NEW MEXICO SENTENCING COMMISSION

DOLORES G. BUSCH, MA, MS LINDA FREEMAN, MA

Tracking Children With Juvenile Referrals to Determine if They Have Subsequent Contacts With the Adult Criminal Justice System: *A Feasibility Study*

Introduction

The New Mexico Children, Youth and Families Department (CYFD) was interested in knowing if children who had referrals as juveniles subsequently get arrested or have court cases filed once they become adults. In the past, CYFD asked the New Mexico Department of Public Safety (DPS) and the New Mexico Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) to confirm if a list of children with juvenile referrals had subsequent arrests or court cases as adults as a way to validate CYFD's risk assessment instrument. CYFD did not receive detailed information regarding the type of charges, dates of incidents or other information. The New Mexico Sentencing Commission (NMSC) receives CYFD, DPS, and AOC data and has memorandums of understanding that allow the use of this data for research purposes. To this end, NMSC staff was asked to conduct a feasibility study to determine if a sample of children with referrals could be matched to data from the DPS and AOC. This task was done as part of a larger multi-year contract between CYFD and NMSC.

Section I: CYFD Samples

DATA SOURCE

The data set was created from CYFD referral and petition data from fiscal years 2004 and 2005. As mentioned above, NMSC receives data from CYFD for research purposes. The data set contains charges, whether or not they were handled informally or if a court case was filed, and demographic information. The purpose of selecting older data was to give time for the referred children to reach the age of 18 and then to follow them into the adult criminal justice system to ascertain whether they re-offended. The data set contains 55,710 referrals and the case status is closed for 53,636 of these. When age restrictions and other constraints were added the population of referrals was reduced to 12,679.

Four sample groups were then formed from this population: 1) children whose referrals were handled informally (informal); 2) children who had a petition filed in District Court (petition); 3) children that were committed to a CYFD facility (facility); and 4) children for whom a motion to seek adult sanctions was filed (ADYO).

We believe that these four groups represent a hierarchy of possible outcomes with informal being the least serious and ADYO being the most serious.

When drawing the samples, gender and ethnicity were checked to make sure the samples were similar to the respective populations. Since this is feasibility study, we decided to work with relatively small, yet representative samples. Our goal was to have sample groups with 300 – 400 per group.

SAMPLE GROUP SELECTION AND SAMPLE SIZE

The informal sample was selected from referrals with a closed case status where the child was 14 or 15 at the time of referral and the Juvenile Probation Parole Officer's (JPPO) decision was to handle them informally. In cases handled informally, a court case is not opened and the child may be assessed/referred, receive informal services or have no further action. A random sample was drawn from 10,608 referrals that met our criteria for the time period (402). When additional restrictions were imposed that moved the sample from the referral level to the individual child level, we were left with a sample of 328.

Petition group members were selected from referrals with a closed case status and the child was 14 or 15 at the date of action. The petition group represents cases where a court case was filed in District Court and the charges were not dismissed or the child was found to

have not committed the alleged offense. Additionally, the petition group excludes children who were sentenced to a CYFD facility or charged as youthful offenders since these children will be included in the facility and ADYO samples. A random sample of 426 was drawn from 1,584 referrals that met our criteria for the time period. When additional restrictions were imposed that moved the sample from the referral level to the individual child level, we were left with a sample of 344.

All children leaving a CYFD secure facility were selected. For facilities, the case status was closed and no age restrictions were imposed because the offenders tend to be older when released from the facility and subsequent supervision. 432 referrals met the criteria. When additional restrictions were imposed that moved the sample from the referral level to the individual child level, we were left with a sample of 318.

The ADYO had a disposition or court action result of a judgment of Youthful Offender or Adult Sanctions, meaning that they were charged as a youthful offender and sentenced as an adult. There were 55 referrals that met the criteria. When additional restrictions were imposed that moved the sample from the referral level to the individual child level, we were left with a sample of 48. Given the small sample size we ultimately decided to exclude this group from our analysis.

Section II: CYFD Sample Groups into the Adult System

This section describes the methodology used to measure recidivism, meaning those individuals in our sample groups that were found to re-offend in the adult criminal justice system. In order to follow the samples into the adult system, two data sets were utilized: 1) the Department of Public Safety's (DPS) data set and the Administrative Office of the Court's (AOC) data set. The variables that are relevant to combining these systems with the CYFD data are mentioned below. Other important variables will be described as they are integrated into the analyses.

DATA SOURCES
Arrest Data
The DPS data set includes data from July 2004 through September 2010. The arrest date, a four-digit social security number (the last four digits), date of birth and the name of the offender are the variables used. Depending on the sample, there is a window of

up to seven years to measure recidivism. Data for the seven years was combined to create one "arrest" data set.

Court Data
Seven separate data tables are received annually from the AOC. The data is merged by NMSC staff to create one data set per year and a unique court case number. Data availability for these purposes includes calendar years 2004 – 2009. Among other variables, the data set contains the full social security number, date of birth and the name of the offender. Data for the six years was combined to create one "court" dataset. The data goes through 12/31/2009, which depending on the sample allowed a window of up to 6 years to measure recidivism. The following case types were excluded in the adult combined data set: juvenile, traffic, youthful offender, lower count appeals and motor vehicle. We did not look at juvenile cases, (juvenile and youthful offender case types), traffic cases, or cases appealed from magistrate courts. One limitation of the data is that Bernalillo County Metropolitan Court cases are not included, since that court currently does not use the same case management system. Additionally, municipal court cases are not included because they are independently operated.

Combining CYFD and Adult Criminal Justice Data Systems
Both the AOC and DPS data sets were linked separately to the CYFD data set. A full social security number was used to link AOC and CYFD. In the case of the DPS data set, the data was linked by date of birth and the last four digits of the offender's social security number. This created one data set with variables that are important to categorize recidivists. Identifiers that distinguish between recidivism as measured by arrest or by court case (magistrate or district) and counts of court filings and arrests per person were created. During the merging process, we found that a person may have multiple arrests or court filings. In these cases the data associated with the first court case filing or arrest date is used, allowing us to calculate the amount of time from age 18 to first arrest or court case filing.

RECIDIVATE BY ARREST AND BY COURT CASE FILING
Individuals that were matched in either the DPS or the AOC data sets were considered recidivists. In our analysis we calculated three measures: recidivism rate, time-to-recidivate and exposure time. Exposure time is the time period in which a person could possibly recidivate. The methodology presented here involves a discussion of the use of the arrest and court data, our recidivism measures, and how we identify recidivists.

A data set was produced consisting of arrest and court data linked separately with the CYFD juvenile referrals. Throughout the analyses, the court and DPS data are analyzed separately. After the initial match into both data sets, the data was combined. Some people were found in both the DPS and AOC data. However we made no attempt to tie arrests to subsequent court cases. This was necessary because the court data is for a shorter time period and excluded Bernalillo County Metropolitan data and municipal court data. We found that the arrest recidivism rate was higher than the court case recidivism rate, confirming that more individuals are arrested than have court cases. In addition, some people were found to have both District and Magistrate court cases. Arrest recidivism rates and court filing recidivism rates are calculated and reported separately.

We define recidivists in the following way: Those who re-offended by arrest or by court case filing as adults, after CYFD supervision expired and after their initial CYFD referral date. To operationalize this definition we implemented three rules.

Rule 1: Adult Recidivists
The first rule is: The offender must be 18 at the time the arrest occurs or court case is filed (minimum arrest or court filing date.) Age is calculated at date of occurrence. Age at arrest is calculated by subtracting the date of birth from the minimum arrest date. For the court system, the same procedure was followed.

Rule 2: Clear of CYFD Supervision/Time-to Measure
The second rule is: The offender must have been clear of CYFD supervision at the date of occurrence. Since the petition and informal groups are not 18 when they leave CYFD supervision for the referral that is in the sample we have to determine the date they turn18. For the facility group the latest of the two dates are used: the facility expiration date, or the date they turn 18. Time to occurrence is measured in days, and is calculated by subtracting the reference dates from the minimum arrest and relevant court dates (as described under Rule #1).

Rule 3: Not a Prior/Exposure Measure
The third rule is: The occurrence must not constitute a prior offense. The objective is to not include cases where the arrest or court date occurred before entrance into the CYFD system (referral date). The reference date for all groups is the date of referral. It is subtracted from the minimum arrest and relevant court filing dates (in days).

Exposure time was calculated after the three rules were instituted and is a measure of the time (in years) each individual was exposed for an arrest from the referral that got them into the study through September 2010.

Arrest Recidivists
Of the 990 individuals tracked into DPS data, 380 were arrested. These 380 are the arrest recidivists and are further broken down into sample groups and will be presented in the results section.

Court Recidivists
Of the 990 individuals tracked into AOC data, 342 were found to have a court case of any type. These are further divided into type: Magistrate only (180), District only (74) and both (88). The 342 by court case type is further broken down into sample groups and will be presented in the results section.

Conviction
The objective is to track court recidivists further into the system, and to report the number convicted in both Magistrate and District courts. After speaking with CYFD staff, it was determined that our analysis focus on sentence information in District Court because cases there are more serious in nature than Magistrate court.

Section III: Results
The previous sections explained how we tracked juvenile referrals into the adult criminal justice system. This section presents recidivism measures by group.

RECIDIVISM RATES & MEASURES
Rates and Counts by Sample Groups
Recidivate by Arrest
Table 1 contains the arrest recidivism rates by group. The sample sizes for informal, petition and facility groups are the counts of children followed into the adult criminal justice system. The arrested count is the number of persons arrested while the total arrests count all arrests for these people. The purpose is to present a comparison of rates and counts within the arrest system among groups. The number of persons arrested divided by the sample size per group is the recidivism rate. It is interesting to note that the informal group has a rate of 18.6 %, petition 45.1% and facility 51.6%. The rate increases as the child's outcome is more serious. Also, the average number of arrests per person as well as the median number is the highest for the facility group (about an average of 3 arrests versus 2 for the other groups).

Recidivate by Court
Court case filing recidivism is presented in Table 2. Consistent with the arrest data, the recidivism rates are highest for both Magistrate and District court case filings for the facility group and lowest for the informal group. Overall the Magistrate court case filing recidivism rate was higher than the District court case filing recidivism rate for all groups.

TIME-TO-RECIDIVATE AND YEARS FOLLOWED (EXPOSURE) BY SAMPLE GROUPS

Comparison of Arrest Recidivism Grouped by Years Followed
Table 3 breaks down our sample groups to illustrate how long we were able to track them into the DPS data set. Individuals are grouped in one-year increments and we are able to calculate the recidivism rate for groups based on how long we tracked them. Additionally, for each group we were able to calculate the average and median number of days till their first arrest. It is important to note that some groups have a small number of individuals, consequently rates in these groups should be interpreted with caution. Looking at the group break outs, we were able to track 93% or more of each group for three years or longer. Recidivism rates generally increased as the number of years tracked increased. The average number of days to first arrest tends to exceed the median or middle number of days indicating that some individuals went long periods of time before being arrested.

Comparison of Court Case Filing Recidivism Grouped by Years Followed
Tables 4-6 look at the court case filing recidivism by the number of years we were able to track them into court data and sample group. Court cases are separated into Magistrate and District case filings.

Looking at Table 4, 72.9% were tracked three years or more. The recidivism rate went up as the number of years tracked went up with those tracked two years having a 11.2% Magistrate case filing recidivism rate and those tracked four years having a 18.7% rate. Looking at District case filing recidivism, those tracked two years had a 5.0% rate compared to 9.4% for those tracked four years.

Table 5 looks at the court case filing recidivism for those in the court petition group. Just over 67% of the sample was tracked three years or more. Recidivism rates increased as the number of years tracked increased. Looking at Magistrate case recidivism, 17.3% of individuals tracked for two years and 37.8% of individuals tracked four years had a Magistrate case

filed. Just over 10% of individuals tracked two years and 13.4% of individuals tracked four years had a District court case filing.

See Table 6 for individuals that were sent to a facility, court case filing recidivism generally increased as the number of years that they were tracked increased. Over 96% of the sample was tracked three years or longer. Of those tracked three years, 23.1% had a Magistrate case filing and 45% of those tracked 5 and 6 years had a Magistrate case filing. For District case filing recidivism, 15.4% of individuals tracked for three years had a District case filing and 40% of those tracked 6 years had one.

Court Case Conviction Recidivism
Table 7 illustrates the difference in court case conviction recidivism rates by sample group. The conviction rate steadily increases with the seriousness of initial CYFD outcome. For the first two groups (informal and petition), the Magistrate conviction recidivism is higher than the District conviction rate (9.5% compared to 3.7% for the informal group and 13.1% compared to 7.3% for the petition group). The committed to a facility sample is different: with a higher District conviction recidivism rate 21.1% compared to 15.1% for magistrate conviction.

DESCRIPTION OF DISTRICT COURT CONVICTIONS
Case Type
The next step is to look at district court convictions by case type. Table 8 shows 34.6% of the cases are Felony Crimes Against the Person and 28.9% are Felony Crimes Against Property. Table 8 lists the case type by each sample group.

Sentences
For individuals convicted of a District court case Table 9 breaks down their sentences into jail/prison and probation categories. Within the jail category we further categorize the sentences into the following categories: jail/prison meaning the individual only got a jail/prison sentence without any additional probation term, given jail/prison and probation meaning the individual was given a jail/prison sentence and an additional probation term, and given jail/prison fully suspended and given probation sentence, meaning the individual was given the sentence and the judge suspended all of the sentence and gave the individual a probation sentence instead. If an individual violates while on probation, the judge has the option of imposing the original sentence.

In all sample groups more people got a jail sentence than a probation only sentence. In the informal and petition

groups more individuals got a fully suspended sentence and probation sentence than jail/prison only or jail/prison and probation. In the facility group, more individuals got a jail/prison and probation sentence.

Probation
Table 10 illustrates the probation sentences for all individuals who got probation sentences by case type. Caution is recommended in comparing length of probation sentences by case type due to the low number of cases. The overall average probation sentence was highest for individuals in the court petition group (nearly 3 years), those in the facility group had an average of just over 31 months and the informal group had an average of almost 28 months.

Jail/Prison Sentence
Table 11 presents jail/prison sentences for individuals whose sentences were not fully suspended. The sentence was computed by subtracting any jail suspension given from the total jail/prison time in days. The number of days served pre-trial are not included Again the number of cases is low so caution should be used when comparing average sentence across groups and case types. The highest average sentence was for the facility group (23 months) followed by informal (19 months) and petition (17 months).

Section IV: Conclusions and Further Research

CONCLUSIONS
We were able to successfully track children with referrals in CYFD into the adult criminal system. By grouping individuals into informal, petition and facility samples we were able to see if the various recidivism rates varied by group. One finding remains consistent throughout the analysis. The children who were committed to a CYFD facility (the most serious outcome) had the highest rate of recidivism as adults for both having been arrested (51.6%), having a court case filing (Magistrate 39.6% and District (31.4%), and having been convicted (Magistrate 15.1% and District 21.1%). Additionally, we were able to look at the sentences in District court cases.

FURTHER RESEARCH
This research has produced a rich data set on children who later re-offend as adults. It provided an opportunity to analyze multiple decision points using our definition of recidivism. It may be interesting to track them into the arrest system as well, and perform the same analysis to determine the types of charges as

was done for the court system. Next, it may be worthwhile to delve a little deeper to develop indicators of the propensity to re-offend based on further details of the child's history in CYFD. For example, a direct comparison of juvenile charges/dispositions to their adult charges/dispositions. In the current study the sample was picked at a point in time and we made no attempts to determine if the referral that put the child in the sample was a first referral, a subsequent referral or if they had additional referrals in CYFD after the referral that put them in the sample. For this reason we do not compare referring offense with later contact with the criminal justice system.

A representative random sample was drawn for children in the informal and petition groups while all facility children were kept. Though we have confidence in the rates generated for the sample groups, it may be interesting to track all children who meet our criteria for a specified time period into the adult system utilizing the methodology developed in this study.

The four samples comprised 1,315 referrals to be linked into the arrest and court systems. Inspection of the data during the next merging process, which moves from the referral level to the individual child level, yielded 277 unusable cases. Some were dropped because of missing social security numbers; others were duplicates meaning the child was selected multiple times. This happened because the sample was selected at the referral level not the person level. A child belonged to more than one sample group, and therefore ended up in the data in multiple ways. In these cases, where all other information was the same, it was decided to keep the referral with the most serious outcome. For example, if a child was in both in the facility and petition groups, they were kept in the facility sample.

Exclusion is due to the fact that that most were either still incarcerated or that they were sentenced as a juvenile, leaving a small number for analysis. The concern of using a small number is two-fold. Disclosure may become an issue, and the other measures may not yield meaningful results.

END NOTES

1. The four samples comprised 1,315 referrals to be linked into the arrest and court systems. Inspection of the data during the next merging process, which moves from the referral level to the individual child level, yielded 277 unusable cases. Some were dropped because of missing social security numbers; others were duplicates meaning the child was selected multiple times. This happened because the sample was selected at the referral level not the person level. A child belonged to more than one sample group, and therefore ended up in the data in multiple ways. In these cases, where all other information was the same, it was decided to keep the referral with the most serious outcome. For example, if a child was in both in the facility and petition groups, they were kept in the facility sample.

2. Exclusion is due to the fact that that most were either still incarcerated or that they were sentenced as a juvenile, leaving a small number for analysis. The concern of using a small number is two-fold. Disclosure may become an issue, and the other measures may not yield meaningful results.

TABLES

Table 1. Arrest Recidivism Rates by Group

Group	N	Recidivists	Percent of Sample
Informal	328	61	18.6%
Petition	344	155	45.1%
Facility	318	164	51.6%

Table 2. Court Case Filing Rates by Group

Group	N	Magistrate		District	
		Recidivists	Percent of Sample	Recidivists	Percent of Sample
Informal	328	49	14.9%	21	6.4%
Petition	344	93	27.0%	41	11.9%
Facility	318	126	39.0%	100	31.4%

Table 3. Years Followed and Time-to-Arrest, All Groups

Number of Years Followed	Number of People in Sample Group	Number of People that Recidivated	Recidivism Rate by Years Tracked	Average Time to Recidivate In Days	Median Number Days To Recidivate
Handled Informally					
Totals	328	61	18.6%	507	440
2 Years	20	1	5.0%	440	440
3 Years	104	17	16.3%	337	277
4 Years	137	24	17.5%	518	527
5 Years	65	17	26.2%	711	723
6 Years	2	2	100.0%	107	107
7 Years	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a
Court Petition					
Totals	344	155	45.1%	465	408
2 Years	23	3	13.0%	234	130
3 Years	126	63	50.0%	387	360
4 Years	138	57	41.3%	493	492
5 Years	57	32	56.1%	592	381
6 Years	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a
7 Years	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a
Committed to a Facility					
Totals	318	164	51.6%	547	404.5
2 Years	6	3	50.0%	232	74
3 Years	6	0	0.0%	n/a	n/a
4 Years	39	16	41.0%	516	446
5 Years	151	75	49.7%	500	394
6 Years	95	57	60.0%	608	292
7 Years	21	13	61.9%	665	504

Table 4. Court Recidivism by Years Followed Informal Group

Number of Years Followed	Number of People in Sample Group	Number of People that Recidivated	Recidivism Rate by Years Tracked
Handled Informally			
Magistrate	328	49	14.9%
1 Years	9	0	0.00%
2 Years	80	9	11.2%
3 Years	134	20	14.9%
4 Years	96	18	18.7%
5 Years	9	2	22.2%
District	328	21	6.4%
1 Years	9	0	0.00%
2 Years	80	4	5.0%
3 Years	134	7	5.2%
4 Years	96	9	9.4%
5 Years	9	1	11.1%

Table 5. Court Recidivism by Years Followed Petition Group

Occurrence and Years Followed	Number of People in Sample Group	Number of People that Recidivated	Rate by Years Tracked
Court Petition			
Magistrate	344	93	27.0%
1 Years	15	2	13.3%
2 Years	98	17	17.3%
3 Years	143	40	27.9%
4 Years	82	31	37.8%
5 Years	6	3	50.0%
District	344	41	11.9%
1 Years	15	0	0.00%
2 Years	98	10	10.2%
3 Years	143	19	13.3%
4 Years	82	11	13.4%
5 Years	6	1	16.7%

Table 6. Court Recidivism by Years Followed Facility Group

Occurrence and Years Followed	Number of People in Sample Group	Number of People that Recidivated	Rate by Years Tracked
Committed to a Facility			
Magistrate	318	126	39.6%
1 Years	3	0	0.0%
2 Years	8	1	12.5%
3 Years	26	6	23.1%
4 Years	130	51	39.2%
5 Years	111	50	45.0%
6 Years	40	18	45.0%
District	318	100	31.4%
1 Years	3	0	0.0%
2 Years	8	2	25.0%
3 Years	26	4	15.4%
4 Years	130	35	26.9%
5 years	111	43	38.7%
6 Years	40	16	40.0%

Table 7. Court Case Conviction Recidivism, All Groups

	N	Recidivists 18 Years or Over and After CYFD Supervision	Percent of Informal Sample
Handled Informally			
Original Sample Size (N)	328		
Convicted in Magistrate Court		31	9.5%
Convicted in District Court		12	3.7%

	N	Recidivists 18 Years or Over and After CYFD Supervision	Percent of Petition Sample
Court Petition			
Original Sample Size (N)	344		
Convicted in Magistrate Court		45	13.1%
Convicted in District Court		25	7.3%

	N	Recidivists 18 Years or Over and After CYFD Supervision	Percent of Facility Sample
Committed to a Facility			
Original Sample Size (N)	318		
Convicted in Magistrate Court		48	15.1%
Convicted in District Court		67	21.1%

Table 8. District Court Convictions by Case Type, All Groups

Case Types for Sample Groups	Informal	Petition	Facility	Total
Adult MV Offenses	0	0	1	1
Felony Crimes Against Property	2	8	20	30
Felony Crimes Against Person	4	9	23	36
Felony Drug Offenses	2	7	8	17
Felony Misc Felony	2	0	5	7
Felony Public Safety	1	0	6	7
Felony First Degree	0	0	1	1
Felony DV	0	0	1	1
Misdemeanor	1	1	2	4
TOTAL	12	25	67	104

Table 9. Summary Table of Sentences, All Groups

		Recidivists 18 Years or Over and After CYFD Supervision	Percent of Informal Sample
		Handled Informally by CYFD	
Original Sample Size (N)	328		
Convicted in District Court		12	3.7%
Given a Jail/Prison Sentence		9	2.7%
Jail/Prison only		1	
Given Jail/Prison and Probation		3	
Jail/Prison Fully Suspended, given probation sentence		5	
Given Only Probation		3	0.9%
		Petition	
Original Sample Size (N)	344		
Convicted in District Court		25	7.3%
Given a Jail/Prison Sentence		21	6.1%
Jail/Prison only		5	
Given Jail/Prison and Probation		7	
Jail/Prison Fully Suspended, given probation sentence		9	
Given Only Probation		4	1.2%
		Facility	
Original Sample Size (N)	318		
Convicted in District Court		67	21.1%
Given a Jail Sentence		52	16.4%
Jail/Prison only		8	
Given Jail/Prison and Probation		24	
Jail/Prison Fully Suspended, given probation sentence		20	
Given Probation		15	4.7%

Table 10. Average Probation Sentence by Group and Case Type		
Probation, Includes Those That Got Jail Time	Count of Persons With Probation Sentences	Average Probation Sentence In Days
Handled Informally		
Adult Motor Vehicle Offenses		
Felony Crimes Against Property	2	1826.3
Felony Crimes Against The Person	3	547.9
Felony Drug Offense	2	455.9
Felony Miscellaneous Felony	2	1095.8
Felony Public Safety	1	364.0
Felony First Degree		
Felony Domestic Violence		
Misdemeanor	1	364.0
Total	11	829.8
Court Petition		
Adult Motor Vehicle Offenses		
Felony Crimes Against Property	6	1270.8
Felony Crimes Against The Person	6	928.0
Felony Drug Offense	7	1121.6
Felony Miscellaneous Felony		
Felony Public Safety		
Felony First Degree		
Felony Domestic Violence		
Misdemeanor	1	547.0
Total	20	1079.6
Committed to a Facility		
Adult Motor Vehicle Offenses	1	547.9
Felony Crimes Against Property	17	1020.2
Felony Crimes Against The Person	19	994.3
Felony Drug Offense	8	924.3
Felony Miscellaneous Felony	5	693.5
Felony Public Safety	5	1167.6
Felony First Degree	1	1095.0
Felony Domestic Violence	1	728.0
Misdemeanor	2	272.0
Total	59	946.6

Table 11. Jail Sentences, Does Not Include Fully Suspended, All Groups

Jail Time, Includes those that got Probation with Jail Sentence Does Not Include Those That Got Fully Suspended Sentences	Count of Persons Convicted and Given Jail Time	Average Jail Sentence In Days
Handled Informally		
Adult Motor Vehicle Offenses		
Felony Crimes Against Property	1	330.0
Felony Crimes Against The Person	3	658.0
Felony Drug Offense		
Felony Public Safety		
Felony First Degree		
Total	4	576.0
Court Petition		
Adult Motor Vehicle Offenses		
Felony Crimes Against Property	3	498.7
Felony Crimes Against The Person	4	426.8
Felony Drug Offense	5	571.1
Felony Public Safety		
Felony First Degree		
Total	12	504.9
Committed to a Facility		
Adult Motor Vehicle Offenses	1	214.0
Felony Crimes Against Property	12	395.0
Felony Crimes Against The Person	13	1097.1
Felony Drug Offense	3	617.6
Felony Public Safety	2	364.5
Felony First Degree	1	365.0
Total	32	692.6