

126365

AN ANALYSIS OF STATE

JJDP PLANS

Prepared for

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Community Research Associates
Champaign, Illinois
December 1986

126365

**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

Public Domain/OJIDP
U.S. Department of Justice
to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	1
Methodology	2
Funding for Various Juvenile Justice Program Areas	2
Identified Juvenile Justice Problems	7
Compliance with the Deinstitutionalization, Separation, and Jail Removal Mandates of the Act	9
Technical Assistance Needs Identified by the States	12
Juvenile Justice Trends	15
Summary	20
Appendix A	22

Introduction

Section 223(a) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act requires that each state participating in the Act submit a three-year plan for carrying out the purposes of the Act. The plan is required to be amended annually to include new programs and new funding levels. Among other things, the formula grant application package requires the states to complete the following sections:

- Attachment A - a list of all programs for which grant support is requested
- Analysis of Juvenile Crime Problems and Juvenile Justice Needs
- Three-Year Program Plan
- Technical Assistance Needs
- Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders and Nonoffenders Plan
(or an assurance if appropriate)
- Separation of Juveniles and Incarcerated Adults Plan (or an assurance if appropriate)
- Removing Juveniles from Adult Jails and Lockups Plan
- Facility/Compliance Monitoring Plan

The most recent three-year plan submitted by the states covers FY 1985-87. In addition, states were required to submit an amended plan covering FY 1986.

In order to determine funding priorities, technical assistance needs, compliance with Sections 223(a) (12), (13), and (14) of the Act, and identified problems and trends in the juvenile justice system at the state level, a content analysis of the FY 1985 three-year plans and FY 1986 amended plans was conducted.

Methodology

A survey instrument was developed and used for each state. Appropriate information was compiled on all states participating in the Act, as well as the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. Five states are not participating in the Act -- Nevada, Wyoming, Hawaii, South Dakota, and North Dakota. Thus, plans from 47 jurisdictions were analyzed.

For each state, four separate documents were used in compiling the information:

- 1) FY 1985-1987 three-year plan;
- 2) FY 1986 amended plan;
- 3) 1985 Plan Supplement Document; and,
- 4) the grant manager's memo (an internal OJJDP document).

Data was compiled, aggregated, and analyzed to address five selected concerns of OJJDP:

- 1) How are states spending their JJDP formula grant allocations?
- 2) What are states' perceived problems with regard to juvenile justice?
- 3) What is the level of compliance with the deinstitutionalization, separation, and jail removal mandates of the Act?
- 4) What are the technical assistance needs identified by the states?
- 5) What are the juvenile justice trends reported at the state level?

Funding For Various Juvenile Justice Program Areas

In an attempt to analyze how states are spending their JJDP allocations, an analysis of each state's "Attachment A" for FY 1986 was conducted.

"Attachment A" is the budget section of a state three-year plan or amended plan which lists the various program areas to be funded by the state and

the level of JJDP funding for each program. A typical "Attachment A" would include seven program areas coupled with funding requests for each.

Since states determine their own program area classifications, there was considerable variation by state in terminology and how many program areas were listed. For example, program areas listed in "Attachment A" may be extremely specific, such as "restitution," or extremely broad, such as "delinquency prevention." Under each program area, the state may fund one project or numerous projects. Also, one state may list ten or more specific program areas coupled with specific funding allocations for each, while another state may list only two broad areas such as "systems improvement" and "delinquency prevention," with an appropriation of \$400,000 for each. Specific projects under these broad areas may include such diverse activities as jail removal, education, diversion, etc. However, no further breakdown of the funds may be available.

Two analyses of "Attachment A" are presented in Table 1. First, all the program areas listed in "Attachment A" from the 47 jurisdictions were categorized into one of 20 program areas and aggregated into total spending for each area. Secondly, an attempt was made to list the total number of states using funds in each of the program areas.

Since the information contained in "Attachment A" was scant, another section of the plan which provided more detail on each program area was used in conjunction with "Attachment A." Occasionally, this section provided a further breakdown of the funds allocated by program areas, and in most plans, more specific information about program objectives and planned activities was provided. For example, a program area may have been listed merely as "alternatives to secure custody." But, a review of this program area may have revealed that the project is mainly a jail

Total State Spending By Program Area

<u>Program Area</u>	<u>Total State Spending</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No. of States Using JJDP Funds</u>
Planning & Administration	\$ 2,843,103	7.0	45
State Advisory Groups	772,300	1.9	46
Delinquency Prevention	10,755,361	26.4	45
Jail Removal	6,633,929	16.3	33
Serious/Violent Offenders	3,588,588	8.8	31
Alternatives to Incarceration	2,262,737	5.6	31
Technical Assistance, Training and Staff Education ¹	2,202,880	5.4	38
Treatment and Rehabilitation of Juveniles	1,937,597	4.8	6
Diversion	1,781,469	4.4	27
Services to Status Offenders (includes DSO)	1,446,977	3.6	37
Institutional Services ²	1,202,001	3.0	6
Juvenile Court Services ³	1,066,871	2.6	13
Research, Evaluation, and Monitoring (includes JJDP compliance monitoring)	949,974	2.3	24
Systems Coordination ⁴	948,563	2.3	15
Drug & Alcohol Abuse Programs	629,162	1.5	19
Child Abuse Programs	571,550	1.4	6
Juvenile Educational Services	397,809	1.0	7
Aftercare or Post-Sentence Services	286,190	.7	3
Services for Pre-Delinquent or "at risk" Youth	251,282	.6	30
Restitution	<u>213,140</u>	<u>.5</u>	22
TOTAL	\$40,741,483	100%	

¹ Also includes such categories as development of standards, program development, juvenile code revision, policy initiatives, and needs assessment.

² Includes residential services and services for detained and incarcerated youth.

³ Includes juvenile court staffing, probation services, juvenile court information systems, and any other court related service.

⁴ Includes such categories as organizational change and development, systems improvement, and inter-agency coordination.

removal project, with additional funds allocated for technical assistance. This additional information aided the coding process.

There are, however, limitations to the data. For example, an analysis of the program specifics under a program area such as "delinquency prevention" may have revealed that funding would be used for "juvenile educational services," "diversion," and "serious offenders," as well as projects usually thought of as delinquency prevention projects. While it would be noted that this particular state would be using JJDP funds in the various areas listed above, the entire funding allocation would be listed under "delinquency prevention" if no further funding breakdown was given. Consequently, you cannot say, for example, that only \$629,162 was spent on drug and alcohol abuse programs, since some of the "delinquency prevention" funds may have been spent in this area.

An analysis of Table 1 reveals that "delinquency prevention" was the largest program category with over \$10 million spent and 45 states using funds for projects in this area. The program descriptions revealed that this area included a wide range of services to delinquents, status offenders, and "at risk," or predelinquent juveniles, such as education, counseling, and recreation, in both residential and non-residential settings. The second largest category was "jail removal," with \$6.6 million allocated and at least 33 states funding jail removal projects. This funding is consistent with OJJDP's emphasis, for the last several years, on states' compliance with the jail removal mandate. Also noteworthy is the finding that relatively little money is being spent on status offender projects and deinstitutionalization, since virtually all states are now in compliance with the deinstitutionalization mandate.

Another analysis conducted with "Schedule A" was simply to note which program area, from among those listed on a state's Schedule A, received

the most funding in that state. The following list notes the program areas and the states which noted the areas as receiving the most funding.

Delinquency Prevention -- California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Florida, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, New Jersey, New Mexico, Ohio, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Utah, Vermont, and Virginia

Jail Removal -- Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Tennessee, and Texas

Rehabilitation of Juveniles -- Connecticut, Montana, North Carolina, and Minnesota

Rehabilitation of Serious Offenders -- California (funded at the same level as delinquency prevention), Georgia, Pennsylvania, and Mississippi

Drug and Alcohol Abuse/Prevention/Treatment -- Massachusetts, Washington, and West Virginia

Alternatives to Secure Custody or Incarceration -- Maryland, (funded at the same level as delinquency prevention), Oklahoma, and Oregon

Community-Based Residential Facilities -- Alabama and Maine

Services for Status Offenders -- Delaware and Indiana

Systemwide Improvement and Coordination -- Pennsylvania (funded at the same level as rehabilitation of serious offenders), and Wisconsin

Dispositional Alternatives -- New York.

From an impressionistic point of view, combining both the fund allocation and a review of the many programs contained in the state files, it seems that the JJDP funds are being spent with about equal emphasis on systems issues and individual programs. Many states, especially those with jail removal problems, are allocating funds to solve statewide problems. Also, many states recognize that the annual JJDP allocation is a very insignificant amount of money with which to solve major juvenile justice concerns. Consequently, in order to be cost effective, much emphasis

is placed on responding to issues at the system level. For example, Table 1 reveals that at least 38 states have used JJDP funds for technical assistance, training, and staff education; 24 for research, evaluation, and monitoring; and 15 for systems coordination.

Another way the JJDP funds seem to be allocated at the state level is through a focus on individual programs, communities, or problem areas. An understaffed residential facility may get relief by receiving a small JJDP staffing grant. A county, experiencing a sudden increase in juvenile court cases, may benefit from a JJDP diversion grant. Or, a problem area, such as drug abuse, may prompt a state to fund specific drug abuse programs in selected communities.

Identified Juvenile Justice Problems

Of the 47 three-year plans reviewed, 31 identified problems in their respective juvenile justice systems. The following list presents the problems and the states which identified the problems.

Jail Removal -- Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Idaho, Indiana, Maine, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, South Carolina, and Texas

Delinquency Prevention -- Arizona, California, Connecticut, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, New Mexico, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, and Vermont

Lack of System Coordination, Planning, and Evaluation -- Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Kentucky, Maine, Montana, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and West Virginia

Lack of Alternatives to Institutions -- Alaska, Georgia, Maine, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Puerto Rico

Serious Juvenile Offenders -- Colorado, Connecticut, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Mexico, and Rhode Island

Inadequate Training for Juvenile Justice Personnel -- Alabama, Georgia, Idaho, Mississippi, Texas, and West Virginia

Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders -- California, Indiana, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Oklahoma

Lack of Rehabilitative Services for Delinquent Youth -- Connecticut, Florida, Maine, Montana, and South Carolina

Need for Treatment Programs for Status Offenders -- Connecticut, Maryland, New Hampshire, Oregon, and Puerto Rico

High Level of Alcohol and Drug Abuse -- Massachusetts, Oklahoma, Washington, and West Virginia

High Level of Physical and Sexual Abuse -- California, New Mexico, and Washington

High Rates of Suspensions, Drop-outs, and Truants -- Massachusetts and Kentucky

Community-Based Youth Diversion -- Alabama and South Carolina

Need for Residential Treatment Services -- Georgia

Need for Community Mediation -- Massachusetts

Lack of Funds for the Construction of Juvenile Detention Facilities -- Oklahoma

Gang Violence Suppression -- California

Inadequate/Slow Judicial Processing of Juveniles -- Colorado

Institutional Overcrowding; Lack of Alternatives; Lack of Services within Institutions -- Maryland

Need for Specialized Family Services -- Massachusetts

Inadequate Separation of Adults and Juveniles in Jails -- Kentucky

Need for Early Intervention -- New Jersey

Delinquency Prevention Programming in the Schools -- Oregon

Juvenile Restitution -- West Virginia

Of the 31 jurisdictions which identified juvenile justice problems, 27 identified the number one problem facing that state, as noted in the list below.

Jail Removal -- Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Indiana, Maine, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Hampshire, and Texas

Delinquency Prevention -- Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, South Carolina, and Vermont

Lack of System Coordination, Planning and Evaluation -- Alabama, Georgia, and Pennsylvania

Lack of Rehabilitative Services for Delinquent Youth -- Florida and Montana

Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders -- Kentucky

Serious Juvenile Offenders -- New Mexico

High Level of Physical and Sexual Abuse -- Washington

High Level of Alcohol and Drug Abuse -- West Virginia

Lack of Funds for the Construction of Juvenile Detention Facilities -- Oklahoma

Institutional Overcrowding; Lack of Alternatives; Lack of Services Within Institutions -- Maryland

Need for Community Mediation -- Massachusetts

Need for Early Intervention -- New Jersey

The problem of jail removal was identified by more states than any other problem, and also was identified as the most serious problem by more states than any other problem. This finding is consistent with the emphasis placed on jail removal by OJJDP over the past few years. Another reason for the current emphasis on jail removal reflected in the three-year plans and FY 1986 amended plan is because most states were required to come into compliance with the jail removal provision by December 1985.

Compliance with the Deinstitutionalization, Separation, and Jail Removal Mandates of the Act

Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders and Nonoffenders

Section 223 (a) (12) (A) of the JJDP Act requires that "...juveniles who are charged with or who have committed offenses that would not be criminal if committed by an adult or offenses which do not constitute violations of valid court orders, or such nonoffenders as dependent or neglected children, shall not be placed in secure detention facilities or secure correctional facilities."

Of the 47 jurisdictions surveyed, 45 were found to be in full compliance with de minimus exceptions with Section 12, based on the 1984 Monitoring Reports. Until the resolution of issues and/or the provision of additional information, an official finding has not been made on two jurisdictions -- District of Columbia and Illinois.

A 1986 analysis of compliance with the deinstitutionalization mandate prepared by OJJDP based on the 1984 Monitoring Reports notes that "the nationwide baseline data for the number of status offenders and nonoffenders held in secure detention and secure correctional facilities was determined to be 198,868. The nationwide current data showed 6,429 status offenders and nonoffenders held in secure facilities... By comparing the baseline and current data, the number of status and nonoffenders held in secure facilities has been reduced by 96.8% over the past 7 to 9 years."

Separation of Juvenile and Adult Offenders

Section 223 (a) (13) requires that "...juveniles alleged to be or found to be delinquent and youths within the purview of paragraph (12) shall not be detained or confined in any institution in which they have regular contact with adult persons incarcerated because they have been convicted of a crime or are awaiting trial on criminal charges."

Of the 47 jurisdictions surveyed, 32 have demonstrated compliance with Section 13, based on the 1984 Monitoring Reports.

Alabama	Massachusetts
Arizona	Michigan
Arkansas	Minnesota
California	New Jersey
Connecticut	New Mexico
Delaware	New York
Florida	North Carolina
Georgia	Oregon
Iowa	Pennsylvania
Louisiana	Puerto Rico
Maine	Rhode Island
Maryland	South Carolina

Tennessee
Texas
Utah
Vermont

Virginia
Washington
West Virginia
Wisconsin

For the remaining 15 jurisdictions listed below, no official finding of compliance has been made. Most had not reached the designated dates of compliance when the 1984 Monitoring Reports had been submitted; others must resolve issues surrounding separation and/or submit additional information.

Alaska	Mississippi
Colorado	Missouri
District of Columbia	Montana
Idaho	Nebraska
Illinois	New Hampshire
Indiana	Ohio
Kansas	Oklahoma
Kentucky	

The 1986 OJJDP analysis of the separation of juvenile and adult offenders based on the 1984 Monitoring Reports notes that "the national baseline data for the number of juvenile offenders held in regular contact with incarcerated adult offenders was determined to be 105,303. The nationwide current data revealed 17,928 juveniles held in regular contact with adults... A comparison of the baseline and current data shows a 83% reduction over approximately a seven-year period."

Removal of Juveniles from Adults Jails and Lockups

Section 223 (a) (14) requires that "...beginning after the five-year period following December 8, 1980, no juvenile shall be detained or confined in any jail or lockup for adults...", except for those juveniles awaiting an "initial court appearance and living in a rural area (outside a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area) and meeting other regulations issued by the Administrator of OJJDP. All states must demonstrate at least substantial compliance (i.e., a 75% reduction)

with the jail removal requirement beginning after December 1985. OJJDP will be evaluating compliance with this provision in early 1987.

A 1986 analysis of jail removal based on the 1984 Monitoring Reports conducted by OJJDP notes that "the nationwide baseline data for the number of juveniles held in adult jails and adult lockups was determined to be 107,124. The nationwide current data reveal 63,238 juveniles held in jails and lockups... By comparing the baseline and current data, the number of juveniles held in adult jails has been reduced by 41%, from approximately 2 to 3 years previous."

Technical Assistance Needs Identified by the States

Technical assistance is requested by the states in two ways. A section of the multi-year plan and amended plan asks the states to identify their technical assistance needs. If the TA requests involve an area of expertise of Community Research Associates (CRA), such as jail removal or juvenile detention planning, OJJDP will coordinate the request with CRA, its primary TA provider. Since CRA has worked with many of the states for a number of years, juvenile justice specialists from the state planning agencies also request TA directly from CRA, which passes on the request to OJJDP for approval. This TA request would not be reflected in the state plans.

In order to capture both methods of requesting TA, an analysis was made of TA requested by the states in the 1986 amended plans and TA requested without the state plans. The following list notes the various categories of TA requested, the total number of requests in each category, and the number of states requesting TA in each category (some states make several TA requests in one category).

<u>Category</u>	<u>No. of TA Requests</u>	<u>No. of States</u>
State Planning Agency		
Planning and Administration	8	8
System Coordination	5	5
Development of Research, Training, and Evaluation Capability	17	11
Information Needed	2	2
Development of State Advisory Groups	6	6
Development of State Courts	3	3
Development of Statewide Information Systems and/or Monitoring	13	11
Diversion/DSO	7	7
Jail Removal	29	21
Delinquency Prevention	6	6
Juvenile Justice in Rural Areas	3	3
Needs Assessment	7	6
Alternatives	14	13
Transportation/Insurance	3	3
Detention Planning	36	26
Training	8	8
Abuse and Neglect/Sex Offenders	6	6
Serious Offenders	6	6
Status Offenders	2	2
Treatment	1	1
Early Identification Program	1	1
Risk Prediction Instrument	1	1
Drug Dependent Youth	1	1
Secure Treatment	1	1

The two categories of technical assistance requested most were detention planning and jail removal. Detention planning in a number of states is a component of jail removal, especially when a regional facility is planned, transportation issues are addressed, or non-secure detention alternatives to jail are proposed.

The finding that the most requested TA was in the area of jail removal and related projects is consistent with the states identifying jail removal as their most serious juvenile justice problem. It also signifies that the states are taking tangible steps toward the resolution of jail removal problems.

A significant amount of TA is provided by CRA, especially in the areas of DSO, jail removal, and juvenile detention planning. The following list notes the categories and states in which TA was provided by CRA in 1986.

<u>Category</u>	<u>No. of TA Projects</u>	<u>States</u>
Development of State Advisory Groups	3	Puerto Rico, Virginia, and Washington
Diversion/DSO	3	Kentucky, South Dakota, and Wyoming
Jail Removal	18	Arkansas, California, Idaho, Iowa, Illinois, Kansas, Missouri, North Dakota, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Nevada, Ohio, and the Virgin Islands
Shelter Care Planning	1	Indiana
Needs Assessment	1	Idaho
Detention Planning	29	Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, District of Columbia, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Missouri, Montana, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Wisconsin, and Wyoming

In addition to TA provided to individual states, CRA also provides TA of a broad nature, such as public education campaigns, training for the State Advisory Groups and State Planning Agencies, monitoring workshops, and the publication of articles on such topics as deinstitutionalization,

jail removal, and juvenile detention.

In addition to a response by CRA, a second route for a TA request involves OJJDP. Some TA is provided by staff of OJJDP, especially when the TA requested is for information on various programs or juvenile justice topics. However, there are some TA requests that simply cannot be addressed since OJJDP presently does not use TA providers other than CRA.

The state plans revealed a number of requests for TA for which there was no TA provider. For example, a number of states requested assistance on developing programs for child abuse victims, sex offenders, serious/violent offenders, chronic status offenders, and drug dependent youth. TA was not provided in any of these areas. Six states requested TA on developing statewide information systems, and again, no TA was furnished to any of these states. Another area which was frequently noted in TA requests, but not provided, was the need for program evaluation models and techniques.

Juvenile Justice Trends

One of the sections of the three-year formula grant application requires the states to complete an analysis, with data, of juvenile crime problems. As in most other sections of the plans which were reviewed, significant variation existed by state. Some states had a minimum of information; others had complete data on many components of the juvenile justice system. Some states had data for one year; others presented a multi-year analysis, by which trends may be noted.

Because of the great disparity in data from state to state, a statistical analysis using aggregate state data could not be completed. However, since a number of states presented trend data, several national trends and issues became evident. Examples from selected states are presented to highlight

the noted trends.

Arrests

Echoing a national trend, most states noted a continued decrease in juvenile arrests since the late 1970's or early 1980's. Arizona, for example, using 1984 data, noted that "juvenile arrests have declined in each of the last four years." In analyzing juvenile arrest data from 1974-1984, the Michigan plan summarized that the incidence of juvenile violent crime was down 32.5% and commented that the findings revealed "a very different reality from the public perception that violent juvenile crime is increasing." California also noted that juvenile arrests for violent crime were down every year between 1980 and 1985.

In Pennsylvania, juvenile arrests decreased from 144,931 in 1978 to 111,167 in 1984, a 23% decline. Similarly, North Carolina experienced a 20% reduction over the five year period from 1979 to 1983 (12,512 to 9,995). Iowa's juvenile arrests decreased 35% from 1978-1983. In Alaska "for the third straight year, juvenile arrests have declined."

Although the national trend which clearly emerges is that juvenile arrests are down, not all states experienced the decline. Florida, for example, experienced a 5% increase in juvenile arrests from 1982 to 1984, while Utah's juvenile arrests rose from 23,822 in 1981 to 25,678 in 1983, an 8% increase. Also, several states which noted a consistent annual decline in juvenile arrests from the late 1970's, noted a slight increase between 1983 and 1984.

Juvenile Court

In most jurisdictions which presented data on juvenile court activity,

there was a decrease in juvenile court cases which paralleled the decline in arrests. For example, in New Hampshire, the number of juvenile court cases declined 13% between 1981 and 1983. In Oklahoma, there were 2,888 petitions filed for juvenile court action in 1983, compared to 3,055 in 1981, a 5% decrease. Pennsylvania experienced a 27% decrease in juveniles referred to court between 1978 and 1984 (45,141 to 32,871). The number of minors for whom petitions were filed in court in Puerto Rico decreased from 3,347 (1981-82) to 2,293 (1983-84), a reduction of 31%. The largest decrease noted in the plans was in Kansas where the "total referrals to juvenile court decreased 46% from 1981."

Juvenile Detention

A number of states noted that while juvenile arrests have declined, the number of juveniles placed in secure detention has increased. In Alabama, while juvenile arrests decreased between 1980 and 1984, "since 1980, there has been a 14.9% increase in the overall percentage of youth detained overnight compared to those who were not detained." Wisconsin noted a 26% increase in juvenile detention placements between 1981 and 1983, while juvenile arrests were down by 1% over the same period. While New Hampshire had a 31% decrease in juvenile arrests between 1980 and 1983, the number of juveniles placed in secure detention increased 13%.

There were, however, states which identified a decrease in the use of juvenile detention. Connecticut noted that the number of juveniles placed in detention decreased steadily from 1976 to 1982. Maine, likewise, commented that the number of juveniles detained generally declined since 1977, except for a year of stability between 1983 and 1984. Oregon admitted 4,801 juveniles to secure detention in 1984, a decrease of 37% from 1982, when 7,620 juveniles were admitted.

The general trend of an increase in the use of juvenile detention is invariably linked to a "get tough" attitude exemplified in the early 1980's. However, it seems that another reason may account for this in a number of states. Several states were identified with a significant decrease in the use of jails for juveniles, and an increase in the number of juveniles placed in detention. Inter-county agreements and transportation arrangements may allow for juveniles to shift from a jail to a detention census.

Juveniles in Jail

The number of juveniles in jails has decreased steadily over the past several years, as noted in the OJJDP analysis of compliance with the jail removal section of the JJDP Act. A review of the state plans documented this finding. A number of states noted rather dramatic decreases in the number of juveniles held in jails. Texas reduced the number of juveniles held in jail by 38% between 1983 (3,381) and 1985 (2,087). In the non-metropolitan counties of Oklahoma, the number of juveniles placed in jails decreased from 5,444 in 1980 to 1,888 in 1984, a 65% decrease. Idaho noted a 90% decrease in the use of adult jails for juveniles between 1978 and 1985, and Wisconsin had a decrease of 32% in juvenile admissions to jails between 1981 (4,277) and 1984 (2,898).

Status Offenders

The success of deinstitutionalization of status offenders has been well documented and may well be thought of as the first significant national ramification of the passage of the JJDP Act in 1974. A spinoff of the deinstitutionalization movement was the dramatic decrease in the number of status offenders processed through juvenile courts since the mid-1970's.

While only a small number of states commented on issues concerning status offenders in their plans, several states presented data which countered the long-term trend of decreasing involvement of status offenders in the juvenile justice system. In California, for example, 1984 status offender arrests increased for the first time since 1974, when the arrests for status offenders increased 18.8% from 1983. In addition, from 1974 to 1983 California experienced an 83% reduction in initial referrals to probation for status offenders. However, this trend changed in 1984. The state plan commented that the change "may be attributed to a change in attitude toward treatment of status offenders by law enforcement agencies."

Likewise, status offender arrests in Arizona increased from 3,741 in 1983 to 4,621 in 1984, an increase of 24%. Between 1982 and 1984, there was a 10% increase in the arrests of runaways in Florida. While the number of status offenders arrested in Illinois declined annually from 1979 to 1983, a slight increase was noted in 1984. And in Iowa, the number of CHINS petitions increased 64% between 1980 and 1984.

Correctional Commitments

While the increased use of juvenile detention seemed evident from the plans reviewed, no comparable increase in the use of correctional placements was discernible. The number of states noting an increase in juvenile correctional commitments was counterbalanced by the number of states noting a decrease. For example, Arizona noted an increase in juvenile correctional commitments from 890 in 1983 to 941 in 1984, an increase of 6%. New Jersey experienced a 28% increase in juvenile commitments from 1982 to 1983. Oregon's commitments increased by 3% in 1984 when juvenile commitments rose to 664 from 646 the previous year.

On the other hand, Illinois experienced a 12% decrease in commitments from 1983 to 1984. In North Carolina, training school admissions went from 700 to 631 between 1980 and 1983, a decrease of 10%. Georgia also experienced a decline in commitments between 1980 and 1983 when commitments fell 14.5%.

Summary

The reauthorization of the JJDP Act in 1980 represented a shift in emphasis by OJJDP. By that time, the evidence was clear that most states had come into compliance with the deinstitutionalization requirement of the Act. However, compliance with the separation requirement was less encouraging. Large numbers of juveniles continued to be held in adult jails and lockups, and many of those juveniles who were separated were held in solitary confinement, isolated from their adult counterparts.

Congress responded by requiring that states remove juveniles from adult jails and lockups altogether rather than having them separated from adult offenders. States would have five years in which to effectuate the complete removal. The shift in emphasis from DSO to jail removal is well documented in the review of state plans. From a funding perspective, the "jail removal" category was the second largest of 20 program areas, after "delinquency prevention." At least 33 states are currently using funds for jail removal projects.

The problem of jail removal was mentioned by more states than any other juvenile justice problem and was identified by more states as the most serious juvenile justice problem than any other problem area. With regard to technical assistance, jail removal and related juvenile detention planning projects were the most requested TA categories. Finally, one

of the most evident juvenile justice trends identified in the plans was the continued decrease in the use of adult jails for juvenile offenders.

While Congress recognized the need for states to comply with the mandates of the Act, there also was recognition that the implementation of juvenile justice is still a state and local function. For this reason, Congress authorized grants under the formula grants program to be in a wide range of areas. Formula grants, pursuant to the Act, are "...for the development of more effective education, training, research, prevention, diversion, treatment, and rehabilitation programs in the area of juvenile delinquency and programs to improve the juvenile justice system."

A review of funding allocations in the state plans by program category, as well as a review of the specific programs funded, revealed a rich diversity of programs funded by OJJDP. Programs were funded for delinquents, status offenders, and predelinquents in a variety of residential and nonresidential settings. A variety of programs were funded for serious offenders as well as nonserious offenders. And, a variety of programs were funded to effectuate system change, as well as individual programs having little impact on systems problems.

In essence, the state plan review revealed both a concern and a commitment, through a number of measured indices, with the most pressing JJDPA mandate -- jail removal -- as well as significant state variability on juvenile justice problems and funding to ameliorate those problems.

APPENDIX A

Distribution of Juvenile Justice Formula Grants
to the 47 Jurisdictions Surveyed - FY 1986

<u>State</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Alabama	\$ 686,000	Mississippi	\$ 493,000
Alaska	\$ 225,000	Missouri	\$ 813,000
Arizona	\$ 529,000	Montana	\$ 225,000
Arkansas	\$ 403,000	Nebraska	\$ 274,000
California	\$4,120,000	New Hampshire	\$ 225,000
Colorado	\$ 529,000	New Jersey	\$1,146,000
Connecticut	\$ 462,000	New Mexico	\$ 269,000
Delaware	\$ 225,000	New York	\$2,714,000
Dist. of Columbia	\$ 225,000	North Carolina	\$ 989,000
Florida	\$1,553,000	Ohio	\$1,780,000
Georgia	\$1,009,000	Oklahoma	\$ 570,000
Idaho	\$ 225,000	Oregon	\$ 438,750
Illinois	\$1,911,000	Pennsylvania	\$1,800,000
Indiana	\$ 935,000	Rhode Island	\$ 225,000
Iowa	\$ 484,000	South Carolina	\$ 573,000
Kansas	\$ 403,000	Tennessee	\$ 770,000
Kentucky	\$ 637,000	Texas	\$2,916,000
Louisiana	\$ 844,000	Utah	\$ 387,000
Maine	\$ 225,000	Vermont	\$ 225,000
Maryland	\$ 671,000	Virginia	\$ 883,000
Massachusetts	\$ 844,000	Washington	\$ 717,000
Michigan	\$1,537,000	West Virginia	\$ 328,000
Minnesota	\$ 695,000	Wisconsin	\$ 790,000
		Puerto Rico	\$ 755,000