Morrow County Juvenile Crime Prevention Plan

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2009-2011

Table of Contents-Executive Summary

	Page
Historical Perspective	3-4
Planning-Summary of the Update Process	5
Participation and Collaboration	6-7
Analysis	8-9
Gaps and Barriers	9-10
JCP Community Issues	10-11
Target Population	11
Strategic Approaches	11
Measurement	12
Continuum of Services	12
Budget Information	12

Executive Summary-Historical Overview

Morrow County, like every other Oregon County, has been tasked by the Oregon Legislature to update local Juvenile Crime Prevention Plans (JCP) for the biennium 2009-2011. The ultimate goal within this process is to not only align JCP plans with the local Comprehensive Plans (CP), which were last submitted in January of 2008 for Morrow County, but moreover to make the JCP plan an integral part of the overall comprehensive plan.

As such, it is important to at least minimally define what the Comprehensive Plan process was, where it fits into Juvenile Justice (among other fields) and how JCP planning relates to the Comprehensive Plan.

In Morrow County, the comprehensive plan was developed and written by Kim Carnine in a contracted capacity with the Local Commission on Children and Families (CCF). Multiple focus issues were identified through empirical survey, research, discussions, meetings etc…with local stakeholders, child welfare professionals, educational professionals, lay and faith based community members, local mental health professionals, public health professionals, business leaders, Court representatives, law enforcement officials, and State and Local government agencies who impact and/or otherwise have some influence in the general sphere of "Children and Families."

Short of engaging in a long discussion of the entire Comprehensive Plan process, let it be sufficient to note that out of the Comprehensive Plan arose certain areas and issues of focus that were identified and applicable to multiple community partners within the overall schematic of a "child and family" purview. Several focus issues within the Comprehensive Plan had relative "crossover" characteristics in that multiple community partner agencies may have a role in addressing and work in conjunction to do as much. Some focus areas tended to be more specific to one or another of the community partners within the network of agencies and people working with children and families.

Of the six (6) identified focus issues, three (3) have at least some "crossover" characteristic wherein the Juvenile Department may have some impact or role in addressing, and one (1) (gang presence and activities), although impacting multiple agencies, partners, and Morrow County communities in general, the Juvenile department along with law enforcement seem to be tasked with the primary role in addressing all phases of development from prevention to intervention to suppression.

There is a common "crossover" thread inherent in most of these focus issues to some degree and multiple people and agencies work together through systemic partnerships with the local CCF in general serving as the local coordinating agency.

As a result of an uptick in general crime and a voter sponsored “get tough on crime” measure (11) in 1994, the Oregon Legislature began focusing on Juvenile Crime and the idea of prevention in earnest in 1998. Juvenile Crime Prevention dollars began being filtered to local communities generally through CCF and/or the Juvenile Department. In Morrow County, JCP dollars are programmatically managed by the Juvenile Department but the funds are tracked and managed through the Local Commission on Children and Families.

In 1998, Morrow County wrote it’s first, and to date only, JCP Plan. Like the Comprehensive plan later, the process of developing this plan was highly inclusive of multiple partners, stakeholders, and interest groups across the spectrum of the social service field. At one point in the process a general town meeting occurred wherein more than 80 people were present to voice input.

In Morrow County, like other counties, multiple teams have long been in existence addressing the whole social gamete of Juvenile Delinquency. Two teams that had actual input into the JCP planning process were the Morrow County Prevention Team (representing Morrow County Schools, Law enforcement, Behavioral Health [then-Now Community Counseling Solutions], the Courts, CCF, County Court, Adult and Family Services, Head Start, DHS Child Welfare, the spiritual community and lay citizens. The other team providing input was the Local Public Safety Coordinating Council (LPSCC) which then consisted of representatives from the Oregon Youth Authority, local mayors, local city managers and county commissioners.

Individuals not a part of the above teams represented included the bar association and District Attorney (now part of LPSCC), advocacy groups including victims, alcohol, tobacco and other drug prevention coalitions, and youth.

In Morrow County, the Juvenile Department is designated the lead agency with respect to JCP by the local Board of County Commissioners. The Morrow County High Risk Juvenile Crime Prevention Plan targets youth who exhibit one or more of the following risk factors: Antisocial behavior, poor family functioning or support, failure in school, substance abuse problems, negative peer associations and/or are clearly demonstrating at-risk behaviors that have come to the attention of a local government entity, other community agencies, schools or law enforcement that will lead to imminent or increased involvement in the juvenile justice system.

.

Planning-Summary of the Update Process

The Juvenile Crime Prevention Advisory Committee (JCPAC) is charged with reviewing every County's JCP plan with an eye to the legislative mandates of evidenced based programming (among other mandates) as well as being sensitive to the individual, often diverse needs of all 36 Oregon Counties.

The Juvenile Crime Prevention Initiative was designed to reduce the number of youth who are at imminent risk of entering the juvenile justice system AND to prevent youth with one or more criminal referrals from re-offending and/or moving further into the juvenile justice system.

In practice, JCP funding has been historically divided along three broad lines of demarcation. (1) Prevention. (2) Basic Services. (3) Diversion Services. (See Appendix A) Prevention dollars flow from and through The Oregon Commission on Children and Families (OCCF), while the Basic and Diversion dollars come from the Oregon Youth Authority (OYA). In Morrow County, the local CCF manages and tracks the Prevention and Basic dollars (while the Juvenile Department has largely been responsible for programming), and the Diversion dollars are pooled with the other fifteen (15) current Central and Eastern Oregon Juvenile Justice Consortium (CEOJJC) counties. As a member of CEOJJC, Morrow County taps into this pool of Diversion money as is appropriate for our most at risk delinquent youth within the County. Prevention and Basic dollars are used ostensibly to manage the "lower to moderate" risk youth already having been targeted as "at risk" through a validated screening tool (JCP risk assessment) or otherwise having been identified as "at risk" pursuant to ORS 417.855.

The 1998 JCP plan served as a model for the current 2009-2011 JCP plan Update that follows even though some of the gaps, barriers and findings are different today, much of this is a result of the implementation of the 1998 JCP plan as well as a slightly changing or evolving societal landscape (social, political, economic etc…). There remain similarities and focus issues consistent with the 1998 findings and plan. On the other hand, there are also some differences in the identified focus issues as well.

Participation and Collaboration

The Morrow County local planning process for the 2009-2011 JCP plan update reflected a similar cross section of those involved in the 1998 initial JCP plan. The Local Juvenile Department along with the Local Commission on Children and Families sought input from as many community partners and stakeholders as exist and were available, and willing to provide input into the 2009-2011 JCP Plan Update. It is important to note that during this 11-12 year period of time (from the start of the 1998 Plan until the end of this Update), there is a significant difference with respect to juvenile delinquency rates, public sentiment and opinion in general. Part of the reason we spend time developing the historical overview of the JCP Initiative is to understand and acknowledge that this historical context is very important.

The 1990's were a time of high crime and a disgusted Oregon populace, and by the late 1990's the Oregon Legislature was hearing the message loud and clear. In the January 13, 1999 edition of the Eugene Register Guard, a headline read "Juvenile Crime Prevention High Priority." The Article went on, "The legislature is jumping into the juvenile crime prevention debate. On the second day of the session no fewer than 10 bills on juvenile crime prevention were in the legislative pipeline." Juvenile Crime Prevention programs were born and hit the ground running. Juvenile Departments, along with Local Commissions created plans and guidelines identifying needs, gaps and barriers within local systems and put programming to the test.

The Oregon Progress Board's 2005 Benchmark Performance Report shows that Oregon's juvenile arrest rate has declined substantially since 1999. A Juvenile Crime Prevention Program Evaluation 2003 Final Report of JCP services and programs described positive results for youth participants. Only four percent of non-offender youth participating in JCP Prevention programs through community providers committed criminal offenses in the 12 months following their program participation.

As economic times changed in the mid to late 2000's, the very programming once so popular, and arguably effective, began to lose political steam as an economic recession dictated a need to cut spending owing to dramatically falling revenue. Couple the economic crisis with a general effectiveness brought on by the JCP Initiative, it became a focus of cuts at the hands of the very same legislature that a decade earlier had created it. The legislative session of 2009 was contentious from start to finish as various social service agencies in effect all fought for the proverbial "shrinking piece of the pie." By the end of the session most every agency felt the effects of being cut in some capacity or another, while some specific programs fared relatively better or worse than others.

Juvenile Crime Prevention was one of many programs that felt the effect of these cuts. As a minimum grant County, Morrow fared probably better than many larger counties. In the final analysis of the cuts Morrow averaged a little over 8% in cuts as compared to some larger counties that faced cuts upwards of 20%.

This context cannot be lost during the discussion of community based participation and collaboration as it relates to the overall JCP plan.

In September 2009, no fewer than 44 invitations (See Appendix B) were sent out to various community partners and agencies for a general work session on JCP planning to be held October 14, 2009.

For the 2009-2011 update the following teams and or agencies and individuals were consulted for input into this JCP Update.

LPSCC representing Community Counseling Solutions (mental health), DHS Child-Welfare, County Commissioners, County Court Judge, Trial Court Administrator (Umatilla and Morrow Counties), Chief of police, County Sheriff, Umatilla and Morrow County Community Corrections, Commission on Children and Families, Public Health, Oregon State Police, District Attorney, and the Juvenile Department.

Individual agencies and community members also consulted included, School District administration (District wide), individual school administrators, school counselors, lay and spiritual groups and organizations, the Oregon Youth Authority, local officials (city), legal representatives (attorneys), and youth.

The process was inclusive and designed to establish a long term partnerships with an added goal of possibly creating a **Juvenile Crime Prevention Partnership Committee** in the process. Morrow County sought to remain diverse in reach, but also to incorporate a more core group from the various individuals and agencies approached, to create a more focused, streamlined group for future JCP work. Individual meetings as well as forum or group meetings were conducted from August 2009 through October 2009. Individuals were contacted, surveyed and screened beginning in July.

Analysis

The Oregon Commission on Children and Families have provided Morrow County with a template of 2007-2009 information that was provided by Morrow County through the Comprehensive Planning Module and a JCP survey conducted by Mr. Joe Christy (then the Washington County Juvenile Department Director). Mr. Christy conducted a telephonic interview with Morrow County Juvenile Department Director Tom Meier regarding JCP strategies, targets, uses etc….

The target population was defined as 10-17 years both male and female youth being served within this demographic. JCP Prevention and Basic services provide for a contracted (full time) Wrap Around Services Provider (WAS). The program is evidenced based and a continuation of the strategy of addressing the gaps and barriers first identified in the 1998 JCP Plan. Specifically, the Wrap Around Services program provides for case management services in an intensive supervision, but strength based model, after hours monitoring of moderate to high risk juveniles as determined by a validated JCP risk screen, family counseling, educational tutoring, mentoring, skill building, vocational assessment and assistance, as well as a liaison to the Juvenile Department Director and Juvenile Court. The current provider is bi-lingual and bi-cultural, which again is a continuation of the strategy employed to address the gaps and barriers defined in 1998, and still remaining a significant need today.

Gang influence and activities remains an identified and serious issue for Morrow County. In fact, the percentage of gang activity tends to ebb and flow depending on several factors. One significant factor in Morrow County currently is a rather large influx of documented gang activities/members moving into the area from other geographical locations. Some have come from neighboring counties while others have come from out of state. In Morrow County, the vast majority of the identified gang incidents attached to juveniles are referred to the WAS program. This is a slight upward departure from past practice and a fairly recent phenomenon (September of 2008). A JJIS snapshot report of youth served by the WAS program from 9/1/08 through 6/11/09 showed 24 moderate to high risk youth active and open at some point during this period. 11 youth (46%) were either referred for gang related activities or were assessed as gang affected youth who would be better served with intensive field supervision provided by the WAS program. Conversely, the total amount of youth referred for gang related activities during this same period and not referred to WAS program was two (2) and these were cases that were not yet adjudicated for one reason or another. Gang prevention and intervention strategies remain a gap today though we continue to address this gap.

The WAS provider is not utilized for translation purposes or court interpretation as was historically the case. These services are provided now by the County to free up the WAS provider to focus primarily on the highest at risk youth who are identified as gang involved, referred for unlawful gang related activities, or have been identified as a family member or close associate of gang affected individuals.

Intensive basic probation supervision services, ua and alcohol testing, community service assistance, vocational assistance and educational tutoring, mentoring and skill building are basic tenets of the WAS program. Life mentoring opportunities, family counseling components and a close one to one relationship building define the Morrow County WAS program. Accountability along with community protection is included with this youth competency dynamic.

The Morrow County Juvenile Department Director is also an active member of the Morrow County Gang Task Force which remains a stable and viable group of mostly law enforcement and education authorities dedicated to the identification, intervention, suppression and eradication of gang activities in Morrow County. Some JCP Basic dollars are used in the funding of educating law enforcement and school personnel on identification and intervention strategies. In addition, JCP Basic dollars are invested in the eradication of gang graffiti by use of a high pressure washing machine, chemical applications and diligent efforts to identify the graffiti and remove it as soon as is possible. Although gang activities and incidents were identified in the Comprehensive Plan of 2008, the 1998 JCP Plan did not mention it as an identified issue or problem. This is another significant departure from the 1998 plan as it is now an identified issue and problem.

Gaps and Barriers

The 1998 JCP Plan identified four (4) major “unmet needs” within the Juvenile Justice continuum in Morrow County. 1) Inadequate, extensive supervision for youth on probation or house arrest. 2) Inadequate shelter care resources. 3) Inadequate detention resources. 4) Inadequate aftercare resources. Clearly, two of these previously unmet needs have been addressed through local JCP planning and coordinated efforts with multiple partner agencies. The Wrap Around Services Provider position was created largely through JCP funding and continues to be effective today. This provider works a flexible schedule and can monitor clients on various forms of probation, pre-adjudicatory sanctions (including conditional release/house arrest) on all ends of the Juvenile crime spectrum. The majority of the WAS providers clients are high risk juveniles requiring greater attention and more community supervision.

Detention services were also addressed during the past 10-11 years since the initial JCP plan was created. Then, Morrow County contracted with Umatilla County’s detention facility and population management was based on a criteria that often times excluded probation violators and “lesser” offenders from being able to be placed in detention. In addition, at that time, the Umatilla County Juvenile Detention facility was a regional facility serving multiple counties including Umatilla, Morrow, Union, Baker, Wallowa, Malheur, Grant and even Walla Walla, Washington for a few years. In addition, it was a treatment facility serving up to 7 Oregon Youth Authority Youth being diverted from institutions. This was a 24 bed facility. Today it is closed.

Morrow County now contracts with NORCOR (Northern Oregon Regional Correctional Facilities) in The Dalles, Oregon. This facility is also a regional facility serving Wasco, Sherman, Wheeler, Gilliam and Hood River counties. The relationship between Morrow and Wasco County is very positive and there have been few, if any, issues getting Morrow County kids lodged in detention regardless as to whether it is simply a violation of probation, or is a more serious offense. In addition, the Morrow County Board Of County Commissioners recently (circa 2007) doubled the Juvenile Detention budget line item and has identified detention as an important tool for the Juvenile Department Director and staff. The Juvenile Judge also supports detention when needed.

JCP COMMUNITY ISSUES

At the 2009 work JCP work session 3 specific areas were targeted and seen by the community as needed focal areas for the current Morrow County JCP plan.

1) Gang Intervention, Prevention and Suppression.

This had been a focus area in the comprehensive plan previously but the group felt it more reasonable to remove it from the comprehensive plan and place it within the JCP plan itself as an important JCP Community Issue. Certain underlying focus areas within the comprehensive plan may influence the gang issue (poverty, drug and alcohol use), but the group felt the gang issue in particular needed addressed via the JCP plan.

Bullying behaviors, graffiti incidences (both in the community and in schools found in student folders, lockers and journals), and fighting were identified as serious issues believed to be gang related in many cases. Gang related legal referrals to the Morrow County Juvenile Department for the 2008-2009 year were far and above what the targeted goal within the comprehensive plan sought. Again, with smaller numbers, one or two significant families may unduly over-represent this trend, but nevertheless it was identified as a significant community issue. The healthy teen survey of 11th graders also revealed a student belief and value system very problematic as it relates to the ability to obtain firearms, individuals carrying firearms, and a general lack of faith in law enforcement to be able to do anything about it. (See Appendix C).

2) Detention Services

The 2009 work group also was concerned about Morrow County's use of detention and whether or not the recent closure of the Umatilla County detention facility might not impact Morrow County in a negative light. There has been a recent bump in population at the Wasco County Juvenile Detention Center (NORCOR) and it was determined that Morrow County ought to be concerned with maintaining our current system of detaining those highest risk youth when they need to be detained. Although there was a general consensus that Morrow County does not currently suffer a lack of detention availability as resulted in one of the four targeted, focus areas of the 1998 JCP plan, there was a strong desire to monitor the situation and not remove it from the Community focus or

issue area. In addition, although funding remains fairly stable, Morrow County's detention budget is generally under great strain and requires constant scrutiny and assessment. Again, one or two major events could rapidly alter business as it relates to detaining high risk juvenile offenders. Detention numbers have been mostly static through the decade. (See Appendix D) From 2001-2009 an average of just over 24 youth are detained on average in any given year by the Morrow County Juvenile Department. In the 2008 year 22 youth were detained and 17 have been detained in 2009 as of October 21, 2009.

3) Intensive supervision of high risk youth

The group acknowledged the general success of the Wrap Around Services Program and felt the focus should remain on maintaining the program at current levels. As a result, the work group of 2009 felt continuing support for the Wrap Around Services Program was an issue they felt needed to be monitored and maintained as a community issue. Time, budgets, and the unknown economic situation were considered to be gaps and/or barriers to the continuing success of the program.

Target Population

The identified target population will be juveniles age 10-17. These will be law enforcement referred juveniles. All Juveniles served by JCP programming will be screened using the JCP risk assessment as has been the custom in Morrow County. All youth referred to JCP services will score as at risk in more than one domain on the JCP risk screening tool. Both male and female youth of various race and ethnicities qualify for JCP services. All youth will be offenders and whereas most will be post adjudicatory, there may be some pre adjudicatory qualified youth though these will likely be much lower in number and frequency.

Strategic Approaches and Strategies

Continued identification of youth demonstrating at-risk behavior will be done via the JCP risk assessment screening tool and other assessments as are warranted and/or needed. All youth referred for an act which would be a violation if committed by an adult who go through intake, receive the JCP risk screen. Additional screening and assessment tools (such as the Oregon Youth Authority Risk/Needs Assessment tool) are currently used for the highest risk offenders identified. The 2009 work group acknowledged some gaps with respect to certain targeted offenders and whether or not services are readily available. Sexual Offender assessment and treatment was one identified gap and barrier in that the local mental health agency does not serve these individuals.

In Morrow County, largely through the Central and Eastern Oregon Juvenile Justice Consortium, we have been able to identify and use multiple therapists even if they are not based in Morrow County proper. (See Appendix E). Although more difficult, we

continue to manage to serve this population of high risk offenders. Most identification begins at intake and assessment and continues throughout the life of an offender and his or her case plan.

Every six months wherein a youth is in the WAS Program or utilizing individualized services in some capacity, a reassessment is completed by either the WAS provider or the Director. The WAS provider contacts families and other agencies as is needed to facilitate connecting youth and families to needed services. In essence, this is the very core of a Wrap Around Service approach.

Measurement

JJIS and the Data Management tool are both used to measure outcomes, track progress and determine program effectiveness. Recidivism reports and various other types of reports can also be ran on JJIS to measure progress.

Continuum of Services

JCP Prevention and Basic dollars are managed by the local Commission on Children and Families. (See appendix A and F). Although the majority of the WAS provider dollars come from prevention, a portion also comes from basic. Basic services also pay for a wide spectrum of Individualized services. More targeted services include mental health, gang education (prevention, intervention and suppression) and substance abuse issues also within the basic services allocation. As there is only one individual assigned to both levels of kid (prevention and basic), these services cross into both JCP risk assessment areas rather seamlessly. Morrow County pools our Diversion dollars within the CEOJJC framework. CEOJJC has established a 2009-2011 Regional Diversion Plan in which Morrow County participates. The diversion money, like the prevention (See Appendix G) and basic dollars utilizes the principles of evidence based intervention strategies in overcoming obstacles rural counties tend to face. Further, this plan highlights the efficacy of the Case Management Model approach to the continuum of services from lowest to highest risk youth. (See Appendix H).

Budget Information

The prevention budget is used to support the Wrap Around Services Program and individualized services for the lower risk (JCP criteria still applies) youth. (See Appendix F) for the specific prevention budget.