

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MINUTES WITH SUPPLEMENTAL TRANSCRIPT
(Where a transcript is available, it is printed in bold type)

OFFICE OF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
YAVAPAI COUNTY, ARIZONA

Prescott, Arizona

October 16, 2003

The Board of Supervisors met in special session at 10:00 a.m. on October 16, 2003.

Present: Chip Davis, Chairman; Gheral Brownlow, Vice Chairman; Lorna Street, Member; Bev Staddon, Clerk.

Also present: Jim Holst, County Administrator; Judge Robert Brutinel, Superior Court Judge and Presiding Judge of Juvenile Court; Director of Juvenile Court Services Gordon Glau; Superior Court Administrator Deborah Schaefer; Juvenile Detention Supervisor Paul Gabaldon; Special Projects Coordinator Angelo Manera; Jane Bristol, Economic Development Coordinator for the City of Prescott; and Joanna Dodder, reporter for the Daily Courier.

Clerk's note: A copy of these minutes with a supplemental transcript is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors and is also available on the County website.

ITEM NO. 1. Study session for discussion only regarding implementation of new juvenile detention facilities.

Chairman Davis began the study session by saying the Board was glad to have the court's assistance in determining what needed to be done with regard to juvenile facilities. Judge Brutinel said the court appreciated the opportunity to work with the Board. He said that he and staff had attended a week-long National Institute of Corrections seminar regarding implementing new juvenile detention facilities and that everyone had learned a great deal. He added that the court understood that it would be the Board that would decide when and where a new facility might be built. Chairman Davis said that the Board would take the final action on that, but that it would do so together with the court. Mr. Gabaldon and Mr. Glau provided the Board with a PowerPoint presentation, first giving the history of the juvenile detention program in Yavapai County, during which Mr. Glau said that at the present time the detention center has 52 beds but that it was a short-term fix. Mr. Gabaldon said that juveniles did not often have to sleep on the floor because of high detention population figures, but that it did still happen from time to time. Mr. Gabaldon briefly reviewed some of the components of planning a new juvenile detention facility, including mission and vision statement importance, the concept of direct supervision, operational programming, staffing, site evaluation, architectural programming and construction issues. Judge Brutinel addressed detention philosophy, saying that the decisions made today about how to design a facility would drive how juveniles are treated in the future. He said the philosophy of the juvenile court was that children would make mistakes and that they needed treatment to help them become productive adults. He said that the citizens had demanded that the courts be tougher on juvenile crime, and that he did not believe that would change. Judge Brutinel said that if he felt a juvenile needed to go to detention he would send him there, but that the court recognized that children were not adults and that they should not be treated in the same manner as adults. He stressed that the court's philosophy about juvenile detention needed to drive how a new facility is designed, and that if juveniles were treated appropriately they would respond. Judge Brutinel said the court was committed to the idea of a juvenile court and believed that it could make a difference in children's lives. He told the Board that the biggest single expense with a new facility would be staffing and that staffing should drive the design of the facility as opposed to allowing the design of the building to drive staffing. He said that in a direct supervision model, staff would be with incarcerated juveniles on a continuous basis, interacting instead of just reacting. Mr. Glau told the Board there had been a 145% increase in juvenile detainees over the past ten years, and that based on past experience he believed the County could expect to see an increase in detention population of about 4% per year. There was brief discussion about how the juvenile detention rate compared to the population increase in the County generally and what

areas of the County juveniles were coming from, during which Mr. Glau said he had seen a slight decrease in the number of referrals from Prescott and an increase in the number of referrals from Prescott Valley and from the Verde Valley. Judge Brutinel added that there were also a lot of people sending their children to live with relatives in Yavapai County. Mr. Glau said that based on population growth, staff estimated the need for a 57-bed detention facility in ten years and an 84-bed facility in 20 years. There was brief discussion about population growth projections, during which Chairman Davis said the County had done projections related to vehicular traffic on County roads and that the traffic numbers projected to be reached in 2015 had already been met by the year 2000. Mr. Glau said that staff's recommendation was to build an 80-bed facility with adequate infrastructure to support additional beds as the need arises. He added that there were things that could affect staff's estimates, including legislative changes and changes in judges' philosophies. There was brief discussion about juvenile detention facilities sometimes providing a better environment for a child than the child's home, during which Mr. Gabaldon said that when a child does not seem to mind being in detention staff tries to spend more time with that child and provide more services. Judge Brutinel added that the court was also asking Child Protective Services to get involved in such situations. Mr. Glau said that detention was really a means to keep the community safe until things could be worked out with a child. Chairman Davis said he believed the juvenile court system was an early investment for the County, and that it was better to fix problems with children now than to do nothing and see them end up in the adult jails. Mr. Glau said his department had also put into place several alternatives to detention, including house arrest, home detention, and electronic monitoring. He said that another program, day reporting, had not been implemented but that by having more alternatives in place the fewer children would have to be kept in detention. He said that alternatives gave judges more options to help keep down the cost of keeping children in detention. Mr. Gabaldon provided a review of a pod design as opposed to a traditional cellblock design, saying that a pod design allows for direct supervision and that there were fewer behavioral problems with direct supervision. He said that the County's current juvenile detention system was a cellblock design and that unless the children were in school or participating in a recreational activity it was not possible to provide direct supervision. There was brief discussion regarding the school program in the detention facility, during which Mr. Glau said that County School Superintendent Paul Street received state funding for the school. Mr. Gabaldon said that because the detention facility has a school, it was also able to receive state funding for commodities and that this had saved the County a significant amount of money. Mr. Gabaldon showed pictures of various juvenile detention facilities around the state, saying that the facility built by Cochise County was optimal. Ms. Schaefer said that a pod design also allowed for more efficient staffing. Mr. Gabaldon next reviewed the infrastructure needs for a new facility, which he said would include a school, courtroom, programming space, medical facilities, food service, recreation, visitation space, and office space. Mr. Glau said that whatever the Board decided to do, it would be important to build the infrastructure to allow for future growth. Chairman Davis asked if it would be possible to build things such as food service and medical facilities in such a way as to allow for use by both juvenile and adult facilities. Judge Brutinel said that aside from the state's sight and sound separation requirements, the court would be supportive of trying to use common facilities where possible, but that the juvenile detention facility needed to look different than the adult jail. Chairman Davis asked if there would be problems related to the nutritional needs of juveniles compared to those of adults, and whether it would be possible to have one kitchen staff prepare the same meal for both detention populations. Mr. Gabaldon said he did not believe there would be a problem, and there appeared to be general agreement that this would be a good idea to pursue. Mr. Holst asked if the current detention facility had the same staffing ratios that would be needed in the new facility. Mr. Gabaldon responded that there were many times when he did not have the staffing he needed. Mr. Gabaldon reviewed site selection issues, including the amount of land available and its location, community concerns, topography and excavation, parking and accessibility. Supervisor Brownlow asked whether there was data available regarding escapes from juvenile detention facilities. Mr. Gabaldon said that all of the data related to escapes said that a person escaping from a detention facility will get out of the immediate area as soon as possible. He said that there is naturally a greater law

enforcement presence in an area where a detention facility is located, and that his experience had been that when a juvenile escapes they always go home. Discussion turned to staffing levels, with Mr. Gabaldon explaining that the current facility has 23 full-time employees (FTEs). He said that operational guidelines for juvenile detention services prescribed a ratio of a minimum of one staff member to ten juveniles during non-sleeping hours and a minimum of one staff member to 20 juveniles during sleeping hours. He said that each day consisted of three eight-hour shifts, during which 16 hours required a 1:10 ratio while eight hours required a 1:20 ratio, and that using a shift relief factor it would take 4.68 FTEs to continuously cover one post. Mr. Glau said that using the shift relief factor, it would take a total of 39 FTEs to staff a 60-bed facility and 51 FTEs to staff an 80-bed facility. He provided the Board with specifics regarding additional staff needs, including position titles, which positions could be reclassified and which positions would be needed as new positions. Mr. Gabaldon next reviewed construction issues, saying it would be important to keep control of the construction project in order to avoid costly errors. Mr. Glau said this would include having regular meetings, and that this was, in fact, historically how the County had dealt with construction projects. Supervisor Brownlow asked why a facility would need to be close to town and whether there might be problems with parents being able to visit if a facility was built too far from town. Judge Brutinel said it was especially important for incarcerated juveniles to be able to visit with their families, and that in many cases the parents or other relatives could not afford to drive very far. He stressed that most of the cost of running a facility was in the staffing and that locating a detention facility away from the community would only serve to increase staffing costs because of transport issues and the like. Chairman Davis asked if there was any funding available for a facility. Mr. Glau replied that there was nothing available from the state. In response to another question from Chairman Davis, Mr. Gabaldon said that as far as he knew the County School Superintendent's Office would continue to provide funding for the detention facility's school program. Mr. Glau said that three of the juvenile detention officers were funded by the state, but that typically the state did not get involved in funding juvenile operations. There was brief discussion about whether the Yavapai County Jail District could include juvenile facilities, during which Mr. Holst said the District had not been established in such a way as to allow for that. In response to a question from Supervisor Brownlow, Mr. Manera said he would estimate the cost of a new juvenile detention facility of the type being discussed on this day at between \$6 million and \$8 million. Chairman Davis said he believed the County was approaching this issue in a better way than it had the last detention facility issue. He said that the court had given the Board a bigger blueprint but that he would like still more information, including plans for transitioning staffing needs. He said he would also like to pursue the idea of developing joint medical, court and food service facilities for both juvenile and adult detention facilities. He said this issue also flowed into the Board's need to look at possible uses for current facilities. There was brief discussion about possible uses for the current juvenile detention facility once a new facility is constructed, during which Supervisor Brownlow said it seemed to him that the need for a new facility was not just a County problem but also a problem for the municipalities. Ms. Dodder asked if the Board had considered adding juvenile facilities to the question it planned to place on the ballot for an upcoming election. Mr. Holst said that even if the Board could add juvenile facilities at this point, all of the additional one-quarter cent sales tax being requested from the voters would be needed to fund the adult jail. Chairman Davis asked if the current adult jail in Prescott would work for a juvenile detention facility. Mr. Glau said his initial reaction was that it would take so much remodeling that it would be cost prohibitive. Judge Brutinel said the court wanted to build a detention facility that would allow staff to deal with children in the appropriate manner and that the current Prescott jail would not allow for a direct supervision model. There was brief discussion regarding remanded juvenile facilities at the Camp Verde Jail, during which Judge Brutinel and Mr. Glau made it clear that remanded juveniles and other juveniles could not be housed together. Supervisor Brownlow asked if it would be feasible to use the remanded facility for regular detention and pay someone else to house the remanded juveniles. Judge Brutinel said that new staff would be required for the Camp Verde location if that were to occur. Chairman Davis asked if it would be possible to look at that as an immediate solution to avoid a crisis. Judge Brutinel said that having a facility in the

Verde would be better for children from that area because they would be closer to their families and transport costs would not be an issue, but that staffing would be required and that it would be expensive. Mr. Holst said he would check the grant for the remanded juvenile facility to see if it was possible to use it for regular juvenile detention. Mr. Gabaldon said he could put some information together regarding additional staffing needs. Chairman Davis said the Board should probably have a study session to talk about County facilities. Supervisor Street said she agreed, and believed the Board needed to come up with a 10-15-20 year plan for facilities. Mr. Holst asked if there was a problem with having to double bunk juveniles now, saying that it would certainly be less expensive if the County could continue to operate with the current detention facility for another three years. Mr. Glau said the double bunking really had not caused any problems. Chairman Davis said he did not know that it made sense to push everything to the limit. Judge Brutinel said everyone knew the population numbers would go up and that it was just a question of how soon it would happen.

ITEM NO. 2. Consider adoption of a Resolution Supporting the Establishment of an Enterprise Zone to include a portion of the unincorporated area of Yavapai County and a portion of the City of Prescott; consider approval of an intergovernmental agreement with the City of Prescott establishing an Enterprise Zone Commission and authorizing submission of an application to the Arizona Department of Commerce for establishment of an Enterprise Zone comprised of identified areas of Yavapai County to include a portion of the incorporated community of Prescott and appoint members of the Enterprise Zone Commission. Upon a motion by Supervisor Brownlow, seconded by Supervisor Street, the Board voted unanimously to approve Resolution No. 1418, to approve the intergovernmental agreement, and to appoint Supervisor Street or her representative to the Enterprise Zone Commission.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned.

ATTEST:

_____ Clerk _____ Chairman