



**TRANSFER OF  
KNOWLEDGE  
WORKSHOP**

Runaway  
and  
Homeless Youth

107292

NCJRS

OCT 9 1987

ACQUISITIONS

UNIT OF THE YOUTH AUTHORITY  
CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING

107292

**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

CA. Department of the <sup>Youth</sup> Authority  
Office of Criminal Justice Planning

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

Additional copies may be obtained from:  
Department of the Youth Authority  
4241 Williamsborough Drive  
Sacramento, California 95823

107292

State of California  
GEORGE DEUKMEJIAN, *Governor*

Youth and Adult Correctional Agency  
N.A. CHADERJIAN, *Secretary*

DEPARTMENT OF THE YOUTH AUTHORITY  
JAMES ROWLAND, *Director*

CRAIG L. BROWN, *Chief Deputy Director*

FRANCISCO J. ALARCON, *Deputy Director*  
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES BRANCH

WILBUR A. BECKWITH, *Deputy Director*  
PAROLE SERVICES BRANCH

RONALD W. HAYES, *Deputy Director*  
PREVENTION & COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS BRANCH

C. A. TERHUNE, *Deputy Director*  
INSTITUTIONS AND CAMPS BRANCH

Cosponsored by

OFFICE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING  
G. ALBERT HOWENSTEIN, JR., *Executive Director*

Produced by

Prevention and Community Corrections Branch  
Richard W. Tillson, *Assistant Deputy Director*  
Marilyn Langford, *Regional Administrator*  
Rito Rosa, *Consultant*

Staff Assistance by

Silvia Delgadillo, *Senior Stenographer*  
Lonna Goodsell-Butts, *Senior Stenographer*  
Vera Harrison, *Stenographer*

*The inclusion of programs described in this publication, other than those directly administered by the Department of the Youth Authority, does not necessarily constitute an endorsement by the State of California or the Department of the Youth Authority.*

## PREFACE

The Department of the Youth Authority, in cooperation with the State Office of Criminal Justice Planning, is conducting a series of Transfer of Knowledge Workshops on a variety of subjects that are of importance to the prevention of delinquency, crime and violence.

A Transfer of Knowledge Workshop is not a typical workshop or training event. Based on the belief that there currently exists in California sufficient knowledge and expertise to solve the major problems of crime and delinquency facing our communities, acknowledged experts are brought together to share information and experience. They present and/or develop program models or action strategies that are then made available to individuals, programs and communities.

Fifty-three representatives from the public and private sectors attended a Transfer of Knowledge Workshop on Runaway and Homeless Youth. The workshop was scheduled for September 18-20, 1985, in Hollywood. The participants were carefully selected to obtain a balance of individuals with the status and/or authority to support the implementation of these programs in their communities; i.e., legislators, judges, law enforcement, probation officials, educators, health and social services representatives, etc.

The product of the workshop was this document, which will be distributed statewide. This publication will provide a means for the participants and others to replicate successful programs and make positive changes in their communities.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Department of the Youth Authority wishes to thank the many individuals, organizations, and agencies that contributed to the development of this publication. Special thanks are extended to all the following people who took time from their busy schedules to contribute their knowledge to make the workshop a success.

### WORKSHOP PLANNING COMMITTEE

**CO-CHAIRPERSONS** ..... Bruce Alan Fisher  
Runaway Federal  
Demonstration Program  
Linda Glassman  
California Child, Youth and  
Family Coalition

**PRESENTERS** ..... Phil Carter  
Options House  
Jane Henderson  
Senator Robert B. Presley's  
Office  
Dr. Lois Lee  
Children of the Night  
Donald W. Mathis  
National Network of  
Runaway and Youth  
Services, Inc.  
Honorable Patrick J. Morris  
Presiding Juvenile Court Judge  
Joel Schwartz  
Gay & Lesbian Community  
Services Center  
David Steinhart  
National Council on Crime &  
Delinquency  
Gary Yates  
High Risk Youth Project  
Children's Hospital

**SMALL GROUP  
FACILITATORS** .....

- Randall Mecham  
Youth Advocates
- Liz Goldsmith  
Western States Youth  
Services Network
- Phil Carter  
Options House
- Dolores Shelley  
Los Angeles Police Department
- Cherie Black  
California Children, Youth and  
Family Coalition
- Joel Schwartz  
Gay & Lesbian Community  
Services Center
- John Schiller  
XANTHOS
- Tom David  
University of California

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
Introduction .....	1
Definitions .....	3
Street Youth .....	3
Rural Youth .....	4
Minority Community Youth .....	5
Gay and Lesbian Youth .....	5
Baby Runners .....	6
Missing Children .....	7
National Perspective .....	9
Donald W. Mathis National Network of Runaway and Youth Services	
Judicial Perspective .....	13
Honorable Patrick J. Morris Presiding Judge of the Juvenile Court San Bernardino County	
Legislative History and Update .....	15
David Steinhart National Council on Crime and Delinquency	
State Legislation .....	17
Jane Henderson Senator Robert B. Presley's Office	
Hollywood Scene — Panel .....	19
Dr. Lois Lee .....	19
Children of the Night	
Phil Carter .....	20
Options House	

Gary Yates .....	21
Children's Hospital	
Joel Schwartz .....	22
Gay and Lesbian Community Services Center	
Lt. Ed Hocking .....	23
Los Angeles Police Department-Hollywood Division	
Workshop Small Group Reports .....	25
Causation and Prevention .....	25
Research and Planning .....	28
Program Design .....	29
Community Coordination .....	31
Current Legislation .....	32
Media and Public Awareness .....	33
Conclusion .....	37
Appendix .....	39
Program .....	41
Planning Committee .....	45
Presenters .....	46
Participants .....	47

## INTRODUCTION

The Workshop was opened with welcoming comments by Ronald W. Hayes, Deputy Director of the Department of the Youth Authority; and G. Albert Howenstein, Jr., Executive Director of the Office of Criminal Justice Planning. Their remarks emphasized the importance to the criminal justice system of total community involvement in addressing the issue of runaway and homeless youth. The opening session included a presentation by David Steinhart, Project Director with the National Council on Crime and Delinquency. He shared his thoughts about the lock-up history of status offenders in California, how it worked and did not work, and provided an update on pending legislation. Mr. Steinhart's presentation was followed by a small group process in which the Workshop participants provided some definitions which delineate the various types of runaway and homeless youth.

The first day's program was capped by a dinner keynote address on runaway and homeless youth by Don Mathis, Associate Director of the National Network of Runaway and Youth Services, in which he shared his observations on such topics as national policy, congressional activities, and funding. Mr. Mathis' presentation was followed by the showing of a movie entitled "Streetwise," a documentary about real youth on the street.

The second day's program opened with a presentation by the Honorable Patrick J. Morris, Presiding Judge of the Juvenile Court in San Bernardino County, in which he provided his perspective on the role and function of the juvenile court with respect to status offenders, including runaway youth. This was followed by small group workshops in which the participants followed a pre-arranged format in addressing runaway and homeless youth issues as they impacted six topics: 1) Causation and Prevention, 2) Research and Planning, 3) Program Design, 4) Community Coordination, 5) Current Legislation, and 6) Media and Public Awareness. The groups generated a report on each of these topics which identified problems, suggested approaches, and made recommendations.

The Workshop's third day program consisted of a general session in which the six small group reports were reported to the participants.

The second day's program also included a presentation by Jane Henderson, Senator Robert B. Presley's Office, who informed the Workshop participants of the Senator's interests and legislative efforts in resolving problems associated with runaway and homeless youth. The program ended with a panel presentation on various services and problems found in the Hollywood area, a gathering place for large numbers of runaway and homeless youth. The panel was followed by a walk/drive along the Hollywood and Los Angeles skid row areas, arranged by the Los Angeles

Police Department, which provided participants with a view of real young people on real streets, the chance to see what is really occurring on the streets.

# DEFINITIONS

Current estimates of the number of runaway and homeless children and youth in America range from 1.3 to 2 million each year. There may be as many as 4 million children who run away from home for at least one night each year. There is no typical runaway or homeless youth. They are most often between the ages of 12 and 18. The runaway population is comprised of male, female, all ethnic and socioeconomic groups from every state. Who are these children and youth? What are their problems and how serious are they? There are no clear categories, but the following definitions were offered by workshop participants (through a small-group process) in the hope they would provide some helpful delineations. These definitions denote the various types of runaway and homeless youth, including characteristics, percentage of runaway and homeless population, special problems, and specific steps to be taken in helping them.

## Street Youth

### 1. Characteristics

- Long history of rejection (home, school, peers)
- Often multiple foster placement failures
- Often physically/sexually abused
- Often thrown out or pushed out

### 2. Percentage

- Federal study = 25%
- Los Angeles estimate = 50%

### 3. Special Problems

- Often lack family to return to
- Often have psycho-social problems
- Often chronic self-destructive behavior
- Often criminal behavior to service
- Chronic "street identity"

#### **4. Recommendations**

- Interagency communication and cooperation among:
  - School system
  - Law enforcement
  - Dept. of Social Services
  - Mental Health system
  - Community-based agencies
  - Other
- Specialized training and staff development
- Increased outreach/drop-in centers
- Clinical evaluation/assessment at intake
- Emergency overnight shelter
- Medical screening and care
- Attentive transitional programs:
  - Education/job development
  - Emancipation/independent living
  - Trained foster parent programs
  - Group homes
  - Long term shelter care

### **Rural Youth**

#### **1. Characteristics**

- Geographically isolated from other runaway populations
- More traditional values
- Runaway for same reasons as their urban counterparts (physical and sexual abuse)
- Their anti-social behavior is easily identifiable in the rural setting
- Subject to more peer pressure

#### **2. Percentage**

- Unknown number of rural runaway and homeless youth

#### **3. Special Problems**

- Vulnerable to exploitation in cities (not street wise)
- Geographically isolated from services

#### **4. Recommendations**

- Provide specialized services to help rural youth become more sophisticated about streets
- Provide specialized programs that address geographic differences
- Resources need to be more equitably distributed into rural areas
- Private/public sector partnerships should be developed to provide resources and services to rural areas

### **Minority Community Youth**

#### **1. Characteristics**

- Minority community includes Asian/Pacific-Black-Hispanic
- Tendency to stay within ethnic community
- Easier to move from house to house within extended family
- Mobility is continuous (one or two days in each house)
- More information is needed

#### **2. Percentage**

This is essentially an invisible group. The percentage is not determined. There should be a special study.

#### **3. Special Problems**

There is a lack of information about minority community runaway youth. The runaway shames the family; therefore, the matter is not reported. The problem has not been openly recognized by the community. There is a distrust of traditional agencies.

#### **4. Recommendations**

- The problem has to be recognized by the community before services can be provided
- The church, as a non-traditional agency, should lead in reaching out in the ethnic community
- Minority runaway/homeless youth need to be given more priority by service providers
- Agencies and service providers should be given more education and specialized training in the area of minority communities
- More study should be made

# Gay and Lesbian Youth

## 1. Characteristics

- More harassed and isolated in home communities than general runaway population
- Seek known large gay/lesbian communities
- Often lead double life to satisfy parental expectations
- Closeted youth generally feel alienated and isolated
- Perceive selves as outcasts, social deviants, sinners, etc.

## 2. Percentage

- Approximately 10% of general population
- Second largest minority in the United States (behind Blacks' 12% population)
- Approximately 30% of Hollywood runaway population

## 3. Special Problems

- Feigning heterosexual lifestyle and leading a double life makes them feel dishonest
- Self disclosure or, "coming out," results in family scandal and leads to being "thrown out"
- Frequent targets of physical and verbal harassment at school
- The normal adolescent fear of feeling "different" is heightened by gay/lesbian awareness
- Personal needs may be unrelated to homosexual orientation
- Large percentage of gay youth are involved in prostitution, which is a major way of spreading AIDS, gay youth tend to resist AIDS education

## 4. Recommendations

- Service providers should promote value of uniqueness and self-worth
- Shelters should strive to provide an environment where gay/lesbian youth can feel safe to disclose sexual orientation
- Service providers should be educated about the gay/lesbian population
- Provide education regarding AIDS

## **Baby Runners**

### **1. Characteristics**

- Out of their homes a short time (first or second time)
- Have a reasonable chance of returning home
- Are younger and stay closer to home than the average street kid
- Anti-social behavior is at a minimum
- Higher chance of success in working with them because they are more pliable

### **2. Percentage**

The consensus is that the vast majority of runaway and homeless youth are in this category (60-75%)

### **3. Special Problems**

- They have fewer problems than other runaways, are less sophisticated about the streets and more vulnerable to exploitation
- They lack knowledge about available resources and very few fall into the hands of agency people. Many solve their own problems
- They develop more serious problems if they do not get help

### **4. Recommendations**

- Service providers need to find them fast and deal with them quickly
- School personnel (counselors and teachers) should be informed of the available resources. They are in a position to identify the kids at the early stages of their running career
- Law enforcement should be made aware that detention is not the answer for baby runners in that they are not criminal or dangerous kids. They have home problems and need to be worked with
- County social service departments should become involved with baby runners. Some of them cannot return home, and need placement services. These departments need to re-examine their policy of not serving status offenders

## **Missing Children**

### **1. Characteristics**

- Abducted by strangers

- Abducted by parents (non-custodian)
- Whereabouts are unknown. Youths are considered missing even if abduction may not be involved if whereabouts remain unknown for 30 days.

## **2. Percentage**

The percentage for missing children is 3%. The category becomes blurred when runaway and homeless youth are classified as "voluntarily missing." Ninety-seven percent of the population is in fact runaway and homeless youth as opposed to those in the missing children category.

## **3. Special Problems**

- Missing children need to be found and protected
- There is a need to provide aftercare services for these kids and their families

## **4. Recommendations**

- Public funding should be made available to provide aftercare services. There is ample federal funding for law enforcement to respond quickly, especially for kids abducted by strangers
- Resources and funding should vary with the type of missing child; i.e., stranger and parental abductions
- There should be inter-agency cooperation gathering and disseminating facts about missing children and runaway-homeless youth; and coordination in effectively utilizing the available funding

## NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

Donald W. Mathis

Mr. Mathis is the Associate Director of the National Network of Runaway and Youth Services, which is a nonprofit membership organization comprised of more than 500 regional, state, and local youth service agencies providing services to troubled youth, including runaways and the homeless. The Network is an advocacy group and administers the National Fund for Runaway Children.

### **Funding**

The federal commitment to serving runaway youth began in 1975 after the Runaway Act was passed in 1974. Sixty-six shelters were started at a cost of about \$8 million. The program has grown to \$23.25 million, funding 260 to 270 shelters. Getting funds is always tough. We welcome letters from young people to our House Representative. We also welcome letters from voting-age individuals to House Representatives and Senators. It looks as if we will get at least basic federal funding for the Runaway Act next year. We have a chance for some increase. Another federal program, the Juvenile Justice and Prevention Act, looks like it will also be funded up to \$70.2 million. About 66 percent of that goes to the states, and the \$4 million California program in which some of you here participate is part of that. These are tough times. The overriding federal budget concern is to reduce the deficit, perhaps balancing the budget, and to institute good tax reforms.

S.1329 (now law), establishes a national grant program of \$50 million for foster care service providers to operate independent living programs. Runaway shelter operators would be eligible. The legislation has emerged from a concern for foster care youths who reach 18 and are not equipped for independent living.

### **Secure Detention**

There is a need for people who are interested in the problems of runaway and homeless youth to discuss the issues. There are disagreements and good arguments on both sides of the secure detention issue. The alternative to reaching a consensus as a result of this dialogue is law or policy by fiat, where no one will be happy with what is decreed. In Washington, D.C., when people make policy, the bottom line is whether the people that are closest to the

services and the protection of these communities can agree. So it is important to share a common understanding between law agencies and youth service providers. Both are concerned with the well-being of young people, their families, and the protection of the community. If we can all operate on that basis, dialogue will be a lot healthier.

For example, there has been federal legislation proposed in the Senate (Emergency Treatment Amendment) to amend the 1974 Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, of which the Runaway Youth Act is also a part, which said that in those cases where youths are in danger to self and/or the community, he/she is to be locked up for up to five days. The proposal was sent to the Senate for a vote without being considered in any committee hearings.

It was suspended only when one senator happened to raise some questions around it; i.e., what happens in five days to make the situation better? When we are talking about detention facilities, we are also talking about budgets and a lot of money. The amending legislation has been deferred by the Senate for further study.

In some people's judgement, there is a swinging back by the national juvenile justice leadership to the way things were in terms of the institutionalization of status offenders. The viewpoint here is that a criminal is a criminal and no distinction should be made between the juvenile and adult courts. If the youths do the crime, they must be prepared to do the time; and the younger they are handled in this manner, the better the chance that they will be turned around. This attitude clashes with the thought that juvenile courts and young people are different and more pliable; and some rehabilitative strategies are at work in community-based programs that can make a difference to young people.

In 1984/85, the National Network of Runaway and Youth Services conducted a national survey and needs assessment of agencies which provide services to runaway and homeless youth. Respondents were from all 50 states and Puerto Rico. The numbers and findings revealed 210 agencies, representing more than 312 shelters and 230 foster homes. The implication of the study with respect to the detention issue is that there is a system of shelters and services for runaway and homeless youth.

We need to get a handle on what we are talking about, the scope of the problem, before we can design new policies and laws that will affect hundreds of thousands of young people. We need to know to whom they should apply; and equally as important, to whom they should not apply. The consensus, including service providers, is that there are some chronic runners who do put themselves and the community in jeopardy, and present special problems to law enforcement and trouble their families. When we talk about

secure detention arrangements, we need to distinguish this group, which comprises a small percentage of the total runaway and homeless youth population (i.e., estimates are 13% or lower) from the vast majority of runaway and homeless youth whose basic problem is of a home and parental nature. The point is that before we start making strict policy about chronic runaways and detention, we need some numbers, and we need to know the reasons kids run away. There are more reasons for running away, even for chronic/habitual runners, than just being a punk kid.

One of the reasons that the Juvenile Justice/Delinquency Prevention and Runaway Youth programs have survived is that people with a vested interest in these services have spoken out and written letters to senators and representatives. Mr. Mathis recommended that they continue these constituency building efforts, maintain strong relationships with each other, and support their programs.

## JUDICIAL PERSPECTIVE

Honorable Patrick J. Morris

Judge Morris, the Presiding Judge of the San Bernardino County Juvenile Court, is investing deeply in juvenile affairs, recruiting foster and shelter care homes and advocating funding and support for myriad juvenile programs.

### **Separation of Status Offenders from the Juvenile Justice System**

Status offenders are a seldom seen commodity in California's county juvenile courts. It has been suggested by some that they be completely removed from their jurisdiction. The divorce of these offenders from the juvenile justice system means that no official requirement can be imposed upon either the youth or his family, even if it is in the minor's best interest. There can be no petition filing, adjudication, nor probation. The indication is that in the states where the elimination of court control has taken place (i.e., Washington, Maine, and Illinois), it has been replaced by an investment of dollars to help insure that the impacted children and youth who are in need of assistance will not be ignored and left unattended; i.e., provision of shelter homes and counseling. Unfortunately, these allocations have have been subjected to modification which has resulted in substantial reductions from the initial funding amounts, reflecting a backing away from commitment by the law makers.

In court control removal, the minors and their service providers may lose some of the best friends they could have to speak for them in high places; i.e., law enforcement, probation, and judges. Good things can happen to kids when judges are in the picture. A judge has the power to right a wrong by the mere utterance of an order. In Orange County, the presiding judge of the juvenile court became upset with the lack of adequate shelter care facilities for children. He got the attention of the policymakers, and things began to happen by placing dependent children in private hospitals, billing the County Auditor, and announcing that he was going to lease the Holiday Inn. This type of judicial leadership has been duplicated in other California counties (i.e., Los Angeles and San Bernardino). In these cases, the judge basically had to put himself on the line for the programs; but when he was out there, things happened.

Judicial political power will become increasingly important as the focus of funding moves from the national to the state and local levels. The prevalent

philosophy at the national level is that it is incumbent on the state and local levels, where the judiciary has its political power base, to provide adequate resources to address children and youth issues. The judges can use their political power and be persuasive in Sacramento and county board rooms. They have a great reservoir of respect in the community-at-large; when they speak, people listen. They also play an important role within the bureaucracy of those agencies that deliver children and youth services. In two counties (Fresno and San Bernardino), they have successfully invested themselves in the networking of these agencies.

There is a new breed of judges in California. Governors are appointing them younger. These new judges are people with a lot of energy and ambition, and they have begun to focus on the good of kids. There are also new management guidelines that have just been put into place this year. They suggest multiple year terms, at least two years in bench service, and most counties are buying into that standard. Juvenile court judges across the State are staying longer; and as they stay, they learn and become more knowledgeable, and become superb advocates for kids.

## **Detention**

If status offenders are going to be part of the juvenile justice system, there will have to be a formula devised for the use of detention. Justice without force of some kind is purely powerless. There has to be some ultimate sanction. In San Bernardino County, the general consensus was that there were some chronic truants that were beyond control and help until State legislation (AB 377 and 378) was passed which enabled the juvenile court to fine parents for failing to have their kids in school. This new law is currently being successfully applied in San Bernardino County. Most of the parents who have been filed on have made sure their kids are in school. Several thousand dollars in fines have been levied on those who have failed to do so.

Secure detention is not always the best motivator for change or reform. It may be the least desirable, but it is one of the tools that we have to work with these kids. The youth have to perceive that there is some power to the order of the court. The success of AB 377 and 378 in Sacramento indicates that the mood has changed and detention is coming. Those who are opposed to such reform are admonished to be compromising rather than dogmatic.

# LEGISLATIVE HISTORY AND UPDATE

David Steinhart

Mr. Steinhart is an attorney specializing in matters related to the juvenile justice system. He is presently the Project Director of the Private Sector Task Force on Juvenile Justice for the National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

In 1976, California passed legislation (AB 3121) prohibiting all secure detention of status offenders — minors subjected to the jurisdiction of the juvenile court under 601 of the Welfare and Institutions Code; i.e., runaways — minors who were not accused of having committed any crime. In the years 1973-1975, we were arresting and incarcerating status offenders in massive numbers; i.e., in 1974, 107,898 were arrested and 50,406 were locked up in juvenile halls.

In 1974, the Federal Juvenile Justice Act was passed which embodied federal juvenile justice policy that required the deinstitutionalization of status offenders. The Act proposed no specific means for conforming state law to federal policy.

In 1977, state legislation was passed (AB 958) modifying AB 3121 and restoring the secure detention of status offenders. The law (current law) permitted up to 72 judicial hours of secure detention to check for outstanding warrants (12 hours of detention) or arrange a return of the minor to his or her parents (24 hours of detention and 72 hours for out of state minors). The law also requires that detained status offenders be held separate and apart from minors being detained under 602 of the Welfare and Institutions Code (criminal offenders). AB 958 raised substantial barriers to California's compliance with the federal deinstitutionalization requirement and threatened the State's future eligibility for juvenile justice funds. Juvenile justice officials have learned to live with the law which essentially involves a hands off approach to status offenders. Just locking up a runaway does not accomplish much, and costs a lot of money.

Since AB 958, the legislature has been very quiet. But 1985 has been an active one in which two very promising bills were approved by legislators and sent to the Governor. AB 1596 (Art Agnos) was signed and SB 881 (Robert Presley) was vetoed. These bills were designed to pick up the critical piece of the reform package that was thrown out of AB 3121 in 1976; i.e., they appropriate state funds for services to runaway and homeless youth. These bills mark the first time in California history that the legislature has approved significant expenditures for services to runaway and homeless youth.

AB 1596 sets up a pilot project for homeless youth in San Francisco and

another one in Los Angeles, and would appropriate \$968,000 for the two projects. It provides outreach services to locate these youth; shelter, health and counseling services; and would attempt to reunite youth with parents where possible or place them in a stable home situation until adulthood.

Even if both bills had been signed into law, the battle over the secure detention of non-criminal youths would not be over. There will always be those who believe that kids should be locked up if they disobey or runaway from home — even if they have been assaulted, beaten, or forced into flight. They will make themselves heard and will have an impact on the policymakers who listen — especially new young legislators who do not know much about our distasteful experience with the lock up of these children in the past. We can count on a continuing debate; and next year, one vehicle for debate will be SB 883 (Presley) extending secure detention for status offenders.

## STATE LEGISLATION

Jane Henderson

Senator Robert B. Presley's Office

During hearings of the Senate Finance Committee, chaired by Senator Robert Presley, testimony was presented concerning the increasing costs of incarcerating juvenile delinquents in the Youth Authority. Senator Presley asked at that time whether the trend of increasing numbers of offenders in state prisons and the Department of the Youth Authority might be reversed by developing new strategies to fight delinquency. Senator Presley notes that criminal careers usually take root during childhood and adolescence. According to Senator Presley, "If we can reach these young people and provide positive direction before they become delinquent and before they enter the criminal justice system, we can achieve the public safety objective of reducing the numbers of criminals and populations in our youth institutions and prisons."

Senator Presley has authored legislation designed to prevent delinquency, including parenting education, helping stop the cycle of child abuse, and funding for shelter-care centers to keep runaways off the streets and out of crime.

### **1985 Legislation Related to Children and Youth**

#### **FAMILY VIOLENCE PREVENTION**

**SB 135** would establish a separate funding program for family violence prevention, with a focus on community education. Administered by the Office of Criminal Justice Planning, it would provide financial and technical assistance to local domestic and family violence programs. There is a \$200,000 appropriation for implementation. (STATUS: Signed into law)

#### **REPORTING OF MISSING PERSONS**

Currently, police department policies vary widely, with some taking missing person reports immediately, and others waiting up to 4 days before taking the report, especially if the missing person is considered a runaway. **SB 391** would require law enforcement agencies to take missing person reports immediately and to forward the reports to state and federal agencies utilizing standard forms. (STATUS: Signed into law)

## **RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH ACT OF CALIFORNIA**

**SB 881** would establish policy language based on federal law and would require counties to develop comprehensive plans for dealing with runaways and homeless youth including counseling services to determine the cause for homelessness and, if appropriate, family reunification (STATUS: Vetoed by Governor)

## **RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH SHELTERS**

**SB 882** would provide a funding source for establishing and operating shelters for runaways and homeless youth. There are several sources under consideration. A Presley hearing last year showed that while there are thousands of homeless and runaway youth in California, there are very few shelters where they can seek assistance. (STATUS: Two year bill)

## **STATUS OFFENDERS**

**SB 883** would authorize law enforcement agencies to hold "status offenders" (truants, habitual runaways) in a secure facility for up to 72 hours in order to ensure that the youth receive counseling services. Would be contingent upon federal legislation giving states this authority (STATUS: Two year bill)

## HOLLYWOOD SCENE

Service providers generally agree that, in the vast majority of cases, the young people are running away from something rather than to something. Many move into the Hollywood area in Los Angeles County. The issue facing policymakers is which service systems and programs can best help resolve the problems of these youth. The consensus is that these youth are best served by community-based shelters and youth programs which provide a mix of counseling and other services in an environment where the youth feel safe, as demonstrated by the testimonies of the following panel of experts who work the "Hollywood Scene".

**Teenage Prostitution** (Dr. Lois Lee — Children of the Night): Dr. Lee is the founder and Executive Director of "Children of the Night", located in Hollywood, which is a program for teenage prostitutes. She is a sociologist-anthropologist with extensive experience in social research and teaching. As a result of her street contacts, she was invited by the prostitutes to observe the kids on the streets. She found 15-16 year old youths on the street, took them home with her, and made phone calls to try to find a place for them to stay. She found them difficult to place because of their prostitution backgrounds. She has estimated that about 80% are incest victims.

Children of the Night's staff and volunteers provide a 24-hour hotline, a walk-in crisis center and an outreach program for street kids and teenage prostitutes. They contact kids on the street, tell them about services, do some undercover investigation, and provide information to law enforcement. Children of the Night is a support system for youth, with a program emphasis on placement.

Teenage prostitutes tend to work in houses of prostitution. Of those seen, 66% are 16 years or younger, 40% are on probation, 10% are on county social service caseloads, and 50% fall between the cracks. Children of the Night staff find it easier to get the children off the streets if they are new or after they have been on the street for a time and are disillusioned. They do crisis intervention and try to link the young person with existing agencies.

**Pimps:** Dr. Lee has studied pimps for a number of years, knows several of them, and has actually gone to pimp bars in Los Angeles. She has presented a professional paper on the typology of pimping strategies, coming up with 22 strategies on how they control prostitutes. Pimps usually have people under them to do their dirty work. There are people under them who are known as "catchers", their sole responsibility is to identify a "package" (a young, lonely, alienated girl with no parental interest). The

package is usually worth from \$50-\$100.

**How Pimps Control Kids:** Deferred gratification - such as telling the kids that they only have to prostitute for a little while and they will get a house in the hills, pools, etc. They are romanticized and swept off their feet. Sometimes the pimps take the young girls to a motel room and buy them clothes, etc. which makes them feel they owe money to the pimps and prostitution becomes a way to pay back. It is hard to convince the young girls that they have been set up by the pimps. The pimps always have an even number of girls and tell each one they care about them. Each one gets a different reason. This results in the girls competing with each other for the pimps.

**Getting Kids Away from Pimps:** Children of the Night staff have to be able to demonstrate to the kids that they know the street better than he/she or the pimp does. They have to be able to point out that the pimp is not masculine and that he is in fact a racist. Whatever ethnic group is on the lower strata, the lower social level, having less access to higher education and a job --- that will be the ethnic group making up the pimp subculture.

**Shelters** (Phil Carter — Options House): Mr. Carter is the former Director of Options House, a runaway shelter for youth. The program has six beds and nine staff and is designed to help 12-18 year old youth in the Hollywood area. He is currently Chairman of the Department of Social Work at California State University, Los Angeles.

There should be shelters everywhere. There is a sparse distribution of shelters in Los Angeles County. Shelters have found themselves in the position of turning down kids. Any kid who seeks help should be able to get it. It is important to get at the kids at the beginning of their adventure in the streets.

Shelters have an overall decent success rate if one looks at the statistics in terms of returning kids home. Most shelters look toward reunification of the family. Some kids should not and do not return home. Shelters are crisis centers on a short-term basis to get kids off the street. It is very difficult to find resources for 16-17 year old youths who have never been in the system. Their resources begin to be reduced when they reach the age of 16 and are cut off by 18.

The staffing of a shelter is a continual problem. There is a high turnover rate among shelter staff; the pay is low. The staff are usually the younger people coming out of school, committed and wanting to serve. Staff conduct

has to be monitored because one person can ruin the program. In addition to staff recruitment, the finding of a site for a new shelter can also be a problem. There are a lot of people out there with goodwill, until you want to put a shelter home in their neighborhoods. Sometimes you cannot take more than six kids even though you have the room, until you get the permission of the neighborhood. It can take years to get the permission because they do not want the home. The shelter has to establish credibility by quietly doing its job, having open houses, and generally running a low profile program. The neighborhood gradually finds that kids who come to shelter homes are not really the negative stereotypes. The building of trust with other agencies is also a continuous problem. The working together does not come about overnight. It develops with experience, communication, knowing what the shelter's limits are, and taking one's share of the responsibility. More resources are needed to provide shelter services in specialized areas; i.e., teenage prostitutes and gay/lesbian youth. Services also need to be provided on a more organized level.

**High Risk Youth Project** (Gary Yates — Children's Hospital): Mr. Yates is the Director of the High Risk Youth Project, Division of Adolescent Medicine, Children's Hospital of Los Angeles. He is currently a Clinical Instructor, Pediatrics, University of Southern California, School of Medicine.

In 1982, Children's Hospital of Los Angeles, Division of Adolescent Medicine, and the Los Angeles Free Clinic began the High Risk Youth Program. The mission of the High Risk Youth Program is to increase access to health services for high risk young people, focusing on the problems of substance abuse, venereal disease, unwanted pregnancy, suicide and depression, runaway, and teenage prostitution.

Many young people in the Hollywood-Wilshire District of Los Angeles face multiple health and psycho-social problems of this nature. The current fragmented system of health care makes it difficult for them to seek and receive the help they need. The High Risk Youth Program integrates existing services into a network of helping resources for high risk youth in the Hollywood-Wilshire District.

Many of the youth in this area avoid traditional service providers out of ignorance or fear. A runaway may be hesitant to approach an "establishment" organization for fear that she/he will be reported to the police. It's only when they contract a venereal disease, become pregnant, or develop other health problems that they seek help.

To consolidate services for these youngsters and to treat all the problems that beset them, the High Risk Youth Program deals with them at the time and place they appear to ask for help. For this reason, most of the services to

be provided under this program take place in the setting of the Los Angeles Free Clinic, which has long been a refuge and a safe source of services and information for this client population. The free medical care aspect of the clinic creates an open door for young people whose entry point into the health and social care system is primarily a medical complaint. In the course of the medical examination, physicians conduct a psycho-social interview with their young patients in order to determine further areas of need which may be present such as food, shelter, job, mental health and drug abuse counseling. If such needs are identified and if the young person wants assistance in any of these areas, the physician will introduce them to another member of the interdisciplinary team (social worker, counselor, health educator, etc.) who will take over from there.

To foster networking and cooperation and to meet the needs of high risk youth in the most comprehensive manner by avoiding losing young people in "bureaucratic cracks" during referral, the program works closely with nearly a dozen organizations in the Hollywood-Wilshire area.

The referral process is a two-way street as these organizations provide an important source of referrals to the High Risk Youth Program. Many of the more than 3,000 youth who have been seen during the last three years have been diverted from repetitive cycles of self-destructive behavior toward more rewarding and satisfying lives. In addition, over 200 professionals (physicians, nurses, social workers, psychologists, health educators, etc.) have received on-site training and many will continue to use their new-found skills to assist youth in communities across the nation.

**Gay Youth Hustling Diversion Program** (Joel Schwartz — Gay and Lesbian Community Services Center): Mr. Schwartz is the Interim Director of the Housing and Youth Department for the Gay and Lesbian Community Services Center in Hollywood. He administers client services including: street outreach, crisis intervention, casework and emergency/transitional housing programs.

The hustlers are approximately one-third gay-identified and two-thirds are "straight" or bisexually-identified. The attractions of hustling are: 1) survival money, although the money is not as substantial as generally imagined; 2) validation for one's sexuality, which can be a powerful reinforcer especially if one is gay and has left or been thrown out of one's home because of negative sexual messages; and 3) the support of a peer group sharing common values and concerns after feeling like an outsider. Types of hustlers include: 1) situational — sell or trade sex in certain situations only (e.g., seeking hitchhiking rides, meals, shelter, drugs, or drinks); 2) occasional — practice hustling as a trade, but not on a regular basis; 3) vocational—chief means of

support is hustling; and 4) career — generally somewhat older and better paid, pose as modeling and escort services rather than operate on the streets.

The Gay Hustling Diversion Program (85% success rate) service components include emergency short-term and long-term shelter (60-90 day), vocational opportunities, and after-care. Youth must commit to legitimate work as a requirement of being eligible for shelter (eligibility extends to 23 years of age). Guidance and instruction are offered in the areas of job training and placement, and independent living; i.e., weekly support groups and maintenance of roommate/apartment finding services. Job readiness training (resume writing, interviewing, etc.) and widespread resources are provided to help insure the achievement of independent and stabilized living.

**Law Enforcement and the Social Agencies** (Lt. Ed Hocking — Los Angeles Police Department/Hollywood Division): Lt. Hocking has been a member of the Los Angeles Police Department for 24 years. He is currently assigned as the Commanding Officer of the Hollywood Area Detective Division. He has been involved with juveniles for 9 years.

The Los Angeles Police Department has 18 geographical areas. Each area has a small juvenile unit that varies between 4 and 8 sworn personnel, with the main centralized juvenile unit with a total strength of approximately 120 officers. Juvenile units are small and not enough time can be devoted to working on the juvenile program; therefore, law enforcement agencies must rely on the active social agencies that are willing to help. They have to work together.

### **Guidelines for Social Agencies in Working with Law Enforcement:**

- DO'S**
1. Introduce yourself to the local agency.
  2. Find out who is in charge of the juvenile unit and physically meet with them.
  3. Be prepared:
    - Name of agency
    - Who's involved?
    - Why is your agency legally recognized?
    - How are you funded?
    - What can you offer?
    - What are you after? What do you want?
    - How long have you been in business?

Who are your counselors or employees?  
What are their credentials or experience?  
How do you screen your staff?  
What are your training programs for your employees?  
Why is your agency needed in the community?

4. Have a fixed location to accept referrals.
5. Establish hot lines with training for counselors, especially when to call the police.
6. Schedule an open house to local authorities.
7. Get involved in community programs and organizations.
8. Offer to come to police roll calls and briefings to introduce yourself and explain your program.

- DON'TS**
1. Don't cry wolf. Nothing could be worse than to expect an immediate police response in the middle of the night after a counselor has reported that a youth has been molested and the investigation determines the incident took place three years ago (bring the youth to the station during the day when the appropriate action can be taken).
  2. Stay away from name calling and inter-agency wars.

**Guidelines for Law Enforcement in Working  
with Social Agencies:**

1. Seek out local social agencies helping juveniles.
2. Determine whether they are legal and/or fall within your department's policy.
3. Offer your services in an advisory capacity and make yourself available.
4. Offer to provide training; i.e., invite agency staff to police seminars.
5. Drop in unexpectedly and see what's going on.
6. When dealing with the runaways, ask them about the social agencies—who provides the best service? Who really cares?

## WORKSHOP SMALL GROUP REPORTS

One of the excitements of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Workshop was the bringing together of people with different perspectives and expertise. During the three-day symposium, the participants were involved in a series of task oriented meetings to generate reports on six pre-selected topics: 1) Causation and Prevention, 2) Research and Planning, 3) Program Design, 4) Community Coordination, 5) Current Legislation and 6) Media and Public Awareness. The format which was set up for the work groups involved their addressing themselves to a definition of the topic, current issues and problems in that area, general approach to the problem, and recommendations on what should be done. The workshop participants generated the following reports:

### Causation and Prevention

#### I. Definition

The identification of underlying circumstances which bring a youth to flee an environment or remain homeless, and the alleviation of those conditions which may precipitate a runaway episode or prolong homelessness.

Comprehensive prevention strategies need to include intervention and aftercare components. Intervention is a strategy for preventing **chronic** running away or **prolonged** homelessness. Aftercare requires a commitment to long-term stabilization and permanency planning, and to the prevention of future crises from de-stabilizing the youth.

#### II. Current Issues and Problems

##### A. Victims of abuse (physical/sexual/emotional)

1. How to upgrade parenting and communication skills in **all** families to prevent "acting out."
2. Penetrating the family's barrier of silence to seek outside help (or society's barrier).

##### B. Single parent family youth

1. T.V. media values often fill the vacuum created by the absence of modeled parental values.
2. How to overcome the youth's frequent inability to deal with

his/her parent's dating partner.

C. "Merged" family youth

1. The one who does not fit into the new family unit.
2. The scapegoated teenager (the "Identified Problem").

D. Pregnant teenagers

1. Sense of family scandal.
2. Medical/nutritional/reproductive issues.

E. Minority youth

1. Severely under-represented in service statistics.
2. Existing programs often geographically or culturally inaccessible.

F. Gay and lesbian youth

1. Intense feeling of alienation/isolation among peer (siblings, schoolmates).
2. Painful/damaging internalization of negative societal messages about being gay or lesbian ("internalized homophobia").
3. Sense of scandal to family and religious group.

G. Adopted children

1. Sense of being second class child.
2. Overcoming fantasy of unknown parent(s) as "rescuer".

H. Refugee and immigrant youth

1. Undocumented Central Americans fleeing political terror and economic hardship.
2. East European and Asian/Pacific immigrant or refugee youth undergoing Americanization in conflict with parents' traditional values.

I. Chronic runners from placements

1. Overcoming a history of mistrust and impermanence.
2. Service providers overcoming a perception of these youth as "unplaceable."

J. Other street youth/long-term runners

**III. General Approach to Problem**

A. Parenting and communication skills within the family.

- B. Sensitivity training for service providers in the area of cultural differences among minority populations; and in the special needs of gay and lesbian runaways; i.e., need to feel safe to self-disclose sexual orientation.
- C. Use of religious institutions and organizations by the social agencies where effective prevention and intervention can be accomplished.
- D. Innovative shelter and supportive services models need to be developed and tested for street kids and other chronically homeless youth.
- E. Public agencies need to elicit input from community-based organizations before setting policy in order to maximize the workings of the overall youth service delivery system.
- F. Secure detention as an effective intervention strategy must include therapeutic adjuncts; i.e., counseling and aftercare, so the youth is not returned to the same unstable environment from which he/she was removed prior to detention.

### III. **Recommendations**

- A. Establish parenting education and communication skills training at all levels of the school curriculum from K-12.
- B. Establish a requirement of a successful completion of a "Parenting Refresher" course for obtaining a marriage license.
- C. Future State funding should place special emphasis on developing program models for different minority communities, and multi-cultural awareness training within existing agencies.
- D. Future State funding should place special emphasis on providing on-going training to staffs regarding the needs of gay and lesbian runaway and homeless youth.
- E. State health and mental health agencies should encourage programs to educate gay and bisexual youth about the prevention of AIDS, and public agencies should work with private agencies in developing policies about serving persons with AIDS.
- F. Cities and counties with street youth populations should stimulate the development of short-term multi-bed shelters (e.g., 20 beds) administered by community-based organizations for chronic street youth.

- G. Federal and State guidelines regarding runaway and homeless youth programs need to include the development of long-term independent living programs for youth up to 21-23 years of age.
- H. Service providers should educate the religious community on the issues of runaway and homeless youth; i.e., domestic violence, and provide information about community resources.
- I. Legislation should be introduced to impose a \$5-\$10 birth registration fee, the generated money to fund local runaway shelters and parenting programs.
- J. Each county should form an advisory committee, including the public and private sectors, to develop public policy impacting on runaway and homeless youth.
- K. Secure detention programs for runaway and homeless youth, if warranted, should be developed and administered by community-based organizations.

## **Research and Planning**

### **I. Definition**

There is a need to ensure that policy and programs are not based on anecdotes and that effective programs and administrative systems are in place to meet the needs of runaway and homeless youth.

### **II. Current Issues and Problems**

- A. There is generally inadequate information on the number, types, characteristics, and locations of runaway and homeless youth.
- B. The data is skewed, depending on who collects it.
- C. The research and planning needs of runaway and homeless youth under 18 years are so substantial that this area should be addressed first, and not expanded to include older youth.
- D. Research should give priority to those runaway and homeless youth unstable and negative living circumstances, as opposed to those youth who, including many from minority groups, are taken care of in stable, extended family situations.
- E. There is a need to identify successful programs that serve the different types of runaway and homeless youth.

### **III. General Approach to Problem**

- A. Every county should collect data on its runaway and homeless youth population.
- B. Research and planning should recognize the existence of various types of runaway and homeless youth, who run for different reasons, and who require differential treatment.
- C. Expand Section 601 of the California State Welfare and Institutions Code to incorporate the various categories of runaway and homeless youth, just as there are sub-divisions under Section 300.
- D. Design a program model for each type of runaway and homeless youth, implement it on an experimental basis, and evaluate for effectiveness.

### **IV. Recommendations**

- A. The State (i.e., Office of Criminal Justice Planning and Department of the Youth Authority) should assume the responsibility for the evaluation of runaway and homeless youth program models. It should set the parameters for the study with broad-based input by experts. State funding should be allocated for the research which should be done by a highly respected research organization. The research should be supported by a State mandate for proper reporting to facilitate complete, accurate, and timely data collection. The counties which are selected to participate in the research should be mandated to provide data through means of a standardized research instrument.
- B. State law should mandate the reporting of runaway and homeless youth in the same manner as child abuse.

## **Program Design**

### **I. Definition**

There is a need for runaway and homeless youth programs which provide a comprehensive blend of services, are community-based, with community involvement and support; and able to provide prevention and intervention strategies which include the early identification of youth problems that result in runaway behavior.

### **II. Current Issues and Problems**

- A. There is a need for communication, networking, and coordination among service providing social agencies. There currently exists some unrealistic expectations of each other.
- B. There is a need for funding in order to maintain and expand services. Many agencies currently have only a limited scope of services.
- C. Training resources are needed in specialized areas; i.e., early identification of potential runaways, needs assessment and diagnosis, domestic violence and child abuse, etc.
- D. There is a need for preventive service strategies which would involve a close working relationship with schools and law enforcement in the early identification of youth problems which result in runaway behavior.
- E. There is a need to fill geographical service gaps. Many communities are not being served or only at an inadequate level.
- F. There is a need to broaden private sector and community support for runaway and homeless youth service.
- G. There is a need for more information and effective runaway and homeless youth service strategies.

### III. **General Approach to Problem**

A program model would be on an organized service delivery system which would include the following services:

- A. Family/youth needs assessment and diagnosis.
- B. Crisis Intervention
  - 1. Shelter
  - 2. Counseling
  - 3. 24-hour hotline
- C. Outreach
- D. Health
- E. Legal and religious
- F. Longer term shelter
- G. Educational
- H. Employment

- I. Aftercare
- J. Community resource agency coordination
- K. Research and program development

#### **IV. Recommendation**

Alameda County (Northern California - San Francisco Bay Area) is recommended as a program model of a service delivery system which provides adequate and comprehensive services to runaway and homeless youth.

### **Community Coordination**

#### **I. Definition**

- A. Community coordination
  1. Process of working together to achieve a common goal
  2. Identifies and maximizes resources
  3. Avoids duplication
  4. Changes agency perception through participation

#### **II. Current Issues and Problems**

- A. Need to remove barriers and establish trust
- B. The goal of the agencies should be more client focused (rather than agency need focused)
- C. Need to simplify agency policies and guidelines
- D. Need for organization continuity and stabilization
- E. Need for comprehensive pilot program to test best method of intervention

#### **III. Recommendation**

Government convene a statehouse conference for purpose of studying the statewide problem of runaway and homeless youth as it relates to coordination of revenues and deployment of resources. This group should consist of but not be limited to representatives of all groups that come into contact with runaway and homeless youth such as law enforcement, courts, public departments of social services, private

social services, juvenile probation, public education, mental health, departments of health, legislators, community people, clients, ex-clients, advocates, parents, religious organizations, business and industry, and academia.

## **Current Legislation**

### **I. Definition**

1985 State legislation included AB 1596 (Agnos) and SB 883 (Presley) which provided for the funding for services to runaway and homeless youth. AB 1596 (signed by Governor) appropriates nearly \$1 million for homeless youth centers in Los Angeles and San Francisco. SB 883 (vetoed by Governor) would have established as statewide grant program of \$3 million for services to runaway and homeless youth.

In 1986, the State legislature will hold hearings on SB 883 (Presley) which provides, among other things, that status offenders may be locked in juvenile halls for 72 hours pending delivery of probation services, and for 30 days (after filing of a supplemental petition) for failure to comply with court orders.

### **II. Current Issues and Problems**

- A. Programs which provide services to runaway and homeless youth are needed throughout the State. Runaway shelters are turning away more youths than they serve.
- B. "Secure Detention" legislation (i.e., SB 883) needs to define for whom the detention is intended.
- C. One of the reasons there is a gap in services is that there exists a generalized suspicion among runaway and homeless youth service providers that law enforcement and other social agencies do not care.

### **III. Recommendation**

Federal, State and local governments need to assume increased leadership roles and responsibilities for programs responding to runaway and homeless youth issues. This involvement would include a provision for increased funding, training resources, and inter-agency coordination.

## Media and Public Awareness

### I. Definition

How can we more effectively utilize media to influence public awareness regarding runaway and homeless youth?

### II. Current Issues and Problems

#### A. Strategies for attracting media coverage

1. Developing a "handle" that reporters find newsworthy
2. "Stroking" developing relationships with media people
3. Building an information base
4. Responding to negative events in the community in a proactive way (e.g., success stories)

#### B. Handling media coverage

1. Ensuring accuracy and minimizing distortion
2. Anticipation **response** to media exposure
3. Confidentiality

#### C. Using media for program and policy development

1. "Tiers" of media; e.g., general audience plus specialized audience vehicles (church magazines), "targeting" local papers
2. Constituency building
3. Control direction/information source

All recommendations addressed to program directors, government agency executives and other interested advocates.

### III. General Approach to Problem/Recommendations

#### A. Strategies for attracting media coverage

1. Reporters need a "**handle**" or a "peg" upon which to base their story. Suggest to them an attention-getting event or personality that can serve as a "grabber" and then back that up with the factual material you wish to communicate.
2. **Cultivating**/stroking newspeople is a subtle process. It involves identifying the right people (those likely to cover your type of story), following up with personal contact, and being aware of their needs and deadline pressures. Maintain regular

contact. . . not only when you need something. Individualize story leads. Try to become one of their "contact people" that they call when they want a quote. When you've received coverage, follow up with a personalized "thank you."

3. Build an **information base** via regular press releases and updates, form a local network of agencies for press purposes that can coordinate and systematize the flow of information, with a central contact person if possible. Hand deliver press releases on special stories. The network could develop a "press board" with story opportunities.

## B. Handling media coverage

The bottom line is you can't **control** media coverage. You can present what you feel is a balanced picture of the issue but they will write what they choose to write.

1. Ensure accuracy and minimize distortion

First, be sure **you** present information accurately. You can offer to review a piece for factual detail, but that's about all. The best way to achieve good reporting is by relating the story to their interests (and the interests of their audience). Correct inaccuracies in stories in as non-confrontational a manner as possible (e.g., personal note).

2. Anticipate a response to any media exposure

Be prepared with facts and materials for follow-up requests and possibly for increased demand for service. If your story implies a need for action, be prepared to provide the necessary follow through.

3. Programs should develop a uniform policy regarding confidentiality for protection of young clients.

Should have standard form summarizing legal constraints and releases. Generally, one should assume that even supposedly "off the record" remarks are actually "on the record."

## C. Using the media for program and policy development

1. There are several **tiers of media**. All are important . . . national, state, local, special interest (churches; "family

section”); private industry newsletters, “local focus” T.V. news magazine shows. Target your efforts according to audience and your needs.

2. Constituency building is the aim. It is what moves the political machinery. Serendipitous spin-offs can yield new and potentially important allies/advocates.

## CONCLUSION

There are no typical runaway and homeless youth. Their needs are as varied as the youth themselves. At the top of the list of needed services is emergency shelter, crisis intervention, counseling, and long-term placement resources. In California, we continue to debate between more lock-up and less lock-up for these youth. At most, the percentage of serious problem, street oriented youth is about 25% of the total runaway and homeless youth population — 1.3 million to 2 million per year. The vast majority are not on the streets and do not have severe problems. We are talking about the youth who lives next door to you, maybe someone in your family; but young people who nevertheless need services.

Please remember that these kinds of things also exist in your cities. These youth belong to all of us. Runaway and homeless youth and their broken families present us with a searing challenge. The ball is in our court and it will be our choice whether the forces shredding families and crushing our young will remain unchecked.

## APPENDIX

# TRANSFER OF KNOWLEDGE WORKSHOP

## RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH

Holiday Inn — Hollywood, CA

September 18 - 20, 1985

### PROGRAM

#### Wednesday, September 18, 1985

- 11:00-12:00 noon ..... Registration  
(Producers Room)
- 12:00-1:15 p.m. .... Lunch  
Convene/Welcome/Transfer of Knowledge Workshop . . . Ronald W. Hayes,  
Deputy Director, Youth Authority  
G. Albert Howenstein, Director, Office of Criminal Justice Planning  
Introduction of Workshop ..... Bruce Fisher, Co-Chairperson  
Overview & Purpose ..... Linda Glassman, Co-Chairperson  
Legislative History and Update ..... David Steinhart,  
National Council on Crime & Delinquency
- 1:15-2:30 p.m. .... Small Groups-Definition  
(Various Rooms)  
1. Street Youth  
2. Rural Youth  
3. Minority Youth  
4. Gay Youth  
5. "Baby" Runners  
6. Missing Children
- 2:30-3:00 p.m. .... Break
- 3:00-5:00 p.m. .... Reporting Back from Small Groups  
(Producers Room) (20 minutes/group)
- 5:00-6:00 p.m. .... Reception/No Host Bar  
(Studio Room)
- 6:00-7:00 p.m. .... Dinner  
(Studio Room)  
National Perspective ..... Don Mathis, Speaker  
National Network of  
Runaway and Youth Services

## Thursday, September 19, 1985

- 7:30-8:00 a.m. .... Continental Breakfast  
(Producers Room)
- 8:00-8:05 a.m. .... Convene — Bruce Fisher  
(Producers Room)
- 8:05-8:30 a.m. .... Legal Perspective — Honorable Patrick J. Morris  
Presiding Juvenile Court Judge  
San Bernardino County
- 8:30-8:45 a.m. .... Task Overview — Linda Glassman & Bruce Fisher  
(Producers Room)
- 8:45-10:00 a.m. .... Small Groups/Facilitators  
(Various Rooms) Program Design — John Schiller  
Community Coordination — Liz Goldsmith  
State Legislation — Randy Mecham  
Research & Planning Strategy — Cherie Black  
Causation & Prevention — Phil Carter  
Public Awareness & Media — Tom David
- 10:00-10:15 a.m. .... Break  
(Producers Room)
- 10:15-12:00 noon .... Resume Group Discussion
- 12:00-1:00 p.m. .... Lunch  
(Windows on Hollywood) Introduction of Speaker — Ronald W. Hayes,  
Deputy Director, California Youth Authority  
California Legislation — Jane Henderson, Speaker  
Senator Robert B. Presley's Office
- 1:00-2:45 p.m. .... Resume Small Groups to Prepare Group Report  
(Various Rooms)
- 2:45-3:00 p.m. .... Break
- 3:00-5:00 p.m. .... Panel — Hollywood Scene  
Lt. Ed Hocking, L.A.P.D. - Hollywood Division  
Joel Schwartz, Gay & Lesbian Community Services Center  
Phil Carter, Cal State - Los Angeles  
Lois Lee, Children of the Night  
Gary Yates, High Risk Youth Project
- 5:00-5:30 p.m. .... Walk/Drive Along Overview —  
Lt. Ed Hocking

## Thursday, September 19, 1985, Continued

- 5:30-6:30 p.m. .... Buffet Dinner  
Show Biz Cafe, Holiday Inn
- 6:30-7:00 p.m. .... Clothing Change
- 7:00-9:30 p.m. .... Walk/Drive Along, Lt. Ed Hocking

## Friday, September 20, 1985

- 7:30-8:00 a.m. .... Continental Breakfast
- 8:00-8:30 a.m. .... Feedback regarding Walk/Drive Along  
(Producers Room)
- 8:30-10:00 a.m. .... Small Group Reports/25 Minutes Each
- 10:00-10:30 a.m. .... Break and Check Out
- 10:30-11:45 a.m. .... Continuation of Small Group Reporting  
(Producers Room)
- 11:45-12:00 noon .... Wrap Up — Bruce Fisher  
Evaluation Sheets — Linda Glassman, Marilyn Langford
- 12:00 noon .... Sandwich Buffet Lunch

## WORKSHOP PLANNING COMMITTEE

Lt. Ed Hocking  
Los Angeles Police Department

Dr. Lois Lee  
Children of the Night

Brother Phil Mandile  
Angel's Flight

Dr. Phil Carter  
Options House

Reverend Diane Hemphill  
Inheritance Christian Center

Liz Goldsmith  
Western States  
Youth Services Network

Jane Henderson  
Senator Robert B. Presley's Office

Nancy Sefcik  
Western States  
Youth Services Network

Randall Mecham  
Youth Advocates

Linda Glassman  
California Child, Youth and  
Family Coalition

Judge Patrick J. Morris  
San Bernardino County

Bruce Alan Fisher  
Runaway Federal  
Discrimination Program

Tom David  
U.C.L.A.

Marilyn Langford  
California Youth Authority

Rito Rosa  
California Youth Authority

Chiquita Sipos  
California Youth Authority

Tom Pedersen  
California Youth Authority

Richard W. Tillson  
California Youth Authority

## **PRESENTERS**

Phil Carter, Chairperson  
Department of Social Services  
Cal State University - Los Angeles

Jane Henderson, Administrative Assistant  
Senator Robert B. Presley's Office

Lt. Ed Hocking  
Detective Bureau - Hollywood Division  
Los Angeles Police Department

Dr. Lois Lee, Director  
Children of the Night

Donald W. Mathis, Associate Director  
National Network of Runaway & Youth Services, Inc.

Honorable Patrick J. Morris  
Presiding Judge of the Juvenile Court  
San Bernardino County

Joel Schwartz, Director  
Gay & Lesbian Community Services Center

David Steinhart, Attorney & Project Director  
National Council on Crime & Delinquency

Gary Yates, M.A., MFCC  
Director - High Risk Youth Project  
Children's Hospital

# **RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH**

## **TRANSFER OF KNOWLEDGE WORKSHOP**

### **PARTICIPANTS**

Shirley Abrams, Past President  
California Council on Children and Youth  
1989 Yorba Drive  
Pomona, CA 91768

Gordon Andahl, Deputy Director  
Orange County Social Services Agency  
P.O. Box 1944  
Santa Ana, CA 92701

Reverend Carl Bennett  
Mission SAFE  
5424 East 14th Street  
Oakland, CA 94601

John P. Bernardi, Special Assistant  
Bureau of Special Operations  
Juvenile Division  
L.A. County D.A.'s Office  
210 West Temple Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Cherie Black, Executive Director  
California Children, Youth and  
Family Coalition  
1722 "J" Street, Suite 11  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Roland C. Belknap  
Chief Deputy Probation Officer  
Riverside County  
3609 11th Street  
Riverside, CA 92502

David Carrillo, Program Coordinator  
Angel's Flight  
6361 Yucca Street  
Hollywood, CA 90020

Phil Carter, Chairperson  
Department of Social Work  
Cal State University - Los Angeles  
5200 Louise  
Encino, CA 91316

Sook Yung Chang  
Asian/Pacific Program Specialist  
Y.W.C.A.  
1125 West 6th Street, #400  
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Tony Cimarusti, Assistant Director  
Crime and Delinquency Prevention  
California Youth Authority  
4241 Williamsborough Drive  
Sacramento, CA 95823

Kenneth Clayman, Public Defender  
Ventura County  
Hall of Justice  
800 South Victoria  
Ventura, CA 93009

Tom David, Director  
Bush Program in Child  
and Family Policy  
200 Dodd Hall  
University of California  
Los Angeles  
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Ray Eberhardt, Program Manager  
High Risk Youth Liaison  
State Department of Education  
721 Capitol Mall  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Bruce A. Fisher, Attorney/Consultant  
Project Director, Adolescent Abuse  
(Runaway Federal  
Demonstration Program)  
351 Sausalito Blvd.  
Sausalito, CA 94965

George Monica, Deputy  
Department of Health & Human Services  
50 U.N. Plaza, Room 479  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Linda Glassman, Chairperson  
California Child Youth Family Coalition  
c/o South Bay Juvenile Diversion  
P.O. Box 270  
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Liz Goldsmith, Chairperson  
Western States Youth Services Network  
1214 28th Street  
San Diego, CA 92602

Ronald W. Hayes, Deputy Director  
Prevention & Community Corrections  
California Youth Authority  
4241 Williamsborough Drive  
Sacramento, CA 95823

Jane Henderson, Administrative Assistant  
Senator Robert B. Presley's Office  
State Capitol, Room 2031  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Lt. Ed Hocking  
Detective Bureau - Hollywood Division  
Los Angeles Police Department  
1358 North Wilcox  
Los Angeles, CA 90028

Linda Irby, Director  
Frazee Community Center  
1140 West Mill Street  
San Bernardino, CA 92410

Elaine Jones, Program Coordinator  
Program Committee  
California Probation, Parole and  
Correctional Association  
8311 Westminster Avenue, Suite 206  
Westminster, CA 92683

Honorable Napoleon J. Jones, Jr.  
Presiding Judge of the  
Juvenile Court  
San Diego County  
220 West Broadway  
P.O. Box 2724  
San Diego, CA 92112

John Kersey,  
Administrative Assistant  
Parole Services - Region III  
California Youth Authority  
143 South Glendale Avenue, #305  
Glendale, CA 91205

Marilyn Langford,  
Regional Administrator  
Prevention & Community  
Corrections  
California Youth Authority  
250 S. El Camino Real, Suite 212  
Tustin, CA 92680

Dr. Lois Lee, Director  
Children of the Night  
1800 N. Highland Avenue, Suite 128  
Hollywood, CA 90028

Don Mathis, Associate Director  
National Network of Runaway and  
Youth Services, Inc.  
905 6th Street, S.W., #411  
Washington, D.C. 20024

Randall Mecham,  
Executive Director  
Youth Advocates  
285 12th Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94118

Olivia Mitchell  
Director of Youth Services  
Los Angeles Mayor's Office  
City Hall - Room 2200  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Honorable Patrick J. Morris  
Presiding Judge of the  
Juvenile Court  
San Bernardino County  
900 East Gilbert Street  
San Bernardino, CA 92415

Nate Newman, Director  
Options House  
6331 Hollywood Blvd.  
Hollywood, CA 90028

Tom Pedersen, Consultant  
California Youth Authority  
Prevention & Community Corrections  
143 South Glendale Avenue, Suite 305  
Glendale, CA 91205

Leeta Pistone, Deputy  
Supervisor Michael Antonovich's Office  
Fifth Supervisorial District  
Los Angeles County  
23241 Ventura Road, #213  
Woodland Hills, CA 91364

Joel Powell, Deputy  
Probation Officer  
Central Placement  
Los Angeles County Probation Dept.  
9150 East Imperial Highway  
Downey, CA 90242

Reverend Jean Richardson  
Old First Church Polk Street  
Town Hall  
1751 Sacramento Street  
San Francisco, CA 94109

Rito Rosa, Consultant  
Prevention & Community  
Corrections  
California Youth Authority  
250 S. El Camino Real, #212  
Tustin, CA 92680

Judith Rosen, Commissioner  
State Juvenile Crime and  
Delinquency Prevention Commission  
5235-4 White Oak Avenue  
Encino, CA 91316

Deputy Ike Sabean  
Homicide Bureau  
211 West Temple Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Stacey Savelle, Program Specialist  
Resource Development Section  
Department of Children Services  
Los Angeles County  
1125 West 6th Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90017

John Schiller, Ph.D.  
Clinical Supervisor  
XANTHOS  
1250 Lincoln Avenue  
Alameda, CA 94501

Joel Schwartz, Director  
Gay & Lesbian Community  
Services Center  
1213 N. Highland Avenue  
P.O. Box 38777  
Hollywood, CA 90038

Ken Schwartzengerger,  
Program Director  
Youth Crisis Services  
3475 Old Conejo Road, Suite C-5  
Newbury Park, CA 91320

Nancy Sefcik, Executive Director  
Western States Youth  
Services Network  
1722 "J" Street, Suite 11  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dolores Shelly, Detective  
Juvenile Coordinator -  
Hollywood Division  
1358 N. Wilcox  
Los Angeles, CA 90028

Donna Silva, Commissioner  
Community Concerns Commission  
State Board of Managers  
State PTA  
14850 Cherry Drive  
Chino Hills, CA 91709

Chiquita Sipos, Consultant  
Prevention & Community  
Corrections  
California Youth Authority  
143 S. Glendale Avenue, Suite 305  
Glendale, CA 91205

Sgt. Bill Snyder  
Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department  
Juvenile Operations Bureau  
Bldg. D, Room 106  
Whittier, CA 90604

David Steinhart, Attorney and  
Project Director  
National Council on Crime  
& Delinquency  
77 Maiden Lane, 4th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94108

Art Tapia, Officer  
San Francisco Police Department  
850 Bryant, Room 553  
San Francisco, CA 94103

Phillip Thomas, Deputy  
Probation Officer  
Intake Detention Control Office  
Los Angeles County  
Probation Dept.  
1601 Eastlake  
Los Angeles, CA 90033

Alphonso Washington,  
Administrative Assistant  
Senator Diane E. Watson's Office  
4401 Crenshaw Blvd.  
Los Angeles, CA 90043

Hugh Watkins, Supervisor  
Parole Services  
California Youth Authority  
5005 Texas Street, #104  
San Diego, CA 92108

Gary Yates, M.A., MFCC  
Director - High Risk Youth Project  
Children's Hospital  
4650 Sunset Blvd.  
Los Angeles, CA 90027