

**PIMA COUNTY JUVENILE DETENTION REFORM
RISK ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT TEST – MARCH/APRIL 2005**

RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*Prepared by David Steinhart,
Annie E. Casey Foundation Technical Assistance Advisor
July 8, 2005*

BACKGROUND AND TEST METHODOLOGY

Risk Assessment Instruments (“RAIs”) are used at all Casey JDAI sites to guide 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 detention 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.

Beginning in 2004, a new Pima County Juvenile Court Detention Risk Assessment Instrument was developed by a working group that included representatives from the Juvenile Court, the Probation Department, prosecution and defense counsel and other juvenile justice stakeholders. The working group reviewed RAI models from other JDAI sites and heard from Casey Foundation detention-reform consultants. In March 2005, a field test of the new RAI was launched. In this test, each minor referred for a detention decision was screened and scored using both RAI forms: the “old” RAI and the revised “test instrument”. Actual detention outcomes during the test period were governed by the “old” RAI. The test group consisted of all minors referred for detention, including minors detained by court order, during the period of March 29 through April 22. Information packets on each screened minor were assembled, including hard copies of the “old” and “test” RAIs, printouts of juvenile court histories, the Probation Referral form (describing the offense) and copies of any warrants that were relevant to the detention decision. The completed packets were forwarded to the Casey RAI analyst for review, calculation and analysis. This report presents the 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 10 minors during the test period were detained by court order; these court-ordered detentions are excluded from the bulk of this screening analysis, because the RAI plays no role in judicial decisions to commit minors to secure detention. Nevertheless, court-detained minors are included in the final section of this report, dealing with bed-space demand for specific groups of detainees.
- **Age and Gender of referrals.** Table 1 shows age and gender of referrals. Males constituted 78% and females constituted 22% of referrals in the test period. Sixteen and seventeen year olds accounted for 46% of all detention referrals. More than one third of all referrals were 14 years of age or younger (N=110 minors). The youngest cases were 3 boys aged 8, 9 and 10 respectively.
- **Detention outcomes, overall and by score.** Table 2 shows the overall detention rate. Of 307 minors in the screening sample, 227 were detained for an overall detention rate of 74%.

Table 3 shows the number and percent of minors detained, by risk score group, for the “old” (governing) RAI. On that instrument, the threshold for detention is 12 points. Serious and violent crimes, and warrant referrals, earn 12 points; other offenses earn fewer points depending on severity; and points are also gained for pending complaints, referral history and legal status. Importantly, the old RAI allows the screener to add up to 6 points in aggravation of the preliminary score for factors such as “prior non-compliance”, “domestic violence” or “more than one felony charge”. The key findings shown in Table 3 are:

- 98% of minors with scores of 12 or more points were detained
- 85% of minors with scores between 8-11 points were detained as overrides
- 43% of minors with scores between 0-7 points were detained as overrides.

The override rates for low-scoring youth (below 12) were quite high. Moreover, the vast majority of minors referred for offenses earning 6 or fewer points, but having 12 or more points on the “old” RAI, crossed the 12 point threshold due to aggravation points added to their underlying scores. These issues—overrides and aggravations—are discussed in additional detail below.

- **Detention outcomes by offense.** Table 4 shows detention outcomes by referral reason or offense, based on the application of the “old” RAI.¹ Perhaps the most notable feature here is the very low referral rate for serious/violent crimes. Only 16 of 307 referrals were for serious/violent offenses earning 12 points, and only 2 more were referred for moderately severe (8 point) crimes. In large, urban JDAI sites it is not unusual to see serious/violent crimes accounting for 15-20% of referrals, versus the 6% serious/violent crime referral rate seen here. From a public safety perspective, at least for this test period, this is good news for Pima County. The great volume of referrals in Pima County is for lower level felony cases (24% of all referrals), misdemeanors (37% of referrals) and probation violations (18% of referrals).

Detention rates exceeded 98% for every offense category except two: “Felony 4,5 6” (71% detention rate) and Misdemeanors (46% detention rate). Probation violators had a nearly 100% detention rate (54 detained out of 55 referrals). Given these consistently high detention rates, the “old” RAI does not appear to be an effective screening or triage device except in misdemeanor cases. This is due largely to the practice of aggravating lower scores to the 12 point level or higher, and to overrides, as discussed below.

- **Aggravation and Override analysis, “old” RAI.** Table 5 shows how score aggravation points and overrides affected detention outcomes using the “old” RAI. Based on their scores for offense and history factors, only 70 minors were detainable (scored at least 12 points) before aggravation or override. Another 52 minors were detained because their scores were aggravated, by adding up to six points, for listed aggravation factors. A close look at each of these 52 cases reveals a pattern of adding just enough aggravation points to hit or slightly exceed the 12 point threshold—e.g., a minor with 6 offense points, and no referral history, would get 6 aggravation points for various aggravation factors. In addition to these aggravation-detentions, another 107 minors scoring under 12 (total score, with aggravations) on the old RAI were detained as overrides. On the ‘old” form, there is no checklist of reasons for overrides—just a blank space for describing the override reason. In most of these cases, no override reason was given, but there was often a notation that a

¹ The offense categories shown in Table 4 (and throughout this analysis) are modified somewhat from the categories that appear on the “old” and “test” RAIs; for example, probation violations and misdemeanors are shown separately in this report.

supervisor had approved the detention. Where reasons were given, they tended to cite danger to others, a risk of flight, or the inability or refusal of parents to retrieve their child.

Table 6 provides additional detail on overrides, showing the number of overrides and a calculated override rate for each offense category, based on application of the “old” RAI form. The total override rate was 70% (i.e., For all minors scoring 12 or fewer points, including any aggravation points, 70% were detained as overrides). This is a very high override rate by JDAI site standards. Some of these overrides are due to the application of a “four hour rule” to this analysis—i.e., any minor detained beyond four hours was counted as a detention rather than a release. Thus, in a small number of cases where there were delays in planned releases, the outcome was counted as a detain-override (for example, there were 14 cases where youth with scores under 12 were released after 5 or 6 hours of detention, and these were counted as detention overrides for purposes of the analysis).

On the “test” RAI, overrides were not well documented. Override reasons appearing on the “old” RAI were rarely reiterated on the “test” RAI. In most of the cases where the “test” RAI indicated the occurrence of an override, the only indication was a check in the box for “Supervisor permission to detain”. This lack of strict compliance with override procedures on the “test” RAI is perhaps due to the fact that the “old” RAI, rather than the test form, governed the detention outcome during the field test.

Some observations related to particular offense groups are:

- *Misdemeanors*. All 11 minors referred on misdemeanors who had scores of 12 or higher were aggravated to or above the 12 point threshold. Another 41 misdemeanor referrals were detained as overrides.
 - *Probation violators*. The “old” RAI had no screening effect on probation violators. All but one (98%) were detained, due either to aggravation of scores above the 12 point threshold (N=15) or override handling (N=39).
- **“Old” RAI results compared to “Test” RAI results.** Table 7 compares the detention outcomes obtained using the “old” (and governing) RAI to the prospective results using the “test” RAI. The comparisons in Table 7 are adjusted to exclude overrides. In short, the “test” RAI produces a lower overall detention rate. The total detention rate using the “old” RAI (i.e, minors who score 12 or more points, excluding overrides) is 39% of referrals, whereas the total detention rate using the “new” RAI is 21% of referrals. Both instruments capture all 12 point and 8 point offenses, and all warrants and courtesy holds, as detention cases (i.e., the detention rate for these offenses is 100% using either form). The major differences appear in relation to the following offense groups:
- Felony 1, 2 and 3 offenses: The test instrument detains 8% versus 58% on the “old” RAI. The difference is due largely to aggravation of scores on the “old” RAI.
 - Felony 4, 5 and 6 offenses: The test instrument detains 9% versus 35% on the “old” RAI; again the difference is due largely to aggravations of scores on the “old” RAI.
 - Misdemeanors and Probation Violations: Based on scores alone, without aggravation or overrides, the new RAI would detain none of these juveniles. Higher detention rates using the old form, as shown in this table, are due to aggravations of scores and overrides.

The principal, detention-reducing effect of the “Test” RAI is that , in contrast to the “old” RAI, it does not allow for the liberal assignment of aggravation points. The “test” RAI limits the total number of aggravation points that can be assigned to 3 points, and ties each

aggravation point to a specific checklist factor. In addition, aggravation points on the “test” RAI are balanced by listed mitigation factors (minus 3 points maximum). On the “test” RAI, we could find only one case in the entire sample in which the underlying score was aggravated to 12 points or more using the aggravation list on the “test” RAI. Mitigation points on the “test” RAI were not a factor; only one mitigation point was assigned in a single case, and it did not affect the recommended outcome in that case.

While these observations suggest that the new RAI could be a much more restrictive detention screen, qualifying fewer children for secure detention, this impression must be tempered by noting that “test” RAI scores have not been subjected to override practice. In the absence of a local policy change, we could expect that most probation violators would continue to be detained, as in the past, by overrides of lower scores, and that a good many misdemeanor and low-level felony cases would have similar override outcomes. The need to control overrides is addressed in the “recommendations” section below.

- **Referrals and detention rates by race/ethnicity.** Tables 8-10 display referrals, county population and detention rates by race/ethnicity. As shown in Table 8, during the test period Whites were 33% of referrals, Blacks were 11% of referrals, Hispanics were 50 % of referrals, Native-Americans were 5% of referrals, and Asian/Other were 1% percent of referrals.

Compared to Pima County population rates (2003 projected population-by-race of children age 8-17, Table 9), Whites were under-represented in the referral population (33% of referrals vs. 44% of the county youth population), Blacks were over-represented (11% of referrals vs. 3% of the county youth population), Hispanics were over-represented (50% of referrals vs. 44% of the county youth population), Native-Americans were evenly represented (4% of referrals vs. 5% of the county youth population) and Asian/Others were under-represented (1% of referrals vs. 4% of the county youth population). The greatest disparity in these referral relationships appears for Blacks who were referred for detention at a rate approximately 4 times greater than their share of the county youth population.

Detention rates (percent of referrals that were detained) were fairly close for each of these racial groups. The lowest rate (50%, for Asian-Other) should be discounted because that sample (only 4 youth) was too small. Detention rates for the other racial groups fell into a zone of 67% (for Whites) to 79% (for Native Americans), with 74% as the whole-sample average detention rate. Table 10 is a detailed accounting of referrals and detention rates by race/ethnicity and offense group. It is difficult, from a review of these data, to discern any significant disparity or discriminatory treatment in relation to the detain rates shown in this test for each offense group.

- **Form completion problems.** We noted some problems in form completion, particularly in filling out the test RAI. These will need to be addressed if the “test” RAI is adopted. They include the following:
 - Serious 12 point offenses on the “old” form were, in several instances, scored as “Felony 1,2 or 3” offenses on the new form (earning only 6 points). This happened often enough to suggest either computer or human error in entering the proper offense (and point score) on the new form. This needs follow-up.
 - Some inconsistency was also observed in the scoring of particular crimes. For example, marijuana possession was scored variously as a Felony 1-3 or Felony 4-6 offense, and while this may be due to differences in the amounts possessed or other associated

behaviors, the differences were not apparent from the file material included with the RAI packets.

- Mitigation factors were almost completely ignored in completing both the old and test RAI.

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 11, 12). 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 the 10 court-ordered detentions in addition to the 227 detentions logged by minors referred for other reasons during the test period (N= 237 total detentions). Using the individual time-in-custody data, we were able to calculate the average length of stay (ALOS) and the total detention time (in bed days) for each offense group. The results are shown in Table 11.

The length of stay data were then annualized to provide estimates of the annual number of detention beds needed in Pima County for each offense subgroup. Those estimates are presented in Table 12. The bedspace estimates—while useful to show relative bed demand for various offense groups—have important limitations described in the footnote to Table 12. As stated in that footnote, we used a simple annualization method to produce these estimates rather than formal corrections projection technology. Peak demand, arrest trends, population projections and other variables affecting referral volume were not incorporated into the bed estimates in Table 12. The estimates probably understate actual bed demand because they omit, from the calculation, minors detained for four hours or less, any minor not included in the screening test sample, and continuing detention time spent by five test sample minors who were still in custody when this report was completed. Additionally, the test period may be atypical because it includes no referrals for certain serious crimes, such as homicide. Despite these limitations, the estimates are generally reliable as indicators of the proportional bed demand imposed by children in different referral and offense groups.

The length of stay analysis shows:

- The average length of stay in detention for all 227 detained minors (excluding judicial order detentions) was 13.5 days. Minors detained on violent (12 point) assaults and as courtesy holds had the longest stays; however, the small number of minors in each of these subgroups limits the utility of this information. For offense groups with enough representation to produce a stable number, the following results are shown in Table 11:
 - Minors detained on warrants stayed nearly a month on average in secure detention (ALOS of 26.2 days).
 - Minors detained on lesser felonies (6 or 3 point crimes) stayed an average of 10 to 11 days in secure detention.
 - The shortest stays applied to minors detained for misdemeanor offenses (ALOS 4.2 days)
 - Probation violators averaged two weeks in secure detention.
- Bedspace demand by offense group (Table 12):
 - Total beds needed. Based on the sample, a total of 137 detention beds are required on an annual basis to support current detention policy and practice in Pima County.

This is somewhat lower than the current (Jan-May 2005) ADP of 145 youth, as expected given the limitations of the bedspace estimate.

- Minors apprehended on warrants required the greatest share of detention beds. Warrant cases were only 17% of referrals but they consume 30% of all estimated beds needed (41 out of 137) to accommodate the annual Pima County detention load, based on the survey and current practice.
- Probation Violators required the next largest share of detention beds. These minors accounted for 18% of referrals but consume, based on the survey estimate, nearly one fourth of all detention beds needed in Pima County (24%). Strategies to control probation violator bed utilization are discussed under the recommendations below.
- Adoption of the new RAI, better control of overrides, reductions in lengths of stay and alternatives for probation violators may significantly reduce total bedspace demand in future months or years.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. The “old” (and currently used) Risk Assessment Instrument is a poor screening device that does not do an adequate job of controlling admissions to detention based on detention risk. As indicated by the test results, the “old” form produced an overall detention rate of 74%, including high detention rates for minors with lesser charges (lower level felonies, misdemeanors and probation violations). The biggest problem with the “old” instrument is the aggravation scheme which allows up to 6 points to be added to the underlying offense/history score, for a variety of broadly described factors such as “noncompliance” that are circled on the form but have no specific, individual point values. It frequently appeared, from a review of the aggravated-to-detention cases, that screening personnel were simply adding enough aggravation points to the underlying score to cross the 12 point detention threshold. Mitigation points were never assigned. Moreover, the “old” form contributes to high override rates because it is open-ended in this respect and lacks any checklist of override reasons. The old form also tends to compound points for probation violations by awarding VOP-related points in sections A, B, C and D. Probation violators were detained 54 out of 55 cases, through aggravation or overrides of scores that did not otherwise qualify for secure detention. As currently applied, the Pima County RAI does not really measure detention risk and does not produce outcomes that are consistent with those detention risks. We recommend replacing this form.

B. The test RAI is a significant improvement over the “old” RAI and should be adopted. The new form cures many of the demonstrated defects of the “old” RAI. Needless compounding of points is avoided by reducing the three history factors to two on the new form. Aggravation points are capped at 3 and are tied to specific, checked aggravation reasons; likewise, mitigation factors are capped at 3 and are on a specific checklist. Special detention reasons, such as warrants, are in a stand-alone section to avoid confusion with new crimes. Finally, override reasons are on a specific checklist, with discretion to impose an override for some other reason on a separate line. Moreover, the “test” RAI offers a better range of choices once the minor is scored, including the opportunity to consider a detention alternative for minors scoring 8-11 points.

Based on the analysis, we would expect to see detention rates remain the same as between the “old” and the “test” form for all 12 point offenses and for special detention cases. In theory, we would also expect to see fewer detentions for low-level felonies, misdemeanors and probation violations. In practice, this may not turn out to be the case if overrides in these cases are not more carefully controlled. See the discussion below on overrides, and the additional discussion on probation violations.

There may be some bugs in the programming or process of entering data on the “test” RAI. As noted in the prior discussion, in several cases 12 point offenses were selected on the “old” RAI but these showed up as Felony 1,2 or 3 (6 point) offenses on the “test” RAI. These form completion problems will need to be addressed if the new RAI is adopted.

- C. Overrides are a problem.** Too many low scoring youth were securely detained beyond four hours. The override rate (percent of youth scoring under 12 who were detained more than 4 hours) was 70% for the entire test sample . A generally accepted target for overrides, based on JDAI objectives and experience, is 15-20%. We strongly recommend that Pima 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 12 points without some other special detention reason.

Most overrides were not handled according to formal override procedure—with a reason stated or checked and with sign off by a supervisor—on either the “old” or the “test” form. This non-compliance with procedure is perhaps mitigated in about 14 cases where the release was delayed to one or two hours beyond the four-hour mark; these situations were counted as detentions and overrides in this analysis, even though they may have been considered “delayed release” events by the detention personnel involved. There may well be a need to provide updated training to staff on override procedures and form completion in override cases.

- D. Probation Violations—Pima County needs to settle on a screening and detention policy for these minors.** Risk screening had almost zero effect on minors referred for probation violations. The detention rate for these youth was 98% (54 of 55 referrals), and they accounted for 24% of all detentions in the test period. All scored fewer than 12 combined offense and history points on the governing RAI but were aggravated or overridden into secure custody. Moreover, based on the length of stay analysis, probation violators stay an average of two weeks in secure detention, and they consume a significant share—about 25 percent—of all beds occupied in the Pima County detention center. Clearly, it is the policy of the Pima County Juvenile Court Center/Probation Department to detain probation violators. Their violations range from a positive drug test, to failure to keep an appointment with the probation officer to skipping school or violating home curfew hours. The old RAI had little effect on detention outcomes for these youth, and the new RAI is likely to produce the same results unless and until Pima County can establish non-detain, alternative sanctions for probation violations. Without intermediate and graduated sanctions, the VOP detention rate will probably continue to hover around 100%, even using a new and improved RAI. Correspondingly, probation violators will continue to occupy a high number of detention beds at significant county operating cost. A number of JDAI sites have successfully developed alternatives to secure detention for probation violations. Some of these alternatives are described in Volume 9 of the Casey “Pathways to Juvenile Detention Reform” series (“Special Detention Cases”). An additional strategy for reducing bed demand and related costs for probation violators is to reduce the average length of stay—for example, based on the survey results, Pima County could reduce its detention ADP by 16 beds if the ALOS for each probation violator could be reduced from two weeks to one.

- E. Warrant cases—a productive area for reform.** Minors apprehended on warrants accounted for 17% of all detentions, and in almost every case (39 of 41), these minors were securely detained. Minors detained on warrants had some of the longest stays in custody, averaging nearly a month each (26.2 days) in secure custody. Correspondingly, they

occupied the single largest share of detention beds (41 beds) on an annual basis, imposing a high detention operating cost on county government. Warrant detentions can be controlled both by reducing warrant-related bookings and by reducing the average length of stay. 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 26 to 13 days), Pima County could reduce estimated ADP (bed demand) by approximately 20 beds. Admissions on warrants can be reduced by replicating some of the warrant and case-processing reforms adopted in other JDAI jurisdictions. In some JDAI sites, intake staff is granted a measure of discretion by the Juvenile Court to score and release minors referred on misdemeanor warrants. Other JDAI strategies to control the detention of minors referred on warrants include: 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”.

F. *Disproportionate Minority Contacts (DMC).* For the juveniles in this test sample, there is no significant evidence of DMC based on detention rates measured for each of five racial groups. Excluding the Asian/Other group (only 4 cases), detention rates by race fell into a zone of 67% to 79%, with Hispanic youth having the highest detention rate. These detention rates will need to be re-analyzed if and when the new RAI is adopted, as they may well change under those circumstances. More significant DMC disparities are found when examining referrals to detention and comparing those referral rates to the minority profile of the Pima County youth population (Tables 8, 9). Most notably, White or Anglo youth are under-represented in the arrest and referral population (33% of referrals vs. 45% of the county youth population) and Black youth are strongly over-represented at nearly four-times their share of the county youth population (11% of referrals vs. 3% of population). Native-Americans and Hispanics have referral rates that are much closer to their population shares. In general, these disparities in referral rates appear to be external to the Pima County Juvenile Court Center and Probation Department. 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. Probation Department decision-making does affect DMC handling of minors already under justice system control (e.g., on warrants and probation violations), and it remains advisable to continue scrutiny of referrals and detention decisions by race for these reasons. Moreover, it is important to note that the DMC results cited here apply only to this 25 day sample. The Pima County Juvenile Court and Probation Department should continue to monitor all referrals and detention rates by race.

G. *Adopt a monitoring plan.* The Pima County Probation Department should adopt a specific RAI monitoring plan to track the effects of implementing the revised RAI, including detention scores and outcomes—with particular attention to the override rates, score aggravation, handling of probation violators and the other problem areas discussed above. Casey advisors can help with the development and implementation of a good monitoring plan.

Table 1
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>	3	5	12	26	37	40	58	56	2	239	78%
<i>Female</i>	0	2	4	7	14	15	13	13	0	68	22%
<i>Total</i>	3	7	16	33	51	55	71	69	2	307	100%

Note: 110 (36%) were 14 years of age or less.

Table 2
Detention Outcomes—Total Sample
 (N = 307 referrals excluding 10 Court Ordered Detentions)

Total referred	No. Detained	Pct. Detained	No. released	Pct. Released
307	227	74%	80	26%

Table 3
Screening Scores by Detain/Release Outcomes (“Old” RAI)
 (N=307 referrals)

SHADED CELLS IN TABLE 3 REPRESENT OVERRIDES OF SCORES

Scores	No. Screened	No. Detained	Pct. Detained	No. Released	Pct. Released
<i>0 – 7 points</i>	117	50	43%	67	57%
<i>8 - 11 points</i>	68	57	84%	11	16%
<i>12 or more points</i>	119	117	98%	2	2%
<i>Courtesy holds</i>	3	3	100%	0	0%
TOTAL	307	227	74%	80	26%

Table 4
Referral Offense By Detention Outcome (“Old” RAI)
 (N= 307 referrals)

Points	Offense Category	Number Referred	Pct. of all referrals	Number Detained	Category Detention rate	Number Released	Category Release rate
Mand. 12 Points	<i>Homicide/Manslaughter</i>	0	0%	0	100%	0	0%
	<i>Sexual assault</i>	5	2%	5	100%	0	0%
	<i>Aggravated assault w/ injury or weapon</i>	4	1%	4	100%	0	0%
	<i>Robbery, first degree burglary</i>	2	1%	2	100%	0	0%
	<i>Possess firearm or explosives</i>	1	--	1	100%	0	0%
	<i>Arson, other</i>	7	2%	7	100%	0	0%
	<i>Warrant</i>	41	13%	39	95%	2	5%
Mand. 8 points	<i>Aggravated Assault</i>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	<i>Sex abuse</i>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	<i>Weapons offense</i>	2	1%	2	100%	0	0%
6 or fewer points	<i>Felony 1, 2 or 3</i>	24	8%	23	96%	1	4%
	<i>Felony 4, 5 or 6</i>	49	16%	35	71%	14	29%
	<i>Misdemeanor</i>	114	37%	52	46%	62	54%
	<i>Probation Violation</i>	55	18%	54	98%	1	2%
	<i>Courtesy hold</i>	3	1%	3	100%	0	0%
	TOTAL	307	100%	227	74%	80	26%

Table 5
Aggravation Analysis, "Old" RAI, By Offense Group
 (N= 227 detained minors)

Offense Category	Number detainable based on Score of 12 points or more before Aggravation	Number detained due to aggravation points pushing score to 12 or higher	Number detained as overrides of scores below 12	Total Detained in this Offense Category
<i>All Mandatory 12 point offenses</i>	60	0	0	58
<i>All Mandatory 8 point offenses</i>	1	1	0	2
<i>Felony 1, 2 or 3</i>	1	13	9	23
<i>Felony 4, 5 or 6</i>	5	12	18	35
<i>Misdemeanor</i>	0	11	41	52
<i>Probation Violation</i>	0	15	39	54
<i>Courtesy hold</i>	3	0	0	3
TOTAL	70	52	107	227

Note to table 5: The total in the bottom row, right hand column is less than the sum of the figures in this row because two minors referred on warrants were handled as "release overrides".

Table 6
Override Rates by Offense group
 (N=307 referrals)

Offense Category	Number referred	Number qualifying for release based on score	Number detained as overrides	Detain Override Rate (Col 4/Col 3)
<i>All Mandatory 12 point offenses</i>	60	0	0	0%
<i>All Mandatory 8 point offenses</i>	2	0	0	0%
<i>Felony 1, 2 or 3</i>	24	10	9	90%
<i>Felony 4, 5 or 6</i>	49	32	18	56%
<i>Misdemeanor</i>	114	103	41	40%
<i>Probation Violation</i>	55	40	39	98%
<i>Courtesy hold</i>	3	0	0	0
TOTAL	307	153	107	70%

Table 7
“Old” RAI versus “Test” RAI Detention Results
Minors Scoring 12 or more points or Special Detention Reason, Excluding Overrides,
by Referral Reason or Offense
 (N=307 referrals)

Points	Referral Reason or Offense	Total Referred	Total Detained	Number scoring 12+ points on “old” RAI	Detention rate using “old” RAI (excluding overrides)	Number scoring 12+ points (or special detention reason) on test RAI	Detention rate using test RAI (excluding overrides)
Mand. 12 points	<i>Homicide/Manslaughter</i>	0	0	0	--	0	--
	<i>Sexual Assault</i>	5	5	5	100%	5	100%
	<i>Aggravated Assault w/ injury or weapon</i>	4	4	4	100%	4	100%
	<i>Robbery or First Degree Burglary</i>	2	2	2	100%	2	100%
	<i>Possess Firearm or Explosives</i>	1	1	1	100%	1	100%
	<i>Arson/ Other</i>	7	7	7	100%	7	100%
	<i>Warrant</i>	41	39	41	100%	41	100%
Mand. 8 points	<i>Aggravated Assault</i>	0	0	0	--	0	--
	<i>Sex abuse</i>	0	0	0	--	0	--
	<i>Weapons offense</i>	2	2	2	100%	0	0%
6 or fewer points	<i>Felony 1, 2 or 3</i>	24	23	14	58%	2	8%
	<i>Felony 4, 5 or 6</i>	49	35	17	35%	0	0%
	<i>Misdemeanor</i>	114	52	12	11%	0	0%
	<i>Probation Violation</i>	55	54	15	27%	0	0%
	<i>Courtesy Hold</i>	3	3	--	100%	3	100%
	TOTAL	307	227	120	39%	65	21%

Table 8
Referrals and Detention Rates by Race/Ethnicity
 (N= 307 referrals)

	Total Referrals	Percent of Total Referrals	Total Detained	Detain Rate for this Racial Group
White (Non. Hispanic)	100	33%	67	67%
Black	33	11%	25	76%
Hispanic	154	50%	122	79%
Native American	16	5%	11	69%
Asian/ Other	4	1%	2	50%
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>307</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>227</i>	<i>74%</i>

Table 9
2003 Population of Pima County, AZ
By Race/Ethnicity for Individuals Between the Ages of 8-17

Race	Number	Percent
White (Non-Hispanic)	56,387	45%
Black	3,978	3%
Hispanic	55,565	44%
Native-American	4,739	4%
Asian/ PI/ Other	4,729	4%
<i>Total Population Age 8-17</i>	<i>125,398</i>	<i>100%</i>

Sources: U.S. Census (2000), Population Estimates for 2003, adjusted for age groups by PCJCC staff.

Table 10
Referrals and Detention Rates by Offense and Race/Ethnicity (N= 307 referrals)

Points	Offense Category	Total referred in this offense category	No. of referrals in this offense category	Offense Detain Rate –	No. of referrals in this offense category	Offense Detain Rate-	No. of referrals in this offense category	Offense Detain Rate-	No. of referrals in this offense category	Offense Detain Rate-	No. of referrals in this offense category	Offense Detain Rate-
			WHITE	WHITE	BLACK	BLACK	HISPANIC	HISPANIC	NATIVE AMER.	NATIVE AMER.	ASIAN/ OTHER	ASIAN/ OTHER
Mand. 12 points	<i>Homicide/Manslaughter</i>	0	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
	<i>Sexual Assault</i>	5	1	100%	1	100%	3	100%	0	--	0	--
	<i>Aggravated Assault w/ injury or weapon</i>	4	0	--	1	100%	3	100%	0	--	0	--
	<i>Robbery or First Degree Burglary</i>	2	2	100%	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
	<i>Possess Firearm or Explosives</i>	1	1	100%	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
	<i>Arson/ Other</i>	7	2	100%	0	--	5	100%	0	--	0	--
	<i>Warrant</i>	41	11	100%	3	100%	26	92%	1	100%	0	--
Mand. 8 points	<i>Aggravated Assault</i>	0	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
	<i>Sex abuse</i>	0	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
	<i>Weapons offense</i>	2	0	--	1	100%	1	100%	0	--	0	--
6 or fewer points	<i>Felony 1, 2 or 3</i>	24	5	100%	3	100%	13	92%	3	100%	0	--
	<i>Felony 4, 5 or 6</i>	49	17	59%	3	67%	26	81%	3	66%	0	--
	<i>Misdemeanor</i>	114	47	45%	15	53%	43	47%	6	33%	3	33%
	<i>Probation Violation</i>	55	14	100%	5	100%	32	97%	3	100%	1	100%
	<i>Courtesy Hold</i>	3	0	--	1	100%	2	100%	0	--	0	--
	TOTAL	307	100	67%	33	76%	154	79%	16	69%	4	50%

Table 11
Average Length of Stay and Detention Bed Days Utilized, by Referral Offense
for all minors detained in test period including court ordered detentions
 (N=237 detained minors)

Points	Offense Category	Number Detained	Percent of all Detentions	Average Length of Stay (in Days)	Number of Bed Days Utilized by test period detainees in this offense group
Mand. 12 points	<i>Homicide/Manslaughter</i>	0	0%	--	--
	<i>Sexual Assault</i>	5	1%	6.6	33
	<i>Aggravated Assault w/ injury or weapon</i>	4	1%	30.3	121
	<i>Robbery or First Degree Burglary</i>	2	1%	9.0	18
	<i>Possess Firearm or Explosives</i>	1	1%	3.8	4
	<i>Arson/ Other</i>	7	3%	10.4	73
	<i>Warrant</i>	39	17%	26.2	1,023
Mand. 8 points	<i>Aggravated Assault</i>	0	0%	--	--
	<i>Sex abuse</i>	0	0%	--	--
	<i>Weapons offense</i>	2	1%	22.8	46
6 or fewer points	<i>Felony 1, 2 or 3</i>	23	10%	10.0	229
	<i>Felony 4, 5 or 6</i>	35	15%	11.6	404
	<i>Misdemeanor</i>	52	22%	4.2	217
	<i>Probation Violation</i>	54	23%	14.6	790
	<i>Courtesy Holds</i>	3	1%	59.9	180
	SUBTOTAL	227	96%	13.8	3,138
	<i>Court ordered detentions</i>	10	4%	6.2	62
	TOTAL	237	100%	13.5	3,200

Table 12
Estimated Annual Detentions, Length Of Stay and Detention Facility Beds
Needed in Pima County For Specific Offense and Referral Categories
 (Based On March/April 2005 RAI Survey Results, and including Court-ordered detentions)

Points	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 *
Mand. 12 points	<i>Homicide/Manslaughter</i>	0	0%	--	--	
	<i>Sexual Assault</i>	73	1%	6.6	482	2
	<i>Aggravated Assault w/ injury or weapon</i>	58	1%	30.3	1,767	5
	<i>Robbery or First Degree Burglary</i>	29	1%	9.0	263	1
	<i>Possess Firearm or Explosives</i>	15	--	3.8	58	1
	<i>Arson/ Other</i>	102	3%	10.4	1,066	3
	<i>Warrant</i>	569	17%	26.2	14,936	41
Mand. 8 points	<i>Aggravated Assault</i>	0	0%	--	--	--
	<i>Sex abuse</i>	0	0%	--	--	--
	<i>Weapons offense</i>	29	1%	22.8	672	2
6 or fewer points	<i>Felony 1, 2 or 3</i>	336	10%	10.0	3,343	10
	<i>Felony 4, 5 or 6</i>	511	15%	11.6	5,928	17
	<i>Misdemeanor</i>	759	22%	4.2	3,168	9
	<i>Probation Violation</i>	788	24%	14.6	11,534	32
	<i>Courtesy Holds</i>	44	1%	59.9	2,628	8
	SUBTOTAL	3,313	96%	13.8	45,845	134
	<i>Court ordered detentions</i>	146	4%	6.2	905	3
	TOTAL	3,459	100%	13.5	46,750	137 *

* All bed figures in last column are rounded up from fractional beds to the next whole bed.

NOTES ON LIMITATIONS OF TABLE 12: The figures in this table are estimates of annual detentions and beds needed, based on 14.6 times the actual activity measured during the 25 day RAI test conducted March/April 2005. These annualized figures are not 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 (137 beds) is lower than the current Pima County detention ADP of 145 minors (for January-May 2005). The difference between the projected bed need (based on the survey) and the actual occupancy may be explained by factors including any of the following: a) bedspace occupied by minors released within four hours was not counted in this estimate, b) bedspace needs projected here may be understated due to omission from the test sample of minors who were detained but not screened and reported to the RAI test analyst, c) five minors were still detained when this report was done, and their additional detention time is not included in these calculations, d) perhaps atypically, no minors were referred in the test month for some of the more serious 8 and 12 point offenses, such as homicide/manslaughter. Finally, 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.

Pima County Juvenile Court Center Probation Department
 DETENTION RISK ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT- TEST FORM- MARCH/APRIL 2005

Name _____ DOB _____ JC# _____
 Referral Date _____ Referral Time _____ Ethnicity _____ Sex: M F
 Address _____ City _____ State _____
 Zip Code _____ School _____ Primary Language: _____
 Primary Referral Offense: _____ Complaint # _____
 DRAF completed by: _____

A. MOST SERIOUS CURRENT OFFENSE (Select one only)

Mandatory 12 Point Offenses:

- First and Second Degree Murder 12
- Driving Under the Influence 12
- Possession of Firearm 12
- Negligent Homicide..... 12
- Manslaughter 12
- Sexual Assault or Molestation 12
- Armed Robbery 12
- First Degree Burglary..... 12
- Escape From Correctional Institution..... 12
- Arson of an Occupied Structure..... 12
- Aggravated Assault (serious physical injury or deadly weapon)..... 12
- Aggravated Robbery..... 12
- Kidnapping..... 12
- Possession of Explosives 12
- Drive-by Shooting 12

MANDATORY 8 POINT OFFENSES:

- Aggravated Assault (felony 1,2 or 3) 8
- Deadly Weapon on School Campus 8
- Carrying A Concealed Weapon (Other than firearm)..... 8
- Sexual Abuse..... 8

ALL OTHER OFFENSES:

- Felony Class 1,2,3 6
- Felony Class 4,5,6 3
- Misdemeanor or Violation of Probation/Condition of Release 1 _____ OFFENSE POINTS

B. OTHER PRIOR PENDING REFERRALS

- Prior Felony Arrest Pending Petition..... 3
- Pending Misdemeanor or Violation of Probation 1 _____ REFERRAL POINTS

Subtotal: Max 3 Points

C. LEGAL STATUS AND COURT HISTORY

- Active Probation/JIPS/Parole 3
- Adjudication last 12 months in Pima County 2
- Prior adjudication, 12-36 months Pima County or last 36 months other jurisdiction..... 1 _____ HISTORY POINTS

Subtotal: Max 3 Points

D. AGGRAVATING FACTORS (Add all that apply, up to 3 points)

- Multiple felony charges for this referral 1
- Intoxicated or evidence of active substance abuse 1
- History of Fire Setting or Animal Cruelty 1 _____ AGGRAVATION POINTS
- Other _____

