

***Juvenile Curfew
and Parental Responsibility
Ordinances***

***Peggy Slavick
with
Steve Aos***

March 1996

**Juvenile Curfew and Parental Responsibility Ordinances
In Washington State**

Peggy Slavick

With

Steve Aos

Washington State Institute for Public Policy

The Evergreen State College
Seminar 3162, MS: TA-00
Olympia, Washington 98505
(360) 866-6000, ext. 6380
Fax: (360) 866-6825

Document No. 96-03-1201

March 1996

Washington State Institute for Public Policy

Mission

The Washington Legislature created the Washington State Institute for Public Policy in 1983. A Board of Directors—representing the legislature, the governor, and public universities—governs the Institute, hires the director, and guides the development of all activities.

The Institute's mission is to carry out practical research, at legislative direction, on issues of importance to Washington State. The Institute conducts research activities using its own policy analysts, academic specialists from universities, and consultants. New activities grow out of requests from the Washington State Legislature and executive branch agencies, often directed through legislation. Institute staff work closely with legislators, as well as legislative, executive, and state agency staff to define and conduct research on appropriate state public policy topics.

Current assignments include a wide range of projects in criminal justice, youth violence, social services, K-12 education, and state government organization.

Board of Directors

Senator Karen Fraser
Senator Jeanine Long
Senator John Moyer
Senator Nita Rinehart
Representative Lisa J. Brown
Representative Steve Hargrove
Representative Helen Sommers
Representative Steve Van Luven

Ken Conte, *House Office of Program Research*
Roland DeLorme, *Western Washington University*
Ruta Fanning, *Office of Financial Management*
Tom George, *Washington State University*
Dale Johnson, *University of Washington*
Edward Seeberger, *Senate Committee Services*
Barbara Smith, *The Evergreen State College*

Staff

Thomas Sykes, Director
Roxanne Lieb, Associate Director

Contents

Executive Summary	ii
Background	1
Survey and Review of Washington Cities With Curfew Ordinances	1
Findings	2
General Types of Curfew Ordinances	2
Curfew Age, Location, and Time Restrictions	2
Police Procedures	3
Fines and Violations	3
Impact on Juvenile Crime	3
Impact on Runaways	4
Citations	5
Funding	5
Legal Challenges	5
Appendix	7
27 Washington Cities With Juvenile Curfew and/or Parental Responsibility Ordinances	7
Descriptions of Individual Ordinances and Survey Responses	8

JUVENILE CURFEW AND PARENTAL RESPONSIBILITY ORDINANCES IN WASHINGTON STATE

Executive Summary

The increase in juvenile violent crime in Washington prompted the 1994 Washington State Legislature to pass a law enabling local jurisdictions to adopt juvenile curfews. Cities and counties are allowed to establish "times and conditions under which juveniles may be present on the public streets, in the public parks, or in any other public place during specified hours."¹ The Washington State Institute for Public Policy was directed by the legislature to study juvenile violence and other at-risk behaviors of youth.² As part of the Institute's research efforts concerning juvenile violence and prevention, a survey was conducted of the cities in Washington with juvenile curfew ordinances.³ The Institute's approach was to review the ordinances and to survey city officials regarding their experiences.

The Institute found that, as of February 1996, 27 cities currently have curfew or parental responsibility ordinances. Appendix A to this report contains a list of the cities and individual curfew definitions. A *juvenile curfew ordinance* assigns responsibility—and possible fines—to the juvenile if he or she is charged with a violation. A *parental responsibility ordinance*, on the other hand, shifts the burden and penalties to the parent or guardian of the juvenile.

Collectively, the 27 cities with curfew or parental responsibility ordinances represent about 10 percent of Washington's total population.

The Institute's survey of the 27 cities with curfews asked city officials if the ordinances were having an effect on juvenile crime rates. Almost half of the Washington cities with curfews reported that their ordinance had an impact on juvenile crime. These effects ranged from observations, such as more active parent involvement and a reduction in the number of youth congregating, to reducing the incidents of malicious mischief, disorderly conduct, auto prowls, and vandalism. Most of these cities had not conducted a formal evaluation of the curfew's impact on crime rates. Only three municipalities have undertaken a statistical analysis; each found a decline in juvenile crime.

The Institute's survey and review was conducted during January and February 1996. This report summarizes the results.

For further information, contact Roxanne Lieb, Associate Director, Washington State Institute for Public Policy, (360) 866-6000, ext. 6380.

¹ RCW 35.21.635 and 36.21.425.

² RCW 70.190.050.

³ Washington counties are also enabled by state law to adopt curfews, but none has as of February, 1996.

JUVENILE CURFEW AND PARENTAL RESPONSIBILITY ORDINANCES IN WASHINGTON STATE

Background

The increase in juvenile violent crime in Washington prompted the 1994 Washington State Legislature to pass a law enabling local jurisdictions to adopt juvenile curfews. Cities and counties are allowed to establish "times and conditions under which juveniles may be present on the public streets, in the public parks, or in any other public place during specified hours."⁴

While no Washington counties have, as yet, established curfew measures, 27 cities have adopted either *juvenile curfew* or *parental responsibility* ordinances, or some variant of the two. A juvenile curfew ordinance assigns responsibility—and possible fines—to the juvenile if he or she is charged with a violation. A parental responsibility ordinance, on the other hand, shifts the burden and penalties to the parent or guardian of the juvenile.

This recent trend in Washington towards enacting curfew ordinances has also occurred nationally. Many cities in the nation have adopted youth curfews or amended existing ones in response to an increasing concern with juvenile crime. A recent survey of 387 cities in 1995 by the United States Conference of Mayors found that 7 out of 10 of the survey cities currently have a curfew ordinance in effect. Of the survey cities with curfews, 21 percent have had them for one year or less.⁵

Survey and Review of Washington Cities With Curfew Ordinances

The Washington State Institute for Public Policy was directed by the 1994 and 1995 Legislature to study juvenile violence and other at-risk behaviors of youth.⁶ As part of the Institute's research efforts concerning juvenile violence and prevention, a survey and review was conducted of the cities in Washington with juvenile curfew ordinances.⁷

The Institute did not undertake an independent statistical analysis to determine whether the curfew ordinances are effective in reducing the rate of juvenile violence. Rather, the Institute's approach was to review the ordinances adopted by the 27 cities and to survey city officials on their experience thus far with their curfew ordinances. The survey was conducted during January and February 1996. This report summarizes the results of this research.

⁴ RCW 35.21.635 and 36.21.425.

⁵ Pionke, John, "Many Cities Adopt Curfews During Past Year," The United States Conference of Mayors, December 1995, Washington DC.

⁶ RCW 70.190.050.

⁷ Washington counties are also enabled by state law to adopt curfews, but none has as of February, 1996.

Findings

1) General Types of Curfew Ordinances

The Institute found that, as of February 1996, 27 cities currently have curfew or parental responsibility ordinances. Appendix A to this report contains a list of the cities and individual curfew definitions. **Collectively, these 27 cities represent about 10 percent of Washington's total population.**

The curfew ordinances of the 27 cities have the following general characteristics:

- Sixteen cities⁸ in Washington have **parental responsibility ordinances**, where only the parent⁹ is found in violation of the ordinance, and is charged and fined.
- Two cities¹⁰ have strictly **curfew ordinances** that charge only the minor with a violation.
- Six cities¹¹ have ordinances that find **both the parent and the minor** in violation, but only the **parent receives a citation**.
- Three cities¹² have ordinances that **charge both the parent and the minor** in violation of the ordinance separately, and have **separate penalties for each**.

2) Curfew Age, Location, and Time Restrictions

Over three-fourths of Washington's cities with curfew ordinances define their age restriction as any person under the age of 18 years. Other cities restrict curfews to juveniles under the age of 14 or 15. Some cities exempt those juveniles who are married from the curfew.

Most of the cities define the restrictive location to include "any area of the public streets, alleys, parks, playgrounds, or other public places or any unsupervised area within the city" or, more simply, to "any public place." Bellingham specifically limits its restrictive area to "any public place in the central business district."

The time restrictions for the curfews vary. Most common is a restriction between the hours of 10 p.m. and 5 or 6 a.m. on school nights, with an extension to 11 p.m. or 12 midnight on non-school nights. Some cities set two curfew age limits. For example, Sunnyside has a curfew for any person under the age of 18 years, and another curfew for any person under the age of 15 years.

⁸ Bellingham, Brewster, Bridgeport, Centralia, Coupeville, Eatonville, Ephrata, Grandview, Long Beach, Omak, Selah, Soap Lake, Sunnyside, Toppenish, Wapato, and Zillah.

⁹ "Parent" is defined as mother, father, or both, guardian or other adult person having the legal care, custody, or control of a child.

¹⁰ Camas and Yakima.

¹¹ Everett, Granger, Kent, Tacoma, Tekoa, and Yelm.

¹² Oak Harbor, Ridgefield, and SeaTac.

Two cities, Wapato and Toppenish, have enacted both daytime and nighttime curfews. Toppenish defines curfew hours as between 10 p.m. and 5 a.m. any day of the week, and between 9 a.m. and 2:30 p.m. Monday through Friday, except on a holiday, when school is not in session, or during school vacations. Wapato's curfew hours are between 9 p.m. and 6 a.m. for children under the age of 14, and between 10 p.m. and 6 a.m. for children between the ages of 14 and 18; and, for all children between the hours of 9 a.m. and 2:45 p.m. Monday through Friday. Evening curfews are extended one hour on evenings before holidays, Saturdays or Sundays.

3) Police Procedures

For most cities with curfews in Washington, the typical police procedure, upon finding a violation of curfew, is to direct or deliver the minor to his or her residence. The police department then notifies the parents or guardian that they are in violation of the ordinance by sending or giving a written citation/notice to the minor's parent. In some cities, the officer is authorized to take the minor into custody, and demand that the parent or guardian appear and take custody of the minor.

4) Fines and Violations

In most Washington cities, parents found guilty of a curfew ordinance are charged with a civil infraction and assessed a fine—often only upon a second violation. These cities issue a notice or warning to the parent upon a first violation. Four cities charge the parent or guardian with a misdemeanor upon a first or subsequent violation.

The fines (monetary penalties) vary from city to city, with most cities increasing the fine upon subsequent violations. For example, Toppenish has a fine of not more than \$25 for a first offense, and up to a maximum of \$300 for additional violations. Two cities allow parents to perform community service in lieu of payment, and three cities include imprisonment in the city jail as a penalty—in one case in lieu of payment, and in two cases in lieu of payment or in addition to a fine, upon a second or third violation. Several cities also require that a report be filed with Washington's Child Protective Services when a violation of the ordinance has occurred.

5) Impact on Juvenile Crime

The Institute did not perform an independent statistical evaluation of whether the curfew ordinances adopted in Washington have had a measurable reduction in juvenile violence or victimization. In order to provide preliminary information on this topic, city officials from jurisdictions with curfews were surveyed by the Institute as to whether the curfew was influencing juvenile crime rates. Almost half of the Washington cities¹³ (13 out of 27 cities)

¹³ Bridgeport, Coupeville, Eatonville, Ephrata, Everett, Long Beach, Ridgefield, Soap Lake, Sunnyside, Tacoma, Tekoa, Yelm and Zillah.

with curfews reported that their ordinance had an impact on juvenile crime.¹⁴ These effects ranged from observations, such as more active parent involvement and a reduction in the number of youth congregating, to reported reductions in incidents of malicious mischief, disorderly conduct, auto prowls, and vandalism. Most of these cities had not conducted a formal evaluation of the curfew's impact on crime rates. (See Appendix A, Section B, for each city official's individual response.)

Three cities, however, did examine statistical differences.

1. A Yelm city official reported a 68 percent decrease in juvenile crimes during curfew hours in 1994.
2. Zillah's police chief reported that juvenile arrests had decreased from 98 arrests in 1994 to 57 arrests in 1995, a 42 percent decrease.
3. Tacoma's Assistant Chief of Police reported a decrease of approximately 30 percent in the number of juvenile arrests during curfew hours (12 midnight to 6 a.m.), when comparing arrests from January to August 1994 with January to August 1995. Tacoma city officials will continue to examine crime statistics for 1995 to determine the overall impact of the ordinance.

Additionally, a Sunnyside police official reports that they are currently collecting data to examine the impact of the curfew ordinance.

Regarding the effectiveness of curfews, the 1995 National Conference of Mayors' survey of 387 cities in the United States noted the following:

"Thirty-six percent of the survey cities said their curfew was very effective and another 20 percent said it was somewhat effective, but 14 percent said it was not effective at all. These differences of opinion appear to relate to the way the curfew is enforced: Officials believe that where there is less parental involvement, there is less curfew effectiveness."¹⁵

Ordinances in Washington State appear to be in concurrence with this national finding that parental involvement is the key to making curfews effective. As noted earlier, nearly all of the curfew ordinances in Washington involve the parents in enforcing the ordinances.

6) Impact on Runaways

None of the cities reported that their ordinance had any impact on runaways (7 cities did not find any impact, and the remaining 20 did not know of any impact.)

¹⁴ Eight cities did not know if there was an impact on juvenile crime, and the remaining six cities did not find any effect.

¹⁵ Pionke, John, "Conference Survey Finds Cities Moving to Youth Curfews," U.S. Mayor, December 11, 1995, pgs. 18-19.

7) Citations

The number of citations issued for violations of curfew in the 27 Washington cities ranged from 0 to 60 annually. The median number of citations was 1; the average was 8 per year. Twelve of the 27 cities reported that they had not issued any citations. Most of the cities (12 out of 15) that did issue citations, have ordinances that only fine the parent.

8) Funding

The most frequently-cited problem for curfew implementation that was cited in the National Conference of Mayors' study was "the shortage of police personnel and the inability of the system to handle the influx of cases."¹⁶

This national finding was confirmed in the Institute's survey of Washington cities. Officials from many of the surveyed cities said the curfew is reduced to "an empty threat," as police officers are compelled to merely "encourage" juveniles to go home because their juvenile system cannot cope with the high volume of juvenile cases.

Most of the Washington cities did not allocate special funding for the implementation of the ordinance. Oak Harbor allocated some funds for their officers' time, which was absorbed in the police department budget. Tacoma provided some funding for advertisements/public announcements.

9) Legal Challenges

The constitutionality of curfew ordinances has become an issue of debate among proponents and opponents of curfews. Two cities reported that the constitutionality of their original curfew ordinances had been challenged on constitutional grounds. Bellingham's original curfew ordinance was challenged in 1993, after a juvenile was arrested for resisting arrest upon being stopped for a curfew violation. The juvenile court judge ruled that the ordinance was unconstitutional although the juvenile had not been charged with violating the curfew.¹⁷ The city then amended the ordinance in 1994 to the current Parental Responsibility Act, which provides that only the parent is cited for a curfew violation, with the main goal of preventing juveniles from becoming crime victims. The state court of appeals may rule on this matter in 1996, with a possible state Supreme Court appeal in 1997.

The constitutionality of Oak Harbor's ordinance was also challenged. Their original 1985 curfew ordinance was amended in October 1995, and they now have a curfew/parental responsibility ordinance that charges both the minor and the parent in violation of curfew separately. Although the constitutionality of Camas' curfew ordinance, where only the juvenile

¹⁶ Pionke, John, "Conference Survey Finds Cities Moving to Youth Curfews," U.S. Mayor, December 11, 1995, pgs. 18-19.

¹⁷ In 1994, a superior court judge ruled that the juvenile court judge was in error on his ruling of unconstitutionality, Deputy Chief, Bellingham Police Department memo.

is found in violation, has not been legally challenged, approximately three years ago the city attorney advised the police department not to charge any curfew cases.¹⁸

The National Conference of Mayors' study also noted that constitutional challenges to curfews were frequently cited by officials in their survey as a problem in implementing the ordinances.

¹⁸ Interview with Michael Slyter, Chief of Police, Camas, Washington.

Appendix

A. 27 Washington Cities with Juvenile Curfew and/or Parental Responsibility Ordinances:*

<i>Bellingham</i>	<i>Omak</i>
<i>Brewster</i>	<i>Ridgefield</i>
<i>Bridgeport</i>	<i>SeaTac</i>
<i>Camas</i>	<i>Selah</i>
<i>Centralia</i>	<i>Soap Lake</i>
<i>Coupeville</i>	<i>Sunnyside</i>
<i>Eatonville</i>	<i>Tacoma</i>
<i>Ephrata</i>	<i>Tekoa</i>
<i>Everett</i>	<i>Toppenish</i>
<i>Grandview</i>	<i>Wapato</i>
<i>Granger</i>	<i>Yakima</i>
<i>Kent</i>	<i>Yelm</i>
<i>Long Beach</i>	<i>Zillah</i>
<i>Oak Harbor</i>	

* Currently identified number of cities with ordinances, as of February 1996.

Sources: *Washington State Institute for Public Policy, February 1996*
and Municipal Research Services Center of Washington, April 1995

B. Descriptions of Individual Ordinances and Survey Responses:

Table References:

Parent is defined as mother, father, or both, guardian or other adult person having the legal care, custody, or control of a child.

¹ Any unemancipated person, male or female.

² Common exemptions include when a child is: accompanied by his/her parent; engaged in lawful employment; on an errand or on legitimate business pursuant to instructions from his parent; involved in an emergency; returning home from school or church sponsored activities, or from other activities supervised by an adult.

³ Upon determination that a violation has occurred.

⁴ As reported by city officials in response to a Washington State Institute for Public Policy survey, January to February 1996.

City	Ordinance Title and Date Enacted	Age Restriction ¹	Curfew Hours and Days of Week ²	Sentence/Fine ³	Effect on Juvenile Crime ⁴
Bellingham	Juvenile Curfew and Parental Responsibility Ordinance; March 1994	Any person 15 years or younger.	10 pm to 5 am Sunday through Thursday, and 11 pm to 5 am Friday, Saturday, and days before holidays.	<i>Parent only is in violation.</i> A violation is a civil infraction. All persons found to have committed an infraction shall be assessed a monetary penalty not to exceed \$250 for each offense.	No effect; main goal of ordinance is to protect minors from becoming victims of crimes.
Brewster	Parental Responsibility for Juvenile Dependents Ordinance; August 1992	Any person under the age of 18 who is not married.	10 pm to 5 am on school nights; 11 pm to 5 am Sunday through Thursday on non-school nights; and 12:01 am to 5 am on Friday and Saturday.	<i>Parent only is in violation.</i> 1st violation: notice/warning to the parent or guardian and a report to CPS; 2nd violation: civil infraction with monetary penalty not to exceed \$500 for each offense.	Effect unknown (an evaluation has not been conducted).

City	Ordinance Title and Date Enacted	Age Restriction ¹	Curfew Hours and Days of Week ²	Sentence/Fine ³	Effect on Juvenile Crime ⁴
Bridgeport	Parental Responsibility for Juvenile Dependents Ordinance; November 1991	Any person who is not married and under the age of 18.	10 pm to 5 am on school nights; 11 pm to 5 am Sunday through Thursday on non-school nights; and 12:01 am to 5 am on Saturday and Sunday.	<i>Parent only is in violation.</i> 1st violation: written notice given/mailed to parent or custodian and report filed with CPS; 2nd violation: civil infraction with fine of not less than \$50 nor more than \$500 for each offense.	Parents taking a more active role in what their children are doing in the evenings and who they are with.
Camas	Curfew on Minors Ordinance; May 1988	All persons under the age of 18.	Any day between 9 pm and 5 am in the downtown core area; any day between 10 pm and 5 am in the Crown Park area.	<i>Minor only is in violation.</i> The minor shall be charged with a misdemeanor in violation of this ordinance and a fine of not more than \$500. (<i>Fines not imposed for last 3 years.</i>)	No effect.
Centralia	Parental Responsibility for Juvenile Dependents Ordinance; September 1992	Any person under the age of 16.	Any day between 12:30 am and 5 am.	<i>Parent only is in violation.</i> 1st violation: written warning given/sent to parent or custodian and incident reported to CPS; 2nd violation: parent charged, summoned to court, and fined not less than \$25 nor more than \$1,000.	No effect.
Coupeville	Curfew Ordinance; December 1985	Any person 17 years or younger.	11 pm to 6 am Sunday through Thursday; and 1 am to 6 am Saturday and Sunday.	<i>Parent only is in violation.</i> 1st violation: written notice sent by certified mail to parent with a warning; 2nd violation: first offense for the parent, with a maximum fine of \$500; a violation by a minor shall be a Class E offense.	Keeps juveniles from congregating and creating acts of malicious mischief.

City	Ordinance Title and Date Enacted	Age Restriction¹	Curfew Hours and Days of Week²	Sentence/Fine³	Effect on Juvenile Crime⁴
Eatonville	Juvenile Curfew and Parental Responsibility Ordinance; April 1995	Any person under the age of 18.	After 1 am on days in which there is no school and after 11 pm on nights preceding school days.	<i>Parent only is in violation.</i> 1st violation: civil infraction with a notice served on the parent; 2nd violation: summons served with a fine of not less than \$50 nor more than \$300; 3rd or subsequent violation: fine of not less than \$300.	Decrease in vandalism and juvenile crimes.
Ephrata	Parental Responsibility for Juveniles Ordinance; March 1993	Any person under the age of 18.	10 pm to 5 am on school nights and 12 midnight to 5 am on non-school nights.	<i>Parent only is in violation.</i> 1st violation: a notice of infraction is served on parent or guardian; 2nd violation: a fine of not less than \$25 nor more than \$1000.	The number of juveniles congregating has been reduced, as well as the incidents of malicious mischief and disorderly conduct.
Everett	City-Wide Curfew Ordinance; April 1994, amended October 1995	Any minor under the age of 18.	Any day between 11 pm and 5 am.	<i>Both parent and minor in violation, but only parent charged and fined.</i> 1st violation: a civil infraction by the parent or guardian with a fine not to exceed \$250 for each offense.	Central Business District (downtown area) has had less juvenile activity.
Grandview	Parental Responsibility for Juveniles Ordinance; 1991	Any person under the age of 18.	Any day between 12 midnight and 5 am.	<i>Parent only is in violation.</i> 1st violation: notice served on parent or guardian; 2nd violation: parent summoned to court and fined not less than \$25 nor more than \$300.	No effect.

City	Ordinance Title and Date Enacted	Age Restriction ¹	Curfew Hours and Days of Week ²	Sentence/Fine ³	Effect on Juvenile Crime ⁴
Granger	Parental Responsibility Law; August 1995	Any person under the age of 18.	Any day between 12 midnight and 5 am.	<i>Both parent and minor in violation, but only parent charged and fined.</i> 1st violation: parent receives notice; 2nd violation: parent summoned to hearing and fined not less than \$25 nor more than \$300.	No effect.
Kent	Juvenile Safety and Family Reconciliation Ordinance; June 1995	Any person under the age of 18.	10 pm to 6 am Sunday through Thursday and 12:01 am to 6 am Saturday and Sunday.	<i>Both parent and minor in violation, but only parent charged and fined.</i> 1st violation: parent receives notice of infraction, appears in court, and is assessed a monthly penalty not to exceed \$50; 2nd violation: not to exceed \$150. In lieu of payment, parent may elect to perform community service at rate of one hour per \$5 owed.	No statistical evidence; effect unknown.
Long Beach	Curfew and Parental Responsibility Ordinance; June 1995	Any person under the age of 18.	11:01 pm to 5 am Sunday through Thursday and 11:59 pm to 5 am Friday and Saturday.	<i>Parent only is in violation.</i> 1st and all other violations: a civil infraction with a fine not to exceed \$250 for each offense.	The number of juveniles congregating has been reduced; less activity in the city.
Oak Harbor	Curfew Ordinance; October 1995	Any person under the age of 18.	11 pm to 5 am Sunday through Thursday and 1 am to 5 am Saturday and Sunday.	<i>Both parent and minor found in violation with separate penalties.</i> Violation by a minor: civil infraction with a fine not to exceed \$200 for each offense; violation by a parent: civil infraction punishable by a fine not to exceed \$200.	Effect unknown.

City	Ordinance Title and Date Enacted	Age Restriction¹	Curfew Hours and Days of Week²	Sentence/Fine³	Effect on Juvenile Crime⁴
Omak	Parental Responsibility Ordinance; August 1992	Any person who is not married and is under the age of 18.	10 pm to 5 am on school nights, 11 pm to 5 am Sunday through Thursday on non-school nights, and 12 midnight to 5 am Friday and Saturday.	<i>Parent only is in violation.</i> 1st violation: parent given/ mailed a written notice and a report filed with CPS; 2nd violation: parent shall have committed a civil infraction and be fined not less than \$50 nor more than \$500 for each offense.	Effect unknown.
Ridgefield	Juvenile Curfew and Parental Responsibility Ordinance; October 1991	Any person 17 years old or younger.	Beginning at 12 midnight on nights preceding non-school days, and 10 pm on nights preceding school days.	<i>Both parent and minor in violation with separate penalties.</i> Parent's 1st violation: notice given to parent; 2nd violation: summons served on parent, charged and fined not less than \$50 nor more than \$300.	A reduction in late night acts of malicious mischief and auto prowls.
SeaTac	Curfew and Parental Responsibility Ordinance; June 1995	Any person under the age of 18.	11 pm to 5 am Sunday through Thursday and 12:01 am to 5 am Saturday and Sunday.	<i>Both parent and minor in violation with separate penalties.</i> Parent's 1st violation within 5 yr. period: a misdemeanor with a fine of not more than \$250; 2nd violation: a misdemeanor with a fine of not more than \$500, imprisonment in jail for not more than 90 days, or both fine and imprisonment. Minor's 1st violation within a 5 yr. period: civil infraction with a fine of \$50; 2nd violation: fine of \$100.	Effect unknown.

City	Ordinance Title and Date Enacted	Age Restriction ¹	Curfew Hours and Days of Week ²	Sentence/Fine ³	Effect on Juvenile Crime ⁴
Selah	Parental Responsibility for Juveniles Ordinance; 1990	Any person under the age of 18.	Any day between 12 midnight and 5 am.	<i>Parent only is in violation.</i> 1st violation: notice given to parent; 2nd violation: parent charged with fine of not less than \$25 nor more than \$300; 3rd violation: parent fined not less than \$50 nor more than \$300.	Effect unknown.
Soap Lake	Parental Responsibility for Juveniles Ordinance; 1991	Any person under the age of 18.	10:30 pm to 5 am Sunday through Thursday, and 12 midnight to 5 am Friday and Saturday.	<i>Parent only is in violation.</i> 1st violation: notice given to the parent; 2nd violation: summons served, charged, and fined not less than \$25 nor more than \$300.	A reduction in crime involving juveniles and fewer numbers of juveniles congregating at night.
Sunnyside	Parental Responsibility for Juveniles Ordinance; 1991	Two age limits: any person under the age of 18, and any person under the age of 15.	Any day between 12 midnight and 5 am for any person under the age of 18; between 10 pm and 5 am for any person under the age of 15.	<i>Parent only is in violation.</i> 1st violation: notice given to the parent; 2nd violation: summons served and fine of not less than \$25 nor more than \$1,000 if judge determines a 2nd violation has occurred.	Yes, there is an effect on juvenile crime rates; currently assembling data.
Tacoma	Curfew Hours for Minors Ordinance; January 1995	Any person under the age of 18.	Any day between 12:01 am and 6 am.	<i>Both parent and minor are in violation, but only parent is charged and fined.</i> 1st violation: a civil infraction with a monetary penalty not to exceed \$250 for each offense; community service may be performed in lieu of fine.	A comparison of juvenile arrests Jan-Aug 1994 with Jan-Aug 1995 found about a 30 percent decrease in the numbers of juveniles arrested during curfew hours. Currently examining crime statistics for 1995 to determine overall impact.

City	Ordinance Title and Date Enacted	Age Restriction¹	Curfew Hours and Days of Week²	Sentence/Fine³	Effect on Juvenile Crime⁴
Tekoa	Juvenile Curfew and Parental Responsibility Ordinance; original March 1967 repealed and amended July 1988	Any person under the age of 18.	Any day between 10 pm and 6 am.	<i>Both parent and minor are in violation, but only parent is charged and fined.</i> Any violation: misdemeanor, not more than \$500 fine and/or not more than 40 hours of community service.	A reduction in vandalism.
Toppenish (both day and night)	Juvenile Curfew and Parental Responsibility Ordinance; original 1993, amended May 1995	Any person under the age of 18.	Any day between 10 pm and 5 am, and between 9 am and 2:30 pm Monday through Friday.	<i>Parent only is in violation.</i> A violation is a civil infraction; 1st violation: not more than a \$25 fine; additional violations: up to a \$300 fine.	No effect.
Wapato (both day and night)	Parental Responsibility Law; original June 1988; amended August 1995 to include daytime	Two age limits: any person under the age of 14, and any person between age 14 up to age 18.	9 pm to 6 am for children under 14; 10 pm to 6 am for children between 14 and 18; and 9 am to 2:45 pm Monday through Friday for all children. Curfews shall be extended 1 hour on evenings before Saturdays, Sundays and holidays.	<i>Parent only is in violation.</i> Violation: a misdemeanor with a fine not to exceed \$300, imprisonment in the city jail for not more than 30 days, or both a fine and imprisonment.	Effect unknown at this time.
Yakima	Curfew and Parental Responsibility Ordinance; March 1994	Any person under the age of 18.	11 pm to 5 am Sunday through Thursday, and 12:01 am to 5 am on Saturday and Sunday.	<i>Minor only is in violation.</i> Violation is a civil infraction; 1st violation: fine of \$100; 2nd violation within a one year period: fine of \$250.	Effect unknown.

City	Ordinance Title and Date Enacted	Age Restriction ¹	Curfew Hours and Days of Week ²	Sentence/Fine ³	Effect on Juvenile Crime ⁴
Yelm	Curfew for Minors and Parental Responsibility Ordinance; original July 1991; amended July 1992	Two age limits: Any child under the age of 16, and any child under the age of 11.	Any day between 12 midnight and 6 am for children under 16, and between 10 pm and 6 am for children under 11.	<i>Both parent and minor are in violation, but only parent is charged and fined.</i> Parent shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and subject to a fine of not more than \$100 per violation. Any child found in violation shall be arrested without a warrant and delivered to parent or guardian.	A 68 percent decrease in juvenile crimes during the hours of curfew (using 1995 statistics).
Zillah	Parental Responsibility for Juvenile Dependents Ordinance; August 1990	Any person who is not married and is under the age of 18.	Any day between 12 midnight and 5 am.	<i>Parent only is in violation.</i> 1st violation: parent given a written notice; 2nd violation: report filed with CPS and second written notice given to parent; 3rd violation: charged and fined up to \$500, imprisonment of up to 30 days, or both fine and imprisonment.	Juvenile arrests decreased from 98 in 1994 to 57 in 1995, a 42 percent decrease.

Washington State Institute for Public Policy, February 1996