

W.S-a.



AGENDA COVER MEMO

AGENDA DATE: August 23, 2006

TO: Board of County Commissioners

DEPARTMENT: County Administration

PRESENTED BY: John Woodrow, PSCC Chair
Gretchen Pierce, PSCC Public Information Task Force Chair

AGENDA TITLE: Report /Public Safety Coordinating Council Report Card on the Criminal Justice System in Lane County

I. ITEM

Report /Public Safety Coordinating Council Report Card on the Criminal Justice System in Lane County

II. ISSUE OR PROBLEM

The Public Safety Coordinating Council has produced a Report Card on the Criminal Justice System for distribution to the public and a more detailed Report Card Data Book which will be available online.

III. DISCUSSION

In 2005 the PSCC constituted a Public Information Task Force chaired by Gretchen Pierce which began to meet in March of that year. As directed in the adopted 2005-06 PSCC Workplan, the Task Force developed a Report Card Data Book on the Criminal Justice System in Lane County and a briefer Report Card which is being printed for distribution to the public. Both documents also will be available on the Lane Council of Governments' and Lane County's websites.

The Report Card was designed to address one of the PSCC Guiding Principles: *We will assist community members to understand and accept their responsibility to contribute to and maintain a safe and just society.*

The Report Card Data Book, phase I of the project, was designed for key system decision and policy makers to use as a baseline to monitor and improve system performance in four categories: Crime and Safety, Resources and Capacity, Efficient and Effective Use

of Resources, and Justice and Accountability. Specific data that is representative of the issues, is updated annually, and has comparable state and national data available was chosen as indicators for each category. The Report Card, phase II of the projected, was designed to report to the public about safety in the community.

A grading system was developed by LCOG staff working with the Task Force. The system uses an unbiased, consistent mathematical formula. The formula uses data to calculate the grade based on Lane County's trend and its current rate over the last seven years of available data compared to the trend and current rate of other geographic areas with comparable data. The grades are:

- A Trend and current rate substantially better than comparison geographic areas
- B Trend and current rate better than comparison geographic areas
- C Trend and current rate roughly equal to comparison geographic areas
- D Trend and current rate worse than comparison geographic areas
- F Trend and current rates substantially worse than comparison geographic areas

A plus (+) is added to the grade if the trend and current rate have improved over the last three years of available data compared to the last seven years. A minus (-) is added to the grade if the trend and current rate have worsened over the last three years of available data compared to the last seven years. Grades of "F" are not eligible for either a plus or a minus. The trend for each category is also noted as *Getting Better*, *Getting Worse*, or *Stable*.

The grades are not meant as a criticism of the various services and programs within the criminal justice system but are intended to paint a picture of the health of the system in those areas.

The report card does have some limitations. Some data which would make excellent indicators is not collected. Also, there are several components of the criminal justice system for which the Task Force was unable to develop measures using comparative Oregon and United States data. For instance, the criminal justice system in Lane County makes extensive use of alternatives to traditional incarceration for several types of offenders. Unfortunately the Task Force could not produce numerical measures for the adequacy of the system to meet community needs nor could we find comparable data for the US and Oregon. Additionally, some data is available sporadically or was only collected and reported once or twice.

Members of the Task Force are:

Gretchen Pierce, Chair
John Clague

Doug Harcleroad
Melinda Kletzok
Tim Laue
Jackie Mikalonis
Lisa Smith
Terry Smith
Linda Wagner
Kevin Williams

IV. IMPLEMENTATION

The Report Card is currently at the printers and will be available for the Board of Commissioners meeting. The PSCC plans to host a meeting with key criminal justice system agency directors to distribute the report card to them prior to its release. The PSCC also plans to hold a news conference after the BCC meeting to announce the availability of the Report Card to the public. Copies of the Report Card will be available through LCOG for anyone wanting to present and distribute it at meetings. The Report Card and the Data Book also will be available on LCOG's and Lane County's websites.

The PSCC plans to update the Report Card annually to provide a way to monitor the health of the criminal justice system over time and compare it to Oregon and, where possible, the United States. It will serve as the basis for a communication and educational tool for system decision makers, policy makers, and the community.


V. ATTACHMENTS

PSCC Report Card on the Criminal Justice System in Lane County (to be added to agenda packets when it returns from the printer)

The Public Safety Coordinating Council's Criminal Justice System Report Card Data Book



Criminal Justice System in Lane County, Oregon
SUMMER 2006



CRIME AND SAFETY

GRADE B- **TREND: GETTING BETTER**

- Serious and violent crime have decreased
- Addressing adult felony violent crime continues to be a high priority
- Lane County ranks among the very worst in the U.S. for serious property crime
- High rate of adult drug abuse drives higher rates of property crimes

RESOURCES AND CAPACITY

GRADE F **TREND: GETTING WORSE**

- The system's capacity to address crime has decreased while population has increased
- 96 fewer jail beds are funded
- 1,000-1,500 misdemeanor crimes annually are not being prosecuted
- Caseloads for parole and probation officers continue to climb (100 cases per officer versus a state rate of 75)
- The system is not able to address adequately many types of crime

EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS

GRADE A **TREND: GETTING BETTER**

- Lane County's arrest and conviction rates are very high despite fewer law enforcement officers, District Attorneys, and jail beds.
- Law enforcement's rate of arrests to reports of crime are higher than other areas of the U.S.
- The cases being brought to trial are successfully prosecuted in a timely fashion.

JUSTICE AND ACCOUNTABILITY

GRADE F **TREND: STABLE**


- Offenders are often not held accountable; 4,000 adult inmates are released annually from jail due to overcrowding
- Sentence lengths continue to be below U.S. averages
- The system's ability to hold people is fading due to jail bed reductions
- Treatment options are fewer and mental health capabilities have been dismantled.
- Re-offense rates remain above state averages
- The percent of people failing to appear for court is very high

CRIME AND SAFETY


GRADE: B- **TREND: Getting Better**

The system is improving in the area of crime and safety with the exception of property crime and pervasive drug abuse. The county's adult drug abuse arrest rate continues to rise and has exceeded both state and U.S. rates since 1994, stabilizing at almost twice the state and U.S. rate.


Drug Abuse Arrest Rate per 10,000 Adults



Rate of Reported Serious, Violent Crime per 10,000 Population




Rate of Reported Serious Property Crime per 10,000 Population



Serious Reported Crime in 2004 per 100,000 Population

Lane County's Rank Among U.S. Counties of 100,000 to 1 Million Population




RESOURCES AND CAPACITY


GRADE: F **TREND: Getting Worse**

The criminal justice system in Lane County has too few law enforcement officers and funded jail beds. The District Attorney is prosecuting fewer crimes due to the loss of prosecutors. The number of probation officers is failing to keep pace with the number of offenders on supervision.

Built vs. Funded Beds




Releases Triggered By Overcrowding as Percent of Lodgings



"Percent of Lodgings" in the chart above is the number of Jail inmates released as a percent of all inmates housed at that time in the Lane County Jail.

District Attorney Felony Intakes per Prosecutor



Because of budget reductions, the District Attorney's Office is no longer prosecuting most non-violent misdemeanors. The number of felony intakes is rising, increasing the number of intakes per prosecutor. A 2004 workload study by the American Prosecutor's Research Institute showed the Lane County District Attorney's Office is staffed at 68 percent — 10 attorneys short of what is needed to handle referred cases.


ADULT CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM INDICATORS

EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE USE OF RESOURCES


GRADE: A **TREND: Getting Better**

The system is doing a good job with the available resources. Law enforcement's rate of arrests per reported crime is higher than other areas of the U.S. At the same time, the number of law enforcement officers per 1,000 population is lower than the Oregon rate and substantially below the national rate. Lane County no longer has an Interagency Narcotics Enforcement Team, SWAT, nor resident deputies in rural communities.

Rate of Arrests to Reports for VIOLENT Crimes



Rate of Arrests to Reports for PROPERTY Crimes




JUSTICE AND ACCOUNTABILITY


GRADE: F **TREND: Stable**

Limited capacity to incarcerate results in a low average sentence rate for Lane County and Oregon compared to the U.S. For all felony offense types combined, offenders in Lane County spend 1/6th to 1/7th the U.S. average time in jail. A very high number of offenders fail to appear for court and re-offense rates for offenders on supervision are high.

3-Year Re-offense Rate for Felony Offenders on Probation Supervision



Percent of Individuals Who Fail to Appear for Court



Average Jail Sentence in Months for All Felonies

	1998	2000	2002
Lane	1	3	1
Oregon	1	2	1
U.S.	6	6	7

This Report Card was prepared by the **Public Safety Coordinating Council (PSCC)** to inform the citizens on the status of their public safety system. Local public safety coordinating councils are charged by the Oregon Legislature with developing county-wide comprehensive plans for the safety and justice system, including use of local and state resources. The PSCC Public Information Task Force, staffed by Lane Council of Governments, prepared this Report Card. The Task Force determined measures and collected longitudinal and baseline data for comparison. The Report Card will be periodically updated so the community can track system progress.

The local **criminal justice system** in Lane County includes: nine law enforcement agencies; four primary public safety answering points (9-1-1 and dispatch centers); the county jail in Eugene; three small city jails; district attorney; public defender; probation and post-prison supervision; State Circuit Court and Eugene and Springfield municipal courts; treatment; juvenile services; juvenile court; shelter; juvenile educational and treatment services; and services to help offenders transition back into the community.

Grading System for the Report Card


The report card grades were calculated using an unbiased, consistent mathematical formula based solely on the data. Each category and the indicators included in each category were assigned grades. Grades were determined by comparing Lane County's trend and its current rate over the last seven years of available data to the trend and current rate of other geographic areas with comparable data.

- A** Trend and current rate substantially better than comparison geographic areas
- B** Trend and current rate better than comparison geographic areas
- C** Trend and current rate roughly equal to comparison geographic areas
- D** Trend and current rate worse than comparison geographic areas
- F** Trend and current rates substantially worse than comparison geographic areas

A plus (+) is added to the grade if the trend and current rate have improved over the last three years of available data compared to the last seven years. A minus (-) is added to the grade if the trend and current rate have worsened over the last three years of available data compared to the last seven years. Grades of "F" are not eligible for either a plus or a minus. The trend for each category is also noted as Getting Better, Getting Worse, or Stable.

For more information on the Report Card, please contact Lane Council of Governments at (541) 682-4283 or visit www.lcog.org.

Lane County has a population of 336,085 people living in a geographic area of 4,618 square miles — roughly the size of the state of Connecticut. The county stretches from the summit of the 10,000 foot Cascade Mountains, through the tree-covered Willamette Valley prairie and wetlands, over the 6,000 foot Coast Range to the Pacific Ocean. Lane is an urban/rural county with more than half the residents (60%) living in Eugene and Springfield, the second largest urban area in the state. Approximately 10% live in small cities and the remaining 30% live in unincorporated areas scattered around the county. A total of 1,433 miles of county roads, 918 miles of city roads, and 484 miles of state maintained roads wind along rivers, lakes, and the two mountain ranges connecting widely separated small cities and the urban core.




JUVENILE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM INDICATORS

EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE USE OF RESOURCES


GRADE: C+ **TREND: Getting Better**

From 1996 to 2003, the percent of juvenile offenders who did not commit new crimes over a 12 month period increased 6%. A small group of juvenile offenders become chronic delinquents. Between 1996 and 2003, the percentage of chronic juvenile offenders decreased 45%. With fewer resources to dedicate to high risk youth, the rate is beginning to creep back up. Chronic offenders commit approximately 70% of all new referrals over three years. A reduction of just 3.8% of chronic offenders creates an estimated reduction of 772 juvenile crimes per year.

Percent of Offenders Not Re-offending within 12 Months



Chronic Offenders (3 or More Referrals within 12 Months)




JUSTICE AND ACCOUNTABILITY

GRADE: F **TREND: Getting Worse**

Between 2000 and 2005, the number of Lane County juveniles released early from detention increased 42% because:

- The ability to hold juveniles accountable is inadequate
- The system's ability to hold juvenile offenders in secure custody is fading due to reduction in services and unfunded detention and treatment beds
- Treatment options, including mental health services, for juvenile offenders have been significantly reduced

Lane County Offenders Released Early from Detention



JUVENILE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM INDICATORS


CRIME AND SAFETY

GRADE: D+


TREND: Getting Better

The juvenile system is improving in the area of crime and safety. Nonetheless, the county crime rate remains much higher than the U.S. rate.

Drug Abuse Arrests per 10,000 Youth



Serious Property Crime Arrests per 10,000 Youth




RESOURCES AND CAPACITY

GRADE: F

TREND: Getting Worse

Resources and capacity are deteriorating. The system has 22% less personnel than 1980-81 with four times the referrals. With reduced state resources, more serious youth offenders are now an additional responsibility for the local juvenile justice system.

Built vs. Funded Beds




Built vs. Funded Beds

	2001-2002			2005-2006		
	Built Beds	Funded Beds	% Funded	Built Beds	Funded Beds	% Funded
Lane County Resources						
Detention	96	32	33%	80	16	17%
Shelter (boys)	19	14	74%	19	7	37%
Shelter (girls)	7	7	100%	7	0	0%
Alcohol and Other Drug Residential Treatment	21	14	67%	21	8	38%
Lane Closed Custody Treatment	0	0		16	16	100%
State Resources Available to Lane County						
State Closed Custody	75	75	100%	75	31	41%



Criminal Justice System in Lane County, Oregon
SUMMER 2006



CRIME AND SAFETY

GRADE D+ **TREND: GETTING BETTER**

- Juvenile arrest rate has decreased
- Juvenile arrest rates for drug and property crime are higher than Oregon or the U.S.
- More than 70% of juveniles on probation have alcohol or other drug problems
- Over 30% of juvenile offenders are using methamphetamine

RESOURCES AND CAPACITY

GRADE F **TREND: GETTING WORSE**

- Capacity of the juvenile justice system has experienced a steady and constant erosion of corrections and treatment options
- 140 beds to hold juvenile offenders accountable remain unfunded
- 60% fewer state beds are available for serious Lane County juvenile offenders
- Juvenile offenders who are mentally ill and at a high risk to re-offend are remaining in the community

EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS

GRADE C+ **TREND: GETTING BETTER**

- Juvenile re-offense rates are declining
- In Lane County and Oregon, 68% of juveniles do not re-offend after they come into contact with the juvenile justice system
- Only a small percent become chronic offenders

JUSTICE AND ACCOUNTABILITY

GRADE F **TREND: GETTING WORSE**

- The ability to hold juveniles accountable is inadequate
- The system's ability to hold juvenile offenders in secure custody is fading due to reduction in services and unfunded detention and treatment beds
- 1,165 juvenile inmates were released early from detention due to overcrowding
- Treatment options, including mental health services, for juvenile offenders have been significantly reduced

PSCC OFFICERS

CHAIR, JOHN WOODROW
Springfield City Councilor

VICE CHAIR, JOHN CLAGUE
Lay Citizen

PSCC VOTING MEMBERS

MARYANN BEARDEN
State Court Judge

RUSS BURGER
Sheriff

LINDA EATON
Community Corrections Manager

KAREN GILLETTE
Public Health Manager

BOBBY GREEN
Commissioner (metro)

DOUG HARCLEROAD
District Attorney

GREG HAZARABEDIAN
Public Defender

TRICIA HEDIN
Lay Citizen

RICHARD MEYERS
Cottage Grove City Manager

GRETCHEN PIERCE
Lay Citizen

ROB ROCKSTROH
Health & Human Services Director

JERRY SMITH
Springfield Chief of Police

LISA SMITH
Youth Services Director

JENNIFER SOLOMON
Eugene City Councilor

FAVE STEWART
County Commissioner

PSCC NON-VOTING MEMBERS

MIKE BLOOM
Oregon State Police

STEVE HARDER
Oregon Youth Authority

BILL VANVACTOR
County Administrator



The Public Safety Coordinating Council's

Criminal Justice System Report Card Data Book

July 2006

For more information, please visit

www.lcog.org

Table of Contents

Public Safety Coordinating Council Vision and Guiding Principles	1
2006 Report Card on the Criminal Justice System in Lane County, Oregon – Background	2
Grading System for the Report Card	3
Report Card At-a-Glance	4
Report Card Data: Part A – Adult and Combined Criminal Justice Data	5
I. Crime and Safety	7
o Reported Crime	7
• Figure 1.1 Rate of Reported Serious, Violent Crime per 10,000 Population	7
• Figure 1.2 Rate of Reported Serious Property Crime per 10,000 Population	7
• Figure 1.3 Serious Reported Crime in 2004 per 1,000 Population – Lane County’s Rank Vs. 252 Metro Countries 100,000 to 1,000,000 Population	8
o Assault, Drug, and Alcohol Crimes	9
• Figure 1.4 Adult Assault Arrest Rate per 10,000 Adults	9
• Figure 1.5 Adult Drug Abuse Arrest Rate per 10,000 Adults	9
• Figure 1.6 DUII Arrests per 10,000 Population	10
o Domestic Violence	11
• Figure 1.7 Lane County Reported DV Assaults per 10,000 Population	11
o Child Abuse	12
• Figure 1.8 Child Abuse Victimization Rate per 10,000 Children Under Age 18	12
o Traffic Accidents	13
• Figure 1.9 Traffic Injury Accidents (Excluding Fatal Crashes) per 10,000 Population	13
• Figure 1.10 Fatal Crashes per 10,000 Population	14
• Figure 1.11 Percent of Fatal Crashes Involving Alcohol	14
o Victimization	15
• Figure 1.12 Percent of Residents Who Report They or Someone In Their Household Has Been A Victim of Crime	15
II. Resources and Capacity	16
o Number of Officers	16
• Figure 2.1 Number of Officers per 1,000 Population	16

- Jail Capacity17
- Figure 2.2 Jail Beds Occupied per 1,000 Reported Crimes17
- Figure 2.3 Funded Jail Beds per 1,000 Reported Crimes17
- Custody and Overcrowding Early Releases18
- Figure 2.4 Built vs. Funded Beds.....18
- Figure 2.5 Built vs. Funded Beds By Facility for 200518
- Figure 2.6 Releases Triggered by Overcrowding as Percent of Lodgings19
- District Attorney Intakes per Lawyer20
- Figure 2.7 Total DA Intakes per Lawyer.....20
- Figure 2.8 DA Felony Intakes per Lawyer.....20
- Figure 2.9 Number of Lawyers Needed in DA's Office.....20
- District Attorney Prosecution Rates21
- Figure 2.10 Felony Jury Cases – Prosecution Rate per 1,000 Population
 Comparable Sized Counties – 250,000 to 400,000 Population21
- Figure 2.11 Felony Resolved Cases – Prosecution Rate per 1,000 Population
 Comparable Sized Counties – 250,000 to 400,000 Population21
- Probation Officer Caseloads.....22
- Figure 2.12 Average PO Caseload Size.....22
- III. Efficient and Effective Use of Resources23
- Arrests per Officer.....23
- Figure 3.1 Rate of Arrests per Officer – Violent Crime23
- Figure 3.2 Rate of Arrests per Officer – Serious Property Crime25
- Arrests to Reports.....24
- Figure 3.3 Rate of Arrests to Reports for Violent Crimes.....24
- Figure 3.4 Rate of Arrests to Reports for Property Crimes24
- Successful Prosecutions25
- Figure 3.5 Percent of Convictions Out of Resolved Felony Cases.....25
- Figure 3.6 Percent of Convictions Out of Resolved Misdemeanor Cases25
- Speedy Trials.....26
- Figure 3.7 Percent of State Court Felony Cases Completed Within 180 Days26

- Figure 3.6 Percent of State Court Misdemeanor Cases Completed Within 180 Days26
- Alternatives to Incarceration27
- IV. Justice and Accountability28
 - Failure To Appear28
 - Figure 4.1 Percent of Court Events Where Defendants Fail to Appear28
 - Figure 4.2 Percent of Individuals Who Fail to Appear28
 - Failures on Supervision29
 - Figure 4.3 Three Year Re-offense Rate for Offenders on Post-Prison Supervision29
 - Figure 4.4 Three Year Re-offense Rate for Offenders on Probation Supervision29
 - Driving Under the Influence of Intoxicants (DUI) Enforcement30
 - Figure 4.5 DUI Enforcement Index30
 - Average Sentence and Supervision Length31
 - Figure 4.6 Average Prison Sentences in Months for Felonies31
 - Figure 4.7 Average Probation in Months32
 - Figure 4.8 Average Jail Sentences in Months for Felonies33

Report Card Data: Part B – Juvenile Data35

- I. Crime and Safety37
 - Juvenile Referrals and Arrests37
 - Figure 1.1 Juvenile Rate of Criminal Referral to Juvenile Services per 1,000 Youth Age 17 and Under37
 - Figure 1.2 Juvenile Arrest Rate per 10,000 Youth Age 10-1737
 - Figure 1.3 Juvenile Violent Crime Arrest Rate per 10,000 Youth38
 - Figure 1.4 Juvenile Drug Abuse Arrest Rate per 10,000 Youth39
 - Figure 1.5 Juvenile Serious Property Crime Arrest Rate per 10,000 Youth39
 - Dropouts40
 - Figure 1.6 Percent of Students Dropping Out of School40
 - Drug and Alcohol Abuse41
 - Figure 1.7 Percent of Juveniles Who Report Marijuana Use in Last 30 Days – 8th Grade41
 - Figure 1.8 Percent of Juveniles Who Report Marijuana use in Last 30 Days – 11th Grade41
 - Figure 1.9 Percent of Juveniles Who Report Binge Drinking in the Last 30 Days – 8th Grade42
 - Figure 1.10 Percent of Juveniles Who Report Binge Drinking in the Last 30 Days – 11th Grade42

II. Resources and Capacity.....	43
o Juvenile Detention Capacity.....	43
• Figure 2.1 Lane County Department of Youth Services Juvenile Bed Resources – Local and State Beds Allocated to Lane County.....	43
• Figure 2.2 Built vs. Funded Beds.....	44
III. Efficient and Effective Use of Resources.....	45
o Juvenile Re-offenses.....	45
• Figure 3.1 Percent of Juvenile Offenders Who Did Not Re-offend Within 12 Months.....	45
• Figure 3.2 Percent of Juvenile Offenders With 1-2 New Referrals Within 12 Months.....	46
o Chronic Juvenile Offenders.....	47
• Figure 3.3 Chronic Juvenile Offenders – Those With Three Or More Referrals Within 12 Months.....	47
o Re-offenses and Tracking Time.....	48
• Figure 3.4 Juvenile Re-offenses At 36 Months By Year.....	48
IV. Justice and Accountability.....	49
o System Capacity.....	49
• Figure 4.1 Lane County Juveniles Released From Detention Early.....	49

Public Safety Coordinating Council Vision and Guiding Principles

Vision Statement

We will live in a safe community supported by a safety and justice system that works together to focus on prevention and restoration, while balancing intervention and enforcement. The system will be built on a solid foundation of constitutional principles, statutory laws and community values which honor and promote personal responsibility, family and neighborhood involvement, and trust among people and institutions.

Guiding Principles

- *We will prevent crime by promoting conditions, behaviors, and individual and community attitudes that result in a safe community;*
- *We will hold youth and adult offenders accountable and employ sanctions which fit the circumstances of the crime and the offender;*
- *We will promote the rights of victims and the community to be compensated and restored*
- *We will provide opportunities for skill trainings, rehabilitation, and reintegration of offenders into the community;*
- *We will assist community members to understand and accept their responsibility to contribute to and maintain a safe and just society;*
- *We will coordinate the programs and activities of governmental and private agencies that affect community safety and justice, and will ensure agencies work in partnership with the business community and citizens.*
- *We will make effective community safety decisions based on research data from a comprehensive information management system*
- *We will support the rights of all individuals to a fair and non-discriminatory legal process.*

2006 Report Card on the Criminal Justice System in Lane County, Oregon – Background

Why Produce a Report Card?

As in locales across the United States, 50-70% of most local jurisdiction budgets in Lane County are allocated to the criminal justice system. This Report Card is designed to report the progress of the criminal justice system in improving services to the community. This project was developed by the Public Safety Coordinating Council (PSCC) to address one of their Guiding Principles: *We will assist community members to understand and accept their responsibility to contribute to and maintain a safe and just society.*

The Report Card is designed to create a forum for the PSCC to report to the public about safety in the community. In addition, it is intended to be a valuable tool for policy makers and community planners to monitor and improve performance.

The Process for Developing the Report Card

The Report Card was developed by the PSCC Public Information Task Force and adopted by the full PSCC. The Task Force, staffed by Lane Council of Governments, determined measures and collected longitudinal and baseline data for comparison. The Report Card will be produced and distributed annually so the community can track system progress.

Criminal Justice System

The local criminal justice system in Lane County includes: nine law enforcement agencies; four primary public safety answering points (9-1-1 and dispatch centers); the county jail in

Eugene; three small city jails; district attorney; public defender; probation and post-prison supervision; State Circuit Court and Eugene and Springfield municipal courts; adult treatment and transitional services; juvenile services; juvenile court; shelter; and juvenile educational and treatment services.

Information on Lane County, Oregon

Lane County has a population of 336,085 people living in a geographic area of 4,618 square miles – roughly the size of the state of Connecticut. The county stretches from the summit of the 10,000 foot Cascade Mountains, through the tree covered Willamette Valley prairie and wetlands, over the 6,000 foot Coast Range to the Pacific

Lane County, Oregon



Ocean. Lane is an urban/rural county with more than half the residents (60%) living in Eugene and Springfield, the second largest urban area in the state. Approximately 10% live in small cities and the remaining 30% live

in unincorporated areas scattered around the county. A total of 1,433 miles of county, 918 miles of city, and 484 miles of state maintained roadways wind along rivers, lakes, and the two mountain ranges in this starkly changing geography, connecting widely separated small cities and the urban core.

Grading System for the Report Card

Each category and the indicators included in each category are assigned grades. Grades were determined by comparing Lane County's trend and its current rate over the last seven years of available data to the trend and current rate of other geographic areas with comparable data.

- A Trend and current rate substantially better than comparison geographic areas
- B Trend and current rate better than comparison geographic areas
- C Trend and current rate roughly equal to comparison geographic areas
- D Trend and current rate worse than comparison geographic areas
- F Trend and current rates substantially worse than comparison geographic areas

A plus (+) is added to the grade if the trend and current rate have improved over the last three years of available data compared to the last seven years.

A minus (-) is added to the grade if the trend and current rate have worsened over the last three years of available data compared to the last seven years.

Grades of "F" are not eligible for either a plus or a minus.

The trend for each category is also noted as *Getting Better*, *Getting Worse*, or *Stable*.

Report Card At-a-Glance

Part A – Adult Criminal Justice System Indicators

- I. Crime and Safety**
Grade: B- Trend: Getting Better
- Reported Crime
 - Assault, Drug, and Alcohol Crimes
 - Domestic Violence
 - Child Abuse
 - Traffic Accidents
 - Victimization
- II. Resources and Capacity**
Grade: F Trend: Getting Worse
- Number of Officers
 - Jail Capacity
 - Custody and Overcrowding Releases
 - District Attorney Intakes per Lawyer
 - District Attorney Prosecution Rates
 - Probation Officer Caseloads

III. Efficient and Effective Use of Resources

- Grade: A Trend: Getting Better**
- Arrests per Officer
 - Arrests to Reports
 - Successful Prosecutions
 - Speedy Trials
 - Alternatives to Incarceration

IV. Justice and Accountability

- Grade: F Trend: Stable**
- Failure to Appear (FTA) for Court Events
 - Failures on Supervision
 - Driving Under the Influence of Intoxicants Enforcement
 - Average Sentence and Supervision Length

Part B – Juvenile Criminal Justice System Indicators

I. Crime and Safety

Grade: D+ Trend: Getting Better

- Juvenile Referrals and Arrests
- Dropouts
- Drug and Alcohol Abuse

II. Resources and Capacity

Grade: F Trend: Getting Worse

- Juvenile Detention Capacity

III. Efficient and Effective Use of Resources

Grade: C+ Trend: Getting Better

- Juvenile Re-offenses
- Chronic Juvenile Offenders
- Re-offenses and Tracking Time


IV. Justice and Accountability

Grade: F Trend: Getting Worse

- Lane County Juveniles Released From Detention Early

Report Card Data: Part A – Adult and Combined Criminal Justice Data

Data were chosen as indicators for each category that are representative of the issues and, where possible, are updated annually and have comparable state and national data available. Some data that would make excellent indicators are not collected. National studies of victimization have regularly found that less than half of all crimes are reported to police. Two surveys of victims in Eugene found similar results, so it seems likely that there are about 80,000 criminal offenses per year in Lane County. The graphic below, done to scale, illustrates that of approximately 42,300 reported crimes in 2003, 18,500 result in arrests, 15,400 involved individuals are booked into the jail, 4,400 result in convictions, 500 result in alternative resolutions, and so on.




Category I: Crime and Safety
Grade: B- Getting Better

Crime and Safety includes: reported crime; adult assault; drug, and alcohol arrests; domestic violence; child abuse; traffic accidents; and victimization.


○ **Reported Crime.** Like Oregon and the US, Lane County's reported crime rate peaked in 1996-97 and has been declining since. An analysis in 2000 for the California Attorney General's Office grouped possible causes for this decrease into eleven categories including: strength of law enforcement, citizen attitudes toward crime, lack of substantial shifts in population composition, particularly youth, robust economy, abatement of the crack cocaine epidemic; and decreased youth handgun use. Others have attributed the decrease to passage of "tough on crime" measures including Oregon's 1994 Ballot Measure 11. There is no clear agreement among researchers and scholars. Lane County's violent crime rate is lower than either Oregon or the US but Lane County's property crime rate, while considerably lower in 2004 than 1997, has been among the highest in the country for the past decade and remains higher than the state or nation.

Figure 1.1 Rate of Reported Serious, Violent Crime per 10,000 Population



Source: FBI, Crime in the United States
 Grade: A-


Figure 1.2 Rate of Reported Serious Property Crime per 10,000 Population



Source: FBI, Crime in the United States
 Grade: C

The figure below shows Lane County's ranking for serious crimes when measured against other metropolitan counties in the United States. For instance, Lane County is in the 94th percentile in Motor Vehicle Theft, meaning only 6% of the counties had a motor vehicle theft rate higher than Lane County's.


**Figure 1.3 Serious Reported Crime in 2004 per 100,000 Population
Lane County's Rank Among 252 Metropolitan Counties of 100,000 to 1,000,000 Population**



Source: FBI, *Crime in the United States*


- Assault, Drug, and Alcohol Crimes. These indicators were chosen because they are “quality of life” crimes – low level community disturbances that make people feel less safe. Although the state and US Assault rates have been decreasing since 1994, Lane County’s rate has remained relatively constant with the county rate exceeding Oregon’s rate for the period 1997-2002. The county’s Adult Drug Abuse Arrest rate continues to rise and has exceeded both state and US rates since 1994, appearing to be stabilizing at almost twice the state and US rate.

Figure 1.4 Adult Assault Arrest Rate per 10,000 Adults




Source: Easy Access to FBI Arrest Statistics
Grade: D+

Figure 1.5 Adult Drug Abuse Arrest Rate per 10,000 Adults



Source: Easy Access to FBI Arrest Statistics
Grade: F

Figure 1.6 DUII Arrests per 10,000 Population




Source: Easy Access to FBI Statistics

Grade: B-

- Domestic Violence.


Figure 1.7 Lane County Reported DV Assaults per 10,000 Population



Source: Area Information Records System
Grade: A-

- o **Child Abuse.** Rates of substantiated victims of child abuse per 10,000 children under age 18 in Lane County through 2004 have exceeded state rates for most of the past 20 years and have exceeded US rates since 1999. (US data prior to 1996 is not readily available.) After peaking in 2000, Lane County's rate began to recede and in 2004 was slightly below the state rate.

Figure 1.8 Child Abuse Victimization Rate per 10,000 Children Under Age 18



Note: Reporting period changed to Federal Fiscal Year in 2003 to conform to federal reporting requirements.


Source: Lane and Oregon – DHS; The Status of Children in Oregon's Child Protection System 2004

Source: US – National Clearinghouse on Child Abuse and Neglect Information: Child Maltreatment 1996-2003

Grade: D+

- Traffic Accidents.

Figure 1.9 Traffic Injury Accidents (Excluding Fatal Crashes) per 10,000 Population




Source: Lane and Oregon - Oregon Department of Transportation

Source: US - US DOT, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Traffic Safety Facts Annual Reports

Grade: A


Figure 1.10 Fatal Crashes per 100,000 Population



Source Lane and Oregon - Oregon Department of Transportation
 Source US - US DOT, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Fatality Analysis Reporting System

Grade: B-

Figure 1.11 Percent of Alcohol Involved Crash Fatalities



Source US DOT, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Fatality Analysis Reporting System

Grade: A

- o **Victimization.** Few countywide surveys have been done to collect data from community members on victimization. Two Lane County public safety polls, however, did include questions on victimization, asking, “Have you, or anyone in your household, been a victim of a crime in Lane County?” Responses are summarized in the table below.

Figure 1.12 Percent of Residents Who Report They or Someone In Their Household Has Been A Victim of Crime

Response	1999	2005
Lane County	54%	53%

*Source: Lane County – Lane County Voter Survey, Community Safety and Justice, June 1999, More Information Public Opinion Research
Lane County Public Safety District Survey, March 2005, Lindholm Research*


Category II: Resources and Capacity

Grade: F *Getting Worse*

Resources and Capacity includes: number of officers; jail capacity; custody and overcrowding releases from Lane County Adult Corrections; District Attorney intakes per lawyer; District Attorney prosecution rates; and Probation Officer caseloads.

- o **Number of Officers.** The State of Oregon number of officers per 1,000 population is considerably lower than the nation's. Lane County's rate is lower than the state rate and only 50% of the US average. Despite this fact, the county's arrest rate per number of officers is considerably higher (see Figures 4.1 and 4.2).

Figure 2.1 Number of Officers per 1,000 Population



Note: Number of Officers includes all law enforcement officers in the county including State Police stationed in Lane County


Source: Lane and Oregon - Law Enforcement Data System, Uniform Crime Report

Source: US - FBI, Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted

Grade: F

- o **Jail Capacity.** The funded jail capacity in Lane County is somewhat lower than in Oregon but substantially lower than the national average. Two measures are provided below because comparable Oregon data on jail beds occupied is not available and national average data is not available for the number of funded beds.

Figure 2.2 Jail Beds Occupied per 1,000 Reported Crimes




Note: The number of jail beds occupied used in this calculation is a one-day snapshot of beds occupied at the Lane County Jail, Forest Work Camp, and Community Corrections Center.

Source: Lane – Lane County Sheriff's Office

Source: US – Bureau of Justice Statistics, Prisoner and Jail Inmates at Midyear

Grade: F

Figure 2.3 Funded Jail Beds per 1,000 Reported Crimes



Note: The number of funded jail beds does not include Forest Work Camp and Community Corrections Center beds in order to utilize data comparable with the state data.

Source: Lane - Lane County Sheriff's Office

Source: Oregon - Oregon Jail Managers Association, Washington County Sheriff

Grade: C

o **Custody and Overcrowding Releases.** Early releases in Lane County due to overcrowding began in March 1986. In 1995, the Forest Work Camp (FWC) was closed due to increasing costs and a levy that did not increase each year to match inflation. From 1986 through 1994, for every year except one (1991), 100% of the beds in the jail and related facilities that were built were funded to be operated. Even in 1991, this percentage dropped only to 97%. In 1997, under Senate Bill 1145, Lane County began receiving felony inmates sentenced to a year or less who would previously have been held in state prisons. Beds were added to the Jail, Community Corrections Center, and Forest Work Camp for additional capacity to hold these offenders. At the same times, budgets were being reduced locally. Resources were no longer sufficient to fund the number of available beds.

Figure 2.4 Built vs. Funded Beds

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Funded Beds	447	395	395	398	420	631	631	631	631	654	587	597
Built Beds	447	455	455	458	480	721	721	721	721	721	731	735
% Operated	100%	87%	87%	87%	88%	88%	88%	88%	88%	91%	80%	81%

Source: Lane - Lane County Sheriff's Office


Figure 2.5 Built vs. Funded Beds By Facility for 2005

2005	Jail	CCC	FWC
Funded Beds	376	116	100
Built Beds	499	116	120
% Operated	75%	100%	83%

Source: Lane - Lane County Sheriff's Office

With current funding, and arrest rates, there is little expectation for improvement in the rate of overcrowding releases as a percentage of lodgings. The number of early releases without pretrial release interviews due to jail overcrowding, however, has been an ongoing systems issue. Beginning this year, overcrowding releases are being coordinated at the Sherman Center using a new, validated Risk Assessment Tool on all arrestees brought to the jail. Pretrial release interviews are being conducted and release agreements are being used as appropriate. This should result in the release of the least risk inmates, however they may still be very dangerous. The peak in 1997 reflects the housing of felons in the Lane County Jail as a result of Senate Bill 1145. The number of releases dropped in 1999 when additional beds were built and opened using State funding allocated specifically to ensure facilities were available to house these offenders. We get an F because we should have zero tolerance of any kind of early release due to lack of jail capacity.


Figure 2.6 Releases Triggered By Overcrowding as Percent of Lodgings



Note: "Percent of Lodgings" is the number of inmates released as a percent of all inmates housed at that time in the Lane County Jail.
 Source: Matrix Summit, Lane County Sheriff's Office 2003
 Grade: F


o **District Attorney Intakes per Lawyer.** Because of budget reductions, the District Attorney's Office is no longer prosecuting most non-violent misdemeanors. For that reason, it is anticipated the number of DA intakes will be reduced in coming years. At the same time, the number of felony intakes is rising, thus greatly increasing the number of felony intakes per the number of lawyers in the DA's Office available to handle those cases. A 2004 study workload study by the American Prosecutor's Research Institute showed the Lane County DA's Office is staffed at 68% – ten attorneys short – of what is needed to handle the cases being referred to it. In 1995, the office was at 92% staffing level, decreasing radically since then due to budget reductions.

Figure 2.7 Total DA Intakes per Lawyer



Source: DA's office, DA CMS
Grade: F

Figure 2.8 DA Felony Intakes per Lawyer



Source: DA's office, DA CMS
Grade: F


Figure 2.9 Number of Lawyers Needed in DA's Office

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Number of Lawyers	23	23	23	24	25	25	25	26	26	26	26	25	23	22
FTE Needed	22	22	22	24	27	27	31	31	31	35	34	32	33	32
% Staffed (Lawyers/FTE Needed)	106%	105%	105%	102%	92%	93%	82%	83%	84%	75%	77%	78%	71%	68%

Source: APRI study, DA CMS


District Attorney Prosecution Rates. Although Lane County's prosecution rate for felony plea bargained cases is higher than Marion and Washington counties and the nation, it is lower for felony jury cases. Lane County makes more plea bargains and tries fewer cases because Lane County caseloads per attorney are too high to go to trial. Lawyers are forced to plea bargain cases to manage the workload and plea bargained cases often result in less serious charges and/or lighter sentences.

Figure 2.10 Felony Jury Cases
Prosecution Rate per 1,000 Population
Comparable Sized Counties – 250,000 to 400,000 Population



Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics Prosecutors' Office Survey
Grade: F

Figure 2.11 Felony Resolved Cases
Prosecution Rate per 1,000 Population
Comparable Sized Counties – 250,000 to 400,000 Population



Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics Prosecutors' Office Survey
Grade: B

- Probation Officer Caseloads. Trend data is not available for this item.

Figure 2.12 Average PO Caseload Size

	2003 Average Caseload Size
Lane	100
Oregon	75

Source: Multnomah County Community Justice Department Survey of Community Corrections Directors in August 2003


Grade: F

Category III: Efficient and Effective Use of Resources
Grade: A *Getting Better*

Efficient and Effective Use of Resources includes: arrests per officer; rate of reports to arrests; successful prosecutions; speedy trials; and alternatives to incarceration. Data is not collected or reported to measure the number of criminal cases not being investigated or filed due to lack of resources.


- Arrests per Officer. Not only is Lane County's rate of arrests to reports high – so is the county's rate of arrests per officer, as can be seen in the charts below. Despite the country's high reported crime rate, law enforcement officers are clearly doing an exceptional job of making arrests.

Figure 3.1 Rate of Arrests per Officer Violent Crime



Source: Lane and Oregon – Law Enforcement Data System, Uniform Crime Report
 Source: US – FBI, Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted,
 Easy Access to FBI Arrest Statistics
 Grade: A


Figure 3.2 Rate of Arrests per Officer Serious Property Crime



Source: Lane and Oregon – Law Enforcement Data System, Uniform Crime Report
 Source: US – FBI, Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted,
 Easy Access to FBI Arrest Statistics
 Grade: A

o Arrests to Reports. The table below shows the ratio of arrests to reports for both violent and property crimes. The arrest rates are higher for Lane County than the state or nation and getting better, with a strong focus on violent crime, even though the number of law enforcement officers per capita is lower (see Figure 2.1).

Figure 3.3 Rate of Arrests to Reports for Violent Crimes



Sources: FBI, Crime in the United States, 2003; Easy Access to FBI Arrest Statistics

Grade: A

Figure 3.4 Rate of Arrests to Reports for Property Crimes




Sources: FBI, Crime in the United States, 2003; Easy Access to FBI Arrest Statistics

Grade: A


- o **Successful Prosecutions.** Lane County's successful prosecution rate is the highest among comparable Oregon counties and considerably exceeds the US average. Despite the low number of attorneys, the DA's Office is doing an excellent job of convicting criminals.

Figure 3.5 Percent of Convictions Out of Resolved Felony Cases



Note: The US Average is an average of comparably-sized counties (250,000 to 400,000 population).
Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics Prosecutors' Office Survey
Grade: B


Figure 3.6 Percent of Convictions Out of Resolved Misdemeanor Cases



Note: The US Average is an average of comparably-sized counties (250,000 to 400,000 population).
Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics Prosecutors' Office Survey
Grade: B

- o **Speedy Trials.** Lane County considerably exceeds the statewide rate for percent of cases completed within 180 days because of the percent of plea bargains and an efficient system to resolve cases.

Figure 3.7 Percent of State Court Felony Cases Completed Within 180 Days




Note: Oregon goal is 98%.

Source: Oregon Circuit Court

Grade: B

Figure 3.8 Percent of State Court Misdemeanor Cases Completed Within 180 Days



Note: Oregon goal is 98%.

Source: Oregon Circuit Court

Grade: B-

Alternatives to Incarceration. There are several components of the criminal justice system in Lane County for which we have been unable to develop measures using comparative Oregon and/or national data. Lane County makes extensive use of alternatives to traditional incarceration for several types of offenders. Alternatives include electronic monitoring, community service, work release, alcohol and drug treatment, peer teen courts, mental health services, and others. For example, in 2003 nearly 2,600 drivers were ordered into DUII diversion or treatment programs and 500 offenders were offered court supervised treatment. Although we believe the capacity of these alternative services is woefully inadequate, at this time we were unable to produce numerical measures to verify and demonstrate this belief. The absence of measures and grades for these and other programs is an important limitation in this first Report Card.


Category IV: Justice and Accountability

Grade: F *Stable*

Justice and Accountability includes: failure to appear; failures on supervision; Driving Under the Influence of Intoxicants enforcement; and average sentence and supervision length.


- o **Failure to Appear (FTA).** In 2004, the PSCC released a study on the failure of defendants to appear for court, including the number of events where defendants failed to appear and the number of unduplicated individuals who fail to appear. The study includes an analysis to determine the cost of time spent by the criminal justice system to address FTA's. In 2005, there were 4,031 Circuit Court events where defendants failed to appear, 3,417 Eugene Municipal Court events, and 1,556 Springfield Municipal Court events. Using the formula developed for the cost study, these events and the resulting system responses and actions collectively cost the criminal justice system approximately \$4.9 million. Since national comparable FTA data is not available, we set a benchmark at 10% for grading purposes.

Figure 4.1 Percent of Court Events Where Defendant Fail To Appear



Source: PCAIRS
Grade: F


Figure 4.2 Percent of Individuals Who Fail To Appear



Source: PCAIRS
Grade: F

○ **Failures on Supervision.** For offenders on parole, recidivism is defined as the total percentage of a release cohort that was convicted of any felony at any time within the specified number of months following release from prison. A release cohort is defined as comprising all individuals who were released to parole or Post-Prison Supervision (PPS) during a six month period. It excludes those released from prison following a revocation from parole/PPS. Inmates initially released on temporary or transitional leave are also included as of their parole or PPS date. For offenders on probation, the definition is similar. Recidivism is defined as the total percentage of an admission cohort that was convicted of any felony at any time within the specified number of months after beginning probation. An admission cohort is defined as comprising all individuals who were sentenced for the first time to felony probation during the same six month period. Some offenders have been sentenced to probation more than once. Each new probation admission is considered a separate case.


Figure 4.3 Three Year Re-offense Rate for Felony Offenders on Parole/Post-Prison Supervision



Note: The Oregon goal is no more than 31%.

Source: Oregon Department of Corrections
Grade: D+

Figure 4.4 Three Year Re-offense Rate for Felony Offenders on Probation Supervision




Note: The Oregon goal is no more than 23%.

Source: Oregon Department of Corrections
Grade: F

- o **Driving Under the Influence of Intoxicants (DUII) Enforcement.** The DUII Enforcement Index is the ratio of the number of DUII arrests to the number of drivers in fatal crashes with any level of blood-alcohol concentration.

Figure 4.5 DUII Enforcement Index



Source: DUII Arrests: Easy Access to FBI Arrest Statistics

Source: Drivers with any BAC in Fatal Accidents: US DOT, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Fatality Analysis Reporting System

Grade: B-

- Average Sentence and Supervision Length. Lane County's and Oregon's average sentence lengths in jail are considerably less than the US average.

Figure 4.6 Average Prison Sentences in Months for Felonies. Oregon's Ballot Measure 11, passed in 1994, provides for mandatory sentencing for certain crimes. Nonetheless, Oregon relies less on incarceration to reduce crime, except for violent crime, than the US average. Oregon began adding prison capacity in the early 1990's and keeping felony offenders with sentences of less than a year in the Lane County jail rather than sending them to a state prison facility in 1997.

i. All offenses		1998	2000	2002
Lane		14	34	41
Oregon		13	35	36
US		57	55	53

ii. Violent offenses		1998	2000	2002
Lane		52	68	95
Oregon		45	66	70
US		100	91	84

iii. Property offenses		1998	2000	2002
Lane		6	27	29
Oregon		7	20	19
US		44	42	41

iv. Drug offenses		1998	2000	2002
Lane		2	17	17
Oregon		5	16	17
US		47	47	48

Source: Lane and Oregon – Oregon Criminal Justice Commission
 Source: US – BJS, State Court Sentencing of Criminal Felons 2002

Figure 4.7 Average Probation in Months. Probationary periods in Oregon are less than the US average but are increasing while nationally periods of supervision are going down. Oregon's Sentencing Guidelines establish probationary periods based on crime sentencing and prior criminal record with maximum probation at five years.

i. All offenses	1998	2000	2002
Lane	26	26	27
Oregon	25	25	27
US	41	38	38

ii. Violent offenses	1998	2000	2002
Lane	40	41	41
Oregon	40	40	41
US	52	44	43

iii. Property offenses	1998	2000	2002
Lane	26	25	28
Oregon	25	25	26
US	39	38	37

iv. Drug offenses	1998	2000	2002
Lane	23	23	23
Oregon	22	21	22
US	38	36	36

Source: Lane and Oregon – Oregon Criminal Justice Commission
 Source: US – BJS, State Court Sentencing of Convicted Felons 2002

Figure 4.8 Average Jail Sentences in Months for Felonies. For all offense types combined, offenders in Lane County spend 600% less time in jail than the average throughout the United States.

i. All offenses		1998	2000	2002
Lane		1	3	1
Oregon		1	2	1
US		6	6	7

ii. Violent offenses		1998	2000	2002
Lane		2	3	3
Oregon		2	2	2
US		7	7	8

iii. Property offenses		1998	2000	2002
Lane		1	6	2
Oregon		1	3	1
US		5	6	7

iv. Drug offenses		1998	2000	2002
Lane		1	1	1
Oregon		1	2	1
US		5	6	6


Source: Lane and Oregon – Oregon Criminal Justice Commission
 Source: US – BJS, State Court Sentencing of Criminal Felons 2002

Report Card Data: Part B – Juvenile Data

Crime and Safety includes: juvenile referrals and arrests; dropouts; and drug and alcohol abuse.


- **Juvenile Referrals and Arrests.** The Juvenile Arrest and Referral rates mirror the adult trend except that Lane County's rate is generally slightly lower than the state rate although far higher than the US rate. Like the adult rate, it has decreased since the higher rates of 1996/97.

Figure 1.1 Juvenile Rate of Criminal Referral to Juvenile Services per 1,000 Youth Age 17 and Under




Source: Lane County Department of Youth Services, Juvenile Justice Data 2003
 Grade: C

Figure 1.2 Juvenile Arrest Rate per 10,000 Youth Age 10-17



Source: Easy Access to FBI Arrest Statistics
 Grade: C


Figure 1.3 Juvenile Violent Crime Arrest Rate per 10,000 Youth



Source: Easy Access to FBI Arrest Statistics


Grade: D+

Figure 1.4 Juvenile Drug Abuse Arrest Rate per 10,000 Youth



Source: Easy Access to FBI Arrest Statistics
Grade: F


Figure 1.5 Juvenile Serious Property Crime Arrest Rate per 10,000 Youth



Source: Easy Access to FBI Arrest Statistics
Grade: D-

- o Dropouts. Lane County's Dropout rate is lower than the state's and the nation's.

Figure 1.6 Percent of Students Dropping Out of School



Note: Prior to 1997, students receiving a GED were counted as drop-outs


Source: Lane and Oregon - Oregon Department of Education, Early Leave Report. As cited by Oregon Progress Board, Oregon Benchmarks 2003 County Data Book

Source: US - Annie E. Casey Foundation, KIDS COUNT

Grade: B+


- Drug and Alcohol Abuse. Lane County exceeded the state and US rates for 2001-03 for percent of 8th graders reporting marijuana use in the last 30 days and still exceeds the US rate. At the 11th grade level, Lane exceeded both state and US rates for 2003 but the Lane, State, and US rates were virtually identical for 2001 and 2005. This is self report data from the Oregon Healthy Teens Survey.

Figure 1.7 Percent of Juveniles Who Report Marijuana Use in Last 30 Days – 8th Grade



Source: Lane and Oregon – Oregon Healthy Teens Survey
 Source: US – Monitoring the Future
 Grade: C+


Figure 1.8 Percent of Juvenile Who Report Marijuana Use in Last 30 Days – 11th Grade (12th Grade US Data)



Source: Lane and Oregon – Oregon Healthy Teens Survey
 Source: US – Monitoring the Future
 Grade: D+

Lane County and Oregon exceeds the nation for binge drinking by both 8th and 11th graders. Binge drinking is defined as having five or more drinks of alcohol within a couple of hours one or more times in the last 30 days.


Figure 1.9 Percent of Juveniles Who Report Binge Drinking in the Last 30 Days – 8th Grade



Source: Lane and Oregon – Oregon Healthy Teens Survey
 Source: US – US Survey on Drug Use and Health

Grade: F

Figure 1.10 Percent of Juveniles Who Report Binge Drinking in the Last 30 Days – 11th Grade



Source: Lane and Oregon – Oregon Healthy Teens Survey
 Source: US – US Survey on Drug Use and Health


Grade: C

Category II: Resources and Capacity

Resources and Capacity includes juvenile detention capacity.

- **Juvenile Detention Capacity.** The Lane County juvenile justice system has 64 fewer funded treatment/secure beds for 2005-06 than it had in 2001-02. As a result, higher risk juvenile offenders are remaining in the community with fewer treatment options. For example, each year the reduction of 44 Oregon Youth Authority (OYA) secure beds causes more than 135 high risk juvenile offenders to remain in the community. These are juveniles who would otherwise have been committed to the state's long term lock up facility. Another impact of the reductions is there are limited detention and treatment beds to hold youth accountable and provide the treatment they need, e.g., alcohol and other drug treatment.

**Figure 2.1 Lane County Department of Youth Services Funded Juvenile Bed Resources
Local Beds and State Beds Allocated to Lane County**



*Note: In 2005-06, 16 detention beds were designated as long-term treatment. While this increased treatment options, it reduced available beds for short-term detention.


Source: Lane County Department of Youth Services

The juvenile justice system differs in how youth are committed to state secure custody. Unlike the adult criminal justice system that can sentence offenders to prison with no cap/matrix issues, the juvenile justice system is limited to a discretionary bed allowance that the Oregon Youth Authority calculates using a county's youth population count and crime rate. It should be noted that the total number of secure custody youth beds available for the entire state of Oregon is not driven by any scientific method or demand forecast formula. The bed allowance has always been a product of what resources were available instead of actual need.

In the late 1990's, an Oregon Youth Authority study asserted that there was a 400 secure custody youth bed deficit in the State of Oregon. Since that time, an additional 250 beds were eliminated.

Figure 2.2 Built vs. Funded Beds

	2001-02			2005-06		
	Built Beds	Funded Beds	% Funded	Built Beds	Funded Beds	% Funded
Lane County Resources						
Detention	96	32	33%	80	16	17%
Shelter (boys)	19	14	74%	19	7	37%
Shelter (girls)	7	7	100%	7	0	0%
Alcohol & Other Drug Residential Treatment	21	14	67%	21	8	38%
Lane Closed Custody Treatment	0	0		16	16	100%
State Resources Available to Lane County						
Oregon Youth Authority Closed Custody	75	75	100%	75	31	41%




Category III: Efficient and Effective Use of Resources
Grade: C+ Getting Better

Efficient and Effective Use of Resources includes: juvenile re-offenses; chronic juvenile offenders; and re-offenses and tracking time.

- **Juvenile Re-offenses.** Between 1996 and 2002, both statewide and locally, we have had a serious decrease in the percent of juvenile offenders who commit new crimes. For 2003, the number of Lane County juvenile offenders who did not commit new crimes over a 12 month period is almost identical to the Oregon rate. Between 1996 and 2003, the county rate increased by 6% compared to a statewide increase of 9%.


Figure 3.1 Percent of Juvenile Offenders Who Did Not Re-offend Within 12 Months
 Percent of Juvenile Offenders who did not Re-offend Within 12 Months



Source: Lane County Department of Youth Services
 Grade: C+

Between 1996 and 2002, the percentage of juvenile offenders who commit one or two new referrals stayed rather constant over the seven year review. Lane is very similar to statewide data. The greatest difference between local and statewide data occurred with 2002 data at 3 percent.


Figure 3.2 Percent of Juvenile Offenders With 1-2 New Referrals Within 12 Months



Source: Lane County Department of Youth Services
 Grade: C+

- **Chronic Juvenile Offenders.** A small group of juvenile offenders become chronic delinquents and commit a majority of new offenses. Chronic offenders commit three or more new crimes over a 12-month period. Between 1996 and 2003, the percentage of chronic juvenile offenders decreased by 45% in Lane County and 40% in Oregon. Now, with less resources to dedicate to high risk youth, the rate is beginning to creep back up. Because the chronic group is so active in their criminal behavior, committing about 70% of all new referrals over three years, even a minor reduction in this group creates significant reduction in victimization in our community. A reduction of just 3.8% of chronic offenders creates an estimated reduction of 772 juvenile crimes.

Figure 3.3 Chronic Juvenile Offenders – Those With Three Or More Referrals Within 12 Months




Source: Lane County Department of Youth Services
Grade: C

○ **Re-offenses and Tracking Time** - The length of follow-up time impacts re-offenses. Statewide data do not track for more than 12 months, however, Lane County has extended the follow-up time to three years. Those data highlight the significant impact by chronic offenders on juvenile crime. Highlights include:

- 6% of offenders were chronic at 12 months follow-up
- 16.6% of offenders were chronic at 36 months follow-up
- The percentage of juveniles who become chronic decreased over five years from 20.4% to 16.6%
- Youth Services' system-wide approach concerning the implementation of best practices has, in part, had a positive impact on juvenile re-offense data. For example, even a slight reduction in the chronic group creates a significant impact on juvenile crime. Estimates on a 3.8% reduction in chronic delinquency yield a reduction of over 700 juvenile crimes in Lane County.

Figure 3.4 Juvenile Re-offenses At 36 Months By Year



Source: Lane County Department of Youth Services

IV. Justice and Accountability
Grade: F Trend: Getting Worse

○ System Capacity

Between 2000 and 2005, the number of Lane County juveniles released early from detention has increased 42%. This is because:

- 64 built detention beds remained unfunded for operations,
- the number of state corrections beds available for Lane County youth was reduced, leaving higher risk offenders in the community, and
- mental health resources have been reduced, putting more juveniles with primary mental health issues into the juvenile justice system.

Figure 4.1 Lane County Juveniles Released From Detention Early

