionary, were viewed as of sufficient importance to be appended to the 227. Thus, detention facilities were assessed using 232 specific standards.

The areas assessed (and number of standards) included:

- Intake (17 Washington (WA), 1 ACA-Mandatory (ACA-M))
- Medical and Health Care (38 WA, 3 ACA-Discretionary (ACA-D))
- Communication, Correspondence, and Visiting (14 WA)
- Security and Control (29 WA, 1 ACA-M, 1 ACA-D)
- Sanitation and Hygiene (13 WA, 1 ACA-M)
- Juvenile Rights (14 WA, 1 ACA-D)
- Rules and Discipline (26 WA)
- Juvenile Records (4 WA, 1 ACA-D)
- Safety and Emergency Procedures (4 WA, 9 ACA-M)
- Program (10 WA)
- Discharge and Inter-jurisdictional Movement (2 WA, 1 ACA-D)
- Administration, Organization and Management (2 ACA-D)
- Fiscal Management (3 ACA-D)
- Personnel (2 ACA-D)
- Training and Staff Development (3 WAC, 2 ACA-D)
- Physical Plant (3 ACA-M, 16 ACA-D)
- Food Service (3 ACA-M, 6 ACA-D)
- Additions and Amendments (2 modified, 2 ACA-M, 3 ACA-D)

The selected standards were reproduced, as drafted by the Disposition Standards Commission and the ACA Commission on Accreditation, with room for juvenile court staff and team members to comment on their assessment. That was the assessment form. The form, which has a complete listing of the standards, can be found in Appendix A.

Self assessment forms were sent to the 18 county Juvenile Court Administrators with detention facilities. Detention managers and other staff made their own judgments about their facility's compliance with standards. Although this method introduced differing interpretations of both standards and compliance, it also meant that whoever completed the form became very familiar with the standard and with their policy and practice. Since the team expected to visit every site, the advantages outweighed the disadvantages.

After the self-assessments were completed, the form and a copy of the facility's operating policy and procedures manual were mailed to the team. Each was reviewed by one or two members of the team, the coordinator and the person making the site visit. Before the site visits began, the team had an overall impression of the areas in which detention staff did not believe they were meeting standards and of the areas in which there were different interpretations of the standards.

Each team member visited six of the 18 facilities. During these visits which lasted from one to two days, depending on the size of the facility, all areas of the facility were visited. Many of the spaces were measured. Staff responsible for specialized functions, such as medical or food service, were interviewed. All standards that detention staff judged as out of compliance in whole or in part were reviewed. Inconsistent judgments already noted by the team were reviewed as well. During this process staff were often asked about other standards which they had previously deemed in compliance.

Before, during, and after the site visits the team members discussed standards for which compliance or cost information were difficult to assess. The purpose of this effort was to identify standards which facilities did not now meet and which would be costly for them to meet. Each team member was responsible for specific chapters of the standards, i.e. for medical, intake, or discipline. The methodology for the cost analysis varied depending upon the standards. That methodology is provided in the section describing findings by chapter of the standards.

This report completes the steps in this assessment and presents our findings and recommendations. The report is somewhat repetitive so that it can be organized along two dimensions. One major section follows the chapters of the standards, so that the reader can review medical care standards as a group. The other major section is arranged by detention facilities, so that the reader can review the problems of compliance any one county would face.

FINDINGS BY CHAPTER OF THE STANDARDS

CHAPTER 1. INTAKE

Washington is one of a small number of states that has adopted statutory criteria to guide pre-trial detention intake practices.⁹ Under RCW 13.40.040, Subsection 2: "a juvenile may not be held in detention unless there is probable cause to believe that: (a) the juvenile has committed an offense or violated terms of a disposition order, and (i) the juvenile will likely fail to appear for further proceedings; or (ii) detention is required to protect the juvenile from himself or herself; or (iii) the juvenile is a threat to community safety; or (iv) the juvenile will intimidate witnesses or otherwise unlawfully interfere with the administration of justice; or (v) the juvenile has committed a crime while another case was pending; or ((b) the juvenile is a fugitive from justice; or (c) the juvenile's parole has been suspended or modified; or (d) the juvenile is a material witness."

When the draft standards for Washington State were developed, the following mandatory holds were recommended: an arrest for an A or A+ felony; an arrest on any new offense while the juvenile is on court imposed condition of release; or an arrest for a second B felony committed within a thirty day period following release.

In contrast, the proposed Washington standards also recommended that a juvenile who has been determined to be a minor first offender or has been arrested for an offense that is mandatorily divertible under the statute should be released.

Individual facilities are allowed to develop written policies and criteria to guide the intake of a juvenile whose referring offense does not require either a mandatory hold or a mandatory release.

Kehoe and Rowan's assessment, based on ACA Standards, raised three specific issues: detention of youth who might have been diverted, isolation of youth during the first hours of their detention, and failure to specify written criteria for detention.

Juvenile Court Administrators identified several issues which would require added costs for compliance with the proposed Washington State Standards. These included the cost of translation or interpretation services, orientation procedures and

⁹ RCW 13.40.040.

materials, and screening criteria. Facility remodeling for the intake area, also mentioned, is covered in Chapter 16, Physical Plant.

Despite the enactment of statutory criteria to guide intake decisions and the proposed additions from the Washington standards, we found significant differences in intake practices throughout detention centers. In some jurisdictions, for example, the intake decision is vested in the referring law enforcement agency; in others, specially trained staff carefully screen all referrals prior to an intake decision.

As an adjunct to the compliance review process, the research team examined the actual detention admissions practices of twelve of the facilities. The methodology required that we access detention logs from July 15, 1991. Working backwards in time the team recorded information on the first 25 pre-adjudicated admissions at each site. When possible, the following data elements were

REASONS FOR PRE-TRIAL ADMISSIONS
AT SELECTED FACILITIES

PRIMARY REASON DETAINED	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
Violent felony	23	8.4%
Non-violent felony	88	32.2%
Misdemeanor	38	13.9%
Warrant	71	26.0%
Probation/parole violation	16	5.7%
Held for other counties	13	4.8%
Alternative residential placement violation	6	2.2%
Held for court remand	5	1.8%
Held for DJR hearing	3	1.1%
Release violation	3	1.1%
Contempt	3	1.1%
Other	4	1.5%
TOTAL	273	99.8%

collected on all sample cases: offense(s) alleged; status (conditional release, probation or parole); failure to appear (prior FTA or FTA believed likely); criminal history (significant or taken into account during admissions decision); community safety (significant or taken into account during admission decision); violation (by type, such as conditional release, probation or parole); and warrant.

The preceding table presents data on the primary reasons for pre-trial detention of 273 sample cases. Note that admissions for alleged criminal offenses accounted for slightly more than one-half (55 percent) of the detentions. In most instance the alleged offenses consisted of non-violent felonies, such as burglary and auto theft, or misdemeanor offenses, such as Theft 3 (generally shoplift) or alcohol violations. Less than 10 percent of the sample was detained for alleged violent felonies.

Approximately one third of the detentions resulted from warrants or violations of conditions of probation or parole. A variety of reasons accounted for the remaining admissions, including detention holds pending trials in adult court (remands), holds pending hearings for youth under DJR jurisdiction, and holds for other counties that contract for detention services. A small proportion of the sample (3%) were admitted for violations of alternative residential placements and contempt of court.

In all, it was difficult to determine from sample cases the extent to which the admissions practices of individual facilities conformed to existing statute or to the provisions of proposed standards. It was apparent, however, that practices varied considerably from one facility to another. Some routinely admitted youth accused of misdemeanors; others systematically excluded them. One facility held a significant number of youth for violating alternative residential placement orders; others rarely or never held youth for "adjustment" or "social" reasons.

The variations in admissions practices suggests that each facility has developed its own culture regarding pre-trial detentions. It is unlikely that each culture conforms to the statutes or to the proposed standards.

Other differences in intake practices were noted among detention facilities. For example, some facilities distribute individual orientation manuals to newly detained youth; others post written orientation instructions or provide oral instructions and respond to questions. Orientation materials in languages other than English or access to interpreters is limited or unavailable in nearly all facilities although some detention staff can speak and write Spanish. Some facilities permit juveniles to make telephone calls to family members and/or attorneys during the admissions process while others do not.

Total estimated cost for all facilities to comply with standards, excluding ambiguous standards, was \$4,095.

Specific standards not being met with current practice

- Trained staff (organizational unit) responsible for intake process, who are delegated to make intake decisions, operating on a 24-hour, seven day week basis (1.01)

Although four of the facilities rated themselves out of compliance with this standard, we found that the ratings were largely meaningless because of wide discrepancies in the interpretation of terms. For example, some type of organizations entity is responsible for the intake process in all eighteen facilities.

In most instances the detention supervisors or workers perform this function. In others probation staff are charged with the function during the traditional work day. On weekends, holidays, and during evening, the intake process is delegated to detention staff, or is performed by an on-call probation officer or facility administrator. When intake is handles by someone who is not present in the facility, the full process may be delayed up to sixteen hours. Thus, all facilities may meet the threshold requirements of the standard, but they do so in widely disparate ways.

We believe that this standard is too vague and that it should be modified to provide more specific guidance to detention administrators. In particular, we recommend that the language of the standard be amended to clarify the following terms:

1. "organizational entity"to include detention and/or probation staff who are specifically trained to perform the intake function.
2. "delegated power to make intake decisions"...one person (such as a shift supervisor, a lead probation officer, or an on-call administrator) should be granted the authority to approve intake decisions during each shift. Third parties, including law enforcement officers, should not be delegated the power to make detention decisions.

- Written policies on mandatory holds (1.102)

One county uses a bond system that permits some juveniles with mandatory holds to be released if bond is posted. Two other counties admit juveniles with alleged Class C felonies and misdemeanors. There are no costs associated with compliance.

Many facilities admit all youth who are referred on warrants or who are referred by law enforcement officers from other counties that contract for detention space. In essence these types of referrals are handled like mandatory holds, even though the underlying offenses may be minor or otherwise qualify as mandatory releases.

- Prohibition of detention of mandatorily divertible youth (1.103)

Youth who meet the definition for mandatory diversion are detained in two counties. In one county this practice occurs when the youth is unable to demonstrate sufficient ties to the community. There are no costs associated with compliance.

- Explanation and training of local law enforcement re: detention screening procedure (1.105)

No specific training or explanation is provided to law enforcement officers re: the detention screening procedure at two facilities. Total cost of compliance is estimated at \$440.

- Written procedures for admitting juveniles (1.112)

Most facilities have something written about orientation which they hand youth during intake. Sometimes it is a page or two which has been repeatedly copied, sometimes it is a video. Two facilities indicated their need for a written handbook which provides basic information about the facility, its rules and its schedule; the orientation process and the court process. References to a handbook appear in several chapters of the standards.

Preparing a handbook takes both staff time and reproduction costs. One facility estimated two weeks of a supervisor's time to assemble the needed materials, approve final copy and supervise the reproduction. The reproduction costs were based on an 8 page booklet with 8.5" x 5.5" pages typeset in sufficient quantity for one year. Estimated total cost was \$4,095.

- Orientation available juvenile's own language. Youth sign statement they received and understood orientation. (1.113)

Spanish speaking staff work in many of the facilities although that was the only language in which staff proficiency was mentioned. Each facility has had some experience obtaining interpreters. Estimated total cost to provide translation services is negligible.

Some facilities do not ask a youth to sign a statement acknowledging receipt of an orientation briefing. Sign off for orientation can be combined with the other intake paperwork and does not represent a significant added cost for the facilities not now meeting that standard.

- Property slips not signed by youth (1.114)

One facility notes that they do not provide juveniles with signed copies of their property slip. Designing and reproducing (using a carbonless paper) a property slip would cost \$200 for 1,200 sets.

- Calls limited to less than two (1.115)

Several counties limit the number of calls that a youth can make at intake. In the case of one county this is due, in part, to the lack of adequate phone equipment, which would cost \$820. In other cases it is a matter of staff time to supervise these calls.

CHAPTER 2. MEDICAL AND HEALTH CARE

Kehoe and Rowan identified medical care as an area of major concern, specifically screening at admission, physicals, and medical training for staff.

The majority of Juvenile Court Administrators indicated that meeting standards in this area represents one of their major cost items.

Because the focus of our examination was oriented toward specific standards, it is possible that youth in some facilities may receive better care and more medical time than appears indicated. Likewise, youth in other facilities may receive less quality care than might be indicated if they completed their self assessment through a narrow interpretation of what a standard requires.

Although an individual standard might not be met at any one facility, our study focuses on those standards where a significant impact is involved because there are a number of facilities who are not in compliance. We will then present a model that would incorporate all standards under a general program approach and list the overall costs to each facility to adopt such an approach.

Specific Standards Not Being Met With Current Practice.

- Delivery of health care services under the direction of a designated health care provider (2.101)

We found varied arrangements for medical care, ranging from comprehensive programs to no on-site services. Sixteen counties have some level of routine medical care. Some have nurses on staff, some contract directly with private nursing services, others contract with agencies, most notably the local health department. One county has a contract, but in practice rarely uses the provider. One county does not have any health care services available in the detention center.

- Designated health care provider makes determinations relative to juvenile's health problems or needs (2.107)

ACA material indicates this health appraisal should be conducted as soon as possible after admission. These health assessments are to be performed by qualified health care professionals and require more than questioning the detainee about health history. By the same token they are not as extensive as a regular physical examination.

Applying the rule that this should be accomplished within the first two days, there are four facilities who meet this standard. The other fourteen facilities do not routinely have health care personnel evaluate all detainees who are held in detention. Individual assessments are completed only if a possible medical problem is noted at intake or the detainee directly requests medical assistance.

- Intake staff are trained by qualified health care staff to conduct health screening upon admission to detention (2.108).

A majority of facilities have some type of form or process to review health issues with juveniles as they are being booked into detention. However, the depth of inquiry varies and fifteen of the eighteen facilities do not have formal training sessions for their intake staff conducted by medical personnel, which is an important element of this standard.

Two County Health Department Nurse Practitioners in Whatcom County who provide services both to juvenile detention and the jail believe that this training could be accomplished in an eight hour session. This was based on their knowledge of certification requirements and own experience. The county physician in Skagit County concurred with that assessment.

- Sick call, conducted by a physician and/or other qualified medical personnel, is routinely held (based on size of facility) ACA-D 2-8269

This standard specifies sick call is conducted once a week for facilities with a population of less than 50 detainees, three times a week for facilities with a population of 50 to 200 juveniles.

Eleven facilities do have regular provisions for sick call while seven only have medical care available on an emergency basis or on a specific case by case request.

In several counties health care personnel do not come into detention unless staff have noted a complaint that they believe warrants further attention by medical personnel.

- When medical services are delivered, adequate space, equipment, and supplies shall be provided (2.114)

The specifics in this standard are not spelled out; however, there seems to be some general understanding of what it should

contain. Seven counties noted they do not have specific space available and would need to remodel.

In five counties the existing facility is so limited there do not seem to be reasonable options to add a medical exam room without major changes in the facility or construction of additional space. Whatcom is presently constructing a new facility which will address their overall physical plant needs.

In some jurisdictions staff indicated they technically have space available but believe it should be improved or expanded to fully meet their needs. Costs are included with total costs are the end of this chapter.

- Physical exams are provided each juvenile held over 30 days. (2.109)

Only four counties meet this standard. Most noted that youth who come under the care of DJR are given physicals, but individuals under local jurisdiction would not be involved unless a specific situation would seem to indicate such a need.

Administrators were able to project an estimated number of juveniles based on those held over 30 days in 1990. They pointed out that costs can vary depending on who is conducting the exam, and the physical itself may uncover the need for a further work up or lab tests. Several counties noted the desirability of ordering lab tests for sexually transmitted diseases (STD); however, the standard does not routinely require this step. King County staff stated that their Health Department is accommodating such tests in their jurisdiction without a charge to detention.

The point has also been raised that the possibility may exist to recover some costs for youth who may be eligible for medical reimbursement if they are from a low income family. However, there are also questions about the cost effectiveness to pursue such reimbursement.

Based on state allowances for medical services and the amount now paid by DJR we estimated the physicals based on an average cost of \$60.00 each for the thirteen facilities who stated they are not currently in compliance. We then factored in \$100 for every 10 youth for lab tests that may be needed and not reimbursed. Finally, we allowed for costs associated with follow up and referrals as indicated through the exam. Costs are included at the end of this chapter.

Requirements to Meet Overall Health Care Standards

The team discovered the difficulties in costing each health care standard as many of them are interrelated. For example, achieving prescription oversight as an isolated function would not require a great deal of time at any one point, yet in the composite with other duties it becomes an integral part of the entire medical program.

Therefore, we developed a proposed pattern that would allow a facility to meet all standards as part of a coordinated health care program needed for their size facility. The key element is having core health care staff available at regular intervals, the amount of their time determined by the average daily population. This presence would then ensure that other supportive functions such as developing written policies, making needed referrals for further health care, and completing required reports, could be addressed.

The proposed base number of hours per week per facility is based on the capacity of each one: 5 hours for Chelan, Clallam, Grant, Lewis, and Skagit Counties; 10 hours for Cowlitz, Okanogan, and Whatcom Counties; 13 hours for Grays Harbor, Kitsap, and Yakima Counties; 18 hours for Clark County; 20 hours for Benton/Franklin Counties; 30 hours for Snohomish County; 35 hours for Thurston County; 45 hours for Spokane County; 90 hours for Pierce County; and 100 hours for King County.

In applying this model and in arriving at the required costs for a each facility to meet these standards we have attempted to determine each facility's current level of service and funding. The total estimated cost is \$219,158, which are the additional costs needed to bring each county into full compliance with health care standards. Of that amount, \$76,320 is to meet the ACA discretionary standards for health care assessments.

Further detail on each county's needs is found in the county reports.

CHAPTER 3. COMMUNICATION, CORRESPONDENCE AND VISITING

This was not an area reviewed by Kehoe and Rowan. The Juvenile Court Administrators identified only one issue with impact in this area: postage for juvenile mail.

We concur. The only standard not being practiced with any frequency is the one requiring postage so that youth can mail two letters a week. One county does not permit telephone access except on a case by case basis. Other standards were not being practiced but facility staff asserted that those standards could be implemented without additional cost. About 20 percent were reported as unmet largely due to the absence of written policies and procedures.

It should be noted that the level system, the method by which most Washington Juvenile Detention Facilities classify youth, can result in youth receiving more or less communication, correspondence and visiting. These limits are above the basic minimums with the occasional exception of youth just entering the facility and assigned to level 1.

Specific Standards Not Being Met with Current Practice

- Postage provided for a minimum of two letters per week (3.108).

The two counties who provide little or no postage for youth estimate that to do so would cost another \$693 a year.

- Timely forwarding of first-class letters and packages (- 3.109).

One county does not have a policy of forwarding letters and packages, instead marking them as sent to the wrong address. This policy can be changed at a small cost of doing the re-writing.

- Reasonable access to telephone to make and receive personal calls (3.114).

One county does not permit youth to make calls except on a case by case basis. This county has no phones in detention that can be used easily by youth and does not routinely permit two calls upon intake. The cost of installing and maintaining another phone is estimated in the Chapter 1. Intake.

Other Issues

Team members found no limits, other than the number of free stamps, on the amount of mail that youth may send or receive. We were told that Division of Juvenile Rehabilitation (DJR) prohibits its youth from receiving mail from juvenile detention facilities. This mail is returned. This practice is upsetting to youth in detention who write to friends being held by DJR.

Facilities typically do not have a policy regarding publications allowed within the facility. The usual practice is to deny those publications which staff believe are not appropriate for youth on a case by case basis. Some facilities severely limit access to publications.

CHAPTER 4. SECURITY AND CONTROL

Previously, only one Juvenile Court Administrator identified a cost associated with implementing this chapter. That standard has since been implemented in that county.

In the self assessment security standards were reported unmet just over 25 percent of the time, 22 percent because there was no written policy and procedure.

We found notable discrepancies between local practice and the three standards requiring some form of inspection, and on the standard specifying legal counsel review of any plans for contraband searches.

One facility does not have a control function.

The cost of adding inspections are included with other inspection costs in Chapter 9. Counties reported that they could absorb the cost of the legal review. To remedy the absence of a control function would involve extensive changes in the facility. Those costs are included with other physical plant changes in Chapter 16.

Specific Standards Not Being Met with Current Practice

- Control function maintained (4.102).

Physical plant limitations prevent one facility from having a control function in the sense of a place. This facility has no need for a central control station for the purpose of managing electric controls. It has no electrical control system, that is, no audio monitors, no electric doors, no cameras. The cost of rectifying this, and other plant problems in this facility, are addressed in Physical Plant - Chapter 16.

- Facility staff use of chemical agents prohibited as controls (4.103).

Two counties plan to introduce chemical controls to their facility. They are training staff in their proper use and developing the policies and procedures now.

- Security devices inspected weekly (4.108).

Most counties inspect their security devices (locks, cameras, alarms, monitors) only intermittently or on an as needed basis. Four counties do not inspect security devices with sufficient regularity even on that basis. The cost of adding this function to the inspection routine is included with all inspections in Safety and Emergency Procedures - Chapter 9.

- Secure areas inspected daily (4.109).

In most facilities, but not all, staff inspect secure areas daily but without the intent of that inspection being clear. One county does not inspect all secure areas daily. The cost of that addition is also included in Chapter 9.

- Administrator visits twice a month (4.110).

Juvenile Court Administrators walk frequently in and out of detention facilities. But those visits are rarely for the specific purpose of assessing the facility and staff performance. Three counties did not have scheduled visits from their administrator.

- Legal counsel reviewed plan for controlling contraband (4.111).

This has been a troublesome legal area and counties are well advised to seek counsel before instituting a search procedure. Four counties had not consulted with their legal counsel. Some simply do not search. Those who do need a legal review. All agreed that one could be done without additional cost.

Other Issues

- Minimum of one male and one female staff on duty at all times (ACA-D 2-8186)

No county said they routinely did not meet this standard. Several said it was very difficult to meet, given their size, and that occasionally they did not have male and female staff on duty, particularly on less desirable shifts. In one facility staff reported that, without sufficient notice of staff unavailability, they may be unable to locate a second staff person and operate with only one person on duty.

- Contingency plan to deal with overcrowding (4.123)

No facility failed to meet this standard in part. Some did not update it annually. The plan in most places is so simple it requires little update. They will double or triple up. Two counties have plans which require that detentions be limited to the available beds.

CHAPTER 5. SANITATION AND HYGIENE

Several Juvenile Court Administrators had identified sanitation issues earlier, particularly inspections. This time slightly over 20 percent of the time sanitation standards were reported as not met, primarily because there was no written policy.

Team members were conscious of general sanitation practices: the cleanliness of the facilities, the conditions of shower stalls, the provision for towels and toothbrushes in sleeping rooms. Some facilities were very clean and others were less so. Some had difficulty cleaning some areas, such as showers that were chronically dirty because of plant deficiencies, such as poor ventilation. Sanitation was not necessarily a function of the facility's size, its crowding, or its age.

Three areas were of particular concern given the standards: inspections, hair care services, and care of the clothing youth are wearing at intake. The cost of meeting these standards was estimated to be an additional \$4,640 a year.

Specific Standards Not Being Met with Current Practice

- Weekly sanitation inspections (5.102).

Four counties do not routinely conduct sanitation inspections. The problem with routine inspections was mentioned first in Chapter 4 and will be concluded with cost estimates in Chapter 9.

- Hair care services (cutting) provided (5.105).

Counties have a variety of ways to provide hair cuts. Most take youth out of the facility for hair cuts. Three do not.

- Protective clothing provided youth on special work details (5.107).

Three counties send youth out on work details requiring special clothing. This work is largely brush cutting done as a part of community service hours. Only one county does not provide protective clothing. To do so would cost that county another \$300.

- Clean clothes provided on schedule (5.109).

Two counties do not meet the daily schedule for clean socks, underwear and towels and the twice weekly schedule for other clean clothing. One county estimates \$1,400 in staff time to wash and sort clothes on the preferred schedule. The other county needs additional socks and underwear to meet the schedule. Their cost would be \$240.

- Washing personal clothing before storage (5.111).

Several counties only wash personal clothing if it is unusually dirty. Some send it home with parents. Only two counties identified this as a cost item. One estimated care of personal clothing would cost another \$1,000 a year for supplies and replacement of damaged clothing. The other county could correct this item without added cost.

Other Issues

- Waste disposal and vermin control (5.104).

One county does not have on-site waste disposal. Staff must carry garbage to a neighboring county building at the end of each shift.

- Programs regarding personal hygiene (5.113).

Several counties identified this as difficult to provide. The school curriculum includes hygiene but not frequently enough to respond to all youth who need it. The nurse instructs youth regarding hygiene in some counties.

CHAPTER 6. JUVENILE RIGHTS

In the earlier assessment Juvenile Court Administrators identified few problems of compliance with the standards regarding juvenile rights. In this assessment they were less sanguine; several had problems with meeting the standards in practice.

As with other chapters, just over 20 percent of the standards were reported as not met. However, in this instance almost half were not met in practice as well as lacking written policy. Several counties had particular problems with this chapter. There are standards here, such as the ones on access to the media and non-uniform appearance of youth, which they do not meet and will not meet.

If all the facilities placing youth in uniforms were to change their clothing policy and give youth more nearly street clothing to wear, the cost would be \$54,746.

Specific Standards Not Being Met with Current Practice

- Grievance procedure available for youth (6.104).

Two counties lack a grievance procedure. The absence of a grievance procedure is correctable; the cost of doing so is in the drafting of an appropriate policy and procedure.

- Outdoor exercise granted (ACA-D 2.8298).

Three counties have no outdoor exercise space. One cannot remedy that problem in its current location without major expense, including the re-routing of a county road. Since this space requirement is repeated in the physical plant standards, the cost is included there. One county needs a new facility, for which physical plant costs have been estimated. The other county is constructing a new facility which will correct this problem.

Other counties place limits on access to outdoor exercise, particularly for youth on Level 1 or in more secure living areas. The effect is to limit some youth to little or no outdoor exercise.

- Uniform appearance of many or all youth (6.113).

Most facilities use jeans, tee shirts with some variation in color, and tennis shoes for apparel. Some facilities put all

youth in uniforms. Others put only major offenders in uniforms. Those facilities using uniforms were asked to estimate the cost of changing to more nearly street wear for all but the most serious offenders. The cost of these changes, including initial purchase and replacement costs, was estimated to be \$54,746.

Clothing costs are dependent upon what the facility already uses. If their current uniform includes coveralls and tennis shoes, only the coveralls would need to be replaced. If the uniform is coveralls and slippers, then all would need to be replaced.

This cost ignores those distinctions and is based on three clothing changes times the 1990 average detention population times a unit cost of \$65. It does assume that in King and Pierce Counties 25 percent of the youth would remain in uniform for security reasons.

- Street clothes not worn to court (6.114).

Facilities take youth to court in their facility clothing. If it is a uniform, then the youth wears a uniform. Some permit a change upon the request of the youth. Courtrooms are close to the facility. Youth enter from a connecting door. It is hard to miss that the youth is from the facility even without a uniform. The cost of shifting to street clothes is provided in the comment about standard 6.113 above.

Other Issues

- Communication with the media (6.109).

Three counties severely limit access of youth to persons outside the facility, including the press. This is a long standing policy and probably will not be changed.

CHAPTER 7. RULES AND DISCIPLINE

Rules and disciplinary standards are designed to insure that all youth are treated fairly and uniformly, within a system of rules and sanctions, without undue harshness, and with opportunity to protest or appeal a disciplinary action.

When Kehoe and Rowan reviewed detention facilities, they were concerned with the tendency to keep some youth in their rooms for long periods of time. This, however, was confinement because of the level system of moving youth through detention programming (see Chapter 10) and not for disciplinary reasons. They noted the need to formalize the disciplinary process in three counties.

When Juvenile Court Administrators reviewed the proposed Washington State standards, two stated that implementation of the standards on rules and discipline would require changes in their practice and be a cost item. This review under represented the difficulties posed by this chapter.

The rules and disciplinary standards, as drafted, detail an approach that would require significant and perhaps unnecessary changes in practice for the state's juvenile detention facilities.

The standards are based on case law developed primarily from adult corrections. In the adult system the penalty for a major infraction is the loss of good time. To protect adult prisoners from unfair imposition of additional time the courts have called for the same due process protections that apply in other loss of liberty situation.¹⁰ The strictures that have structured adult disciplinary matters are being amended even now.

Nearly all Washington State juvenile detention facilities have adopted some form of the level system. A youth enters detention at the first level without privileges. Usually this stage lasts only a few days while the youth receives orientation and staff assesses his/her needs. During this phase s/he may spend little time out of his or her room.

As youth meet the facility's expectations for their behavior, they move up one or more levels, acquiring more privileges. If they fail to meet expectations or engage in misconduct, they will be reduced one or more levels. Some will fall back to the first level and be effectively on long term room restriction.

¹⁰ The adult disciplinary decision from the Supreme Court is *Wolff v. McDonnell*, 418 U.S. 539 (1974).

The levels form a system of rewards and punishments. But it is not consistent with due process protections, if those protections come into play with each infraction.

The standards call for distinctions between major and minor misconduct and the penalties associated with both. Under the standards a minor misconduct would result in something less than an hour's room restriction. A major misconduct results in a stiffer penalty. Most facilities have made distinctions in misconduct and in the penalties imposed. Minor forms of misconduct can have many results other than room restriction.

Major misconduct or repeated minor misconduct can result in loss of privileges and reduction in levels. As levels are reduced, the youth returns to longer periods in his/her room. The result can be the equivalent of room restriction. Room restriction is not the same loss of liberty faced by an adult losing good time.

A youth accumulates a series of infractions, knowing that the next one can result in loss of level. In the same way a youth can accumulate a series of good reports, knowing that the next will result in the gain of a level. Discipline within the level system is usually immediate.

Detention staff noted that by the time a disciplinary hearing occurred, most youth would have been placed back in program. Hence, having a hearing before major discipline is imposed, particularly if major discipline is room restriction beyond one hour, would defeat what they are trying to achieve with the level system.

One aspect of due process is the opportunity to appeal. Some facilities use their grievance procedure as a means of appeal. The grievance process allows a youth to request a supervisor to address a question or to review a staff action. However, this may not be a legally sufficient substitute for a due process appeal.

The two systems, rules and discipline in the due process modality and rules and discipline in the level modality, are significantly different. To ensure that the objectives of standards on rules and discipline are met these differences must be recognized.

Reconciling protection for juveniles being disciplined from arbitrary and unfair treatment and the operational requirements of the level system will require further effort. The team recommends that this chapter be reviewed by the Disposition Standards Commission before submission to the legislature.

Most of the standards in this chapter, particularly those requiring hearings (WA 7.113, 7.114, 7.115, 7.116, 7.117, 7.118, 7.119, 7.121, 7.122, 7.123, and 7.124), can be met by only a few coun-

ties. Other standards can be met by most counties with the minor additional cost of \$8,964.

Specific Standards Not Being Met with Current Practice

- Staff trained to be familiar with rules and discipline (7.103).

One county provides little or no formal training for staff. To do so in this area would cost \$1,056.

- During room restriction communication by staff every 15 minutes (7.105).

Two counties do not comply with this standard. To do so would not add significantly to staff's present duties.

- Room restriction for minor misbehavior not exceeding one hour (7.106).

Room restrictions over one hour are common. The youth's level may affect the time on restriction. Some facilities have not defined time limits this narrowly so that room restriction for minor misbehavior may be as much as 72 hours. To limit room restrictions to one hour would require major change for seven counties.

- Hearings on any major rule violations for which youth is restricted beyond 24 hours (7.109).

Few counties provide hearings as meant by this standard; seven counties specifically identified their non-compliance. Some have a grievance process or a supervisory review of discipline that is parallel. For most facilities to introduce hearings would be a major change in procedure and require more staff time. These costs have not been accumulated.

Other standards require a hearing or are closely related to that process. They are 7.113, 7.114, 7.115, 7.116, 7.117, 7.118, 7.119, 7.121, 7.122, 7.123, and 7.124. The same group of counties fail to meet each one.

- Supervisory review of restrictions longer than one hour within 24 hours (7.110).

For smaller county to meet this standard supervisors must be on-call and come in over weekends as needed. Two counties identi-

fied they were not in compliance. Most supervisory staff are on-call already. To add this to the time they come in would add overtime expenses. One county estimated they would come in six times a year for two hours each time at \$20 an hour for overtime. This totals to \$240 a year.

- Youth on restriction permitted exercise, etc.; exceptions are justified in writing (WA 7.111).

One county does not provide exercise to youth on restriction because of staff shortages. To remedy this would cost significant more staff time. They estimate another 465 hours a year or \$5,350.

- Youth on restriction visually checked every 15 minutes and visited daily by supervisor (WA 7.112).

Some counties are less formal than this when checking on youth. Some may be too lax regarding frequent checks. One county places higher security youth on the equivalent of room restriction because their facility design gives them little choice. These youth are not checked as frequently as this standard requires. There would be little cost for more frequent checks in the smaller counties. The county with higher security youth would have a staff cost of \$2,318.

- Group discipline for the misbehavior of one youth prohibited (7.126).

One county does discipline groups for infractions that originate with one youth. A change in practice would not be an expense.

CHAPTER 8. JUVENILE RECORDS

Earlier assessments had identified no problems with this chapter. The only problem identified this time was with locked, confidential files, which are specified by an ACA discretionary standard. To meet this standard would require changes in practice in most counties and cost an estimated \$4,050 for locking file cabinets.

Specific Standards Not Being Met with Current Practice

- Juvenile records kept in locked files and marked confidential ((ACA-D 2-8119)).

Most facilities keep juvenile records in file cabinets located in the control room. Access to that room is limited. Although those limitations vary by facility, all meet the intent of the standard if not the letter.

However, since this practice does not meet the narrow terms of this standard, counties were asked to estimate the cost of obtaining a locking file cabinet and marking files. It was assumed that a file cabinet held an average of 25 files and cost \$150 each. The number of files was based on the 1990 average daily population.

CHAPTER 9. SAFETY AND EMERGENCY PROCEDURES

Kehoe and Rowan spoke of the importance of fire drills and emergency evacuation procedures. Holding fire drills and preparing evacuation procedures can be difficult but not expensive. The Juvenile Court Administrators did not identify costs associated with failure to meet these standards.

Ten standards were added to this chapter as a result of the inclusion of mandatory ACA standards.

The cost of performing four types of inspections would be \$18,952. The provision of exit signs would add \$3,366. Emergency generators are estimated to cost \$45,000. Fire doors and perimeter fencing are estimated at \$7,000. The total cost of implementing this chapter would be \$74,318.

Specific Standards Not Being Met with Current Practice

- Regular independent fire and safety inspections, weekly fire and safety inspection by staff (ACA-M 2-8172)

Most facilities have periodic visits from the local fire marshal or fire department although these inspections are not necessarily annual and are of unknown quality. However, eleven counties identified they did not have a weekly fire and safety inspection by staff.

This inspection is one of four which were estimated as a group. The others are the weekly inspection of security devices (4.108), daily inspection of secure areas (4.109) and sanitation inspections (5.102). Most facilities conduct all types of inspections, but do not maintain adequate records of doing so. Some conduct inspections infrequently and could make them regularly without added staff time.

Some counties do not have any weekly inspections by staff. The combination of all four represents significant amounts of staff time for five facilities. Cost was calculated by the time required for the inspection times the staff's hourly rate. The total estimate for the four types of inspections was \$18,952.

- Designated exits for prompt evacuation of juveniles and staff members (ACA 2-8129-M).

- Two identifiable exits in each juvenile housing area and other high density areas (ACA 2-8130-M).
- Distinct and permanently marked exits, continuously visible at all times, clear and maintained in usable condition (ACA 2-8177-M)

One county does not have fire doors at the end of the living units. If fire doors were cut in the end walls, there would also need to be a perimeter fence enclosing the areas into which juveniles would exit. The cost of the doors and the fence are estimated at \$7,000.

Most counties had enough clearly marked exit signs for their housing areas. However, three counties identified a need for lighted, marked exit signs. Among them they require 17 signs.

The cost of a lighted signs, wired and backed up with continuous charging batteries, is \$132 each. A protective cage over the light adds \$66 = \$198 each. The total cost would be \$3,366, without the additional cost of wiring each sign into the nearest electrical connection.

- No alternate source of power (ACA-D 2-8178).

Three counties do not have emergency generators; they have key overrides. Emergency generators serve two important immediate functions in a locked facility. They permit doors to be opened electronically and they provide sufficient lights for egress.

In event of a longer term power outage, an emergency generator could be brought in to serve the facility. None the less onsite emergency power is the preference.

The cost of obtaining and installing alternate power has been estimated at \$15,000 in one location, extended to all three would be \$45,000.

Other Issues

- No fire drills (9.104).

Although all but one county marked themselves in compliance on this standard, many do not conduct fire drills as a routine procedure nor do they do so over all shifts. Further, the drills may not involve actual evacuation of juveniles.

Only one facility has tested staff plans using a simulated emergency. Their experience suggests that the other facilities should have simulated emergency drills.

CHAPTER 10. PROGRAMS

The Washington proposed standards list ten program standards, all of which are supported by ACA discretionary standards. The standard which provides juveniles with activities and services outside their rooms 14 hours per day (ACA-D 2-8138 in Physical Plant) is also discussed here as the team believes this is a programming issue.

Kehoe and Rowan identified the following areas of concern in programming: exercise, recreation, including physical and non-physical activity; social services programs, including substance abuse groups and group counseling; eating in a common room; and non-disciplinary confinement to room.

The team discovered many discrepancies between what detention centers had indicated (in the self assessment) what programming they did with youth and what programming was operating. These deficiencies became quickly apparent when the daily schedule of activities was examined.

Many facilities rely heavily on the school teacher and program to provide the majority of the programming. In these facilities the youth spend more hours in their rooms during the weekends than during the week, because the only scheduled activity is an hour or so of recreation time each day.

Staff with special talents and skills have starting sharing them with detention youth. In one county, for instance, a staff person, who is a photographer, is teaching youth to use a camera. This is certainly an area in which other staff might contribute to program activities.

In reviewing this chapter it is essential to note the strong interrelationships of available space, sufficient staff, and daily population.

Because the interior activity space is used for so many different purposes: eating, visiting, active games, quiet activities, it is particularly sensitive to population changes. In some facilities the interior activity space is also used for a classroom, which further inhibits its use for other programming.

As population increases, staff must spend more time in custodial supervision and monitoring. If staff also cook, meal preparation further impacts their availability for programming activities.

The number of detention staff on duty is usually divided equally between the day and evening shifts. But the evening shift staff

have the greater responsibility for program as the school day is over by 3:00 PM.

Specific Standards Not Being Met with Current Practice

- Facility makes available services and programs, including education, visiting, communication, counseling, supervision, medical services, food service, recreation and exercise, and reading materials. (10.101).

Every facility indicated they have minimum programs established as required by this standard. However, this standard does not speak to the quality or depth of these services. Many facilities indicated they would like to offer a higher level of service than is currently possible due to staff and space limitations.

Five counties noted problems with providing educational services. As their populations have increased, their classroom space is no longer adequate. This may mean that not every youth in detention is able to attend school.

In Pierce County, the secure building (A) population can be as high as 65 youth. Under these circumstances 30-35 youth attend school only four hours every other day, due to classroom space limitations. They are in the process of planning to rebuild this wing. In Spokane County, detention school can accommodate 40 students, but their daily population can be as high as 65 youth.

Washington State law requires that all youth participate in school 180 days a year, five hours per day, until they are sixteen years old. School size and number of teachers are based on the number of students on a specific day in early October used by every other school in the state. This is unfortunate for detention centers as their population traditionally rises soon after the official school count is taken.

As noted by Kehoe and Rowan, the team discovered spotty social services programming in the detention centers. When such programming existed, it was usually run by outside people on twice or three times weekly schedule. Such programs as substance abuse counseling, anger management, and group counseling were observed. None of these programs were scheduled on weekends.

Kehoe and Rowan had also noted the value of youth eating in a common room, rather than eating in their own rooms. The team discovered that breakfast was often eaten in one's room, but lunch and dinner were usually eaten in a common room. The level system sometimes determined which youth were allowed to come together for meals.

No cost was estimated for this standard, due to its impact on staff and space.

- Juveniles introduced into general population's program as soon as admitted, except for medical or security reasons (10.102).

Most detention centers assess the youth's needs during the first day or two of detention. This is when health assessments are done, when educational achievement is checked, when orientation occurs. In some facilities, however, this does not keep these youth isolated from the general population.

Eight counties limit access of newly admitted youth to programs for the first 24 hours. Most report they use this period for orientation and assessment of the youth's needs. In most cases the youth is not totally confined to his/her room. They may be intermingled for meals and for limited recreation.

There would be no cost to a change in these practices.

- Criteria defined for selecting reading and viewing materials (10.105)

Nearly every detention staff person visited admitted that they had no written criteria for books and videos. All said that staff or management decided what materials came into detention, usually on an item by item basis. All requested help with establishing criteria.

- Daily access to recreational opportunities; at least one hour daily of physical exercise (10.110).

Many facilities noted that physical exercise was part of the school program, and did not include it as a specific part of their own programming. Others did not distinguish between recreation and exercise even though the standard is clear.

Nearly half the facilities had less space, indoors or outdoors, than the standard requires, but managed to provide recreation and exercise programs. Several are in process of rebuilding or remodeling their space.

- Juveniles are provided activities and services outside their rooms at least 14 hours a day (ACA-D 2-8138 and 3-JDF-2C-02)

When interviewed, staff of every detention center reported they do not meet this requirement for all youth detained in their

facility. While actual time out of room varies considerably from county to county, the majority of counties program their detainees for eight to ten hours of activity per day. Typically, school occupies five hours of that time, meals an hour plus, exercise/recreation an hour, and specialized programs or activities the rest.

The interrelationship of number of available staff, space, and detained youth, which is discussed earlier, is very obvious in meeting this standard. Cost for all counties to implement the 14-hour per day requirement is \$311,532. This figure is based on additional staff time, but not added space cost.

For two counties the need for additional space overrides the need for more staff. Staff costs for these counties are not included here.

Other issues

The level system, used by fourteen counties, is a factor in programming. This system allows detainees the opportunity to earn privileges, one of which is additional time out of room. But the reverse is also true: when a youth disobeys the rules of his current level, he moves to a lower level, and often spends more time in his room.

As a result, a youth may be out of his rooms for different lengths of time depending on which level he is on. Even when a youth reaches the highest level in the system, his total time out of room does not equal fourteen hours, except in three counties.

CHAPTER 11. DISCHARGE AND INTER-JURISDICTIONAL MOVEMENT

Washington State has promulgated only two standards concerning the release and inter-jurisdictional movement of juveniles. The practices of all eighteen facilities are in compliance with these standards although three facilities need to develop or update their written policies and procedures. The costs of compliance with these standards are minimal, and are covered in Chapter 12, Administration, Organization and Management

Specific Standards Not Being Met with Current Practice

- Juveniles who allegedly have violated probation not be placed in detention except to protect public safety, prevent self-injury, facilitate transfer or ensure juvenile's presence at court hearings (ACA-D 2-8406)

The Juvenile Reform Act of 1977 permits the detention of alleged probation and parole violators. These detentions are common practice in many facilities.

Because the practice is permissible under state law, this discretionary standard is not included in Washington's Draft Standards.

A review of a sample of cases at twelve of the facilities indicated that a significant proportion of the admissions to detention occurred as a result of alleged violations or on warrants for alleged violations. These data suggest that detention practices concerning violators should be revisited within the context of a review of proposed intake standards.

CHAPTER 12. ADMINISTRATION, ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Proposed Washington State Standards did not include chapters on administration and management. The ACA Standards do. It is in these chapters that the many references to standard operating policies and procedures come together as a manual.

The standards proposed for Washington speak often to the need for policies and procedures, but not to the need for a "manual." For that reason small portions of these two ACA chapters were included in this assessment.

The cost estimated for the work of re-writing manual sections is \$24,642.

Specific Standards Not Being Met with Current Practice

- Incomplete standard operating policy and procedure manuals (SOP) (ACA-D 2-8012) (ACA-D 2-8013) (ACA-D 2-8051)

Most facilities are using SOPs that do not cover all standards referenced herein. Some facilities have better manuals than others do. All would like to make major revisions. Some are in the process of doing so.

Some 386 SOP sections need to be written according to the staff of the 18 facilities. This is an average of 23 sections per facility. Staff of some counties see more work needed in this area than do their counterparts in other counties. Staff in one county identified no items and in another found only one item that needed to be written. Another county found 56. Four counties had between 40 and 50 items. Eleven counties have between 2 and 21 to write.

A review of the needed SOP items by chapter indicates that some require more work than others. Some chapters specify more policies and procedures than do others. The chapter which requires the most drafting is Chapter 4: Security. Some 71 SOP items are missing. This is just over 10 percent.

Since the team interviewed each detention manager, the GJJAC staff have made available, on disk, copies of the model policies and procedures manual produced by the ACA in conjunction with the Second Edition of the Standards. Detention managers can modify these to complete the missing SOP items.

Cost estimates for these revisions are based on all items for all facilities. They assume that the detention manager must take

major responsibility for this work, that each standard would require four hours of work, including any time spent informing staff of the new policies and procedures. The cost estimates use the average detention manager salary as reported in the 1991 JCA Salary Survey. The cost would be \$24,642.

This is a conservative estimate since some counties were more meticulous than others in identifying SOP work. As staff begin re-writing their manuals, comparison with a model will inevitably suggest other areas in which work should be done.

CHAPTER 14. PERSONNEL

The proposed Washington State standards do not include requirements on personnel issues. This survey looked at two ACA personnel standards. One standard specified a personnel policy manual and enumerated its sections.

Most detention managers reported that their county had a personnel manual for all county employees. Some include personnel matters in their own Juvenile Court manual. Improvements in policy and procedure manuals have been addressed above in Chapter 12.

The second ACA standard recommends that juvenile detention workers receive salaries equal to those of others in similar positions in the state or region. When Kehoe and Rowan reviewed detention facilities, one of their most persistent issues was inequity in pay.

Since the proposed Washington State standards did not address personnel issues, the Juvenile Court Administrators included no costs for implementation. They do, however, recognize the importance of this issue and recently completed their own survey of salaries.

Comparisons with jail staff indicated that to achieve equity would cost an additional \$614,689 in 1991, if all detention staff were in entry positions, and \$1,302,131, if all detention staff had five years seniority. Parity with the average base or entry level salary for 288 detention workers would cost \$128,616, again if all detention staff were in entry positions. Parity with DJR institutional staff would cost an additional \$288,748.

Specific Standards Not Being Met with Current Practice

- Compensation and benefits comparable to similar occupational groups in state or region (ACA-D 2-8083).

Compared to entry level county jail salary.

Compared to county jail salaries after five years seniority.

Compared to average detention salary.

Compared to entry level DJR institutional staff.

Within the last year the Juvenile Court Administrators and the Office of the Administrator of the Courts (OAC) has completed a survey of salaries of juvenile court staff in most counties.¹¹ The OAC study enables comparisons across counties.

This study used the same information that a county reported to the OAC. If information was not available from the OAC survey, we obtained the data directly from a county.

Although there are several possible comparisons, juvenile detention staff appear most interested in local comparisons to county jail staff. Comparisons can also be made with DJR institutional staff and with detention staff in other counties. The latter two comparisons introduce variations in cost of living from one region of the state to another.

Comparisons within counties used jail salaries. Despite the differences in approach that detention and jail staff bring to their work, there is no other large pool of county employees doing comparable work. We were told repeatedly that jail staff started at levels more nearly comparable to detention staff and gradually earned more, that jail staff received more added pay through shift differentials, for example.

We compared only entry level salaries and salaries after five years for line staff. We did not compare supervisory salaries. We did not compare basic benefits (which are the same in counties with common benefit packages). We did not look for pay additions, such as shift differentials. We computed annual total increases for line staff only. We did not add increases for senior staff, supervisors, or managers, all of whose salaries would go up if the detention staff received increases.

The 288 detention workers average \$1,617 a month at entry level. Their counterparts in the jails average \$1,828 a month. To bring detention worker salaries in line with jail staff would cost \$614,689 in 1991.¹²

The common perception is that detention and jail salaries widen over the years. Although this is true in some counties, the average difference remains about \$200. Detention workers with five years seniority receive an average salary of \$2,017. Jail staff with five years on the job average \$2,230.

¹¹ 1991 Juvenile Court Administrators' Salary Survey, Office of the Administrator of the Courts, 1991.

¹² This compares Benton/Franklin juvenile detention workers to Benton County jail staff. This seems appropriate since the detention facility is in Benton County.

Detention staff were not asked about the seniority of their staff. Our perception was that some counties kept staff for extended periods and that others had high turnover. If all 288 detention workers had five years seniority, it would cost \$1,302,131 to bring them into line with more senior jail staff salaries.

Comparisons with other detention staff salaries can be made directly from the JCA Salary Study. More than half the counties pay their detention staff above the average. The seven with salaries below the average would require another \$128,616 to raise salaries to that level.

Comparisons with DJR institutional staff salaries are difficult. Institutional line staff fall into three categories: basic security staff, treatment staff, and cottage supervisors. Detention staff can have multiple responsibilities; many go far beyond security concerns. Yet most detention staff would not be characterized as treatment staff or as unit supervisors. This comparison of salaries is with basic security staff and entry level pay of \$1,746 a month.

Most detention workers make less than DJR institutional security staff during their first year. Four counties pay their detention workers more upon entry. If those counties paying lower salaries were to raise those salaries to the level of DJR, then the added annual cost would be \$288,748.

CHAPTER 15. TRAINING AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT

The proposed Washington State standards did not include training. For one, RCW 43.101.220 requires "all corrections personnel of the state and all counties...employed after January 1, 1982" to complete basic corrections training. Detention staff are considered corrections personnel within the meaning of the statute. Basic training is 80 hours. The training is provided by the Criminal Justice Training Academy, "together with facilities, supplies, materials, and the room and board for non-commuting attendees."

Washington statutes speak to supervisory training as well. Those transferred or promoted to supervision or management are to receive further training.

The ACA Standards include training, specifying 80 hours of initial training for new employees and persons promoted to supervisory positions, and 40 hours of training in each subsequent year.

Training is divided into two segments: the 80 hours basic training for newly hired detention workers and newly promoted supervisors and the 40 hours training in each subsequent year of employment for workers and supervisors. The former requirements are part of the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) and the latter are part of the American Correctional Association (ACA) standards for juvenile detention facilities.

Only one county does not provide initial training for new employees. The cost to do so would be \$8,997. Initial training upon promotion is somewhat less common. The cost to remedy those deficiencies would be \$10,959. Subsequent year training is rarely 40 hours. To meet that standard would cost another \$175,937 for both detention workers and their supervisors. The total cost of meeting training standards would be \$195,893.

Specific Standards Not Being Met with Current Practice

The cost to meet each standard in this chapter was calculated using the same methodology. Costs for replacement staff, travel and per diem were calculated for each staff who should be sent to training. The replacement cost varied from location to location depending on wage rates. When a supervisor was replaced, some counties require both a replacement staff cost and a pay differential for acting supervisor.

The travel cost was figured at the actual mileage from the facility to the Seattle training site times the Internal Revenue

Service current mileage rate of \$.275. For those facilities with less than 150 miles round trip to Seattle it was assumed people would drive back and forth every day, for those facilities with more than 150 miles round trip, it was assumed people would stay over for the full training period. No ride sharing was assumed.

The per diem cost was calculated using 1991 DSHS rates for high cost locations: \$103 per day for Seattle.

- Basic training (80 hours) for all full time employees responsible for care, custody and safety of youth in county juvenile court detention centers at Juvenile Security Workers Academy (WAC 139-10-210).

Basic academy training is required for all corrections workers, including those in juvenile detention, as of January 1, 1982. Nearly all the detention centers send their employees to the Criminal Justice Training Center (CJTC) for their first year's training. Some have difficulty getting staff to training within their first six months of employment, but manage it within one year.

Perhaps one-third of the current employees of one county were hired prior to January 1, 1982 and were not required to have this training. The others, hired subsequently, have not been trained. Eight staff need basic training. The cost of this training was estimated to be \$8,997.

- Supervisory training: first-level, 40 hours, or second-level, variable, for promoted or appointed supervisors (WAC 139-10-310) and for middle managers who manage and develop programs (WAC 139-10-410).

Persons promoted to the first level of supervision are expected to attend a 40 hour course of training at the WCJRC. When promoted to a second level of supervision, staff are expected to receive more training. The latter amount varies in length.

Thirteen supervisors in four counties need supervisory training. Some of these counties will send their new supervisors to training. Others will not. The cost to provide this training for all 13 would be \$10,959.

- All childcare staff to receive 40 hours training for each subsequent year of employment (ACA-D 2-8093).

Three counties provide the requisite annual training to their staff; fifteen do not.

There are several problems related to subsequent year training, and staff referred to one or more of these in our interviews. One, replacement staff is expensive and difficult to find. Two, what constitutes training? Three, what training records are needed? Four, experienced staff are familiar with most of the present training packages. Five, sending staff to Seattle to the CJTC can be expensive.

When staff goes away to be trained, then relief or overtime staff has to replace him or her. Of course, the staff being trained continues to receive his/her salary. This doubles staff costs. Of even greater concern in some counties is the difficulties of finding sufficient relief staff to cover for those people at training.

Partly as a result of those problems, many counties provide some, but not all, the required subsequent training hours for their staff in-house or in-county. This training is typically in smaller increments than a week. Topics such as evacuation procedures, CPR, physical force techniques, and anger management skills are the subjects of in-house trainings in detention centers.

When queried, many supervisory staff were not always aware that these topics might satisfy some of the subsequent year training requirements. It seems reasonable to assume that to meet these requirements, a training segment should have a curriculum and a means to measure of what staff knew before and after the training.

This also assumes that someone keeps a record of training received, including a copy of the curriculum and any test scores. The same staff person could keep a tally of who has received training and who has not.

Many of the detention center staff were concerned about what subject matters might be available for subsequent year training. Too many of their experienced staff had completed all the training readily available.

Others were concerned about the cost of sending people to the Criminal Justice Training Center in Seattle.

Costs for subsequent year training assume that a full 40 hours of training would be provided to each staff person. When some training was already provided, the costs include less than 40 hours of subsequent training. Each facility identified the number of hours its staff needed.

The total cost for subsequent training of as much as 40 hours for the staff of 15 counties was \$153,157.

- All supervision staff to receive 40 hours training for each subsequent year of employment (ACA-D 2-8093).

Eight counties do not provide the full complement of subsequent year training for supervisors. Twenty-six supervisors receive less than 40 hours a year. Several receive no subsequent year training. To provide sufficient training to meet this standard would cost another \$22,780.

Other issues

- Appropriate and available training packages for training in subsequent years

Those counties with a program coordinator could develop a curriculum that could be repeated periodically (every six months) in order to include all line and supervisory staff in rotation. Such training should include the current CPR, first aid, and other health maintenance training. Any new training developed by a local facility should have a curriculum, i.e. a plan of study, and pre and post testing. The subject matter should be presented in a sufficiently broad manner as to allow multiple levels of learning.

Those counties with smaller staffs might consider using the training videos that Juvenile Justice Section, DSHS, has. Some of these materials have their own teaching guides; others need to have teaching guides developed for them. When the team inquired about the use of these videos, they learned that only one of the detention centers had requested using these videos in the past year.

The team also contacted the CJTC to see what kinds of subsequent year training the academy might offer for detention center staffs. CJTC staff have offered subsequent year training off-site. The CJTC staff have asked what detention managers would consider useful material. Managers asked for CPR, first aid, and defensive tactics.

The idea of tailoring training packages for individual detention facilities has been discussed among CJTC training staff as many believe each center has its own flavor or personality which, in training, could be investigated and examined. At this point CJTC has received no expression of interest from the detention centers.

Detention line staff could be queried to determine in what specific ways training might be useful as staff perform their own jobs.

• Training for relief or permanent part-time staff

All facilities rely on relief staff, for weekends, vacations, holidays and sick leave. In some facilities, relief staff are the equivalent of permanent part-time employees without benefits. In others there is a constant problem with maintaining a pool of relief staff.

Some counties have chosen to train these staff as though they were full-time employees. Other counties regard this training as an introduction to other similar county positions (particularly in law enforcement) and refuse to train relief staff.

Although training for permanent part-time staff is not part of any standard, the team agreed that those with full responsibility for program and activities (particularly those who regularly work swing shift) should actively participate in programs rather than acting as custodians of the juveniles in their care.

Standards should be developed regarding the appropriate tasks for relief staff and the training which would be required to perform those duties. No costs were estimated for training of relief staff.

CHAPTER 16. PHYSICAL PLANT

The proposed Washington State standards do not include a chapter on conditions of the physical plant in which youth are detained. Hence, all the standards noted below were selected from those promulgated by the American Correctional Association, Commission on Accreditation and include both mandatory and discretionary standards.

In consultation with the GJJAC nineteen of the thirty-four ACA plant standards were selected for inclusion in this assessment. These standards specify square foot for sleeping and activities areas, sufficient showers and toilets to accommodate the population, ventilation, accessibility, and safety features, such as designated exits.

Kehoe and Rowan noted some physical plant deficiencies in the counties they visited. They suggested brightening interiors with residents' own art work or posters, modifying sleeping areas to include windows and increased lighting levels, minimizing suicide hazards in sleeping areas by removing vents and/or metal angles on furniture. They noted the lack of covered outdoor areas in one county, and the need for an observation room for youth who are ill or suicidal in another.

Because this area is not part of the Washington proposed standards, the Juvenile Court Administrators did not note any physical plant problems in their report.

The team observed a wide variety in the physical plants which hold the juvenile detention centers. They range from a facility built in 1956 to several presently under construction. How well each center met the standards of this chapter was not always relevant to its age, although age was relevant to its condition and maintenance.

Most detention centers are housed in the same building, or set of buildings, with the juvenile court room(s), court administrative offices and probation offices. But the team only concerned its review with that portion of the building used for detention purposes.

Two standards in this chapter were met in full by all the detention centers.

- Facility perimeter is secured so that juveniles remain within and general public access is controlled (ACA-D 2-8131)

- Male and female juveniles do not occupy the same sleeping room (ACA-D 2-8141)

One juvenile detention facility meets the minimum space requirements of the ACA standards, given its current capacity.

Four facilities are currently engaged in significant remodeling or rebuilding projects: Clallam, King, Pierce and Whatcom Counties. Clallam has not selected a site for its new facility although money has been set aside. Pierce has money appropriated, and has selected an architect (8/91) for its remodeling. King is building a new section of its facility, which should be completed during 1992, and remodeling others. Whatcom has begun its new facility, which should be occupied by Summer 1993.

These projects are expected to correct most of the deficiencies that have been identified. In the case of King and Whatcom Counties the characteristics of each new facility are known. With Clallam and Pierce Counties, there are no specific architectural drawings against which to compare standards. However, since all four projects are funded and space changes are certain, no costs were estimated for the projects in these counties.

Four counties have multiple problems with their facilities. The space for detainees and/or their activities is limited. The mechanical systems are inadequate. Two have no central control. The team recommends that these facilities be replaced.

These counties have a total of 74 beds among them, and they may need more. That question was not a part of this study. Conservatively, to replace nothing but the sleeping and program space would cost as much as \$5,000,000. And the facilities need kitchens, admissions areas, medical space and so forth.

Nine counties fail to meet some plant standards but could probably remedy those problems without scrapping their buildings. How extensive a remodeling they would need depends on the number of juveniles they house. Some are routinely over capacity. Some double bunk. Both conditions violate standards. Of greater significance are the limited amounts of program space in several facilities. If we ignore the capacity/population issues, the deficiencies in these counties could be remedied for about \$2,800,000.

Specific standards not being met with current practice

A. Mandatory ACA standards

Two ACA mandatory standards in the physical plant section address fire safety, specifically exit requirements for prompt evacuation. These were reviewed in Chapter 9, Safety and treated as a group with the other fire safety requirements.

The other mandatory standard concerns interior finishes and is noted below.

- Documentation about the interior finishing materials in juvenile living areas that are in accordance with recognized national fire safety codes. (ACA-M 2-8159)

Several counties indicated that they did not meet this standard. However, the team discovered this situation was largely the result of the detention manager not knowing the precise material used in the finishes or not understanding the relationship between fire safety and interior finishes. In most cases the local fire department or the county's insurance expert can assist detention staff with this requirement at no cost.

B. Discretionary ACA standards: housing areas

Seven discretionary standards concern housing and activity requirements. These standards are specific about square feet for sleeping areas, for day rooms, for indoor and outdoor activity areas. They enumerate the requirements for toilets, showers, lighting. They stipulate the furnishings of the sleeping rooms. These standards are interrelated so that assessment of their impact is easier when they are reviewed as a unit. Although the cost of remedies for individual standards are not readily identified, this review will treat these standards both singly and as a group.

Living, sleeping, school, indoor and outdoor recreation areas were measured in each detention center visited. All available day room or indoor recreation space was measured: quiet rooms for reading and television viewing, classroom space (if available for other uses after school hours), and dining room space (if available for other uses outside meal times).

- Sizes of sleeping rooms, partitioning of multiple occupancy rooms (ACA-D 2-8138: 70 sf. per person, and JDF-2C-02: 35 sf. per person)

Team members measured the size of the sleeping rooms in all facilities. Assuming that all smaller sleeping rooms are single occupancy, even though they are currently occupied by two juveniles in many facilities, only one county fails to provide 70 square feet in its sleeping rooms. Their sleeping rooms are 58 square feet.

The more recent edition of the ACA standards proposes 35 square feet unencumbered space for single occupancy rooms. The unencumbered space in that county is 32 sf., placing it out of compliance with either standard on sleeping space.

- Single and multiple occupancy (no more than 20 percent of unit bed capacity) sleeping rooms (ACA-D 2-8137).

Five of the twelve counties not presently rebuilding their facilities double bunk more than 20 percent of their rooms. This does not include youth on the floor in single rooms because of chronic crowding. These twelve facilities now have capacities of 377 youth. Without the doubled rooms they would have 67 (18 percent) fewer beds.

The standard on multiple occupancy can be met by reducing population, an unlikely prospect since all but one of these counties are regularly over capacity, or by adding capacity.

One county (Pierce) will not meet this standard when the first phase of their reconstruction is completed. They will still have perhaps a third of their population in multiple occupancy rooms.

- Other requirements of sleeping rooms: access to toilet 24 hours per day without staff assistance, wash basin and drinking water, hot and cold running water, bed above floor level, storage space, natural light (ACA-D 2-8139)

One county does not provide toilets and wash basins in all sleeping rooms. Nor have they adopted the alternative of leaving the doors unlocked so that youth can access the common facilities without staff assistance. Staff have been adding toilets (the plumbing chases were previously built) by buying the units and installing them using county materials and labor. To complete this process would cost \$64,428 at present prices for the combined toilet and wash basin.

- Requirements for housing areas: lighting, toilets and showers, HVAC systems, drinking fountain (ACA-D 2-8133).

At least one facility has reduced natural lighting significantly for security reasons.

All counties have adequate toilets and showers for their capacity but several do not have enough for the number of youth they detain. One county has a shower for 16 juveniles. Given their staffing and program schedule, this is not enough to permit youth daily showers. Thus, the facility is out of compliance with Sanitation and Hygiene standard WA 5.112. Although their space is limited, one remedy would be to install another shower head.

Five counties identified problems with their heating, ventilation and air conditioning systems. Two have estimates for correcting the problems (\$111,500) Another county recently made some corrections which have not been fully satisfactory and is not certain about what else can be done. Precise and reliable estimates of cost in each county would require an assessment by a mechanical engineer.

C. Discretionary ACA standards: activity areas

Another group of ACA discretionary standards speak to the space required for activities: recreation, school, eating, program, watching television, whatever youth may do outside their rooms and inside the facility.

- Size of day rooms (35 sf. per detainee) and indoor activity spaces (100 sf. per detainee) (ACA-D 2-8140 and ACA-D 2-8143).

Two spaces are described specifically in the standards, day rooms and indoor activity spaces. Day room is a space adjacent to ones sleeping space such as found in a facility with several sleeping wings and one day room per hall. Indoor activity spaces may include a multi-purpose room, quiet rooms for reading and television viewing, classroom space (if available for other uses after school hours), and dining room space (if available for other uses outside meal times).

The 35 square feet required for day rooms is included in the 100 square feet of indoor activity area so that 100 square feet per detainee is the criteria used. For example, if a facility's bed capacity were 28, then that facility should also have 2,800 square feet of indoor activity area. This space might be divided into several distinct rooms or, more commonly, be in one large multi-purpose room with one or two smaller adjoining rooms, used for school or library or television.

Six counties have indoor activity areas that are less than the size required by the standards. Some come close. The facility with a capacity of 28 has only enough indoor activity area for 21 youth. That is a more manageable deficiency than what is faced

in three other counties where the indoor activity area is only one fourth the required size.

Three of the counties with very small indoor activity spaces are with the group recommended for replacement. One is not. If the other three counties were to construct only activity space sufficient to match their bed capacity, using the formula detailed later at the end of this section, the cost is estimated to be \$2,512,000.

One of the facilities with very limited space for indoor activities plans to correct this deficiency by expanding into its outdoor space. The result will be to increase the indoor space, but decrease the outdoor area.

- Visiting area that allows for privacy (ACA-D 2-8147) -

Visiting presents special problems for facilities. Space is needed for both personal and professional visitors. There should be an opportunity for contact and there should be a place for privacy when needed. It would be desirable if the latter were visual as well as audio privacy.

When facilities are small, staff are flexible or the visiting hours are sufficient, there are ways to meet these various requirements. Although staff in many of these facilities were not always happy with the necessary compromises, it cannot be said that facilities failed to meet this standard.

- Size of outdoor recreation area(s) to be twice that of indoor activity area(s) and covered (ACA-D 2-8148 and JDF-2E-01).

Two facilities did not have outdoor recreation areas. In one of these counties the site is too small to accommodate an outdoor activity area. In the other county location is a problem in a different way. The facility is on the second floor and cannot readily expand.

A third facility is about to incorporate most of their outdoor area into the indoor program area. A fourth county has an outdoor area that is just under the required square footage and not covered. A fifth county does not have a covered area. A sixth county has a generous outdoor area which is only a few square feet larger than their ample indoor area.

The counties with site problems cannot add recreation area within their present configurations. The two without covered space estimate the cost of expansion and covering to be \$65,000. No

remedy is estimated for the facility with large spaces both indoors and out.

D. Discretionary ACA standard: areas required for specific needs

- One room available for continuing staff observation of ill, mentally disordered, injured or non-ambulatory juveniles (ACA-D 2-8128); plumbing and security furniture for confinement room (ADA-D 2-8151).

Four facilities place an ill or mentally disordered juvenile in a sleeping room and post staff outside. Several place youth who need to be observed in a room inaccessible from the living areas. Few facilities have a room in which a youth can easily be observed without placing a staff outside the door. The facilities using specially assigned staff to observe juveniles typically restrict the observation period as much as possible.

While staff posted outside the room meets the minimal intent of the standard regarding observation, those counties do not necessarily comply with the standard on the furnishings for the room. The four counties using sleeping rooms for observation do not. Other counties have more isolated rooms but not with limited furnishings in which they can place a youth who is disturbed.

The observation room should be observable; that is, in a clear sight line from the control room, or with a door opening that is large enough for staff to observe a youth inconspicuously. The room should be properly furnished. Then staff do not need to be assigned to stand watch at the door of the confinement room except under unusual circumstances.

- Central medical room with medical examination facilities (ACA-D 2-8150).

Half of the facilities do not have medical space in the facility. Either they take juveniles out for medical care or, when medical staff come to the facility, they see youth in their rooms. For five facilities the costs of providing a central medical room was included in the chapter on health care. For three other detention centers the costs of a medical room and examining facilities are more comprehensive. As discussed in the section below on costs of meeting standards, these facilities have multiple problems within their current facility.

E. Discretionary ACA standard: care of the facility

The final ACA discretionary standard concerns preventive maintenance.

- Written plan for preventive maintenance with provisions for emergency repairs or replacement of equipment (ACA-D 2-8158).

Nine detention centers did not have a written preventive maintenance plan. The larger counties had maintenance staff who were conscientious about maintaining the facility and making needed repairs even though there was no written plan. In the smaller counties, where county crews maintained the facility, detention staff did not know what was done concerning preventive work.

F. Discretionary ACA standard: capacity

One discretionary ACA standard refers to the number of youth housed in the facility.

- The population in housing/living units does not exceed the facility's rated capacity (ACA-D 2-8126).

Nine of the county detention centers reported that they were over their rated capacities during the past year. One had a 1990 average daily population which exceeded the capacity. Two others have average daily populations equal, or nearly so, to their capacity. They routinely exceed capacity. Five stated that they were over capacity during June 1991. Of this group three counties are remodeling or rebuilding their facilities.

Cost of meeting plant standards

This study was not intended to provide architectural assessments of existing facilities or specific cost estimates for major remodeling or new construction. There are too many variables beyond the scope of this study: the condition of the sites involved, the cost of permits and fees in a particular locale, escalation of costs to point of construction.

We have provided a starting point by noting the facilities that are in the process of new construction or major reconstruction. We have noted the costs, when available, of addressing specific physical plant deficiencies. Those costs total \$2,756,428.

Most of the specific costs would be incurred by the nine facilities (Benton/Franklin, Clark, Cowlitz, Grant, Kitsap, Lewis,

Snohomish, Spokane, and Thurston) that could be in compliance with plant standards through minor to more extensive remodeling. Several of the eight are close to their capacity (Benton/Franklin, Clark, Kitsap, Thurston) or double bunking (Clark, Spokane, Thurston) and would have to reduce their population or increase their capacities in the process.

One has sleeping rooms that are just below the newest standard. Three have too little activity space. At least four (Benton/Franklin, Snohomish, Spokane, Thurston) of the nine have tentative plans to modify their facilities.

There are four facilities (Chelan, Okanogan, Skagit, Yakima) that cannot be remodeled, either due to land or building constrictions. These facilities currently have a collective capacity of 74 beds. Two of those counties are engaged in serious discussions about how to remedy their problems. One is making modifications now. There are no definitive costs associated with replacement of those facilities.

Although this assessment was not intended to provide architectural cost estimates, we can postulate a very rough and conservative estimate of replacement costs by stringing together a series of conditions.

The first condition limits the space to be replaced to that required for sleeping rooms and accompanying indoor activity areas and does not include square feet for support space, such as space needed for kitchen, property storage, visiting, admissions, offices, control stations, etc. In other words, 170 square feet of space is needed for each of 74 beds.

The second condition applies a commonly used net to gross factor of 1.5 to account for circulation, mechanical, etc. spaces. The third condition applies an estimated cost per square foot of \$125. And the fourth condition doubles the resulting amount to account for the added costs of permits, inspections, project management, equipment, contingencies, inflation, etc.

Given those conditions, a minimum replacement cost for 74 beds can be estimated to be less than \$5,000,000.

CHAPTER 17. FOOD SERVICE

There are no Washington draft standards regarding food service in detention facilities. But there were three mandatory and six discretionary ACA standards included in this review.

When Kehoe and Rowan examined food service in the detention facilities, they were concerned about those childcare workers who also cooked, and noted the need for more cooks and food service preparers. They were also concerned about those facilities whose menus were not approved by a dietician.

But their greatest concern was for where meals were eaten. They noted repeatedly that meals should be eaten in a common room, using regular utensils.

The review team concurs. Team members ate one meal, usually lunch, in nearly every facility they visited, and observed three different models of food preparation.

The first, the external kitchen model, is used by seven facilities. These facilities transport hot meals prepared at other locations, such as the county jails, rather than cook meals on site. Jail menus are typically modified to reflect the nutritional needs of adolescents. For example, milk is substituted for coffee beverages; fresh fruit is often used in place of cookies or other high sugar items, etc.

Other facilities, usually in larger counties, often use professional cooks to prepare all meals in an kitchen at the facility. Meals at these facilities typically follow established menus that are repeated periodically, usually every 30-60 days.

The last model relies upon detention staff to prepare meals in an onsite kitchen. This model is found most often in smaller facilities that cannot afford the services of professional cooks. Yet, those facilities who posted a cook's salary paid the cook the same wage as their beginning staff.

Typically, detention staff on all shifts are involved in the preparation, cleanup, or setup of one or more meals. Menus are generally more eclectic than those seen in facilities that use other food preparation models.

The team shares Kehoe and Rowan's concern about child care staff who also cooked. We believe these people are trained to work with youth in a detention setting, and the time they spend cooking detracts from the time they spend interacting with youth.

All facilities participate in the federal school lunch program and have access to commodities, such as peanut butter, cheese, etc. Although the variety of commodities available to facilities has declines in recent years, these items help reduce overall food costs to counties.

All facilities serve evening snacks. In the past snacks often consisted of cookies, ice cream, or other items with high sugar content of low nutritional value. During the last several years most facilities have attempted to serve healthier snacks, such as fresh fruit, nuts, popcorn, and fresh vegetable sticks.

Total estimated cost to comply with food service standards is \$6,910.

Specific standards not being met with current practice

- Annual review by dietician or physician of facility's system of dietary allowance to ensure compliance with recommended food allowances (ACA-M 2-8217)

At least six facilities do not submit their menus or other systems of dietary allowance to annual reviews. An independent dietician estimated that a set of written menus could be reviewed in four hours so that total costs for compliance are estimated at \$720.

- Food service staff develop advanced, planned menus and follow the schedule (ACA-D 8219)

Facilities that prepare meals onsite don't always use planned menus, or even when they do, the menus may be modified to suit the tastes of staff/youth or the availability of food stuffs and ingredients. Three of the four counties who do not comply with this standard also do not submit their menus for annual review. It is likely that a professional review of their menus would meet both standards.

- Three meals, two hot, provided at regular meal times, with no more than 14 hours between evening meal and breakfast (ACA-D 2-8226)

There are approximately 15 hours between the evening meal and breakfast in one facility. If the count begins at dinner, rather than at snack time, an additional two hours per day of the cook's time would be required for a total cost of \$6,190.

- Provisions for adequate storage, loading and garbage disposal facilities (ACA-D 2-8228)

One facility has no loading area or garbage disposal area. Detention staff carry all trash and garbage to the nearest dumpster which is at the jail 1 1/2 blocks away. This cost of compliance is incorporated in Chapter 16, Physical Plant.

FINDINGS BY COUNTY

BENTON/FRANKLIN

The Benton/Franklin Youth Services Center is located in Kennewick, the county seat of Benton County in southeast Washington.

The facility has 28 beds, holding youth from Benton, Franklin, Walla Walla, Columbia, Kittitas, and Klickitat Counties and youth from Morrow and Umatilla, Oregon. In 1990, it detained 818 youth; and its average daily population was 34.

During June 1991, the facility was over capacity 30 days. It lacks sleeping, day room and school space for its detainees. The living unit space in relationship to the program space is routinely over capacity. Ventilation is a particular problem.

In 1990, a cost estimate of \$3.4 million was given to add 20 beds and adjust the program space to meet standards. There are currently no plans for remodeling.

A licensed nurse who is available 20 hours a week provides health care services. The team determined that additional time from the physician is needed to review health assessments and that the medical manual needs to be updated to comply with Washington and ACA standards.

Program services are adequate although youth are not out of their rooms 14 hours a day. One more full time employee for each day and swing shift would be needed to meet this requirement. The school area, as noted above, is crowded.

Entry level salaries for detention staff in this facility were found to be lower than those for jail staff in Benton County. Further, Benton/Franklin detention staff were paid considerably less than the average salary for detention staff across all eighteen facilities.

Staff receive training during their first year of employment, but need 16 hours additional training in each subsequent year of employment.

The review team has estimated \$388,925 for Benton/Franklin to comply with proposed standards. Only a small portion of this cost is related to compliance with Washington standards. Over two-thirds of this cost is a minimal estimate for physical plant improvements that comply with ACA standards.

CHELAN

The Chelan County Youth Service Center is located in Wenatchee, in central Washington.

The facility has 16 beds. It holds youth from Chelan, Douglas, Grant, and Okanogan Counties. In 1990, it detained 432 youth; and its average daily population was 10.8.

During June 1991, it was within its capacity although the population has been as high as 22 in recent months. The facility was built in 1956 and needs to be replaced as remodeling is not possible on the present site. Its spaces, indoors and outdoors, are not sufficient for its present capacity. Its heating and ventilating system is inadequate. The team has recommended a new building for detention facilities.

The Chelan County Health Department provides health care services. A licensed nurse comes to detention when youth are ill. The team determined that regular sick call and health assessments, physicals for youth held over 30 days, and training for staff were needed to comply with Washington and ACA standards.

Program services are adequate despite the physical limitations of the facility. Level One youth, however, may or may not receive one hour per day of physical exercise.

Entry level salaries for detention staff in this facility were found to be similar to those for jail staff in Chelan County. However, Chelan detention staff were paid more than the average salary for detention staff across all eighteen facilities.

Staff receive full training during their first year of employment, but need 40 hours training in each subsequent year of employment.

The review team has estimated \$1,078,636 for Chelan to comply with proposed standards. Only a small portion of this cost is related to compliance with Washington standards. Over 90 percent of this cost is a minimal estimate for physical plant improvements that comply with ACA standards.

CLALLAM

The Clallam County Youth Services Center is located in Port Angeles, Washington, the county seat of Clallam County in north-west Washington.

The facility has 13 beds, holding youth from Clallam and San Juan Counties. In 1990, it detained 297 youth; and its average daily population was 7.2.

During June 1991, it was within its capacity. Clallam has plans to build a new facility (with money appropriated three years ago), but has not chosen a site. The housing area needs an additional window, and all rooms need storage space. The indoor activity area is less than 100 sf. per youth. In addition, the facility lacks an emergency source of power.

A physician is under contract to provide health care services, but there is no nurse in this facility. The team determined that physicals for youth held over 30 days, training for staff and updating the health care operating procedures were needed to comply with Washington and ACA standards.

Program services include ministry, drug/alcohol evaluations and groups, health issues (such as AIDS prevention). The school program is headed by a teacher who is very involved in transition planning for youth and has an admirable record on successful GEDs. Further, detention staff contribute their own talents to program interests with detainees. One person teaches photography to detainees. Others train detainees in CPR.

Entry level salaries for detention staff in this facility were found to be lower than those for jail staff in Clallam County. However, Clallam detention staff were paid more than the average salary for detention staff across all eighteen facilities.

Staff receive full training during their first year of employment and in subsequent years.

The review team has estimated \$40,810 for Clallam to comply with proposed standards. Approximately 10 percent of this cost is related to compliance with Washington standards. Over half of this cost is related to ongoing costs, particularly salary parity, relative to ACA standards.

CLARK

The Clark County Youth Services Center is located in Vancouver, the county seat of Clark County in southwest Washington.

The facility has 38 beds, holding youth from Clark, Skamania, and Klickitat Counties. In 1990, it detained 1,096 youth; and its average daily population was 30.

During June 1991, it was over capacity 19 days. Staff estimated the facility was over capacity at least 50 percent of the days during the past year; 41 to 42 youth was the average number detained, but 49 were housed on one occasion.

Staff are discussing the feasibility of expanding the present building or building a new one. All detained youth are double bunked, the indoor space is less than 100 sf. for each detainee, and the classroom space is overcrowded.

Contracts are in place with both a doctor and nurse. The nurse is available for one hour daily sick call, and a physician is available on call. The team determined that additional sick call time, health assessments, additional physician oversight, physicals for youth held over 30 days, training for staff and rewriting the health care manual were needed to comply with Washington and ACA standards.

Program services are adequate although youth are not out of their rooms 14 hours a day. One more full time employee for each day and swing shift would be needed to meet this requirement. The classroom space is crowded.

Management staff need to work on updating their standard operating procedures and policies. Nineteen standards were identified as needing policies written.

Entry level salaries for detention staff in this facility were found to be lower than those for jail staff in Clark County. Further, Clark detention staff were paid less than the average salary for detention staff across all eighteen facilities.

Staff receive full training in their first year of employment, but need 28 additional hours in each subsequent year of employment.

The review team has estimated \$852,818 for Clark to comply with proposed standards. Only a small portion of this cost is related to compliance with Washington standards. Nearly 90 percent of this cost is a minimal estimate for physical plant improvements that comply with ACA standards.

COWLITZ

The Cowlitz County Youth Service Center is located in Kelso, the county seat of Cowlitz County in southwest Washington.

The facility has 23 beds. In 1990, it detained 550 youth; and its average daily population was 16.7.

During June 1991, it was within its capacity. The facility was built in 1961, but remodeled in 1989. Its indoor space is sufficient for its capacity although it needs storage space in each sleeping room. However, it has no outdoor space, and cannot make space within its present configuration.

The Cowlitz County Health Department provides emergency care. No medical staff are routinely available. The team determined that regular sick call, health assessments, physicals for youth held over 30 days, training for staff, updating the health care manual, and remodeling the examining room were needed to comply with Washington and ACA standards.

A series of weekly inspections is needed here, both for security and safety.

Program services are satisfactory, and youth are out of their rooms 14 hours a day after their first 24 hours in the facility.

Management staff need to work on updating their standard operating procedures and policies. Fifty six standards were identified as needing policies written.

Entry level salaries for detention staff in this facility were found to be lower than those for jail staff in Cowlitz County. However, Cowlitz detention staff were paid more than the average salary for detention staff across all eighteen facilities.

Staff receive full training during their first year of employment, but need 16 hours additional training in each subsequent year of employment.

The review team has estimated \$80,386 for Cowlitz to comply with proposed standards. Nearly one third of this cost is related to compliance with Washington standards. Another two thirds is for ongoing costs, particularly salary parity, relative to ACA standards.

GRANT

The Grant County Youth Services Center is located in Ephrata, in the Columbia Basin area of central Washington.

The facility has 15 beds. It holds youth from Adams, Grant and Kittitas Counties. In 1990, it detained 427 youth; and its average daily population was 9.6.

During June 1991, it was within its capacity. The facility was built in 1964, but remodeled in 1988. Since that remodeling took place, there has been a serious air circulation problem between the court services wing and detention.

The Grant County Health Department provides health care on contract. The agreement includes 100 hours of professional services per year. The team determined that health assessments, physician oversight, physicals for youth held over 30 days, and remodeling for a medical examining room were needed to comply with Washington and ACA standards.

Program services are adequate, and youth are out of their rooms 14 hours a day.

Entry level salaries for detention staff in this facility were found to be lower than those for jail staff in Grant County. Further, Grant detention staff were paid considerably less than the average salary for detention staff across all eighteen facilities.

Staff receive full training during their first year of employment, and 40 hours each subsequent year.

The review team has estimated \$15,060 for Grant to comply with proposed standards. Over half this cost is related to compliance with Washington standards, particularly health care. About one-third is a minimal estimate for physical plant improvements that comply with ACA standards.

GRAYS HARBOR

The Grays Harbor Youth Services Center is located in Aberdeen, the county seat of Grays Harbor County in western Washington.

The facility has 33 beds. It holds youth from Clallam, Grays Harbor, Pacific, and Wahkiakum Counties. In 1990, it detained 447 youth; and its average daily population was 23.5.

During June 1991, it was within its capacity. The facility was built in 1981, and has adequate sleeping, indoor activity, and outdoor recreation space for its detainees. It does, however, need lighted exit signs in the sleeping areas.

The facility needs an orientation handbook for its youth, and staff have begun working on this project.

A nurse practitioner, who is an employee of a county health organization, provides medical care four hours per week, and on request. The team determined that health assessments, physicals for youth held over 30 days, and training for staff were needed to comply with Washington and ACA standards.

Programming services are adequate, but youth are not out of their rooms for 14 hours a day. One more full time employee would be needed to meet this requirement.

Entry level salaries for detention staff in this facility were found to be lower than those for jail staff in Grays Harbor County. Further, Grays Harbor detention staff were paid less than the average salary for detention staff across all eighteen facilities.

Staff receive training during their first year of employment, but need 40 hours training in each subsequent year of employment. Supervisors need both 40 hours supervisory training, plus 40 hours subsequent year training.

Grays Harbor needs two more hours of the cook's time daily to satisfy the standard concerning the lapsed time between dinner and breakfast.

The review team has estimated \$117,997 for Grays Harbor to comply with proposed standards. About one-fourth of this cost is related to Washington standards, particularly health care. The remainder is for ongoing costs, primarily salary parity, that comply with ACA standards.

KING

The King County Youth Services Center is housed within the Department of Youth Service, located near downtown Seattle, in western Washington.

The facility has 120 beds. In 1990, it detained 5,675 youth; and its average daily population was 107.7.

During June 1991, the facility was over capacity 18 days. The facility is presently undergoing extensive remodeling with a new building to be completed in 1992, and remodeling of existing space to follow. Its capacity will remain 120 beds.

Medical service is available six days a week, and a local doctor provides sick call twice a week. The health care provided follows ACA guidelines. King is an ACA sanctioned facility for medical care.

All youth receive a minimum of nine plus hours out of their sleeping room. Only level three youth receive 14 hours of time out of room. This situation should be improved when the new facility is occupied.

Entry level salaries for detention staff in this facility were found to be lower than those for jail staff in King County. However, King detention staff were paid considerably more than the average salary for detention staff across all eighteen facilities.

Staff receive full training during their first year of employment, but only 20 hours in each subsequent year. Both line staff and supervisors need an additional 20 hours training.

The review team has estimated \$949,148 for King to comply with proposed standards. Nearly all this cost is for ongoing costs, salary parity and training, relative to ACA standards.

KITSAP

The Kitsap County Youth Services Center is located in Port Orchard, the county seat of Kitsap County in the south central Puget Sound region of western Washington.

The facility has 24 beds. It holds youth from Jefferson and Kitsap Counties. In 1990, it detained 988 youth; and its average daily population was 19.

During June 1991, the facility was over its capacity 11 days and has remained near capacity for several months. The facility was built in 1970, and its kitchen and control were remodeled in 1980. Its shower facilities are not well located to serve its current population.

Kitsap has no medical service in its facility. Health needs are addressed by a local hospital, where youth are taken when they are ill. The team determined that regular sick call, health assessments, physician oversight, physicals for youth held over 30 days, training for staff, updating the health care manual, and remodeling a space for medical examinations were needed to comply with Washington and ACA standards.

A series of weekly inspections is needed here for security, safety and sanitation purposes.

Program services include anger management and group counseling, in addition to the regular school program. However, youth are not out of their rooms 14 hours per day. One more full time employee for each day and swing shift would be needed to meet this requirement. The facility was in the process of hiring another staff person, either to cook or supervise youth; this additional person should help with programming problems.

Management staff need to work on updating their standard operating procedures and policies. Forty two standards were identified as needing policies written.

Entry level salaries for detention staff in this facility were found to be lower than those for jail staff in Kitsap County. However, Kitsap detention staff were paid slightly more than the average salary for detention staff across all eighteen facilities.

No staff have received training during their initial year of employment. Further, one supervisor also needs this first year training. Both staff and supervisors should receive training in each subsequent year of employment.

The review team has estimated \$126,813 for Kitsap to comply with proposed standards. Nearly one-third of this cost is related in compliance with Washington standards, particularly health care. About two-thirds is for ongoing costs, such as additional staff for programming purposes and salary parity, that comply with ACA standards.

LEWIS

The Lewis County Youth Services Center is located in Chehalis, the county seat of Lewis County in southwest Washington.

The facility has 18 beds. In 1990, it detained 332 youth; and its average daily population was 8.1.

During June 1991, the facility was within its capacity. The facility was built in 1979. It has adequate sleeping and indoor recreation space for its capacity, but its school room is small for the number of students. Although its outdoor space is only 37 sf. more than its indoor space, both are quite large.

A local doctor is under contract to provide medical services, and is available on call: both to come to detention and to receive youth at his office. The team has determined that regular sick call, health assessments, physicals for youth held over 30 days, training for staff, and remodeling a space for medical examinations were needed to comply with Washington and ACA standards.

Entry level salaries for detention staff in this facility were found to be lower than those for jail staff in Lewis County. Further, Lewis detention staff were paid less than the average salary for detention staff across all eighteen facilities.

Staff receive full training during their first year of employment, but need 40 hours training in each subsequent year of employment.

The review team has estimated \$34,154 for Lewis to comply with proposed standards. One-third of this cost is related to compliance with Washington standards, particularly health care. Two-thirds is related to ongoing costs, mostly salary parity, that comply with ACA standards.

OKANOGAN

The Okanogan County Youth Services Center is located in Okanogan, the county seat of Okanogan County in north central Washington.

The facility has 20 beds. It holds youth from north Douglas, Ferry, Stevens, Pend Oreille and Okanogan Counties. In 1990, it detained 263 youth; and its average daily population was 14.5.

During June 1991, the facility was over capacity three days. The facility was built in 1974, and occupies the second floor of a two story building.

It is presently being remodeled to add more school room space. But remodeling will reduce the outdoor recreation area, which is already too small by standard. Even so, all detainees are double bunked, and the indoor activity space is inadequate for the population. The team has recommended a new building for detention facilities, because the facility cannot fully comply with ACA plant standards despite its current remodeling.

The facility contracts with Okanogan Farm Workers' Clinic for health care services. Sick call at the jail is available to youth three days a week. No services are provided in the facility. The team has determined that health assessments, training for staff, and updating the health care manual were needed to comply with Washington and ACA standards.

Program services include drug and alcohol programs, anger management, communications skills, and school. Some youth have received nutrition training and are permitted to prepare meals. Detainees are out of their rooms more than 14 hours a day, up to 18 hours in some circumstances.

Entry level salaries for detention staff in this facility were found to be lower than those for jail staff in Okanogan County. Further, Okanogan detention staff were paid considerably less than the average detention staff across all eighteen facilities.

Staff receive full training during their first year of employment. Both staff and supervisors need 40 hours training in each subsequent year of employment.

The review team has estimated \$1,295,806 for Okanogan to comply with proposed standards. Only a small portion of this cost is related to compliance with Washington standards. Nearly all of the cost is a minimal estimate for physical plant improvements that comply with ACA standards.

PIERCE

The Pierce County Youth Services Center is located in Tacoma, the county seat of Pierce County in western Washington.

The facility has 115 beds. In 1990, it detained 2,649 youth; and its average daily population was 92.7.

During June 1991, it was over capacity one day although staff acknowledge this is occurring more frequently. The facility was built in 1970, and is presently in the early stages of remodeling its "A" wing, for youth who need secure space. All of the new rooms will be single occupancy, but no outdoor area is planned for this wing. No remodeling is planned for the "C" wing, which houses up to 50 youth in multiple sleeping rooms.

Medical services are provided by a doctor, who is under contract, and two nurses, who are full time employees and available six days a week. The team determined that health assessments, physicals for youth held over 30 days, and training for staff were needed to comply with Washington and ACA standards.

A series of weekly inspections is needed here for security, safety and sanitation purposes.

How many hours each youth spends out of his/her room depends on both the level position and the unit. Space is a major problem in this facility, but is being addressed with the new construction. More staff are planned with the new wing. More out of room time should be expected.

Management staff need to work on updating their standard operating procedures and policies. Fifty standards were identified as needing policies written.

Entry level salaries for detention staff in this facility were found to be lower than those for jail staff in Pierce County. However, Pierce detention staff were paid more than the average detention staff across all eighteen facilities.

Staff receive training during their first year of employment, but need 16 additional hours training in each subsequent year.

The review team has estimated \$54,279 for Pierce to comply with proposed standards. Nearly three-fourths of this cost is related to compliance with Washington standards. Approximately one-fifth is ongoing costs, particularly training, that comply with ACA standards.

SKAGIT

The Skagit County Youth Services Center is located in Mt. Vernon, the county seat of Skagit County in the north central Puget Sound region of western Washington.

The facility has 14 beds. It holds youth from Island, San Juan and Skagit Counties. In 1990, it detained 599 youth; and its average daily population was 11.15.

During June 1991, the facility was over capacity 13 days. It was built in 1963, and remodeled in 1988. Forty percent of its detainees are double bunked; it has only one exit from the living area, and no option to cut another one; it has no control room; its outdoor space is not adequate; and it has HVAC problems. The team has recommended a new building.

A private doctor, who is under contract, is available for emergencies. He can see juveniles when he comes to the jail, but youth must be transported across the street to the jail. The team determined that regular sick call, health assessments, physicals for youth held over 30 days, and training for staff were needed to comply with Washington and ACA standards.

A series of weekly inspections is needed here for security and safety purposes.

Program services are adequate although youth are not out of their rooms 14 hours a day. Program space is a significant problem. One more full time employee for each day and swing shift would be needed to meet this requirement.

Management staff need to work on updating their standard operating procedures and policies. Forty-eight standards were identified as needing policies written.

Entry level salaries for detention staff in this facility were found to be lower than those for jail staff in Skagit County. However, Skagit detention staff were paid more than the average detention staff across all eighteen facilities.

Staff receive full training during their first year of employment, but need 16 additional hours training in each subsequent year.

The review team has estimated \$976,018 for Skagit to comply with proposed standards. Only a small portion of this cost is related to compliance with Washington standards, primarily health care. Over 90 percent is a minimal estimate for physical plant improvements that comply with ACA standards.

SNOHOMISH

The Denny Youth Services Center is located in Everett, the county seat of Snohomish County in western Washington.

The facility has 35 beds. In 1990, it detained 1909 youth; and its average daily population was 28.3.

During June 1991, the facility was over capacity nearly all days. For six of the first eleven months of 1991, the average daily population was over 35. The facility was built in 1966. It has sleeping rooms that are too small by ACA standards. A master plan for new housing clusters, new kitchen, and covered recreation area has been presented to Snohomish County General Services.

Medical services are provided by a pediatric nurse practitioner, who is present 8-10 hours per week. There is no physician under contract. The team has determined that health assessments, physicals for youth held over 30 days, and training for staff were needed to comply with Washington and ACA standards.

A series of weekly inspections is needed here for security, sanitation and safety purposes.

Program services are adequate although youth are not out of their rooms 14 hours per day. One more full time employee for each day and swing shift would be needed to meet this requirement.

Management staff need to work on updating their standard operating procedures and policies. Forty standards were identified as needing policies written.

Entry level salaries for detention staff in this facility were found to be lower than those for jail staff in Snohomish County. However, Snohomish detention staff were paid more than the average salary for detention staff across all eighteen facilities.

Staff receive full training during their first year of employment, but need 16 additional hours training in each subsequent year.

The review team has estimated \$97,988 for Snohomish to comply with proposed standards. Nearly 20 percent of this cost is related to compliance with Washington standards, particularly health care. The remainder is ongoing costs, added staff time for programming and salary parity, that comply with ACA standards.

SPOKANE

The Spokane County Youth Services Center is located in Spokane, the county seat of Spokane County in eastern Washington.

The facility has 65 beds. It holds youth from Asotin, Garfield, Ferry, Lincoln, Pend Oreille, Spokane and Stevens Counties. In 1990, it detained 1150 youth; and its average daily population was 54.

During June 1991, it was within its capacity. The facility was built in 1979. It has 90 percent of its detainees double bunked, it needs more toilet/wash basin combinations since access to toilets is controlled by staff at present.

Staff are concerned about the lack of an orientation handbook for detained youth.

Two nurses and a physician provide medical services. One nurse works five days a week during the days, and the other works five evenings a week for four hours. The physician is under contract for 40 hours per year within the facility; he also sees youth at his office, and is available for consultation with the nurse(s). The team determined that physicals for youth held over 30 days and training for staff are needed to comply with Washington and ACA standards.

In order for staff to observe "red flag" youth according to standard, additional staff time would be needed.

A series of weekly staff inspections is needed here: for security, sanitation and safety.

Program services are adequate, but the school can only accommodate 40 youth (65 bed capacity). Only those youth at the highest level are out of their rooms 14 hours a day. One more full time employee would be needed to meet this requirement.

Entry level salaries for detention staff in this facility were found to be lower than those for jail staff in Spokane County. However, Spokane detention staff were paid more than the average detention staff across all eighteen facilities.

Staff receive full training during their first year of employment, but need 16 hours additional training in each subsequent year of employment.

The review team has estimated \$160,490 for Spokane to comply with proposed standards. Ten percent of this cost is related to compliance with Washington standards. Approximately 40 percent

is a minimal estimate for physical plant improvements that comply with ACA standards. Half is ongoing costs, particularly salary parity, to comply with ACA standards.

THURSTON

The Thurston County Youth Services Center is located in Olympia, the county seat of Thurston County in the south Puget Sound region of western Washington.

The facility has 56 beds. It holds youth from Clark, Cowlitz, Mason and Thurston Counties. In 1990, it detained 1,594 youth; and its average daily population was 56.

During June 1991, the facility was over capacity three days. The facility was built in 1972, and originally designed to hold 36 youth. At its present capacity, 82 percent of its detainees are double bunked; its interior recreation spaces (dayroom and multipurpose room) and exterior recreation areas are much too small for its population; and its HVAC system is inadequate. Plans to expand the facility were developed in 1990.

Medical services are provided by a nurse, who is available two hours a day, two days a week and a doctor who is available one hour per week. The team determined that health assessments and training for staff were needed to comply with Washington and ACA standards.

Program services are inhibited by the lack of space in the facility. The school runs in shifts as it is too small to accommodate all detainees at one time. As a result, youth are not out of their rooms 14 hours a day. Two additional full time employees would be needed to meet this requirement.

Management staff should continue their work on updating their standard operating procedures and policies. Twenty-one standards were identified as needing policies written.

Entry level salaries for detention staff in this facility were found to be lower than those for jail staff in Thurston County. However, Thurston detention staff were paid more than the average salary for detention staff across all eighteen facilities.

Staff receive full training during their first year of employment, but need 40 hours training per year in each subsequent year of employment.

The review team has estimated \$1,753,677 for Thurston to comply with proposed standards. Only a small portion of this cost is related to compliance with Washington standards. Over 90 percent is a minimal estimate for physical plant improvements than comply with ACA standards.

WHATCOM

The Whatcom County Youth Services Center is located in Bellingham, the county seat of Whatcom County in the north central Puget Sound region of western Washington.

The facility has 14 beds. In 1990, it detained 664 youth; and its average daily population was 14.4.

During June 1991, detention was over capacity 18 days. The county is presently building a new facility, which will be completed in 1993. It will have a capacity for 32 youth, and will meet proposed standards.

Medical services are provided by a nurse practitioner who is in detention 5 days per week, 2 hours per day. She is under the direction of a physician with the County Health Department. At the present time space for medical examinations is severely cramped, but the new facility is designed with this space. The team determined that physicals for youth held over 30 days are needed to comply with Washington and ACA standards.

Program services are adequate although youth are not out of their rooms 14 hours a day. Space is a major problem here, but the new facility will rectify this situation.

Entry level salaries for detention staff in this facility were found to be lower than those for jail staff in Whatcom County. However, Whatcom detention staff were paid more than the average for detention staff across all eighteen facilities.

Staff receive full training during their first year of employment, and 40 hours training per year in each subsequent year of employment.

The review team has estimated \$18,906 for Whatcom to comply with proposed standards. Over one-fourth of this cost is related to compliance with Washington standards. The remainder is ongoing costs, particularly salary parity, that comply with ACA standards.

YAKIMA

The Yakima County Youth Services Center is located in Yakima, the county seat of Yakima County in south central Washington.

The facility has 24 beds, holding youth from Kittitas, Klickitat and Yakima. In 1990, it detained 1,013 youth; and its average daily population was 22.8.

During June 1991, the facility was over capacity 16 days. It's sleeping rooms are too small, it lacks two exits from each housing area, it has no central control, and its indoor activity area is too small. Further, it lacks an emergency source of power.

Medical services are provided by a nurse practitioner, employed by the Health Department, who is comes into detention for sick call. The team determined that health assessments for detainees were needed to comply with Washington and ACA standards.

A series of weekly inspections is needed here for security, sanitation and safety purposes. In order to comply with fire safety standards, fire doors are needed at the end of each living unit hall.

Program services are adequate although youth are not out of their rooms 14 hours a day. Two additional full time employees would be needed to meet this requirement. Program space is also a major problem here.

Entry level salaries for detention staff in this facility were found to be lower than those for jail staff in Yakima County. Further, Yakima detention staff were paid slightly less than the average salary for detention staff across all eighteen facilities.

Staff receive full training during their first year of employment, but need 16 additional hours training per year in each subsequent year of employment.

The review team has estimated \$1,640,883 for Yakima to comply with proposed standards. Only a small portion of this cost is related to compliance with Washington standards. Over 90 percent is a minimal estimate for physical plant improvements that comply with ACA standards.