

PSCC OFFICERS

CHAIR, JOHN CLAGUE
Lay Citizen

VICE CHAIR, FAYE STEWART
Commissioner (Rural)

VOTING MEMBERS

ROBERT LEHNER
Chief of Police

RUSS BURGER
Sheriff

DOUG HARCLEROD
District Attorney

MARYANN BEARDEN
State Court Judge

GREG HAZARABEDIAN
Public Defender

SUSAN MCFARLAND
Acting Community
Corrections Manager

BOBBY GREEN
Commissioner (Metro)

LISA SMITH
Youth Services Director

ROB ROCKSTROH
Health & Human Services
Director (Mental Health)

KAREN GILLETTE
Public Health Manager

JENNIFER SOLOMON
Eugene City Councilor

HILLARY WYLIE
Springfield City Councilor

CHUCK SPIES
Lowell City Administrator

GRETCHEN PIERCE
Lay Citizen

TIM LAUE
Lay Citizen

PAUL SOLOMON
Lay Citizen

NON-VOTING MEMBERS

MIKE BLOOM
OSP Representative

STEVE HARDER
Oregon Youth Authority

JEFF SPARTZ
County Administrator



The Public Safety Coordinating Council's Criminal Justice System Report Card Data Book

January 2008

Please Note:

When a new chart was added which includes updated data, a ★ was placed by the Figure title.

When the new data resulted in a change in the grade, a ★ was added next to the new grade.

Where no new data was available, no grade was given for 2008.

For 2006 and 2008 PSCC Adult and Juvenile *Criminal Justice System Report Cards*
please visit www.lcog.org/lgs/safety.html

Table of Contents

Public Safety Coordinating Council Vision and Guiding Principles	1
2008 Report Card on the Criminal Justice System in Lane County, Oregon – Background	2
Grading System for the Report Card	3
Report Card At-a-Glance	4
Report Card Data: Part A – Adult and Combined Criminal Justice Data	5
I. Crime and Safety	7
○ Reported Crime	7
● Figure 1.1 Rate of Reported Serious, Violent Crime per 10,000 Population	7
● Figure 1.2 Rate of Reported Serious Property Crime per 10,000 Population	7
● Figure 1.3 Serious Reported Crime in 2004 per 1,000 Population – Lane County’s Rank Vs. 252 Metro Counties 100,000 to 1,000,000 Population	8
○ Assault, Drug, and Alcohol Crimes	9
● Figure 1.4 Adult Assault Arrest Rate per 10,000 Adults.....	9
● Figure 1.5 Adult Drug Abuse Arrest Rate per 10,000 Adults.....	9
● Figure 1.6 DUII Arrests per 10,000 Population	10
○ Domestic Violence.....	11
● Figure 1.7 Lane County Reported DV Assaults per 10,000 Population	11
○ Child Abuse.....	12
● Figure 1.8 Child Abuse Victimization Rate per 10,000 Children Under Age 18	12
○ Traffic Accidents	13
● Figure 1.9 Traffic Injury Accidents (Excluding Fatal Crashes) per 10,000 Population	13
● Figure 1.10 Fatal Crashes per 10,000 Population	14
● Figure 1.11 Percent of Fatal Crashes Involving Alcohol.....	14
○ Victimization.....	15
● Figure 1.12 Percent of Residents Who Report They or Someone In Their Household Has Been A Victim of Crime.....	15
II. Resources and Capacity	17
○ Number of Officers	17
● Figure 2.1 Number of Officers per 1,000 Population.....	17

○ Jail Capacity	18
• Figure 2.2 Jail Beds Occupied per 1,000 Reported Crimes.....	18
• Figure 2.3 Funded Jail Beds per 1,000 Reported Crimes	18
○ Custody and Overcrowding Early Releases	19
• Figure 2.4 Built vs. Funded Beds	19
• Figure 2.5 Built vs. Funded Beds By Facility for 2005.....	19
• Figure 2.6 Releases Triggered by Overcrowding as Percent of Lodgings.....	20
○ District Attorney Intakes per Lawyer.....	21
• Figure 2.7 Total DA Intakes per Lawyer	21
• Figure 2.8 DA Felony Intakes per Lawyer.....	21
• Figure 2.9 Number of Lawyers Needed in DA’s Office	21
○ District Attorney Prosecution Rates.....	22
• Figure 2.10 Felony Jury Cases – Prosecution Rate per 1,000 Population Comparable Sized Counties – 250,000 to 400.000 Population.....	22
• Figure 2.11 Felony Resolved Cases – Prosecution Rate per 1,000 Population Comparable Sized Counties – 250,000 to 400.000 Population.....	22
○ Probation Officer Caseloads.....	23
• Figure 2.12 Average PO Caseload Size	23
III.Efficient and Effective Use of Resources	25
○ Arrests per Officer	25
• Figure 3.1 Rate of Arrests per Officer – Violent Crime	25
• Figure 3.2 Rate of Arrests per Officer – Serious Property Crime.....	25
○ Arrests to Reports	26
• Figure 3.3 Rate of Arrests to Reports for Violent Crimes	26
• Figure 3.4 Rate of Arrests to Reports for Property Crimes	26
○ Successful Prosecutions.....	27
• Figure 3.5 Percent of Convictions Out of Resolved Felony Cases.....	27
• Figure 3.6 Percent of Convictions Out of Resolved Misdemeanor Cases.....	27
○ Speedy Trials	28
• Figure 3.7 Percent of State Court Felony Cases Completed Within 180 Days.....	28

• Figure 3.6 Percent of State Court Misdemeanor Cases Completed Within 180 Days.....	28
IV. Justice and Accountability	29
○ Failure To Appear	29
• Figure 4.1 Percent of Court Events Where Defendants Fail to Appear.....	29
• Figure 4.2 Percent of Individuals Who Fail to Appear.....	29
○ Failures on Supervision	30
• Figure 4.3 Three Year Re-offense Rate for Offenders on Post-Prison Supervision.....	30
• Figure 4.4 Three Year Re-offense Rate for Offenders on Probation Supervision.....	30
○ Driving Under the Influence of Intoxicants (DUII) Enforcement.....	31
• Figure 4.5 DUII Enforcement Index	31
○ Average Sentence and Supervision Length	32
• Figure 4.6 Average Prison Sentences in Months for Felonies.....	32
• Figure 4.7 Average Probation in Months.....	33
• Figure 4.8 Average Jail Sentences in Months for Felonies.....	34
Report Card Data: Part B – Juvenile Data.....	35
I. Crime and Safety	37
○ Juvenile Referrals and Arrests	37
• Figure 1.1 Juvenile Rate of Criminal Referral to Juvenile Services per 1,000 Youth Age 17 and Under.....	37
• Figure 1.2 Juvenile Arrest Rate per 10,000 Youth Age 10-17.....	37
• Figure 1.3 Juvenile Violent Crime Arrest Rate per 10,000 Youth.....	38
• Figure 1.4 Juvenile Drug Abuse Arrest Rate per 10,000 Youth.....	39
• Figure 1.5 Juvenile Serious Property Crime Arrest Rate per 10,000 Youth	39
○ Dropouts	40
• Figure 1.6 Percent of Students Dropping Out of School	40
○ Drug and Alcohol Abuse	41
• Figure 1.7 Percent of Juveniles Who Report Marijuana Use in Last 30 Days – 8 th Grade.....	41
• Figure 1.8 Percent of Juveniles Who Report Marijuana use in Last 30 Days – 11 th Grade.....	41
• Figure 1.9 Percent of Juveniles Who Report Binge Drinking in the Last 30 Days – 8 th Grade	42
• Figure 1.10 Percent of Juveniles Who Report Binge Drinking in the Last 30 Days – 11 th Grade.....	42

II. Resources and Capacity.....	43
○ Juvenile Detention Capacity	43
• Figure 2.1 Lane County Department of Youth Services Juvenile Bed Resources – Local and State Beds Allocated to Lane County.....	43
• Figure 2.2 Built vs. Funded Beds	44
III. Efficient and Effective Use of Resources	45
○ Juvenile Re-offenses.....	45
• Figure 3.1 Percent of Juvenile Offenders Who Did Not Re-offend Within 12 Months.....	45
• Figure 3.2 Percent of Juvenile Offenders With 1-2 New Referrals Within 12 Months.....	46
○ Chronic Juvenile Offenders.....	47
• Figure 3.3 Chronic Juvenile Offenders – Those With Three Or More Referrals Within 12 Months	47
○ Re-offenses and Tracking Time	48
• Figure 3.4 Juvenile Re-offenses At 36 Months By Year	48
IV. Justice and Accountability.....	49
○ System Capacity	49
• Figure 4.1 Lane County Juveniles Released From Detention Early	49

Public Safety Coordinating Council Vision and Guiding Principles

Vision Statement

We will live in a safe community supported by a safety and justice system that works together to focus on prevention and restoration, while balancing intervention and enforcement. The system will be built on a solid foundation of constitutional principles, statutory laws and community values which honor and promote personal responsibility, family and neighborhood involvement, and trust among people and institutions.

Guiding Principles

- *We will prevent crime by promoting conditions, behaviors, and individual and community attitudes that result in a safe community.*
- *We will hold youth and adult offenders accountable and employ sanctions which fit the circumstances of the crime and the offender.*
- *We will promote the rights of victims and the community to be compensated and restored.*
- *We will provide opportunities for skill training, rehabilitation, and reintegration of offenders into the community.*
- *We will assist community members to understand and accept their responsibility to contribute to and maintain a safe and just society.*
- *We will coordinate the programs and activities of governmental and private agencies that affect community safety and justice, and will ensure agencies work in partnership with the business community and citizens.*
- *We will make effective community safety decisions based on research data from a comprehensive information management system.*
- *We will support the rights of all individuals to a fair and non-discriminatory legal process.*

2008 Report Card on the Criminal Justice System in Lane County, Oregon – Background

Why Produce a Report Card?

As in locales across the United States, 50-70% of most local jurisdiction budgets in Lane County are allocated to the criminal justice system. This Report Card is designed to report the progress of the criminal justice system in improving services to the community. This project was developed by the Public Safety Coordinating Council (PSCC) to address one of their Guiding Principles: *We will assist community members to understand and accept their responsibility to contribute to and maintain a safe and just society.*

The Report Card is designed to create a forum for the PSCC to report to the public about safety in the community. In addition, it is intended to be a valuable tool for policy makers and community planners to monitor and improve performance.

The Process for Developing the Report Card

The Report Card was developed by the PSCC Public Information Task Force and adopted by the full PSCC. The Task Force, staffed by Lane Council of Governments, determined measures and collected longitudinal and baseline data for comparison. This is the second Report Card, produced and distributed so the community can track system progress.

Criminal Justice System

The local criminal justice system in Lane County includes: nine law enforcement agencies; four primary public safety answering points (9-1-1 and dispatch centers); the county jail in Eugene; three small city jails; district attorney; public defender;

probation and post-prison supervision; State Circuit Court and Eugene and Springfield municipal courts; adult treatment and transitional services; juvenile services; juvenile court; shelter; and juvenile educational and treatment services.

Information on Lane County, Oregon

Lane County has a population of **343,140** people living in a geographic area of 4,618 square miles – roughly the size of the state of Connecticut. The county stretches from the summit of the 10,000 foot Cascade Mountains, through the tree covered Willamette Valley prairie and wetlands, over the 6,000 foot Coast Range to the Pacific

Ocean. Lane is an urban/rural county with more than half the residents (60%) living in Eugene and Springfield, the second largest urban area in the state.

Approximately 10% live in small cities and the remaining 30% live in unincorporated areas

scattered around the county. A total of 1,433 miles of county, 918 miles of city, and 484 miles of state maintained roadways wind along rivers, lakes, and the two mountain ranges in this starkly changing geography, connecting widely separated small cities and the urban core.



Grading System for the Report Card

Data were chosen as indicators for each category that are representative of the issues and, where possible, are updated annually and have comparable state and national data available. Some data that would make excellent indicators are not collected.

Each category and the indicators included in each category are assigned grades. Grades are determined by comparing Lane County's trend and its current rate over the last seven years of available data to the trend and current rate of other geographic areas with comparable data.

- A Trend and current rate substantially better than comparison geographic areas
- B Trend and current rate better than comparison geographic areas
- C Trend and current rate roughly equal to comparison geographic areas
- D Trend and current rate worse than comparison geographic areas
- F Trend and current rates substantially worse than comparison geographic areas

A plus (+) is added to the grade if the trend and current rate have improved over the last three years of available data compared to the last seven years.

A minus (-) is added to the grade if the trend and current rate have worsened over the last three years of available data compared to the last seven years.

Grades of "F" are not eligible for either a plus or a minus.

Report Card At-a-Glance

Part A – Adult Criminal Justice System Indicators

I. Crime and Safety

Grade 2006: B-

Grade 2008: B-

- Reported Crime
- Assault, Drug, and Alcohol Crimes
- Domestic Violence
- Child Abuse
- Traffic Accidents
- Victimization

II. Resources and Capacity

Grade 2006: F

Grade 2008: F

- Number of Officers
- Jail Capacity
- Custody and Overcrowding Releases
- District Attorney Intakes per Lawyer
- District Attorney Prosecution Rates
- Probation Officer Caseloads

III. Efficient and Effective Use of Resources

Grade 2006: A

Grade 2008: B

- Arrests per Officer
- Arrests to Reports
- Successful Prosecutions
- Speedy Trials
- Alternatives to Incarceration

IV. Justice and Accountability

Grade 2006: F

Grade 2008: D

- Failure to Appear (FTA) for Court Events
- Failures on Supervision
- Driving Under the Influence of Intoxicants Enforcement
- Average Sentence and Supervision Length

Part B – Juvenile Criminal Justice System Indicators

I. Crime and Safety

Grade 2006: D+

Grade 2008: D+

- Juvenile Referrals and Arrests
- Dropouts
- Drug and Alcohol Abuse

II. Resources and Capacity

Grade 2006: F

Grade 2008: F

- Juvenile Detention Capacity

III. Efficient and Effective Use of Resources

Grade 2006: C+

Grade 2008: C-

- Juvenile Re-offenses
- Chronic Juvenile Offenders
- Re-offenses and Tracking Time

IV. Justice and Accountability

Grade 2006: F

Grade 2008: F

- Lane County Juveniles Released From Detention Early

Report Card Data: Part A – Adult and Combined Criminal Justice Data


Category I: Crime and Safety

Grade 2006: B- Grade 2008: B-

Crime and Safety includes: reported crime; adult assault; drug, and alcohol arrests; domestic violence; child abuse; traffic accidents; and victimization.

- Reported Crime.


★Figure 1.1 Rate of Reported Serious, Violent Crime per 10,000 Population



Source: FBI, *Crime in the United States*

Grade 2006: A- Grade 2008: B★

★Figure 1.2 Rate of Reported Serious Property Crime per 10,000 Population




Source: FBI, *Crime in the United States*

Grade 2006: C- Grade 2008: D-★

The figure below shows Lane County's ranking for serious crimes when measured against other metropolitan counties in the United States. For instance, Lane County is in the 98th percentile in Motor Vehicle Theft, meaning only 2% of the counties had a motor vehicle theft rate higher than Lane County's. Lane County was in the 94th percentile in 2004.


**★Figure 1.3 Serious Reported Crime in 2005 per 100,000 Population
Lane County's Rank Among 259 Metropolitan Counties of 100,000 to 1,000,000 Population**



Source: FBI, *Crime in the United States*

○ Assault, Drug, and Alcohol Crimes.


★ Figure 1.4 Adult Assault Arrest Rate per 10,000 Adults



Source: Easy Access to FBI Arrest Statistics

Grade 2006: D+ Grade 2008: C★


★ Figure 1.5 Adult Drug Abuse Arrest Rate per 10,000 Adults



Source: Easy Access to FBI Arrest Statistics

Grade 2006: F Grade 2008: F

★ Figure 1.6 DUII Arrests per 10,000 Population




Source: Easy Access to FBI Statistics

Grade 2006: B- Grade 2008: F★

○ Domestic Violence.

★Figure 1.7 Lane County Reported DV Assaults per 10,000 Population




Source: Area Information Records System

Grade 2006: A- Grade: A-

○ Child Abuse.

★Figure 1.8 Child Abuse Victimization Rate per 10,000 Children Under Age 18



Note: Reporting period changed to Federal Fiscal Year in 2003 to conform to federal reporting requirements.


Source: Lane and Oregon – DHS: *The Status of Children in Oregon’s Child Protection System 2004*

Source: US – *National Clearinghouse on Child Abuse and Neglect Information: Child Maltreatment 1996-2003*

Grade 2006: D+ Grade 2008: A-★

○ Traffic Accidents.

★ Figure 1.9 Traffic Injury Accidents (Excluding Fatal Crashes) per 10,000 Population




Source: Lane and Oregon - Oregon Department of Transportation

Source: US - US DOT, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Traffic Safety Facts Annual Reports

Grade 2006: A Grade 2008: A-★

★Figure 1.10 Fatal Crashes per 100,000 Population




Source: Lane and Oregon – Oregon Department of Transportation

Source: US – US DOT, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Fatality Analysis Reporting System

Grade 2006: B- Grade 2008: B-

★Figure 1.11 Percent of Alcohol Involved Crash Fatalities



Source: US DOT, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Fatality Analysis Reporting System

Grade 2006: A Grade 2008: B-★

o **Victimization.** Few countywide surveys have been done to collect data from community members on victimization. Two Lane County public safety polls, however, did include questions on victimization, asking, “Have you, or anyone in your household, been a victim of a crime in Lane County?” Responses are summarized in the table below.

Figure 1.12 Percent of Residents Who Report They or Someone In Their Household Has Been A Victim of Crime

Response	1999	2005
Lane County	54%	53%

*Source: Lane County – Lane County Voter Survey, Community Safety and Justice, June 1999, Moore Information Public Opinion Research
Lane County Public Safety District Survey, March 2005, Lindholm Research*


Category II: Resources and Capacity

Grade 2006: F Grade 2008: F

Resources and Capacity includes: number of officers; jail capacity; custody and overcrowding releases from Lane County Adult Corrections; District Attorney intakes per lawyer; District Attorney prosecution rates; and Probation Officer caseloads.

- o Number of Officers.

★Figure 2.1 Number of Officers per 1,000 Population



Note: Number of Officers includes all law enforcement officers in the county including State Police stationed in Lane County


Source: Lane and Oregon - Law Enforcement Data System, Uniform Crime Report

Source: US – FBI, Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted

Grade 2006: F Grade 2008: F

○ Jail Capacity.

★Figure 2.2 Jail Beds Occupied per 1,000 Reported Crimes



Note: The number of jail beds occupied used in this calculation is a one-day snapshot of beds occupied at the Lane County Jail, Forest Work Camp, and Community Corrections Center.


Source: Lane County Sheriff's Office

Source: US – Bureau of Justice Statistics, Prisoner and Jail Inmates at Midyear

Grade 2006: F

Grade 2008: F

★Figure 2.3 Funded Jail Beds per 1,000 Reported Crimes



Note: The number of funded jail beds does not include Forest Work Camp and Community Corrections Center beds in order to utilize data comparable with the state data.

Source: Lane County Sheriff's Office


Source: Oregon - Oregon Jail Managers Association, Washington County Sheriff

Grade 2006: C

Grade 2008: F★

○ Custody and Overcrowding Releases.

★ Figure 2.4 Built vs. Funded Beds



Source: Lane County Sheriff's Office

Figure 2.5 Built vs. Funded Beds By Facility for 2007

2007	Jail	CCC	FWC
Funded Beds	400	93	100
Built Beds	507	122	125
% Operated	79%	76%	80%

Source: Lane County Sheriff's Office

★Figure 2.6 Releases Triggered By Overcrowding as a Percent of Lodgings




Note: “Percent of Lodgings” is the number of inmates released as a percent of all inmates housed at that time in the Lane County Jail.

Source: Matrix Summit, Lane County Sheriff's Office, 2003

Grade 2006: F Grade 2008: F

○ District Attorney Intakes per Lawyer.


★Figure 2.7 Total DA Intakes per Lawyer



Source: DA's office; DACMS

Grade 2006: F Grade 2008: C+★

★Figure 2.8 DA Felony Intakes per Lawyer



Source: DA's office; DACMS

Grade 2006: F Grade 2008: F


Figure 2.9 Number of Lawyers Needed in DA's Office

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Number of Lawyers	23	23	23	24	25	25	25	26	26	26	26	25	23	22
FTE Needed	22	22	22	24	27	27	31	31	31	35	34	32	33	32
% Staffed (Lawyers/FTE Needed)	106%	105%	105%	102%	92%	93%	82%	83%	84%	75%	77%	78%	71%	68%

Source: APRI study, DACMS


○ District Attorney Prosecution Rates.

★ Figure 2.10 Felony Jury Cases
 Prosecution Rate per 1,000 Population
 Comparable Sized Counties – 250,000 to 400,000 Population



Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics Prosecutors' Office Survey
 Grade 2006: F Grade 2008: F

★ Figure 2.11 Felony Resolved Cases
 Prosecution Rate per 1,000 Population
 Comparable Sized Counties – 250,000 to 400,000 Population



Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics Prosecutors' Office Survey
 Grade 2006: B Grade 2008: B

- **Probation Officer Caseloads.** Trend data is not available for this item.

Figure 2.12 Average PO Caseload Size

	2003 Average Caseload Size
Lane	100
Oregon	75

Source: Multnomah County Community Justice Department Survey of Community Corrections Directors in August 2003

Grade 2006: F


Category III: Efficient and Effective Use of Resources

Grade 2006: A Grade 2008: B★

Efficient and Effective Use of Resources includes: arrests per officer; rate of reports to arrests; successful prosecutions; speedy trials; and alternatives to incarceration. Data is not collected or reported to measure the number of criminal cases not being investigated or filed due to lack of resources.

○ **Arrests per Officer.**


**★ Figure 3.1 Rate of Arrests per Officer
Violent Crime**



Source: Lane and Oregon – Law Enforcement Data System, Uniform Crime Report
Source: US – FBI, Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted;
Easy Access to FBI Arrest Statistics

Grade 2006: A Grade 2008: B★

**★ Figure 3.2 Rate of Arrests per Officer
Serious Property Crime**




Source: Lane and Oregon – Law Enforcement Data System, Uniform Crime Report
Source: US – FBI, Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted;
Easy Access to FBI Arrest Statistics

Grade 2006: A Grade 2008: A-★

○ Arrests to Reports.


★Figure 3.3 Rate of Arrests to Reports for Violent Crimes



Sources: FBI, *Crime in the United States, 2003*; *Easy Access to FBI Arrest Statistics*

Grade 2006: A Grade 2008: A-★

★Figure 3.4 Rate of Arrests to Reports for Property Crimes




Sources: FBI, *Crime in the United States, 2003*; *Easy Access to FBI Arrest Statistics*

Grade 2006: A Grade 2008: A-★

○ Speedy Trials.

★ Figure 3.5 Percent of State Court Felony Cases Completed Within 180 Days




Note: Oregon goal is 98%.

Source: Oregon Circuit Court

Grade 2006: B Grade 2008: B+★

★ Figure 3.6 Percent of State Court Misdemeanor Cases Completed Within 180 Days



Note: Oregon goal is 98%.

Source: Oregon Circuit Court

Grade 2006: B- Grade 2008: C+★


Category IV: Justice and Accountability

Grade 2006: F Grade 2008: D★

Justice and Accountability includes: failure to appear; failures on supervision; Driving Under the Influence of Intoxicants enforcement; and average sentence and supervision length.

- Failure to Appear (FTA).

★Figure 4.1 Percent of Court Events Where Defendant Fail To Appear




Source: PCAIRS

Grade 2006: F

Grade 2008: F

★Figure 4.2 Percent of Individuals Who Fail To Appear




Source: PCAIRS

Grade 2006: F

Grade 2008: F

○ Failures on Supervision.

★Figure 4.3 Three Year Re-offense Rate for Felony Offenders on Parole/Post-Prison Supervision




Note: The Oregon goal is no more than 31%.

Source: Oregon Department of Corrections

Grade 2006: D+ **Grade 2008: D-★**

★Figure 4.4 Three Year Re-offense Rate for Felony Offenders on Probation Supervision




Note: The Oregon goal is no more than 23%.

Source: Oregon Department of Corrections

Grade 2006: F **Grade 2008: D+★**

- **Driving Under the Influence of Intoxicants (DUII) Enforcement.** The DUII Enforcement Index is the ratio of the number of DUII arrests to the number of drivers in fatal crashes with any level of blood-alcohol concentration.

★Figure 4.5 DUII Enforcement Index



Source: DUII Arrests: Easy Access to FBI Arrest Statistics

Source: Drivers with any BAC in Fatal Accidents: US DOT, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Fatality Analysis Reporting System

Grade 2006: B- Grade 2008: A★

○ Average Sentence and Supervision Length.

Figure 4.6 Average Prison Sentences in Months for Felonies.

i. All offenses	1998	2000	2002
Lane	14	34	41
Oregon	13	35	36
US	57	55	53

ii. Violent offenses	1998	2000	2002
Lane	52	68	95
Oregon	45	66	70
US	100	91	84

iii. Property offenses	1998	2000	2002
Lane	6	27	29
Oregon	7	20	19
US	44	42	41

iv. Drug offenses	1998	2000	2002
Lane	2	17	17
Oregon	5	16	17
US	47	47	48

Source: Lane and Oregon – Oregon Criminal Justice Commission
 Source: US – BJS, State Court Sentencing of Convicted Felons 2002

Figure 4.7 Average Probation in Months.

i. All offenses	1998	2000	2002
Lane	26	26	27
Oregon	25	25	27
US	41	38	38

ii. Violent offenses	1998	2000	2002
Lane	40	41	41
Oregon	40	40	41
US	52	44	43

iii. Property offenses	1998	2000	2002
Lane	26	25	28
Oregon	25	25	26
US	39	38	37

iv. Drug offenses	1998	2000	2002
Lane	23	23	23
Oregon	22	21	22
US	38	36	36

*Source: Lane and Oregon – Oregon Criminal Justice Commission
 Source: US – BJS, State Court Sentencing of Convicted Felons 2002*

Figure 4.8 Average Jail Sentences in Months for Felonies.

i. All offenses	1998	2000	2002
Lane	1	3	1
Oregon	1	2	1
US	6	6	7

ii. Violent offenses	1998	2000	2002
Lane	2	3	3
Oregon	2	2	2
US	7	7	8

iii. Property offenses	1998	2000	2002
Lane	1	6	2
Oregon	1	3	1
US	5	6	7

iv. Drug offenses	1998	2000	2002
Lane	1	1	1
Oregon	1	2	1
US	5	6	6

*Source: Lane and Oregon – Oregon Criminal Justice Commission
 Source: US – BJS, State Court Sentencing of Convicted Felons 2002*


Report Card Data: Part B – Juvenile Data

Category I: Crime and Safety
Grade 2006: D+ Grade 2008: D+

Crime and Safety includes: juvenile referrals and arrests; dropouts; and drug and alcohol abuse.


○ Juvenile Referrals and Arrests.

★ **Figure 1.1 Juvenile Rate of Criminal Referral to Juvenile Services per 1,000 Youth Age 17 and Under**




Source: Lane County Department of Youth Services, Juvenile Justice Data 2003
Grade 2006: C Grade 2008: C

★ **Figure 1.2 Juvenile Arrest Rate per 10,000 Youth Age 10-17**



Source: Easy Access to FBI Arrest Statistics
Grade 2006: C Grade 2008: D+★


★Figure 1.3 Juvenile Violent Crime Arrest Rate per 10,000 Youth



Source: Easy Access to FBI Arrest Statistics

Grade 2006: D+ Grade 2008: C-★


★Figure 1.4 Juvenile Drug Abuse Arrest Rate per 10,000 Youth



Source: Easy Access to FBI Arrest Statistics

Grade 2006: F Grade 2008: F

★Figure 1.5 Juvenile Serious Property Crime Arrest Rate per 10,000 Youth




Source: Easy Access to FBI Arrest Statistics

Grade 2006: D- Grade 2008: D+★

- **Dropouts.** Lane County's Dropout rate is lower than the state's and the nation's.

★ **Figure 1.6 Percent of Students Dropping Out of School**



Note: Prior to 1997, students receiving a GED were counted as drop-outs


Source: Lane and Oregon - Oregon Department of Education, Early Leave Report. As cited by Oregon Progress Board, Oregon Benchmarks 2003 County Data Book

Source: US - Annie E. Casey Foundation, KIDS COUNT

Grade 2006: B+ Grade 2008: B+

○ **Drug and Alcohol Abuse.** Lane County exceeded the state and US rates for 2001-03 for percent of 8th graders reporting marijuana use in the last 30 days and still exceeds the US rate. At the 11th grade level, Lane exceeded both state and US rates for 2003 but the Lane, State, and US rates were virtually identical for 2001 and 2005. This is self report data from the Oregon Healthy Teens Survey.

★ **Figure 1.7 Percent of Juveniles Who Report Marijuana Use in Last 30 Days – 8th Grade**




Source: Lane and Oregon – Oregon Healthy Teens Survey

Source: US – Monitoring the Future

Grade 2006: C+ Grade 2008: D-★

★ **Figure 1.8 Percent of Juveniles Who Report Marijuana Use in Last 30 Days – 11th Grade (12th Grade US Data)**




Source: Lane and Oregon – Oregon Healthy Teens Survey

Source: US – Monitoring the Future

Grade 2006: D+ Grade 2008: D-★

Lane County and Oregon exceeds the nation for binge drinking by both 8th and 11th graders. Binge drinking is defined as having five or more drinks of alcohol within a couple of hours one or more times in the last 30 days.

★ **Figure 1.9 Percent of Juveniles Who Report Binge Drinking in the Last 30 Days – 8th Grade**




Source: Lane and Oregon – Oregon Healthy Teens Survey

Source: US – US Survey on Drug Use and Health

Grade 2006: F Grade 2008: F

★ **Figure 1.10 Percent of Juveniles Who Report Binge Drinking in the Last 30 Days – 11th Grade**



Source: Lane and Oregon – Oregon Healthy Teens Survey

Source: US – US Survey on Drug Use and Health

Grade 2006: C Grade 2008: F★


Category II: Resources and Capacity

Grade 2006: F Grade 2008: F

Resources and Capacity includes juvenile detention capacity.

- Juvenile Detention Capacity.

**★Figure 2.1 Lane County Department of Youth Services Funded Juvenile Bed Resources
Local Beds and State Beds Allocated to Lane County**



***Note:** In 2005-06, 16 detention beds were designated as long-term treatment. While this increased treatment options, it reduced available beds for short-term detention.


Source: Lane County Department of Youth Services

The juvenile justice system differs in how youth are committed to state secure custody. Unlike the adult criminal justice system that can sentence offenders to prison with no cap/matrix issues, the juvenile justice system is limited to a discretionary bed allowance that the Oregon Youth Authority calculates using a county's youth population count and crime rate. It should be noted that the total number of secure custody youth beds available for the entire state of Oregon is not driven by any scientific method or demand forecast formula. The bed allowance has always been a product of what resources were available instead of actual need.

In the late 1990's, an Oregon Youth Authority study asserted that there was a 400 secure custody youth bed deficit in the State of Oregon. Since that time, an additional 250 beds were eliminated.

★Figure 2.2 Built vs. Funded Beds

	2001-02			2006-07		
	Built Beds	Funded Beds	% Funded	Built Beds	Funded Beds	% Funded
Lane County Resources						
Detention	96	32	33%	80	16	17%
Shelter (boys)	19	14	74%	19	7	37%
Shelter (girls)	7	7	100%	7	0	0%
Alcohol & Other Drug Residential Treatment	21	14	67%	21	8	38%
Lane Closed Custody Treatment	0	0		16	16	100%
State Resources Available to Lane County						
Oregon Youth Authority Closed Custody	75	75	100%	75	33	44%




Category III: Efficient and Effective Use of Resources

Grade 2006: C+ Grade 2008: C-★

Efficient and Effective Use of Resources includes: juvenile re-offenses; chronic juvenile offenders; and re-offenses and tracking time.

- Juvenile Re-offenses.


★Figure 3.1 Percent of Juvenile Offenders Who Did Not Re-offend Within 12 Months



Source: Lane County Department of Youth Services

Grade 2006: C+ Grade 2008: C-★

★ Figure 3.2 Percent of Juvenile Offenders With 1-2 New Referrals Within 12 Months




Source: Lane County Department of Youth Services

Grade 2006: C+ Grade 2008: C-★

○ **Chronic Juvenile Offenders.** A small group of juvenile offenders become chronic delinquents and commit a majority of new offenses. Chronic offenders commit three or more new crimes over a 12-month period.

★ **Figure 3.3 Chronic Juvenile Offenders – Those With Three Or More Referrals Within 12 Months**




Source: Lane County Department of Youth Services

Grade 2006: C

Grade 2008: D-★

○ Re-offenses and Tracking Time

Figure 3.4 Juvenile Re-offenses At 36 Months By Year




Source: Lane County Department of Youth Services

IV. Justice and Accountability
Grade 2006: F Grade 2008: F

- System Capacity

★Figure 4.1 Lane County Juveniles Released From Detention Early



Source: Lane County Department of Youth Services

Grade 2006: F Grade 2008: F