

**CONNECTICUT
JUVENILE JURISDICTION
PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE**

FINAL REPORT

February 12, 2007

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Connecticut remains one of only three states—along with North Carolina and New York—that draw the line of adulthood for criminal justice purposes at 16. As a result, Connecticut is out of step with both the vast majority of states in its treatment of youth and the current scientific research demonstrating significant cognitive differences between adults and older adolescents.

In 2006, the Connecticut General Assembly established the Juvenile Jurisdiction Planning and Implementation Committee (the Committee) and charged it with creating a plan to align the state's policies with mainstream practice. State lawmakers took this action with the knowledge that incorporating 16- and 17-year-old youth into the juvenile justice system will not only promote public safety in Connecticut by fostering positive youth development, but it will also, in the long run, cost state taxpayers less than handling this distinct category of youth in the adult criminal justice system.

Since it first convened in August 2006, the Committee has gathered public testimony, considered analyses from studies commissioned by state agencies, and met regularly to weigh this information and evidence. As a result of these efforts, the Committee recommends that the General Assembly take the following actions:

- Pass legislation in the 2007 session to raise the age of juvenile jurisdiction from 16 to 18, effective July 1, 2009;
- Prepare the existing state juvenile justice system for this change by improving court diversion and pre-trial detention practices;
- Establish Regional Youth Courts to accommodate the expected influx of 16- and 17-year-olds;
- Phase in community and residential services and staffing to serve 16- and 17-year-olds effectively;
- Create a Policy and Operations Coordinating Council with a clear mandate to implement these recommendations and to resolve, prior to the effective date, key tasks and outstanding issues identified in this report; and
- Appropriate funds necessary to accomplish these changes prior to the effective date.

These recommendations, ratified and endorsed by the Committee, form the basis of a legislative plan to incorporate 16- and 17-year-olds into Connecticut's juvenile justice system. This plan will be introduced for consideration by the General Assembly during the 2007 legislative session.

INTRODUCTION

This is the final report of the Juvenile Jurisdiction Planning and Implementation Committee (the Committee) established by the Connecticut General Assembly in 2006. While the official product of the Committee's work since its establishment last year, the report represents more broadly the culmination of over five years of reflection, collaboration, and compromise among Connecticut practitioners, legislators, and advocates united around a common purpose: to bring Connecticut justice policy in line with national best practice by incorporating all youth under 18 years of age under the jurisdiction of the Superior Court for Juvenile Matters ("juvenile court").

At the outset of this report, the Committee reaffirms that raising the age of juvenile jurisdiction makes sense from a policy perspective and will align Connecticut with both the vast majority of states in their treatment of youth and the current scientific research demonstrating the significant relevant differences between adults and older adolescents. Furthermore, the Committee is confident that incorporating 16- and 17-year-old youth into the juvenile justice system will not only promote public safety through positive youth development, but will also cost less than handling this distinct category of youth in the adult criminal justice system over the long term.

This report on the Committee's implementation plan and recommendations is presented in two sections, preceded by a background section on broader issues of juvenile justice practice, a summary of Connecticut's work on this topic over the past five years, and a description of the Committee's mandate and methodology. Section A details the Committee's implementation plan and recommendations. This section delineates a timeline and substantive methods to modify operational and system components critical to the successful expansion of juvenile jurisdiction. The recommendations described in Section B are intended to structure an ongoing process and a system of accountability for the transition period. Combined, the recommendations presented in Sections A and B ensure that the juvenile justice system will be ready to accommodate 16- and 17-year-olds by the effective date of July 1, 2009.

The recommendations and implementation plan set out in this report usher in a new era for Connecticut and its youth—one in which the state dedicates itself to focusing on the inherent potential of each of its children while also maintaining the safety of its families and communities. The Committee recognizes that the implementation of this initiative is a complex undertaking that affects a host of agencies, service providers, communities, and ultimately young people themselves. It also realizes that the goal is well within reach. With this plan, the Committee provides realistic and concrete steps to bring 16- and 17-year-olds into the juvenile justice system in a timely, effective, and fiscally prudent manner.

BACKGROUND

A full appreciation of this report and its recommendations must be predicated upon an understanding of their context. Accordingly, this section provides a brief overview of some of the issues associated with raising the age of juvenile jurisdiction, a relevant history of juvenile and criminal justice practice in Connecticut, and a summary of the methodology used by the Juvenile Jurisdiction Planning and Implementation Committee.

Raising the Age: An Overview of the Issue

More than 100 years ago, recognizing the inherent differences between youth and adults, reformers created a separate justice system for juveniles. At the time, youth were thought to lack moral and judgmental maturity and were therefore considered less culpable for deviant behavior than were adults. In more recent years, however, high rates of violence among youth inspired many lawmakers to become more “tough on crime.” In Connecticut, as elsewhere, laws were passed that increasingly brought young people—especially older teenagers—under the jurisdiction of the adult court. An improved understanding of youth development, supported by greater scientific knowledge about brain functioning, has caused lawmakers to reconsider this approach to administering justice to young people.

Many of the factors associated with this trend are reflected in the U.S. Supreme Court’s March 2005 decision outlawing the death penalty for anyone younger than age 18. In *Roper v. Simmons*, the Court noted:

Three general differences between juveniles under 18 and adults demonstrate that juvenile offenders cannot with reliability be classified among the worst offenders. First. . . [a] lack of maturity and an underdeveloped sense of responsibility are found in youth more often than in adults and are more understandable among the young. . . . The second area of difference is that juveniles are more vulnerable or susceptible to negative influences and outside pressures, including peer pressure The third broad difference is that the character of a juvenile is not as well formed as that of an adult. . . . These differences render suspect any conclusion that a juvenile falls among the worst offenders. . . . From a moral standpoint it would be misguided to equate the failings of a minor with those of an adult, for a greater possibility exists that a minor’s character deficiencies will be reformed. . . . For the reasons we have discussed . . . a line must be drawn. . . . The age of 18 is the point where society draws the line for many purposes between childhood and adulthood.¹

In addition to these “general differences” noted by the Supreme Court to be associated with youth under age 18—a lack of maturity, heightened susceptibility to external influences, and insufficiently developed character—counting 16- and 17-year-olds as

¹ 543 U.S. 551, 569-70, & 574 (2005).

adults in the criminal justice context is inconsistent with their treatment in almost every other legal context. By law, in most states 16- and 17-year-olds cannot vote, purchase or consume alcohol, gamble, or marry without the written consent of their parents. Neither can they serve on the juries that decide whether a 16- or 17-year-old will go to prison.

Critical both to the Supreme Court's reasoning and to evolving national best practices are recent developments in neuroscience suggesting that teenagers are neither competent to stand trial under the same circumstances as adults nor as blameworthy for their actions. Brain imaging studies comparing adults and adolescents confronted with difficult decisions show, for example, that adolescents, whose brains are not yet fully developed, take longer than adults to judge something to be a bad idea and are slower to respond appropriately. Adults have also been found to have more activity in the parts of the brain that create mental imagery and signal internal distress. This has led researchers to believe that adults who are confronted with a potentially dangerous scenario are more likely to create a mental image of possible outcomes than children are and to have an adverse, preemptive response to those images.² Other studies have confirmed significant age-related differences in cognitive processing affecting adolescents' ability to make sound judgments.³

Incorporating 16- and 17-year-old youth into the juvenile justice system also makes sense from a policy perspective. Studies comparing the recidivism rates of youth processed in the juvenile system with those handled in the adult system indicate that youth processed in the adult system are likely to re-offend more quickly and at higher rates.⁴ The juvenile justice system is typically characterized by higher staff-to-youth ratios, staff who are philosophically oriented toward treatment and rehabilitation, and programming that facilitates the development of social competencies. Youth in adult facilities, meanwhile, are particularly vulnerable to depression, sexual exploitation and physical assault.⁵

² A.A. Baird, J.A. Fugelsang, and C.M. Bennett, "What were you thinking?" available at <http://www.theteenbrain.com/research/projects/goodidea2.php> [last visited February 4, 2007].

³ Studies conducted by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Research Network on Adolescent Development and Juvenile Justice continue to support this conclusion. Analyses have indicated that there are significant age-related changes in individuals' likelihood of considering the future consequences of their actions and in their susceptibility to peer influence. Available at <http://www.mac-adoldev-juvjustice.org/page26.html> [last visited February 4, 2007].

⁴ Most studies comparing the two systems have corroborated this claim. See, e.g., J.A. Fagan, "The comparative advantage of juvenile versus criminal court sanctions on recidivism among adolescent felony offenders," *Law and Policy* 18 (1 and 2): 77-113 (1996); D.M. Bishop, C.E. Frazier, L. Lanza-Kaduce, and L. Winner, "The transfer of juveniles to criminal court: Does it make a difference?" *Crime and Delinquency*, 42: 171-191 (1996); L. Winner, L. Lanza-Kaduce, D.M. Bishop, and C.E. Frazier, "The transfer of juveniles to criminal court: Reexamining recidivism over the long term." *Crime and Delinquency* 43(4): 548-563 (1997).

⁵ See, e.g., Coalition for Juvenile Justice, *Childhood on Trial: The Failure of Trying & Sentencing Youth in Adult Criminal Court*, 2005, available at <http://www.appa-net.org/about%20appa/CJJ-report.pdf> [last visited February 4, 2007]; Jason Ziedenberg and Vincent Schiraldi, *The Risks Juveniles Face When They Are Incarcerated with Adults*, Justice Policy Institute, June 1997, available at <http://www.cjcj.org/jpi/risks.html> [last visited February 4, 2007]; Martin Forst et al., "Youth in prisons and training schools: perceptions and consequences of the treatment-custody dichotomy," *Juvenile and Family Court*, vol. 4 (1989) (finding that child offenders who enter adult prison when they are still below the age of 18 are five times more likely to be sexually assaulted, twice as likely to be beaten by staff, and 50 percent more likely to be attacked with a weapon than are minors in juvenile facilities).

Processing youth in the juvenile justice system, particularly when alternatives to custodial incarceration are utilized, may also cost less than processing youth as adult criminals.⁶ In the 2006 legislative session, researchers from the Urban Institute testified to the Connecticut General Assembly that moving 16- and 17-year-old youth out of the adult system and into the juvenile system, while maintaining all other services for youth as they are, would return approximately \$3 in benefit for every \$1 in cost, assuming no new juvenile detention construction is required. If new construction is required, the transition of juveniles would result in slightly less than a \$1 in benefit for every \$1 in cost in the year the construction occurs, and \$3 in benefit for every \$1 in cost in subsequent years.⁷ Evidence-based programs that have demonstrated positive pro-social outcomes among youth participants—such as Functional Family Therapy, Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care, and Multi-Systemic Therapy—yield dramatic cost savings immediately and, over the long term, each dollar spent on such programs can result in cost savings in the range of \$11, 988, \$27,202, and \$38,047 per youth respectively, based on significant reductions in recidivism and in averted incarceration and hospitalization costs.⁸

Historical Context in Connecticut

Connecticut is one of only three states—along with North Carolina and New York—that draw the line of adulthood for criminal justice purposes at age 16.⁹ In keeping with national trends and the evolving understanding of the fundamental differences between youth and adults, however, Connecticut has been considering extending the age of juvenile jurisdiction for some time.

In 2003, the General Assembly created a “Juvenile Justice Implementation Team” to “review all matters, including funding, necessary to implement an increase, by not more than two years, in the age limit for purposes of jurisdiction in juvenile matters.” Consistent with its legislated mandate, after an extensive review the Implementation

⁶ See the forthcoming National Center for State Courts report, “Potential benefits and public savings in changing juvenile jurisdiction in Connecticut Superior Court.” The report details considerable potential cost savings and cost avoidance that Connecticut can achieve through shorter pre-trial detention, lower potential re-arrest rates, and court caseload benefits.

⁷ John Roman, *The Economic Impact of Raising the Age of Juvenile Jurisdiction in Connecticut: Remarks before the Judiciary and Appropriations Committee, Connecticut General Assembly, February 21, 2006*, Urban Institute, 2006; see also Aos, Steve, Robert Barnoski, Roxanne Lieb, and Polly Phipps, *The Comparative Costs and Benefits of Programs to Reduce Crime, v 4.0*. Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy, 2001.

⁸ See Hornby Zeller Associates, “Connecticut service needs study: 16 and 17-year-old court-involved youth: preliminary findings,” Presentation to the Juvenile Jurisdiction Planning and Implementation Committee, January 4, 2007.

⁹ Thirty-seven states and the District of Columbia maintain an upper age limit of 18, while 10 states use an upper age limit of 17. A number of states that draw the line at ages younger than 18 have recently considered raising the age of juvenile jurisdiction. Illinois and Wisconsin introduced legislation in 2006 that would have raised the upper age limit of each state’s juvenile court from 17 to 18. New Hampshire took steps to raise the age to 18 during its 2002 legislative session. Although this effort ultimately did not prevail, the compromise legislation that passed allows youth in the care and custody of the Division for Juvenile Justice Services to remain so until their 18th birthday, if so deemed by the juvenile court. The movement to raise the age of juvenile jurisdiction to 18 is also gaining momentum in North Carolina, where the North Carolina Sentencing and Policy Advisory Study Commission recently recommended that the state should raise the age to 18.

Team presented a report detailing its findings and recommendations in February 2004. The report recommended several changes to the juvenile justice system that would be necessary to incorporate 16- and 17-year-olds without diminishing the services provided to the children already under its purview. While many of the Team’s participants favored increasing the age if provided with the appropriate funding, the report estimated that the age change would cost more than \$160 million. This price tag—which assumed the construction of two 150-bed facilities for pre- and post-adjudicatory custody—proved overwhelming and stymied further consideration of the issue during that legislative session.

Approximately two years later, at the close of its 2006 legislative session, Connecticut’s General Assembly revisited the issue and established the Juvenile Jurisdiction Planning and Implementation Committee. The Assembly charged the Committee with the following mandate:

“ . . . to plan for the implementation of any changes in the juvenile justice system that would be required in order to extend jurisdiction in delinquency matters and proceedings to include sixteen-year-old and seventeen-year-old children within the Superior Court for Juvenile Matters.”¹⁰

The enabling legislation for the Committee further mandated that on or before February 1, 2007, it should submit a report on its findings, together with any recommendations for appropriate legislation, to the joint standing committees of the General Assembly. This report is the fulfillment of that mandate.

The Juvenile Jurisdiction Planning and Implementation Committee

Consistent with its legislated mandate, the Juvenile Jurisdiction Planning and Implementation Committee convened for biweekly sessions beginning in August 2006.¹¹ Over 14 meetings between August 2006 and January 2007, the Committee received presentations by relevant practitioners and other stakeholders regarding the current juvenile justice system and the changes that would be required to raise the age of juvenile jurisdiction.¹²

In September 2006, to further inform its process, the Committee issued requests for proposals for project oversight and management and a service needs study. In October, the Committee selected the Vera Institute of Justice (Vera) and Hornby Zeller Associates, Inc., respectively, as vendors to complete these tasks, with work commencing November 1, 2006.¹³ The Judicial Branch commissioned the National Center for State Courts

¹⁰ Public Act 06-187, section 16. See Appendix A for the enabling legislation.

¹¹ See Appendix B for a list of Committee members.

¹² See Appendix C for a list of presenters and schedule of presentations given to the Committee.

¹³ Specifically, Hornby Zeller was tasked with completing a study of service needs for court-involved youth ages 16 and 17, and with providing recommendations based on that study for the services, programs, and interventions most likely to be effective with prevalent specific profiles of this population. The Vera Institute was hired to oversee and manage all project related activities, including meeting timelines and facilitating successful and timely project completion. The Requests for Proposals issued by the Committee are available at <http://www.cga.ct.gov/hdo/jpic/>.

(NCSC) to conduct a courts study. Hornby Zeller and NCSC gathered and synthesized data and conducted interviews with system officials and personnel, delivering periodic progress reports to the Committee. Vera managed the biweekly discussions of the Committee in an effort to distill its findings and recommendations for the final report.

As project manager, Vera worked with the co-chairs to identify the principal areas that most required the Committee's attention. The co-chairs then divided the Committee into three workgroups to develop discrete findings and recommendations in each of these areas. The remaining sections of this report present the Committee's findings and recommendations.

THE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

The Juvenile Jurisdiction Planning and Implementation Committee's work comes to a close on February 8, 2007. In keeping with its mandate, the Committee has articulated a plan, structure, and process for implementing the change in juvenile court jurisdiction effective July 1, 2009. Five recommendations form the core of the Committee's implementation plan. These are:

1. Pass legislation in the 2007 session to raise the age of juvenile jurisdiction from 16 to 18 with an effective date of July 1, 2009;
2. Improve court diversion and pre-trial detention practices;
3. Establish Regional Youth Courts;
4. Phase in services and staffing; and
5. Establish a Policy and Operations Coordinating Council.

These proposals are presented sequentially, beginning with the passage of legislation in the 2007 session to raise the age of juvenile jurisdiction from 16 to 18 effective July 1, 2009. The Committee sees recommendations two, three, and four as necessary steps for preparing the existing state juvenile justice system for the change scheduled for 2009. The rationale and implementation procedures for these steps are described in greater detail in Section A, below.

Recognizing that raising the age of juvenile jurisdiction will require the resolution of various ancillary or unresolved issues and concerns—some immediate, others more long term—the Committee further recommends that legislators establish a Policy and Operations Coordinating Council with a clear mandate to resolve the issues delineated below prior to the effective date. A detailed account of the Committee's rationale and plan for the Policy and Operations Coordinating Council is presented in Section B.

A. Implementation Plan: Central Components

In carrying out its mandate, the Committee formed three workgroups, each focusing on a different aspect of the overall task.¹⁴ The Front-End Workgroup was responsible for developing recommendations to ensure that established systems and stakeholders are

¹⁴ See Appendix D for a list of designated workgroup members.

adequately prepared for a change in jurisdictional age. The Court-Related Issues Workgroup focused on articulating recommendations to ensure that juvenile courts (i.e., dockets, courthouses, attorneys, and staff) will be prepared to manage an influx in population following the change. Finally, the Services Workgroup was charged with developing recommendations to ensure that appropriate services will be available to support the unique needs of an expanded juvenile justice population.

The workgroups used this planning opportunity to think about how to improve the state's juvenile justice system following the age change. All three workgroups rejected the assumption that the state would simply maintain the status quo following the reform. Instead, they sought to incorporate the best parts of the state's existing processes, learn from national best practices, and envision a system that better serves the juvenile justice population in Connecticut at minimal cost.

Recommendations one through four form the central components of the Committee's implementation plan. Recommendation one specifies a reasonable and practicable timeframe for agencies and other stakeholders to prepare for the change in juvenile jurisdiction. Recommendations two, three, and four outline substantive methods to modify, within this timeframe—operational and system components critical to the reform's success.

Recommendation 1: Pass legislation in the 2007 session to raise the age of juvenile jurisdiction from 16 to 18 with an effective date of July 1, 2009. The Committee's first recommendation is that legislation to raise the age of juvenile jurisdiction in Connecticut from 16 to 18 be passed in the 2007 legislative session with an effective date of July 1, 2009. The Committee recommends that the jurisdictional change not be retroactive: only those 16- and 17-year-olds who are arrested on or after July 1, 2009, should be handled in the juvenile court system. Committee members are confident that the 2009 effective date provides agencies with ample time and opportunity for planning, budgeting, and transitioning.

Recommendation 2: Improve court diversion and pre-trial detention practices. The Front-End Workgroup was tasked with developing discrete recommendations to ensure that existing pre-trial systems and stakeholders are adequately prepared for a change in jurisdictional age. Given this mandate, the workgroup endorsed, as a general matter, *the development of programs and policies geared toward prevention and diverting more youth from the juvenile justice system at the point of arrest.* By enhancing existing community-based programs for youth of all ages— such as Juvenile Review Boards and Youth Service Bureaus—the Committee expects that more children and families will be served outside of the juvenile court process and with better outcomes. Further discussion of prevention and diversion follows in Section B.

As one important component of this recommendation, the workgroup considered pre-trial detention practices with an eye toward assessing potential capacity concerns and ensuring the most appropriate use of pre-trial detention for youth of all ages. The workgroup was particularly concerned about the large social and economic costs associated with juvenile detention. The average annual detention bed cost in Connecticut is approximately

\$119,000.¹⁵ Last fiscal year, the costs of managing the state's 206-bed system exceeded \$20 million. Moreover, national literature confirms that detention leads to negative outcomes for youth.¹⁶ Research conducted by the Vera Institute of Justice, for example, has demonstrated that a stay in detention is, by far, the greatest predictor of dispositional placement at sentencing. Of the New York City youth studied who were placed with the New York State Office of Children and Family Services at sentencing, nine out of ten spent some of the previous 30 days in detention. Conversely, of those youth studied who received a community-based disposition at sentencing, nine out of ten were in the community the entire month prior to disposition. And in Connecticut, as in most jurisdictions nationally, the vast majority of juveniles detained are youth of color. A recent study found that youth of color represent 65 percent of the state's juvenile detention population while comprising only 29 percent of the state's total population of youth between ages 10 and 15.¹⁷

In light of this framework, the Front-End Workgroup recognized that some of the youth detained under the current system might be better served in the community. A preliminary examination of detention data provided by the Court Support Services Division (CSSD) confirmed this premise. The workgroup learned that, on any typical day, approximately 30 percent of the juvenile detention population in Connecticut is being held for non-violent, non-Serious Juvenile Offenses (*e.g.*, violations of probation, breach of peace, or violations of Families with Service Needs orders).¹⁸ The workgroup agreed that detention may not be the most appropriate option for this population, and, with the appropriate interventions, juvenile detention use might be reduced to yield significant capacity and cost savings.

In an effort to project pre-trial detention needs for 16- and 17-year-olds after the jurisdictional change, the workgroup determined that the number of pre-adjudicated and committed 16- and 17-year-old youth who will require secure housing after the venue change should be smaller than the number currently housed with the Department of Correction (DOC).¹⁹ On November 1, 2005, DOC held 339 inmates aged 16 or 17, excluding A & B felony offenders. Of those, 101 were sentenced and, under the jurisdictional change, would likely be under the custody of the Department of Children and Families (DCF). Of the 238 remaining, data indicates that at least 23 percent (55)

¹⁵ Annual costs in some jurisdictions well exceed that; in Bridgeport, it costs \$145,000 per year to hold a juvenile in detention.

¹⁶ See, *e.g.*, James Austin, Kelly Dedel Johnson, and Ronald Weitzer, *Alternatives to Secure Detention and Confinement of Juvenile Offenders*, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Bulletin, September 2005; Barry Holman and Jason Ziedenberg, *The Dangers of Detention: The Impact of Incarcerating Youth in Detention and Other Secure Facilities*, Justice Policy Institute, 2006; David L. Marcus "Communities helping kids," *The American Prospect Online*, September 2005, available at <http://www.prospect.org/web/page.wv?section=root&name=ViewPrint&articleId=10122> [last visited February 5, 2007].

¹⁷ Connecticut Juvenile Justice Alliance, *Out of Balance: Failures in Addressing Disproportionate Minority Contact within Connecticut's Juvenile Justice System*, available at http://www.ctjja.org/resource_category_9.html [last visited February 4, 2007].

¹⁸ While the average daily population varies, overall capacity in Connecticut's juvenile detention system is approximately 206 beds.

¹⁹ A statutory grant of juvenile status to 16- and 17-year-olds will allow for their detention for reasons other than the pending charge.

were held for non-violent offenses such as misdemeanors and probation violations. Moreover, the comparative frequency of court appearances in the juvenile court expedites case movement, reducing the average length of stay in pre-adjudication status from 40 days in the adult correctional system to 14 days in the juvenile system. The potential incorporation, discussed in Section B, of a bond or bond-like system into the juvenile processing of 16- and 17-year-olds may be explored as an option for reducing any associated increase in pre-trial detention.

With this in mind, the Committee *recommends the introduction of a statewide validated risk assessment instrument to inform juvenile detention admission decisions*. Many jurisdictions across the country use risk assessment instruments to reserve detention beds for kids who pose the greatest risks to public safety—and have saved significant costs by doing so.²⁰ Risk assessment instruments use objective factors to evaluate the risks of re-arrest and failure to appear and to classify arrested youth into three categories: high (appropriate for detention), low (released), and moderate (released with structured supervision). Detention risk assessment instruments typically weigh factors such as a juvenile’s present offense, prior history, and propensity toward risk of flight to determine whether detention is the most appropriate response. In addition, by minimizing the impact of subjective racial biases, risk assessment instruments serve as an important strategy for addressing disproportionate minority confinement. Once established, the Committee recommends that the detention risk assessment instrument be reviewed on an annual basis and revised to meet evolving system needs and trends.

The introduction of a statewide detention risk assessment instrument in Connecticut will require the concurrent expansion of pre-trial supervision programs to serve youth who score in the moderate range. The Committee *recommends the establishment of a*

²⁰ See e.g., Annie E. Casey Foundation, “Results: impact of JDAI,” available at <http://www.aecf.org/initiatives/jdai/results.htm> [last visited February 5, 2007].

Throughout its deliberations, the Front-End Workgroup considered the experiences of other jurisdictions that have implemented detention risk assessment instruments. In 1997, for example, officials in Santa Cruz, California, developed screening criteria to ensure that the county’s detention beds were reserved for the more serious and violent offenders. With the implementation of the new screening instrument, some non-violent offenders (e.g., misdemeanants, property offenders) were screened out of the county’s detention facility and placed in alternative programs. As a consequence, the detention population in Santa Cruz decreased by 43 percent between 1996 and 2001 and the percentage of minority youth in detention was reduced from 64 percent in 1997 to 54 percent in 2001. Placing a juvenile in an alternative program costs the county \$64 a day, compared to \$184 a day for detention, and the county avoided spending millions of dollars to staff and build bigger detention facilities. (See Peggy Townsend, “Detention redemption,” *The American Prospect Online*, September 2005, available at <http://www.prospect.org/web/page.wv?section=root&name=ViewPrint&articleId=10125> [last visited February 5, 2007]).

Likewise, by implementing detention risk assessment and a continuum of community-based alternatives, Cook County, Illinois (Chicago), has halved its detention population without seeing any increases in failure to appear or re-offense rates. Importantly, as a result of its detention reform efforts, Cook County realized a corresponding decline in the number of youth committed to the Illinois Department of Corrections (DOC). In 1996, 902 youth were committed to DOC; in 2005, that number dropped to 420, for an average annual savings of \$23,000 per bed. (See Barry Holman and Jason Ziedenberg, *The Dangers of Detention: The Impact of Incarcerating Youth in Detention and Other Secure Facilities*, Justice Policy Institute, 2006). New Mexico is an example of a state where detention risk assessment has been legislatively mandated statewide. Copies of the risk assessment instruments employed in Cook County, Santa Cruz, and New Mexico are included in Appendix E.

spectrum of appropriate services and supervision to ensure that youth who score in the mid-risk category on the risk assessment instrument appear at all court hearings and do not re-offend during the pendency of their petition. In accord with national best practices, the Committee recommends that youth be appropriately matched to pre-trial services and supervision programs that are the least restrictive, while still ensuring public safety.

Taken together, recommendation two promotes the objective, rational and cost-effective use of juvenile detention resources. By introducing a statewide risk-assessment instrument and appropriate pre-trial services, the Committee believes the State of Connecticut can take important steps toward providing sufficient pre-trial detention capacity for an expanded juvenile court population, without requiring the investment of significant financial resources or sacrificing public safety. Based on the experiences of other jurisdictions, the Committee also projects that these types of interventions will yield cost savings over the long term.

Recommendation 3: Establish Regional Youth Courts. The Court-Related Issues Workgroup was tasked with articulating findings regarding how court processes will be affected by raising the age of juvenile jurisdiction to 18 and developing discrete recommendations to ensure that the juvenile courts are prepared for this change.

Working closely with the National Center for State Courts (NCSC), the Court-Related Issues Workgroup focused on how juvenile court facilities and staff could be reorganized and adapted to process the influx of approximately 10,000 16- and 17-year-olds (representing more than 12,000 cases) at the lowest cost to the state while attending to the unique needs of these youth. Members of the group also underlined their concern, shared by the 2004 Implementation Team, that agency resources currently utilized in service of juveniles under age 16 not be diluted by the introduction of older youth to the juvenile system. The group considered courtroom space needs, as well as office space that would be required for new staff. The group was particularly concerned about the need for staff increases across agencies—including, but not limited to, additional probation officers, judges, public defenders, state’s attorneys, social workers, parole social workers, and court clerical staff.

The group considered four potential models for organizing the courts: adapting existing juvenile court space to incorporate 16- and 17-year-old youth, constructing new juvenile court facilities, utilizing existing Geographical Area (GA) courthouse space, and developing regional youth courts. After weighing the options, the workgroup ascertained that existing juvenile court space would be physically insufficient to accommodate the number of cases projected by adding 16- and 17-year-olds to the docket. Building new juvenile court facilities would involve heavy costs in terms of bricks and mortar and significant delays due to siting and construction. Processing 16- and 17-year-olds in the GA, the group determined, would be ideologically inconsistent with affording them the full protection of juvenile status. In contrast, establishing Regional Youth Courts would bring 16- and 17-year-olds fully into the juvenile court, significantly reduce the costs and delays associated with constructing new facilities by realigning existing resources, and protect younger juveniles by creating a separate processing sphere for older youth. As a result, the workgroup concluded that the establishment of Regional Youth Courts represents the most efficient, workable, and attractive option.

The Regional Youth Courts Plan, as detailed by the Judicial Branch, makes use of existing and currently unoccupied or underutilized juvenile courthouse facilities to establish a unique court processing sphere for 16- and 17-year-olds in the juvenile court. The Judicial Branch has identified 11 potential regional court locations. Eight of these—Bridgeport, Bristol, Hartford, Rockville, Stamford, Waterbury, Waterford, and Willimantic—will utilize existing space.²¹ Two—Middletown and Torrington—will utilize space available in planned but yet-to-be constructed juvenile courthouses set to be operational in 2010 and 2011, respectively. The site for a New Haven regional youth court is yet to be determined.

The Regional Youth Courts Plan now proposed is expected to cost approximately \$3 to 5 million for space modifications in fiscal year 2008; \$1.5 million for leasing beginning in fiscal year 2009; and \$5.9 million for Judicial Branch staffing costs beginning in fiscal year 2009. The Judicial Branch has estimated that five Superior Court judges along with approximately 100 probation officers, as well as additional judicial marshals, support staff, court interpreters, and victim advocates will be required to administer the Regional Youth Courts.²² The Office of the Chief Public Defender anticipates needing 17 to 20 new staff, including attorneys, investigators, and social workers.²³

The Committee with this report *endorses and recommends the establishment of Regional Youth Courts for 16- and 17-year-olds in accordance with the plan set out by the Judicial Branch*. Legislative authorization of this plan is required to ensure its legitimacy and operational readiness by the effective date of the change in age of jurisdiction of the juvenile court.

Recommendation 4: Phase in an effective system of services and supports for 16- and 17-year-olds. The Services Workgroup was charged with developing recommendations to ensure that appropriate services are available to support the unique needs of 16- and 17-year-olds, a group that cannot be treated simply as either younger adults or older children. The workgroup also had specific instructions to ensure that services for children currently being served in the juvenile justice system not be diluted by the expanded jurisdiction.²⁴

²¹ The Bristol site will incorporate cases from New Britain and Torrington, until the juvenile court in Torrington is completed in 2011. The Stamford site will incorporate cases from Norwalk, and the Waterbury site will incorporate cases from Danbury.

²² See Appendix F for the NCSC study “Implications of changing juvenile jurisdiction for adjudication and case-processing personnel needs in Connecticut Superior Court.” See also the forthcoming NCSC report, “Assessing the Judicial Branch’s proposed Regional ‘Youth Sessions’ to implement juvenile jurisdiction change in Connecticut.” Committee members recognize that some court staffing enhancements will be necessary irrespective of the jurisdictional change.

²³ The projected impact on staffing in the Chief State’s Attorney’s Office is forthcoming. Comprehensive fiscal analyses will accompany the legislation introduced to advance the Regional Youth Courts Plan.

²⁴ Approximately 2,256 16- and 17-year-olds are placed on adult probation statewide annually. See the State of Connecticut Judicial Branch Court Support Services Division, “JJPIC: proposed court and service system for 16 & 17 year olds,” Presentation to the Juvenile Jurisdiction Planning and Implementation Committee, January 4, 2007, available at <http://www.cga.ct.gov/hdo/jpic/> [last visited February 4, 2007].

At the outset, the workgroup defined the following set of principles or conditions for a system of services for older adolescents:

- Services need to be age and developmentally appropriate;
- A continuum of services, including preventive and lower-end or diversionary services, should be available;
- Services must be tailored to the needs of the individual and provided in the least restrictive manner possible while maintaining the safety of the community;
- Services need to be accessible (i.e., timely, community-based, culturally competent, gender responsive, and trauma informed);
- Services should employ a strengths-based approach to youth, families, and communities;
- Services should support both youth and families;
- Services need to be evaluated for quality in delivery and outcomes;
- Service outcomes should be tied to meeting milestones in healthy adolescent development; and
- Service provision should build upon, expand, and improve the state’s current infrastructure.

Guided by these principles, the Committee endorses a four-point plan for expanding services to address the needs of 16- and 17-year-olds and to fill in the gaps—in particular, the dearth of substance abuse and mental health services—that currently exist in the juvenile justice system.

First, the *Court Support Services Division (CSSD)* will expand the probation workforce, relying on veteran probation officers carefully selected and motivated to work with older adolescents to lead and staff the new regional courts. CSSD will train probation officers in tandem with contracted service providers to reinforce a team-oriented case management approach.

Second, *state agencies will expand and adapt their existing array of juvenile programs with special attention to mental health and substance abuse services.* In general, services need to be expanded in order to preserve the existing level of delivery to younger juveniles as well as adapted to the different developmental needs of older adolescents. Specifically, Hornby Zeller’s service needs study recommends expanding evidence-based clinical programs to address the behavioral, mental health, and substance abuse needs of 16- and 17-year-old offenders.²⁵ Currently, the Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services’ programs are inaccessible to individuals under 18. CSSD and DCF, in response, plan to increase access to evidence-based programs—such as Brief Strategic Family Therapy, Multi-Systemic Therapy, and Functional Family Therapy—which cover both substance abuse and mental health issues, as well as expand in-patient substance abuse detoxification and treatment for juveniles with serious mental health problems. Other services that are targeted for expansion and modification include clinical evaluations; treatment for problem sexual behavior; home-based therapies; social skill

²⁵ See p. 69 of the Hornby Zeller report “Connecticut service needs study: 16 and 17-year-old court-involved youth” in Appendix G.

development, including anger management and impulse control; girls groups; trauma recovery; and juvenile review boards and diversion.

Third, the Committee *supports the creation of new programs for 16- and 17-year-olds, focusing particularly on educational and vocational supports*. Committee members voiced concern about the lack of education and employment services for youth who have been habitually truant; suspended or expelled; or who are returning from incarceration or placement. Hornby Zeller's study cites services related to education and employment as the single most frequent need in the assessments currently done on youth offenders, especially for minority youth.²⁶ As one response to this need, DCF plans to adapt and expand its current educational re-entry program to address the needs of youth, and is working collaboratively with CSSD to make this program available to juveniles with pending delinquency petitions.

The final step of the four-point plan is to *establish an infrastructure that will ensure positive outcomes*. This will include assigning staff to training, implementation, and quality assurance, conducting research on the implementation and measuring outcomes, and applying Results-Based Accountability principles and practices to the state's service delivery system.

The Committee *recommends that services be phased in through the four-point plan in two stages*. The first stage begins in fiscal year 2007, when the state will begin to address the needs of 16- and 17-year-olds by building an experienced, core group of parole, probation, and program providers. For services to be effectively delivered, the expansion of contracted services and the development of a trained workforce must take place well in advance of July 1, 2009. The second stage of implementation will coincide with the implementation date of the raise in jurisdictional age. At that point, as the Regional Youth Courts open, a core group of practitioners will be ready to serve the courts and the 16- and 17-year-olds processed through them.

Based on current DCF and CSSD contracts, Hornby Zeller estimates a net initial cost for new and expanded services of \$19.4 million after the jurisdictional change, with a subsequent \$18.6 million cost net of savings.²⁷ With the full implementation of a continuum of services and evidence-based programs for 16- and 17-year-olds, the Hornby Zeller service needs study projects that the state can reasonably expect to achieve an improvement in recidivism of 10 percent.²⁸ Assuming that the recidivism rate of youth on probation after the jurisdictional change conservatively drops to 32.4 percent, the total annual savings on contracted services alone is estimated at \$819,000. Should the impact of the services be greater than the conservative projection, the total annual savings will increase correspondingly.

To further offset the costs of services, the Committee also *recommends that CSSD, DCF, and other relevant state agencies collaborate to ensure that federal reimbursement is obtained to the maximum extent possible*, particularly for clinical services for youth on

²⁶ Ibid, p. 70.

²⁷ Ibid, pp. vii-viii and pp. 60-64.

²⁸ Ibid, p. 64.

probation. For every 10 percent of clinical services that could be reimbursed under Medicaid, the state stands to recover \$500,000.²⁹ State agencies will need to ensure that all youth are tested for Medicaid eligibility and that service providers' eligibility to provide Medicaid services is a factor in granting contracts.

The Committee concludes that it will be feasible to add community-based services and supports for older adolescents by the effective date of July 1, 2009, without negative impacts to younger juveniles. In addition, an improved network of age-appropriate services and support will benefit not only the 16- and 17-year-olds who will begin entering the juvenile justice system, but also those youth who remain court-involved after their 16th birthday. Consequently, the Committee *recommends adequate appropriations in the 2007-08 budget cycle for agencies to implement this service plan.*³⁰

B. Implementation Plan: A Process Going Forward

Recommendation 5: Establish a Policy and Operations Coordinating Council. To ensure an intelligent, effective implementation process prior to the effective date of the jurisdictional change, the Committee *recommends the establishment of a Policy and Operations Coordinating Council.* Council membership should include one designee from each of the following constituency groups:

- The Legislature,
- A Juvenile Matters judge,
- Superior Court Operations,
- Department of Children and Families,
- Law enforcement,
- Juvenile defense,
- Juvenile prosecution,
- Court Support Services Division,
- Department of Education,
- Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services,
- Department of Correction, and
- The advocacy community.

By legislative mandate, the Policy and Operations Coordinating Council will be charged with advancing the central components set forth in the Committee's implementation plan: development, introduction and validation of a statewide detention risk assessment instrument; roll-out of the Regional Youth Courts Plan; and implementation of a comprehensive system of community-based and residential services for the population served by the juvenile court. Moreover, it will complete these components prior to July 1, 2009, when the jurisdictional change goes into effect.

The Policy and Operations Coordinating Council will submit status reports to the Legislature at quarterly intervals detailing its progress in completing its mandate. The

²⁹ Ibid, p. 65.

³⁰ Comprehensive fiscal analyses related to the service plan are under development.

Policy and Operations Coordinating Council will submit a final report no later than January 1, 2009.

The Committee *recommends that financial support for the efforts of the Policy and Operations Coordinating Council be identified in the 2007 legislative session.* Such resources will support the provision of technical assistance and research services to support an informed planning process, as well as the Council's staffing and analytical requirements. Costs for this effort are estimated to be approximately \$250,000 per year.

Toward the end of its process, the Committee turned its attention toward delineating the nature and scope of several unresolved issues, with the goal of providing a clear blueprint for implementation during the period leading up to the effective date. The Committee *recommends that the Policy and Operations Coordinating Council be legislatively authorized—and required—to resolve these key tasks and outstanding issues,* which are listed below, prior to the effective date of July 1, 2009.

Key Tasks and Outstanding Issues

Diversion Services and Assessments

In the interests of most effectively serving an expanded juvenile court jurisdiction, the Committee recommends that prevention and diversion services—such as Juvenile Review Boards and Youth Service Bureaus—be made more widely available. Prior to implementation of the jurisdictional change, determinations should be made regarding where and how such services should be augmented and how best to channel state and federal funds to that end. Furthermore, as discussed more fully in Hornby Zeller's service needs study, assessment mechanisms for more systematically identifying which populations are appropriate for diversion should be studied and implemented prior to July 1, 2009.³¹

Facility Space for Pre-Trial Detention and Long-Term Placements

The Committee recommends that comprehensive projections be developed during the implementation phase to determine the detention bed capacity that will be required to accommodate an expanded juvenile justice population. Projections should take into account factors such as the adoption of the detention risk assessment instrument, a 14-day average pre-trial length of stay for juveniles, the prohibition of detention for status offenders who violate Families with Service Needs orders,³² an expanded service delivery network, more flexible statutory opportunities for parole and alternative programming in the juvenile court system, and other relevant system changes that may arise during the implementation phase, e.g., the introduction of bonds for juveniles. Based on these factors, preliminary projections from CSSD estimate that within three years of the age change, approximately 150 16- and 17-year-olds who are awaiting trial will require secure accommodation in the juvenile system, a 25 percent reduction from the current number of youth confined pre-trial by DOC. The Committee also recommends that feasible alternative options to provide the requisite pre-trial detention capacity be identified prior to July 1, 2009.

³¹ Ibid, pp. 22-29.

³² Public Act 05-250, effective October 1, 2007.

As is the case with pre-trial detention capacity, although there are likely to be long-term placement savings attributable to the changes in policy and practice recommended in this report, there may also be a need for additional bed space to accommodate the expanded population of delinquency commitments. Current population projections, completed by Hornby Zeller in January 2007, indicate that a range of 78 to 192 additional placement beds may be required to house the expanded committed delinquent population. The Committee recommends a more thorough investigation of this issue. One suggestion is to conduct a review of the case files of 16- and 17-year-old youth who are currently incarcerated to more definitively assess placement impact prior to the effective date of the jurisdictional change.

Agency Jurisdiction: Collateral Impacts of Raising the Age

As juvenile court jurisdiction expands to include 16- and 17-year-old children, the scope of jurisdiction in a number of stakeholder agencies will be collaterally impacted. Some of these collateral effects include:

- Which agency will have the authority and responsibility for providing mental health and substance abuse services to the older adolescent population (*e.g.*, DCF or the Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services)?
- To what age will DCF have authority and control over juveniles committed to it by the court as delinquent? If the agency's jurisdictional age limit is held to be 18, youth who are arrested close to their 18th birthday may only be subject to DCF's authority and receive services for a short period of weeks or months. Alternatively, if the agency's jurisdictional age limit is extended to 21 or 25, we create a more flexible opportunity for long-term service provision for older adolescents.
- Regarding long-term placements, which agency will be responsible for housing 16- and 17-year-old adolescents sentenced to a period of long-term placement after the jurisdictional change (*e.g.*, DOC, DCF)?
- Does raising the age of juvenile court jurisdiction have consequences for state statutes setting the mandatory age of school attendance?

Youth in Crisis

In Connecticut, 16- and 17-year-olds who are beyond their parents control, have run away from home, or who fail to go to school are termed Youth in Crisis (YIC). Effective July 1, 2000, the Juvenile Court was given legislative authority to provide services for these youth. The YIC law clearly allows status offenders to be referred to juvenile court, but such a ruling would be unenforceable; under current law, the court is prohibited from declaring a Youth in Crisis delinquent or imprisoning him or her.³³ With this in mind, following the change in jurisdictional age, issues remain to be resolved regarding YIC jurisdiction and classification. In particular, some Committee members question the necessity of a separate YIC designation after the age is raised.

³³ CGS §46b-150f (c).

Serious Juvenile Offenses

Members of the Committee believe that existing statutory definitions of detainable offenses may be overly expansive. Current law allows a police officer to place a child in detention without a court order for Serious Juvenile Offenses (SJO), as defined in Connecticut General Statutes (CGS) §46b-120(12). While the SJO classification includes Class A and B felonies, gun and weapons charges, and escape, it also includes a number of offenses for which a child or youth might not face detention were the case to be reviewed by a judge. For example, drug possession with intent to sell, burglary, larceny, and risk of injury to a minor are all classified as SJOs.³⁴ These are offenses where the facts of the crime and the level of the child's involvement regularly factor into the decision to detain. Requiring judicial approval before detaining these non-violent offenders would help insure that only those children who need a secure setting are detained. The Committee recommends that the scope of the SJO classification be examined and modified where appropriate.

Importing Process Elements from Adult Criminal Court After the Age Change

Committee members have noted with enthusiasm that the focused attention on juvenile justice policy occasioned by the change in the age threshold presents a rare opportunity to offer innovative visions for the future of juvenile justice practices. As part of the ongoing debate, therefore, members have agreed that the new juvenile court process, following the jurisdictional change, should incorporate the best parts of existing juvenile and adult court processes. Prior to the effective date of the jurisdictional change, the Committee recommends that careful consideration be given to assessing whether and how any of the following elements of the adult criminal court process might be legislatively imported to the juvenile court after the age change:

- *Jury Trials.* There are no jury trials in juvenile court; in adult criminal court, a defendant may request a jury trial if he or she is facing the possibility of incarceration.
- *Bond.* In juvenile court, bond is not available prior to arraignment. At arraignment, however, the court is allowed to release a juvenile to bail. In adult court, a defendant may be released upon posting a cash or surety bond at arrest.
- *Release and Parental Notification.* If a juvenile is arrested and a parent is unavailable, the juvenile will likely be held in a detention center and presented before court on the next business day. In the juvenile system, a youth cannot be released at the point of arrest except to a parent or responsible adult, and the youth is not eligible to be released on bond. In contrast, an arrested adult may be released upon his or her own recognizance or upon posting of a bond; parental notification and release to a responsible adult is not required.
- *Fines.* The imposition of monetary fines as an alternative disposition is not permissible in juvenile court. Fines are allowable dispositional alternatives in adult criminal court pursuant to C.G.A. §53a-41 and §53a-42.³⁵

³⁴ See, e.g., CGS §21a-277; CGS §21a-278; CGS §53a-101; CGS §53a-102a; and CGS §53a-103a. Only the most serious burglary and larceny offenses are classified as SJOs.

³⁵ In a January 3, 2007 memorandum, the Office of Fiscal Affairs estimated that approximately \$800,000 of total revenues can be attributed to 16- and 17-year-olds for criminal fines, bond forfeiture, and various program fees (e.g., Adult Probation; Accelerated Rehabilitation; Alcohol Education Program). Estimates

- *Expungement.* In juvenile court, a youth may apply to expunge a delinquency record two years after completion of a sentence (four years after completion of a sentence if there is a Serious Juvenile Offense) if he or she has remained out of legal trouble. In adult criminal court, the records of a 16- or 17-year-old youth are expunged automatically (no petition for erasure is required) at age 21, so long as the youth has not been subsequently convicted of a felony prior to his or her 21st birthday.
- *Probationary Sentences.* In juvenile court, youth may be placed on probation supervision for as long as the judge deems necessary. In adult court, there are statutory limits on the period of probation that can be imposed on 16- and 17-year-old offenders based on the degree of the offense.

Custodial Interrogation³⁶

Under Connecticut law, any admission, confession, or statement made by a child to a police officer or juvenile court official is inadmissible evidence unless made in the presence of a parent or guardian and after the parent or guardian and child have been advised of the child’s constitutional rights under *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436 (1966).³⁷ During testimony before the Committee, some witnesses expressed concern that extending this obligation to 16- and 17-year-olds would have a substantial impact on law enforcement practices. Any statements or confessions by 16- and 17-year-old offenders are now admissible as evidence in adult criminal court if they have been advised of their *Miranda* rights. After the jurisdictional change these statements would be inadmissible in juvenile court unless they were made in the presence of parents after notice of *Miranda* rights to both child and parent. The Committee acknowledges that this issue will require additional debate and resolution prior to July 1, 2009.

Motor Vehicle Infractions

Issues emerged during the Committee process regarding where contested motor vehicle infractions will be tried after the change in jurisdiction. Currently, for youth under the age of 16, motor vehicle infractions constitute delinquent acts. Alternatively, for youth over the age of 16, infractions can often be resolved without criminal consequences. The Committee recommends that attention be directed to this issue to determine whether the definition of delinquent act should be changed to exclude motor vehicle infractions, which might be handled more efficiently in motor vehicle courts.

School-Related Issues

The connection between school and youth arrest in Connecticut demands further exploration and attention. A significant proportion of Connecticut’s court-involved youth arrive at the system due to either an arrest at school or an arrest while suspended from school. As Hornby Zeller identified among its findings, over 90 percent of African-American youth on probation with CSSD have been suspended or expelled from school

suggest that an additional \$1.2 million is generated from this age group for fines, fees, and surcharges imposed for motor vehicle violations and infractions.

³⁶ This paragraph was largely excerpted from a memorandum compiled by the National Center for State Courts, “Exclusion of confessions or statements by 16- and 17-year-olds if juvenile jurisdiction in Connecticut is to be expanded,” December 12, 2006.

³⁷ CGS §46b-137(a).

at least once.³⁸ Prior to the effective date of the jurisdictional change, consideration should be paid to assessing, costing out, and developing appropriate interventions for addressing the extensive educational needs of system-involved 16- and 17-year-olds. Committee members also stressed the need to strengthen schooling and build in preventive supports for younger children to reduce the overall level of and need for services before they turn 16.

CONCLUSION

The Juvenile Jurisdiction Planning and Implementation Committee, through a comprehensive and consensus-based process, has identified five recommendations intended to raise the age of juvenile jurisdiction in Connecticut from 16 to 18. While the Committee appreciates that implementation of the age change is a complex undertaking affecting numerous agencies, service providers, and communities, it remains committed to this critical endeavor. With this plan, the Committee provides realistic and concrete steps to bring 16- and 17-year-olds into the juvenile justice system in a timely, feasible, and cost-effective manner.

³⁸ See p. 70 of the Hornby Zeller service needs study in Appendix G.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

An Act Concerning Children of Families with Service Needs, CT Public Act No. 05-250.

An Act Concerning General Budget and Revenue Implementation Provisions, CT Public Act No. 06-187, section 16.

Annie E. Casey Foundation, "Results: Impact of JDAI." <<http://www.aecf.org/initiatives/jdai/results.htm>> (February 5, 2007).

Aos, Steve, Robert Barnoski, Roxanne Lieb, and Polly Phipps, *The Comparative Costs and Benefits of Programs to Reduce Crime, v 4.0*. Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy, 2001.

Austin, James, Kelly Dedel Johnson, and Ronald Weitzer, *Alternatives to Secure Detention and Confinement of Juvenile Offenders*, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Bulletin, September 2005.

Baird, A.A., J.A. Fugelsang, and C.M. Bennett, "What were you thinking?" <<http://www.theteenbrain.com/research/projects/goodidea2.php>> (February 4, 2007).

Bishop, D.M., C.E. Frazier, L. Lanza-Kaduce, and L. Winner, "The transfer of juveniles to criminal court: Does it make a difference?" *Crime and Delinquency*, 42: 171-191 (1996).

Coalition for Juvenile Justice, *Childhood on Trial: The Failure of Trying & Sentencing Youth in Adult Criminal Court*, 2005. <<http://www.appa-net.org/about%20appa/CJJ-report.pdf>> (February 4, 2007).

Connecticut Juvenile Justice Alliance, *Out of Balance: Failures in Addressing Disproportionate Minority Contact within Connecticut's Juvenile Justice System*. <http://www.ctjja.org/resource_category_9.html> (February 4, 2007).

Dougherty, Victoria, Malia Sieve, and Terri Thomalla, "State of Connecticut Juvenile Justice Programs: Recidivism Outcome Evaluation." Connecticut Policy and Economic Council (CPEC), July 2002.

Fagan, J.A., "The comparative advantage of juvenile versus criminal court sanctions on recidivism among adolescent felony offenders," *Law and Policy* 18 (1 and 2): 77-113 (1996).

Forst, Martin et al., "Youth in Prisons and Training Schools: Perceptions and Consequences of the Treatment-Custody Dichotomy," *Juvenile and Family Court*, vol. 4 (1989).

Holman, Barry, and Jason Ziedenberg, *The Dangers of Detention: The Impact of Incarcerating Youth in Detention and Other Secure Facilities*, Justice Policy Institute, 2006.

Hornby Zeller Associates, Inc., "Connecticut Service Needs Study: 16 And 17 Year-Old Court-Involved Youth: Final Report," January 29, 2007.

Hornby Zeller Associates, Inc., "Connecticut Service Needs Study: 16 And 17 Year-Old Court-Involved Youth: Preliminary Findings," Presentation to the Juvenile Jurisdiction Planning and Implementation Committee, January 4, 2007.

John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Research Network on Adolescent Development and Juvenile Justice. <<http://www.mac-adoldev-juvjustice.org/page26.html>> (February 4, 2007).

Marcus, David L. "Communities Helping Kids," *The American Prospect*, September 2005. <<http://www.prospect.org/web/page.wv?section=root&name=ViewPrint&articleId=10122>> (February 5, 2007).

National Center for State Courts, "Assessing the Judicial Branch's proposed Regional 'Youth Sessions' to implement juvenile jurisdiction change in Connecticut." Forthcoming (February 2007).

National Center for State Courts, "Exclusion of Confessions or Statements by 16- and 17-Year-Olds if Juvenile Jurisdiction in Connecticut is to be Expanded," December 12, 2006.

National Center for State Courts, "Implications of Changing Juvenile Jurisdiction for Adjudication and Case-Processing Personnel Needs in Connecticut Superior Court," January 23, 2007.

National Center for State Courts, "Potential benefits and public savings in changing juvenile jurisdiction in Connecticut Superior Court." Forthcoming (February 2007).

Roman, John, *The Economic Impact of Raising the Age of Juvenile Jurisdiction in Connecticut: Remarks before the Judiciary and Appropriations Committee, Connecticut General Assembly, February 21, 2006*, Urban Institute, 2006.

Roper v. Simmons, 543 U.S. 551, (2005).

The State of Connecticut Judicial Branch Court Support Services Division, "JJPIC: Proposed Court and Service System for 16 & 17 year olds," Presentation to the Juvenile Jurisdiction Planning and Implementation Committee, January 4, 2007. <<http://www.cga.ct.gov/hdo/jjplic/>> (February 4, 2007).

Townsend, Peggy, "Detention Redemption," *The American Prospect Online*, September 2005. <<http://www.prospect.org/web/page.ww?section=root&name=ViewPrint&articleId=10125>> (February 5, 2007).

Winner, L., L. Lanza-Kaduce, D.M. Bishop, and C.E. Frazier, "The transfer of juveniles to criminal court: Reexamining recidivism over the long term," *Crime and Delinquency* 43(4): 548-563 (1997).

Ziedenberg, Jason, and Vincent Schiraldi, *The Risks Juveniles Face When They Are Incarcerated with Adults*, Justice Policy Institute, June 1997. <<http://www.cjcj.org/jpi/risks.html>> (February 4, 2007).

APPENDIX A

**Juvenile Jurisdiction Planning and Implementation Committee
Enabling Legislation**

APPENDIX A

House Bill No. 5846 Public Act No. 06-187 9 of 89

Sec. 16. (*Effective from passage*) There is established a juvenile jurisdiction planning and implementation committee that shall consist of the following members:

- (1) Six members of the General Assembly, one of whom shall be appointed by the speaker of the House of Representatives, one of whom shall be appointed by the president pro tempore of the Senate, one of whom shall be appointed by the majority leader of the House of Representatives, one of whom shall be appointed by the majority leader of the Senate, one of whom shall be appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives and one of whom shall be appointed by the minority leader of the Senate;
- (2) The chairpersons and ranking members of the joint standing committees of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to the judiciary and human services, or their designees;
- (3) The Chief Court Administrator, or the Chief Court Administrator's designee;
- (4) The Commissioner of Children and Families, or the commissioner's designee;
- (5) The Commissioner of Correction, or the commissioner's designee;
- (6) A judge of the superior court assigned to hear juvenile matters, appointed by the Chief Justice;
- (7) The Chief Public Defender, or the Chief Public Defender's designee;
- (8) The Child Advocate, or the Child Advocate's designee;
- (9) The Chief State's Attorney, or the Chief State's Attorney's designee;
- (10) The Secretary of the Office of Policy and Management, or the secretary's designee; and
- (11) Four members of the advocacy community, two of whom shall be appointed by each of the co-chairs of the Juvenile Court Jurisdiction Committee.

The members of the General Assembly appointed by the speaker of the House of Representatives and the president pro tempore of the Senate shall serve as the co-chairs of the committee. All appointments to the committee shall be made not later than thirty days after the effective date of this section. Any vacancy shall be filled by the appointing authority.

The chairpersons of the committee shall schedule the first meeting of the committee to be held not later than sixty days after the effective date of this section. The committee shall plan for the implementation of any changes in the juvenile justice system that would be required in order to extend jurisdiction in delinquency matters and proceedings to include sixteen-year-old and seventeen-year-old children within the Superior Court for Juvenile Matters. On or before February 1, 2007, the committee shall submit a report, in accordance with section 11-4a of the general statutes, on the committee's findings, together with any recommendations for appropriate legislation, to the joint standing committees of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to the judiciary and human services.

APPENDIX B

**Members of the
Juvenile Jurisdiction Planning and Implementation Committee**

APPENDIX B

CO-CHAIRS

Sen. Toni Harp
10th Senate District
Deputy President Pro Tempore;
Chair, Appropriations

Rep. Toni Walker
93rd House District
Deputy Majority Leader

MEMBERS

Portia Bonner, Ph.D.
Assistant Superintendent
Hamden Public Schools

Joyce Bosco
Executive Director
Southside Family House

Liz Brown
Commission on Children

William Carbone
Executive Director
Court Support Services Division
Judicial Branch

Fran Carino
Supervisory Juvenile Prosecutor for
Statewide Matters
Office of the Chief State's Attorney

Jeff Carr
Parole Services
Department of Children and Families

Donald Devore
Director, Bureau of Juvenile Services
Department of Children and Families

Darlene Dunbar
Commissioner
Department of Children and Families

Rep. Robert Farr
19th House District
Judiciary Committee designee

Sen. Judith Freedman
26th Senate District
Senate Minority Leader designee

Deborah Fuller
External Affairs
Judicial Branch

Rep. Lile R. Gibbons
150th House District
Human Services Committee designee

Hector Glynn
Executive Director
Connecticut Juvenile Justice Alliance

Janice Gruendel
Senior Advisor on Early Childhood
Governor's Office

Susan Hamilton
Undersecretary
Office of Policy and Management

Rep. Gail Hamm
34th House District
House Majority Leader designee

Sen. Mary Ann Handley
4th Senate District
Co-Chair Human Services

Sen. John A. Kissel
7th Senate District
Human Services Committee designee

Lisa Kouzoujian
Juvenile Law Attorney

APPENDIX B

Mickey Kramer
Associate Child Advocate
Office of the Child Advocate

Theresa Lantz
Commissioner
Department of Correction

Hon. William Lavery
Chief Court Administrator
Judicial Branch

Sal Luciano
Executive Director
Council 4 AFSCME

Mary Marcial
Director of Programs and Treatment
Department of Correction

Sen. Edward Meyer
12th Senate District
Senate Majority Leader designee

Jeanne Milstein
Child Advocate
Office of the Child Advocate

Hon. Barbara Quinn
Chief Administrative Judge for Juvenile
Matters
Judicial Branch

Christine Rapillo
Director of Juvenile Delinquency
Defense
Office of the Chief Public Defender

Peter Rockholz
Deputy Commissioner
Department of Mental Health and
Addiction Services

Ellen Scalettar
Senior Policy Fellow
Connecticut Voices for Children

Chief Carl Sferrazza
Enfield Police Department

Deborah DelPrete Sullivan
Legal Counsel
Office of the Chief Public Defender

Rep. Cathy C. Tymniak
133rd House District
House Minority Leader designee

APPENDIX C

Presenting Witnesses and Other Participants

APPENDIX C

August 3, 2006

Hector Glynn, Executive Director,
Connecticut Juvenile Justice Alliance

September 7, 2006

Chief Tom Sweeney, Glastonbury Police
Department

Lt. Keith O'Brien, Glastonbury Police
Department

Chief Thomas Flaherty, Milford Police
Department and Executive Director, Police
Officer Standards and Training Council

Lt. Stan Konesky, Instructor, Police
Officer Standards and Training Council

September 21, 2006

Sherry Haller, Executive Director, The
Justice Education Center

Eleanor Lyon, Lyon & Associates

William Carbone, Executive Director,
Court Support Services Division, Judicial
Branch

Brian Hill, Criminal Sanctions Monitor,
Juvenile Matters, Judicial Branch

Barbara Lanza, Program Manager,
Center for Best Practices, Court Support
Services Division, Judicial Branch

Julie Revaz, Program Manager, Court
Support Services Division, Judicial Branch

Theresa Lantz, Commissioner,
Department of Correction

George Coleman, Interim Commissioner,
State Board of Education

Peter Rockholz, Deputy Commissioner,
Department of Mental Health and
Addiction Services

October 5, 2006

Peter Rockholz, Deputy Commissioner,
Department of Mental Health and
Addiction Services

Christine Rapillo, Director of Juvenile
Delinquency Defense, Office of the Chief
Public Defender

Darlene Dunbar, Commissioner,
Department of Children & Families

Donald Devore, Director of Juvenile
Services, Department of Children &
Families

October 17, 2006

Jeanne Milstein, Child Advocate, Office
of the Child Advocate

Theresa Lantz, Commissioner,
Department of Correction

Mary Marcial, Director of Programs and
Treatment, Department of Correction

November 2, 2006

Dr. Reginald Mayo, Superintendent, New
Haven Public Schools

Winston Johnson, Director of Social
Work & Psychiatric Services, Hartford
Public Schools

James Shannon, Director of Pupil &
Family/Community, Bridgeport Public
Schools

Asst. Chief Herman Badger, New Haven
Police Department

Lt. Achilles Rethis, Hartford Police
Department

Sgt. Matthew Eisele, Hartford Police
Department

Sgt. Jesus Ortiz, Bridgeport Police
Department

November 16, 2006

Darlene Dunbar, Commissioner,
Department of Children & Families

John Dixon, Superintendent, Connecticut
Juvenile Training School, Department of
Children & Families

Susan O'Brien, Director of Parole
Services, Department of Children &
Families

Karen Andersson, Health Management
Administrator, Administrative Service
Organization

Lori B. Szczygiel, Chief Executive
Officer, Connecticut Behavioral Health
Partnership, Administrative Service
Organization

APPENDIX C

November 30, 2006

Dr. Abigail Baird, Assistant Professor of Psychological and Brain Sciences, Dartmouth University

Hon. William Lavery, Chief Court Administrator, Judicial Branch (submitted memorandum)

December 21, 2006

Francis J. Carino, Supervisory Juvenile Prosecutor for Statewide Matters, Office of the Chief State's Attorney

January 4, 2007

Julie Revaz, Program Manager, Court Support Services Division, Judicial Branch

Dennis E. Zeller, President and founder, Hornby Zeller Associates

Helaine Hornby, Vice President, Hornby Zeller Associates

January 18, 2007

Dennis E. Zeller, President and founder, Hornby Zeller Associates

Helaine Hornby, Vice President, Hornby Zeller Associates

Sara Mogulescu, Director, Center on Youth Justice, Vera Institute of Justice

January 25, 2007

Sara Mogulescu, Director, Center on Youth Justice, Vera Institute of Justice

February 8, 2007

Jeanne Milstein, Child Advocate, Office of the Child Advocate

APPENDIX D

Designated Working Group Members

APPENDIX D

Front End Workgroup

Leo Arnone, Court Support Services Division, Judicial Branch (*facilitator*)

Anne Marie DeGraffenreidt, Department of Children and Families

Rep. Robert Farr

Susan Hamilton, Office of Policy and Management

Rep. Gail Hamm

Brian Hill, Court Support Services Division, Judicial Branch

David Iaccarino, Court Operations, Judicial Branch

Sen. John Kissel

Theresa Lantz, Department of Correction

Jeanne Milstein, Office of the Child Advocate

Sue O'Brien, Department of Children and Families

Chief Carl Sferrazza, Enfield Police Department

Rep. Cathy Tymniak

Court-Related Issues Workgroup

Christine Rapillo, Office of the Chief Public Defender (*facilitator*)

Fran Carino, Office of the Chief State's Attorney

Larry D'Orsey, Judicial Branch

Donald Devore, Department of Children and Families

Antonio Donis, Department of Children and Families

Sen. Judith Freedman

Deborah Fuller, External Affairs, Judicial Branch

Sen. Mary Ann Handley

Lisa Kouzoujian, Juvenile Law Attorney

Hon. William Lavery, Judicial Branch

Hon. Barbara Quinn, Judicial Branch

Deborah DelPrete Sullivan, Office of the Chief Public Defender

Services and Disposition Workgroup

Hector Glynn, Connecticut Juvenile Justice Alliance (*facilitator*)

Portia Bonner, Ph.D., Hamden Public Schools

Joyce Bosco, Southside Family House

Liz Brown, Commission on Children

William Carbone, Court Support Services Division, Judicial Branch

Jeff Carr, Department of Children and Families

John Dixon, Connecticut Juvenile Training School, Department of Children and Families

Darlene Dunbar, Department of Children and Families

Rep. Lile R. Gibbons

Janice Gruendel, Governor's Office

Mickey Kramer, Office of the Child Advocate

Hon. Michael Mack, Judicial Branch

Sen. Edward Meyer, Senate Majority Leader designee

Julie Revaz, Court Support Services Division, Judicial Branch

Cindy Rutledge, Department of Children and Families

APPENDIX E

Risk Assessment Instruments

Cook County, IL

State of New Mexico

Santa Cruz County, CA

**COOK COUNTY JUVENILE COURT
JUVENILE JUSTICE DIVISION
JUVENILE PROBATION DEPARTMENT**

SCREEN DATE: _____ SCREEN TIME: _____ SCREENER: _____
 YOUTH OFFICER: _____ DISTRICT: _____
 MINOR RESPONDENT: _____ DOB: _____ AGE: _____

SEX: M / F RACE: WHITE / BLACK / HISPANIC / ASIAN / OTHER P.O.: _____
 RD#: _____ IR#: _____ FAMILY FOLDER NUMBER: _____
 (REQUIRED) (REQUIRED)

FACTOR

1.	MOST SERIOUS INSTANT OFFENSE: _____	SCORE
	(Choose only one item indicating the most serious charge)	
	Automatic Transfer Cases	15
	Violent Felonies Agg Batt – Bodily Harm, Agg Battery with/Firearm, AggCrimSexAsslt, Agg Discharge of a Firearm , Agg Vehicular Invasion, Armed Robbery w/ Handgun, Armed Violence W/Firearm, Home Invasion, Murder, U UW-Gun).....	15
	Agg Batt against Police Officer, Agg Domestic Battery, Domestic Battery W/Bodily Harm, Agg Robbery, Agg Stalking, Child Pornography, Hate Crime W/ Bodily Injury, Hate Crime @Place of Worship, Heinous Batt, Residential Arson	12
	Other Forcible Felonies – (Agg Batt, CrimSexAbuse, Hate Crime, Intimidation, Kidnapping, Robbery, Vehicle Invasion).....	10/12*
	Other Offenses	
	Felony Sale of Cannabis (Class 1 or 2 felony amount), Arson, DCS.....	10/12*
	PCS w/int deliver, Residential Burglary, U UW (not a gun), Possession Explosives.....	7/10*
	Felony Possession of Narcotics/Drugs for Sale or Other Felonies.....	5/7*
	Misdemeanor Possession of Narcotics/Drugs or Other Weapons Possession.....	3
	Other Misdemeanors.....	2
	Not Picked up on New Offense (WARRANT)	0
	<hr/>	
	2. PRIOR AUTHORIZED SECURE DETENTIONS (Choose only one item)	
	Prior detention within the last 24 hour period.....	8
	Prior detention within the last seven days.....	7
	Six or more total detentions within the last 12 months (# _____).....	10
	One to five detentions within the last 12 months (# _____).....	6
	No detentions within the last 12 months.....	0
	<hr/>	
	3. PAST FINDINGS OF DELINQUENCY – CLOSED PROCEEDINGS (Choose only one item)	
	IDOC Discharged.....	8
	Past Finding of Delinquency on a violent felony.....	7
	Past Finding of Delinquency on a felony.....	5
	Past Finding of Delinquency on a misdemeanor (# of findings x 1 up to a total of 3 points).....	1 / 2 / 3
	No Past Finding of Delinquency.....	0
	<hr/>	
	4. CURRENT CASE STATUS (Choose only one item)	
	Criminal Court Case Pending.....	8
	IPS.....	7
	Probation (# _____).....	4
	Supervision (# _____).....	2
	Not an active case.....	0
	<hr/>	
	5. PETITIONS PENDING ADJUDICATION (Choose only one item)	
	2 + Petitions Pending (# _____).....	3
	1 Petition Pending.....	1
	No Petitions Pending.....	0
	<hr/>	
	6. UNDER DETENTION ALTERNATIVE RESTRICTIONS	
	Electronic Monitoring.....	10
	Shelter Care Facility.....	9
	Evening Reporting Center.....	7
	Home Confinement.....	5
	<hr/>	
	7. WARRANT CASES (Choose only one item)	
	Category 1: Mandatory Detention.....	15
	Category 2: Non-Mandatory Detention.....	8
	<hr/>	
	TOTAL SCORE	_____

***ALL SUBSEQUENT POLICE
REFERRALS FOR THESE
OFFENSES**

DECISION SCALE

- Score 0-9..... **AUTHORIZE RELEASE** (with notice of prioritized date for 5-12 Conference)
- Score 10-14..... **COMPLETE NON-SECURE DETENTION OPTIONS FORM**
- Score 15 +..... **AUTHORIZE DETENTION** (for minors 13 years of age and older)

(Complete non-secure custody options for minors under 13 years of age before placement into secure detention unless Minor is charged with U UW-Firearm in or on school grounds)

ADMINISTRATIVE OVERRIDE: YES NO REASON: _____
FINAL DECISION: DETAIN RELEASE RELEASE WITH CONDITIONS

MR lives at: _____ Apt. _____ City: CHGO/ _____ IL/ _____ Zip: _____

MR lives with: _____ Relation: _____ Phone: 312 / 630 / 708 / 773 / 847 _____

COOK COUNTY JUVENILE COURT
Juvenile Justice Division – Juvenile Probation Department

rev. 01-10-06

888 Unknown
 999 No new charge

JA 15 POINTS

(Automatic Transfer 15 + years old)
 231 Agg Vehicular Hijacking with F/A
 234 Agg Criminal Sexual Assault
 242 UUW – School Grounds
 243 Murder
 256 Robbery – Armed with Firearm A/T
 257 DCS on school grounds to a minor under
 to a minor under the age of 17
 258 Agg Batt with firearm on school grounds
 or on a conveyance

JA 15 POINTS

330 Exploitation of a Child
 334 Aggravated Firearm Discharge
 339 Aggravated Battery/ Great Bodily Harm
 341 Aggravated Vehicular Invasion
 342 Aggravated Vehicular Hijacking
 343 Aggravated Battery with Firearm
 360 Armed Violence with Firearm
 408 Attempt Murder
 442 UUW – School Grounds (non A/T)

 443 UUW Public Housing (non A/T)
 450 UUW – Firearm
 520 Criminal Sexual Assault
 534 Aggravated Criminal Sexual Assault (non A/T)
 539 Aggravated Kidnapping

540 Involuntary Manslaughter
 541 Manslaughter - Voluntary
 543 Murder (non A/T)
 548 Solicitation of Murder
 552 Reckless Homicide
 556 Armed Robbery
 570 Aggravated – Arson
 572 Home Invasion
 573 Robbery Armed Firearm

 589 Armed Violence
 777 Interstate Warrant

JA 12 POINTS

361 Aggravated Battery against police officer
 362 Aggravated Domestic Battery
 363 Domestic Battery with Bodily Harm
 364 Aggravated Robbery
 365 Aggravated Stalking
 366 Child Pornography
 367 Hate Crime with Bodily Injury
 368 Hate Crime at Place of Worship
 369 Heinous Battery
 370 Residential Arson

JA 10 POINTS

325 Ethnic Intimidation
 335 Vehicle Invasion
 338 Vehicle Hijacking
 345 Vehicular Endangerment
 346 Stalking
 347 Hate Crime
 351 Unlawful Del Cannabis
 Class 1 & 2 Fel Amt
 403 Attempt Criminal Sex Assault
 411 Attempt Armed Robbery
 423 Attempt Aggravated Arson
 424 Aggravated Cruelty to Animals

JA 10 POINTS

427 Attempt Agg Crim Sex Assault
 503 Arson
 507 Aggravated Battery
 527 Firearm – Unlawful Sale
 533 Criminal Sexual Abuse
 535 Intimidation
 538 Kidnapping
 550 Aggravated Criminal Sex Abuse
 555 Robbery
 574 Controlled Substance – Del
 580 Gang Organization Recruitment

JA 7 POINTS

319 Unlawful Del Cannabis – Misdemeanor Amt
 333 Poss Contl Sub w/Int to Del
 445 Weapons – Unlawful Sale
 524 Explosives Possession
 564 Unlawful Use of Weapon
 585 Residential Burglary

JA 5 POINTS

322 Bring Contraband into Institution
 323 Child Pornography, Sexual
 324 Burglary to Auto
 326 Compel – Conf by Threat
 329 Juvenile Pimping
 337 Agg Poss Stolen Vehicle

JA 5 POINTS

352 Possession of Cannabis Fel Amt
 406 Attempt Kidnapping
 409 Attempt Criminal Sex Abuse
 410 Attempt Robbery
 412 Attempt Theft of Auto
 414 Attempt Theft over \$300

JA 5 POINTS

422 Attempt Residential Burglary
 424 Attempt Arson
 432 Attempt Aggravated Crime
 433 Attempt Aggravated Sexual Abuse
 434 Attempt Aggravated Sex with Family
 511 Burglary
 528 Forgery
 544 Controlled Sub Poss – Fel Amt
 554 Restraint - Unlawful

JA 5 POINTS

558 Theft of Auto
 560 Theft over \$300
 566 Sexual Relationship w/Family
 577 Possession of Stolen Auto

JA 3 POINTS

312 Unauthorized Storage of Weapon
 313 Poss of Cannabis – Mis Amt
 328 Poss Conc Dangerous Weapon
 348 Misdemeanor Sale Cannabis
 350 Theft of Firearm
 400 Attempt Burglary
 435 Attempt Forgery
 446 Attempt Poss of Controlled Sub
 504 Aggravated Assault

JA 2 POINTS

302 Ticket Scalping
 303 Endangering Life/Health Child
 305 Contributing to Neglect of Child
 308 Poss/Theft Detection Device
 309 Vandalism
 310 Aiding a Fugitive
 311 Obstructing Service of a Process
 314 Alteration Identification of Vehicle
 315 Obt Service Defraud Elec Device
 316 Unlawful Sale of Fireworks
 317 Leaving Motor Vehicle Accident
 318 Peddling Merchandise without License
 320 Hitchhiking
 321 Unlawful Use of a Computer
 336 Looting
 401 Attempt Crim Damage to Property
 404 Attempt Eavesdropping
 405 Attempt Retail Theft
 413 Attempt Theft Under \$300
 415 Attempt Deceptive Practice
 416 Attempt Theft from Person
 417 Attempt Theft Lost/Mislaid Property
 419 Attempt Sex within Family
 420 Attempt Escape
 421 Attempt Crim Trespass to Land
 426 Attempt Theft from Auto
 430 Attempt Theft from Coin Op Machine
 431 Attempt Theft of City Property
 436 Attempt Poss Of Burglary Tools

438 Attempted Battery
 499 Miscellaneous Attempt
 500 Abortion
 501 Air Rifle – Carry Discharge
 502 Air Rifle – Unlawful Sale
 506 Battery
 508 Bribe – Accepting
 509 Bribe – Offering
 510 Bribery
 512 Burglary Tool – Possession of
 513 Civil Rights – Violated
 514 Conspiracy
 516 Criminal Damage to Property
 517 Criminal Trespass to Vehicle
 519 Deception Practice
 521 Disorderly Conduct
 522 Distribute Abortifacient
 523 Eavesdropping
 525 False Fire Alarm
 526 Defacing Identifying Mark
 529 Gambling
 530 Gambling – Keeping Place of
 531 Gambling – Syndicated
 532 Glue Sniffing
 536 Intoxicating Compound - Sale of
 537 Intoxicating Compound – Use of
 542 Mob Action
 545 Obscenity
 546 Prostitution – Soliciting

547 Prostitution
 549 Public Indecency
 551 Reckless Conduct
 553 Resisting or Obstructing Police
 557 Solicitation
 559 Theft Under \$300
 561 Theft – Deception or Threat
 562 Theft from Person
 563 Theft – Lost/Mislaid Property
 565 Assault
 568 Unregistered Gun
 569 Unregistered Gun Carrier
 575 Crim Damage to Stat Supp Prop
 576 Poss of Stolen Property
 578 Unlawful Use of Credit Card
 579 Unlawful Poss of Ammo/Firearm
 581 Escape
 582 Theft
 583 Criminal Trespass to Land
 584 Poss Drug Paraphernalia
 586 Retail Theft
 587 Tampering with Vehicle
 588 Phone Call Harassment
 591 Residential Theft
 592 Theft of Service
 593 Harass Witness by Commnctn
 594 Damage to Coin Op Machine
 595 Theft Cntrts of Coin Op Mach
 596 Criminal Trespass to Residence



DETENTION SCREENING

Statewide Risk Assessment II

FACTS #:		First Name:		Last Name:	
SS#:		DOB:		Gender: Male Female	
Taken into Custody/Arrested:		Date:		Time:	
				Referral County:	
Screener:			Screening Date:		
			Time:		
Primary Reason for Referral/Detention:	<input type="checkbox"/> Delinquent Offense	<input type="checkbox"/> Drug Court or Juvenile Court Hold (post disp)			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Delinquent Offense+VOP, VCO, Other Viol. <i>(delinquent offense while on probation)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Disposition –15 day Detention			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Probation/Parole Violation <i>(with warrant)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Detained Pending Post-Dispositional Placement			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Viol. of Court Order/Cond Order of Release	<input type="checkbox"/> Committed/Diag – return to court on pending case			
		<input type="checkbox"/> ICJ/INS Hold			
		<input type="checkbox"/> Transfer from Other Center _____			
<i>If one of the above is checked, complete entire form</i>			<i>If one of the above is checked, complete:</i>		
			o <i>Special Detention Cases, if applicable</i>		
			o <i>Detention Admission (required)</i>		
Primary (most serious) Referral Offense:					
Enumerated		Fel/Mis:		Degree:	
				Det Category:	
Use or Possession of a Weapon in Commission of Crime: <input type="checkbox"/> Knife or other sharp instrument <input type="checkbox"/> Firearm <input type="checkbox"/> Other					

A. OFFENSE (Score only the most serious instant offense)

- 0. All enumerated offenses in 31-22-8.....12
 - 1. Violent Offense Against Person Resulting in Serious Bodily Injury or Death ..12
 - 2. Violent Sexual Felony.....12
 - 3. Use or Possession of Firearm in Commission of a Crime12
 - 4. Felony Crimes of Violence 8
 - 5. Felony Sexual Offenses 8
 - 6. Felony Property Crimes including Auto Theft 5
 - 7. All Other Felony Crimes and Misdemeanors..... 3
 - 8. All infractions, Petty Misdemeanors and non-criminal probation violations..... 0
 - **Enumerated offense will not be mitigated**** + _____
- OFFENSE SCORE**

B. PRIOR OFFENSE HISTORY (Score only one of the following)

- Felony petition *filed and* pending 6
 - Prior felony adjudication/within the last six months, or two or more adjudications including one felony within the last 12 months..... 5
 - Prior felony adjudication within the last three years..... 3
- PRIOR HISTORY SCORE** + _____

C. RISK OF FTA AND REOFFENSE (Add all that apply up to 3 points)

- Previous Escape/abscond from secure facility, or court ordered placement 1/ea
 - Previous failure to appear for court 1/ea
 - Pending citations or referrals 1/ea
- FTA AND REOFFENSE SCORE** + _____

D. Aggravating Factors (Add all that apply, up to 3 points)

- Multiple Offenses are alleged for this referral 1/ea
 - Two or more adjudicated offenses involving violence in the last year 1/ea
 - Crime or behavior alleged was particularly vicious or violent..... 1/ea
- AGGRAVATING FACTORS SCORE** + _____

E. Mitigating Factors (Subtract all that apply, up to 3 points)

- **Do not complete for enumerated offenses****
 - Involvement in offense was remote, indirect or otherwise mitigated 1/ea
 - Family member or caretaker able to assume responsibility for minor 1/ea
 - No arrests or citations within the last year 1/ea
- MITIGATING FACTORS SCORE** - _____

TOTAL SCORE (A+ B+ C + D - E)



Violation of home detention/electronic monitoring

Hold for out of state

Arrest Bench Parole Det order Magistrate/Municipal Not indicated on warrant Home Detention Electronic Monitoring INS ICJ	Escape from Secure Facility Abscond from out of home placement FTA Probation Violation Runaway
--	--

Non-Secure Detention Placement (at time of decision)	
Services: <i>(Check all that apply)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Home Detention <input type="checkbox"/> Electronic Monitoring <input type="checkbox"/> Community Monitoring (non-electronic monitoring) <input type="checkbox"/> Surveillance <input type="checkbox"/> 24 Hour House Arrest <input type="checkbox"/> Other: <i>(explain)</i> _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Community Corrections <input type="checkbox"/> Emergency Shelter Bed <input type="checkbox"/> CCMHC <input type="checkbox"/> Community Custody Program <input type="checkbox"/> Group Home <input type="checkbox"/> Youth Reporting Center

Detention Admission			
Admitted into Secure Detention:	Date:	Time:	Det Center:

SANTA CRUZ COUNTY JUVENILE DETENTION
SCREENING RISK ASSESSMENT

AREA 1. MOST SERIOUS INSTANT OFFENSE (choose highest one) (Arrest warrant for a new offense is scored as the offense)

- a. Any 707(b)offense 10 (No Mitigation to apply)
- b. Loaded Firearm 10
- c. Felony Crimes of violence 8
- d. Felony sexual offenses 7
- e. Felony high speed chase (driver only) 7
- f. Sale of drugs 7
- g. Court Identified gang member who committs misdemeanor crime of violence 5
- h. Other felony offenses except drugs 5
- i. Possession drug for sale 5
- j. Violent misdemeanor/possession of weapon 4
- k. Possesssion of drugs 3
- l. Misdemeanors 2
- m. Probation violations 0

AREA 2. CURRENT ARREST ON WARRANT

- a. Surrendered 0
- b. Apprehended 1
- c. Apprehended with resistance 2

AREA 3. LEGAL STATUS

- a. Pending Court (petition has been filed or case is "off calendar for personal service") 6
- b. Ward – last sustained offense within 3 months 4
- c. Ward – last sustained offense 3 months/1 year 3
- d. Ward – last sustained offense > 1 year 2
- e. 654/725 W&I (informal probation/6 months without wardship) 2
- f. Transfer in-custody (score for sustained offense)
- g. Open deferred entry of judgement 3
- h. None 0

AREA 4. RISK OF FTA AND REOFFENSE

- a. Previous 871 W&I (escape from a Juvenile Hall or Ranch Camp) 2 points each
- b. Previous FTAs1 point each (never to exceed 3 points)
- c. Pending referrals/citations0-3 points each (never to exceed 3 points)

AREA 5. RISK OF NEW OFFENSE

- a. Previously arrested or cited for new offense while pending court.....3 points

AREA 6. MITIGATING FACTORS (Can decrease by 1 to 3 points total – specify)

- a. Family member or caretaker able to assume responsibilty for minor
- b. Stability in school and/or employment
- c. First arrest at 16 or older
- d. No arrests or citations within the last year
- e. Other (please specify below)

AREA 7. AGGRAVATING FACTORS (Can increase by 1 to 3 points total – specify)

- a. Runaway behavior from home
- b. Poor or no attendance at school
- c. Two or more sustained offenses involving violence in the last year.
- d. Multiple Offenses
- e. Other (please specify below)

AREA 8. VICTIM/WITNESS FACTORS

- a. Threats of violence against current victim subsequent to offense 3
- b. Threats of violence to witness in current case subsequent to offense..... 3
- c. Previously victimized same person/family member..... 2
- d. Crime appears based on race, gender, sexual orientation, age, homelessness, disability or religion (hate crime)..... 2
- e. Minor has easy access to victim and crime was of a violent nature or a residential burglary..... 2

AREA 9. SUBSTANCE USE FACTORS

- a. Minor currently in treatment for alcohol/drug issues (-2)
- b. No known substance use in the last year..... (-2)

PATTERN OF SUBSTANCE USE - PICK ONE BELOW:

- c. Knowledge of recent, active substance use and/or one or more positive urine test in the past 30 days..... 1
- d. Current IV drug use (within the past 72 hours) 10
- e. Daily use of a narcotic for at least 30 days (not marijuana) 3
- f. Drug or alcohol use 3-6x's week for at least 90 days (must have documentation of this) 2
- g. Daily use of alcohol or marijuana and minor is 14 or under.....3
- h. Daily use of alcohol or marijuana and minor is 15 or older.....2

DETENTION DECISION (CHECK)

Release without restriction (0-5 points)

Release without restriction or Home Supervision release (6-9 points)

Detain (10 or more points)

OVERRIDE: (STATE REASONS)

MANDATORY DETENTION CASES (Current Case)

THESE CASES ARE TO BE AUTOMATICALLY DETAINED BUT STILL SCORED

- a. Escapee from county institution
- b. Home supervision/E.M. arrest/Fresh arrest while on home supervision/E.M.
- c. Abscond from placement
- d. Placement failure
- e. Pickup and Detain
- f. Warrant without Judge previously agreeing to release by P.O.

APPENDICES F & G

**Please see separate volume for reports from
the National Center for State Courts
and
Hornby Zeller Associates, Inc.**