



Oregon Youth Authority

10-Year Strategic Plan  
For Close Custody Facilities

Final Report

August 26, 2014

 DLR Group

**CHINN**  
PLANNING



**Table of Contents**

*Section I..... Executive Summary*

*Section II..... Overview of Oregon Youth Authority and Facilities*

*Section III..... Forecast of Future Oregon Youth Authority Population*

*Section IV..... Oregon Youth Authority Existing Facilities Assessment*

*Section V..... Conceptual Program Statements for Facility Components and Campuses*

*Section VI..... Master Plan Facility Recommendations*

**Appendices**

*Appendix A..... Master Plan Diagrams*

*Appendix B..... Building Cost Model Information*

*Appendix C..... Oregon Youth Authority Population Trends and  
Youth Profile Characteristics*

*Appendix D..... OYA Administrative Office Options Summary*

**Index of Tables and Figures**

Figure 2-1.....Oregon’s Juvenile Justice System  
Figure 2-2 .....Mission, Vision, Values and Key Goals of Oregon Youth Authority  
Figure 2-3 .....Youth Reformation System  
Figure 2-4..... Our Culture – Positive Human Development  
Figure 2-5 .....Oregon Youth Authority – Organizational Structure  
Figure 2-6 .....Location of Oregon Youth Authority Facilities  
Table 2-7 .....Oregon Youth Authority Correctional and Transition  
Facilities Operational Capacity -2014 State of Oregon  
  
Table 3-1 .....Oregon Youth Authority Close Custody Demand Forecast State of Oregon  
  
Figure 4-1 .....National Best Practice in Juvenile Correctional Operations and Facilities  
Figure 4-2 .....Physical Plant Ideal Characteristics  
Figure 4-3 .....MacLaren YCF  
Figure 4-4 .....Hillcrest YCF  
Figure 4-5 .....North Coast YCF  
Figure 4-6 .....Oak Creek YCF  
Figure 4-7 .....Rouge Valley YCF  
Figure 4-8 .....Eastern Oregon YSF  
Figure 4-9 .....Tillamook YCF and Camp Tillamook  
Figure 4-10 .....RiverBend  
Figure 4-11 .....Camp Florence  
Table 4-12.....Draft Housing Capacity per Best Practices  
  
Table 5-1 .....Conceptual 16 Bed Dormitory  
Housing Unit Program Statement  
Table 5-2 ..... Conceptual 24 Capacity  
Camp - Bed Dormitory Housing Unit Program Statement  
Table 5-3 .....Treatment Center Program Statement  
Table 5-4 ..... Intake/Assessment Center (Adjacent to Intake Housing)  
Program Statement  
Table 5-5 ..... Intake/Special Needs Housing Program Statement  
Table 5-6 .....MacLaren Block Program Statement  
Table 5-7 .....Regional Facilities Block Program Statement  
Table 5-8 .....Camp Facilities Program Statement  
Table 5-9 .....Facility Comparison  
  
Figure 6-1 .....Youth Reformation System

## Section 1

# **Executive Summary**

***“The Oregon Youth Authority (OYA) has two aging youth correctional facilities in the Willamette Valley that are operating well below the intended bed capacity and that have significant deferred maintenance needs. The April 2013 Oregon Youth Authority Demand Forecast projects a reduction in the number of close custody beds necessary to house incarcerated youth and also shows a need for a substantial increase in the number of community residential treatment beds. The Joint Committee on Ways and Means directs OYA to develop a facilities plan that:***

- 1. Evaluates facilities in terms of capacity, operating and maintenance cost, and deferred maintenance need;***
- 2. Develops 10 year or longer term plans for the facilities;***
- 3. Includes recommendations and rationale for facility disposition, if appropriate; and***
- 4. Recommends future use of the buildings that OYA would no longer need.”***

*Source: Attachment A 2013 HB5050 – A Budget Note.*

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This 10-Year Strategic Plan was developed in response to “Attachment A 2013 HB5050 – A Budget Note.” This directive cites the need to evaluate OYA facilities and determine appropriate responses for long-term use of existing facilities, considering current and future capacity needs and condition.

Oregon Youth Authority engaged DLR Group Architecture and Planning, inc and Chinn Planning to facilitate this process, develop options for consideration and make recommendations regarding the directive.

DLR Group and Chinn Planning offer the following summary of findings and recommendations that are discussed in detail in the body of the report:

### Overview of the Oregon Youth Authority System

The Oregon Youth Authority is the state juvenile justice agency for court-committed youth including youth in close custody placements and community residential programs. Due to legislation passed in Oregon, youth committed to OYA custody can be committed from the juvenile or adult court. Youth committed by the adult court (referred to as DOC youth) comprise roughly half of youth offenders in OYA facilities. All youth can be held up to age 25. This combination of populations (OYA and DOC) and variation in length of stay and age provide unique challenges for operating multiple youth facilities across the state.

This Strategic Plan supports the mission, vision and values of OYA.

- *Mission - OYA protects the public and reduces crime by holding youth offenders accountable and providing opportunities for reformation in safe environments.*
- *Vision - Youth who leave OYA go on to lead productive crime-free lives.*
- *Values - OYA’s core values are: Integrity, Professionalism, Accountability, and Respect.*

The OYA mission statement promotes youth reformation in safe environments, with integrated security and youth treatment goals. The vision of returning OYA youth to the community to lead crime free and productive lives requires close custody facilities that have a treatment and educational and vocational focus to support youth in the development of skills to ensure successful transition to the community after release from OYA custody.

Oregon is developing the Youth Reformation System (YRS) which is focused on enhanced outcomes for youth from data-informed decision-making. The culture of OYA is based on the principles of Positive Human Development, including the belief that youth can be held accountable and strengthened at the same time and that individuals are resources to be developed, not problems to be fixed. All services and facility programs should support the goal of achieving youth success by creating safety and security, forming caring and supportive relationships, maintaining high expectations and accountability, supporting meaningful participation and encouraging connection to communities.

OYA currently operates 10 facilities across the state with four of those sites on the I-5 corridor, four on the Oregon coast, and two in eastern Oregon. The current budgeted capacity of these sites is 657 beds.

## OYA Facilities Assessment

DLR Group and Chinn Planning toured representative OYA facilities and engaged OYA staff via interviews to assess the functionality and condition of existing facilities. The key issues affecting OYA facilities are physical (age and condition of facilities), environmental (access to daylight, views, appropriate finishes, and safety provided by seismic upgrades) and programmatic (access to the right types and configuration of spaces for programs such as treatment, recreation, housing, visitation, education and vocational programs). DLR Group and Chinn Planning find that all three categories of facility need drive the recommended facility plan.

The current mix of facilities within the OYA system does not support the vision, mission and culture of OYA. Housing and living areas reflect the most serious gap between vision and reality. The majority of youth are housed (with long lengths of stay) in densely populated dormitory living units. Program and treatment space is not adequate to support relief and break-out space.

- PROGRAMMATIC FACILITY ISSUES:

- The critical programmatic function of intake processing is currently housed at Hillcrest and is inadequate. It lacks space for the interview and processing functions. Housing at Hillcrest for youth in the intake process is dormitory style. Single-room housing is recommended for these youth.
- Housing environments that are not conducive to the Positive Human Development initiative include walled-in and secure unit control stations that potentially limit staff and youth interaction and a lack of daylight and views in regional housing units at RiverBend and Tillamook Youth Correctional Facility (YCF).
- Access to single-occupancy room environments for mental health and other special housing categories is limited. More single-occupancy housing is needed.
- Campuses are underutilized (unused housing units) at MacLaren and Hillcrest.
- Regional facilities lack dedicated education space and are missing adequate vocational space and visiting space.
- Regional facilities, with the exception of Oak Creek, lack adequate exterior recreation space.
- Regional facilities lack adequate indoor recreation space.
- The trend at Rogue Valley is to operate at maximum capacity due to its location in relationship to southern Oregon population centers and the type of programs and treatment provided. As such its core facilities for programs (vocational, educational, recreational and visiting) are especially lacking and should be addressed as soon as possible.

## ENVIRONMENTAL FACILITY ISSUES

- The intake facility for male youth at Hillcrest is not an appropriate environment for a youth's first encounter with the OYA system. It is small, correctional in feel and does not provide a reassuring first experience for the youth.
- Lack of single-room housing environments for intake, mental health and behavior management is a primary driving issue for initial facility recommendations. Over 80% of the existing housing configurations are dormitory style. Ideally, most housing should be single-occupancy rooms.
- Housing density is high in operating housing units (approaching 25). A best practice approach would assign from 12 to 16 youth to housing units.
- All regional facility housing units lack windows and views. RiverBend and Tillamook YCF housing units lack windows and views.
- Seismic upgrades are needed at most buildings at MacLaren and Hillcrest and at Camp Tillamook, Camp Hilgard and Camp Florence buildings.
- Regional facilities are very correctional in design and have limited opportunity for youth movement to and from appropriate program areas for school, vocational, treatment, recreation and visiting.
- Tillamook YCF and RiverBend facility (formerly RiverBend YCF, now used for transition program) are very correctional in design, with almost no windows in youth areas.
- Geer facility at MacLaren is very correctional in design and has an interior recreation courtyard with limited views. It does have adequate windows into youth housing areas.
- The unoccupied Young Women's Transitional Facility at Oak Creek is the best example of appropriate housing (mini-dorms in a transitional setting).
- Operational funding limitations have created a pattern of facility use that requires maximizing the density in operating housing units while leaving adjacent units closed.

## PHYSICAL FACILITY ISSUES

- There is a significant deferred maintenance backlog at all facilities due mostly to age of buildings and associated systems.
- Conditions of camps and transition facilities vary. Camp Florence, Camp Hilgard and Camp Tillamook are aging wood frame construction and as such have shorter life spans for building shell and finish systems. It is recommended where possible that these facilities be renovated and used for program areas rather than housing to extend their useful life.
- System wide the deferred maintenance backlog is approximately \$21 million. It is critical that this backlog be addressed as part of the master plan implementation process. Commitment to long-term use and programmatic renovation of facilities must be coupled with needed upgrades and maintenance of existing building systems. The deferred maintenance is a significant portion of the overall master plan need. The deferred maintenance backlog includes:
  - \$5.6M at MacLaren
  - \$5M at Hillcrest
  - An average of approximately \$2M each at Regional facility.
  - Approximately \$1.3M at RiverBend
  - Approximately \$600K each at Tillamook and Camp Florence.

## **Forecast of Future OYA Population**

A key component of a strategic facilities plan is the forecast of capacity requirements. Forecasting has become challenging for juvenile correctional populations. Recent trends show declining population levels across the country. Many jurisdictions are planning for downsized populations but at the same time are fearful of a reversal of trends that could impact correctional populations.

The Oregon Office of Economic Analysis (OOEA) produces a semi-annual juvenile corrections population forecast that provides projections for close custody bed space managed by the Oregon Youth Authority. Total Close Custody offenders are projected to increase from 645 in 2015 to 659 in 2024.

It is important to note that the OOEA forecast has traditionally been utilized as a statement of maximum youth population to be served at any one point in time. In order to manage OYA facilities effectively, a maximum capacity level of 3%-5% above projected average daily population is recommended to account for peaks in population that occur within the year (See appendix C, Table C-6). Using a factor of 5%, the projected maximum population of 659 beds in 2024 would equate to a projected average daily population of 626 beds.

## **Master Plan Recommendations**

The recommended facility improvements are a flexible response to future youth populations. Although DLR Group and Chinn Planning advise that a decreasing future population is highly likely, the extent of that decrease is difficult to predict. Because of this, it is important that the recommendations for facility improvements be phased in a manner that allows maximum flexibility in response to these variables.

### **Phase 1 – Overview (See Appendix A for campus diagrams and detailed list of proposed project elements)**

1. All Sites: Phase 1 includes funding and completing selected deferred maintenance and seismic retrofit work, especially those associated with buildings slated for renovations or additions in Phase 1.
2. Update and improve MacLaren YCF to accommodate current MacLaren programs and add current Hillcrest populations and programs. (See Appendix A - Diagrams 1.0, 1.1 and 1.2)
3. DLR Group / Chinn Planning recommend that the Hillcrest Campus be closed at the end of Phase 1. Some immediate investments are recommended to improve the housing and intake environments for the short term while Phase 1 is implemented. (See Appendix A – Diagram 2)
4. Improve Oak Creek's housing environment and open the Transition Housing Unit. (See Appendix A – Diagram 3)
5. Improve Rogue Valley's housing environment, recreation area and support spaces. (See Appendix A – Diagram 4)

6. Improve North Coast's housing environments at two of three housing units. (See Appendix A – Diagram 5)
7. Improve RiverBend's housing environments at the YCF Building by removing Unit Control Room Walls/Barriers and adding windows. (See Appendix A – Diagram 6)
8. Improve Tillamook YCF housing environments. (See Appendix A – Diagram 7)
9. Improve Eastern Oregon's housing environments. (See Appendix A – Diagram 8)
10. Camp Florence should remain in its current configuration. (See Appendix A – Diagram 9)

## **Phase 2 – Overview (See Appendix A for campus diagrams and scope of potential phase elements)**

In general, Phase 2 elements include the remainder of renovation work and building construction necessary to achieve facilities that respond to the population and to the programmatic space goals stated in Section 5 of this report. See Appendix A – diagrams 1.0 through 9 for a graphic description of these elements.

### **Recommended Facility Budgets**

The recommended budget for all phases of the Master Plan implementation (Including Immediate Steps, Phase 1 and Phase 2) is \$97.38 million. Deferred Maintenance is 17% of this total need.

The recommended budget for Phase 1 is \$47.87 million. Key considerations regarding the Phase 1 budget are:

- Deferred Maintenance is over 22% of the phase. In addition renovations are nearly 14% of the phase total. These two components, totaling 36% of the phase, would be appropriate expenditures regardless of the other Master Plan goals to consolidate campuses or improve other core facilities.
- Approximately 64% of this phase is primarily in response to program-driven construction, sitework and reconfiguration for appropriate housing at MacLaren and upgraded core facilities at Rogue Valley.

DLR Group studied the implications of potentially declining youth populations on master plan budgets. While the factors that could drive populations lower are real, there is no way to predict or ensure that populations will fall. As an example DLR Group selected random population targets to study at lower population levels. If populations decline to a 456-bed level over the next 10 years, the required master plan expenditure would be reduced by approximately \$26 million. Expenditures would be reduced to a lesser degree for 10-year population endpoints between 456 and current populations. It is possible that populations could decline more than this amount. This analysis is intended only to show that future investments will be less should youth populations decline and to give some understanding of the level of this potential reduction.

### **Rationale for Phase 1 Investments and Facility Closure**

The Master Plan recommendations to close the Hillcrest Campus are based on the following rationale:

- OYA will improve operational cost efficiency by closing one of the two campus sites in the Willamette Valley. DLR Group / Chinn Planning recommend that Hillcrest Campus be closed and that the youth served at that facility be redistributed to other facilities. Key programs for intake and mental health would be relocated to MacLaren.
- Hillcrest campus has significant deferred maintenance needs and costs that can be avoided.
- While both MacLaren and Hillcrest have buildings in seismic risk categories, the recommendations acknowledge that the costs to retrofit the multistory buildings at Hillcrest Campus will be more than the single-story building stock at MacLaren.
- The existing dormitory buildings (Scott Hall and Norblad Hall) would be difficult and costly to reconfigure into more ideal configurations in comparison to existing one-story housing buildings at MacLaren.

- Available acreage at Hillcrest is limited in comparison to MacLaren. The acreage at MacLaren is desirable for future flexibility and for overall access to open space for recreation, vocational activities and programs.
- The property value at Hillcrest campus is estimated to be in the range of \$5 million. After the completion of Phase 1, proceeds from the sale of this property could be utilized to fund a portion of the necessary Phase 2 scope of work.

### **Recommendations for Future Facility Investments**

Future facility investments should be considered and would be recommended should populations dictate. Considerations for future investment would be based on issues such as:

- Operational cost savings.
- Viability of obtaining necessary and qualified staff.
- Location of facilities in relationship to home community of the majority of youth served.
- Avoiding portions of the proposed Phase 2 investment, especially those facilities with significant deferred maintenance needs.
- Potential for sale of property and capture of funds to use for other Phase 2 elements.

### **Implementation Schedule**

The schedule for implementation of the Master Plan is governed by funding cycles, phasing of construction projects and required design and construction time frames. DLR Group anticipates the following schedule milestones for implementation of the master plan.

- Immediate Steps – MacLaren Prototype Cottage Renovation and Hillcrest Immediate Steps: Now through June 2015.
- Phase 1 Funding / Design / Construction: Now through August 2017.
- Master Plan Update 1: January 2016 through March 2016.
- Phase 2 Funding / Concept Design: May 2016 through December 2017.
- Master Plan Update 2: January 2018 through March 2018.
- Phase 2 Funding / Design / Construction: March 2018 through October 2020.

Implementation of the Immediate Steps, Phase 1 and 2 of the master plan will require approximately six years of the 10-year master planning window.

## **PLANNING PROCESS – OYA PROJECT COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

Dan Berger, Superintendent – MacLaren YCF

Heber Bray, Operations and Policy Analyst – Close Custody Programs and Services

Jan Dean, Assistant Director - Business Services

Rex Emery, Facilities Manager – Physical Plant Operations

Erin Fultz, Chief of Operations – Close Custody Programs and Services

Troy Gregg, Superintendent – Hillcrest YCF

Ken Jerin, Superintendent – Rogue Valley YCF

Christine Kirk, Public Policy Advisor and Government Relations Manager

Clint McClellan, Assistant Director – Close Custody Programs and Services

Shannon Myrick, Strategic Initiatives Manager

Joe O’Leary, Deputy Director

Fariborz Pakseresht, Director

Ann Snyder, Communications Office Manager

## **OYA PROJECT CONSULTANTS**

Kent Larson, Principal, DLR Group

Lori Coppenrath, Senior Associate, DLR Group

Karen Chinn, President, Chinn Planning