

CLARK COUNTY JUVENILE DETENTION REFORM RISK ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT TEST – FEBRUARY 2005

RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*Prepared by David Steinhart,
Annie E. Casey Foundation Technical Assistance Advisor
June 14, 2005*

BACKGROUND AND TEST METHODOLOGY

Risk Assessment Instruments (“RAIs”) are used at all Casey JDAI sites to guide intake personnel making the critical decision of whether to detain or release a referred juvenile. RAIs assign points to each referred minor based on objective criteria—such as the nature of the offense and the minor’s offense history. The minor’s total score indicates the level of risk presented by the minor, and serves as a guide to detention decision-makers. RAIs have been shown to be effective in controlling juvenile detention populations and in implementing release-from-custody policies that meet juvenile justice goals, including the goal of public protection.

In 2004 a new Clark County Juvenile Detention Risk Assessment Instrument was developed by a committee of stakeholders including representatives from the Juvenile Court, the Juvenile Justice Services Department, law enforcement, prosecution and defense counsel. In February 2005, a field test of the new RAI was launched. The field test lasted through the end of February. The test group consisted of all minors referred for detention, and included minors detained on judicial orders. The test protocol required that an RAI form be completed on each referred juvenile. Information packets on each screened minor were assembled, including a copy of the RAI, printouts of basic offender and parent information, police affidavits and reports on the presenting offense, copies of bench or arrest warrants and computerized juvenile court histories. The completed packets were forwarded to the Casey RAI analyst for review, calculation and analysis. This report presents results and recommendations of that analysis.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

- **Sample size.** The sample consisted of 307 minors referred for RAI screening and detention decision during the test period. Another 43 minors during the test period were ordered into detention by the court; these “judicial order” cases are excluded from the bulk of this screening analysis, because the RAI plays no role in judicial commitments to detention. Nevertheless, court-detained minors are included in the final section of this report, dealing with bed-space demand for specific groups of detainees.
- **Detention outcomes, overall and by score.** Table 1 shows the overall detention rate. Of 307 minors in the screening sample, 262 were detained for an overall detention rate of 85%. Table 2 shows the number and percent of minors detained, by risk score group. On the Clark County instrument, the threshold for detention is 15 points; minors scoring 10-14 are eligible for a detention alternative; and minors scoring 0-9 points are recommended for outright release. In this test period, 61% of all minors scoring 0-9 points were securely detained and 74% of minors scoring 10-14 points (thus qualifying for a detention alternative) were securely detained. Ninety-eight percent of minors scoring 15 or more points, or qualifying under a “special” or “mandatory” detention category, were securely detained.

The high detention rates for low scoring youth indicate a strong divergence between the outcomes recommended by the RAI and the outcomes in actual practice, with a strong bias toward secure detention of low-risk youth. Said differently, Clark County intake decision-makers

in this field test had a very high override rate. Overrides are highlighted on Table 2 in the shadowed cells, and they are analyzed in greater detail below.

- **Detention outcomes by offense.** Table 3 shows detention outcomes by referral reason or offense. Detention rates exceeded 80% for every offense category except for felony sex offenses (only two minors referred, one released) and for two of the lowest offense levels (Category G, “GM/Misdemeanors Against Persons”, and Category I, “Other GM/Misdemeanor, or violation of parole or SMYC aftercare”), where the detain rates remained strong at 78% and 68% respectively. One would expect to see much steeper declines in detention rates at lower levels of offense severity, but that pattern is hard to discern in these test results.
- **Special and mandatory detention cases.** Table 4 displays special and mandatory detention cases by points scored. Minors who meet a special or mandatory detention criterion are, with rare exceptions, securely detained regardless of their final score on the RAI. A total of 49 minors (16 percent of the entire sample) were detained on warrants. The next largest special detention group consisted of minors subject to 12 hour holds on domestic violence charges. Minors referred for offenses involving firearms comprised the third largest special/mandatory detention group. Some observations related to these groups are:
 - *Warrant cases.* More than half of the special detentions for warrants were on misdemeanor warrants (30 of 49 total warrant detentions)—i.e., for underlying behaviors that might not have qualified for detention on the original charge. This substantial subset of detainees may suggest an area for development of administrative sanctions or discretion to release these youth under circumstances approved by the court.
 - *Domestic violence cases.* These minors, once referred, are subject to a 12 hour hold mandated by law in the state of Nevada. Interestingly, all but one of the 26 children held on DV charges scored less than 9 points on the RAI, and 19 of these 26 youth scored 5 or fewer points. Often, it appeared from the police reports in these cases that parents and siblings of the detained minor bore some measure of responsibility for the domestic disturbance (e.g., mom or dad tried to physically restrain the minor from leaving home, minor then shoved back), but that police opted to arrest the minor as the most convenient de-escalation tactic. All minors detained on 12 hour holds were released at or near the 12 hour mark.
 - *Firearm cases.* Mandatory detention status of these cases was largely irrelevant since all 23 minors in this category also qualified for detention based on point scores of 15 or higher.
 - *Prostitution arrests.* Of 7 girls arrested for prostitution, five were detained for relatively long periods as mandatory “material witness” holds. This is discussed further in the “conclusions and recommendations” below.
- **Age and Gender of referrals.** Males constituted 77 percent and females constituted 23 percent of referrals in the one month test period; the proportion of girls referred is slightly higher than found in other RAI/JDAI test sites where girls typically comprise 15-20 percent of total referrals. Sixteen and seventeen year olds accounted for 52% of all detention referrals. A fourth of all referrals were 14 years of age or younger (N=81 minors). The youngest cases were 17 boys between the ages of 10 and 12 and three girls between the ages of 9 and 12.
- **Overrides.** An override is a decision to detain a minor whose score is low enough to qualify for release or for a non-secure detention alternative. Table 6 shows override numbers and rates for each RAI scoring group. In all, 73 out of a total 115 minors with scores below 15 (and not qualified for special or mandatory detention) in this field test were detained as overrides, for a total override rate of 64%. While there is no hard or national standard for an appropriate override rate, a generally accepted principle in detention reform is that overrides should not exceed 15 to 20 percent of minors who qualify for release based on their risk scores. Clark County’s rather high override rate is explained, in part, by the application of a four hour rule to

the analysis of this field test—i.e., any minor booked and held in secure confinement for more than four hours was counted as a detained minor. To offer some perspective on the effect of the four hour rule, we also calculated the override rate for this sample using an 8 hour rule (i.e., all minors detained for 8 or fewer hours are classified for purpose of the analysis as releases). Even using an 8 hour rule, the override rate for this sample exceeded 50% of low-scoring youth. The high detain override rate suggests a strong need to implement intake controls or practices that will close the gap between RAI indicated outcomes and actual detention outcomes

Normally, when a low-scoring minor is detained, the case must be handled officially as an override, with a reason given for detaining the minor and with supervisor sign-off on the override. This process was not followed routinely in the field test. Of the 73 detain overrides in this sample, only 10 were processed as formal overrides with a reason checked for the override. Of the 10 cases where an override reason was given, nine were over-riden on the basis of “danger to others/ history of violence”, though substantiation of this basis for override in the case records was rare.

One explanation for this departure from standard procedure may well be that the “four hour rule” distinguishing a detention from a release had not been officially adopted at the time of the field test. The situation is complicated by the Clark County practice of closing its detention center overnight to parents who might otherwise be able to retrieve their child home within four hours of booking. But these factors alone—unfamiliarity with the four hour target for release and nighttime closure—do not fully explain the high override rate. Many youth qualifying for outright release (RAI total scores of 9 or under) were held for periods in excess of 12 hours, without formal processing as an override.

To provide a more detailed view of these override practices and circumstances, we have included Table 11 (Override Summary) listing all 73 detain overrides and 3 release overrides by gender, race, age and offense, total RAI score and total time in secure detention. A review of the 73 detain overrides underscores the need for greater staff compliance with override procedures, and perhaps indicates related needs to improve parental access to the detention center in nighttime hours and to utilize other strategies to reduce secure custody times for low-scoring youth.

- **Ethnicity of referrals, detention rates by ethnicity.** Table 7 displays referrals and detention rates by ethnicity. Whites were 36% of referrals, Blacks were 33% of referrals, Hispanics were 26 % of referrals, and Asian/Other were 5% percent of referrals. Compared to Clark County population rates (2004 projected population-by-ethnicity of children age 10-17, Table 8), Whites were under-represented (36% of referrals vs. 48% of the county youth population), Blacks were over-represented (33% of referrals vs. 12% of the county youth population), Hispanics were under-represented (26% of referrals vs. 33% of the county youth population) and Asian/Others were slightly under-represented (5% of referrals vs. 7% of the county youth population). Detention rates for all ethnic groups fell into the 75-90% range.
- **Form completion problems.** For the most part, the Clark County RAIs were completed accurately, with few form errors. Clark’s system is automated; an intake screener enters the RAI data on a computer terminal at the intake desk, based on an interview with the minor, offense information from law enforcement, and a records scan. This automated RAI data entry method probably helps to minimize form errors. However we did notice a the following discrepancies or errors on more than one occasion:
 - Inconsistency in selection of offense categories for the same crime. Prostitution, for example, was processed alternatively as an “H” offense (5 points) or an “I” offense (3 points).

- Stacking of current charges. In some instances, points were awarded for “additional charges in this referral” when the charges were essentially lesser included offenses in the primary offense (e.g., conspiracy + attempt + principle offense).
- Stacking of priors. In some cases, multiple charges from the same prior adjudication event were added together, compounding points for prior history and carrying the case over the 15 point threshold, even though prior adjudications involving multiple charges are supposed to be handled as single events for purposes of assigning history points.
- Override protocols ignored: this has been discussed above.

Form completion issues like these are normally addressed by adopting written guidelines for completing RAI forms and/or by staff training targeted to specific RAI procedures.

- **Length of stay and bedspace analysis.** (Tables 9, 10). The survey collected information on the time each detained minor spent in secure confinement, measured from the hour of booking to the hour of release. For this part of the analysis, we included Judicial Order detentions (N=305 total detentions). Using this information, we were able to determine the average length of stay (ALOS) and the total detention time (in bed days) for each offense group. The results are shown in Table 9.

The length of stay data were then annualized to provide general estimates of the number of detention beds needed in Clark County for each offense subgroup; these estimates are presented in Table 10. These bedspace estimates—while useful to show relative bed demand for various offense groups—have important limitations described in the footnote to Table 10. Notably, there is a wide divergence between the total number of estimated beds needed (129 beds) based on the time spent in custody by the February detention sample and the actual number of beds occupied in the Clark County Juvenile Detention Center (230 ADP for June 2005). Several reasons for the discrepancy are referenced in the footnote to Table 10. From a review of the June population data, it appears that the February 2005 test group may have failed to include an unknown number of judicially committed minors. Other possible explanations are that other types of referrals or admissions were not screened and included in the test sample; that February 2005 was an atypically light referral month; or that detention practice has changed since the test occurred. The bed estimates in Table 10 are generally reliable as a means of comparing bed demand between the various classes of youth referred, based on the custody times spent by youth in the February 2005 RAI survey. They are not, as indicated in the footnote to Table 10, formal projections taking into account peak demand, population changes and other factors that normally are included in a formal correctional facility needs assessment.

The length of stay analysis shows:

- The average length of stay in detention for all 262 detained minors (excluding judicial order detentions) was 11.3 days. Minors referred for felony drug trafficking and non felony sex offenses had the longest stays (average 34 days for drug traffic, average 22 days for non felony sex) ; however, the small number of minors in each of these subgroups limits the utility of this information. Perhaps appropriately, minors referred for Class A felonies against persons racked up the highest total number of bed days, with an ALOS of 19.7 days. Minors referred for firearm offenses had the next longest ALOS (16.9 days) followed by minors detained on warrants (16.5 days). The shortest stays were experienced by offense level G minors (GM/Misdemeanors Against Persons), with an ALOS of 1.6 days. Minors committed by the court on judicial orders stayed an average of 9.7 days.

- Bedspace demand by offense group (Table 10). Additional findings are:
 - Minors apprehended on warrants required the greatest share of detention beds. Warrant cases consume an estimated 29 detention beds out of an estimated total 115 beds needed to accommodate new referrals (that is, 25% of all beds needed for new referrals, excluding court-ordered detentions).
 - Category A serious and violent crimes demand the next highest number of beds relative to other classes of detainees—27 beds or 24% of all beds needed for new referrals.
 - Misdemeanor cases together (Categories G, H and I) constituted 27% of referrals but, due to their shorter average lengths of stay, need only 14 beds (12% of total estimated beds needed for new referrals).
 - Better control of overrides, and/or controls on the time spent in custody by minors referred on warrants, could significantly lower total bedspace demand in future months or years.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- A. ***The test RAI appears to be an adequate screening device for Clark County and should be formally adopted or confirmed in essentially its present form.*** No major flaws or inequities in the risk assessment instrument itself were confirmed by the test results. The most significant problems emerging from the RAI test are external to the form and relate to the high override rate and to high detention volume for minors apprehended on warrants. The RAI is adequate in its present form for continuing application in Clark County.
- B. ***Overrides are a problem.*** Too many low scoring youth were securely detained beyond four hours. The override rate (percent of youth scoring under 15, without a special or mandatory detention reason, who were detained more than 4 hours) was 64% for the entire test sample. Even if the four hour rule is relaxed, for purposes of analysis only, to an 8 hour rule, the override rate hovers above 50%. A generally accepted target for overrides, based on JDAI objectives and experience, is 15-20%. We strongly recommend that Clark County adopt an interim goal of cutting its override rate (based on a four hour rule) to not more than 25% of minors who score below 15 points without some other special or mandatory detention reason.

Only 10 of 73 detain overrides were handled according to formal override procedure—with a reason checked and sign off by a supervisor. This low level of compliance with override procedure is mitigated by the fact that a four hour rule was not in effect at the time of the test, so intake personnel really had no time-based benchmark for determining the need to follow override procedures. In the future, compliance with override procedures should improve. There may well be a need to provide additional or updated training to staff on these override procedures. Where override procedures were followed and a reason was checked (N=10 cases), the reason most frequently checked was “danger to others/history of violence”, but this was not usually verifiable from the backup records included with each RAI test case. If training is provided on overrides, some guidelines or definitions should be developed to help standardize overrides of low-scoring youth based on suspected “danger to others”.

We also have noted in the discussion above the impact of current policy closing the detention center to parents who wish to retrieve low-scoring youth during nighttime hours. This policy contributes to overrides by preventing parental pickup before the expiration of four custody hours, if the pickup does not occur prior to closing time. Costs related to staying open longer may be offset by lower detention rates if more children can be returned home without an overnight stay.

- C. **Warrant cases—a compelling area for reform.** Minors apprehended on warrants accounted for nearly 20% of all detentions and (with some of the longest stays of any group) for about 25% of all estimated beds needed for new referrals (excluding judicial order detentions). The Clark County RAI essentially mandates secure detention for minors with felony or misdemeanor bench or arrest warrants, and for traffic warrants in both categories as well. According to our count of warrant referrals in this test, more minors were referred and detained on misdemeanor warrants (N= 30) than on felony warrants (N=19). In some JDAI sites, intake staff is granted some measure of discretion by the Juvenile Court to score and release minors referred on misdemeanor warrants. A number of other case-processing reforms have been successfully applied at JDAI sites to reduce warrant-based detentions. Examples of case processing reforms in this area are: a) creating a new warrant class, particularly for FTA cases, where the judge pre-identifies the case as “releasable” based on risk screening results at intake; b) strategies to prevent FTAs and the issuance of FTA warrants; c) strategies to clear bad or stale warrants from police and court records. These warrant-control strategies are described in detail in the Annie E. Casey “Pathways to Detention Reform” Volume 9 entitled, “Special Detention Cases”. Warrant detentions can be controlled both by reducing warrant-related bookings and by reducing the average length of stay in warrant cases. For example, if warrant admissions to detention are cut by one half and the ALOS in warrant cases is reduced by one half (from average 16 to 8 days), Clark County could reduce estimated ADP (bed demand) by approximately 15 beds.
- D. **Prostitution cases- material witness orders.** There were 7 arrests in the sample for prostitution—all girls between the ages of 13 and 17. None scored more than 7 points but all were detained. Five of the seven were detained on “material witness” orders, presumably as vice holds to leverage arrests of their manager-pimps. The average length of stay for these five girls was 23 days in secure detention (three were incarcerated for 29 , 34 and 37 days respectively). In most cases these girls came to Las Vegas from some other state, and their length of stay in custody may be partially explained by time needed to locate parents and make arrangements for return home. Since Las Vegas is likely to remain a magnet for this activity, we simply recommend that detention policies affecting young girls arrested for prostitution be reviewed to guard against unnecessarily long stays in secure custody and to provide, perhaps, for a more service-oriented response that can address issues of child victimization associated with this form of behavior. Among other JDAI sites, San Francisco also faces these issues.
- E. **Disproportionate Minority Confinement (DMC).** For the juveniles in this test sample, there is no significant evidence of DMC based on the rates of detention measured for each of four ethnic groups—because all groups were detained at fairly high rates. White, Black and Hispanic youth were detained at rates between 83% and 90% of total referrals in each of those ethnic groups; Asian/other youth had a slightly lower detention rate (75%). Larger differences appear when referral rates by race, rather than detention rates, are compared to the racial profiles of the Clark County youth population (obtained from the Nevada State Demographer, showing the Clark County population by race, for youth 10 through 17 for 2004). A comparison of referrals-to-detention and population share shows the following: Whites are significantly under-represented in the referral population (36% of referrals to detention vs. 48% of the county youth population); Blacks are significantly over-represented in the referral population (33 % of referrals-to-detention vs. 12% of the county youth population); Hispanics are somewhat under-represented in the referral population (26% of referrals vs. 33% of the county youth population); and Asian/other youth are evenly represented in both categories (5% of referrals vs. 7% of the county youth population). In general, these disparities in referral rates appear to be external to the Clark County Department of Juvenile Justice Services and its detention decision-makers. They are explained either by disparate youth behavior patterns in the community and/or by law enforcement practices affecting rates of arrest for different racial groups. Department decision-making does affect referrals of minors already under justice system control (e.g., on warrants

and probation violations), so it may be helpful to continue to scrutinize referrals by race for these reasons. Moreover, since the DMC results cited here apply only to this one month sample, the Clark County Department of Juvenile Justice Services should continue to monitor all referrals and detention rates by race.

- F. Training needs related to the RAI process and form completion.** While overall there were very few form completion errors, in some cases points were double-counted or compounded for the same offense behavior. We noticed this on some forms under Factor 2, “additional charges in this referral”, where offenses derived from or included in the primary offense were counted as additional felonies (e.g., original charge is burglary, compounded under factor 2 for attempt or conspiracy to commit burglary). In one example, a minor alleged to have stolen four golf carts got 7 points for the offense, then 8 points for three additional felonies (three more carts), thus crossing the 15 point detention threshold. Inconsistency also appeared in scoring warrant cases— in some cases, screeners included current offense points for an underlying warrant charge, or included points for prior issuance of the warrant. Since warrants are mandatory or special detention cases, the number of points is theoretically irrelevant to the outcome. Even so, there should be a consistent policy on scoring minors referred on warrants. Scoring warrant cases in a consistent manner may prove helpful if, at some future date, misdemeanor warrant referrals are handled differently from felony warrant referrals.
- G. Adopt a monitoring plan.** The Clark County Dept. of Juvenile Justice Services should adopt a specific RAI monitoring plan to track RAI detention scores and outcomes, with particular attention to the override rate and to the other problem areas discussed above. Casey advisors can help with the development and implementation of a good monitoring plan.

Table 1
Detention Outcomes—Total Sample
 (N = 307 excluding 43 Judicially Ordered Detentions)

Total referred	No. Detained	Pct. Detained	No. released	Pct. Released
307	262	85%	45	15%

Table 2
Screening Scores by Detain/Release Outcomes

SHADED CELLS IN TABLE 2 REPRESENT OVERRIDES OF SCORES

Scores	No. Screened	No. Detained	Pct. Detained	No. Released	Pct. Released
<i>0 – 9 points</i>	92	56	61%	36	39%
<i>10 – 14 points</i>	23	17	74%	6	26%
<i>15 or more points, or Special or Mandatory Detention Case</i>	192	189	98%	3	2%
<i>Totals</i>	307	262	85%	45	15%

Table 3
Referral Offense By Detention Outcome

Offense Category	Number Referred	Pct. of all referrals	Number Detained	Category Detention rate	Number Released	Category Release rate
<i>A—Felonies against persons</i>	38	12%	38	100%	0	0%
<i>B—Possession or use of firearm</i>	24	8%	24	100%	0	0%
<i>C—Felony Sex Offense</i>	2	1%	1	50%	1	50%
<i>D—Use of dangerous or deadly weapon in crime</i>	9	3%	8	89%	1	11%
<i>E—Felony Narcotics Trafficking</i>	3	1%	3	100%	0	0%
<i>F—All other Felonies</i>	64	21%	54	86%	10	14%
<i>G—GM/ Misdemeanors Against Persons (incl. D.V.)</i>	45	15%	35	78%	10	22%
<i>H—Non Felony Sex Offenses</i>	2	1%	2	100%	0	0%
<i>I—Other GM/Misdemeanor or Viol.Parole/ SMYC-AC</i>	66	21%	45	68%	21	32%
<i>J—Violation of Probation</i>	2	1%	2	100%	0	0%
<i>Arrest or Bench Warrant</i>	51	17%	49	96%	2	4%
<i>Courtesy hold</i>	1	--	1	100%	0	0%
<i>Total</i>	307	100%	262	85%	45	15

Table 4
**Minors Detained as Special or Mandatory Detention Cases
 by Risk Score**

	Warrant-Felony	Warrant-Misdemeanor	DV—12 hour hold	Use of Firearm	Material Witness Order	Fugitive Hold or Escapee	Other Jurisdiction	Other Special or Mand.
0-9 points	13	24	25	0	5	2	11	2
10-14 points	4	5	1	0	0	0	2	2
15+ points	2	1	0	23	0	3	3	0
<i>All</i>	19	30	26	23	5	5	16	4

Table 5
Age by Gender of Referrals (N= 307 referrals)

	10 or less	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18 or more	Total	Pct.
<i>Male</i>	1	6	10	23	26	44	63	57	7	237	77%
<i>Female</i>	1	0	2	4	8	14	16	23	2	70	23%
<i>Total</i>	2	6	12	27	34	58	79	80	9	307	100%

Note: 81 (26%) were 14 years of age or less.

Table 6
Override Rate by RAI Scoring Group (N=307 referrals)

RAI Score Group	Number Referred	Number Detained	Override Rate
0-9 points (Release)	92	56	61%
10-14 points (Detention Alternative)	23	17	74%
<i>Total Scoring 10-14</i>	115	73	64%
15 or more points (Detain) or special or mandatory detention	192	189	2%
<i>Total Sample</i>	307	262	--

Table 7
Referrals and Detention Rates by Offense and Ethnicity
(N= 307 referrals)

<u>Offense Category</u>	Total Referred	WHITE	Pct. of referrals for this offense	Offense Detain Rate - White	BLACK	Pct. of referrals for this offense	Offense Detain Rate-Black	HISPAN.	Pct. of referrals for this offense	Offense Detain Rate-Hispan.	ASIAN/ OTHER	Pct. of referrals for this offense	Offense Detain Rate-As/Oth
<i>A—Felonies against persons</i>	38	8	21%	100%	22	58%	100%	6	16%	100%	2	5%	100%
<i>B—Possession/use firearm</i>	24	7	29%	100%	9	38%	100%	7	29%	100%	1	4%	100%
<i>C—Felony Sex Offense</i>	2	1	50%	100%	1	50%	100%	0	--	--	0	--	--
<i>D—Use Dangerous/ Deadly Weapon</i>	9	6	67%	83%	0	--	--	2	22%	100%	1	11%	100%
<i>E—Felony Narcotics Trafficking</i>	3	3	100%	100%	0	--	--	0	--	--	0	--	--
<i>F—All Other Felonies</i>	64	20	31%	90%	22	34%	82%	20	31%	90%	2	3%	50%
<i>G—GM/ Misdemeanor Against Persons</i>	45	20	44%	75%	10	22%	70%	13	29%	92%	2	4%	50%
<i>H—Non-Felony Sex Offenses</i>	2	1	50%	0%	0	--	--	0	--	--	1	50%	100%
<i>I-- Other GM/Misdemeanor or Viol. Parole/ SMYC-AC</i>	66	25	38%	60%	16	24%	69%	19	29%	74%	6	9%	83%
<i>J—Violation of Probation</i>	2	0	--	--	1	50%	100%	1	50%	100%	0	--	--
<i>Arrest or Bench Warrant</i>	51	18	35%	100%	20	39%	95%	12	24%	100%	1	2%	0%
<i>Courtesy hold</i>	1	0	--	--	1	100%	100%	0	--	--	0	--	--
TOTAL	307	109	36%	83%	102	33%	86%	80	26%	90%	16	5%	75%

Table 8
2004 Population of Clark County, NV
Racial Profile for Individuals Between the Ages of 10-17

Race	Number	Percent
White	89,080	48%
Hispanic	60,630	33%
Black	22,665	12%
Asian/ PI/ Eskimo-Aluet/ Other	13,355	7%
<i>Total Population Age 10-17</i>	<i>185,730</i>	<i>100%</i>

Sources: Nevada State Demographer, Age/Sex/Race Projections for Clark County, 2004

Table 9
Average Length of Stay and Detention Bed Days Utilized, by Referral Offense, for all test period minors detained including court ordered detentions (N=305 detained minors)

Offense Category	Number Detained	Percent of all Detentions	Average Length of Stay (in Days)	Number of Bed Days Utilized by this Offense Group
<i>A—Felonies against persons</i>	38	12%	19.7	756
<i>B—Possession/use firearm</i>	24	8%	16.9	405
<i>C—Felony Sex Offense</i>	1	--	10.0	10
<i>D—Use Dangerous/ Deadly Weapon in Crime</i>	8	3%	11.1	89
<i>E—Felony Narcotics Trafficking</i>	3	1%	34.0	102
<i>F—All Other Felonies</i>	54	18%	9.4	517
<i>G—GM/ Misdemeanor Against Persons</i>	35	11%	1.6	58
<i>H—Non-Felony Sex Offenses</i>	2	1%	22.3	45
<i>I-- Other GM/Misdemeanor or Viol. Parole/ SMYC-AC</i>	45	15%	6.1	275
<i>J—Violation of Probation</i>	2	1%	5.6	11
<i>Arrest or Bench Warrant</i>	49	16%	16.5	692
<i>Courtesy hold</i>	1	--	0.6	1
SUB-TOTAL	262	86%	11.3	2,961
<i>Judicial Order Detentions</i>	43	14%	9.7	417
TOTAL	305	100%	11.1	3,378

Table 10
**Estimated Annual Detentions, Length Of Stay and Detention Facility Beds
 Needed in Clark County For Specific Offense and Referral Categories**
 (Based On February 2005 RAI Survey Results)
 (N = 3,965 Annual Estimated Detentions including Court-ordered Detentions)

Offense Category	Estimated Annual No. of Minors Detained	Percent of Annualized Detentions	Average Length of Stay (Days)	Total Bed Days By Offense Category	Total No of Beds Needed by Offense Category
<i>A—Felonies against persons</i>	494	12%	19.7	9,732	27
<i>B—Possession/use firearm</i>	312	8%	16.9	5,273	15
<i>C—Felony Sex Offense</i>	13	--	10.0	130	1
<i>D—Use of Dangerous/ Deadly Weapon</i>	104	3%	11.1	1,154	4
<i>E—Felony Narcotics Trafficking</i>	39	1%	34.0	1,326	4
<i>F—All Other Felonies</i>	702	18%	9.4	6,598	19
<i>G—GM/ Misdemeanor Against Persons</i>	455	11%	1.6	728	2
<i>H—Non-Felony Sex Offenses</i>	26	1%	22.3	580	2
<i>I-- Other GM/Misdemeanor or Viol. Parole/ SMYC-AC</i>	585	15%	6.1	3,569	10
<i>J—Violation of Probation</i>	26	1%	5.6	146	1
<i>Arrest or Bench Warrant</i>	637	16%	16.5	10,511	29
<i>Courtesy hold</i>	13	--	0.6	8	--
SUBTOTAL	3,406	86%	11.3	39,755	114
<i>Judicial Order detentions</i>	559	14%	9.7	5,422	15
TOTAL	3,965	100%	11.1	45,177	129 *

* Bed totals in this column are rounded up from fractional to whole beds.

NOTES ON LIMITATIONS OF TABLE 10: The figures in this table are estimates of annual detentions and beds needed, based on 13 times the actual activity measured during the 28 day RAI test conducted in February 2005. These annualized figures are not derived from a formal facility projection; they do not take into account seasonal variations, peak detention needs, population and arrest trends or other normal variations in detention flow. Within these limitations, the "beds needed" estimates in the right-hand column are useful for purposes of showing relative bed demand for different offense categories and booking reasons. The grand total estimate shown (129 beds) is well below the current (June 2005) Clark County detention center population of approximately 230 detained minors. The difference between the projected bed need (based on the survey) and the actual occupancy may be explained by factors including any or all of the following: a) bedspace occupied by minors released within four hours was not counted in this estimate, b) the February 2005 sample did not include all minors who were in fact detained during the test period (based on a review of June 2005 detention population data, it appears that court-ordered detentions account for many more detentions than can be explained by this survey), or c) February 2005 was an atypical referral month. The detention space estimates shown in this table are based on an assumption of "no change" from detention policies and practices that were in effect during the test period.

Table 11
Summary of Override Cases

Test No.	M/F	Race	Age	Total RAI Pts	<u>Offense Description</u>	Hours Detained	If processed as override, reason given
007	M	H	16	6	Spit on officer	8	--
008	M	W	17	5	Stolen property	7	--
009	M	W	17	3	Stolen property	16	--
013	M	W	17	7	Possession marijuana	16	--
014	M	W	16	12	Possession brass knuckles	26	--
029	M	H	16	2	Vandalism	16	--
030	M	H	16	4	Tagging	10	--
031	M	H	16	5	Tagging	10	--
037	M	B	14	11	Driving without license	21	--
039	M	B	17	7	Trespass	13	--
040	M	H	17	11	Possession drug paraphernalia	6	--
041	M	W	16	10	Possession drug paraphernalia	6	--
042	M	W	15	6	Possession marijuana	5	--
043	M	W	16	7	Vehicle theft	7	--
049	M	W	13	5	Malicious property destruction	10	--
051	F	B	16	4	Minor in gaming establishment	12	--
055	M	H	11	3	Possess belt buckle knife	5	--
058	M	H	16	3	Tagging	12	--
065	M	B	15	7	Possession drugs	9	
068	M	B	16	5	Misdemeanor assault	234	Formal OR: danger to others/ history violence
095	M	W	15	4	Tamper with vehicle	18	--
097	M	H	16	12	Stole items from auto	14	--
102	M	B	13	14	Possession marijuana with intent to sell	16	--
105	M	H	16	7	Possession drug paraphernalia	12	--
106	M	H	16	3	Possession switchblade	5	--
112	M	B	14	7	Possession stolen vehicle	38	--
115	M	B	15	9	Attempted auto theft	9	--
120	M	H	17	7	Possession stolen vehicle	212	--
121	M	PI	16	7	Possession drug paraphernalia	192	Formal OR: danger to others/history violence
125	M	H	15	4	Possession marijuana	9	--

Test No.	M/F	Race	Age	Total RAI Pts	Offense Description	Hours Detained	If processed as override, reason given
126	F	B	17	5	Vandalism	10	--
136	F	W	15	5	Possession marijuana	10	--
137	M	H	15	7	Possession stolen vehicle	102	Formal OR: Parents refuse custody
138	M	H	16	3	Driving Under Influence	89	--
149	M	B	16	6	Probation violation	30	--
152	M	B	15	8	Shoplift	6	--
156	M	H	13	7	Burglary at school	7	--
157	M	H	12	7	Burglary at school	6	--
158	M	H	13	5	Obstructing officer	8	--
164	M	H	17	8	Possession switchblade	7	--
172	M	W	17	8	Possession stolen vehicle	12	--
174	F	H	14	5	Misdemeanor assault	17	--
177	M	B	11	5	Misdemeanor assault	12	--
178	F	W	15	7	Shoplift	20	--
180	F	H	15	6	Misdemeanor assault	17	--
181	M	H	13	11	Trespass	13	
187	M	B	15	10	Malicious property destruction	1056	--
197	M	H	15	13	Possession stolen vehicle	744	
205	M	B	15	9	Curfew	792	Formal OR: danger to others/history violence
207	M	H	16	10	Vehicle theft	552	Formal OR: danger to others/history violence
217	F	W	17	6	Prostitution	888	Formal OR: vice hold as material witness
234	M	W	15	12	Set off bottle bomb in school trash can	24	Formal OR: danger to others/history violence
241	M	H	16	12	Same as above	24	Formal OR: danger to others/history violence
242	M	A	16	12	Same as above	96	Formal OR: danger to others/history violence
243	M	W	15	12	Same as above	24	Formal OR: danger to others/history violence
278	M	B	16	10	Possession of knife	22	--
279	F	W	17	10	Shoplift	11	--
287	F	B	14	7	Possession stolen property	12	--
289	M	W	17	12	Possession drugs	10	--
290	F	W	16	8	Possession drugs	648	Formal OR: danger to others/history violence
302	F	H	9	7	Burglary of toys	10	--
307	F	H	12	7	Same as above	10	--

Test No.	M/F	Race	Age	Total RAI Pts	Offense Description	Hours Detained	If processed as override, reason given
312	M	B	16	7	Stolen wallet	5	--
313	F	H	16	3	Possession drug paraphernalia	18	--
319	M	B	14	3	Possession stolen bike	10	--
320	M	W	12	3	Same as above	8	--
321	M	PI	14	4	Possession marijuana	5	--
322	M	W	17	9	Tagging	11	--
327	M	W	16	5	Tagging	15	--
335	M	B	14	7	Shoplift	5	--
338	M	PI	17	7	Possession marijuana	18	--
341	M	W	17	8	Under Influence marijuana	12	--
347	M	W	16	3	Disturbing the peace	12	--
DETAIN OVERRIDE TOTALS:				Ave. RAI Score		Ave. Hours in Detention	--
73				7		87	
RELEASE OVERRIDES							
Test No.	M/F	Race	Age	Total RAI Pts	Offense Description	Hours Detained	If processed as override, reason given
006	M	B	13	15	Felony sex assault	3	No formal override; ADHD minor
034	M	AI/AL	12	12	Warrant- mandatory detention	1	No formal override; minor self-surrendered
038	F	B	14	0	Warrant- mandatory detain	0	No formal override; minor self-surrendered
RELEASE OVERRIDE TOTALS				Ave. RAI Score			
3				9			

Indicated Decision:

(By Points Only) 0-9 Release 10-14 Detention Alternative 15+ Secure Detention

Mandatory Detainment Circumstances

Felony/GM Bench Warrant (BW) Felony/GM Arrest Warrant (AW) Felony/GM Traffic Warrant (TW)
 Use of Firearm in Current Offense (GR) Hospitalization of Victim Resulting from Current Offense (HOSP)
 Immigration Hold (IMM) Federal Hold (FH) Material Witness Order (MWO)
 Fugitive Hold (FUG) Escapee (ESC)

Special Detainment Circumstances

OJ with charge (OJ) New Offense Committed While in Detention Alternative (DRRP)
 SMYC – New Offense (NDO) SMYC – Institutional Hold (IH/SMYC) Courtesy Hold (CH)
 Misdemeanor Bench Warrant Misdemeanor Arrest Warrant Misdemeanor Traffic Warrant
 JSO Runaway/No Placement (JSOR)

Judicial Order Information

JO (Judicial Order) JO-DC (Drug Court) JO-MC (Municipal Court)
 JO-TR (Truancy) JO-OA (Outlying Areas) JO-RC (Recommend Commitment)
 Court Commitment SMYC (CC-SMYC) JO-DC (Drug Court) Court Commitment DCFS (CC-DCFS)

Override Information

****Override Up (Detaining a Youth that Does Not Meet Detainment Eligibility Requirements) (OR)**

Parent Refuses to Retrieve Youth Parent Unable to Retrieve Youth
 Gang Involvement Related to Current Offense (Gang Enhancement/F.I. Card on File)
 Imminent Danger to Self (mental health diagnosis, previous hospitalization, suicide attempts, etc.)
 Presents a Danger to Others/History of Violence by Youth Youth Presently has a Suspended Commitment Order
 Other (See Comments) Parent Not Available to Retrieve Youth

****Override Down (Not Detaining a Youth Who Meets Detainment Eligibility Requirements) (OD)**

Lesser Involvement in Crime than Indicated by Charge Other (See Comments)
 Parent/Guardian Cooperative Age of Offender

Comments: