

140206

**REPORT OF THE
VIRGINIA STATE CRIME COMMISSION**

Transportation of Juveniles

**TO THE GOVERNOR AND
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA**



HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 55

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
RICHMOND
1990**

140206

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

NCJRS

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.

JAN 12 1993

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by
Virginia State Crime Commission

ACQUISITIONS

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

MEMBERS OF THE VIRGINIA STATE CRIME COMMISSION 1989

From the Senate of Virginia:

Elmon T. Gray, Chairman
Howard P. Anderson
Elmo G. Cross, Jr.

From the House of Delegates:

Robert B. Ball, Sr., Vice Chairman
V. Thomas Forehand, Jr.
Raymond R. Guest, Jr.
A. L. Philpott
Warren G. Stambaugh
Clifton A. Woodrum

Appointments by the Governor:

Robert C. Bobb
Robert F. Horan, Jr.
George F. Ricketts, Sr.

Attorney General's Office:

H. Lane Kneidler



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

VIRGINIA STATE CRIME COMMISSION

General Assembly Building

IN RESPONSE TO
THIS LETTER TELEPHONE
(804) 225-4534

ROBERT E. COLVIN
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

MEMBERS:

FROM THE SENATE OF VIRGINIA:
ELMON T. GRAY, CHAIRMAN
HOWARD P. ANDERSON
ELMO G. CROSS, JR.

FROM THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES:
ROBERT B. BALL, SR., VICE CHAIRMAN
V. THOMAS FOREHAND, JR.
RAYMOND R. GUEST, JR.
A. L. PHILPOTT
WARREN G. STAMBAUGH
CLIFTON A. WOODRUM

APPOINTMENTS BY THE GOVERNOR:

ROBERT C. BOBB
ROBERT F. HORAN, JR.
GEORGE F. RICKETTS, SR.

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
H. LANE KNEEDLER

January 16, 1990

TO: The Honorable L. Douglas Wilder, Governor of Virginia
and Members of the General Assembly

In a letter dated February 1, 1990, Senator J. Granger Macfarlane requested the Virginia State Crime Commission to consider issues related to transporting non-violent juveniles who are in detention facilities.

Pursuant to §9-125 of the Code of Virginia, a study was conducted by the Commission during 1989. I have the honor of submitting herewith the study report and recommendations on the transportation of non-violent juveniles.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Elmon T. Gray".

Elmon T. Gray
Chairman

Treatment Issues Subcommittee Studying

TRANSPORTATION OF JUVENILES

Members:

Delegate Clifton A. Woodrum, Chairman
Delegate Robert B. Ball, Sr.
Delegate V. Thomas Forehand, Jr.
Delegate Raymond R. Guest, Jr.
Mr. Robert F. Horan, Jr.
Mr. H. Lane Kneedler
Rev. George F. Ricketts, Sr.
Delegate Warren G. Stambaugh

Staff

Robert E. Colvin, Executive Director
D. Robie Ingram, Staff Attorney
Susan A. Bass, Research Assistant
Sylvia A. Coggins, Administrative Assistant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Authority for Study.....1

II. Members Appointed to Serve.....1

III. Executive Summary.....2

IV. Study Design.....3

V. Background.....3

VI. Objectives/Issues.....4

VII. Applicable Law/Analysis and Discussion.....4

VIII. Findings.....7

IX. Conclusions.....8

X. Acknowledgements.....9

Appendix A: House Bill No. 1251, 1989 Session.....A-2

Appendix B: Letter Requesting Study.....B-2

Appendix C: Code of Virginia §16.1 - 254.....C-2

Appendix D: Legislative Impact Statement.....D-2

Appendix E: Detention Home Survey.....E-2

Appendix F: Proposed Legislation.....F-2

Appendix G: Morgenthau's Report.....G-2

Appendix H: Program Cost Analysis.....H-2

Appendix I: Final Proposed Legislation.....I-2

I. AUTHORITY FOR STUDY

During the 1989 legislative session, Delegate Alan A. Diamonstein and Senator J. Granger Macfarlane patroned identical bills that would designate the agency having custody or responsibility for supervision of a child in custody, detention or shelter care as responsible for transportation of the child. (See Appendix A.) Both bills were withdrawn and, in a letter dated February 1, 1989, Senator J. Granger Macfarlane formally requested that the Virginia State Crime Commission place the issue of juvenile transportation on its 1989 agenda for study. (See Appendix B.)

§9-125 of the Code of Virginia establishes and directs the Virginia State Crime Commission (VSCC) "to study, report, and make recommendations o' all areas of public safety and protection." §9-127 of the Code of Virginia provides that "the Commission shall have duty and power to make such studies and gather information in order to accomplish its purpose, as set forth in §9-125, and to formulate its recommendations to the Governor and the General Assembly." §9-134 of the Code of Virginia authorizes the Commission to "conduct private and public hearings, and to designate a member of the Commission to preside over such hearings." The Virginia State Crime Commission, in fulfilling its legislative mandate, undertook the study of juvenile transportation as requested by Senator MacFarlane.

II. MEMBERS APPOINTED TO SERVE

During the April 18, 1989 meeting of the Crime Commission, its Chairman, Senator Elmon T. Gray of Sussex, selected Delegate Clifton A. Woodrum to serve as chairman of the Treatment Issues subcommittee studying juvenile transportation. Members of the Crime Commission who serve on the subcommittee were:

Delegate Clifton A. Woodrum of Roanoke, Chairman
Delegate Robert B. Ball, Sr., of Richmond
Delegate V. Thomas Forehand, Jr., of Chesapeake
Delegate Raymond R. Guest, Jr., of Front Royal
Mr. Robert F. Horan, Jr., of Fairfax County
Mr. H. Lane Kneedler, Attorney General's Office
Rev. George F. Ricketts, Sr., of Richmond
Delegate Warren G. Stambaugh of Arlington

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

During the 1989 Session, Delegate Diamonstein and Senator Macfarlane patroned identical bills that would designate the agency having custody or responsibility for supervision of a child as responsible for transportation of the child. Both bills were withdrawn, and Senator Macfarlane formally requested by letter that the Virginia State Crime Commission place the issue of juvenile transportation on its 1989 agenda for study.

Existing law states that the chief judge of the juvenile and domestic relations district court shall designate the appropriate agencies to be responsible for transporting juveniles.

Throughout the course of this study, detention home operators have indicated a willingness to transport low-risk juveniles to local service appointments, if additional resources are provided. The sheriffs are willing to make all transports involving high-risk juveniles, court-related transports, and transports between detention centers.

Following considerable discussion of the issue among the affected entities, the subcommittee endorsed the Department of Youth Services' proposal that a one-week intensive study of the issue be conducted on behalf of the Department by Mr. John Morgenthau, an experienced consultant on this issue.

Mr. Morgenthau's study was completed, and his report supports legislation that would shift to the agency having custody the responsibility of transporting low-risk juveniles to local service appointments. In addition, Mr. Morgenthau recommended that the proposed amendment be modified to establish four pilot sites where this approach would be tested for a one year period. The sites recommended include Roanoke, Newport News, one Commission operated rural and one Commission operated urban locality.

The subcommittee found that it was inefficient to continue the current practice of having fully trained and equipped deputy sheriffs transport non-violent, low-risk juveniles between detention homes and local medical, dental and other service appointments. The subcommittee found these transports to be more efficiently and appropriately handled by personnel employed by the juvenile detention homes.

The Department of Youth Services prepared an analysis of the costs involved in establishing such a pilot program, and the Commission staff responded with an analysis which recommended a lower level of funding. Both analyses were discussed at length during the final meeting of the subcommittee. They found the lower figures to be reasonable. However, the subcommittee took no position on recommending the pilot projects. Instead, they recommended that the information developed by the subcommittee be formally presented by the Commission to Senator Macfarlane, Governor Wilder and the 1990 General Assembly for their review. On January 16, 1990, the Commission voted to approve the findings and recommendations of the Treatment Issues Subcommittee.

IV. STUDY DESIGN

The subcommittee held seven meetings and heard numerous staff briefings on the issue of juvenile transportation.

The staff and the Chairman, Delegate Clifton A. Woodrum, met with the Sheriff's Department of the City of Roanoke, and the staff met with both detention center personnel and the Sheriff's Department of Newport News. The Department of Corrections and the Virginia State Sheriffs' Association contributed greatly to the study effort and were instrumental in the development of the study proposals.

Subcommittee Meetings

June 19, 1989
July 27, 1989
August 14, 1989
September 18, 1989
October 17, 1989
December 20, 1989
January 9, 1990

Reports to Subcommittee

Initial Report - June 19, 1989
Update - July 27, 1989
Update - August 14, 1989
Update - September 18, 1989
Update - October 17, 1989
Update - December 19, 1989
Final subcommittee update - January 9, 1989

V. BACKGROUND

During the 1989 Session, Delegate Alan A. Diamonstein and Senator J. Granger Macfarlane patroned identical bills that would designate the agency having custody or responsibility for supervision of a child as responsible for transportation of the child. (See Appendix A.) Both bills were withdrawn. Existing law states that the chief judge of the juvenile and domestic relations district court shall designate the appropriate agencies to be responsible for transporting juveniles. (See Appendix C.)

A legislative impact statement prepared by the Department of Corrections, Department of Youth Services, indicated that the potential fiscal impact of such a bill was significant. (See Appendix D.) In that statement, Glen Radcliffe of the Department of Youth Services estimated that shifting the responsibility of juvenile transportation to the agency having custody would cost \$1,217,864 for one fiscal year in salaries and fringe benefits alone. After consultation with the Virginia State Sheriffs' Association, Senator Macfarlane referred this matter to the Virginia State Crime Commission for further study.

Two jurisdictions voicing particular concerns over this issue are the cities of Roanoke and Newport News.

Commission staff members met with Delegate Clifton A. Woodrum and Sheriff W. Alvin Hudson in Roanoke to discuss the problem in that jurisdiction. Among other things, it was learned that in Roanoke the Sheriff's Office is solely responsible for the transportation of juveniles.

Members of the Commission staff also met with Brenda Wiggins, Director of the Newport News Juvenile Detention Center, and separately with Newport News Sheriff Clay B. Hester. In Newport News, the detention center is responsible for the transporting of all juveniles except those classified by the court as "violent and out of control."

In both jurisdictions, the responsible agencies indicated (1) the need for additional resources and personnel for the transportation of juveniles, (2) conflicts in transportation scheduling, and (3) difficulty in establishing criteria for the division of the responsibility among those potentially responsible under current law.

VI. OBJECTIVES/ISSUES

In response to the concerns raised by the affected parties in Roanoke and Newport News, and by Sheriffs' Association Executive Director John Jones on behalf of the Association, the following objectives and issues were identified.

- A. Determine which agency or agencies might be responsible for the transportation of juveniles.
- B. Develop criteria for division of labor if the responsibility is to be borne by more than one agency.
- C. Determine the amount of funds, if any, currently available for juvenile transportation needs and the source(s) and recipient(s) of those funds.
- D. Determine whether additional funds should be allocated to the responsible agency and for what purposes (i.e., salary, vehicles).
- E. Determine what, if any, special training is necessary for those responsible for transporting of children.

VII. APPLICABLE LAW; ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

A. Current Law and Proposed 1989 Amendment

Under §16.1-254 of the Code of Virginia, the chief judge of the juvenile and domestic relations district court shall designate the appropriate agency in the jurisdiction to be responsible for the transportation of children who are in custody, detention or shelter care. (See Appendix C.) During the 1989 legislative session, Delegate Alan A. Diamonstein and Senator J. Granger Macfarlane patroned identical bills that would designate the agency having custody or responsibility for supervision of a child as responsible for transportation of the child. (See Appendix A.) Delegate Diamonstein's bill was introduced to insure that the detention center would continue to be responsible for transporting juveniles. Conversely, Senator Macfarlane's bill was introduced to shift the responsibility for transporting juveniles from the Sheriff's Department to the detention center.

B. Analysis and Discussion

1. Fiscal Impact

According to a legislative impact statement prepared by the Department of Corrections (DOC), such legislation would require additional full time equivalent personnel (FTE's) at the 31 court service units and the 17 detention facilities across the state. Adding one transportation officer at each court service unit and two at each detention home would cost at least \$1,217,864 per year in salaries and fringe benefits alone. (See Appendix D.) Group homes and other similar programs would also require additional FTE's. Furthermore, according to the DOC, this bill would require additional training for staff in appropriate restraint and transportation techniques.

The Department of Corrections strongly opposed this bill "unless appropriate FTE's and equipment monies are provided to court service units, detention homes, and other affected programs." Both bills were subsequently withdrawn, and by letter dated February 1, 1989, Senator Macfarlane requested that this study of juvenile transportation be done. (See Appendix B.)

2. Funding Issues

A key issue in this study is the availability of funds for personnel and vehicles to provide transportation of juveniles. To determine the types of funding available for juvenile transportation, the staff contacted Mr. James Roberts of the House Appropriations Committee Staff and Mr. Stephen Pullen of the Department of Youth Services. Mr. Roberts and Mr. Pullen both explained that there is no funding specifically earmarked for transportation of juveniles.

In addition, Mr. James Matthews of the Compensation Board was contacted. He explained that the Board funds the salaries of deputy sheriffs and pays their mileage, but the Board does not provide funds specifically earmarked for transportation of juveniles.

To get an example of the costs of such transportation, the staff contacted Mr. Mark Johnson, director of the Coyner Springs Detention Center in Roanoke County, who estimated that it would cost the center \$60,000 in start-up costs for personnel for the first year, and \$25,000 to purchase a secure vehicle if the Center were made responsible for transporting the children.

The Commission staff also contacted the Department of Corrections to determine the amount of funds, if any, currently available for juvenile transportation needs. According to the Department of Youth Services, the federal government provided a total of \$9,000 in annual non-expandable grant funds to be channeled through the Department of Criminal Justice Services to court service units to pay off-duty deputy sheriffs to transport juveniles.

The detention centers receive funding from the state and the locality. The state's portion of the funding comes in the form of a block grant which is distributed to each facility. Of this money, a 3% reserve is set aside to be used only in emergencies. Although there are no strict guidelines, an emergency is generally considered a situation that would endanger the program or cause it to fail. This 3% emergency reserve cannot be used to pay employees to transport juveniles (but it has been recently used in Newport News to purchase a van for juvenile transportation.) At the end of the fiscal year, the money remaining in the fund is distributed to the detention centers.

3. Meeting of Affected Entities

The staff arranged and attended a meeting among John Jones of the Virginia State Sheriffs' Association, Mike Leininger of the Department of Corrections, and Glenn Radcliffe of the Department of Youth Services. Mr. Jones indicated that the Sheriffs' Association favors shifting the responsibility for juvenile transportation from the sheriff's departments to the detention centers, except in the case of transports to and from court and in situations where a juvenile is violent and disruptive.

Mr. Leininger and Mr. Radcliffe indicated that they were opposed to shifting the responsibility to the detention centers because the centers lack the necessary vehicles and personnel. Mr. Leininger and Mr. Radcliffe requested that a survey of the detention homes be conducted to determine whether transportation problems exist in all jurisdictions. The staff conducted an informal telephone survey of each of the 17 detention centers. (See Survey at Appendix E.)

4. Detention Center Survey

According to the survey, only 3 jurisdictions report problems with the present system. They are Newport News, Petersburg and Coyner Springs (Roanoke). The sheriff's departments handle juvenile transportation for six centers, and it is a shared responsibility between the Sheriff's department and the detention center in four jurisdictions. Most centers service several jurisdictions.

Summary of Results of Telephone Survey:

For medical appointments:

- Two centers require transportation less than once per week.
- Nine centers require transportation 1-5 times per week.

For court appointments:

- Two centers require transportation 1-5 times per week.
- Two centers require transportation 5-10 times per week.
- Four centers require transportation more than 10 times per week.

Vehicles:

- Three centers have secure vehicles.
- Six centers have non-secure vehicles used for administrative purposes.
- Four centers do not have vehicles.

Transfer of Juveniles:

- Five centers make space for additional children when beds are full.
- Eight centers send additional children to other facilities.

Examples:

All local transports are handled by a locally funded transportation unit at the Fairfax Detention Center. The Fairfax Sheriff's department transports only when a child is being transferred to another center, and the Sheriff's department has never been involved in the local transport of juveniles. Their system apparently works well.

According to the Montgomery County Sheriff's Department, 160 transports of juveniles to court were made by deputies last year, and no problems with the present system were reported.

5. Study Sponsored by Department of Corrections

Following considerable discussion of the issue among the affected entities, the Department of Corrections' Department of Youth Services proposed to the subcommittee that a one-week intensive study of the issue of juvenile detention be conducted on behalf of the Department by Mr. John Morgenthau, an accomplished consultant on the issue. As proposed, the study would be paid for by the American Correctional Association and conducted in the latter part of October, 1989. The subcommittee endorsed the proposal and withheld recommendations pending the results of the study.

VIII. FINDINGS

Mr. Morgenthau's study was completed, and his report was presented to the subcommittee at its December, 1989 meeting (See Appendix G). The report supports the Bill previously proposed by the subcommittee as an appropriate approach to the problem of transporting low-risk juveniles to local medical and dental appointments, psychiatric evaluations and special placements (See Appendix F). Furthermore, the bill was endorsed by the Virginia State Sheriff's Association.

In addition, Mr. Morgenthau recommended that the proposed amendment be modified to establish four pilot sites where this approach would be tested for a one year period. The sites recommended include Roanoke, Newport News, one Commission operated rural and one Commission operated urban locality.

The subcommittee agreed that a one-year pilot project should be considered and directed the Commission staff to work with representatives from the Department of Youth Services to develop a realistic figure of its cost. The following figures were provided by the four proposed pilot sites.

<u>Location</u>	<u>Pilot Cost</u>	<u>Population</u>
Northern Virginia	\$ 36,430	44.8
Crater	42,000	20.0
Newport News	41,729	34.4
Roanoke City	57,458	18.8

Commission staff believed the above figures to be excessive and made a report to the subcommittee. The financial proposals dealt chiefly with vehicles and personnel. At least two of the proposals included requests for funding for new full-size vehicles, maintenance costs and insurance costs in addition to the mileage reimbursement. This type of funding is contrary to the state's current funding practice for sheriffs' offices which does not provide money up-front for purchasing vehicles, or any other costs. Instead, deputy sheriffs operate patrol vehicles at a reimbursement rate of \$.24 per mile for the initial 15,000 miles per year and \$.11 per mile for each additional mile. The Commission staff analysis recommended the same type of funding for the transportation of low-risk juveniles to and from local service appointments.

In light of this information, the staff prepared an independent analysis of the vehicle, personnel and total costs (See Appendix H). The following table reflects necessary resources as calculated by the staff.

<u>Location</u>	<u>Vehicle</u>	<u>Personnel</u>	<u>Total</u>
Northern Virginia	\$ 3,248	\$ 10,763	\$ 14,011
Crater	3,248	\$ 4,797	8,045
Newport News	3,248	8,255	11,503
Roanoke City	3,248	4,508	7,756

IX. CONCLUSIONS

Throughout the course of this study, detention home operators have indicated a willingness to transport low-risk juveniles to local service appointments, if additional resources are provided. The sheriffs are willing to make all transports involving high-risk juveniles, court-related transports, and transports between detention centers.

The pilot project recommended in Morgenthau's report would establish four sites to test this approach for a one year period.

The Department of Youth Services (DYS) prepared an analysis of the costs involved in establishing such a program, and the Commission staff responded with a subsequent analysis which recommended a significantly lower level of funding. Both analyses were discussed at length during the final meeting of the subcommittee. The subcommittee found the lower figures to be reasonable. However, they took no position on recommending the pilot projects.

The main issue of concern raised in discussions during the 1989 General Assembly were tied to the \$1.2 million fiscal impact reported by the Department of Corrections. During the course of this study, a cost estimate for a one year pilot project for four jurisdictions was sought by the subcommittee. The cost estimates which were provided to the subcommittee were found to be excessive and Commission staff was directed to analyze the estimates. The subcommittee found that a much more conservative cost was likely to be encountered.

Extrapolating the staff analysis in Appendix H, the subcommittee estimates the total annual cost for 17 detention homes to transport low-risk juveniles to local service appointments to be less than \$180,884 annually.

The subcommittee further found that an implementation on July 1, 1991 of the bill proposal listed in Appendix F, if the General Assembly chose to adopt it, would provide for adequate pre-planning and transition.

In conclusion, the subcommittee found that it was inefficient to continue the current practice of having fully trained and equipped deputy sheriffs transport non-violent, low-risk juveniles between detention homes and local medical, dental and other service appointments. The subcommittee found these transports to be more efficiently and appropriately handled by personnel employed by the juvenile detention homes.

It was also found that the number of transports could be reduced by providing some services in the detention home on a purchase of services basis. The responsibility for transporting the low-risk individuals may serve as an additional impetus for reducing the number of transports.

The subcommittee felt it had accomplished its charge by fully exploring the issue, encouraging the Department of Corrections consultant's study, and identifying realistic cost estimates. The findings and conclusions of the subcommittee were reached after considerable deliberation and input from the various interested parties.

Since the study was conducted pursuant to a letter of request from Senator Macfarlane (as opposed to a directive from the full General Assembly), the subcommittee voted at its January 9, 1990 meeting to recommend that the information developed by the subcommittee, without a specific recommendation, be formally presented by the Commission to Senator Macfarlane, Governor Wilder and the 1990 General Assembly for their review. Should Senator Macfarlane choose to introduce the matter for consideration by the 1990 General Assembly, Commission staff would be made available to testify on the work and findings of the subcommittee. On January 16, 1990, the Commission voted to approve the findings and recommendations of the Treatment Issues Subcommittee.

X. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The members of the subcommittee extend thanks to the following agencies and individuals for their cooperation and valuable assistance to this study effort.

American Correctional Association

Compensation Board

James Mathews, Assistant Executive Secretary

Coyner Springs Detention Center

Mark Johnson, Director

Department of Corrections

Michael Leininger, Legislative Liaison

Department of Criminal Justice Services

Robert O'Neal, Juvenile Justice Research Analyst

Department of Youth Services

Charles Kehoe, Director

Glenn Radcliffe, Chief of Operations for Community Programs

Steve Pullen, Business Manager

Henrico Juvenile Detention Center

Joseph Campbell, Director

House of Delegate Appropriations Committee Staff

James Roberts, Senior Legislative Fiscal Analyst

Morgenthau & Plant Associates

John Morgenthau, Consultant

Newport News Juvenile Detention Center

Brenda Wiggins, Director

Joanne Smith, Assistant Director

Newport News Sheriff's Office

Sheriff C. B. Hester

Roanoke Sheriff's Office

Sheriff W. A. Hudson

Captain Paul Barrett

Major George MacMillan

University of Richmond, T.C. Williams School of Law

Professor Robert E. Shephard, Jr.

Virginia State Sheriffs' Association

John Jones, Executive Director

APPENDIX A

1989 SESSION

LD6199452

HOUSE BILL NO. 1251
Offered January 16, 1989

A BILL to amend and reenact § 16.1-254 of the Code of Virginia, relating to transportation of children in custody, detention or shelter care.

Patrons—Diamonstein and Maxwell

Referred to the Committee for Courts of Justice

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia:

1. That § 16.1-254 of the Code of Virginia is amended and reenacted as follows:

§ 16.1-254. Responsibility for and limitation on transportation of children.—The agency having custody or responsibility for supervision of a child pursuant to §§ 16.1-246, 16.1-247, 16.1-248.1, 16.1-249 or 16.1-250 shall be responsible for transportation of the child. However, the chief judge of the juvenile and domestic relations district court shall designate the appropriate agencies in each may direct another agency of the county, city and or town, other than the Department of State Police, to be responsible for the transportation of children pursuant to §§ 16.1-246, 16.1-247, 16.1-248.1, 16.1-249 and 16.1-250, and as otherwise ordered by the judge transport a child who is known to be violent and disruptive . In no case shall a child known or believed to be under the age of fifteen years be transported or conveyed in a police patrol wagon.

No child shall be transported with adults suspected of or charged with criminal acts.

Official Use By Clerks

Passed By
The House of Delegates
without amendment
with amendment
substitute
substitute w/amdt

Passed By The Senate
without amendment
with amendment
substitute
substitute w/amdt

Date: _____

Date: _____

Clerk of the House of Delegates

Clerk of the Senate

APPENDIX B

SENATE OF VIRGINIA

FILED
FEB 02 1989
LEGISLATIVE

J. GRANGER MACFARLANE
21ST SENATORIAL DISTRICT
CITY OF ROANOKE
TOWN OF VINTON
SOUTHWESTERN AND EASTERN
ROANOKE COUNTY
P. O. BOX 301
ROANOKE, VIRGINIA 24002



COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS
AGRICULTURE CONSERVATION
AND NATURAL RESOURCES
COMMERCE AND LABOR
LOCAL GOVERNMENT
TRANSPORTATION

February 1, 1989

The Honorable Elmon T. Gray
Chairman, Virginia State Crime Commission
Room 326

Re: SB 568

Dear Elmon:

As you know, I introduced the enclosed bill and appeared before the Senate Courts of Justice committee during this Session.

However, some opposition developed from the Department of Corrections wherein they claimed they did not have the personnel or the equipment to transport young people, as the sheriff's had requested.

Accordingly, rather than create a confrontation and ill feelings and after consultation with the Sheriffs Association, I have concluded that it will be in the best interests of the affected young people who are in custody, the Department of Corrections, and the Sheriffs across the Commonwealth, if the Crime Commission will consider placing this matter on their 1989 agenda.

I respectfully trust that you and the Commission will give this matter every consideration. I would be most appreciative if you will please advise me if you will work on this in 1989.

Thank you for your time and interest. I will be happy to provide you with any information you may request.

Sincerely,

J. Granger Macfarlane

JGM:dj

Enclosure

cc: The Honorable Alan A. Diamonstein

bcc: John Jones ✓
Alvin Hudson

APPENDIX C

§ 16.1-254. Responsibility for and limitation on transportation of children. — The chief judge of the juvenile and domestic relations district court shall designate the appropriate agencies in each county, city and town, other than the Department of State Police, to be responsible for the transportation of children pursuant to §§ 16.1-246, 16.1-247, 16.1-248.1, 16.1-249 and 16.1-250, and as otherwise ordered by the judge. In no case shall a child known or believed to be under the age of fifteen years be transported or conveyed in a police patrol wagon.

No child shall be transported with adults suspected of or charged with criminal acts. (Code 1950, § 16.1-196; 1956, c. 555; 1958, c. 344; 1971, Ex. Sess., c. 109; 1973, c. 440; 1974, c. 358; 1977, c. 559; 1979, c. 202.)

APPENDIX D

DATE 1/18/98

REVIEWED AND APPROVED

SUM/ DIR
CRIM DEP
MGR

THE POTENTIAL IMPACT OF THIS BILL IS

1 2 3 4 5
NEGLIGIBLE VERY LARGE

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
1989 LEGISLATIVE IMPACT STATEMENT

-
1. BILL NO.: HB 1251 / SB 528 2. PATRON(S): Diamonstein, Maxwell
3. COMMITTEE: Courts of Justice 4. REVIEWER: Glenn Radcliffe
-

5. BILL SUMMARY/PURPOSE: To specify that the agency having custody or supervision of a child shall be responsible for the transportation of the child.

6. CURRENT SITUATION: Section 16.1-254 of the Code presently provides for the chief juvenile & domestic relations court judge to designate the appropriate agency in the jurisdiction to be responsible for the transportation of children.

7. PROGRAM/POLICY IMPLICATIONS FOR AGENCY/CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM:
(If fiscal impact, attach DPB-LIS form)

Would require Additional FTE's at court service units and detention facilities. There are currently 31 court service units and 17 detention homes in the Commonwealth. Adding one transportation officer (Grade 6) at each court service unit and two at each detention home would cost a minimum of \$1,217,864 per year in salaries and fringe benefits alone. Under the current language of the bill group homes and other similar programs would also require additional FTE's.

This bill would require additional training for staff in appropriate restraint and transportation techniques and may involve state reimbursement for purchase of transportation vehicles.

8. SPECIFIC AGENCY/POLITICAL SUBDIVISION AFFECTED

DOC, DSS, Locally-operated detention homes and group homes, Sheriff's and Police Department

9. OTHER COMMENTS: (Include any pertinent history, recommendations,

etc., use back of form if necessary)

The current transportation system for juveniles seems to be operating effectively.

10. RECOMMENDATION:

The Department is strongly opposed to this bill unless appropriate FTE's and equipment monies are provided to court service units, detention homes, and other affected programs.

FINANCIAL IMPACT OF H. B. 1251 RELATING TO TRANSPORTATION OF CHILDREN

FACILITY	NO. OF TRANSPORTATION OFFICERS	SALARY	RETIREMENT	SOCIAL SEC.	GROUP INS.	HOSPITALIZATION	TOTAL
COURT SERVICE UNITS	31 (ONE AT EACH UNIT) @ \$17,338 EACH	\$537,478	\$67,238	\$40,365	\$5,418	\$43,772	\$694,271
JUV. DETENTION HOMES	34 (TWO AT EACH FACILITY) @ 2/3 OF SALARY AND BENEFITS	\$392,955	\$49,159	\$29,511	\$3,961	\$48,008	\$523,594
	TOTAL COSTS FOR ONE FISCAL YEAR	\$930,433	\$116,397	\$69,876	\$9,379	\$91,780	\$1,217,864

APPENDIX E

TELEPHONE QUESTIONNAIRE
(DETENTION HOMES)

JUVENILE TRANSPORTATION STUDY

FACILITY NAME: _____

LOCATION: _____

CONTACT: _____

PHONE: _____

1. How many children are in the home? _____

In social services custody? _____

How many beds? _____

2. How many staff per shift? _____ No. Shifts? _____

3. How many vehicles for transport? _____

Secure Vehicles? _____

4. What are transportation needs?

Medical? _____ No. Trips/Wk? _____

Court? _____ No. Trips/Wk? _____

Other _____ No. Trips/Wk? _____

5. Who provides transportation services?

Medical: _____

Court: _____

Other: _____

Violent, disruptive children: _____

6. Are there problems making transportation arrangements?

W/Sheriff? _____

W/Your Staff? _____

7. What do you do when your beds are full?

Send children to another facility? _____

Make space(pull out a cot)? _____

8. What jurisdictions do you serve? _____

9. Is there a better way to transport juveniles than is in effect at your home? _____

10. Further Comments? _____

APPENDIX F

Juvenile Transportation Study

Proposed Amendment

§16.1-254. Responsibility for and limitation on transportation of children. A. The detention center having custody or responsibility for supervision of a child pursuant to §§16.1-246, 16.1-247, 16.1-248.1, 16.1-249 or 16.1-250 shall be responsible for transportation of the child to all local medical appointments, dental appointments, psychiatric evaluations and special placements. B. However, the chief judge of the juvenile and domestic relations district court shall designate the appropriate agencies in each county, city, and town, other than the Department of State Police, to be responsible for (i) the transportation of violent and disruptive children and (ii) the transportation of children to destinations other than those set forth in A. above, pursuant to §§16.1-246, 16.1-247, 16.1-248.1, 16.1-249 and 16.1-250, and as otherwise ordered by the judge. In no case shall a child known or believed to be under fifteen years be transported or conveyed in a police patrol wagon.

No child shall be transported with adults suspected of or charged with criminal acts.

APPENDIX G

**CONSULTATION REPORT FOR THE
COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA REGARDING THE
TRANSPORTATION OF JUVENILES IN DETENTION STATUS**

Sponsored By The
AMERICAN CORRECTIONAL ASSOCIATION
8025 Laurel Lakes Court
Laurel Maryland 20707

Prepared By
JOHN MORGENTHAU
November 25, 1989

**CONSULTATION REPORT FOR THE
COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA REGARDING THE
TRANSPORTATION OF JUVENILES IN DETENTION STATUS**

I. INTRODUCTION

In response to increasing concern on the part of members of the General Assembly of Virginia, sheriffs, judges, staff of the Department of Corrections Division of Youth Services, and other key officials in the Commonwealth of Virginia regarding the designation of responsibility for and the costs related to providing transportation for juveniles in secure detention status, Charles Kehoe, Director of the Department of Youth Services, requested technical assistance from the American Correctional Association (ACA) to conduct a review of the current situation. The firm of Morgenthau & Plant Associates was retained by ACA to conduct the review.

The purposes of this review are threefold:

- o Review the conditions and circumstances surrounding the development of Senate Bill No. 568, offered to the General Assembly of Virginia on January 18, 1989, and a proposed amendment to that Bill which is currently being considered.

- o Assess the various ways different jurisdictions throughout the Commonwealth provide transportation for juveniles in detention status to determine whether current practices meet the need for public safety, present a personal risk to the transporter, are cost efficient, and are appropriate when viewed in light of national standards and practices for the transportation of youth.

- o Develop a series of recommendations designed to resolve the immediate transportation related concerns of all involved parties and propose a plan of action to address the longer term issues of designation of responsibility and costs associated with providing transportation for juveniles in secure detention status.

The review included an on-site visit October 17-25, 1989, during which time discussions were held with numerous Division of Youth Services central office staff, all four Regional Administrators and their staffs, eight Detention Home Superintendents, four Court Services Unit Directors, thirty-five juveniles who had been transported recently, and the following public officials and other key individuals who had an interest in this matter:

- o Delegate Clifton A. (Chip) Woodrum, Sixteenth District
- o Judge Robert P. Frank, Newport News
- o Judge Larry G. Elder, Petersburg, Dinwiddie
- o Judge Philip Trompeter, Roanoke
- o Executive Director John Jones, Virginia Sheriffs Assoc.
- o Sheriff Clay Hester, City of Newport news
- o Sheriff Alvin Hudson, Roanoke City
- o Director Robert Colvin, Virginia Crime Commission

- o Attorney Robie Ingram, Crime Commission
- o Budget Manager Walt Smiley, Dept. of Planning and Budget
- o Staff Analyst Jim Roberts, House Appropriations Committee
- o President Jay Melvin, Virginia Detention Home Assoc.
- o President Dave Marsden, Virginia Juvenile Officers Assoc.
- o Executive Director Wayne Frith, Crater Juvenile Detention Commission and Member, Executive Committee of the Virginia Council on Juvenile Detention
- o President Harry Ayer, Virginia Court Services Assoc.
- o Chairperson Becky China, Virginia Community Residential Care Association

II. BACKGROUND

The Department of Corrections requested Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJJPA) funding in 1977 for the transportation of juveniles to detention homes in lieu of placement in adult jails. Participation by the localities was limited, and in the first two years of operation, all transportation reimbursements were for travel between jails, detention homes and court. In the third year sheriffs were reimbursed for transporting youth to medical, dental and diagnostic appointments. In the fourth year, the Department combined transportation networks with other jail removal initiative projects, and grant file documentation indicates that since that time, while there were participating localities, not all jurisdictions were aware of this resource, and up to 66% of allocated funds (FY's 83 to 89) for this purpose remained unspent.

The JJJPA grant for FY 1988/89 did not expand the number of localities in the network. The Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) expressed reluctance to continue to provide JJJPA funding for local transportation networks due to continual underspending and the Department of Correction's reliance on federal funds to carry out transportation activities mandated by state law. The Department was asked by DCJS to develop and submit a cost assumption plan prior to the disbursement of funds. The Department in turn asked the participating jurisdictions for a cost assumption plan, four of which indicated that they would no longer offer transportation services if their localities would be financially responsible to do so. DCJS clarified its intent to the Department that state dollars were to assume the cost of transporting youth, and a letter rescinding the expectations for localities was circulated.

During the 1989 session of the General Assembly of Virginia, Senator Granger Macfarlane introduced Senate Bill No. 568, which would have amended Section 16.1-254 of the Code of Virginia, relating to transportation of children in custody, detention or shelter care. The amendment would have required the agency having custody or responsibility for supervision of a child to be responsible for transportation of the child, except that the Chief Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court may direct another agency of the county, city or town, other than the Department of State Police, to transport a child who is known to be violent and disruptive. This amendment would have addressed inadequate resource base, workload, scheduling, and other concerns expressed initially by Sheriffs in Roanoke and Newport News.

The Bill did not pass, and Senator Macfarlane requested the Crime Commission to review the issue of transportation of juveniles. Delegate Clifton A. (Chip) Woodrum, Sixteenth District, sitting as Chairman of the Crime Commission's Treatment Committee, met several times with representatives from the Department of Corrections, John Jones of the Virginia Sheriffs Association, and staff from the Senate Finance and House Appropriations Committees. The initial position of the Sheriffs, as represented by Mr. Jones, was to divest themselves from the duty of transporting non-violent juveniles. That position was modified as a result of these meetings. Their current position would have detention home staff assume responsibility for transporting non-violent juveniles in their custody to all local medical and dental appointments, psychiatric evaluations and special placements. Sheriffs would retain the duty to transport juveniles to and from court and those found to be violent and disruptive.

III. TRANSPORTATION WORKLOAD

FINDINGS

In August, 1989, the Department of Youth Services requested from each of the seventeen detention homes specific information about transportation activities which had taken place at their homes during the first month of each quarter for fiscal year 1988. While this data is not complete (in some instances records had not been kept), it does establish a baseline for further analysis. These data reveal that, for the four months specified, there were 936 youth transported for the following reasons:

o Medical/Dental	393
o Pre-existing Medical/Dental	138
o Psychological Examination	69
o To Another Facility	186
o For Placement Interviews	18
o Circuit Court	132

The above instances of transportation were provided by:

o Sheriff's Departments	612
o Detention Home Staff	84
o Court Service Unit Staff	48
o Police Departments	39
o Parents	5
o Social Services Staff.	2

When annualized, these data indicate a significant transportation workload impact, particularly for sheriffs and other law enforcement personnel.

In addition to the above data, detention home superintendents also identified a number of concerns relating to cost, scheduling, who decides which youth are violent and disruptive, and communication problems between their staff and judges, sheriffs, court service units, and others involved in the transportation of youth. They were also concerned about the overall negative impact of transportation requirements in light of overcrowded conditions in

many detention homes and inadequate personnel, vehicle, and equipment resources to meet this need.

Superintendents further expressed concern about the changing nature of youth detained within some of their facilities. This was particularly true for detention homes located in the northern part of the Commonwealth and along major north/south interstate highways, where significantly increasing numbers of violent and disruptive juveniles from northern states are arrested as a result of their involvement in drug trafficking and other criminal behavior. These youth are often unknown to local juvenile justice and corrections professionals, are very mature in stature and demeanor, and present additional security and supervision requirements for detention home staff. Many of these juveniles are dangerous and require the added security of well equipped vehicles and trained transportation staff when being transported for any reason.

Superintendents also acknowledged that not all youth in secure detention status were violent and disruptive, and that many of them could be (and currently are) safely transported by detention home staff, counselors, parents and other non-law enforcement personnel, without compromise to public safety.

Discussions with Sheriffs from Roanoke and Newport News, John Jones of the Sheriffs Association, and various Division of Youth Services and court service unit staff, revealed many parallel observations and concerns.

In addition to discussions with public officials and agency personnel, approximately 35 youth from throughout the Commonwealth were interviewed concerning their transportation related experiences while in secure detention status. Many of them stated that for purposes of medical/dental appointments, psychological evaluations, and special placements, they had been transported by many different individuals, including law enforcement personnel, detention home staff, counselors, parents and/or relatives, volunteers, and group home staff.

Youth reported that transportation for court hearings and for movement between detention homes was almost always provided by sheriffs deputies. Responses to specific questions about their handling by these deputies revealed that, with few exceptions, their experiences were basically positive and were well within standards characteristic of professionally trained law enforcement personnel carrying out this function.

The few exceptions noted above included:

- o Complaints that meals and bathroom stops were not always provided on long (up to 5 hour) trips.
- o Complaints of direct contact with adult prisoners (in one instance being shackled to an adult during a trip, and in several other instances, being placed in holding cells with adults).
- o Complaints of embarrassment resulting from exposure to public view while in mechanical restraints (including leg shackles, handcuffs and restraining belts).

CONCLUSIONS

The approach to transportation of juveniles in secure detention status varies considerably from jurisdiction to jurisdiction and, while these variations are not in and of themselves problematic, more consistency throughout the Commonwealth would result in improved transportation services to youth and more efficient use of scarce resources to meet increasing transportation needs.

There are increasing numbers of youth placed in detention homes who have a documented history of violent behavior, a documented history of escape or attempted escape, are from out of state and unknown to local professionals, or who face serious charges and sanctions (particularly certification to adult court). These youth should be classified as "high-risk" as they are more likely to pose security problems when being transported than those youth who do not have such a history, are known to local professionals, or who are not facing serious charges and sanctions. The development of a secure transportation system, including appropriately equipped vehicles and trained staff, will be necessary in order to more efficiently meet the current and future transportation needs of these high-risk youth.

While the number of high-risk youth placed in detention homes is increasing, there are also increasing numbers of "low-risk" youth (those who are not violent, have no history of escape or attempted escape, are known to local professionals, and are not facing serious charges and sanctions). Transporting these low-risk youth in mechanical restraints in secure Sheriff's department vehicles supervised by Sheriff's deputies is neither necessary nor an efficient use of law enforcement resources.

The Department of Youth Services is the most appropriate agency in the Commonwealth to provide transportation services for youth who are involved in the juvenile justice system. Personnel who are specially trained to work with youth, including those who are high-risk, should have responsibility for their supervision and handling while under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The workload impact on Sheriff's departments resulting from the need to transport youth to and from court for hearings and between detention homes due to overcrowding is significant, and will continue to grow in the future. Greater control of this increasing drain on Sheriff's resources might be achieved by evaluating whether there are workable alternatives available which would reduce the need for transportation of youth for these purposes.

Insights offered by Sheriffs Hester (Newport News) and Hudson (Roanoke City) led to an evaluation of current transportation requirements from the point of view of whether they were necessary. Several detention home superintendents expressed very creative ideas about alternative ways to provide medical/dental services and psychological evaluations within their facilities, thereby eliminating the need for transportation altogether for these purposes.

Where these services would be difficult to provide within the detention home, superintendents mostly agreed that, given additional resources, their staff could provide transportation when needed for non-violent youth. In instances

serving multiple jurisdictions), resources could be given to court service units who would make arrangements for transportation services for non-violent youth as needed.

The use of closed circuit television linkages between detention homes and courts for selected hearings might be a workable alternative in some jurisdictions. Increased resources could be used by detention home and court service unit staff to transport non-violent youth to and from court hearings, which would result in more efficient use of transportation dollars. The development of "holdover" programs which provide for supervision of youth overnight in community facilities (i.e. a room in a firehouse, church, or motel) might result in reducing the more costly movement of youth between detention homes due to overcrowding. These and other strategies to reduce the need for transportation wherever possible and without compromise to public safety should be included in plans to address future transportation need.

The proposed amendment to Section 16.1-254, which reflects the current position of the Sheriffs Association, is an excellent first step towards a cost efficient approach to address an initial problem of transporting low-risk youth to local medical and dental appointments, psychiatric evaluations and special placements. In discussions with a variety of individuals who have an interest in this matter, several recommendations were raised which are worthy of merit. These include:

- o Modify the amendment to establish four pilot sites for a one year period where this approach would be tested. The recommended sites include Newport News, Roanoke, one Commission operated urban and one Commission operated rural locality. Establish a small workgroup to visit each of the four sites and, with the assistance of the DYS Regional Administrators, conduct a review of projected costs, staffing, equipment and vehicle needs, and issues and concerns which need resolution. The workgroup members should include Jay Melvin, Wayne Frith, Mark Johnson, Harry Ayer, and John Jones. Robie Ingram should be asked to participate in at least one of the reviews to assist with statutory issues which might be raised.

- o Modify the amendment to permit counselors, parents, volunteers and others to transport low-risk youth where appropriate.

- o Modify the amendment to designate detaining jurisdictions as responsible for transporting youth in detention status for appointments which are more than 25 miles from the detention facility.

- o Modify the amendment to mandate that DYS conduct a formal study of the four pilot sites and the transportation needs throughout the Commonwealth and submit a report with recommendations to the General Assembly in January, 1991. In addition to staffing and cost analysis, the formal study should include strategies which reduce the need to move juveniles out of detention homes for purposes of medical and dental appointments, psychiatric evaluations, and special placements, as well as strategies designed to avoid transporting juveniles between detention homes due to overcrowding.

APPENDIX H



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

VIRGINIA STATE CRIME COMMISSION

General Assembly Building

IN RESPONSE TO
THIS LETTER TELEPHONE
(804) 225-4534

ROBERT E. COLVIN
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

MEMBERS
FROM THE SENATE OF VIRGINIA
ELMON T. GRAY, CHAIRMAN
HOWARD P. ANDERSON
ELMO G. CROSS, JR.

FROM THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES:
ROBERT B. BALL, SR., VICE CHAIRMAN
V. THOMAS FOREHAND, JR.
RAYMOND R. GUEST, JR.
A. L. PHILPOTT
WARREN G. STAMBAUGH
CLIFTON A. WOODRUM

APPOINTMENTS BY THE GOVERNOR
ROBERT C. BOBB
ROBERT F. HORAN, JR.
GEORGE F. RICKETTS, SR.

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
H. LANE KNEEDLER

January 4, 1990

The Honorable Clifton A. Woodrum
P.O. Box 1371
Roanoke, Virginia 24007

Dear Chip:

On December 20, 1989, your treatment subcommittee studying juvenile transportation agreed that a one-year pilot project would be proposed involving four detention homes who would assume the responsibilities of transporting non-violent detainees to local medical, dental and psychiatric appointments.

One of the detention home directors at the meeting guessed at \$55,000 as the additional annual cost for his own center. The subcommittee then directed staff to work out a realistic figure with Division of Youth Services Director Chuck Kehoe and the detention home representatives. On Wednesday, January 3, 1989, Mr. Kehoe provided figures which were developed by the four proposed pilot sites as follows:

<u>Location</u>	<u>Pilot Cost</u>	<u>Population</u>
Northern Virginia	\$ 36,430	44.8
Crater	42,000	20.0
Newport News	41,729	34.4
Roanoke City	57,458	18.8

I believe the figures to be excessive in light of the proposed activity, to wit: transport non-violent children to local "service" appointments. The remainder of this letter lists the basis of this conclusion.

Delegate Woodrum
January 4, 1990
page two

Review of the Proposals:

A review of the details of the requests, (copies attached) reveals requests for a new Ford Crown Victoria with cellular phone, security package, car insurance at \$2,500, maintenance cost \$1,000 AND \$.24 per mile for 3120 miles. Another request listed a 12 passenger van at \$19,000 AND \$.24 per mile for 5200 miles.

Regarding personnel, Northern Virginia listed three trips per week times four hours per trip times two people at \$10.50 per hour, plus 7.65% FICA which equals \$13,564. It should be noted that according to "The Friday Report," Northern Virginia reports the highest average daily population of the four proposed pilot sites. Two other sites with smaller populations listed more than \$35,000 in total estimated personnel costs.

Staff Analysis: Vehicles

Local sheriff's offices (and in some cases individual deputy sheriffs) receive at total of \$.24 per mile reimbursement from the State to cover depreciation, maintenance, repair, fuel and all other cost associated with operating a patrol vehicle. No funding is provided up front for the purchase. The same formula should be used in the instant case.

Northern Virginia estimated 3,120 and Roanoke estimated 5,200 additional miles annually to undertake this project. At \$.24 per mile, the associated costs of \$748 and \$1,248 are very reasonable.

\$500 for a protective vehicle screen and unlocking the rear door handles, along with \$1,500 for a radio (Department of Corrections or local sheriff's frequency) would appear to be reasonable.

Additionally, Mr. Kehoe advised that each detention center currently has at least one public-use vehicle available.

Staff Analysis: Personnel

According to figures and testimony provided to the subcommittee by the Department of Corrections, 17 detention homes, which housed a total average of 523.4 juveniles during December 1989, reported 618 transports over a four month period in 1989 for current and pre-existing medical, dental, psychological and placement appointments. This equates to 3.5422239 trips per detainee per year. ($618 \times 3/523.4$). Assuming four hours total time on average for each trip, the total man hours required per detention home could be determined by 4 hours \times 3.5422239 trips (= 14.17 - rounded) \times average daily population (ADP).

* It should be noted that testimony revealed a minimum reported trip and waiting time of 15 minutes and a maximum of 10 hours. No further data was available for staff comparison. Also, the total of 618 transports for the 4 month period includes violent AND non-violent juveniles.

Delegate Woodrum
January 4, 1990
page three

One consideration raised by Mr. Kehoe was that several areas may have to pay time and a half to employ qualified people. Under this assumption, the hourly personnel cost listed by Northern Virginia of \$11.30 (including FICA) would be \$16.95 at time and a half.

	<u>ADP x factor = man hours x hour rate (1.5) = total \$</u>				
Northern Virginia	44.8 x 14.17 =	635	x	16.95	= \$10,763
Crater	20.0 x 14.17 =	283	x	16.95	= 4,797
Newport News	34.4 x 14.17 =	487	x	16.95	= 8,255
Roanoke City	18.8 x 14.17 =	266	x	16.95	= 4,508

Recommendation for Discussion

Roanoke listed the highest anticipated additional annual mileage at 5,200 miles. Using this higher figure for all locations at \$.24 per mile reimbursement, \$1500 for a radio and \$500 for security enhancement, the table below lists the total vehicle costs that could be anticipated.

Using the time and a half hourly rate calculation, the table also lists total anticipated personnel costs. Finally, total cost is listed.

<u>Locality</u>	<u>Vehicle</u>	<u>Personnel</u>	<u>Total</u>
Northern Virginia	\$ 3,248	\$ 10,763	\$ 14,011
Crater	3,248	4,797	8,045
Newport News	3,248	8,255	11,503
Roanoke City	3,248	4,508	7,756

I hope this analysis is of use to your subcommittee in initiating your discussions on January 9th. I look forward to seeing you then.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Colvin
Executive Director

REC/rn

cc: Mr. Chuck Kehoe

<u>DETENTION</u>	<u>AVG.</u>	<u>x</u>	<u>FACTOR</u>	<u>=</u>	<u>MAN</u>	<u>HOURS</u>	<u>x</u>	<u>HOURLY RATE</u>	<u>=</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>PERSONNEL</u>	<u>+</u>	<u>5200</u>	<u>MILES</u>	<u>+</u>	<u>\$2000 VEHICLE</u>	<u>RADIO AND</u>	<u>SECURITY</u>	<u>=</u>	<u>TOTAL COST</u>
								<u>(1.5)</u>		<u>COST</u>			<u>x .24</u>							<u>1st YEAR</u>
<u>Western Region</u>																				
Shenandoah Valley	24.8		14.17		351			\$16.95		\$5949			\$1248			\$2000				\$9197
Roanoke	18.8		14.17		266			16.95		4508			1248			2000				7756
Danville	29.6		14.17		419			16.95		7102			1248			2000				10350
New River Valley	15.8		14.17		224			16.95		3797			1248			2000				7045
Highlands	14.0		14.17		198			16.95		3356			1248			2000				6604
<u>Northern Region</u>																				
Rappahannock	17.6		14.17		249			16.95		4221			1248			2000				7469
Northern Va.	44.8		14.17		635			16.95		10763			1248			2000				14011
Prince William	23.2		14.17		329			16.95		5577			1248			2000				8825
Fairfax	39.4		14.17		558			16.95		9458			1248			2000				12706
<u>Central Region</u>																				
Chesterfield	24.4		14.17		346			16.95		5865			1248			2000				9113
Richmond	61.0		14.17		864			16.95		14645			1248			2000				17893
Lynchburg	16.0		14.17		227			16.95		3848			1248			2000				7096
Henrico	19.2		14.17		272			16.95		4610			1248			2000				7858
<u>Eastern Region</u>																				
Tidewater	57.8		14.17		819			16.95		13882			1248			2000				17130
Norfolk	62.6		14.17		887			16.95		15035			1248			2000				18283
Newport News	34.4		14.17		487			16.95		8255			1248			2000				11503
Crater	20.0		14.17		283			16.95		4797			1248			2000				8045

TOTAL COST FIRST YEAR \$180

H-5

az49sh94Z

RECEIVED

JUN 2 1990

FILE

CL

Residential Population
"The Friday Report"

Director
Department of Youth Services

Detention	Budgeted Capacity	12-01-89			12-08-89			12-15-89			12-22-89			12-29-89			MONTHLY AVG.		
		M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
WESTERN REGION																			
Shenandoah Valley	32	20	7	27	19	5	24	23	7	30	16	4	20	18	5	23	19.2	5.6	24.8
Roanoke	21	17	0	17	21	0	21	19	1	20	15	2	17	17	2	19	17.8	1.0	18.8
Banville	30	25	5	30	25	5	30	27	4	31	25	5	30	22	5	27	24.8	4.8	29.6
New River Valley	20	15	3	18	18	2	20	13	1	14	12	2	14	11	2	13	13.8	2.0	15.8
Highlands	20	14	3	17	12	3	15	10	4	14	8	2	10	12	2	14	11.2	2.8	14.0
Region Total ---	123	91	18	109	95	15	110	92	17	109	76	15	91	80	16	96	86.8	16.2	103.0
NORTHERN REGION																			
Rappahannock	21	13	6	19	15	5	20	13	3	16	16	1	17	13	3	16	14.0	3.6	17.6
Northern Va.	43	49	5	54	43	3	46	37	3	40	37	3	40	40	4	44	41.2	3.1	44.8
Pr. William	21	19	5	24	19	5	24	21	3	24	18	2	20	23	1	24	20.0	3.2	23.2
Fairfax	33	35	7	42	33	5	38	34	6	40	31	7	38	32	7	39	33.0	6.4	39.4
Fairfax L/S	10	4	1	5	5	2	7	6	2	8	6	1	7	5	0	5	5.2	1.2	6.4
Region Total ---	128	120	24	144	115	20	135	111	17	128	108	14	122	113	15	128	113.4	18.0	131.4
CENTRAL REGION																			
Chesterfield	32	20	4	24	24	5	29	21	5	26	20	4	24	18	1	19	20.6	3.8	24.4
Richmond	52	62	0	62	67	1	68	64	1	65	55	1	56	53	1	54	60.2	0.8	61.0
Lynchburg	20	11	6	17	12	6	18	12	6	18	13	2	15	11	1	12	11.8	4.2	16.0
Henrico	20	19	4	23	16	3	19	18	3	21	15	3	18	13	2	15	16.2	3.0	19.2
Region Total ---	124	112	14	126	119	15	134	115	15	130	103	10	113	95	5	100	108.8	11.8	120.6
EASTERN REGION																			
Tidewater	52	65	10	75	52	9	61	54	9	63	35	8	43	39	8	47	49.0	8.8	57.8
Norfolk	43	58	11	69	57	12	69	57	10	67	47	7	54	46	8	54	53.0	9.6	62.6
Newport News	18	29	4	33	28	6	34	31	7	38	30	3	33	31	3	34	29.8	4.6	34.4
Crater	22	22	0	22	20	2	22	17	2	19	18	2	20	15	2	17	18.4	1.6	20.0
Tidewater L/S	12	10	4	14	12	5	17	7	4	11	9	3	12	8	3	11	9.2	3.8	13.0
Newport News L/S	12	11	4	15	10	3	13	7	1	8	9	3	12	10	2	12	9.4	2.6	12.0
Region Total ---	159	195	33	228	179	37	216	173	33	206	148	26	174	149	26	175	168.8	31.0	199.8
State Total	534	518	89	607	508	87	595	491	82	573	435	65	500	437	62	499	477.8	77.0	554.8

9-H

M=Male F=Female

APPENDIX I

1 D 12/30/89 Ingram C 01/10/90 kmk

2 SENATE BILL NO. HOUSE BILL NO.

3 A BILL to amend the Code of Virginia by adding a section numbered
4 16.1-254.1, relating to transportation of children in detention
5 homes.

6

7 Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia:

8 1. That the Code of Virginia is amended by adding a new section
9 numbered 16.1-254.1 as follows:

10 § 16.1-254.1. Experimental program for transportation of
11 children.--A. Notwithstanding the provisions of § 16.1-254, those
12 juvenile detention centers designated by the Department of Youth
13 Services as participants in an experimental program for transportation
14 of children shall be subject to the following responsibilities and
15 limitations on the transportation of children:

16 1. The detention center having custody or responsibility for
17 supervision of a child, pursuant to §§ 16.1-246, 16.1-247, 16.1-248.1,
18 16.1-249, or 16.1-250, shall be responsible for transportation of the
19 child to all local medical appointments, dental appointments,
20 psychiatric evaluations, and special placements.

21 2. However, the chief judge of the juvenile and domestic
22 relations district court shall designate the appropriate agencies in
23 each county, city, or town, other than the Department of State Police,
24 to be responsible for (i) the transportation of violent and disruptive
25 children and (ii) the transportation of children to destinations other
26 than those set forth in subdivision 1 above, pursuant to §§ 16.1-246,

1 16.1-247, 16.1-248.1, 16.1-249, and 16.1-250, and as otherwise ordered
2 by the judge.

3 In no case shall a child known or believed to be under fifteen
4 years of age be transported or conveyed in a police patrol wagon. No
5 child shall be transported with adults suspected of or charged with
6 criminal acts.

7 B. This section shall expire on June 30, 1991.

8

#