

Juvenile Justice System
Crime Analysis
State of Hawaii
Fiscal Year 2012-2014

This project was supported by grant awarded by the Office of Youth Services, Department of Human Services. The opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views, official positions or policies of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and the U.S. Department of Justice.

This report was prepared by Meripa T. Godinet and Fenfang Li under a contract with the Office of Youth Services, Department of Human Services. Points of view or opinions expressed in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the contracting agency.

Acknowledgments

We would like to acknowledge Maria Sadaya-Ibus of JJIS for her help in obtaining the data used in this report.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----|
| Executive Summary | iii |
| Introduction | 4 |
| Methodology | 4 |
| Analysis for SFY 2012 to 2014 | |
| I.A. Arrest by type of offense, gender, age, and ethnicity | 11 |
| I.B. Referral by type of offense, gender, age, and ethnicity | 18 |
| I.C. Diversion by type of offense, gender, age, and ethnicity | 25 |
| I.D. Petition by type of offense, gender, age, and ethnicity | 32 |
| I.E. Detention by type of offense, gender, age, and ethnicity | 38 |
| I.F. Adjudication by type of offense, gender, age, and ethnicity | 44 |
| I.G. Probation by type of offense, gender, age, and ethnicity | 50 |
| I.H. HYCF by type of offense, gender, age, and ethnicity | 56 |
| I.I. Waiver to adult court by type of offense, gender, age, and ethnicity | 60 |
| Youth Gangs in Hawaii | 62 |
| Recommendation on data reporting and collection | 66 |
| Recommended Problem Statements | 67 |
| References | 71 |
| Appendices | |
| Appendix 1: Youth population ages 10-17 years and population proportions of selected ethnic/racial groups | |

Executive Summary

As a participant of the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) Formula Grant Program, the state of Hawaii is required to conduct an analysis of current juvenile crime problems, juvenile justice and delinquency prevention and educational needs within the state. The accompanying report prepared by the University of Hawaii, Myron B. Thompson School of Social Work assesses delinquency trends by county, ethnicity, age, gender, and offense type at various stages of the state of Hawaii's juvenile justice system. Major trends arranged by decision points in the system are summarized briefly below.

Arrests

Status offenses have consistently remained the highest offense type in arrests for all 3 years for all 4 counties. Status offenses for all three years for the State as well as the individual circuits made up for more than 40 to over 50% of all arrests. While Honolulu, Hawaii, and Kauai circuits showed property offenses as the second highest in arrests across the three years, "other" and "drug" type of offenses were second highest for Maui in arrests depending on the year. All circuits showed a decrease in arrest as the years progressed except for Hawaii that showed an increase and then decrease between 2013 and 2014. Honolulu had the lowest arrest rates compared to the other circuits for all three years.

Referrals

Status offenses accounted for more than half of all referrals (Table 2-1a) statewide for all three years. All four circuits showed high percentages of referrals for status offenses that ranged from 40% in Hawaii County (2012) to 62% in Kauai (2014). The referral rates of Maui, Hawaii, and Kauai circuits were two times more than the referral rates for Honolulu for certain years. All four circuits showed that the largest percentage of their referrals were from status offenses with Honolulu showing the highest percentage with the exception of Kauai in 2014. Property offenses is usually the second highest type of offense in referrals with the exception of Maui showing drug offenses as the second highest in the latter years. "Other" types of offenses were also among the top four for all circuits depending on the year. The top four types of offenses for each circuit in the arrest decision point were similar to their respective types of offense in the subsequent phase of referral.

Diversions

Overall, all four circuits showed that the largest percentage of their diversions were for status offenses. Hawaii and Kauai circuits consistently had the largest percentage of diversions, generally exceeding the state rate. The second largest offense in diversion was property offenses as shown in the rates for each circuit, and for the state. Almost all, depending on the year, of Kauai's diversion offenses are status offenses.

Petitions

In three of the circuits, property and “other” types of offenses were the top in petition. Maui diverted from that to show status offense as the highest offense for all years accounting for a third or more of the offenses petition to family court. The Hawaii circuit also shows a noticeable difference between the males and females for the petition phase in the two previous years but the difference dramatically decreased in 2014. All circuits reflected a percentage difference between the genders of more than 30% in 2012 with Kauai showing the highest difference (42%).

Detentions

Statewide, the largest offense type in the detention phase was in the “other” offense category across all three years, followed by person, then property (Table 4-1a, 4-2a, 4-3a). For the county of Honolulu, the largest offense type in the detention phase was also in the “other” offense category across all three years, followed by person and then property. A similar pattern was also observed in Maui except for 2013, where sex offenses tied with person offenses to be the second highest type. More males were placed in detention compared to females for all three years (Tables 4-1b, 4-2b, 4-3b) statewide except for Hawaii circuit. . Hawaii is the only circuit that either had more females compared to males or only a female in detention.

Adjudications

Property offenses were the highest type of offense adjudicated for the state of Hawaii, accounting for more than a quarter for all three years. Status was the second highest in all three years except for 2013 where person offenses were the second highest. With the exception of Kauai, all of the circuits had status offense as one of the top three offenses that resulted in adjudication for 2013 and 2014. For Kauai circuit the top three offenses are non-contact personal offenses, property, and “other” types of offenses

Probations

The Honolulu circuit had the majority of sex offense probation cases, accounting for over two-thirds to 100% of all sex offense probation cases in the state across the three years. Hawaii and Maui circuits consistently showed drug offenses as one of the top four in probation for each year, with Hawaii circuit having the largest proportion of drug offenses in the state, accounting from a third to 44% of all drug offenses of probation cases. In the Kauai circuit, “other” type of offenses had the highest percentage of all probation cases in this circuit, accounting for 56% to 69% of all probation there. In 2012 and 2013, Maui and Kauai had status offense cases that resulted in probation. In 2014 no status offense showed in the probation phase.

HYCF

The “other” type of offenses accounted for almost half or more than half of the offenses in HYCF placement across all three years (range: 43% to 52%). Property offenses were the second highest (ranges: 22% to 32%) and person type of offenses were the third highest group (ranges 11% to 15%). In addition, status offense also was noted in 2012 and 2013. It is not clear from the data if this was the offense that led them to HYCF. Ages represented in HYCF ranged from 14 to 17, with over 90% in the age group 15 to 17.

Waivers and transfers

The 15 waivers in 2012 were all from Hawaii circuit, coming from two juveniles. All two juveniles were males, aged 17. One is of Filipino and the other of Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian ethnicity. The 4 waivers in 2013 in Honolulu for sex offenses were from the same juvenile, who was a Caucasian male, aged 17. The 12 waivers in 2014 were all from Maui, from one juvenile, who was a 17-year Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian male for person and property offenses.

Gender Race and Ethnicity

At all points in the system males had the largest percentage in all phases with the exception of the Detention phase for Hawaii circuit that showed female to either be more than males. Caution is taken when interpreting this finding as the number of youth in this phase for the Hawaii circuit is minute. While gender differences were noticed in all phases of the system for most of the circuits, Hawaii County however showed very small percent differences between the sexes at the earlier stages (arrest and referral). The latter stages (diversion, petition, detention, adjudication, HYCF) showed substantially larger differences between males and females. Older age groups, generally age 16 and 17, also have the highest rates in the system, beginning with arrests and establishing a trend that is consistent along decision points.

Ethnically, Native Hawaiians continue to be overrepresented in all decision points after arrest. They are also underrepresented in diversion. Filipinos are not disproportionately represented in the arrest and referral decision points and are underrepresented in the latter stages of the JJS. Like previous reports, Samoans during the 2012-2014 period continue to be overrepresented in the Honolulu circuit in various phases except for referrals in 2013. Whites, while overrepresented in arrests, were not disproportionate in the latter phases except in HYCF. Blacks, Mixed Pacific Islanders, and Samoans are generally overrepresented in the system at each decision point, again beginning with arrests. Mixed Pacific Islanders and Mixed Race consistently shows as one of the top five ethnic categories in the various phases.

INTRODUCTION

As a participant of the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) Formula Grant Program, the state of Hawaii is required to conduct an analysis of current juvenile crime problems, juvenile justice and delinquency prevention and educational needs within the state. This includes a review of juvenile gangs, delinquency prevention and juvenile justice needs, and mental health services for juvenile within the state. The analysis would be the basis for the State's three-year plan that serves as the focal point for the formulation of the state's juvenile justice needs and problem statements. The Office of Youth Services being the designated State agency in Hawaii that administers this program and monitors compliance with the federal requirements of the HHDP Act contracted the University of Hawaii research team to perform the crime analysis that presents delinquency trends by county, ethnicity, age, gender, and offense type at various stages of the JJS.

METHODOLOGY

Existing data from the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) was used for the crime analysis. The JJIS is the statewide information system managed by the State of Hawaii, Department of the Attorney General that combines juvenile offender information from the police, prosecutors, Family Court, and the Hawaii Youth Correctional Facility. The system includes juveniles' first exposure to the justice system and extends through prosecution, adjudication, and incarceration. JJIS is also the repository for statewide information on missing children. Data for calendar year 2012, 2013, and 2014 were received through portable CD-ROMs. In the portable CD-ROMs, there were three Microsoft Access database, each one containing data for each fiscal year. In each of the Access database, there were 9 data tables, each table representing a unique decision point of the juvenile justice system, from arrest to waiver. In each of the data table, there were information on Juvenile's demographical data, such as date of birth, gender and ethnicity. Each individual was assigned a unique identification number (ID), which was then replaced by a unique scramble ID. The CD-ROMs also contains an Excel file which contains codes regarding charges, charge description, and major seven groups of offenses.

Each of the data table from the three Access database was then imported to SAS and a SAS dataset was created for each data decision point, which combines the three year data together for that decision point. For each data decision point, the following variables were created:

- Calendar year for each of those decision points.
- Age at each decision point, decided by years between date of birth and the date that decision point occurred. For example, age when the juvenile was arrested was determined by the difference in years between arresting date and the juvenile's date of birth. Ages 10 – 17 were included for further analyses. Ages below 10 and at or above 18 were eliminated from the analysis.

- Ethnicity, a new variable created accordingly to the protocols how OYS wants race/ethnicity to be categorized. It has a total of 15 categories: African American, Caucasian, Chinese, Filipino, Hawaiian/Part-Hawaiian, Japanese, Korean, Latino/Hispanic, Mixed Race, Native American, Other Asian/Mixed Asian, Other Pacific Islander/ Mixed Pacific Islander, Samoan, All Others, and Unknown. The ethnicity variable was created by recoding the existing 43 different categories of various ethnicities into the 15 categories described before. Hawaiian has the first overriding priority. For example, if Hawaiian was indicated among the five ethnic variables, then that juvenile's ethnicity is coded as Hawaiian; Samoan has the second priority in overriding all other ethnic groups.

Other variables included in the SAS data set of each decision point included:

- Scrambled JJIS identification number (this is a unique number provided to every youth who enters Hawaii's juvenile justice system)
- Sex (male, female, unknown)
- County (location of offense)
- Date of birth
- Date of arrest, referral, diversion, detention, etc.
- Offense(s) for which youth entered the juvenile justice system
- Offense severity (whether the offense was considered a Felony A, Felony B, Felony C, Misdemeanor, Petty Misdemeanor, Status Offense, or Law Violation offense)
- Zip code of the juvenile's residence;
- Original five variables for the juvenile's ethnicity

For the County of Kauai, JJIS has not received new data for arrest data since July 26, 2013. Therefore, only data received before this date was included as data for fiscal year 2014.

A total of 9 SAS data sets were created based on the nine decision points or stages of the juvenile justice process (arrest, referrals to Family Court, diversion, detention, petitions, adjudication, probation, HYCF, Waiver to adult court). Those 9 files were then used for further analysis as described below.

ANALYSIS

As a requirement of the juvenile crime analysis, the secondary data from JJIS was used to analyze the following:

1. Juvenile arrests by offense type, gender, age and race;
2. Number and characteristics (by offense type, gender, race, age) of juveniles referred to juvenile court, for allegedly committing a delinquent or status offense;
3. Number of cases handled informally (non-petitioned) or diverted

4. Number of cases handled formally (petitioned) by gender, race, and type of disposition (probation, commitment);
5. Number of delinquent and status offenders admitted, by gender and race, to juvenile detention facilities and waiver to adult court;

Analysis of each stage of the juvenile justice process

The analysis does not assume that the stages to be analyzed are in a sequence. All stages are analyzed separately and one has no bearing on another. As found in the analysis, youth identification codes for a stage may or may not be found in the previous stage. For example, a substantial amount of cases in referrals could not be located in the arrest data file of the same or previous year. This may be due to cases such as status offenses that were referred directly from the schools and were not recorded in the arrest decision point. Another reason for the uniqueness of each stage is due to the fact that circuits vary in the way they handle youth entering the juvenile justice system. For instance, Hawaii County on occasions may have a youth referred directly to family court without processing an arrest report particularly in cases where the police find adequate evidence that warrants family court involvement. Other reasons may be due to multiple entries to a stage. For example, detention cases may be from point of arrest, disposition, or from other stages of the juvenile justice system. Thus, the analysis will show a snapshot of a stage by age, gender, ethnicity, and type of offense.

Duplicated and Unduplicated Counts – Determining Offense Severity

In a given year, about half of all youth arrested are arrested for more than one offense. This proportion tends to hold up across the various stages in Hawaii's juvenile justice system. Given this pattern of youth being processed for multiple offenses, it was necessary that a system be established which would enable us to examine the unique number of youth that go through the system, as well as the total number of arrests, referrals, diversions, etc. that occur in each fiscal year. For example, if a youth was adjudicated five times in a fiscal year, he or she could be counted five times in analyses. When analyzed in this manner, the sheer number of adjudications rises substantially because those youth adjudicated more than once are counted more than once. In this report, these types of analyses will be referred to as **“duplicated”** counts. **“Unduplicated”** counts are when a youth is counted only once upon entry into the system regardless of the number of offenses.

At the request of the Juvenile Justice State Advisory Council working with the Office of Youth Services, some analyses in this report will present the data using duplicated counts, while others will examine unduplicated counts. When comparing different major offense categories (see below), duplicated counts will be presented. When comparing the data by way of ethnicity, age, and gender, unduplicated counts will be presented. With regard to the latter three analyses (ethnicity, age, and gender), the council members wanted unduplicated counts in order to see the unique number of youth within those demographics who were

being processed through the nine different juvenile justice system stages. However, committee members wanted to see the total impact of different offense types that were occurring across Hawaii's four counties, and therefore, asked to see duplicated counts for the seven different offense types. The only decision point that uses all duplicated counts is detention.

Offense Categories

Each of the forty-five offenses was categorized into seven major offense categories, presented below. The Juvenile Justice Information Committee's subcommittee on research developed the offense categories established for this report. On the whole, these categories follow typical offense categories established in national studies although there are some exceptions. The "person no contact" category includes offenses typically included under the "person" category. However for the purposes of this report, the offenses of terroristic threatening, weapons violations, and harassment were combined to form the "person no contact" category since these offense, while severe, normally do not involve injurious physical contact.

Additionally, minor alcohol offenses are sometimes defined as status offenses. For the purposes of this report, any offenses involving alcohol (e.g., prohibitions) have been included in the "drug offense" category. Aside from these minor discrepancies, the seven major offense categories utilized in this report are similar to offense categories used in other juvenile delinquency research projects.

Person Offenses:

| | |
|----------------|---------------------|
| Homicide | Robbery |
| Assault 1 or 2 | Abuse family member |
| Kidnapping | Assault 3 |

Sex Offenses:

| | |
|--------------------|---------------|
| Sex assault 1 or 2 | Prostitution |
| Sex assault 3 | Open lewdness |
| Sex assault 4 | |

Drug Offenses:

| | | |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Dangerous drugs | Detrimental drugs (felonies) | Other drug violations |
| Detrimental drugs (felonies) | Detrimental drugs (misdemeanors) | |
| Harmful drugs | Alcohol (includes prohibitions) | |

Person No Contact Offenses:

| | |
|---|---|
| Terroristic threatening 1 Weapons (felonies) | Harassment Weapons (misdemeanors) |
| Terroristic threatening 2 | |

Property Offenses:

| | | |
|---|--|-----------------------|
| Burglary | Computer/credit card fraud | Other property |
| Motor vehicle theft Larceny-theft 1 or 2 | Larceny-theft 3 or 4 Trespass (misdemeanor) | Trespass (violations) |

Status Offenses:

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Protective supervision violation | Beyond parental control | Person in need of supervision |
| Runaway | Curfew | Compulsory school attendance |
| Truancy | Injurious behavior | Other status offense |

Other Offenses:

| | |
|---------------------|---------|
| Parole violation | Traffic |
| Furlough violation | Other |
| Probation violation | |

Methodological Limitations

Generally, juveniles' flow and attrition transpires sequentially through the nine juvenile justice system's decision points (from arrest down to waiver). However, due to differences in resources and processing procedures between jurisdictions, there are a few significant county differences that exist across the State of Hawaii. These differences in procedure can account for mild discrepancies in data analyses.

Kauai County Data

The 2014 Arrest data for Kauai County included only the month of July, 2013. Thus the omission limited a fuller understanding of arrests rates for Kauai for the entire 2014 fiscal year.

Hawaii County Arrests and Referrals

Occasionally in Hawaii circuit, youth enter the juvenile justice system without having an arrest record documented in JJIS. When this occurs, police report the incident in which a juvenile(s) may have engaged in a form of a delinquency. The

officer(s) will always fill out a police report if the incident merits further processing of the youth(s) through the juvenile justice system.

However, in some cases when officers feel there is adequate evidence, they will not arrest the youth(s), but instead “refer” the youth(s) directly to the prosecutor. From there, if the prosecutor determines there is sufficient evidence to prosecute the youth(s), the prosecutor will forward the necessary paperwork on to 3rd Circuit Family Court and the process advances from there. When this process occurs, JJIS catalogues it as a “referral” without an arrest, which appears inconceivable on paper without understanding this unique systemic variation.

Lag time Between Decision Points

Each fiscal year begins on July 1 and ends the following June 30. Inevitably, as the fiscal year turns over, some youth will be in the midst of going through different decision points in the juvenile justice system. For example, a youth may have been arrested on June 25, 2006 (end of fiscal year 2006) and not been referred until July 2, 2006 (beginning of fiscal year 2007). This situation can occur between any two decision points along the continuum.

In cases where this flow through the system occurs over the course of two fiscal years, it is impossible to examine one fiscal year and track a particular youth’s attrition through the system for a unique fiscal year. In order to address this issue at least at the juncture between arrests and referrals, all referral cases were identified for each fiscal year. Each of those individual youths was then linked up with his/her arrest from that same fiscal year and/or the prior fiscal year as a means of tracking attrition more accurately at the earliest stage of the juvenile justice system.

Ethnicity

JJIS allows each of its member agencies to enter up to five ethnicities for each youth. When police departments input ethnicity/ethnicities for an arrested youth, ethnicity may be determined by a youth’s self-reported description, as expressed by family, or as determined by the police (e.g., through the youth’s last name). This process can have obvious flaws, as it is extremely difficult to determine ethnicity in Hawaii, where a high proportion of youth come from multiple ethnic backgrounds.

If a youth progresses on to the referral stage, the Family Court asks that the youth’s family bring in his/her birth certificate. In most cases, the birth certificate is provided (statistics are not maintained on how often), at which point the Family Court can more accurately determine the youth’s ethnicity/ethnicities. If a youth’s

family does not bring in a birth certificate, the family can verbally state the youth's ethnicity/ethnicities.

As is common in most scholarly studies and political processes in Hawaii, if a youth was documented as "Hawaiian," he or she was counted in this report as Hawaiian, irrespective of whether or not the youth also held other ethnicities documented in JJIS. Again, this "one drop" rule, while imperfect, is the most common method of analyzing ethnicity in the State of Hawaii. Hawaiians have shown over-representation in Hawaii's juvenile and adult justice systems. This method inevitably contributes to Hawaiians' over-representation.

RESULTS

I.A. Arrests

In 2012, arrests for the state of Hawaii totaled 10,957 and the arrest rate per 1,000 youth was 83.7¹ (Table 1-1a). The total number of arrests in 2013 decreased to 10,726 and the arrest rate was 79.1. For 2014, the total number of arrests was 8,885 (Table 1-2a), with an arrest rate of 65.5. For the year 2014, Kauai County only had data for July 2013; hence, only 19 arrests were reported. The arrest rates for the four circuits varied during the three-year period. Kauai had the highest arrest rate in both 2012 (193.7), and 2013 (163.4). Maui had the second highest arrest rate, followed by Hawaii county. For all three years, Honolulu had the lowest arrest rates (2012, 68.3; 2013, 67.5; 2014, 65.5) compared to other counties.

Type of Offense

Status offenses were the highest type of offense for the state of Hawaii (51%) in 2012. This resonated across the four circuits which all showed high percentages for status offenses. Status offenses for all three years accounted for more than 50% or more for the state as well as all the circuits except for Maui who was consistently just below half. For all years, Honolulu, Kauai, and Hawaii consistently showed property offenses as the second highest reason for arrest (See Table 1-1a). Maui diverted from the three counties for all three years indicating “Drug” type of offense as the second highest except for 2012.

A closer examination of the data by type of offense showed that Maui county made up over a third of all drug arrests in 2013 and 2014 (33.4% in 2013 and 37.4% in 2014) and “other” offense types in arrests (35.3% in 2014)². Drug offenses ranked second in type of arrests made in 2013 and 2014 but ranked fourth in 2012, where property types of arrests ranked second and “other” offense types ranked 3rd in the county. Hawaii circuit showed drug offenses to be the third reason for arrest in all three years (11.9% in 2012; 11.3% in 2013; and 10.9% in 2014). Kauai circuit showed the same pattern in 2012 & 2013.

Status offenses have consistently remained the highest offense type in arrests for all three years for all four circuits. All three of the circuits had property offenses as the second highest for all arrests across the three years with the

¹ General population information on the total number of youth ages between 10 and 17 years were taken from American Community Survey (ACS). ACS 2013 data was also used to calculate rates for 2014.

² Figure was calculated using the county/circuit data as numerator over state data.

exception of Maui that showed drug offense” to be the second highest in the latter years. .

Statewide data and the individual circuits showed a progressive decrease in arrest rates from 2012 to 2014 with the exception of Hawaii County which showed a decrease from 2012 to 2013 but increased from 2013 and 2014.

Gender

Consistently throughout the state and the counties males were arrested more than females at a 3 to 2 ratio. This ratio changes for Hawaii County as the years progress. In 2013 the gender ratio approaches 1 to 1 and the trend continues on to 2014. For example, the statewide and other circuits show a difference in percentage between male and female arrests that is within a 20% range. Hawaii County’s data shows the percentage arrest difference between males and females to start with a 20% difference and by 2014 the difference was .07%. This indicates that for Hawaii County, girls are being arrested at almost the same rate as males.

Age

As shown in Tables 1-1b, 1-2b, & 1-3b, a progressive increase was shown in arrests as age increases from 10 to 15. Furthermore, statewide and the individual circuit data showed that ages 14-17 accounts for nearly 80% or more of all arrests for the state as well as the individual circuits throughout the three years. The age group that shows to have the highest percentage of arrest varied between 16 and 17 depending on the year and county.

Race/Ethnicity

Across all three years, Native Hawaiians were the group with the largest arrest percentage (range: 31%-33%) statewide, followed by Caucasian (around 16%). Mixed group was the third highest group in both 2012 and 2013, around 16%, except in 2014, where Filipino (14%) passed Mixed Race group (9%).

When the arrest rates by ethnicity were compared to their respective ethnic proportion in the population based on the 2010 census data³, certain ethnic groups showed overrepresentation in the system, either statewide or in certain circuit and either across all three years or in some particular year. For example, according to the census data, among youth ages 10-17, Caucasian constituted 14% statewide, 12% in Honolulu, 20% in Maui, 19% in Hawaii, and 20% in Kauai. Although statewide, there was no overrepresentation of Caucasian in the system of arrest cases (about 16% across the three years), or in the Honolulu circuit

³ Proportion in the population for selected ethnic/racial group was taken from the 2010 census. See appendix 1.

(between 6% to 9% across the three years), they were overrepresented in the Maui, Hawaii, and Kauai across those three years, in particular, in 2012 and 2013, where proportions of Caucasians among all arrests were about 30% in Maui, 26% in Hawaii and 35% in Kauai.

Hawaiian alone or in combination constituted about a third of youth 10-17 years old statewide and between 30% and 45% among the four circuits, with Hawaii having the highest percentage of 45%. No overrepresentation was seen among Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian among in arrests statewide (about 31%). In each of the four circuits, percentages of all arrests from Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian were lower than their percentages in the youth population across the three years.

Filipino constituted about 15% statewide, 15% on Honolulu, 19% on Maui, 8% on Hawaii, and 17% on Kauai for the percentage of arrests. Unlike previous crime analysis report (2009-2011), the 2013-2014 data for Filipino youth shows that they are not being arrested at a disproportionate rate compared to their proportion in the population for the counties of Honolulu and Maui. . Nevertheless, in both Hawaii and Kauai circuits, Filipino was slightly overrepresented in the system. For example, in Hawaii circuit, about 10% of all arrests were Filipinos, slightly higher than their population proportion of 8%. In Kauai, about 22% of all arrests were Filipinos, higher than their population percentage of 17%.

African Americans constituted about 1.5% of the total youth population statewide, 1.9% in Honolulu, 0.4% in Maui, 0.5% in Hawaii and 0.4% in Kauai. Percentage of all arrests that were from African Americans constituted less than 2% statewide, between 1.5% and 2.5% in Honolulu, between 0.7 to 1.6% in Maui, between 2-3% in Hawaii and less than 1% in Kauai. Hence, data showed no overrepresentation of African Americans in the system statewide, or in the circuit of Honolulu, Maui, and Kauai. In Hawaii, there is a slight overrepresentation of African Americans in the system.

Samoaan alone or in combination constituted 5% of the youth population statewide, 6% in Honolulu, 2% in Maui, 2% in Hawaii and 1% in Kauai. Given their proportion in the population, Samoaan youth were not arrested at a disproportionate rate compared to their proportion in the state as well as in other counties unlike previous crime analysis reports.

Table 1-1a Arrest rates by type of offense and circuit for 2012 (duplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|--------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Total arrests | 10,957 | 6,198 | 1,876 | 1,531 | 1,352 |
| Arrest rate[§] | 83.7 | 68.3 | 131.0 | 84.7 | 193.7 |
| Type of Offense | | | | | |
| Drug | 945 (8.6%) | 418 (6.7%) | 199 (10.6%) | 182 (11.9%) | 146 (10.8%) |
| Person | 868 (7.9%) | 539 (8.7%) | 127 (6.8%) | 87 (5.7%) | 115 (8.5%) |
| Property | 2,155 (19.7%) | 1,386 (22.4%) | 263 (14.0%) | 301 (19.7%) | 205 (15.2%) |
| Sex | 136 (1.2%) | 113 (1.8%) | 11 (0.6%) | 7 (0.5%) | 5 (0.37%) |
| Status | 5,534 (50.5%) | 3,190 (51.5%) | 899 (47.9%) | 772 (50.4%) | 673 (49.8%) |
| Person NC | 510 (4.7%) | 243 (3.9%) | 111 (5.9%) | 44 (2.9%) | 112 (8.3%) |
| Other | 809 (7.4%) | 309 (5.0%) | 266 (14.2%) | 138 (9.0%) | 96 (7.1%) |

Table 1-2a Arrest rates by type of offense and circuit for 2013 (duplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Total arrests | 10,726 | 6,180 | 2,119 | 1,312 | 1,115 |
| Arrest rate | 79.1 | 67.5 | 130.4 | 64.6 | 163.4 |
| Type of Offense | | | | | |
| Drug | 955 (8.9%) | 326 (5.3%) | 319 (15.1%) | 148 (11.3%) | 162 (14.5%) |
| Person | 897 (8.4%) | 597 (9.7%) | 158 (7.5%) | 52 (4.0%) | 90 (8.1%) |
| Property | 1,902 (17.7%) | 1,242 (20.1%) | 256 (12.1%) | 228 (17.4%) | 176 (15.8%) |
| Sex | 99 (0.9%) | 76 (1.2%) | 12 (0.6%) | 0 (0%) | 11 (1.0%) |
| Status | 5,523 (51.5%) | 3,281 (53.1%) | 947 (44.7%) | 763 (58.2%) | 532 (47.7%) |
| Person NC | 499 (4.7%) | 237 (3.8%) | 164 (7.7%) | 18 (1.4%) | 80 (7.2%) |
| Other | 851 (7.9%) | 421 (6.8%) | 263 (12.4%) | 103 (7.9%) | 64 (5.7%) |

Table 1-3a Arrest rates by type of offense and circuit for 2014 (duplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|
| Total arrests | 8,885 | 5,666 | 1,729 | 1,471 | 19 |
| Arrest rates | 65.5 | 61.9 | 106.4 | 72.4 | |
| Type of Offense | | | | | |
| Drug | 736 (8.3%) | 295 (5.2%) | 275 (15.9%) | 161 (10.9%) | 5 (26.3%) |
| Person | 617 (6.9%) | 403 (7.1%) | 148 (8.6%) | 62 (4.2%) | 4 (21.1%) |
| Property | 1718 (19.3%) | 1,181 (20.8%) | 222 (12.8%) | 310 (21.1%) | 5 (26.3%) |
| Sex | 115 (1.3%) | 93 (1.6%) | 16 (0.9%) | 6 (0.4%) | 0 (0%) |
| Status | 4,673 (52.6%) | 3,141 (55.4%) | 721 (41.7%) | 806 (54.8%) | 5 (26.3%) |
| Person NC | 334 (3.8%) | 201 (3.6%) | 103 (6.0%) | 30 (2.0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other | 692 (7.8%) | 352 (6.2%) | 244 (14.1%) | 96 (6.5%) | 0 (0%) |

* General population information on the total number of youth ages between 10 and 17 years were taken from the American Community Survey (ACS). The data from 2013 ACS was used to estimate the arrest rate for year 2014. Kauai rate for 2014 was not calculated as only part of data from July was available.

Table 1-1b Arrest rates by gender, age, ethnicity, and circuit for 2012 (unduplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|--------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Gender | | | | | |
| Male | 3,400 (61.5%) | 1,966 (60.6%) | 661 (63.6%) | 449 (59.9%) | 324 (65.7%) |
| Female | 2,124 (38.4%) | 1,276 (39.3%) | 378 (36.4%) | 301 (40.1%) | 169 (34.3%) |
| Total | 5,526 (100%) | 3,244 (100%) | 1,039 (100%) | 750 (100%) | 493 (100%) |
| Age | | | | | |
| 10 | 49 (0.9%) | 20 (0.6%) | 24 (2.3%) | 1 (0.1%) | 4 (0.8%) |
| 11 | 133 (2.4%) | 66 (2.0%) | 33 (3.2%) | 14 (1.9%) | 20 (4.1%) |
| 12 | 317 (5.7%) | 172 (5.3%) | 74 (7.1%) | 32 (4.3%) | 39 (7.9%) |
| 13 | 564 (10.2%) | 358 (11.0%) | 102 (9.8%) | 58 (7.7%) | 46 (9.3%) |
| 14 | 857 (15.5%) | 485 (15.0%) | 170 (16.3%) | 140 (18.7%) | 62 (12.6%) |
| 15 | 1,108 (20.0%) | 658 (20.3%) | 192 (18.4%) | 165 (22.0%) | 93 (18.9%) |
| 16 | 1,274 (23.0%) | 755 (23.3%) | 247 (23.7%) | 164 (21.9%) | 108 (21.9%) |
| 17 | 1,227 (22.2%) | 730 (22.5%) | 200 (19.2%) | 176 (23.5%) | 121 (24.5%) |
| Total | 5,529 (100%) | 3,244 (100%) | 1,042 (100%) | 750 (100%) | 493 (100%) |
| Ethnicity | | | | | |
| Caucasian | 897 (16.2%) | 217 (6.7%) | 309 (29.7%) | 209 (27.9%) | 162 (32.9%) |
| Hawaiian | 1793 (32.4%) | 1081 (33.3%) | 324 (31.1%) | 241 (32.1%) | 147 (29.8%) |
| African American | 78 (1.4%) | 48 (1.5%) | 7 (0.7%) | 19 (2.5%) | 4 (0.8%) |
| Chinese | 32 (0.6%) | 23 (0.7%) | 3 (0.3%) | 4 (0.5%) | 2 (0.4%) |
| Filipino | 617 (11.2%) | 260 (8.0%) | 160 (15.4%) | 83 (11.1%) | 114 (23.1%) |
| Japanese | 163 (3.05%) | 73 (2.3%) | 33 (3.2%) | 29 (3.9%) | 28 (5.7%) |
| Korean | 20 (0.4%) | 16 (0.5%) | 4 (0.4%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Latino/ Hispanic | 85 (1.5%) | 43 (1.3%) | 14 (1.3%) | 19 (2.5%) | 9 (1.8%) |
| Native American | 4 (0.1%) | 1 (0.0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (0.4%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Asian/ Mixed | | | | | |
| Asian | 115 (2.1%) | 111 (3.4%) | 2 (0.2%) | 1 (0.13%) | 1 (0.2%) |
| Other Pacific | | | | | |
| Islander/ Mixed | | | | | |
| Pacific Islander | 267 (4.8%) | 191 (5.9%) | 41 (3.9%) | 24 (3.2%) | 11 (2.2%) |
| Samoan | 244 (4.4%) | 230 (7.1%) | 4 (0.4%) | 6 (0.8%) | 4 (0.8%) |
| Other | 160 (2.9%) | 0 (0%) | 89 (8.5%) | 62 (8.3%) | 9 (5.6%) |
| Unknown | 140 (2.5%) | 55 (1.7%) | 33 (3.2%) | 50 (6.7%) | 2 (0.4%) |
| Mixed Race | 914 (16.5%) | 895 (27.6%) | 19 (1.8%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Total | 5,529 (100%) | 3,244 (100%) | 1,042 (100%) | 750 (100%) | 493 (100%) |

Table 1-2b Arrest rates by gender, age, ethnicity, and circuit for 2013 (unduplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|--------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Gender | | | | | |
| Male | 3,125 (60.6%) | 1,775 (61%) | 728 (61.7%) | 341 (55.6%) | 281 (61.5%) |
| Female | 2,034 (39.4%) | 1,134 (39.0%) | 452 (38.3%) | 272 (44.4%) | 176 (38.5%) |
| Total | 5,162 (100%) | 2,910 (100%) | 1,182 (100%) | 613 (100%) | 457 (100%) |
| Age | | | | | |
| 10 | 61 (1.2%) | 24 (0.8%) | 28 (2.4%) | 4 (0.7%) | 5 (1.1%) |
| 11 | 115 (2.2%) | 53 (1.8%) | 37 (3.1%) | 5 (0.8%) | 20 (4.4%) |
| 12 | 262 (5.1%) | 144 (5.0%) | 67 (5.7%) | 21 (3.4%) | 30 (6.6%) |
| 13 | 535 (10.4%) | 287 (9.9%) | 133 (11.3%) | 70 (11.4%) | 45 (9.9%) |
| 14 | 806 (15.6%) | 458 (15.7%) | 184 (15.6%) | 103 (16.8%) | 61 (13.4%) |
| 15 | 1035 (20.5%) | 606 (20.8%) | 219 (18.5%) | 120 (19.6%) | 90 (19.7%) |
| 16 | 1211 (23.5%) | 679 (23.3%) | 269 (22.8%) | 159 (25.9%) | 104 (22.8%) |
| 17 | 1137 (22.0%) | 659 (22.7%) | 245 (20.7%) | 131 (21.4%) | 102 (22.3%) |
| Total | 5,162 (100%) | 2,910 (100%) | 1,182 (100%) | 613 (100%) | 457 (100%) |
| Ethnicity | | | | | |
| Caucasian | 869 (16.8%) | 175 (6.0%) | 363 (30.7%) | 158 (25.8%) | 173 (37.9%) |
| Hawaiian | 1622 (31.4%) | 928 (31.9%) | 366 (31.0%) | 220 (35.9%) | 108 (23.6%) |
| African American | 89 (1.7%) | 46 (1.6%) | 19 (1.6%) | 17 (2.8%) | 7 (1.5%) |
| Chinese | 33 (0.6%) | 19 (0.7%) | 7 (0.6%) | 4 (0.7%) | 3 (0.7) |
| Filipino | 618 (12.0%) | 244 (8.4%) | 204 (17.3%) | 72 (11.8%) | 98 (21.4%) |
| Japanese | 107 (2.1%) | 39 (1.3%) | 25 (2.1%) | 21 (3.4%) | 22 (4.8%) |
| Korean | 16 (0.3%) | 14 (0.5%) | 2 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Latino/ Hispanic | 68 (1.3%) | 33 (1.1%) | 11 (0.9%) | 17 (2.8%) | 7 (1.5%) |
| Native American | 7 (0.1%) | 5 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (0.3%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Asian/ Mixed | | | | | |
| Asian | 97 (1.9%) | 95 (3.3%) | 1 (0.1%) | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Pacific | | | | | |
| Islander/ Mixed | | | | | |
| Pacific Islander | 228 (4.4%) | 158 (5.4%) | 23 (2.0%) | 26 (4.2%) | 21 (4.6%) |
| Samoan | 227 (4.4%) | 210 (7.2%) | 5 (0.4%) | 6 (1.0%) | 6 (1.3%) |
| Other | 188 (3.6%) | 0 (0%) | 128 (10.8%) | 52 (8.5%) | 8 (1.8%) |
| Unknown | 154 (3.0%) | 120 (4.1%) | 13 (1.1%) | 17 (2.8%) | 4 (0.9%) |
| Mixed Race | 839 (16.3%) | 824 (28.3%) | 15 (1.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Total | 5,162 (100%) | 2,910 (100%) | 1,182 (100%) | 613 (100%) | 457 (100%) |

Table 1-3b Arrest rates by gender, age, ethnicity and circuit for 2014 (unduplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Gender | | | | | |
| Male | 2,662 (60.0%) | 1,712 (60.2%) | 631 (63.2%) | 310 (53.5%) | 9 (56.2%) |
| Female | 1,776 (40.0%) | 1,132 (39.8%) | 368 (36.8%) | 269 (46.5%) | 7 (43.8%) |
| Total | 4,439 (100%) | 2,845 (100%) | 999 (100%) | 579 (100%) | 16(100%) |
| Age | | | | | |
| 10 | 43 (1.0%) | 20 (0.7%) | 18 (1.8%) | 4 (0.7%) | 1 (6.25%) |
| 11 | 93 (2.1%) | 45 (1.58%) | 39 (3.9%) | 8 (1.4%) | 1 (6.25%) |
| 12 | 215 (4.8%) | 133 (4.67%) | 55 (5.5%) | 26 (4.5%) | 1 (6.25%) |
| 13 | 412 (9.3%) | 265 (9.31%) | 100 (10%) | 46 (8.0%) | 1 (6.25%) |
| 14 | 719 (16.2%) | 448 (15.75%) | 171(17.1%) | 98 (17.0%) | 2 (12.5%) |
| 15 | 907 (20.4%) | 600 (21.09%) | 182 (18.2%) | 121 (21.0%) | 4 (25%) |
| 16 | 1,073 (24.2%) | 693 (24.36%) | 223 (22.3%) | 154 (26.6%) | 3 (18.75%) |
| 17 | 978 (22.0%) | 641 (22.53%) | 212 (21.2%) | 122 (21.1%) | 3 (18.75%) |
| Total | 4,440 (100%) | 2,845 (100%) | 1,000 (100%) | 579 (100%) | 16 (100%) |
| Ethnicity | | | | | |
| Caucasian | 655 (14.8%) | 262 (9.21%) | 245 (24.5%) | 144 (24.9%) | 4 (25.0%) |
| Hawaiian | 1,461 (32.9%) | 955 (33.57%) | 319 (31.9%) | 184 (31.8%) | 3 (18.8%) |
| African American | 102 (2.3%) | 70 (2.46%) | 17 (1.7%) | 14 (2.4%) | 1 (6.3%) |
| Chinese | 30 (0.7%) | 23 (0.81%) | 6 (0.6%) | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) |
| Filipino | 574 (13.0%) | 326 (11.46%) | 182 (18.2%) | 60 (10.4%) | 6 (37.5%) |
| Japanese | 149 (3.4%) | 86 (3.02%) | 41 (4.1%) | 22 (3.8%) | 0 (0%) |
| Korean | 11 (0.3%) | 9 (0.32%) | 2 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Latino/ Hispanic | 78 (1.8%) | 51 (1.79%) | 8 (0.8%) | 18 (3.1%) | 1 (6.3%) |
| Native American | 9 (0.2%) | 6 (0.21%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (0.5%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Asian/ Mixed | | | | | |
| Asian | 66 (1.5%) | 58 (2.04%) | 7 (0.7%) | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Pacific | | | | | |
| Islander/ Mixed | | | | | |
| Pacific Islander | 412 (9.3%) | 348 (12.23%) | 28 (2.8%) | 35 (6.0%) | 1 (6.3%) |
| Samoan | 217 (4.9%) | 203 (7.14%) | 5 (0.5%) | 9 (1.6%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other | 207 (4.7%) | 0 (0%) | 129 (12.9%) | 78 (13.5%) | 0 (0%) |
| Unknown | 84 (1.9%) | 67 (2.36%) | 7 (0.7%) | 10 (1.7%) | 0 (0%) |
| Mixed Race | 385 (8.7%) | 327 (13.4%) | 4 (0.4%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Total | 4440 (100%) | 2845 (100%) | 1000 (100%) | 579 (100%) | 16 (100%) |

I.B. Referrals

The referral rate in 2012 for the State of Hawaii per 1000 youth was 75.7 (Table 2-1a) and there was a steady decrease for 2013 (65.5) and 2014 (65.9) per 1000 youth (Table 2-2a and 2-3a). Kauai had the highest referral rate for all three years (196.1 for 2012, 160.1 for 2013 and 149.1 for 2014), followed by Hawaii which was 136.0 for 2012, 96.1 for 2013 and 117.5 for 2014. Maui County ranked the third highest. All three counties had over twice the rate of referrals compared to Honolulu for all three years, in particular, Kauai, where referral rates were four times higher in 2012 and three times higher in both 2013 and 2014. Similar to the arrest rates, the referral rates for Honolulu remained the lowest of all the other circuits during the three years (52.1 for 2012, 50.2 for 2013 and 46.3 for 2014).

Type of Offense

Status offenses accounted for more than half of all referrals (Table 2-1a) statewide for all three years. All four circuits showed high percentages of referrals for status offenses that ranged from 40% in Hawaii County (2012) to 62% in Kauai (2014). For Kauai and Hawaii, property offenses accounted for the second highest referrals for 2012 and 2013, except for 2014 where "other" types of offenses accounted for the second highest in Kauai. Honolulu's second highest reason for referral was "other" types of offense in 2013 and 2014, except for 2012, where property was the second highest. With the exception of 2012, Drug offenses were the second largest reason for referrals in the Maui circuit in 2013 and 2014 (around 15%). In 2012, "other" types of offenses were the second largest reason in Maui.

Overall, all four circuits showed that the largest percentage of their referrals were of status offenses. Honolulu had the largest percentage and consistently showed status offenses accounting for over 50% of their referrals. Given the population of youth ages 10-17 in Honolulu, the proportion of referrals for each offense would show Honolulu to be high given their proportion in the state. However, several types of offenses show other counties to exceed those of Honolulu. Such offenses include drug for Maui in 2013 (32.0% compared to 19.5% in Honolulu) and 2014 (30.1% compared to 17.0% in Honolulu) and drug in Hawaii County in 2012 (44.1% compared to 23.8% in Honolulu in 2012). Person no contact types of offenses was higher in Kauai in 2012 (34.7%) than the Honolulu County (30.1%).

For the Honolulu circuit, the top four that were consistent throughout 2012-2014 types of offenses that were referred to Family court were status, property, person, and "other." This is consistent with the top four types of offenses that were reported in arrests.

Gender

Males were consistently higher in referrals compared to females for all circuits across all years (Tables 2-1b, 2-2b, 2-3b). The difference between the genders decreased slightly statewide from 19.5% in 2012 to 18% in 2013 to 14.3% in 2014. In both Honolulu and Hawaii County, there was an increase in the difference between 2012 and 2013 and a decrease from 2013 to 2014. The difference in Maui remained around 22% for the three years. The largest difference was seen in Kauai, where difference between boys and girls was as large as 26% in 2012, 33% in 2013 and 27% in 2014.

Age

Over 60% of all arrests for the state of Hawaii consist of youth within the age of 15 to 17 throughout the three years; a pattern that is also reflected in the arrests proportions for each county (Tables 2-1b, 2-2b, 2-3b). Age 14 is also an age worth noting, as the percentage of referrals within this age group accounts for a noticeable proportion of referrals within each county (from 11.0% to 16.6%). As shown in the following tables, the jumps in referrals from age 13 to 14 are quite substantial for each county as well as for the state.

Ethnicity

The largest referral group by far for all years was Hawaiian youth (See Tables 2-1b, 2-2b, 2-3b) statewide and for Honolulu and Maui circuit, accounting to over a third of total referrals. The “Unknown” category was the second highest statewide and the highest for both Hawaii and Kauai circuit. The top five ethnicity groups statewide and across all circuits were: Hawaiian or Unknown, Caucasian, Filipino and Mixed Race group.

It is important to note that the state, Hawaii, and Kauai circuit data showed substantial percentage across the three years of “unknown” ethnicity. As shown in the following tables, for all three years, it was the largest group in referrals for both Hawaii and Kauai circuit and the second largest group in referrals statewide. It accounted for more than a third for both Hawaii and Kauai, and between 15% and 18% statewide for the three years. This warrants further study as this category in the referral decision point should be little to non-existent as the referral stage requires a birth certificate to verify demographic information such as ethnicity.

Again when comparing referral rates to their respective ethnic proportion in the youth population based on the 2010 census data, certain ethnic groups showed overrepresentation in the system, either statewide or in certain circuit and either across all three years or in some particular year.

Relative to their proportion in the population for the state of Hawaii, Honolulu County, Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian Youth were overrepresented in the Honolulu circuit (percentage of total arrest 39.9 % vs. population percentage of 29.5%) across the three years and Maui circuit for 2012 and 2013 (percentage of total arrest about 42.4% vs. population percentage of 36.5%) but not 2014. No-overrepresentation was seen in the Hawaii or Kauai circuit. Disproportionality of H/NHs in referrals particularly for the Honolulu circuit is a concern because they were not overrepresented at the arrest stage and yet they are disproportionality referred to Family Court.

Samoan/Part Samoan was overrepresented in 2013 statewide and in all the four circuits. However, no overrepresentation was seen in either 2012 or 2014. No overrepresentation was seen among Whites, Filipinos, or African Americans across those three years or in each of the four circuits across the three years.

Table 2-1a Referral rates by type of offense and circuit for 2012 (duplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Total referrals | 9,905 | 4,732 | 1,347 | 2,457 | 1,369 |
| Referral rates | 75.7 | 52.1 | 94.1 | 136.0 | 196.1 |
| Type of Offense⁺ | | | | | |
| Drug | 675 (6.8%) | 161 (3.4%) | 147 (10.9%) | 298 (12.1%) | 69 (5.0%) |
| Person | 677 (6.8%) | 365 (7.7%) | 54 (4.0%) | 189 (7.7%) | 69 (5.0%) |
| Property | 1647 (16.6%) | 790 (16.7%) | 208 (15.4%) | 455 (18.5%) | 194 (14.2%) |
| Sex | 122 (1.2%) | 52 (1.1) | 0 (0%) | 63 (2.6%) | 7 (0.5%) |
| Status | 4982 (50.3%) | 2,564 (54.2%) | 729 (54.1%) | 991 (40.3%) | 698 (51.0%) |
| Person NC | 525 (5.3%) | 158 (3.34%) | 28 (2.1%) | 157 (6.4%) | 182 (13.3%) |
| Other | 1,277 (12.9%) | 642 (13.6%) | 181 (13.4%) | 304 (12.4%) | 150 (11.0%) |

Table 2-2a Referral rates by type of offense and circuit for 2013 (duplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Total referrals | 8,876 | 4,591 | 1,239 | 1,953 | 1,093 |
| Referral rates | 65.5 | 50.2 | 76.3 | 96.1 | 160.1 |
| Type of Offense⁺ | | | | | |
| Drug | 609 (6.9%) | 119 (2.6%) | 195 (15.7%) | 201 (10.3%) | 94 (8.6%) |
| Person | 637 (7.2%) | 374 (8.2%) | 53 (4.3%) | 131 (6.7%) | 79 (7.2%) |
| Property | 1292 (14.6%) | 606 (13.2%) | 175 (14.1%) | 324 (16.6%) | 187 (17.1%) |
| Sex | 154 (1.7%) | 65 (1.4%) | 32 (2.6%) | 44 (2.3%) | 13 (1.2%) |
| Status | 4,451 (50.2%) | 2,487 (54.2%) | 558 (45.0%) | 891 (45.6%) | 515 (47.1%) |
| Person NC | 344 (3.9%) | 135 (2.9%) | 52 (4.2%) | 91 (4.7%) | 66 (6.0%) |
| Other | 1,389 (15.7%) | 805 (17.5%) | 174 (14.0%) | 271 (13.9%) | 139 (12.7%) |

Table 2-3a Referrals rates by type of offense and circuit for 2014 (duplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|-------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|
| Total referrals | 8,937 | 4,237 | 1,295 | 2,387 | 1,018 |
| Referrals rates | 65.9 | 46.3 | 79.7 | 117.5 | 149.1 |
| Type of Offense- | | | | | |
| Drug | 665 (7.4%) | 113 (2.7%) | 202 (15.6%) | 290 (12.2%) | 60 (5.9%) |
| Person | 566 (6.3%) | 257 (6.1%) | 94 (7.3%) | 140 (5.9%) | 75 (7.4%) |
| Property | 1,387 (15.5%) | 585 (13.8%) | 168 (13.0%) | 545 (22.8%) | 89 (8.7%) |
| Sex | 104 (1.2%) | 54 (1.3%) | 25 (1.9%) | 8 (0.3%) | 17 (1.7%) |
| Status | 4,651 (52.0%) | 2,320 (54.8%) | 594 (45.9%) | 1,108 (46.4%) | 629 (61.8%) |
| Person NC | 211 (2.4%) | 91 (2.2%) | 20 (1.5%) | 68 (2.9%) | 32 (3.14%) |
| Other | 1,353 (15.1%) | 817 (19.3%) | 192 (14.8%) | 228 (9.6%) | 116 (11.4%) |

· General population information on the total number of youth ages between 10 and 17 years were taken from American Community Survey; Data from 2013 ACS was used to estimate the rate for year 2014.

· The sum of the seven charges may not add up to the total due to missing data.

Table 2-1b Referral rates by gender, age, ethnicity, and circuit for 2012 (unduplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|--------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| Gender | | | | | |
| Male | 2,461 (59.7%) | 1,210 (57.6%) | 354(63.2%) | 660 (60.6%) | 237 (64.2%) |
| Female | 1,658 (40.3%) | 890 (42.4%) | 206 (36.8%) | 430 (39.4%) | 132 (35.8%) |
| Total | 4,119 (100%) | 2,100 (100%) | 560 (100%) | 1,090 (100%) | 369 (100%) |
| Age | | | | | |
| 10 | 42 (1.0%) | 13 (0.6%) | 4 (0.7%) | 21 (1.9%) | 4 (1.1%) |
| 11 | 57 (1.4%) | 20 (1.0%) | 4 (0.2%) | 26 (2.4%) | 7 (1.9%) |
| 12 | 73 (4.4%) | 47 (3.8%) | 34 (5.7%) | 34 (4.3%) | 13 (4.4%) |
| 13 | 362 (8.8%) | 197 (9.4%) | 38 (6.8%) | 90 (8.3%) | 37 (10.0%) |
| 14 | 588 (14.3%) | 299 (14.2%) | 77 (13.8%) | 177 (16.2%) | 35 (9.5%) |
| 15 | 854 (20.7%) | 451 (21.48%) | 117 (20.9%) | 225 (20.6%) | 61 (16.5%) |
| 16 | 983 (23.9%) | 516 (24.6%) | 149 (26.6%) | 235 (21.6%) | 83 (22.5%) |
| 17 | 1053 (25.6%) | 518 (24.7%) | 154 (27.5%) | 256 (23.5%) | 125 (33.9%) |
| Total | 4,119 (100%) | 2,100 (100%) | 560 (100%) | 1,090 (100%) | 369 (100%) |
| Ethnicity | | | | | |
| Caucasian | 511 (12.4%) | 192 (9.1%) | 97 (17.3%) | 178 (16.3%) | 44 (11.9%) |
| Hawaiian | 1549 (37.6%) | 851 (40.5%) | 242 (43.2%) | 336 (30.8%) | 120 (32.5%) |
| African American | 73 (1.8%) | 52 (2.5%) | 4 (0.7%) | 17 (1.6%) | 0(0%) |
| Chinese | 10 (0.2%) | 8 (0.4%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) |
| Filipino | 359 (8.7%) | 194(9.2%) | 65 (11.6%) | 65 (6.0%) | 35 (9.5%) |
| Japanese | 79 (1.9%) | 39 (1.9%) | 9 (1.6%) | 23 (2.1%) | 8 (2.2%) |
| Korean | 13 (0.3%) | 12 (0.6%) | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Latino/ Hispanic | 75 (1.8%) | 36 (1.7%) | 22 (3.9%) | 16 (1.5%) | 1 (0.3%) |
| Native American | 2 (0.1%) | 2 (0.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Asian/ Mixed | | | | | |
| Asian | 53 (1.3%) | 47 (2.2%) | 3 (0.5%) | 3 (0.3%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Pacific | | | | | |
| Islander/ Mixed | 275 (6.7%) | 225 (10.7%) | 17 (3.0%) | 30 (2.8%) | 3 (0.8%) |
| Pacific Islander | | | | | |
| Samoan | 144 (3.5%) | 131 (6.2%) | 3 (0.5%) | 8 (0.7%) | 2 (0.5%) |
| Mixed Race | 343 (8.3%) | 242 (11.5%) | 33 (5.9%) | 38 (3.5%) | 30 (8.1%) |
| Unknown | 633 (15.4%) | 69 (3.3%) | 64 (11.4%) | 374 (34.3%) | 126 (34.2) |
| Total | 4,119 (100%) | 2,100 (100%) | 560 (100%) | 1,090 (100%) | 369 (100%) |

Table 2-2b Referral rates by gender, age, ethnicity, and circuit for 2013 (unduplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|--------------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Gender | | | | | |
| Male | 2,136 (59.0%) | 1005 (58.0%) | 367 (61.1%) | 498 (56.5%) | 266 (66.7%) |
| Female | 1,481 (41.0%) | 730 (42.0%) | 234 (39.0%) | 384 (43.5%) | 133 (33.3%) |
| Total | 3,617 (100%) | 1,735 (100%) | 601 (100%) | 882 (100%) | 399 (100%) |
| Age | | | | | |
| 10 | 42 (1.2%) | 7 (0.4%) | 3 (0.5%) | 27 (3.1%) | 5 (1.3%) |
| 11 | 53 (1.5%) | 20 (1.2%) | 3 (0.5%) | 20 (2.3%) | 10 (2.5%) |
| 12 | 148 (4.1%) | 61 (3.5%) | 21 (3.5%) | 41 (4.7%) | 25 (6.3%) |
| 13 | 340 (9.4%) | 161 (9.3%) | 54 (9.0%) | 92 (10.4%) | 33 (8.3%) |
| 14 | 520 (14.4%) | 253 (14.6%) | 77 (12.8%) | 146 (16.6%) | 44 (11.0%) |
| 15 | 753 (20.8%) | 383 (22.1%) | 122 (20.3%) | 171 (19.4%) | 77 (19.3%) |
| 16 | 881 (24.4%) | 433 (25.0%) | 157 (26.1%) | 207 (23.5%) | 84 (21.1%) |
| 17 | 880 (24.3%) | 417 (24.0%) | 164 (27.3%) | 178 (20.2%) | 121 (30.3%) |
| Total | 3,617 (100%) | 1,735 (100%) | 601 (100%) | 882 (100%) | 399 (100%) |
| Ethnicity | | | | | |
| Caucasian | 447 (12.4%) | 175 (10.1%) | 109 (18.1%) | 128 (14.5%) | 35 (8.8%) |
| Hawaiian | 1,312 (36.3%) | 684 (39.4%) | 250 (41.6%) | 245 (27.8%) | 133 (33.3%) |
| African American | 68 (1.9%) | 43 (2.5%) | 9 (1.5%) | 16 (1.8%) | 0 (0%) |
| Chinese | 21 (0.6%) | 13 (0.8%) | 1 (0.2%) | 6 (0.7%) | 1 (0.3%) |
| Filipino | 286 (7.9%) | 127 (7.3%) | 67 (11.2%) | 53 (6.0%) | 39 (9.8%) |
| Japanese | 66 (1.8%) | 35 (2.0%) | 9 (1.5%) | 18 (2.0%) | 4 (1%) |
| Korean | 9 (0.3%) | 8 (0.5%) | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Latino/ Hispanic | 55 (1.5%) | 25 (1.4%) | 13 (2.2%) | 16 (1.8%) | 1 (0.3%) |
| Native American | 4 (0.1%) | 3 (0.2%) | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Asian/ Mixed | | | | | |
| Asian | 33 (0.9%) | 30 (1.7%) | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (0.5%) |
| Other Pacific | | | | | |
| Islander/ Mixed | | | | | |
| Pacific Islander | 268 (7.4%) | 225 (13.0%) | 13 (2.2%) | 22 (2.5%) | 8 (2.0%) |
| Samoa | 123 (8.0%) | 187 (10.8%) | 35 (5.8%) | 22 (2.5%) | 44 (11.0%) |
| Mixed Race | 288 (1.6%) | 0 (0%) | 14 (2.6%) | 30 (3.6%) | 3 (1.4%) |
| Unknown | 637 (17.6%) | 69 (4.1%) | 89 (14.8%) | 349 (39.6%) | 130 (32.6%) |
| Total | 3,617 (100%) | 1,735 (100%) | 601 (100%) | 882 (100%) | 399 (100%) |

Table 2-3b Referral rates by gender, age, ethnicity, and circuit for 2014 (unduplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Gender | | | | | |
| Male | 1,959 (57.2%) | 930 (56.2%) | 351 (61.0%) | 506 (54.5%) | 172 (63.7%) |
| Female | 1,469 (42.9%) | 724 (43.8%) | 224 (39.0%) | 423 (45.5%) | 98 (36.3%) |
| Total | 3,428 (100%) | 1,654 (100%) | 575 (100%) | 929 (100%) | 270 (100%) |
| Age | | | | | |
| 10 | 28 (0.8%) | 9 (0.5%) | 8 (1.4%) | 8 (0.9%) | 3 (1.1%) |
| 11 | 57 (1.7%) | 18 (1.1%) | 11 (1.9%) | 22 (2.4%) | 6 (2.2%) |
| 12 | 139 (4.1%) | 62 (3.8%) | 18 (3.1%) | 46 (5.0%) | 13 (4.8%) |
| 13 | 267 (7.8%) | 117 (7.1%) | 43 (7.5%) | 87 (9.4%) | 20 (7.4%) |
| 14 | 524 (15.3%) | 275 (16.6%) | 80 (13.9%) | 139 (15.0%) | 30 (11.1%) |
| 15 | 726 (21.2%) | 369 (22.3%) | 127 (22.1%) | 185 (19.9%) | 45 (16.7%) |
| 16 | 826 (24.1%) | 396 (23.9%) | 144 (25.0%) | 224 (24.1%) | 62 (23.0%) |
| 17 | 861 (25.1%) | 408 (24.7%) | 144 (25.0%) | 218 (23.5%) | 91 (33.7%) |
| Total | 3,428 (100%) | 1,654 (100%) | 575 (100%) | 929 (100%) | 270 (100%) |
| Ethnicity | | | | | |
| Caucasian | 383 (11.2%) | 129 (7.8%) | 72 (12.5%) | 157 (16.9%) | 25 (9.3%) |
| Hawaiian | 1219(35.6%) | 659 (39.8%) | 210 (36.5%) | 256 (27.6%) | 94 (34.8%) |
| African American | 58 (1.7%) | 38 (2.3%) | 3 (0.5%) | 13 (1.4%) | 4 (1.5%) |
| Chinese | 10 (0.3%) | 9 (0.5%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.1%) | 0 (0%) |
| Filipino | 280 (8.2%) | 147 (8.9%) | 58 (10.1%) | 59 (6.4%) | 16 (6.0%) |
| Japanese | 68 (2.0%) | 30 (1.8%) | 7 (1.2%) | 28 (3.0%) | 3 (1.1%) |
| Korean | 6 (0.2%) | 4 (0.2%) | 2 (0.4%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Latino/ Hispanic | 74 (2.2%) | 31 (1.7%) | 17 (3.0%) | 25 (2.7%) | 1 (0.4%) |
| Native American | 1 (0.0%) | 1 (0.06%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Asian/ Mixed | | | | | |
| Asian | 33 (1.0%) | 26 (1.6%) | 6 (1.0%) | 1 (0.1%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Pacific | | | | | |
| Islander/ Mixed | | | | | |
| Pacific Islander | 290 (8.5%) | 227 (13.7%) | 22 (3.8%) | 38 (4.1%) | 3 (1.1%) |
| Samoan | 121 (3.5%) | 101 (6.1%) | 3 (0.5%) | 16 (1.7%) | 1 (0.4%) |
| Mixed Race | 265 (7.7%) | 175 (10.6%) | 40 (7.0%) | 25 (2.7%) | 25 (9.3%) |
| Unknown | 620 (18.1%) | 77 (4.7%) | 135 (23.5%) | 310 (33.4%) | 98 (36.3%) |
| Total | 3,428 (100%) | 1,654 (100%) | 575 (100%) | 929 (100%) | 270 (100%) |

I.C. Diversion

A total of 4,243 cases in 2012 were in diversion or informally handled for a rate of 32.4 per 1000 youth between the ages of 10-17 (Table 3-1a). Honolulu (26.2) and Maui (20.0) were below the state average. Rates in Hawaii (62.0) and Kauai (65.2) were double of the state average.

In 2013, a total of 3,702 cases were diverted or informally handled which translates into a statewide diversion rate of 27.3 per 1000. This is a slight decrease from 2012 (Table 3-2a). Hawaii had the highest rate (47.2), followed by Kauai (34.3), then Honolulu (25.2). Maui had the lowest rate (16).

Total number of diversion cases increased to 4,155 in 2014, resulting in a diversion rate of 30.7 (Table 3-3a). Again, Hawaii (64.3) and Kauai (57.1) diversion rates doubled the state average. Honolulu's (24.2) rate was close to the state average. Maui (13.7) was the lowest rate, which was less than half of the state average.

For all three years Hawaii and Kauai circuits reported substantially higher diversion rates compared to other circuits.

Type of Offense

The highest percentages of diversion cases across the years for all circuits were for status offenses. Approximately 90% or more of the diversion cases were of status offences for Honolulu, Maui, and Kauai. Hawaii circuited status offenses accounted for a lot less of the diversion cases. (66 % to 72%). For all counties, status offenses made up about 85% of all cases that were in the diversion phase. For all three years, all circuits showed property offenses as the second highest in diversion except for 2013 for Maui, where drug was the second highest. Hawaii circuit, however, showed the largest percentage of diversion drug offenses compared to other circuits and accounted for 60% to 67% among all drug offenses in those three years. Kauai differs greatly from the other circuits in the types of offenses that are diverted. Aside from status offenses, only one case was diverted in 2013 for a property offense and one in 2014 for a person NC offense.

Gender

Diversion percentages were higher for males than females both statewide and for Maui, Hawaii, and Kauai but were close for Honolulu across all three years. The data also showed Kauai to have the largest percentage difference in all three years (17 in 2012, 33% in 2013 and 24% in 2014). Honolulu showing a significantly lower percentage in the difference (4% to 8%) compared to the other circuits across all three years.

Noticeably while Maui circuit shows an approximate of 20% difference with males and females in the arrest and referral stages, the diversion phase throughout the three years indicates a difference of 11% or below.

Age

As shown in Tables 3-1b, 3-2b, & 3-3b, a progressive increase was shown in arrests as age increases from 10 to 15. Furthermore, statewide and the individual circuit data showed that ages 14-17 accounts for nearly 70% or more of all diversions for the state as well as the individual circuits throughout the three years. The age group that shows to have the highest percentage of diversions varied between 16 and 17 depending on the year and county. Age 15 is also an age worth noting, as the percentage of diversions within this age group accounts for a noticeable proportion within each county. As shown in the following tables, the jumps in diversion from age 14 to 15 are quite substantial for each county as well as for the state.

Ethnicity

The largest group by far for all years was Hawaiian youth (See Tables 3-1b, 3-2b, 3-3b) statewide and for all circuits for all the three years, accounting for about a third of all diversion cases. The top five ethnicity groups statewide and across all circuits were: Hawaiian, Caucasian (for statewide, Honolulu and Maui County) or Unknown (for Hawaii and Kauai County), Filipino and Mixed Race group.

It is important to note that both the Hawaii and Kauai circuit data showed again substantial percentage across the three years of “unknown” ethnicity. As shown in the following tables, for all three years, it was the second largest group in diversions for both Hawaii and Kauai circuit, accounting for 28% to 36%.

When comparing diversion rates to their respective ethnic proportions in the youth population based on the 2010 census data^{**4}, certain ethnic groups showed overrepresentation in the system, either statewide or in certain circuit and either across all three years or in some particular year.

Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian was over-represented in Honolulu circuit (percentage among all diversions of 39.2% vs. percentage of the youth population of 29.5%) and as a result, slightly overrepresented statewide (36.7% vs. 32.8% respectively). Nevertheless, the data showed no overrepresentation of Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian in Maui, or Hawaii or Kauai. In both Hawaii and Kauai,

⁴ Proportion in the population for each ethnic/racial group was taken from the 2010 census. See appendix 1.

the percentages of all diversions of Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian across the three years were far below (10% or more lower) their percentages in the population. This underrepresentation warrants further examination as it may suggest that H/NH cases are being diverted less than their proportion.

African Americans were slightly overrepresented in Maui in 2013 (0.4% of the population vs. 2% of all diversions) and in Hawaii in both 2012 and 2013 (0.5% of the population vs. 2% of all diversions). No overrepresentation of African Americans was seen statewide, or in the Honolulu circuit, or in the Kauai circuit for all three years.

No overrepresentation was seen in Whites across the three years both statewide and in each of the four circuits. In Kauai circuit, the percentages of all diversions of Caucasian across those three years (10.7%) were far below their percentage in the youth population (20.2%). No overrepresentation was seen in Filipinos or Samoan/Part Samoan.

Table 3-1a Diversion rates by type of offense and circuit for 2012 (duplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|------------|
| Total diversions | 4,243 | 2,381 | 286 | 1,121 | 455 |
| Diversion rates | 32.4 | 26.2 | 20.0 | 62.0 | 65.2 |
| Type of Offense | | | | | |
| Drug | 155 (3.7%) | 46 (1.9%) | 4 (1.4%) | 105 (9.4%) | 0 (0%) |
| Person | 69 (1.6%) | 12 (0.5%) | 1 (0.4%) | 56 (5%) | 0 (0%) |
| Property | 362 (8.5%) | 233 (9.8%) | 4 (1.4%) | 125 (11.2%) | 0 (0%) |
| Sex | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (1.0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Status | 3532 (83.2%) | 2072 (87.0%) | 271 (94.8%) | 734 (65.5%) | 455 (100%) |
| Person NC | 52 (1.2%) | 11 (0.5%) | 0 (0%) | 41 (3.7%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other | 72 (1.7%) | 7 (0.3%) | 6 (2.1%) | 59 (5.3%) | 0 (0%) |

Table 3-2a Diversion rates by type of offense and circuit for 2013 (duplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Total diversions | 3,702 | 2,302 | 260 | 960 | 234 |
| Diversion rates | 27.3 | 25.2 | 16.0 | 47.2 | 34.3 |
| Type of Offense | | | | | |
| Drug | 120 (3.2%) | 37 (1.6%) | 12 (4.6%) | 71 (7.8%) | 0 (0%) |
| Person | 43 (1.2%) | 10 (0.4%) | 0 (0%) | 33 (3.6%) | 0 (0%) |
| Property | 241 (6.5%) | 156 (6.8%) | 4 (1.5%) | 80 (8.8%) | 1 (0.43%) |
| Sex | 1 (0.0%) | 1 (0.0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Status | 3172 (85.7%) | 2057 (89.4%) | 243 (93.5%) | 639 (70.5%) | 233 (99.6%) |
| Person NC | 33 (0.9%) | 9 (0.4%) | 1 (0.4%) | 23 (2.5%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other | 92 (2.5%) | 32 (1.4%) | 0 (0%) | 60 (6.6%) | 0 (0%) |

Table 3-3a Diversion rates by type of offense and circuit 2014 (duplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Total diversions | 4,155 | 2236 | 223 | 1306 | 390 |
| Diversion rates | 30.7 | 24.4 | 13.7 | 64.3 | 57.1 |
| Type of Offense⁺ | | | | | |
| Drug | 151 (3.6%) | 32 (1.4%) | 4 (1.8%) | 115 (8.8%) | 0 (0%) |
| Person | 46 (1.1%) | 8 (0.4%) | 2 (0.9%) | 36 (2.8%) | 0 (0%) |
| Property | 311 (7.5%) | 156 (7.0%) | 6 (2.7%) | 149 (11.4%) | 0 (0%) |
| Sex | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Status | 3531 (85.0%) | 2000 (89.5%) | 207 (92.8%) | 935 (71.6%) | 389 (99.7%) |
| Person NC | 27 (0.7%) | 9 (0.4%) | 0 (0%) | 17 (1.3%) | 1 (0.3%) |
| Other | 89 (2.2%) | 31 (1.4%) | 4 (1.8%) | 54 (4.1%) | 0 (0%) |

⁺ General population information on the total number of youth ages between 10 and 17 years were taken from the American Community Survey (ACS); Data from 2013 ACS was used to estimate the rate for 2014.

⁺ The sum of the seven charges may not add up to the total due to missing data.

Table 3-1b Diversion rates by gender, age, ethnicity, and circuit for 2012 (unduplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|--------------------|---------------|--------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| Gender | | | | | |
| Male | 1,355 (54.3%) | 761 (52.2%) | 110(54.7%) | 387 (57.7%) | 97 (58.4%) |
| Female | 1,142 (45.7%) | 698 (47.8%) | 91 (45.3%) | 284 (42.3%) | 69 (41.6%) |
| Total | 1,938 (100%) | 941(100%) | 329 (100%) | 535 (100%) | 133 (100%) |
| Age | | | | | |
| 10 | 17 (0.7%) | 10 (0.7%) | 2 (1.0%) | 5 (0.8%) | 0 (0%) |
| 11 | 35 (1.4%) | 19 (1.3%) | 1 (0.5%) | 15 (2.2%) | 0 (0%) |
| 12 | 116 (4.7%) | 64 (4.4%) | 6 (3.0%) | 43 (6.4%) | 3 (1.8%) |
| 13 | 216 (8.7%) | 136 (9.3%) | 12 (6.0%) | 59 (8.8%) | 9 (5.4%) |
| 14 | 372 (14.9%) | 208 (14.3%) | 27 (13.4%) | 117 (17.4%) | 20 (12.1%) |
| 15 | 538 (21.6%) | 320 (21.9%) | 49 (24.4%) | 143 (21.3%) | 26 (15.7%) |
| 16 | 605 (24.2%) | 346 (57.2%) | 61 (30.4%) | 146 (21.8%) | 52 (31.3%) |
| 17 | 598 (24.0%) | 356 (24.4%) | 43 (21.4%) | 143 (23.9%) | 56 (33.7%) |
| Total | 2,497 (100%) | 1,459 (100%) | 201 (100%) | 671 (100%) | 166 (100%) |
| Ethnicity | | | | | |
| Caucasian | 324 (13.0%) | 149(10.2%) | 41 (20.4%) | 122 (18.2%) | 12 (7.2%) |
| Hawaiian | 937 (37.5%) | 577 (39.6%) | 74 (36.8%) | 226 (33.7%) | 60 (36.1%) |
| African American | 58 (2.3%) | 44 (3.0%) | 0 (0%) | 14 (2.1%) | 0 (0%) |
| Chinese | 6 (0.2%) | 4 (0.3%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (0.3%) | 0 (0%) |
| Filipino | 237 (9.5%) | 149(10.2%) | 32 (16.0%) | 42 (6.3%) | 14 (8.4%) |
| Japanese | 49 (2.0%) | 27 (1.9%) | 2 (1%) | 16 (2.4%) | 4 (2.4%) |
| Korean | 11 (0.4%) | 10 (0.7%) | 1 (0.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Latino/ Hispanic | 51 (2.0%) | 31 (2.2%) | 7 (3.5%) | 12 (1.8%) | 1 (0.6%) |
| Native American | 2 (0.2%) | 2(0.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0(0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Asian/ Mixed | | | | | |
| Asian | 37 (1.5%) | 36 (2.5%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Pacific | | | | | |
| Islander/ Mixed | | | | | |
| Pacific Islander | 171 (6.9%) | 144 (9.9%) | 9 (4.5%) | 17 (2.5%) | 1 (0.6%) |
| Samoan | 87 (3.5%) | 80 (5.5%) | 2 (1%) | 4 (0.6%) | 1 (0.6%) |
| Mixed Race | 213 (8.5%) | 163 (11.2%) | 13 (6.5%) | 23 (3.4%) | 14 (8.4%) |
| Unknown | 314 (12.6%) | 43 (3.0%) | 20 (10.0%) | 192 (28.6%) | 59 (35.5%) |
| Total | 2,497 (100%) | 1,459 (100%) | 201 (100%) | 671 (100%) | 166 (100%) |

Table 3-2b Diversion rates by gender, age, ethnicity, and circuit for 2013 (unduplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|--------------------|--------------|--------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| Gender | | | | | |
| Male | 1,112(53.7%) | 655 (52.3%) | 109 55.6%) | 266 (53.1%) | 82 (66.7%) |
| Female | 960 (46.3%) | 597 (47.7%) | 87 (44.4%) | 235 (46.9%) | 41 (33.3%) |
| Total | 2,072 (100%) | 1,252 (100%) | 196 (100%) | 501 (100%) | 123 (100%) |
| Age | | | | | |
| 10 | 11 (0.5%) | 6 (0.5%) | 1 (0.5%) | 3 (0.6%) | 1 (0.8%) |
| 11 | 23 (1.1%) | 16 (1.3%) | 2 (1.0%) | 4 (0.8%) | 1 (0.8%) |
| 12 | 79 (3.8%) | 48 (3.8%) | 7 (3.6%) | 22 (4.4%) | 2 (1.6%) |
| 13 | 181 (8.7%) | 111 (8.9%) | 12 (6.1%) | 55 (11.0%) | 3 (2.4%) |
| 14 | 317 (15.3%) | 196 (15.6%) | 30 (15.3%) | 79 (15.8%) | 12 (9.8%) |
| 15 | 448 (21.6%) | 284 (22.7%) | 41 (21.0%) | 103 (20.6%) | 20 (16.3%) |
| 16 | 505 (24.4%) | 293 (23.4%) | 56 (28.6%) | 118 (23.6%) | 38 (30.9%) |
| 17 | 508 (24.5%) | 298 (23.8%) | 47 (24.0%) | 117 (23.4%) | 46 (37.4%) |
| Total | 2,072 (100%) | 1,252 (100%) | 196 (100%) | 501 (100%) | 123 (100%) |
| Ethnicity | | | | | |
| Caucasian | 285 (13.8%) | 138 (11.0%) | 43 (21.9%) | 89 (17.8%) | 15 (12.2%) |
| Hawaiian | 741 (35.8%) | 481 (38.4%) | 71 (36.2%) | 156 (31.1%) | 33 (26.8%) |
| African American | 47 (2.3%) | 34 (2.7%) | 4 (2.0%) | 9 (1.8%) | 0 (0%) |
| Chinese | 15 (0.7%) | 10 (0.8%) | 1 (0.5%) | 3 (0.6%) | 1 (0.8%) |
| Filipino | 182 (8.8%) | 107 (8.6%) | 25 (12.8%) | 34 (6.8%) | 16 (13.0%) |
| Japanese | 42 (2.0%) | 27 (2.2%) | 3 (1.6%) | 11 (2.2%) | 1 (0.8%) |
| Korean | 6 (0.3%) | 6 (0.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Latino/ Hispanic | 33 (1.6%) | 23 (1.8%) | 5 (2.6%) | 5 (1%) | 0 (0%) |
| Native American | 1 (0.1%) | 1 (0.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Asian/ Mixed | | | | | |
| Asian | 21 (1.0%) | 21 (1.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Pacific | | | | | |
| Islander/ Mixed | | | | | |
| Pacific Islander | 180 (8.7%) | 156 (12.5%) | 7 (3.6) | 15 (3.0%) | 2 (1.6%) |
| Samoan | 77 (3.7%) | 71 (5.7%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (1%) | 1 (0.8%) |
| Mixed Race | 174 (8.4%) | 136 10.9%) | 8 4.1%) | 14 (2.8%) | 16 (13.0%) |
| Unknown | 268 (12.9%) | 41 (3.3%) | 29 (14.8%) | 160 (31.9%) | 38 (30.9%) |
| Total | 2,072 (100%) | 1252 (100%) | 196 (100%) | 501 (100%) | 123 (100%) |

Table 3-3b Diversion rates by gender, age, ethnicity, and circuit for 2014 (unduplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|--|---------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|
| Gender | | | | | |
| Male | 1,058 (51.2%) | 615 (58.1%) | 83 (55.0%) | 315 (51.05%) | 45 (64.3%) |
| Female | 1,008 (48.8%) | 613 (49.9%) | 68 (45.0%) | 302 (48.95%) | 25 (35.7%) |
| Total | 2,066 (100%) | 1,228 (100%) | 151 (100%) | 617 (100%) | 70 (100%) |
| Age | | | | | |
| 10 | 16 (0.8%) | 9 (0.7%) | 1 (0.7%) | 6 (1.0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 11 | 30 (1.5%) | 14 (1.4%) | 2 (1.3%) | 13 (2.1%) | 1 (1.4%) |
| 12 | 83(4.0%) | 50 (4.1%) | 5 (3.3%) | 27 (4.4%) | 1 (1.4%) |
| 13 | 164 (8.0%) | 85(6.9%) | 16 (10.6%) | 61 (9.9%) | 2 (2.9%) |
| 14 | 328 (15.9%) | 210 (17.1%) | 15 (10.0%) | 96 (15.6%) | 7 (10%) |
| 15 | 442 (21.4%) | 267 (21.7%) | 30 (19.9%) | 129 (20.9%) | 16 (22.9%) |
| 16 | 504 (24.4%) | 289 (23.5%) | 50 (33.1%) | 150 (24.3%) | 15 (21.4%) |
| 17 | 499 (24.5%) | 304 (24.8%) | 32 (21.2%) | 135 (21.9%) | 28 (40%) |
| Total | 2,066 (100%) | 1228 (100%) | 151 (100%) | 617 (100%) | 70 (100%) |
| Ethnicity | | | | | |
| Caucasian | 237 (11.5%) | 101 (8.2%) | 22 (14.6%) | 105 (17.0%) | 9 (12.9%) |
| Hawaiian | 760 (36.8%) | 488 (39.7%) | 53 (35.1%) | 196 (31.8%) | 23 (32.9%) |
| African American | 42 (2.0%) | 27 (2.2%) | 1 (0.7%) | 13 (2.1%) | 1 (1.4%) |
| Chinese | 8 (0.4%) | 8 (0.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Filipino | 191 (9.2%) | 123 (10.0%) | 20 (13.3%) | 45 (7.3%) | 3 (4.3%) |
| Japanese | 50 (2.4%) | 25 (2.0%) | 4 (2.7%) | 21 (3.4%) | 0 (0%) |
| Korean | 3 (0.2%) | 3 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Latino/ Hispanic | 47 (2.3%) | 27 (2.2%) | 3 (2.0%) | 17 (2.8%) | 0 (0%) |
| Native American | 1 (0.1%) | 1 (0.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Asian/ Mixed Asian | 19 (0.9%) | 18 (1.5%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Pacific Islander/ Mixed Pacific Islander | 196 (9.5%) | 165 (13.4%) | 6 (4.0%) | 22 (3.6%) | 3 (4.3%) |
| Samoan | 75 (3.6%) | 64 (5.2%) | 1 (0.7%) | 10 (1.6%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other | 17 (1.2%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (2.5%) | 13 (2.9%) | 0 (0%) |
| Mixed Race | 156 (7.6%) | 126 (10.3%) | 6 (4.0%) | 16 (2.6%) | 8 (11.4%) |
| Unknown | 281 (13.6%) | 52 (4.2%) | 35 (23.2%) | 171 (27.7%) | 23 (32.9%) |
| Total | 2,066 (100%) | 1,228 (100%) | 151 (100%) | 617 (100%) | 70 (100%) |

I.D. Petition (Formally Handled)

The number of petition cases in the state totaled to 4,845, with petition rate of 37.0 per 1000 youth in 2012. The rates across the circuits varied greatly (Table 4-1a, 4-2a, 4-3a). Kauai had the highest rates in all three years (107.2 in 2012, 84.5 in 2013 and 65.2 in 2014), followed by Maui and Hawaii. Honolulu County had the lowest rate. Petition rates decreased from 37.0 per 1,000 in 2012 to 32.7 in 2013 and then 30.0 in 2014. In Hawaii County, rates also decreased across those three years, from 58.9 in 2012 to 48.2 in 2013 and then to 41.7 in 2014. Rates in Honolulu remained similar across those three years. In Maui County, the rate decreased from 60.8 in 2012 to 44.7 in 2013 but then increased back to 56.2 in 2014.

Type of Offense

Statewide, the largest offense type in the petition phase was in the “other” offense category across all three years, followed by property, status, person and drug (Table 4-1a, 4-2a, 4-3a). For the county of Honolulu, the largest offense type in the petition phase was also in the “other” offense category across all three years, followed by property, status (in both 2012 and 2014) or person (2013). In Maui circuit, the largest type of offense in the petition phase was status. Drug type of offense was the second largest in 2014. Hawaii and Kauai circuits showed property offenses as the largest percentage of cases in the petition phase within their respective circuits for all three years.

A third or more of the offenses petition to family court for Maui circuit is status offense. In addition, status offense is one of the top four offense to be petitioned to Family Court.

Gender

More males were formally handled than females for all three years (Tables 4-1b, 4-2b, 4-3b). Kauai and Honolulu showed the largest gender difference across the three years. In particular, the Honolulu circuit showed differences between the genders to be 37% or more for all three years. This is a contrast from data in previous phases (arrests, referrals, diversion) that showed Honolulu circuit to have the least difference between the genders. The Hawaii circuit also shows a noticeable difference between the males and females for the petition phase in the two previous years but the difference dramatically decreased in 2014. All circuits reflected a percentage difference between the genders of more than 30% in 2012 with Kauai showing the highest difference (42%).

Age

Statewide percentage showed 17 as the modal age for all three years for having the highest petition (Tables 4-1b, 4-2b, 4-3b). This trend was reflected in all

circuits except for Hawaii for 2013 and 2014 where age 16 was the modal age. Hawaii also showed the highest percentage of youth ages 10 -11 (n=33; 6.5%) in the petition phase. Overall the three age groups that are consistently high in petition throughout the three years, in all of the circuits are ages 15, 16, and 17.

Ethnicity

Hawaiian youth had the highest percentage of petitions (30% or more) compared to other ethnic groups across all circuit for all three years except for Hawaii circuit for 2013 and 2014 ,where the “unknown” ethnic group accounted for the highest percentage (Tables 4-1b, 4-2b, 4-3b). The “unknown” ethnic group had the second largest percentage of petitions, with the majority of them from Hawaii circuit (about half). This continues to be a concern as legal documentations are used to verify youth identity at this stage.

Comparing petition rates to their respective ethnic proportions in the youth population based on the 2010 census data^{††}, some ethnic groups showed overrepresentation in the system, either statewide or in certain circuit and either across all three years or in some particular year.

The data showed overrepresentation of Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian in the system statewide (petition percentage of 38.9% vs. population percentage of 32.8%), and in the circuits of Honolulu (42% vs. 29% respectively) and Maui (between 40-48% vs. 36% respectively). In Kauai, Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian was slightly over-represented in 2013 and 2014 but not in 2012. In the Hawaii circuit, percentage of Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian of all petition cases was below their population percentage.

The data showed no overrepresentation of Filipinos or African Americans in the system. Although Caucasians and Filipinos accounted for the third or fourth highest in petitions, their petition rates were below their proportion in the population both statewide and in each of the four circuits across the three years.

⁴ Proportion in the population for each ethnic/racial group was taken from the 2010 census. See appendix 1.

Table 4-1a Petition rates by type of offense and circuit for 2012 (duplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|------------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Total petitions | 4,845 | 2,162 | 871 | 1064 | 748 |
| Petition rates | 37.0 | 23.8 | 60.8 | 58.9 | 107.2 |
| Type of Offense | | | | | |
| Drug | 420 (8.7%) | 101 (4.7%) | 109 (12.5%) | 142 (13.3%) | 68 (9.1%) |
| Person | 564 (11.6%) | 331 (15.3%) | 53 (6.1%) | 114 (10.7%) | 66 (8.8%) |
| Property | 1126 (23.2%) | 512 (23.7%) | 176 (20.2%) | 258 (24.2%) | 180 (24.1%) |
| Sex | 110 (2.3%) | 52 (2.4%) | 1 (0.1%) | 51 (4.8%) | 6 (0.8%) |
| Status | 1026 (21.2%) | 390 (18.0%) | 346 (39.7%) | 185 (17.4%) | 105 (14.0%) |
| Person NC | 411 (8.5%) | 135 (6.2%) | 24 (2.8%) | 75 (7.0%) | 177 (23.7%) |
| Other | 1188 (24.5%) | 641 (29.7%) | 162 (18.6%) | 239 (22.5%) | 146 (19.5%) |

Table 4-2a Petition rates by type of offense and circuit for 2013 (duplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|------------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Total petitions | 4,432 | 2,149 | 727 | 97 | 577 |
| Petition rates | 32.7 | 23.5 | 44.7 | 48.2 | 84.5 |
| Type of Offense | | | | | |
| Drug | 399 (9%) | 75 (3.5%) | 119 (16.4%) | 121 (12.4%) | 84 (14.6%) |
| Person | 599 (13.5%) | 388 (18.1%) | 44 (6.1%) | 97 (9.9%) | 70 (12.1%) |
| Property | 951 (21.5%) | 442 (20.6%) | 131 (18.0%) | 240 (24.5%) | 138 (23.9%) |
| Sex | 155 (3.5%) | 64 (3.0%) | 31 (4.3%) | 51 (5.2%) | 9 (1.6%) |
| Status | 808 (18.2%) | 275 (12.8%) | 212 (29.2%) | 214 (21.9%) | 107 (18.5%) |
| Person NC | 291 (6.6%) | 132 (6.1%) | 42 (5.8%) | 65 (6.6%) | 52 (9.0%) |
| Other | 1229 (27.7%) | 773(36.0%) | 148 (20.4%) | 191 (19.5%) | 117 (20.3%) |

Table 4-3a Petition rates by type of offense and circuit for 2014 (duplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|------------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Total petitions | 4,067 | 1,860 | 914 | 848 | 445 |
| Petition rates | 30.0 | 20.3 | 56.2 | 41.7 | 65.2 |
| Type of Offense | | | | | |
| Drug | 413 (10.2%) | 72 (3.9%) | 174 (19.0%) | 111 (13.1%) | 56 (12.6%) |
| Person | 468 (11.5%) | 240 (12.9%) | 89 (9.7%) | 72 (8.5%) | 67 (15.1%) |
| Property | 881 (21.7%) | 381 (20.5%) | 145 (15.9%) | 275 (32.4%) | 80 (18.0%) |
| Sex | 104 (2.6%) | 53 (2.9%) | 25 (2.7%) | 7 (0.8%) | 19 (4.3%) |
| Status | 851 (20.9%) | 271 (14.6%) | 291 (31.8%) | 201 (23.7%) | 88 (19.8%) |
| Person NC | 147 (3.6%) | 76 (4.1%) | 20 (2.2%) | 25 (3.0%) | 26 (5.8%) |
| Other | 1203 (29.6%) | 767 (41.2%) | 170 (18.6%) | 157 (18.5%) | 109 (24.5%) |

* General population information on the total number of youth ages between 10 and 17 years were taken from the American Community Survey (ACS); Data from 2013 ACS was used to estimate the rate for 2014.

* The sum of the seven charges may not add up to the total due to missing data.

Table 4-1b Petition rates by gender, age and ethnicity, and circuit for 2012
(unduplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|--------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Gender | | | | | |
| Male | 1,290 (67.4%) | 592 (68.5%) | 213 (64.6%) | 311 (65.6%) | 174 (71.0%) |
| Female | 623 (32.7%) | 272 (31.5%) | 117 (35.5%) | 163 (34.4%) | 71 (29.0%) |
| Total | 1,913 (100%) | 864 (100%) | 330 (100%) | 474 (100%) | 245 (100%) |
| Age | | | | | |
| 10 | 18 (0.9%) | 1 (0.12%) | 2 (0.6%) | 10 (2.1%) | 5 (2.0%) |
| 11 | 20 (1.1%) | 4 (0.46%) | 3 (0.9%) | 8 (1.7%) | 5 (2.0%) |
| 12 | 63 (3.3%) | 22 (2.6%) | 11 (3.3%) | 15 (3.2%) | 15 (6.1%) |
| 13 | 157 (8.2%) | 80 (9.7%) | 21 (6.4%) | 28 (5.9%) | 28 (11.4%) |
| 14 | 264 (13.8%) | 131 (15.2%) | 46 (13.9%) | 64 (13.5%) | 23 (9.4%) |
| 15 | 389 (20.3%) | 177 (20.5%) | 70 (21.2%) | 101 (21.3%) | 41 (16.7%) |
| 16 | 481 (25.1%) | 240 (27.8%) | 81 (24.6%) | 113 (23.8%) | 47 (19.2%) |
| 17 | 521 (27.2%) | 209 (24.2%) | 96 (29.1%) | 135 (28.5%) | 81 (33.1%) |
| Total | 1913 (100%) | 864 (100%) | 330 (100%) | 474 (100%) | 245 (100%) |
| Ethnicity | | | | | |
| Caucasian | 207 (10.8%) | 61 (7.1%) | 47 (14.2%) | 65 (13.7%) | 34 (13.9%) |
| Hawaiian | 782 (40.9%) | 368 (42.6%) | 158 (47.9%) | 172 (36.3%) | 84 (34.3%) |
| African American | 20 (1.0%) | 10 (1.2%) | 2 (0.6%) | 8 (1.7%) | 0 (0%) |
| Chinese | 5 (0.3%) | 5 (0.6%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Filipino | 126 (6.6%) | 56 (6.5%) | 27 (8.2%) | 21 (4.4%) | 22 (9.0%) |
| Japanese | 33 (1.7%) | 16 (1.9%) | 3 (0.9%) | 9 (1.9%) | 5 (2.0%) |
| Korean | 4 (0.2%) | 4 (0.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Latino/ Hispanic | 34 (1.8%) | 9 (1.04%) | 17 (5.2%) | 7 (1.5%) | 1 (0.4%) |
| Native American | 1 (0.1%) | 1 (0.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Asian/ Mixed | | | | | |
| Asian | 17 (0.9%) | 14 (1.6%) | 2 (0.6%) | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Pacific | | | | | |
| Islander/ Mixed | | | | | |
| Pacific Islander | 150 (7.8%) | 123 (14.2%) | 14 (4.2%) | 12 (2.5%) | 1 (0.4%) |
| Samoan | 68 (3.6%) | 60 (6.9%) | 1 (0.3%) | 5 (1.1%) | 2 (0.8%) |
| Mixed Race | 174 (9.1%) | 110 (12.7%) | 20 (6.1%) | 23 (4.9%) | 21 (8.6%) |
| Unknown | 292 (15.3%) | 27 (3.1%) | 39(11.8) | 151 (31.9%) | 75 (30.6%) |
| Total | 1913 (100%) | 864 (100%) | 330 (100%) | 474 (100%) | 245 (100%) |

Table 4-2b Petition rates by gender, age, ethnicity and circuit for 2013 (unduplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|--------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Gender | | | | | |
| Male | 1,187 (65.0%) | 493 (68.7%) | 212 (63.1%) | 311 (61.3%) | 171 (64.8%) |
| Female | 638 (35.0%) | 225 (31.3%) | 124 (36.9%) | 196 (38.7%) | 93 (35.2%) |
| Total | 1,825 (100%) | 718 (100%) | 336 (100%) | 507 (100%) | 264 (100%) |
| Age | | | | | |
| 10 | 25 (1.4%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (0.6%) | 21 (4.1%) | 2 (0.8%) |
| 11 | 19 (1.0%) | 1 (0.1%) | 1 (0.3%) | 12 (2.4%) | 5 (1.9%) |
| 12 | 65 (3.6%) | 17 (2.4%) | 11 (3.3%) | 20 (3.9%) | 17 (6.4%) |
| 13 | 171 (9.4%) | 63 (8.8%) | 31 (9.2%) | 49 (9.7%) | 28 (10.6%) |
| 14 | 244 (13.4%) | 90 (12.5%) | 42 (12.5%) | 80 (15.8%) | 32 (12.1%) |
| 15 | 393 (21.5%) | 168 (23.4%) | 66 (19.6%) | 109 (21.5%) | 50 (18.9%) |
| 16 | 436 (23.9%) | 197 (27.4%) | 78 (23.2%) | 115 (22.7%) | 46 (17.4%) |
| 17 | 472 (25.9%) | 182 (25.4%) | 105 (31.3%) | 101 (19.9%) | 84 (31.8%) |
| Total | 1825 (100%) | 718 (100%) | 336 (100%) | 507 (100%) | 264 (100%) |
| Ethnicity | | | | | |
| Caucasian | 184 (10.1%) | 49 (6.8%) | 51 (15.2%) | 67 (13.2%) | 17 (6.4%) |
| Hawaiian | 706 (38.7%) | 301 (41.9%) | 157 (46.7%) | 139 (27.4%) | 109 (41.3%) |
| African American | 23 (1.3%) | 15 (2.1%) | 2 (0.6%) | 6 (1.2%) | 0 (0%) |
| Chinese | 5 (0.3%) | 3 (0.4%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (0.4%) | 0 (0%) |
| Filipino | 104 (5.7%) | 29 (4.0%) | 33 (9.8%) | 22 (4.3%) | 20 (7.6%) |
| Japanese | 24 (1.3%) | 10 (1.4%) | 4 (1.2%) | 7 (1.4%) | 3 (1.1%) |
| Korean | 3 (0.3%) | 2 (0.3%) | 1 (0.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Latino/ Hispanic | 30 (1.6%) | 12 (1.7%) | 8 (2.4%) | 9 (1.8%) | 1 (0.4%) |
| Native American | 2 (0.1%) | 1 (0.1%) | 1 (0.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Asian/ Mixed | | | | | |
| Asian | 15 (0.8%) | 11 (1.5%) | 1 (0.3%) | 1 (0.2%) | 2 (0.8%) |
| Other Pacific | | | | | |
| Islander/ Mixed | | | | | |
| Pacific Islander | 141 (7.7%) | 113 (15.7%) | 6 (1.8%) | 19 (3.8%) | 3 (1.1%) |
| Samoan | 66 (3.6%) | 58 (8.1%) | 2 (0.6%) | 4 (0.8%) | 2 (0.8%) |
| Mixed Race | 146 (8%) | 82 (11.4%) | 21 (6.3%) | 14 (2.8%) | 29 (11.0%) |
| Unknown | 376 (20.6%) | 32 (4.5%) | 49 (14.6%) | 217 (42.8%) | 78 (29.6%) |
| Total | 1,825 (100%) | 718 (100%) | 336 (100%) | 507 (100%) | 264 (100%) |

Table 4-3b Petition rates by gender, age, ethnicity, and circuit for 2014 (unduplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|--|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Gender | | | | | |
| Male | 1,036 (62.9%) | 436 (69.5%) | 231 (59.5%) | 233 (54.4%) | 136 (66.3%) |
| Female | 612 (37.1%) | 191 (30.5%) | 157 (40.5%) | 195 (45.6%) | 69 (33.4%) |
| Total | 1,648 (100%) | 627 (100%) | 388 (100%) | 428 (100%) | 205 (100%) |
| Age | | | | | |
| 10 | 13 (0.8%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (1.6%) | 5 (1.2%) | 2 (1.0%) |
| 11 | 25 (1.5%) | 2 (0.3%) | 7 (1.8%) | 11 (2.6%) | 5 (2.4%) |
| 12 | 46 (2.8%) | 9 (1.4%) | 8 (2.1%) | 17 (4.0%) | 12 (5.9%) |
| 13 | 117 (7.1%) | 43 (6.9%) | 27 (7.06%) | 26 (6.1%) | 21 (10.2%) |
| 14 | 234 (14.2%) | 96 (15.3%) | 48 (12.4%) | 66 (15.4%) | 24 (11.7%) |
| 15 | 343 (20.8%) | 143 (22.8%) | 85 (21.9%) | 91 (21.3%) | 24 (11.7%) |
| 16 | 433 (26.3%) | 167 (26.6%) | 100 (25.8%) | 118 (27.6%) | 48 (23.4%) |
| 17 | 437 (26.5%) | 167 (26.6%) | 107 (27.6%) | 94 (22.0%) | 69 (33.7%) |
| Total | 1648 (100%) | 627 (38.1%) | 388 (100%) | 428 (100%) | 205 (100%) |
| Ethnicity | | | | | |
| Caucasian | 174 (10.6%) | 44 (7.0%) | 47 (12.1%) | 66 (15.4%) | 17 (8.3%) |
| Hawaiian | 613 (37.2%) | 262 (41.8%) | 154 (39.7%) | 115 (26.9%) | 82 (40%) |
| African American | 23 (1.4%) | 16 (2.6%) | 3 (0.8%) | 3 (0.7%) | 1 (0.5%) |
| Chinese | 1 (0.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) |
| Filipino | 91 (5.5%) | 30 (4.8%) | 30 (7.8%) | 20 (4.7%) | 11 (5.4%) |
| Japanese | 21 (1.3%) | 7 (1.1%) | 6 (1.6%) | 6 (1.4%) | 2 (1.0%) |
| Korean | 3 (0.2%) | 2 (0.3%) | 1 (0.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Latino/ Hispanic | 25 (1.5%) | 8 (1.3%) | 9 (2.3%) | 7 (1.6%) | 1 (0.5%) |
| Native American | 1 (0.1%) | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Asian/ Mixed Asian | 10 (0.6%) | 5 (0.8%) | 5 (1.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Pacific Islander/ Mixed Pacific Islander | 137 (8.3%) | 100 (16.0%) | 14 (3.6%) | 19 (4.4%) | 4 (2.0%) |
| Samoan | 59 (3.6%) | 52 (8.9%) | 3 (0.8%) | 4 (0.9%) | 0 (0%) |
| Mixed Race | 125 (7.6%) | 69 (11%) | 25 (6.4%) | 13 (3.0%) | 18 (14.4%) |
| Unknown | 365 (22.2%) | 31 (4.9%) | 91 (23.5%) | 174 (40.7%) | 69 (33.7%) |
| Total | 1,648 (100%) | 627 (100%) | 3,888 (100%) | 428 (100%) | 205 (100%) |

I.I. Detention

The number of detention cases in the state totaled to 513, with a detention rate of 3.9 per 1000 youth in 2012. In 2013, the total number of detention cases in the state was 672, resulting in a rate of 5.0 per 1,000 youth. In 2014, the total number of detention cases was 616, resulting a rate of 4.5 per 1,000 youth.

Honolulu circuit had over 90% of all detention across the three years. Detention rates in the Honolulu circuit were close to the state average. In 2013, Maui circuit counted for 7% of all the detention cases, with a detention rate (ranges 1.8 to 2.5 per 1,000 youth).much lower than the state average across the three years (ranges 3.9 to 5.0 per 1,000 youth). Very few detention cases were from Hawaii and Kauai.

Type of Offense

Statewide, the largest offense type in the detention phase was in the “other” offense category across all three years, followed by person, then property (Table 4-1a, 4-2a, 4-3a). For the county of Honolulu, the largest offense type in the detention phase was also in the “other” offense category across all three years, followed by person and then property. A similar pattern was also observed in Maui except for 2013, where sex offenses tied with person offenses to be the second highest type.

Gender

More males were placed in detention compared females for all three years (Tables 4-1b, 4-2b, 4-3b) statewide except for Hawaii circuit. Honolulu showed the largest gender difference across the three years except for 2012 where Maui had the largest gender difference. In particular, the Honolulu circuit showed differences between the genders to be 32% or more for all three years. This is a contrast from data in previous phases (arrests, referrals, diversion) that showed Honolulu circuit to have the least difference between the genders. Hawaii is the only circuit that either had more females compared to males or only a female in detention.

Age

Statewide percentage showed 16 as the modal age for all three years for having the highest detention (Tables 4-1b, 4-2b, 4-3b). This trend was reflected in Honolulu and Maui. Overall the three age groups that are consistently high in detention throughout the three years, in both Honolulu and Maui circuits are ages 15, 16, and 17. Honolulu was the only circuit that had youth ages 10 to 12 in detention for all three years.

Ethnicity

For both statewide and the Honolulu circuit, Hawaiian youth had the highest percentage of detentions (40% or more) compared to other ethnic groups across the three years, followed by Mixed Race (11%), then Other Pacific or Mixed Pacific (10%), then Caucasian (9%), Samoan (8%). In the Maui circuit, the top highest ethnic group was also Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian and the second highest group was Caucasian for all those three years.

Comparing detention rates to their respective ethnic proportions in the youth population based on the 2010 census data⁴, some ethnic groups showed overrepresentation in the system, either statewide or in certain circuit and either across all three years or in some particular year.

The data showed strikingly overrepresentation of Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian in the system both statewide (detention percentage of 45% vs. population percentage of 33%), and in the circuits of Honolulu (42-45% vs. 29% respectively) and Maui (between 39-68% vs. 36% respectively). In both Kauai and Hawaii circuits, the total number of Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian in the detention system was too small to make reasonable investigation of whether they are overrepresented or not.

No overrepresentation of African Americans or Samoan/Part Samoan was seen in the system. Although Caucasians accounted for the third or fourth highest in detentions, their detention rates were below their proportion in the population both statewide and in each of the four circuits across the three years. The same pattern was also found for Filipinos, of which the detention rates were below their proportion in the population both statewide and in each of the four circuits across the three years.

⁴ Proportion in the population for each ethnic/racial group was taken from the 2010 census. See appendix 1.

Table 5-1a Detention rates by type of offense and circuit for 2012 (duplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|---------|----------|
| Total detentions | 513 | 471 | 35 | 5 | 2 |
| Detention rates [*] | 3.9 | 5.2 | 2.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Type of Offense[*] | | | | | |
| Drug | 19 (3.7%) | 17 (3.6%) | 2 (5.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Person | 166 (32.4%) | 153 (32.5%) | 13 (37.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Property | 84 (16.4%) | 77 (16.4%) | 5 (14.3%) | 2 (40%) | 0 (0%) |
| Sex | 8 (1.6%) | 7 (1.5%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (20%) | 0 (0%) |
| Status | 28 (5.5%) | 26 (5.5%) | 2 (5.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Person NC | 28 (5.5%) | 27 (5.7%) | 1 (2.9%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other | 180 (35.1%) | 164 (34.8%) | 12 (34.3%) | 2 (40%) | 2 (100%) |

Table 5-2a Detention rates by type of offense and circuit for 2013 (duplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|----------|-----------|
| Total detentions[†] | 672 | 637 | 29 | 3 | 3 |
| Detention rates [†] | 5.0 | 7.0 | 1.8 | 0.1 | 0.4 |
| Type of Offense[†] | | | | | |
| Drug | 25 (3.7%) | 22 (3.5%) | 1 (3.5%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (66.7%) |
| Person | 211 (31.4%) | 208 (32.7%) | 3 (10.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Property | 91 (13.5%) | 90 (14.1%) | 1 (3.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Sex | 15 (2.2%) | 12 (1.9%) | 3 (10.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Status | 40 (6%) | 38 (6%) | 2 (6.9%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Person NC | 48 (7.1%) | 47 (7.4%) | 1 (3.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other | 242 (36%) | 220 (34.5%) | 18 (62.1%) | 3 (100%) | 1 (33.3%) |

Table 5-3a Detention rates by type of offense and circuit for 2014 (duplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|-----------|---------|
| Total detentions | 616 | 568 | 41 | 3 | 4 |
| Detention rates | 4.5 | 6.2 | 2.5 | 0.1 | 0.6 |
| Type of Offense[†] | | | | | |
| Drug | 22 (3.6%) | 18 (3.2%) | 3 (7.3%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (25%) |
| Person | 156 (25.3%) | 147 (25.9%) | 8 (19.5%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (25%) |
| Property | 95 (15.4%) | 89 (15.7%) | 3 (7.3%) | 1 (33.3%) | 2 (50%) |
| Sex | 17 (2.8%) | 16 (2.8%) | 1 (2.4%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Status | 8 (1.3%) | 4 (0.7%) | 4 (9.8%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Person NC | 32 (5.2%) | 32 (5.6%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other | 286 (46.4%) | 262 (46.1%) | 22 (53.7%) | 2 (66.7%) | 0 (0%) |

^{*} General population information on the total number of youth ages between 10 and 17 years were taken from the American Community Survey (ACS); Data from 2013 ACS was used to estimate the rate for 2014.

[†] The sum of the seven charges may not add up to the total due to missing data.

Table 5-1b Detention rates by gender, age, and ethnicity for 2012 (unduplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|--|-------------|-------------|------------|----------|----------|
| Gender | | | | | |
| Male | 279 (67.7%) | 256 (67.7%) | 20 (71.4%) | 2 (40%) | 1 (100%) |
| Female | 133 (32.3%) | 122 (32.3%) | 8 (28.6%) | 3 (60%) | 0 (0%) |
| Total | 412 (100%) | 378 (100%) | 28 (100%) | 5 (100%) | 1 (100%) |
| Age | | | | | |
| 10 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 11 | 1 (0.2%) | 1 (0.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 12 | 8 (1.8%) | 7 (1.7%) | 1 (3.6%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 13 | 27 (6.1%) | 25 (6.1%) | 2 (7.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 14 | 52 (11.8%) | 48 (11.8%) | 4 (14.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 15 | 76 (17.2%) | 71 (17.4%) | 4 (14.3%) | 1 (20%) | 0 (0%) |
| 16 | 156 (35.4%) | 141 (34.6%) | 11 (39.3%) | 3 (60%) | 1 (100%) |
| 17 | 121 (27.4%) | 114 (28%) | 6 (21.4%) | 1 (20%) | 0 (0%) |
| Total | 441 (100%) | 407 (100%) | 28 (100%) | 5 (100%) | 1 (100%) |
| Ethnicity | | | | | |
| Caucasian | 40 (9.1%) | 36 (8.9%) | 4 (14.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Hawaiian | 195 (44.2%) | 173 (42.5%) | 19 (67.9%) | 2 (40%) | 1 (100%) |
| African American | 8 (1.8%) | 7 (1.7%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (20%) | 0 (0%) |
| Chinese | (0%) | (0%) | (0%) | (0%) | (0%) |
| Filipino | 18 (4.1%) | 16 (3.9%) | 1 (3.6%) | 1 (20%) | 0 (0%) |
| Japanese | 12 (2.7%) | 12 (3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Korean | 1 (0.2%) | 1 (0.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Latino/ Hispanic | 9 (2%) | 7 (1.7%) | 2 (7.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Native American | (0%) | (0%) | (0%) | (0%) | (0%) |
| Other Asian/ Mixed Asian | 5 (1.1%) | 5 (1.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Pacific Islander/ Mixed Pacific Islander | 46 (10.4%) | 45 (11.1%) | 1 (3.6%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Samoan | 35 (7.9%) | 34 (8.4%) | 1 (3.6%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Unknown | 23 (5.2%) | 22 (95.7%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (4.4%) | 0 (0%) |
| Mixed Race | 49 (11.1%) | 49 (12%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Total | 441 (100%) | 407 (100%) | 28 (100%) | 5 (100%) | 1 (100%) |

Table 5-2b Detention rates by gender, age, and ethnicity for 2013 (unduplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|----------|----------|
| Gender | | | | | |
| Male | 283 (67.9%) | 269 (68.5%) | 14 (60.9%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Female | 134 (32.1%) | 124 (31.6%) | 9 (39.1%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) |
| Total | 417 (100%) | 393 (100%) | 23 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (100%) |
| Age | | | | | |
| 10 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 11 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 12 | 6 (1.4%) | 6 (1.4%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 13 | 30 (6.8%) | 29 (6.9%) | 1 (4.4%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 14 | 50 (11.3%) | 47 (11.2%) | 3 (13%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 15 | 114 (25.7%) | 107 (25.6%) | 5 (21.7%) | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) |
| 16 | 130 (29.4%) | 123 (29.4%) | 7 (30.4%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 17 | 113 (25.5%) | 106 (25.4%) | 7 (30.4%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Total | 443 (100%) | 418 (100%) | 23 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) |
| Ethnicity | | | | | |
| Caucasian | 38 (8.6%) | 33 (7.9%) | 5 (21.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Hawaiian | 204 (46.1%) | 189 (45.2%) | 13 (56.5%) | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) |
| African American | 12 (2.7%) | 11 (2.6%) | 1 (4.4%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Chinese | 1 (0.2%) | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Filipino | 14 (3.2%) | 14 (3.4%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Japanese | 6 (1.4%) | 6 (1.4%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Korean | 1 (0.2%) | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Latino/ Hispanic | 6 (1.4%) | 6 (1.4%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Native American | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Asian/ Mixed | | | | | |
| Asian | 3 (0.7%) | 3 (0.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Pacific | | | | | |
| Islander/ Mixed | | | | | |
| Pacific Islander | 59 (13.3%) | 59 (14.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Samoaan | 32 (7.2%) | 32 (7.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Unknown | 23 (5.2%) | 22 (5.4%) | 1 (4.4%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Mixed Race | 44 (9.9%) | 41 (9.8%) | 3 (13%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Total | 443 (100%) | 418 (100%) | 23 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) |

Table 5-3b Detention rates by gender, age, and ethnicity for 2014 (unduplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Gender | | | | | |
| Male | 229 (65.2%) | 208 (66.5%) | 19 (57.6%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (66.7%) |
| Female | 122 (34.8%) | 105 (33.6%) | 14 (42.4%) | 2 (100%) | 1 (33.3%) |
| Total | 351 (100%) | 313 (100%) | 33 (100%) | 2 (100%) | 3 (100%) |
| Age | | | | | |
| 10 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 11 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 12 | 3 (0.8%) | 3 (0.9%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 13 | 13 (3.4%) | 13 (3.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 14 | 54 (14%) | 50 (14.4%) | 4 (12.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 15 | 92 (23.8%) | 81 (23.3%) | 10 (30.3%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (33.3%) |
| 16 | 117 (30.3%) | 107 (30.8%) | 8 (24.2%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (66.7%) |
| 17 | 107 (27.7%) | 94 (27%) | 11 (33.3%) | 2 (100%) | 0 (0%) |
| Total | 386 (100%) | 348 (100%) | 33 (100%) | 2 (100%) | 3 (100%) |
| Ethnicity | | | | | |
| Caucasian | 31 (8%) | 24 (6.9%) | 6 (18.2%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) |
| Hawaiian | 169 (43.8%) | 154 (44.3%) | 13 (39.4%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (66.7%) |
| African American | 9 (2.3%) | 9 (2.6%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Chinese | 1 (0.3%) | 1 (0.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Filipino | 24 (6.2%) | 20 (5.8%) | 4 (12.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Japanese | 6 (1.6%) | 6 (1.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Korean | 1 (0.3%) | 1 (0.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Latino/ Hispanic | 6 (1.6%) | 4 (1.2%) | 2 (6.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Native American | 1 (0.3%) | 1 (0.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Asian/ Mixed | | | | | |
| Asian | 1 (0.3%) | 1 (0.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Pacific | | | | | |
| Islander/ Mixed | | | | | |
| Pacific Islander | 47 (12.2%) | 45 (12.9%) | 2 (6.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Samoan | 24 (6.2%) | 22 (6.3%) | 2 (6.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Unknown | 19 (4.9%) | 18 (5.2%) | 1 (3.0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Mixed Race | 47 (12.2%) | 42 (12.1%) | 3 (9.1%) | 1 (50%) | 1 (33.3%) |
| Total | 386 (100%) | 348 (100%) | 33 (100%) | 2 (100%) | 3 (100%) |

I.A. Adjudications

In 2012, adjudications for the State of Hawaii totaled 2,366 and the adjudication rate per 1,000 youth was 18.1 (Table 6-1a). The total number of adjudications decreased to 2,136 (15.8) in 2013 and further decreased in 2014 to 1,798 (13.3). The adjudication rates for the four circuits varied greatly (Tables 6-1a, 6-2a, 6-3a). Kauai circuit rate was the highest, which more than doubled the state average rates for the three years. Honolulu was the lowest across all three years with 13.1 in 2012, 12.2 in 2013 and 10.1 in 2014.

Type of Offense

Property offenses were the highest type of offense adjudicated for the state of Hawaii, accounting for more than a quarter for all three years. Status was the second highest in all three years except for 2013 where person offenses were the second highest. This pattern was also observed in Honolulu circuit, where property offenses were the highest, followed by either person or status offenses. In Maui circuit, status offense was the highest, followed by either property or “other” types of offenses. Drug offenses ranked the fourth in Maui for all three years. With the exception of Kauai, all of the circuits had status offense as one of the top three offenses that resulted in adjudication for 2013 and 2014. For Kauai circuit the top three offenses are non-contact personal offenses, property, and “other” types of offenses.

For Hawaii circuit, the largest type of offense was status for 2013 and 2014, followed by “other” types of offenses, then drug offenses. For 2012, property offense was the largest, followed by “other” types, then status.

Property and status offenses have consistently remained one of the top three highest offense types in adjudication for all three years for all circuits. Property offenses for all three years for the state as well as the individual circuits made up nearly a quarter or more of all adjudications. Maui circuit had the largest percentage for drug offenses for all three years compared to other circuits.

Gender

Consistently throughout the three years, male cases were adjudicated at a higher rate than females. In general, the difference ranged from 21% to 46%. Honolulu

circuit had the largest difference for 2013 (41%) and 2014 (40%) while Kauai had the largest in 2012 (46%) (Table 6-1b).

Age

More than 80% of adjudications were from youth ages 14 and older. Either age 17 or age 16 had the largest percentage of adjudications for all circuits and for all three years, except for Hawaii circuit, where age 15 had the largest percentage for 2013 and 2014 (Table 6-1b).

Race/Ethnicity

All three years indicated Native Hawaiians to make up the largest percentage of adjudications for each circuit for all three years except for Hawaii, where “unknown” group had the largest adjudicated cases in 2013 and 2014 (Table 6-1b, 2b, 3b). The “unknown” group had the second largest adjudicated cases in the state and in all circuits except for Honolulu. Hawaii circuit made up the majority of the “unknown” groups, accounting to 40% to 56% of all the youth in this group for the three years. Caucasian, Filipino or Mixed Race were the next largest groups both statewide and across all circuits except for Honolulu.

In the Honolulu circuit, Other Pacific or Mixed Pacific group was the second largest group, followed by mixed group, Samoan, Filipino and then Caucasian.

Comparing adjudication rates to their respective ethnic proportions in the youth population based on the 2010 census data^{§§4}, some ethnic groups showed overrepresentation in the system, either statewide or in certain circuit and either across all three years or in some particular year.

The data showed strikingly overrepresentation of Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian in the system both statewide (adjudication percentage of 39.3-44.1% vs. population percentage of 32.8%), and in the circuits of Honolulu (42.1-45.0% vs. 29.5% respectively), Maui (between 39.6-49.3% vs. 36.5% respectively), and Kauai (between 39.8-47.1% vs. 36.1% respectively). In the Hawaii circuit, however, rates of adjudication of Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian were below their population proportions across the three years.

No overrepresentation of African Americans or Samoan/Part Samoan was seen in the system. Although Caucasians and Filipinos were among the top six ethnic groups among all adjudicated cases, their adjudication rates were below their proportion in the population both statewide and in each of the four circuits across the three years.

⁴ Proportion in the population for each ethnic/racial group was taken from the 2010 census. See appendix 1.

Table 6-1a Adjudication rates by type of offense and by circuit for 2012 (duplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|
| Total adjudications | 2,366 | 1,193 | 298 | 461 | 313 |
| Adjudication rates | 18.1 | 13.1 | 20.8 | 25.5 | 44.8 |
| Type of Offense⁺ | | | | | |
| Drug | 200 (8.5%) | 75 (6.3%) | 52 (13.0%) | 54 (11.7%) | 19 (6.1%) |
| Person | 364 (15.4%) | 227 (19.0%) | 41 (10.3%) | 64 (13.9%) | 32 (10.2%) |
| Property | 670 (28.3%) | 380 (31.8%) | 94 (23.6%) | 123 (26.7%) | 73 (23.3%) |
| Sex | 59 (2.5%) | 39 (3.3%) | 1 (0.3%) | 17 (3.7%) | 2 (0.6%) |
| Status | 506 (21.4%) | 290 (24.3%) | 113 (28.3%) | 75 (16.3%) | 28 (8.9%) |
| Person NC | 221 (9.3%) | 92 (7.7%) | 11 (2.8%) | 24 (5.2%) | 94 (30.0%) |
| Other | 346 (14.6%) | 90 (7.5%) | 87 (21.8%) | 104 (22.6%) | 65 (20.8%) |

Table 6-2a Adjudication rates by type of offense and circuit for 2013 (duplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| Total adjudications | 2,136 | 1,118 | 329 | 416 | 273 |
| Adjudication rates | 15.8 | 12.2 | 20.2 | 20.5 | 40.0 |
| Type of Offense⁺ | | | | | |
| Drug | 196 (9.2%) | 55 (4.9%) | 51 (15.5%) | 53 (12.7%) | 37 (13.6%) |
| Person | 388 (18.2%) | 278 (24.9%) | 26 (7.9%) | 46 (11.1%) | 38 (13.9%) |
| Property | 560 (26.2%) | 331 (29.6%) | 57 (17.3%) | 90 (21.6%) | 82 (30.4%) |
| Sex | 68 (3.2%) | 38 (3.4%) | 12 (3.7%) | 15 (3.6%) | 3 (1.1%) |
| Status | 387 (18.1%) | 186 (16.6%) | 84 (25.5%) | 91 (21.9%) | 26 (9.5%) |
| Person NC | 153 (7.2%) | 88 (7.9%) | 18 (5.5%) | 21 (5.1%) | 26 (9.5%) |
| Other | 384 (18.0%) | 142 (12.7%) | 81 (24.6%) | 100 (24.0%) | 61 (22.3%) |

Table 6-3a Adjudication rates by type of offense and circuit for 2014 (duplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Total Adjudications | 1798 | 927 | 381 | 278 | 212 |
| Adjudication rates | 13.3 | 10.1 | 23.4 | 13.7 | 31.1 |
| Type of Offense⁺ | | | | | |
| Drug | 204 (11.4%) | 60 (6.5%) | 75 (19.7%) | 39 (14.0%) | 30 (14.2%) |
| Person | 274 (15.2%) | 171 (18.5%) | 44 (11.6%) | 25 (9.0%) | 34 (16.0%) |
| Property | 503 (28.0%) | 309 (33.3%) | 79 (20.7%) | 69 (24.8%) | 46 (21.7%) |
| Sex | 60 (3.3%) | 41 (4.4%) | 9 (2.4%) | 3 (1.1%) | 7 (3.3%) |
| Status | 388 (21.6%) | 195 (21.0%) | 85 (22.3%) | 83 (29.9%) | 25 (11.8%) |
| Person NC | 86 (4.8%) | 58 (6.3%) | 7 (1.8%) | 10 (3.6%) | 11 (5.2%) |
| Other | 283 (15.7%) | 93 (10.3%) | 82 (21.5%) | 49 (17.6%) | 59 (27.8%) |

^{*} General population information on the total number of youth ages between 10 and 17 years were taken from the American Community Survey (ACS); Data from 2013 ACS was used to estimate the rate for 2014.

⁺ The sum of the seven charges may not add up to the total due to missing data.

Table 6-1b Adjudication rates by gender age ethnicity 2012 (unduplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Gender | | | | | |
| Male | 914 (69.3%) | 438 (69.5%) | 149 (67.1%) | 202 (68.2%) | 125 (73.1%) |
| Female | 405 (30.7%) | 192 (30.5%) | 73 (32.9%) | 94 (31.8%) | 46 (26.9%) |
| Total | 1319 (100%) | 630 (100%) | 222 (100%) | 296 (100%) | 171 (100%) |
| Age | | | | | |
| 10 | 7 (0.5%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (0.9%) | 5 (1.7%) | 0 (0%) |
| 11 | 13 (1.0%) | 2 (0.3%) | 2 (0.9%) | 5 (1.7%) | 4 (2.3%) |
| 12 | 37 (2.8%) | 20 (3.2%) | 5 (2.2%) | 5 (1.7%) | 7 (4.1%) |
| 13 | 108 (8.2%) | 59 (9.4%) | 12 (5.4%) | 21 (7.1%) | 16 (9.4%) |
| 14 | 196 (14.9%) | 103 (16.4%) | 30 (13.5%) | 45 (15.2%) | 18 (10.5%) |
| 15 | 273 (20.7%) | 131 (20.8%) | 48 (21.6%) | 66 (22.3%) | 28 (16.4%) |
| 16 | 346 (26.2%) | 173 (27.5%) | 59 (26.6%) | 73 (24.7%) | 41 (24.0%) |
| 17 | 339 (25.7%) | 142 (22.5%) | 64 (28.8%) | 76 (25.7%) | 57 (33.3%) |
| Total | 1319 (100%) | 630 (100%) | 222 (100%) | 296 (100%) | 171 (100%) |
| Ethnicity | | | | | |
| Caucasian | 132 (10.0%) | 36 (5.7%) | 28 (12.6%) | 40 (13.5%) | 28 (16.4%) |
| Hawaiian | 582 (44.1%) | 283 (45.0%) | 105 (47.3%) | 126 (42.6%) | 68 (39.8%) |
| African American | 15 (1.1 %) | 7 (1.1%) | 1 (0.5%) | 7 (2.4%) | 0 (0%) |
| Chinese | 1 (0.1%) | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Filipino | 84 (6.4%) | 38 (6.0%) | 23 (10.4%) | 9 (3.0%) | 14 (8.2%) |
| Japanese | 25 (1.9%) | 13 (2.1%) | 1 (0.45%) | 7 (2.4%) | 4 (2.3%) |
| Korean | 3 (0.2%) | 3 (0.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Latino/ Hispanic | 22 (1.7%) | 4 (0.6%) | 13 (5.9%) | 4 (1.4%) | 1 (0.6%) |
| Native American | 1 (0.1%) | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Asian/ Mixed | | | | | |
| Asian | 15 (1.1%) | 13 (2.1%) | 1 (0.5%) | 1 (0.3%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Pacific | | | | | |
| Islander/ Mixed | 107 (8.1%) | 91 (14.4%) | 10 (4.5%) | 5 (1.7%) | 1 (0.6%) |
| Pacific Islander | | | | | |
| Samoan | 51 (3.9%) | 43 (6.8%) | 1 (0.5%) | 5 (1.7%) | 2 (1.2%) |
| Mixed | 124 (9.4%) | 79 (12.5%) | 14 (6.3%) | 15 (5.1%) | 16 (9.4%) |
| Unknown | 157 (11.9%) | 18 (2.9%) | 25 (11.3%) | 77 (26.0%) | 37 (21.6%) |
| Total | 1319 (100%) | 630 (100%) | 222 (100%) | 296 (100%) | 171 (100%) |

Table 6-2b Adjudication rates by gender, age, ethnicity, and circuit 2013 (unduplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|--------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Gender | | | | | |
| Male | 797 (66.3%) | 375 (70.5%) | 138 (63.6%) | 176 (62.6%) | 108 (62.8%) |
| Female | 405 (33.7%) | 157 (29.5%) | 79 (36.4%) | 105 (37.4%) | 64 (37.2%) |
| Total | 1,202 (100%) | 532 (100%) | 217 (100%) | 281 (100%) | 172 (100%) |
| Age | | | | | |
| 10 | 9 (0.8%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (1.0%) | 7 (2.5%) | 0 (0%) |
| 11 | 10 (0.8%) | 1 (0.2%) | 1 (0.5%) | 6 (2.1%) | 2 (1.2%) |
| 12 | 36 (3%) | 13 (2.4%) | 6 (2.8%) | 7 (2.5%) | 10 (5.8%) |
| 13 | 112 (9.3%) | 52 (9.8%) | 19 (8.8%) | 27 (9.6%) | 14 (8.1%) |
| 14 | 180 (15.0%) | 71 (13.3%) | 31 (14.3%) | 53 (19.0%) | 25 (14.5%) |
| 15 | 283 (23.5%) | 131 (24.6%) | 44 (20.3%) | 74 (26.3%) | 34 (19.8%) |
| 16 | 289 (24.0%) | 152 (28.6%) | 49 (22.6%) | 58 (20.6%) | 30 (17.4%) |
| 17 | 283 (23.5%) | 112 (21.1%) | 65 (30.0%) | 49 (17.4%) | 57 (33.1%) |
| Total | 1,202 (100%) | 532 (100%) | 217 (100%) | 281 (100%) | 172 (100%) |
| Ethnicity | | | | | |
| Caucasian | 110 (9.1%) | 31 (5.8%) | 31 (14.3%) | 36 (12.8%) | 12 (7.0%) |
| Hawaiian | 499 (41.5%) | 224 (42.1%) | 107 (49.3%) | 87 (31.0%) | 81 (47.1%) |
| African American | 14 (1.2%) | 9 (1.7%) | 1 (0.5%) | 4 (1.4%) | 0 (0%) |
| Chinese | 1 (0.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.4%) | 0 (0%) |
| Filipino | 68 (5.7%) | 22 (4.1%) | 19 (8.8%) | 12 (4.3%) | 15 (8.7%) |
| Japanese | 17 (1.4%) | 6 (1.1%) | 2 (1.0%) | 6 (2.1%) | 3 (1.7%) |
| Korean | 1 (0.1%) | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Latino/ Hispanic | 19 (1.6%) | 9 (1.2%) | 5 (2.3%) | 4 (1.4%) | 1 (0.6%) |
| Native American | 1 (0.1%) | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Asian/ Mixed | | | | | |
| Asian | 11 (0.9%) | 9 (1.7%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.4%) | 1 (0.6%) |
| Other Pacific | | | | | |
| Islander/ Mixed | 109 (9.1%) | 96 (18.1%) | 3 (1.4%) | 8 (2.9%) | 2 (1.2%) |
| Pacific Islander | | | | | |
| Samoan | 49 (4.1%) | 43 (8.1%) | 2 (1.0%) | 2 (0.7%) | 2 (1.2%) |
| Mixed Race | 106 (8.8%) | 60 (11.3%) | 14 (6.5%) | 10 (3.6%) | 22 (12.8%) |
| Unknown | 197 (16.4%) | 21 (4.0%) | 33 (15.2%) | 110 (39.2%) | 33 (19.2%) |
| Total | 1202 (100%) | 532 (100%) | 217 (100%) | 281 (100%) | 172 (100%) |

Table 6-3b Adjudication rates by gender, age, ethnicity, and circuit 2014 (unduplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|--------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Gender | | | | | |
| Male | 693 (66.0%) | 315 (70.2%) | 151 (60.4%) | 125 (61.3%) | 102 (68.9%) |
| Female | 358 (34.0%) | 134 (29.8%) | 99 (39.6%) | 79 (38.7%) | 46 (31.1%) |
| Total | 1,051 (100%) | 449 (100%) | 250 (100%) | 204 (100%) | 148 (100%) |
| Age | | | | | |
| 10 | 8 (0.76%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (2.4%) | 2 (1.0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 11 | 15 (1.4%) | 2 (0.5%) | 5 (2%) | 5 (2.5%) | 3 (2.0%) |
| 12 | 18 (1.7%) | 5 (1.1%) | 5 (2%) | 3 (1.5%) | 5 (3.4%) |
| 13 | 76 (7.2%) | 35 (7.8%) | 16 (6.4%) | 10 (4.9%) | 15 (10.1%) |
| 14 | 160 (15.2%) | 76 (16.9%) | 30 (12%) | 3.4 (16.7%) | 20 (13.5%) |
| 15 | 233 (22.2%) | 106 (23.2%) | 59 (23.6%) | 53 (26.0%) | 15 (10.1%) |
| 16 | 264 (25.1%) | 116 (25.8%) | 58 (23.2%) | 56 (27.5%) | 34 (23.0%) |
| 17 | 277 (26.4%) | 109 (24.3%) | 71 (28.4%) | 41 (20.1%) | 56 (37.8%) |
| Total | 1,051 (100%) | 449 (100%) | 250 (100%) | 204 (100%) | 148 (100%) |
| Ethnicity | | | | | |
| Caucasian | 94 (8.9%) | 27 (6.01%) | 29 (11.6%) | 25 (12.3%) | 13 (8.8%) |
| Hawaiian | 413 (39.3%) | 190 (42.3%) | 99 (39.6%) | 57 (28.0%) | 67 (45.3%) |
| African American | 16 (1.5%) | 12 (2.7%) | 2 (0.8%) | 2 (1.0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Chinese | 1 (0.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.5%) | 0 (0%) |
| Filipino | 62 (5.9%) | 22 (4.9%) | 18 (7.2%) | 11 (5.4%) | 11 (7.4%) |
| Japanese | 10 (1.0%) | 6 (1.3%) | 1 (0.4%) | 3 (1.5%) | 0 (0%) |
| Korean | 2 (0.2%) | 1 (0.2%) | 1 (0.4%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Latino/ Hispanic | 16 (1.5%) | 4 (0.9%) | 7 (2.8%) | 5 (2.5%) | 0 (0%) |
| Native American | 1 (0.1%) | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Asian/ Mixed | | | | | |
| Asian | 7 (0.7%) | 4 (0.9%) | 3 (1.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Pacific | | | | | |
| Islander/ Mixed | 104 (10.0%) | 79 (17.6%) | 10 (4%) | 11 (5.4%) | 4 (2.7%) |
| Pacific Islander | | | | | |
| Samoan | 39 (3.71%) | 35 (7.8%) | 2 (0.8%) | 2 (1.0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Mixed Race | 91 (8.7%) | 50 (11.1%) | 15 (6%) | 10 (4.9%) | 16 (10.8%) |
| Unknown | 195 (18.6%) | 18 (4.0%) | 63 (25.2%) | 77 (37.8%) | 37 (25%) |
| Total | 1051 (100%) | 449 (100%) | 250 (100%) | 204 (100%) | 148 (100%) |

I.G. Probation

The total number of cases in probation was 473 for 2012, 547 for 2013 and 365 for 2014 (Tables 7-1a, 7-2a, and 7-3a). The probation rate statewide was 3.6 per 1,000 in 2012, 4.0 in 2013 and 2.7 in 2014. Maui circuit had the highest probation rates in 2012 and 2013, with rates of 4.7 in 2012, 4.6 in 2013 and 3.1 in 2014, compared to the lowest probation rates found in Kauai circuit (1.3 in 2012, 2.5 in 2014 and 1.9 in 2015).

Type of Offense

In 2012, property offenses had the highest percentage of all probation cases statewide and among all circuits except for Kauai circuit, where “other” types of offenses had the highest (55.6%). Person was the second highest statewide and for Honolulu, Maui, and Kauai. For Hawaii, Drug was the second highest offense type.

The Honolulu circuit had the majority of sex offense probation cases, accounting for over two thirds to 100% of all sex offense probation cases in the state across the three years. Hawaii and Maui circuits consistently showed drug offenses as one of the top four in probation for each year, with Hawaii circuit had the largest proportion of drug offences in the state, accounting from a third to 44% of all drug offenses of probation cases. In the Kauai circuit, “other” type of offenses had the highest percentage of all probation cases in this circuit, accounting for 56% to 69% of all probation there. In 2012 and 2013, Maui and Kauai had status offense cases that resulted in probation. In 2014 no status offense showed in the probation phase.

Gender

Males made up over two thirds (73% for 2012; 68% for 2013 and 70% for 2014) of the probation population statewide and in the Honolulu and Maui circuits (Tables 7-1b, 2b, 3b). Kauai circuit showed the most fluctuation in gender difference across the years. It had more girls than boys for both 2012 and 2013 but in 2014, over two thirds were boys. The largest gender difference was seen in Honolulu circuit, where there was a difference of 55% in 2012.

Age

From 2012 to 2014, the modal youth age at probation statewide and for Honolulu circuit was 15. Over 80% of all probation cases were made up of youth ages 14 and older. The majority probation cases under age 14 were from the Honolulu circuit. As a matter of fact, the total number of probation cases in the neighboring circuit were small, in particular Kauai county, where 8 cases were probated in 2012, 10 in 2013 and 13 in 2014 (Tables 7-1b, 2b, 3b). For 2013 and 2014,

Hawaii circuit accounted for most if not all of the probation cases who were 10 to 11 years old.

Ethnicity

All three years indicated Hawaiians/Part Hawaiians to have the largest percentage of probations (ranging from about 36-75%) for each circuit except for Hawaii circuit where the “unknown” group was the largest group in 2013 and 2014. For all three years, the “unknown” category was mostly from the Hawaii circuit. Statewide, Other Pacific or Mixed Pacific was the second highest, followed by Caucasian (9.5%) or Mixed Race. This was also observed in Honolulu. In the neighboring circuit, the second highest group was either Caucasian or Unknown group, followed by Filipino group.

Comparing probation rates to their respective ethnic proportions in the youth population based on the 2010 census data^{***4}, some ethnic groups showed overrepresentation in the system, either statewide or in certain circuit and either across all three years or in some particular year.

The data showed strikingly overrepresentation of Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian in the system both statewide (probation percentages of 35.8-46.2% vs. population percentage of 32.8%), and in the circuits of Honolulu (36.2-42.2% vs. 29.5% respectively), Maui (between 46.2-62.6% vs. 36.5% respectively). In the Hawaii circuit, however, rates of probation of Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian were below their population proportions in both 2013 and 2014. In Kauai circuit, the total number of adjudicated cases from Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian was too small for the investigation.

No overrepresentation of African Americans or Samoan/Part Samoan was seen in the system. Although Caucasians and Filipinos were among the top five ethnic groups among all adjudicated cases, their adjudication rates were below their proportion in the population both statewide and in each of the four circuits across the three years.

⁴ Proportion in the population for each ethnic/racial group was taken from the 2010 census. See appendix 1.

Table 7-1a Probation rates by type of offense and circuit for 2012 (unduplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|-----------|
| Total probations | 473 | 321 | 67 | 76 | 9 |
| Probation rates | 3.6 | 3.5 | 4.7 | 4.2 | 1.3 |
| Type of Offense⁺ | | | | | |
| Drug | 61 (13.0%) | 29 (9.0%) | 9 (13.4%) | 23 (30.3%) | 0 (0%) |
| Person | 117 (24.7%) | 84 (26.2%) | 15 (22.4%) | 15 (19.7%) | 3 (33.3%) |
| Property | 187 (39.5%) | 135 (42.1%) | 24 (35.8%) | 28 (36.8%) | 0 (0%) |
| Sex | 27 (5.7%) | 27 (8.4%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Status | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (1.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Person NC | 43 (9.1%) | 33 (10.3%) | 3 (4.5%) | 6 (7.9%) | 1 (11.1%) |
| Other | 37 (7.8%) | 13 (4.1%) | 15 (22.4%) | 4 (5.3%) | 5 (55.6%) |

Table 7-2a Probation rates by type of offense and circuit for 2013 (duplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Total probations | 547 | 391 | 74 | 65 | 17 |
| Probation rates | 4.0 | 4.3 | 4.6 | 3.2 | 2.5 |
| Type of Offense⁺ | | | | | |
| Drug | 48 (8.8%) | 24 (6.1%) | 7 (9.5%) | 17 (26.2%) | 0 (0%) |
| Person | 140 (25.6%) | 110 (28.1%) | 9 (12.2%) | 17 (26.2%) | 4 (23.5%) |
| Property | 195 (35.7%) | 147 (37.6%) | 25 (33.8%) | 21 (32.3%) | 2 (11.8%) |
| Sex | 44 (8.0%) | 30 (7.7%) | 11 (14.9%) | 3 (4.6%) | 0 (0%) |
| Status | 2 (0.4%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (1.4%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (5.9%) |
| Person NC | 51 (9.3%) | 44 (11.3%) | 6 (8.1%) | 1 (1.5%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other | 67 (12.3%) | 36 (9.2%) | 15 (20.3%) | 6 (9.2%) | 10 (58.8%) |

Table 7-3a Probation rates by type of offense, and ethnicity for 2014 (duplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|-------------------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|
| Total probations | 365 | 238 | 51 | 63 | 13 |
| Probation rates | 2.7 | 2.6 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 1.9 |
| Type of Offense | | | | | |
| Drug | 52 (14.3%) | 20 (8.4%) | 8 (15.7%) | 23 (36.5%) | 1 (7.7%) |
| Person | 78 (21.4%) | 65 (27.3%) | 6 (11.8%) | 6 (9.5%) | 1 (7.7%) |
| Property | 140 (38.4%) | 96 (40.3%) | 17 (33.3%) | 25 (39.7%) | 2 (15.4%) |
| Sex | 35 (9.6%) | 27 (11.3%) | 7 (13.7%) | 1 (1.6%) | 0 (0%) |
| Status | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0(0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Person NC | 16 (4.4%) | 13 (5.5%) | 2 (3.9%) | 1 (1.6%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other | 44 (12.1%) | 17 (7.1%) | 11 (21.6%) | 7 (11.1%) | 9 (69.2%) |

[·] General population information on the total number of youth ages between 10 and 17 years were taken from the American Community Survey (ACS); Data from 2013 ACS was used to estimate the rate for 2014.

⁺ The sum of the seven charges may not add up to the total due to missing data.

Table 7-1b Probation rates by gender, age, ethnicity, by circuit for 2012 (unduplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| Gender | | | | | |
| Male | 223 (73.1%) | 157 (77.7%) | 23 (62.2%) | 40 (69.0%) | 3 (37.5%) |
| Female | 82 (26.9%) | 45 (22.3%) | 14 (37.8%) | 18 (31.0%) | 5 (62.5%) |
| Total | 305 (100%) | 202 (100%) | 37 (100%) | 58 (100%) | 8 (100%) |
| Age | | | | | |
| 10 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 11 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 12 | 13 (4.3%) | 8 (4.0%) | 2 (5.4%) | 3 (5.2%) | 0 (0%) |
| 13 | 30 (9.8%) | 25 (12.4%) | 2 (5.4%) | 3 (5.2%) | 0 (0%) |
| 14 | 59 (19.3%) | 41 (20.3%) | 5 (13.5%) | 12 (20.7%) | 1 (12.5%) |
| 15 | 75 (24.6%) | 54 (26.7%) | 10 (27.0%) | 10 (17.2%) | 1 (12.5%) |
| 16 | 73 (23.9%) | 48 (23.8%) | 12 (32.4%) | 11 (19.0%) | 2 (25%) |
| 17 | 55 (18.0%) | 26 (12.9%) | 6 (16.2%) | 19 (32.8%) | 4 (50%) |
| Total | 305 (100%) | 202 (100%) | 37 (100%) | 58 (100%) | 8 (100%) |
| Ethnicity | | | | | |
| Caucasian | 29 (9.5%) | 11 (5.5%) | 7 (19.0%) | 10 (17.2%) | 1 (12.5%) |
| Hawaiian | 141 (46.2%) | 85 (42.2%) | 23 (62.2%) | 27 (46.6%) | 6 (75%) |
| African American | 4 (1.3%) | 2 (1.0%) | 2 (5.0%) | 2 (3.0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Chinese | 1 (0.3%) | 1 (0.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Filipino | 17 (5.6%) | 12 (5.9%) | 3 (8.1%) | 2 (3.5%) | 0 (0%) |
| Japanese | 6 (2.0%) | 6 (3.0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Korean | 1 (0.3%) | 1 (0.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Latino/ Hispanic | 4 (1.3%) | 1 (0.5%) | 2 (5.4%) | 1 (1.7%) | 0 (0%) |
| Native American | 1 (0.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (1.3%) |
| Other Asian/ Mixed | | | | | |
| Asian | 3 (1.0%) | 3 (1.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Pacific | | | | | |
| Islander/ Mixed | | | | | |
| Pacific Islander | 35 (11.5%) | 34 (16.8%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (1.7%) | 0 (0%) |
| Samoan | 14 (4.6%) | 13 (6.4%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (1.7%) | 0 (0%) |
| Unknown | 21 (6.9%) | 7 (3.5%) | 0 (0%) | 14 (24.1%) | 0 (0%) |
| Mixed Race | 29 (9.1%) | 26 (12.9%) | 2 (5.4%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (12.5%) |
| Total | 305 (100%) | 202 (66.23%) | 37 (12.13%) | 58 (19.02%) | 8 (2.62%) |

Table 7-2b Probation rates by gender, age, ethnicity, and circuit for 2013 (unduplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|--|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|-----------|
| Gender | | | | | |
| Male | 230 (68.1%) | 170 (72.0%) | 25 (65.8%) | 32 (59.3%) | 3 (30%) |
| Female | 108 (32.0%) | 66 (28.0%) | 13 (34.2%) | 22 (40.7%) | 7 (70%) |
| Total | 338 (100%) | 236 (100%) | 38 (100%) | 54 (100%) | 10 (100%) |
| Age | | | | | |
| 10 | 8 (1.2%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (1.3%) | 7 (3.0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 11 | 12 (1.7%) | 2 (0.6%) | 1 (1.3%) | 8 (3.5%) | 1 (1.4%) |
| 12 | 10 (3.0%) | 7 (3.0%) | 2 (5.3%) | 11 (4.8%) | 4 (5.8%) |
| 13 | 65 (9.4%) | 35 (11.2%) | 4 (5.1%) | 1 (1.9%) | 0 (0%) |
| 14 | 59 (17.5%) | 38 (16.1%) | 10 (26.3%) | 7 (13.0%) | 4 (40%) |
| 15 | 93 (27.5%) | 69 (29.2%) | 10 (26.3%) | 12 (22.2%) | 2 (20%) |
| 16 | 81 (24.0%) | 60 (25.4%) | 6 (15.8%) | 13 (24.1%) | 2 (20%) |
| 17 | 49 (14.5%) | 29 (12.3%) | 6 (15.8%) | 13 (24.1%) | 1 (10%) |
| Total | 338 (100%) | 236 (100%) | 38 (100%) | 54 (100%) | 10 (100%) |
| Ethnicity | | | | | |
| Caucasian | 35 (10.4%) | 17 (7.2%) | 8 (21.1%) | 10 (18.5%) | 0 (0%) |
| Hawaiian | 136 (40.2%) | 95 (40.3%) | 20 (52.6%) | 15 (27.8%) | 6 (60%) |
| African American | 4 (1.2%) | 4 (1.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Chinese | 8 (1.2%) | 3 (1.0%) | 2 (2.6%) | 3 (1.3%) | 0 (0%) |
| Filipino | 20 (5.9%) | 12 (5.1%) | 3 (7.9%) | 3 (5.6%) | 2 (20%) |
| Japanese | 5 (1.5%) | 4 (1.7%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (1.9%) | 0 (0%) |
| Korean | 3 (0.4%) | 3 (1.0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Latino/ Hispanic | 7 (2.1%) | 5 (2.1%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (3.7%) | 0 (0%) |
| Native American | 4 (0.6%) | 1 (0.3%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (1.3%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Asian/ Mixed Asian | 3 (0.89%) | 2 (0.9%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (1.85%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Pacific Islander/ Mixed Pacific Islander | 56 (16.6%) | 52 (22.0%) | 1 (2.6%) | 3 (5.6%) | 0 (0%) |
| Samoan | 18 (5.3%) | 17 (7.2%) | 1 (2.6%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Mixed Race | 28 (8.3%) | 21 (8.9%) | 2 (3.7%) | 2 (3.7%) | 0 (0%) |
| Unknown | 26 (7.7%) | 7 (3.0%) | 1 (2.6%) | 17 (31.5%) | 1 (10%) |
| Total | 338 (100%) | 236 (100%) | 38 (100%) | 54 (100%) | 10 (100%) |

Table 7-3b Probation rates by gender, age, ethnicity, and circuit for 2014 (duplicated)

| | State | Honolulu | Maui | Hawaii | Kauai |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|-----------|
| Gender | | | | | |
| Male | 163 (70.3%) | 112 (73.7%) | 18 (69.2%) | 24 (58.5%) | 9 (69.2%) |
| Female | 69 (29.7%) | 40 (26.3%) | 8 (30.8%) | 17 (41.5%) | 4 (30.8%) |
| Total | 232 (100%) | 152 (100%) | 26 (100%) | 41 (100%) | 13 (100%) |
| Age | | | | | |
| 10 | 3 (0.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (2.0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 11 | 11 (2.5%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (4.8%) | 8 (5.4%) | 0 (0%) |
| 12 | 5 (2.2%) | 4 (2.6%) | 1 (3.9%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 13 | 14 (6.0%) | 9 (5.9%) | 4 (15.4%) | 1 (2.4%) | 0 (0%) |
| 14 | 52 (22.4%) | 34 (22.4%) | 9 (34.6%) | 5 (12.2%) | 4 (30.8%) |
| 15 | 60 (25.9%) | 46 (30.3%) | 4 (15.4%) | 7 (17.1%) | 3 (23.1%) |
| 16 | 59 (25.4%) | 41 (27.0%) | 4 (15.4%) | 13 (31.7%) | 1 (7.7%) |
| 17 | 42 (18.1%) | 18 (11.8%) | 4 (15.4%) | 15 (36.6%) | 5 (38.5%) |
| Total | 232 (100%) | 152 (100%) | 26 (100%) | 41 (100%) | 13 (100%) |
| Ethnicity | | | | | |
| Caucasian | 21 (9.0%) | 13 (8.5%) | 4 (15.4%) | 4 (9.8%) | 0 (0%) |
| Hawaiian | 83 (35.8%) | 55 (36.2%) | 12 (46.2%) | 10 (24.4%) | 6 (46.2%) |
| African American | 3 (1.3%) | 3 (2.0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Chinese | 5 (1.1%) | 3 (1.5%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (1.4%) | 0 (0%) |
| Filipino | 20 (8.6%) | 13 (8.5%) | 1 (3.9%) | 5 (12.2%) | 1 (7.7%) |
| Japanese | 5 (2.2%) | 3 (2.0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (4.9%) | 0 (0%) |
| Korean | 3 (0.7%) | 2 (1.0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.7%) | 0 (0%) |
| Latino/ Hispanic | 6 (2.6%) | 3 (2.0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (7.3%) | 0 (0%) |
| Native American | 2 (0.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (1.4%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Asian/ Mixed | | | | | |
| Asian | 1 (0.4%) | 1 (0.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Pacific | | | | | |
| Islander/ Mixed | | | | | |
| Pacific Islander | 25 (10.8%) | 23 (15.1%) | 1 (3.9%) | 1 (2.4%) | 0 (0%) |
| Samoa | 15 (6.5%) | 12 (7.9%) | 1 (3.9%) | 2 (4.9%) | 0 (0%) |
| Mixed Race | 32 (13.8%) | 21 (13.8%) | 3 (11.5%) | 3 (9.4%) | 5 (38.5%) |
| Unknown | 21 (9.0%) | 5 (3.3%) | 4 (15.4%) | 11 (26.8%) | 1 (7.7%) |
| Total | 232 (100%) | 152 (100%) | 26 (100%) | 41 (100%) | 13 (100%) |

I.A. HYCF

In 2012 HYCF mandates for the State of Hawaii totaled 108, at a rate of 0.83 per 1,000 youth (Table 8-1a). In 2013 and 2014 a visible decrease was shown to 90 (0.6) and 53 (0.4) respectively.

Type of Offense

2012 through 2014

The “other” type of offenses accounted for almost half or more than half of the offenses in HYCF placement across all three years (range: 43% to 52%). Property offenses were the second highest (ranges: 22% to 32%) and person type of offenses were the third highest group (ranges 11% to 15%) (Table 8-1a).

In addition, status offense also was noted in 2012 and 2013. It is not clear from the data if this was the offense that led them to HYCF.

Gender

Consistently throughout the three years, around 70% of the cases in HYCF were males. The differentiation percentage between male and female ranged from 40% to 51% across the three years.

Age

Ages represented in HYCF ranged from 14 to 17, with over 90% in the age group 15 to 17. From 2012 to 2014, the modal age was 17 for 2012 and 2013. Age 16 had the second highest percentages for those two years. In 2014, age 16 and 17 tied to have the highest percentage (38.8%). Age 14 represented the least percentage in HYCF (range: 4% to 7%).

Race/Ethnicity

All three years indicated Native Hawaiians to have the largest percentage of HYCF placements, from 62.3% in 2012 to 54.2% in 2013 and 49% in 2014. Mixed Race (13.2%) was the second highest in 2012, followed by Caucasian (10.4%), and then Samoan (4.7%). In 2013, Other Pacific or Mixed Pacific was the second highest (13.3%), followed by Mixed Race (13.2%), and then Caucasian (6.0%). In 2014, Samoan was the second highest group (14.3%), followed by Mixed Race (10.2%) and then Caucasian (8.2%).

Ethnic groups that were overrepresented in HYCF relative to their proportion in the population were Hawaiians/Part Hawaiians and Blacks, in particular, Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian, which was overwhelmingly disproportionately higher (rate of HYCF of 62% vs. 33% in the population). No overrepresentation was seen

among Whites or Samoans/Part Samoans. Rates in HYCF of Filipinos were below their population percentage across the three years.

Table 8-1a HYCF rates by type of offense and circuit for the three years (duplicated)

| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|------------------------------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| Total HYCF | 108 | 90 | 53 |
| HYCF rates [*] | 0.83 | 0.64 | 0.39 |
| Type of Offense⁺ | | | |
| Drug | 5 (4.6%) | 3 (3.3%) | 1 (1.9%) |
| Person | 15 (13.9%) | 10 (11.1%) | 8 (15.1 %) |
| Property | 24 (22.2%) | 23 (25.6%) | 17 (32.1 %) |
| Sex | 3 (2.8%) | 0 (0.0%) | 2 (3.8 %) |
| Status | 1 (0.9%) | 2 (2.2%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Person NC | 5 (4.6%) | 5 (5.6%) | 2 (3.8%) |
| Other | 55 (50.9%) | 47 (52.2%) | 23 (43.4%) |

* General population information on youth ages between 10 and 17 were taken from census 2010 to calculate referral rates.

⁺ The sum of the seven charges may not add up to the total due to missing data.

Table 8-1b HYCF rates by gender, age, ethnicity and circuit for the three years (unduplicated)

| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|--|-------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Gender | | | |
| Male | 74 (69.8%) | 61 (73.5%) | 37 (75.5%) |
| Female | 32 (30.2%) | 22 (26.5%) | 12 (24.5%) |
| Total | 106 (100%) | 83 (100%) | 49 (100%) |
| Age | | | |
| 10 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 11 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 12 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 13 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 14 | 7 (6.6%) | 6 (7.2%) | 2 (4.1%) |
| 15 | 18 (17.0%) | 17 (20.5%) | 9 (18.4%) |
| 16 | 31 (29.2%) | 29 (34.9%) | 19 (38.8%) |
| 17 | 50 (47.2%) | 31 (37.4%) | 19 (38.8%) |
| Total | 106 (100%) | 83 (100%) | 49 (100%) |
| Ethnicity | | | |
| Caucasian | 11 (10.4%) | 5 (6.0%) | 4 (8.2%) |
| Hawaiian | 66 (62.3%) | 45 (54.2%) | 24 (49.0%) |
| African American | 0 (0%) | 2 (2.4%) | 2 (4.1%) |
| Chinese | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Filipino | 2 (1.9%) | 1 (1.2%) | 3 (6.1%) |
| Japanese | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (2.0%) |
| Korean | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Latino/ Hispanic | 1 (0.9%) | 1 (1.2%) | 1 (2.0%) |
| Native American | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Asian/ Mixed Asian | 1 (0.9%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Pacific Islander/ Mixed Pacific Islander | 5 (4.7%) | 11 (13.3%) | 2 (4.1%) |
| Samoaan | 5 (4.7%) | 5 (6.0%) | 7 (14.3%) |
| Other | 1 (0.9%) | 1 (1.2%) | 0 (0%) |
| Unknown | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Mixed Race | 14 (13.2%) | 11 (13.2%) | 5 (10.2%) |
| Total | 106 (100%) | 83 (100%) | 49 (100%) |

I.I. Transfer or waiver to adult court

A total of 4 juveniles made up a total of 31 waivers to adult court across the three years. Among the 31 waivers, 15 were in 2012, resulting in a rate of 0.11 per 1,000 youth. The total number of waivers in 2013 was 4, resulting in a rate of 0.03 per 1,000 youth. The total number of waivers in 2014 was 12, resulting in a rate of 0.09 per 1,000 youth (Table 8-1a).

The 15 waivers in 2012 were all from Hawaii circuit, coming from two juveniles. All two juveniles were males, aged 17. One is of Filipino and the other of Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian ethnicity. The 4 waivers in 2013 in Honolulu for sex offenses were from the same juvenile, who was a Caucasian male, aged 17. The 12 waivers in 2014 were all from Maui, from one juvenile, who was a 17-year Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian male for person and property offenses.

Table 8-1a Waiver to adult court was reported for youth ages 10-17 during 2012, 2013 and 2014 (duplicated)

| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|------------------------------------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| Total Waive | 15 | 4 | 12 |
| Waive rates | 0.11 | 0.03 | 0.09 |
| Type of Offense⁺ | | | |
| Drug | 1 (6.7%) | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Person | 3 (20.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 7 (58.3%) |
| Property | 3 (20.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 5 (41.7%) |
| Sex | 3 (20.0%) | 4 (100.0%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Status | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Person NC | 1 (6.7%) | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Other | 4 (26.7%) | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) |

^{*} General population information on the total number of youth ages between 10 and 17 years were taken from the American Community Survey (ACS); Data from 2013 ACS was used to estimate the rate for 2014.

⁺ The sum of the seven charges may not add up to the total due to missing data.

Table 8-1b Waiver to adult court was reported for youth ages 10-17 during 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014 (unduplicated)

| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Gender | | | |
| Male | 2 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) |
| Female | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Total | 2 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) |
| Age | | | |
| 10 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 11 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 12 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 13 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 14 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 15 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 16 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 17 | 2 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) |
| Total | 2 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) |
| Ethnicity | | | |
| Caucasian | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) |
| Hawaiian | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) |
| African American | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Chinese | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Filipino | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Japanese | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Korean | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Latino/ Hispanic | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Native American | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Asian/ Mixed Asian | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other Pacific Islander/ Mixed Pacific Islander | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Samoan | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Unknown | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Total | 2 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) |

Youth Gangs in Hawaii

JJIS maintains no information on gang affiliation or influence. Any gang related information pertinent to Hawaii residents is forwarded by Hawaii's state police to the federal authorities through a system called the Western States Information Network. Thus, discerning the level of gang activity among Hawaii youth through JJIS is not possible. Information on youth gangs in Hawaii for this report is based on the available literature.

Youth gangs impact the communities they thrive in, and the families they originate from. Gangs impact the community by increasing violent and criminal activity as well as decreasing the moral and feelings of safety amongst community members. On a national level the Los Angeles juvenile justice website reports, "Gangs exist in urban areas, and more recently even in the rural areas as well. They number well over a quarter million youths throughout the country" LAPD (2012). Thus, on a local level youth gangs are not only a problem for the urban areas of Honolulu; they affect communities in rural areas of Oahu and all neighbor islands.

In 2003, an analysis of the Hawaii Student Alcohol, Tobacco, and Drug use surveys from the 2000 data set by Chesney-Lind, Pasko, Marker, Freeman, and Nakano (2004) found that students from both urban and rural areas scored high on "gang involvement". However contributors and risk factors for gang involvement differ from rural to urban communities. "In rural areas such as Kau, Leileihua, Lanai, Hana, Kohala, and Keaau family factors are salient, while urban areas such as Cambell, Waipahu, Farrington personal factors like risk taking behaviors (such as selling drugs) and involvement with delinquent peer groups yielded comparatively higher reports" (Chesney-Lind et al. 2004. P. 36). These numbers do not mean anything to the public unless there is an understanding of how detrimental gang activity is to the youth involved, their families, and the public as a whole.

According to the Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Youth Violence National and State Statistics at a Glance (2009), a total of 650,843 young people ages 10–24 years were treated in emergency departments for nonfatal injuries sustained from assaults." Furthermore, a literature review by Godinet, Mayeda, & Arnsberger (2006-2008) found, "gang association, past or present, has a significant and positive correlation with delinquency among Hawaii youth" (p. 55). Hawaii is an example of a state with many types of gangs made up of youth who join these groups for a variety of reasons. In order to prevent, intervene, and decrease the magnitude of gangs in Hawaii it is important to identify why they are so prevalent and why youth partake in gang activity.

The literature on gangs identify risk factors common amongst youth who are in gangs and reasons why they join. The common assumptions are that youth join

to “be cool”, for economic gain, or to feel a sense of family and connectedness they are not finding at home. Gangs function for many youth as an extension of the family that also provides protection from the environmental conditions prevalent in many communities with high gang membership. Other factors also include traditions in which youth are involved in gangs they want to follow in the footsteps of their family members who are also in a gang, or may also be coerced into joining. The LAPD 2012 website points out “gang involvement can begin as early as elementary school. Children as young as seven or eight years of age have been recruited to work in criminal street gangs”(LAPD, 2012). This information tells us that intervention programs need to reach children of all ages as well as families. Youth in Hawaii join gangs for similar reasons as youth in other states. However, attention also needs to be given to the variety of cultures in which gang members are immersed. Such communities are at high risk because if systems such as schools, families, and the police are not able to nurture the youth, they will turn to their peers. An occurrence that is frequent in communities that are highly transitional because of immigration and/or chronic poverty (Vigil, 2002).

Hawaii Youth Gangs

Gangs in Hawaii are made up of youth from many cultural backgrounds, and according to LAPD (2012), “Gangs often form along ethnic and racial lines, although there is an increasing trend of young people joining gangs for economic motives” (The Center for Youth Research, 2004, p.90). Both racial lines and economic motives are related to Hawaii’s history of immigration. Hawaii’s rich immigration history explains the variety of gangs formed by racial commonalities. The most recent group to have immigrated is generally the one struggling to assimilate. Today, Hawaii is experiencing a large number families emigrating from the various nations within the Micronesia geographical location. This group continues to experience discrimination from the local community as well as from other immigrant groups. This places them at a high risk for gang involvement due to the need for protection from other groups. As found in a report from the Office of Youth Services immigrant groups stick together for protection when they become a target of violence for another group (Chesney –Lind, Pasko, Marker, Matsen, Lawyer, Johnson, Gushiken, and Freeman, 2005). Other risk factors that have been found to increase the likelihood a child will join a gang include language barriers, substance abuse, and high drop-out rates.

Nonetheless not all youth who are immigrants who live in poverty-stricken areas become gang members. According to a study by Okamoto et al. (2008) youth may have cultural buffers such as traditional activities that decrease the chance a youth will join a gang. Family involvement has been found to decrease youth involvement in gangs as well as school and police involvement. This idea is supported by Godinet et al (2006-2008), as the review found, “resources that connect immigrant and economically distressed families to schools and the police in positive manners.

Consequences of gang activities

Youth gangs are commonly involved in criminal activity such as selling drugs, prostitution, theft, and other illegal actions affecting their peers, families, and the general public. The Center for Youth Research Project, (2005) found, an alarming trend that was reported at the most recent meeting of the YGRS (youth gang response system) (November, 30, 2004). Youth involved in gangs were from KPT (a subsidized housing project) were “targeting” tourists and members of the military, and picking fights with strangers sometimes motivated by robbery (State of Hawaii, Office of Youth Services, 2004, p6). This is a concern because aspects such as the tourist industry will be affected if citizens fear gang violence and robbery. As the economy continues to spiral down gang activity may become more economically motivated thus increasing robbery, drug smuggling, and prostitution. Lind et al (2004) pointed out that youth who are highly attached to delinquent peer groups and low attachment to positive family relations, also are experiencing low attachment to school, low to no commitment to education, and poor grades” (p 20). If youth in Hawaii are not graduating from high school they may be more likely to remain in a gang and use gang activity as their means of income. Overall risk factors as well as factors that maintain the cyclical nature of gangs both need to be targeted to combat gangs.

Literature reviews and studies have found a collaborative approach has the highest success rate in addressing gangs. Looking to areas with similar cultural factors as Hawaii may provide insight into what works and does not work for youth gangs. New Zealand youth gangs are made up of Maori youth as well as youth of various ethnicities. The New Zealand Parliament website explains reasons for youth gangs: “Youth gangs and youth delinquency appear to be related to economic deprivation with gangs more likely to grow in depressed or disorganized communities lacking a sense of pride. In such communities the parents’ engagement with their children can be limited by their long work hours and financial pressures” (2009). Youth gangs in Hawaii have become a coping mechanism for youth who are not thriving in their homes or communities. The spectrum of factors that propel gang involvement is wide and makes it difficult to determine what interventions are most effective. Reviewing what the state of Hawaii is currently doing to address youth gangs as well as needs that are not being met may help to identify the most effective approach to decreasing youth gangs.

Strategies to Reduce Problems associated with Youth Gangs

Youth gang prevention programs usually follow one of three approaches, prevention, intervention, or suppression. According to the New Zealand Parliament website (2009) an evaluation of comprehensive gang programs in the US concluded that, when properly implemented, a combination of prevention, intervention, and suppression strategies was successful in reducing the gang problem”. In 2008, the Los Angeles City Controller submitted a blue print for a comprehensive city wide anti-gang strategy that focused on better coordination and collaboration of existing programs rather than streamlining or allocating

monies for additional programs. The rationale states, “since each of the City’s communities affected by gangs is unique and different [similar to Hawaii gangs], the societal infrastructure and individual needs of each area will vary. Only through a comprehensive, community-level and citywide department-level needs assessment will the City be able to marshal the appropriate mix of youth development and anti-gang services to address the underlying causes of each community’s gang problem” p. 2. The ability for programs to be able to shift their intervention model and to be able to collaborate with various programs for youth and families is beneficial in Hawaii as gangs range from urban centered local Hawaiian gangs, to rural gangs, to gangs comprised of one ethnic group bound together by discrimination, to gangs created to model a mainland gang. The approach described in the Blueprint calls for a comprehensive approach similar to the approach supported by Howell & Curry (2009) involving mobilization and community organization.

Recommendations for data collection on gangs

Data on gang related activities and offenses still have not been collected for the Juvenile Justice Information System. Such information can provide a better understanding of gang related activities which is information that can be used to better understand the extent of the problem. The challenge in collecting this data is that in many instances, the offense can’t be easily identified as gang related unless the offender admits it. However, an objective way to gather information on offenses that might be considered gang related is information on who the amount of youth that committed the same offense. Another recommendation is to run several focus groups with naturally existing self- identified youth gang members at neutral locations to interview regarding the nature of their gang, reasons for their involvement, and questions about what would have prevented them from being in a gang and what would it take for them to leave a gang. This approach would require the facilitator to be experienced and non- threatening to the participants.

Recommendation for Data Reporting

Unknown ethnicity

A significant number of youth are identified ethnically as “unknown” through virtually every level of Hawaii’s juvenile justice system. This can be expected at the level of arrest, as police are not always equipped to accurately input a youth’s ethnicity(ies). However, even at the arrest level and especially through the subsequent juvenile justice system stages, it is critical that how ethnicity is reported and categorized follows a common process.

For example, the state, Hawaii, and Kauai circuit data showed substantial percentage across the three years of “unknown” ethnicity in the referral phase for both Hawaii and Kauai circuit and the second largest group in referrals statewide. It accounted for more than a third for both Hawaii and Kauai, and between 15% and 18% statewide for the three years. This is a concern for all subsequent decision points. Unknown ethnicity warrants attention as this category in the referral and other subsequent decision points should be little to non-existent as the referral stage requires a birth certificate to verify demographic information such as ethnicity.

Consistent Processing Through the Juvenile Justice System

The other major concern with data reporting lies in the different ways that youth are processed through the system. As noted previously, in some counties, arrests can be bypassed and youth enter the system for the first time at the referral level. Ostensibly, this can also occur if schools are able to refer youth to prosecutors for status offenses, such as truancy. When an arrest is not made, it skews data analyses by increasing the overall proportion between referrals and arrests. This in turn makes county comparisons problematic.

It also is unclear how different types of diversions are entered into JJIS, if they are entered at all. In meetings with service providers, it was determined that diversions to community services immediately following arrest are rarely entered in some counties. Additionally, diversions can occur after a youth is referred to Family Court or after he or she has been adjudicated. The point at which a youth is diverted within the juvenile justice system needs to be noted in JJIS so that flow through the system can be accurately assessed.

Broadly speaking, when different circuits take different approaches to processing youth through their respective systems, comparative analyses are highly problematic. Granted counties have different resources available in the way of staff and organizations. Still, it would benefit the State of Hawaii to have its

juvenile justice system function as consistently as possible across all four counties when it comes to reporting data accurately and using data for strategic planning.

Missing Kauai circuit Data for arrests

Arrest data for Kauai circuit for 2014 had only the month of July, 2013. Thus, information on arrests for Kauai was based on 19 arrests. It is noted that the missing information was due to change in computer system. Kauai's new computer system could not be synced with the main system thus Kauai's arrest information for 2014 was not available.

Recommended Problem Statement

The following problem statements are based on the data analysis from the perspective of the authors.

1. Status Offenders

The results of the analysis consistently showed status offenses as the highest type of offense in arrests and referrals. While findings showed a large percentage of status offenses diverted at the family court level, subsequent phases (petition, adjudication) continued to show status offenses as one of the top three offenses for all Counties except Kauai that didn't have status offense as one of the four top offense in adjudication. Furthermore, a third or more of the offenses petition to family court for Maui circuit were status offenses. What has improved during this crime analysis period is that status offenses was not one of the top four offenses in probation. What does warrant a closer look is the existence of status offenses in HYCF. However, while cases of status offenses showed in the 2012 and 2013 data for HYCF, 2014 reported no status offenses. This is progress but the progression of status offenses in the system continues to require monitoring to assure that youth offenders are not being placed in HYCF for a status offense.

2. Type of Offenses

Property and other offenses were consistently among the top two or three across the four circuits, across all years, for all phases. Drug offenses were consistently high for Hawaii circuit and Maui and among the top four for Kauai and Honolulu for all phases.

It is clear, particularly for Hawaii and Maui circuits that substance abuse services are necessary to address the problem which was an issue seen in the previous crime analysis reports.

Kauai differs greatly from the other circuits in the types of offenses that are diverted. Aside from status offenses, only one case was diverted in 2013 for a property offense and one in 2014 for a person NC offense. A further exploration of Kauai's system would be useful to better understand their decision making process on the types of offenses that can receive diversion.

3. Disproportionality

The data for 2012 to 2014 indicates that Native Hawaiian youth are not disproportionately arrested. What is of concern however is that they are overrepresented in all subsequent phases of the Juvenile Justice System except for diversion statewide and in all of the circuits except for Hawaii. This can be an indication of discrepancies that occur in the processing of Native Hawaiian youths in the JJS as compared to other ethnicities. Conversely, while Whites are overrepresented in arrests for Maui, Hawaii, and Kauai circuits their referral rates are lower than their proportion in the population.

Filipinos who were overrepresented in previous crime analysis reports for all decision points were within the range of their proportion to the population. In fact, the rates for Filipino youths in the petition, detention, adjudication, probation, and HYF were below their population percentages for all four of the circuits. However, Samoans continue to be disproportionately represented in various phases of JJS in the Honolulu circuit.

As Native Hawaiians continue to be overrepresented in the JJS, more attention is needed to address this concern. An examination of the JJS system with regard to its practice and processing of Native Hawaiian youth in addition to inclusion of culturally relevant practice as a necessary option and solution for these youth are recommendations to help address the disproportionate problem.

4. Mixed Pacific Islander and Mixed Race ethnic categories

These ethnic groupings are worth a closer examination as the data consistently shows an overrepresentation in all phases across all years. The Mixed categories doesn't provide relevant information on the specific Pacific Islander ethnic group who are experiencing difficulties within the JJS.

5. System Improvements

Maui, Kauai, and Hawaii rates of arrests, referrals, petitions, adjudications per 1000 youth were two to three times more than Honolulu, an issue that was also seen in the previous crime analysis report (2006-2008 & 2009-2011). In many instances, they surpass the State rates. This is worth a closer examination as the youth populations of these respective counties are less than Oahu's.

Ethnic identification is also an issue to be aware of as a noticeable percentage of youth still were not given an ethnic identification in all phases. This is particularly noticeable with the Hawaii circuit data. This is a problem as per Family Court procedures; the referral state requires a birth certificate to verify demographic information such as ethnicity.

5. Prevention & Age

Given the body of literature that advocates for the deterrence of status offenders from further involvement in the Juvenile Justice System, prevention strategies or services at the arrest and referral decision points become vital. In addition, evaluation of these services is equally important as data would help program planners and funders determine the efficacy of such prevention services.

Similar to previous crime analysis reports, the age groups of 16 to 17 were the largest at all decision points. In examining the data, age 14 seems to be the age when the numbers start showing a rapid incline. Thus, a recommendation is to target prevention services for youth below 14. Also worth noting for Hawaii circuit is the number of youth ages 10-11 that are in the probation phase compared to the other circuits.

6. Gender

The least gender difference was reflected in the Hawaii circuit in the arrest, referral, and diversion phases. However, in subsequent phases (petition, probation, adjudication, HYCF) gender difference increased rapidly. Diversion phase had the lowest gender difference for all phases with the exception of Kauai, a phenomenon that needs attention as previous phases showed a bigger gender difference in all the Counties except Hawaii. Examination of case processing for Honolulu, Maui, and Kauai is recommended to assure that cases are being reviewed and decisions are based on criteria set forth by law and not based on gender.

Additionally, while Maui circuit shows an approximate of 20% difference with males and females in the arrest and referral stages, the diversion phase throughout the three years indicates a difference of 11% or below. This requires further examination as it may reflect a discrepancy in the process for female youth offenders in the Maui circuit.

References:

- Chesney-Lind, M., Paskp, L., Marker, N., Freeman, S., and Nakano, J.(2004). Arresttrends, gang involvement, and truancy in hawaii: an interim report to the twenty-second Hawaii state legislature. *Center for Youth Research Social Science Research Institute. University of Hawaii at Manoa.* Honolulu, HI.
- Chesney-Lind, M., Pasko, L., Marker, N., Matsen, J, A., Lawyer, K., Johnson, E., Gushiken, T., & Freeman, S. (2005). Volume I: Gangs in hawaii: past and present findings. Center for Youth Research Social Science Research Institute University of Hawaii at Manoa. Report No. 418. Honolulu, HI.
- Chick, N, L. (2008) Blueprint for a comprehensive citywide anti-gang strategy. *Los Angeles City Controller.*
- Department of Business, Economic Development & Tourism.
http://hawaii.gov/dbedt/info/census/Census_2010/demographic uploaded February 12, 2012.
- Godinet, M., Mayeda, D., and Arnsberger, P. (2006-2008). JJS Crime analysis State of Hawaii.
- Godinet, M., & Li, F. (2009-2011). JJS Crime analysis State of Hawaii.
- Governor's office of gang and youth violence policy. (2012). Big brothers.big sisters. Retrieved from
<http://www.calgrip.ca.gov/applications/ebp/?v=detail&navid=168&categoryIds=1&typelds=0&ageGroupIds=0&settingIds=0&id=11>.
- House of Representatives Twenty-Sixth Legislature (2011). A bill for an act, relating to the weed and seed strategy. HB. NO. 1512. Retrieved from Hawaii State Legislature.
- Howell, C, J, and Curry, D, G. (2009). Mobilizing communities to address gang problems. NYGC Bulletin. OJJDP: 4. January, 2009.
- LAPD. (2012). Introduction to gangs. *Official Website of the Los Angeles Police Department.*
- New Zealand Parliament (2009). Young people and gangs in New Zealand. Governor's office of gang and youth violence policy. (2012). Big brothers.big sisters. Retrieved from <http://www.calgrip.ca.gov>.

Vigil, J.D. (2002). *A Rainbow of Gangs: Street Cultures in the Mega-City*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Appendix 1. The total number of youth population ages 10-17 years and population proportions of selected ethnic/racial groups statewide and by county, according to the 2010 census data*

| | Statewide | | Honolulu | | Maui | | Hawaii Island | | Kauai | |
|---|--------------|---------|--------------|---------|--------------|---------|---------------|---------|--------------|---------|
| | Total Number | Percent | Total Number | Percent | Total Number | Percent | Total Number | Percent | Total Number | Percent |
| All groups | 133050 | | 91421 | | 15909 | | 18957 | | 6763 | |
| African American Alone | 1,937 | 1.5% | 1,737 | 1.9% | 68 | 0.4% | 103 | 0.5% | 29 | 0.4% |
| Native Hawaiian alone or in combination | 43,680 | 32.8% | 26,977 | 29.5% | 5,803 | 36.5% | 8,457 | 44.6% | 2,443 | 36.1% |
| Caucasian alone | 18,700 | 14.1% | 10,536 | 11.5% | 3,213 | 20.2% | 3,614 | 19.1% | 1,337 | 19.8% |
| Filipino alone | 19,540 | 14.7% | 13,924 | 15.2% | 2,944 | 18.5% | 1,515 | 8.0% | 1,157 | 17.1% |
| Samoan alone or in combination | 6,674 | 5.0% | 5,875 | 6.4% | 274 | 1.7% | 439 | 2.3% | 86 | 1.3% |

* Link for the Census data: (1) for selected ethnic groups: http://census.hawaii.gov/Census_2010/SF2/ ; (2) for all groups: <http://www.infoplease.com/us/census/data/hawaii/demographic.html>