

Juvenile Justice System Crime Analysis State of Hawaii Fiscal Year 2015-2017

This project was supported by a 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 the Aloha Data 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 the assistance of Maria Sadaya-Ibus with the Juvenile Justice Information System for her assistance and support with the data.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary..... 4

INTRODUCTION..... 9

METHODOLOGY..... 9

RESULTS: Analysis of FY2015 to 2017..... 15

Arrests15

 Type of Offense 15

 Gender 16

 Age 16

 Race/Ethnicity..... 16

Referrals22

 Type of Offense 22

 Gender 22

 Age 22

 Ethnicity 23

Diversion.....28

 Type of Offense 28

 Gender 28

 Age 28

 Ethnicity 29

Petition (Formally Handled)34

 Type of Offense 34

 Gender 34

 Age 34

 Ethnicity 34

Detention.....40

 Type of Offense 40

 Gender 40

 Age 40

 Ethnicity 40

Adjudications46

 Type of Offense 46

 Gender 46

 Age 46

 Race/Ethnicity..... 47

Probation52

 Type of Offense 52

 Gender 52

 Age 52

 Ethnicity 53

HYCF	58
Type of Offense	58
Gender	58
Age.....	58
Race/Ethnicity.....	58
Transfer or waiver to adult court.....	60
<i>Recommendation for Data Reporting.....</i>	<i>62</i>
<i>Appendix 1. The total number of youth population ages 10-17 years and population proportions of selected ethnic/racial groups</i>	<i>74</i>
<i>Appendix 2. American Community Survey (ACS), 2015-2016, for the State of Hawai'i and for each County</i>	<i>75</i>

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 Circuit, 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.

Judicial Circuits

The State of Hawai'i is comprised of four official Counties. Each County is within one of the four Judicial Circuits, represented by the four major islands. Because of the uniqueness of each County, within its respective Judicial Circuit, it is important to report not only on the statewide data, but also the data for each of the four Counties and respective Circuit.

In addition to a statewide analysis, the report includes analysis results for the First, Second, Third, and Fifth Circuits. Please note that the analysis does not include the Fourth Judicial Circuit, which previously represented a portion of the island of Hawai'i. In 1943, the Fourth Judicial Circuit was eliminated, when it merged into the Third Circuit of the (Big) Island of Hawai'i.

Please also note that the analysis does not include the County of Kalawao, which consists of that portion of the Island of Moloka'i known as Kalaupapa, Kalawao, and Waikolu, commonly known as the Kalaupapa Settlement, which is not a portion of the County of Maui, but constituted a County by itself. Kalawao County is under the jurisdiction and control of the Hawai'i State Department of Health (DOH), as governed by the laws and rules relative to the DOH in the care and treatment of persons affected with Hansen's disease.

Below are the listing of each of the five Judicial Circuits and respective County, including the Island(s) within each jurisdiction.

1. First Judicial Circuit: City and County of Honolulu, Island of O`ahu and other islands of the State of Hawai'i, and not in any other Circuit;
2. Second Judicial Circuit: Maui County, including Islands of Maui, Moloka'i and Lana'i, excluding the area commonly known as the Kalaupapa Settlement, County of Kalawao (see above);
3. Third Judicial Circuit: Hawai'i County, (Big) Island of Hawai'i;
4. Fourth Judicial Circuit: Eliminated in 1943 (see above);
5. Fifth Judicial Circuit: Kaua'i County, including Islands of Kaua'i and the privately-owned Island of Ni`ihau. Any arrests of juveniles on Ni`ihau are not reported separately for Ni`ihau, and are handled with respective data reported by and for the Island of Kaua'i.

Arrests

Status offenses (SO) have consistently remained the highest offense type in arrests for all four Circuits with the Third Circuit showing the highest percentages¹ (over 60s) from 2015 to 2017. Additionally, the First, Second, and Fifth Circuits showed a decrease in SO arrests percentages throughout the three years. Conversely while the raw arrests data for the Third Circuit showed a decrease over time, the percentage of arrests for SO progressively increased from 2015 to 2017. Both the First and Third Circuits showed property offenses as second highest in arrests for all three years. In 2015 and 2016, the Second Circuit showed other type of offense as the second highest and drug offenses in 2017. The Third Circuit showed drug offenses as the second highest across all three years with its arrest percentages for this type of offense more than doubled that of the First and Third Circuits. Age range of arrests was from 10-17 years old with 15-17 years old accounting for over 80% of arrests.

Referrals

The referral rates² for the Third and Fifth Circuits were over twice the referral rates of the First Circuit across the three years. All four Circuits showed the largest percentage of their referrals were from status offenses with the First and Fifth Circuits showing the highest percentages (high 50s to over 60s). Status offenses accounted for more than 50% of referrals for each Circuit, each year with the exception of the Second Circuit in 2016 and 2017. However, the First Circuit had the lowest rates of referrals compared to other Circuits, and its percentage of status offenses still made up the majority of the referrals (high 50s and 60s). For all three years, other type of offenses accounted for the second highest percentage of referrals for all three Circuits except the Second Circuit for years 2015 and 2016 which showed drug and property offenses to be the second highest in referrals respectively. Referrals for property type of offenses ranked third in referrals for the First and Third Circuits for all three years, for the Second Circuit in years 2015 and 2017, and in 2015 for the Fifth Circuit. The Fifth Circuit in 2016 and 2017 showed person NC offenses as the third highest type of offense in referrals. Hawaiian youth were slightly overrepresented³ for the First Circuit in referrals for all three years.

Diversions

Of the 3 years, diversion rates² were the highest in 2016 for all Circuits. Diversion rates for 2017 for all Circuits showed a noticeable decrease from 2015 and 2016. The Third Circuit reported substantially higher diversion rates compared to other Circuits for all three years. Overall, all four Circuits showed the largest percentage of diversions for status offenses with the First, Second, and Fifth Circuits consistently

¹ Percentages are calculated by dividing the number of type of offense by the total number of incidents within a phase by Circuit (For example: SO/Total # of arrests for each Circuit).

² Rates for each phase and Circuit was calculated using the general population of youth ages between 10 and 17 years for the State of Hawaii and for each County taken from the American Community Survey (ACS) (See Appendix 2). ACS 2015 population data was used to calculate rates for 2015. ACS 2016 data was used to calculate rates for both 2016 and 2017. Formula: Rate = # of incidence/Total 10-17 year old youth population for Hawaii State and then for each Circuit X 1000.

³ Proportion in the population for selected ethnic/racial group was taken from the 2010 census to check for overrepresentation. See appendix 1 for population information for the State and for each County.

showing over 90% of SO cases in diversion across the three years. The Third Circuit however showed percentages in the 70s and low 80s. The First Circuit showed property offenses as the second highest in diversion across all three years. Property, other, and drug types of offenses had the second highest depending on the year for Second and Third Circuits. The percentage of diversions for Hawaiians and African Americans were higher than their proportion in the population for the First and Third Circuits respectively.

Petitions

Petition rates for the First Circuit were noticeably lower across the three years compared to the other three Circuits. The highest type of offense in petition for the Third Circuit was status offense for two (2016 and 2017) of the three years. In 2017, almost 50% of petitions in the Third Circuit was for status offenses. The Second Circuit also showed status offenses to have the highest percentage of petitions for years 2015 and 2017. The other offense category was the highest in the petition phase for the First and Fifth Circuits for all three years.

More males were formally handled in the system compared to females. The Fifth and First Circuits showed the largest gender difference across the three years. The differences ranged from 36% to 48%. Hawaiian youth continue to be overrepresented in petition for all Circuits except the Third Circuit across the three years.

Detentions

Detention rates were highest for the First Circuit and surpassed the State rates for all three years. This is to be expected as detention facilities are on Oahu. Other offense type accounted for over 60% in detention for all three years across all four Circuits. Age range from 15-17 years old accounted for more than 80% of detentions. A marked difference in the percentages of males and females in detention across the three years with the First Circuit showing over 50% difference for all three years. Disproportionately represented in detention are Hawaiian youth relative to their population proportion for all three years and across all Circuits.

Adjudications

Status and property offenses have consistently remained the top two highest offense types in adjudication for all three years according to the Statewide data. A similar pattern was shown with the First Circuit across the years and the Second Circuit for the latter two years. Additionally, the Third Circuit's top two offense categories for the three years in adjudication were status offense and other. Adjudications for the Fifth Circuit showed the highest percentage for other offense category followed by property and person no contact offenses depending on the year. More than 80% of adjudications were from youth ages 14 or older with 16 and 17 years old accounting for the largest percentages for all Circuits across the three years. Hawaiians made up the largest percentage of adjudications for each Circuit for all three years except for the Third. However, only the First Circuit showed an overrepresentation of Hawaiian youth in adjudication based on the 2010 census data of youth population.

Probations

The probation rates varied within each Circuit for the three-year period. The First Circuit showed the least variation while the Second and Third Circuits showed the most. For example, the probation rates for the Second Circuit in 2017 was five times higher than the 2015 rate. On the contrary, probation rates for the Third Circuit decreased by a half from 2015 to 2017. Notably, rates for the Fifth Circuit for all three years more than doubled that of the State probation rates. Statewide, property offenses had the highest percentage in 2017(30.7%) and tied with person offenses in 2016 (25.8%) but not 2015, where other type of offenses had the highest (33.8%). Only the Second Circuit had status offense as the fourth highest in probation for 2017. The mode age in probation is 16 or 17 years old Statewide and the Third Circuit depending on the year. Over 80% of all probation cases were youth ages 14 and older. Overrepresentation of Hawaiians in the system on a Statewide level and specifically in the First, Second, and Fifth Circuits in probation was substantial with the Fifth Circuit showing the highest levels. All of the Circuits, particularly the Third Circuit showed a large percentage of unknown ethnicity for years 2015 and 2016. By 2017 all Circuits with the exception of the First Circuit had no unknown ethnicity.

HYCF

The rate of HYCF mandates for the State of Hawaii was .5 per 1000 youth in 2015 and 2016 and declined in 2017 (.3 per 1000 youth). The top two offense categories were other and property which accounted for more than 50% followed by person offenses. Age range for 2015 and 2016 in HYCF was from 14 to 17 years old with 17 years old being the highest. In 2017, 5.6% (n=2) of youth were age 13 in HYCF. Hawaiians were grossly overrepresented in HYCF for all three years. Samoans were also noticeably disproportionate in 2016 and while the percentage decreased in 2017, they were still overrepresented.

Waivers and transfers

Eleven cases were waived to adult court within the 2015-2017 period. All of the waived cases were males ranging in age from 16 to 17 years old in 2015 and then age 17 in the last two years. Ethnicity of youth whose cases were waived or transferred to adult court were Hawaiian, Samoan and Filipino and mix Pacific Islander in different years.

Gender, Age, and Race and Ethnicity

At all points in the system males had the largest percentage in all phases. Gender differences were noticed in all phases of the system with the earlier stages (arrest, referral, and diversion) showing smaller gender differences. The latter stages (petition, detention, adjudication, HYCF) showed substantially larger differences between males and females. Ages 14 to 17 years old accounted for nearly 80% or more of youth in all phases of the juvenile justice system with the exception of cases waived who were either 16 and/ or 17 years old youths. Older age groups, generally age 16 and 17 years old, also have the highest rates in the system for juveniles, beginning with arrests and establishing a trend that is consistent along decision

points. With arrest being the first point of contact with the Juvenile Justice system in 2017, Caucasians were overrepresented Statewide relative to their proportion in the population but were not disproportionately represented in any subsequent phase of the juvenile system. Hawaiians on the other hand were not overrepresented in arrests given their proportion in the population but were overrepresented in subsequent points of contact in the juvenile justice system with HYCF showing the greatest disparity. Filipinos were slightly overrepresented in arrests but only for the Fifth Circuit. A disproportionate number of African Americans showed in arrests only, and Samoans in latter stages of the system.

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 Circuit, 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 years 2015, 2016, and 2017 were received through portable CD-ROM. In the portable CD-ROM, there were 10 SPSS data files, 5 excel codes documents, and 1 referral table instructions word document. The SPSS files included: Arrests, Referrals, Detentions, Probations, and HYCF for fiscal years 2015, 2016 and 2017. The excel files were codebooks that accompanied their respective datasets (arrests, referrals, detentions, probations) which contains information such as charges, charge description, Circuit, etc. The referral table word document explained the inclusion of the other phases (diversion, petition, adjudication, waivers) in the referral datasets and their respective codes that were entered under the disposition variable. The datasets provided allowed the researchers to examine each unique decision point of the juvenile justice system, from arrest to waiver. The datasets included information on a juvenile's demographic data, such as date of birth, gender and ethnicity. Each individual was assigned a unique scrambled ID by the JJIS.

Each of the SPSS datasets 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.
- The original ethnicity variable was recoded according to the categories specified by OYS. The original ethnicity variable included 43 different ethnicities which were collapsed and recoded into 15 ethnic categories which includes: 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. 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)
- Circuit (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)
- Original five variables for the juvenile's ethnicity

For the Fifth Circuit, only partial arrest data was received by JJIS for 2017 and was included in the analysis.

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, the Third Circuit 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

circuits, 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 2 (felonies)	Other drug violations
Detrimental drugs 1 (felonies)	Detrimental drugs (misdemeanors)	
Harmful drugs	Alcohol (includes prohibitions)	

Person No Contact Offenses (Person NC):

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

Property Offenses:

Burglary	Computer/credit card fraud	Other property
Motor vehicle theft	Larceny-theft 3 or 4	
Larceny-theft 1 or 2	Trespass	

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 transpire 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 Circuit differences that exist across the State of Hawaii. These differences in procedure can account for mild discrepancies in data analyses.

Third Circuit Arrests and Referrals

Occasionally in the Third 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 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 the Third 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, 2016 (end of fiscal year 2016) and not be referred until July 2,

2016 (beginning of fiscal year 2017). 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 overrepresentation in Hawaii's juvenile and adult justice systems. This method inevitably contributes to Hawaiians' overrepresentation.

RESULTS: Analysis of FY2015 to 2017

Arrests

In 2015, arrests for the State of Hawaii totaled 9,715 and the arrest rate per 1,000 youth was 74.4² (Table 1-1a). The total number of arrests in 2016 increased to 10,515 and the arrest rate was 81.3 and then decreased in 2017 for a total number of arrests of 7,613 (arrest rate: 58.8). For the year 2017, the Fifth Circuit had data only from July 1st, 2016 to December 7th, 2016; hence, only 376 arrests were reported. Thus, arrest rate for the Fifth Circuit for 2017 was not calculated. The arrest rates for the First, Second, and Third Circuits varied during the three-year period. This is also the case for the Fifth Circuit in years 2015 and 2017. Compared to the First and Third Circuits, the Second Circuit in general had the highest arrest rate across the three years. However, in 2016, the arrest rate for the Fifth Circuit almost tripled that of the Second Circuit. For all three years, the First Circuit had the lowest arrest rates (2015, 56.8; 2016, 59.9; 2017, 45.6) compared to other Circuits.

Type of Offense

Status offenses was the highest category of offense in arrests for the State of Hawaii (54%) in 2015. This resonated across the four Circuits which all showed high percentages for status offenses. Status offenses for all three years for the State as well as the individual Circuits made up almost 50% or more, depending on the Circuit, of all arrests except for the Second Circuit. For all three years, the First and Third Circuits consistently showed property offenses as the second highest reason for arrest (See Table 1-1a). The Fifth Circuit, on the other hand, showed drug type of offense as the second highest across all three years. Drug and other types of offenses were either second or third highest in arrest percentages for the Second Circuit depending on the year.

A closer examination of the data by type of offense showed that in 2017, 47%⁴ of all arrests for drug type of offenses and 48%⁴ of all other type of offenses in the State were from the Second Circuit. Within the Second Circuit, drug offenses ranked second in type of arrests made in 2017 and third in both 2015 and 2016. The Third Circuit showed drug offenses to be the third highest reason for arrests in all three years (7.7% in 2015; 8.5% in 2016; and 10.1% in 2017). In the Fifth Circuit, drug type of offenses ranked second in years 2015 and 2016, and also in 2017 with only part of the reported data. Property type of offense was second highest Statewide, accounting for about one sixth (in 2015) to one seventh (in 2016 and 2017) of all arrests across the three years. The First Circuit had the highest proportions (over 60%⁴) of arrests for property type of offenses across the three years.

In summary, status offenses have consistently remained the highest offense type in arrests for all three years for all four Circuits. The First and Third Circuits had property offenses as the second highest in arrests across the three years. The Fifth

⁴ Type of offense # of incidents by Circuit/ TTL # of incident of same type of offense for the State

Circuit showed drug offenses as the second highest across the three years. The Second Circuit showed to have the largest percentage of arrests for other type of offenses⁴ consistently for all three years compared to the other neighboring Circuits.

Gender

Consistently throughout the three years, males were arrested more than females. As shown in the Statewide data, difference in percentage between male and female arrests ranged from 20.1% in 2015 to 22.3% in 2017. The same pattern was observed for all individual Circuits, except for the Fifth Circuit for year 2016, where the difference was only 5% between males and females.

Age

As shown in Tables 1-1b, 1-2b, and 1-3b, a progressive increase was shown in arrests as age increases from 10 to 17 years old. Furthermore, Statewide and the individual Circuit data showed that the 14-17 years old accounted 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 Circuit.

Race/Ethnicity

Across all three years, Hawaiians were the group with the largest arrest percentage (around 28%) Statewide, except for 2016, where persons of unknown race accounted for a noticeable 38.2%. Caucasians (ranged 12.0% to 22.8%) were the second largest group, and Filipinos followed as the third largest group (ranged from 10.5% to 16.8%).

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 a particular year. For example, according to the census data, among youth ages 10-17, Caucasians constituted 14% Statewide, 12% in the First Circuit, 20% in the Second Circuit, 19% in the Third Circuit, and 20% in the Fifth Circuit. For both year 2015 and 2016, there was no overrepresentation of Caucasians in the system of arrest cases (16.6% and 12.0% respectively) both Statewide and by Circuit. In 2017, however, they were overrepresented both Statewide (22.8%) and across individual Circuit (First Circuit: 18.9%; Second Circuit: 26.7%; and Third Circuit: 29.0%) except for the Fifth Circuit (22.2%), where data was only available for half of the year.

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 the Third Circuit having the highest percentage of 45%. No overrepresentation was seen among Hawaiians/Part Hawaiians among all arrests Statewide (about 26%). In each of the four Circuits, percentages of all arrests for Hawaiians/Part Hawaiians were lower than their percentages in the youth population across the three years.

Filipino youth constituted about 15% of the total 10-17 years old youth population Statewide, 15% in the First Circuit, 19% in the Second Circuit, 8% in the Third Circuit, and 17% in the Fifth Circuit. Compared to the 2010 youth population census data, the arrests percentages did not show an overrepresentation of Filipinos Statewide, or the First, Second, and Third Circuits. These Circuits showed a percentage of total arrests from the Filipino ethnic group to be lower than their population proportion. However, in the Fifth Circuit, Filipinos were overrepresented in the system as shown by the higher percentage of arrests (22%) compared to their population proportion of 17%.

African Americans constituted about 1.5% of the total youth population Statewide, 1.9% in the First Circuit, 0.4% in the Second Circuit, 0.5% in the Third Circuit and, 0.4% in the Fifth Circuit. Percentage of all arrests who were African Americans constituted less than 2% Statewide in 2015 and 2016. In 2017, African Americans constituted 3% of all arrests and data showed a slight overrepresentation of African Americans in the system in 2017 both Statewide and across all four Circuits (First Circuit: 4.6%; Second Circuit: 1.6%, Third Circuit: 2.5%; Fifth Circuit: 1.2%).

Samoan, alone or in combination, constituted 5% of the youth population Statewide, 6% in the First Circuit, 2% in the Second Circuit, 2% in the Third Circuit, and 1% in the Fifth Circuit. No overrepresentation was seen of Samoans in the system, either Statewide or in each of the four Circuits across the three years in arrests.

Table 1-1a Arrest rates by type of offense and Circuit for 2015 (duplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Total arrests	9,715	5,036	2,259	1,495	925
<i>Arrest rate</i> ²	74.7	56.8	140.7	81.1	134.7
Type of Offense					
<i>Person</i>	718 (7.4%)	389 (7.7%)	198 (8.8%)	63 (4.2%)	68 (7.3%)
<i>Drug</i>	789 (8.1%)	269(5.3%)	250(11.1%)	115(7.7%)	155(16.8%)
<i>Sex</i>	122(1.3%)	78 (1.5%)	29(1.3%)	13(0.9%)	2(0.2%)
<i>Person NC</i>	589 (6.0%)	263(5.2%)	228(10.0%)	22 (1.5%)	76(8.2%)
<i>Property</i>	1544(15.9%)	1021 (20.3%)	249(11.0%)	186(12.4%)	88(9.5%)
<i>Status</i>	5252(54.1%)	2807(55.7%)	966(42.8%)	982(65.7%)	497(53.7%)
<i>Other</i>	701(7.2%)	209(4.1%)	339(15.0%)	114(7.6%)	39(4.2%)

Table 1-2a Arrest rates by type of offense and Circuit for 2016 (duplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Total arrests	10,515	5272	2410	1377	1456
<i>Arrest rates</i> ²	81.3	59.9	150.9	74.4	211.1
Type of Offense					
<i>Person</i>	783(7.4%)	436(8.3%)	181(7.5%)	51(3.7%)	115(7.9%)
<i>Drug</i>	1103(10.5%)	345(6.5%)	331(13.7%)	117(8.5%)	310(21.3%)
<i>Sex</i>	127(1.2%)	85(1.6%)	23(0.9%)	8(0.6%)	11(0.7%)
<i>Person NC</i>	637(6.0%)	272(5.1%)	228(9.4%)	27(1.7%)	110(7.5%)
<i>Property</i>	1510(14.3%)	972(18.4%)	320(13.3%)	140 (10.1%)	78(5.4%)
<i>Status</i>	5457(51.9%)	2832(53.7%)	975(40.5%)	931(67.6%)	719(49.4%)
<i>Other</i>	898(8.5%)	330(6.3%)	352(14.6%)	103 (7.5%)	113(7.7%)

Table 1-3a Arrest rates by type of offense and Circuit for 2017 (duplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Total arrests	7,613	4,013	2,243	981	376
<i>Arrest rates</i> ²	58.8	45.6	140.5	53.0	N/A ⁵
Type of Offense					
<i>Person</i>	565(7.4%)	348 (8.7%)	142 (6.3%)	35 (3.6%)	40 (10.6%)
<i>Drug</i>	888(11.7%)	282 (7.0%)	415 (18.5%)	99 (10.1%)	92 (24.5%)
<i>Sex</i>	127(1.7%)	108 (2.7%)	16 (0.7%)	3 (0.3%)	0 (0.00%)
<i>Person NC</i>	502(6.6%)	234(5.8%)	230(10.3%)	18(1.8%)	20 (5.3%)
<i>Property</i>	1030(13.5%)	628(15.7%)	273(12.2%)	102(10.4%)	27(7.2%)
<i>Status</i>	3786(49.7%)	2125(52.9%)	826(36.8%)	666(67.9%)	169(44.9%)
<i>Other</i>	715(9.4%)	288(7.2%)	341(15.2%)	58(5.9%)	28(7.5%)

⁵ Rate for the Fifth Circuit in 2017 was not calculated as only part of the full year data was available at the time of this analysis.

Table 1-1b Arrest counts by gender, age, ethnicity, and Circuit for 2015 (unduplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Gender					
<i>Female</i>	1,870 (38.6%)	1,016 (39.6%)	490 (37.5%)	218 (41.5%)	146 (32.7%)
<i>Male</i>	2,973 (61.4%)	1,551 (60.4%)	815 (62.4%)	307 (58.5%)	300 (67.3%)
Total	4,844 (100%)	2,568 (100%)	1,305 (100%)	525 (100%)	446 (100%)
Age					
<i>10</i>	49 (1.0%)	17 (0.6)	27 (2.0%)	2 (0.1%)	3 (0.6%)
<i>11</i>	136 (2.8%)	43 (1.7%)	73 (5.6%)	6 (1.1%)	14 (3.1%)
<i>12</i>	299 (6.2%)	128 (4.9%)	118 (9.0%)	27 (5.1%)	26 (5.8%)
<i>13</i>	504 (10.4%)	254 (9.9%)	154 (11.8%)	55 (10.5%)	41 (9.2%)
<i>14</i>	730 (15.1%)	424 (16.5%)	181 (13.9%)	74 (14.1%)	51 (11.4%)
<i>15</i>	970 (20.0%)	533 (20.8%)	227 (17.4%)	116 (22.1%)	94 (21.1%)
<i>16</i>	1,088 (22.5%)	597 (23.2%)	242 (18.5%)	137 (26.1%)	112 (25.1%)
<i>17</i>	1,068 (22.0%)	572 (22.3%)	283 (21.7%)	108 (20.6%)	105 (23.5%)
Total	4,844 (100%)	2,568 (100%)	1305 (100%)	525 (100%)	446 (100%)
Ethnicity					
<i>African American</i>	99 (2.0%)	66 (2.57%)	19 (1.5%)	11 (2.1%)	3 (0.7%)
<i>All Others</i>	177 (3.6%)	0 (0.0 %)	146 (11.2 %)	21 (4.0%)	10 (2.2%)
<i>Caucasian</i>	804 (16.6%)	235 (9.1%)	369 (28.3%)	108 (20.6%)	92 (20.6%)
<i>Chinese</i>	28(0.5%)	13 (0.5%)	10 (0.8%)	4 (0.8%)	1 (0.2%)
<i>Filipino</i>	661 (13.7%)	317 (12.3%)	194 (14.9%)	50 (9.5%)	100 (22.4%)
<i>Hawaiian</i>	1388 (27.6%)	719 (28.0%)	377(28.9%)	151(28.8%)	91(20.4%)
<i>Japanese</i>	114 (2.35%)	53 (2.0%)	26 (2.0%)	13 (2.5%)	22 (4.9%)
<i>Korean</i>	16 (0.3%)	14 (0.5%)	2 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Latino/Hispanic</i>	78 (1.6%)	28 (1.1%)	9 (0.7%)	24 (4.6%)	17 (3.8%)
<i>Mixed Race</i>	157 (3.2%)	151 (5.9%)	6 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Native American</i>	9 (0.2%)	4 (0.2%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (0.9%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Other Asian/Mixed Asian</i>	63 (1.3%)	57 (2.2%)	6 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0(0.0%)
<i>Other Pacific Islander (PI) /Mixed PI</i>	376 (7.8%)	281 (10.9%)	31 (2.4%)	30 (5.7%)	34 (7.6%)
<i>Samoan</i>	184 (3.8%)	165 (6.4%)	7 (0.5%)	6 (1.1%)	6 (1.3%)
<i>Unknown</i>	740 (15.3%)	465 (18.1%)	103 (7.9%)	102 (19.4%)	70 (15.7%)
Total	4,844 (100%)	2,568 (100%)	1,305 (100%)	525 (100%)	446 (100%)

Table 1-2b Arrest counts by gender, age, ethnicity, and Circuit for 2016 (unduplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Gender					
<i>Female</i>	1,890 (39.3%)	952 (39.9%)	463 (34.6%)	176 (38.9%)	299 (47.2%)
<i>Male</i>	2,910 (60.6%)	1427 (59.9%)	875 (65.4%)	276 (61.0%)	332 (52.5%)
Total	4,804 (100%)	2,381 (100%)	1,338 (100%)	452 (100%)	633 (100%)
Age					
10	68 (1.4%)	22 (0.9%)	35 (2.6%)	4 (0.9%)	7 (1.1%)
11	157 (3.2%)	55 (2.3%)	71 (5.3%)	10 (2.2%)	21 (3.3%)
12	313 (6.52%)	129 (5.4%)	134 (10.0%)	21 (4.6%)	29 (4.6%)
13	515 (10.7%)	243 (10.2%)	184 (13.7%)	43 (9.5%)	45 (7.1%)
14	763 (15.9%)	385 (16.1%)	186 (13.9%)	63 (13.9%)	129 (20.4%)
15	931 (19.4%)	491 (20.6%)	244 (18.2%)	95 (21.0%)	101 (15.9%)
16	1,016 (21.1%)	521 (21.9%)	237 (17.7%)	108 (23.9%)	150 (23.7%)
17	1,041 (21.7%)	535 (22.5%)	247 (18.4%)	108 (23.9%)	151 (23.8%)
Total	4,804 (100%)	2,381 (100%)	1,338 (100%)	452 (100%)	633 (100%)
Ethnicity					
<i>African American</i>	69 (1.4%)	47(1.9%)	14 (1.0%)	5 (1.1%)	3 (0.5%)
<i>All Others</i>	139 (2.9%)	0 (0.00%)	121 (9.0%)	1 (0.2%)	17 (2.7%)
<i>Caucasian</i>	578 (12.0%)	173 (7.3%)	249 (18.6%)	76 (16.8%)	80 (12.6%)
<i>Chinese</i>	17 (0.3%)	12 (0.5%)	2 (0.1%)	2 (0.4%)	1 (0.2)
<i>Filipino</i>	504 (10.5%)	191 (8.0%)	141 (10.5%)	30 (6.6%)	142 (22.4%)
<i>Hawaiian</i>	933 (19.4%)	501 (21.0%)	222 (16.6%)	114 (25.2%)	96 (15.2%)
<i>Japanese</i>	91 (1.9%)	35 (1.5%)	26 (1.9%)	12 (2.6%)	18 (2.8%)
<i>Korean</i>	18 (0.4%)	15 (0.6%)	2 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.2%)
<i>Latino/Hispanic</i>	35 (0.7%)	15 (0.6%)	8 (0.6%)	6 (1.3%)	6 (0.9%)
<i>Mixed Race</i>	100 (2.1%)	98 (4.1%)	2 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Native American</i>	1 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.2%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Other Asian/Mixed Asian</i>	37 (0.7%)	37 (1.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Other Pacific Islander (PI) /Mixed PI</i>	337 (7.0%)	277 (11.6%)	26 (1.9%)	21 (4.6%)	13 (2.0%)
<i>Samoan</i>	110 (2.3%)	98 (4.1%)	8 (0.6%)	4 (0.9%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Unknown</i>	1,835 (38.2%)	882 (37.0%)	517 (38.6%)	180 (39.8%)	256 (40.4%)
Total	4,804 (100%)	2,381 (100%)	1,338 (100%)	452 (100%)	633 (100%)

Table 1-3b Arrest counts by gender, age, ethnicity and Circuit for 2017 (unduplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Gender					
<i>Female</i>	1,487 (38.8%)	749 (39.8%)	476 (36.9%)	158 (39.1%)	104 (41.3%)
<i>Male</i>	2,341 (61.1%)	1,134 (60.2%)	813 (63.1%)	246 (60.9%)	148 (58.7%)
Total	3,828 (100%)	1,883 (100%)	1,289 (100%)	404 (100%)	252 (100%)
Age					
10	47(1.2%)	13 (0.7%)	28 (2.2%)	5 (1.2%)	1 (0.4%)
11	102 (2.6%)	33 (1.7%)	59 (4.8%)	6 (1.5%)	4 (1.6%)
12	274 (7.1%)	94 (4.9%)	138 (10.7%)	21 (5.2%)	21 (8.3%)
13	439 (11.5%)	191 (10.1%)	189 (14.6%)	46 (11.4%)	13 (5.1%)
14	588 (15.3%)	288 (15.3%)	201(15.6%)	59 (14.6%)	40 (15.9%)
15	754 (19.7%)	405 (21.5%)	211 (16.3%)	76 (18.8%)	62 (24.6%)
16	851 (22.2%)	455 (24.1%)	232 (17.9%)	109 (26.9%)	5 (21.8%)
17	774 (20.2%)	404 (21.4%)	232 (17.9%)	82 (20.3%)	56 (22.2%)
Total	3,829 (100%)	1,883 (100%)	1,290 (100%)	404 (100%)	252 (100%)
Ethnicity					
<i>African American</i>	120 (3.1%)	86 (4.6%)	21 (1.6%)	10 (2.5%)	3 (1.2%)
<i>All Others</i>	428 (11.2%)	247 (13.1%)	146 (11.3%)	10 (2.5%)	25 (9.9%)
<i>Caucasian</i>	874 (22.8%)	356 (18.9%)	345 (26.7%)	117 (28.9%)	56 (22.2%)
<i>Chinese</i>	59 (1.5%)	55 (2.9%)	4 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Filipino</i>	644 (16.8%)	300 (15.9%)	221 (17.1%)	40 (9.9%)	83 (32.9%)
<i>Hawaiian</i>	1,108 (28.9%)	454 (24.1%)	447 (34.6%)	161 (39.8%)	46 (18.2%)
<i>Japanese</i>	125 (3.2%)	67 (3.5%)	34 (2.6%)	14 (3.5%)	10 (3.9%)
<i>Korean</i>	15 (0.4%)	12 (0.6%)	3 (0.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Latino/Hispanic</i>	75 (1.9%)	63 (3.3%)	4 (0.3%)	7 (1.7%)	1 (0.4%)
<i>Mixed Race</i>	31 (0.8%)	29 (1.5%)	2 (0.1)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Native American</i>	6 (0.1%)	4 (0.2%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Other Asian/Mixed Asian</i>	17 (0.4%)	15 (0.8%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Other Pacific Islander (PI) /Mixed PI</i>	153 (4.0%)	77 (4.1%)	38 (2.9%)	33 (8.2%)	5 (1.9%)
<i>Samoan</i>	120 (3.1%)	109 (5.8%)	4 (0.3%)	7 (1.7%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Unknown</i>	54 (1.4%)	9 (0.5%)	21 (1.6%)	1 (0.2%)	23 (9.1%)
Total	3,829 (100%)	1,883 (100%)	1,290 (100%)	404 (100%)	252 (100%)

Referrals

The referral rate for the State of Hawaii per 1000 youth was 56.3 per 1000 youth in 2015 and 55.4 in 2016 (Table 2-1a). There was a decrease in 2017 (47.5) (Table 2-2a and 2-3a). The Third Circuit had the highest referral rate for 2015 (106.4) and the Fifth Circuit in 2016 (124.2). In 2017 the referrals for the Third and Fifth Circuits were very similar (86.3 and 86.6 respectively). Additionally, these Circuits had over twice the rate of referrals compared to the First Circuit for all three years. Referral rates for the First Circuit remained the lowest of all Circuits during the three years (39.6 for 2015, 39.1 for 2016 and 31.7 for 2017).

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 with the First Circuit (63.3% in 2016, and 64.9% in 2017) and Fifth Circuit showing the highest percentages (62% in 2015; 60% in 2017). Property type of offenses ranked third Statewide and across the four Circuits followed by other type of offenses. Drug offenses ranked fourth Statewide and in the Second and Third Circuits. In the First and Fifth Circuits, drug offense ranked lower than person type, or person no contact type of offenses in referrals.

Overall, all four Circuits showed that the largest percentage of their referrals were status offenses. The First Circuit had the largest percentage and consistently showed status offenses accounting for over 60% of all their referrals, except in 2015 (58.1%). Several types of offenses show larger percentages in the Second, Third, and Fifth Circuits as compared to the First Circuit. Such offenses include drug for the Third Circuit across all three years (Third Circuit: 40.8%, 43.2%, 43.0% respectively vs. First Circuit: 22.9%, 24.5%, and 13.7%) and the Second Circuit in 2015 (30.5%) and 2017 (37.9%).

Gender

Males were consistently higher in referrals compared to females for all Circuits across all years (Tables 2-1b, 2-2b, 2-3b). In 2015, the largest difference was seen in the Fifth Circuit, where difference between boys and girls was as large as 38%. In both 2016 and 2017, the largest difference between boys and girls (36% and 26% respectively) was seen in the Second Circuit.

Age

Over 60% of all referrals for the State of Hawaii consisted of youth within the age of 15 to 17 years old throughout the three years; a pattern that is also reflected in the arrests proportions for each Circuit (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 Circuit (about 15%). As shown in the following tables, the jump in referrals from age 13 to 14 is quite substantial for each Circuit 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 the First and Third Circuits, accounting for over a third of total referrals. The Unknown category was the second highest Statewide and the highest for both the Third and Fifth Circuits. The top five ethnicity groups in referral Statewide and across all Circuits were: Hawaiian or Unknown, Caucasian, Other Pacific Islander/ Mixed Pacific Islander or Filipino, and Mixed Race group.

It is important to note that Statewide, the Third and Fifth Circuits' 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 the Third and Fifth Circuits and the second largest group in referrals Statewide. It accounted for more than a third Statewide including the Third and Fifth Circuits, except for year 2017. This warrants further attention 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.

When comparing referral rates to their respective ethnic proportion in the youth population based on the 2010 census data³, the only group which showed a slight overrepresentation was Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian youth in the First Circuit across those three years (about 36% in all referrals vs. 29.5% in population). No overrepresentation was seen in Samoans/Part Samoans, Whites, Filipinos, or African Americans across the three years either Statewide or in each of the four Circuits.

Table 2-1a Referral rates by type of offense and Circuit for 2015 (duplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Total referrals	7,316	3,512	1,131	1,961	712
<i>Referral rates</i> ²	56.3	39.6	70.5	106.4	103.7
Type of Offense					
<i>Person</i>	419 (5.7%)	236 (6.7%)	53 (4.7%)	105 (5.4%)	25 (3.5%)
<i>Drug</i>	446 (6.1%)	102 (2.9%)	136 (12.0%)	182 (9.3%)	26 (3.7%)
<i>Sex</i>	85 (1.2%)	27 (0.78%)	22 (2.0%)	22 (1.1%)	14(2.0%)
<i>Person NC</i>	339 (4.6%)	157 (4.5%)	59 (5.2%)	90 (4.6%)	33 (4.6%)
<i>Property</i>	864 (11.8%)	428 (12.2%)	135(11.9%)	253 (12.9%)	48 (6.7%)
<i>Status</i>	4119 (56.3%)	2040 (58.1%)	591 (52.3%)	1047 (53.4%)	441 (61.9%)
<i>Other</i>	1044 (14.3%)	522 (14.9%)	135 (11.9%)	262 (13.4%)	125 (17.6%)

Table 2-2a Referral rates by type of offense and Circuit for 2016 (duplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Total referrals	7,172	3,445	1,128	1,742	857
<i>Referral rates</i> ²	55.4	39.1	70.6	94.0	124.2
Type of Offense					
<i>Person</i>	431 (6.0%)	204 (5.9%)	51 (4.5%)	88 (5.1%)	88 (10.3%)
<i>Drug</i>	417 (5.81%)	102 (3.0%)	93 (8.2%)	180 (10.3%)	42 (4.9%)
<i>Sex</i>	46 (0.6%)	21 (1.0%)	7 (0.6%)	12 (0.7%)	6 (0.7%)
<i>Person NC</i>	320 (4.5%)	127 (3.7%)	48 (4.3%)	79 (4.5%)	66 (7.7%)
<i>Property</i>	884 (12.3%)	402 (11.7%)	220 (19.5%)	212 (12.2%)	50 (5.8%)
<i>Status</i>	4095 (57.1%)	2180 (63.3%)	546 (48.4%)	913 (52.4%)	456 (53.2%)
<i>Other</i>	979 (13.7%)	409 (11.9%)	163 (14.5%)	258 (14.8%)	149 (17.4%)

Table 2-3a Referrals rates by type of offense and Circuit for 2017 (duplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Total referrals	6,142	2,791	1,154	1,602	595
<i>Referral rates</i> ²	47.5	31.7	72.3	86.6	86.3
Type of Offenses					
<i>Person</i>	319 (5.2%)	138 (4.9%)	49 (4.3%)	72 (4.5%)	60 (10.0%)
<i>Drug</i>	372 (6.0%)	51 (1.8%)	141 (12.2%)	160 (9.9%)	20 (3.4%)
<i>Sex</i>	66 (1.07%)	31 (1.1%)	4 (0.4%)	23 (1.4%)	8 (1.34%)
<i>Person NC</i>	216 (3.5%)	79 (2.8%)	51 (4.4%)	51 (3.2%)	35 (5.9%)
<i>Property</i>	678 (11.0%)	315 (11.3%)	178 (15.4%)	161 (10.1%)	24 (4.0%)
<i>Status</i>	3668 (59.7%)	1810 (64.9%)	541 (46.9%)	959 (59.9%)	358 (60.2%)
<i>Other</i>	823 (13.4%)	367 (13.2%)	190 (16.5%)	176 (11.0%)	90 (15.1%)

Table 2-1b Referral counts by gender, age, ethnicity, and Circuit for 2015 (unduplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Gender					
<i>Female</i>	1,225 (40.3%)	612 (42.2%)	180 (35.1%)	360 (42.7%)	73 (30.9%)
<i>Male</i>	1,815 (59.7%)	838 (57.8%)	332(64.8%)	482 (57.2%)	163 (69.1%)
Total	3,040 (100%)	1,450 (100%)	512 (100%)	842 (100%)	236 (100%)
Age					
10	28 (0.9%)	6 (0.4%)	4 (0.8%)	16 (1.9%)	2 (0.8%)
11	50 (1.6%)	17 (1.2%)	9 (1.7%)	18 (2.1%)	6 (2.5%)
12	146 (4.8%)	55 (3.8%)	23 (4.5%)	58 (6.9%)	10 (4.2%)
13	288 (9.5%)	121 (8.3%)	52 (10.1%)	103 (12.2%)	12 (5.1%)
14	438 (14.4%)	228 (15.7%)	69 (13.5%)	121 (14.4%)	20 (8.5%)
15	630 (20.7%)	312 (21.5%)	109 (21.3%)	172 (20.4%)	37 (15.7%)
16	723 (23.8%)	364 (25.1%)	110 (21.5%)	188 (22.3%)	61 (25.8%)
17	737 (24.2%)	347 (23.9%)	136 (26.5%)	166 (19.7%)	88 (37.3%)
Total	3,040 (100%)	1,450 (100%)	512 (100%)	842 (100%)	236 (100%)
Ethnicity					
<i>African American</i>	43 (1.4%)	26 (1.8%)	5 (0.9%)	11 (1.3%)	1 (0.4%)
<i>Caucasian</i>	274 (9.0%)	81 (5.6%)	73 (14.2%)	103 (12.2%)	17 (7.2%)
<i>Chinese</i>	3 (0.1%)	3 (0.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Filipino</i>	213 (7.0%)	117 (8.1%)	38 (7.4%)	43 (5.1%)	15 (6.3%)
<i>Hawaiian</i>	997 (32.8%)	528 (36.4%)	178 (34.8%)	207 (24.6%)	84 (35.6%)
<i>Japanese</i>	45 (1.4%)	23 (1.6%)	5 (0.9%)	14 (1.6%)	3 (1.3%)
<i>Korean</i>	6 (0.2%)	6 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Latino/Hispanic</i>	52 (1.7%)	21 (1.4%)	10 (1.9%)	19 (2.2%)	2 (0.8%)
<i>Mixed Race</i>	210 (6.9%)	144 (9.9%)	34 (6.6%)	14 (1.6%)	18 (7.6%)
<i>Native American</i>	5 (0.1%)	1 (0.1%)	1 (0.2%)	3 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Other Asian/Mixed</i>					
<i>Asian</i>	31 (1.0%)	285 (1.9%)	2 (0.4%)	1 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Other Pacific Islander (PI)/Mixed PI</i>	248 (8.1%)	176 (12.1%)	24 (4.7%)	42 (4.9%)	6 (2.5%)
<i>Samoan</i>	55 (1.8%)	50 (3.4%)	1 (0.2%)	4 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Unknown</i>	858 (28.2%)	246 (16.9%)	141 (27.5%)	381 (45.2%)	90 (38.1)
Total	3,040 (100%)	1,450 (100%)	512 (100%)	842 (100%)	236 (100%)

Table 2-2b Referral counts by gender, age, ethnicity, and Circuit for 2016 (unduplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Gender					
<i>Female</i>	1,160 (41.0%)	634 (44.9%)	132 (32.0%)	303 (40.3%)	91 (35.8%)
<i>Male</i>	1,669 (59.0%)	777 (55.1%)	280 (67.9%)	449 (59.7%)	163 (64.2%)
Total	2,829 (100%)	1,411 (100%)	412 (100%)	752 (100%)	254 (100%)
Age					
10	26 (0.9%)	5 (0.3%)	4 (0.9%)	15 (1.9%)	2 (0.8%)
11	64 (2.2%)	20 (1.4%)	12 (2.9%)	23 (3.0%)	9 (3.5%)
12	162 (5.7%)	75 (5.3%)	32 (7.8%)	45 (5.9%)	10 (3.9%)
13	279 (9.8%)	142 (10.0%)	38 (9.2%)	84 (11.2%)	15 (5.9%)
14	414 (14.6%)	234 (16.6%)	50 (12.1%)	99 (13.1%)	31 (12.2%)
15	577 (20.4%)	293 (20.8%)	81 (19.6%)	151 (20.1%)	52 (20.5%)
16	663 (23.4%)	319 (22.6%)	83 (20.1%)	184 (24.5%)	77 (30.3%)
17	644 (22.7%)	323 (22.9%)	112 (27.2%)	151 (20.1%)	58 (22.8%)
Total	2,829 (100%)	1,411 (100%)	412 (100%)	752 (100%)	254 (100%)
Ethnicity					
<i>African American</i>	33 (1.2%)	27 (1.9%)	2 (0.5%)	4 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Caucasian</i>	197 (6.9%)	69 (4.9%)	50 (12.1%)	67 (8.9%)	11 (4.3%)
<i>Chinese</i>	3 (0.1%)	3 (0.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Filipino</i>	164 (5.8%)	71 (5.0%)	38 (9.2%)	37 (4.9%)	18 (7.1%)
<i>Hawaiian</i>	77 (27.5%)	423 (29.9%)	124 (30.1%)	143 (19.0%)	87 (34.2%)
<i>Japanese</i>	28 (0.9%)	14 (0.9%)	2 (0.5%)	10 (1.3%)	2 (0.8%)
<i>Korean</i>	8 (0.3%)	7 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.4%)
<i>Latino/ Hispanic</i>	38 (1.3%)	17 (1.2%)	8 (1.9%)	13 (1.7%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Mixed Race</i>	170 (6.0%)	108 (7.6%)	27 (6.5%)	12 (1.6%)	23 (9.0%)
<i>Native American</i>	1 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Other Asian/Mixed Asian</i>	25 (0.9%)	21 (1.5%)	4 (0.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Other Pacific Islander (PI)/Mixed PI</i>	277 (8.0%)	164 (11.6%)	24 (5.8%)	36 (4.8%)	3 (1.2%)
<i>Samoan</i>	55 (1.9%)	51(3.6%)	1 (0.2%)	3 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Unknown</i>	1,103 (38.9%)	436 (30.9%)	132 (32.0%)	426 (56.6%)	109 (42.9%)
Total	2,829 (100%)	1,411 (100%)	412 (100%)	752 (100%)	254 (100%)

Table 2-3b Referral counts by gender, age, ethnicity, and Circuit for 2017 (unduplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Gender					
<i>Female</i>	1,069 (41.4%)	515 (43.4%)	143 (36.7%)	315 (40.8%)	96 (40.8%)
<i>Male</i>	1,512 (58.5%)	671 (56.5%)	246 (63.2%)	457 (59.2%)	138 (58.7%)
Total	2,582 (100%)	1,186 (100%)	389 (100%)	772 (100%)	235 (100%)
Age					
10	52 (2.0%)	9 (0.7%)	6 (1.5%)	31 (4.0%)	6 (2.5%)
11	56 (2.2%)	12 (1.0%)	3 (0.7%)	37 (4.8%)	4 (1.7%)
12	170 (6.6%)	58 (4.9%)	22 (5.6%)	75 (9.7%)	15 (6.4%)
13	257 (9.9%)	118 (9.9%)	40 (10.3%)	81 (10.5%)	18 (7.6%)
14	383 (14.8%)	183 (15.4%)	49 (12.6%)	118 (15.3%)	33 (14.0%)
15	521 (20.2%)	268 (22.6%)	76 (19.5%)	133 (17.2%)	44 (18.7%)
16	625 (24.2%)	302 (25.4%)	103 (26.5%)	167 (21.6%)	53 (24.2%)
17	518 (20.0%)	236 (19.9%)	90 (23.1%)	130 (16.84%)	62 (26.4%)
Total	2,582 (100%)	1,186 (100%)	389 (100%)	772 (100%)	235 (100%)
Ethnicity					
<i>African American</i>	40(1.5%)	28 (2.3%)	2 (0.5%)	9 (1.2%)	1 (0.4%)
<i>Caucasian</i>	258 (9.9%)	80 (6.7%)	50 (12.8%)	100 (12.9%)	28 (11.9%)
<i>Chinese</i>	7 (0.3%)	6 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	13 (1.4%)	4 (1.5%)
<i>Filipino</i>	181 (7.0%)	93 (7.8%)	29 (7.4%)	30 (3.9%)	29 (12.3%)
<i>Hawaiian</i>	995 (38.5%)	520 (43.8%)	165 (42.4%)	234 (30.3%)	76 (32.3%)
<i>Japanese</i>	38 (1.5%)	16 (1.3%)	3 (0.8%)	14 (1.8%)	5 (2.1%)
<i>Korean</i>	5 (0.2%)	5 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Latino/ Hispanic</i>	41 (1.6%)	14 (1.2%)	13 (3.3%)	14 (1.8%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Mixed Race</i>	200 (7.7%)	117 (9.9%)	41 (10.5%)	20 (2.6%)	22 (9.3%)
<i>Native American</i>	4 (0.1%)	2 (0.2%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.2%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Other Asian/Mixed Asian</i>	33 (1.3%)	27 (2.3%)	3 (0.8%)	2 (0.2%)	1 (0.4%)
<i>Other Pacific Islander (PI)/Mixed PI</i>	236 (9.1%)	166 (14.0%)	31 (7.9%)	39 (5.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Samoan</i>	50 (1.9%)	42 (3.5%)	1 (0.2%)	7 (0.9%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Unknown</i>	494 (19.1%)	70 (5.9%)	51 (13.1%)	300 (38.8%)	73 (31.0%)
Total	2,582 (100%)	1,186 (100%)	389 (100%)	772 (100%)	2350 (100%)

Diversions

The Statewide diversion rate for 2015 was 24.1 per 1000 youth (Table 3-1a). Diversion rates for the First Circuit (18.4) and Second Circuit (18.8) were below the State average. Diversion rate in the Fifth Circuit (29.7) was close to the State rate while the Third Circuit (53.7) doubled that of the State diversion rate.

In 2016, a total of 3,809 cases were diverted which equals to a diversion rate of 29.4² per 1000 for the State of Hawaii, which is a slight increase from 2015 (Table 3-2a). The Third Circuit had the highest rate of diversion (58.2), followed by the Fifth Circuit (38.6), then the First Circuit (24.2). The Second Circuit had the lowest rate of diversion (21.3).

Total number of diversion cases decreased in 2017 to 2,837, resulting in a diversion rate of 21.9 per 1000 youth² (Table 3-3a). Again, The Third Circuit (18.2) diversion rate (18.2) was close to the State rate. The Second Circuit (8.8) was the lowest rate (8.8), which was less than half of the State diversion rate.

For all three years, the Third Circuit 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 87% or more of the diversion cases were of status offenses Statewide and over 90% for the First, Second, and Fifth Circuits. The Third Circuit accounted for over 70% across the three years with 2017 having the largest percentage of SO (83%) in diversion. For all three years, Statewide and the First Circuit showed property offenses as the second largest percentage in diversion. In the Second and Third Circuits, drug type of offenses had the second largest percentages within their respective Circuits.

Gender

Diversion percentages were higher for males than females both Statewide and for the Second, Third, and Fifth Circuits but the gap was smaller for the First Circuit across all three years. The data also showed the Fifth Circuit to have the largest percentage difference in all three years (33% in 2015, 20% in 2016 and 10% in 2017). The First Circuit showed a significantly lower percentage difference (7% in 2015 and 6% in 2017) compared to the other Circuits. In 2016, the difference between boys and girls in the First Circuit was less than one percent.

Age

As shown in Tables 3-1b, 3-2b, and 3-3b, a progressive increase was shown in arrests as age increases from 10 to 15 years old. Furthermore, Statewide and the individual Circuits data showed that ages 14-17 years old accounted 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 showed to have the highest percentage of

diversions varied between 16 and 17 years old depending on the year and Circuit. Age 15 is also an age worth noting, as the percentage of diversions within this age group accounts for a noticeable proportion within each Circuit. As shown in the following tables, the jump in diversion from age 14 to 15 are quite substantial as shown in the Statewide percentages (2015: 15% to 22%; 2016: 15% to 21%; 2017: 16% to 23%) and with the First and Fifth Circuits (See Tables 3-1b, 3-2b, 3-3b)..

Ethnicity

Hawaiian youth (See Tables 3-1b, 3-2b, 3-3b) was the largest group for 2015 and 2017, both Statewide and for all Circuits except for the Third Circuit, where persons of unknown race accounted for the highest percentage. The top five ethnicity groups Statewide and across all Circuits were: Hawaiian, Unknown, Caucasian, other Pacific Islander, and Filipino.

It is important to note that both the Third and Fifth Circuit data showed substantial percentage across the three years of unknown ethnicity. In particular, 2016 where the percentage of unknown in ethnicity accounted for 53% in the Third Circuit and 33% in the Fifth Circuit.

When comparing diversion percentages to their respective ethnic proportions in the youth population based on the 2010 census data³, certain ethnic groups showed overrepresentation in the system, either Statewide or in certain Circuits and either across all three years or in a particular year.

Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian ethnicity was overrepresented in the First Circuit (percentage among all diversions of 37.3% vs percentage of the youth population of 29.5%) and also slightly overrepresented Statewide (34% vs 32.8% respectively). The data for the other three Circuits did not indicate overrepresentation of Hawaiians/Part Hawaiians in diversion.

African Americans were slightly overrepresented in the Third Circuit across the three years (0.5% of the population vs 1.3% of all diversions). However, no indication of overrepresentation of African Americans showed Statewide or in the First, Second, or Fifth Circuits for all three years.

The percentages indicated no overrepresentation of Caucasians across the three years both Statewide and in each of the four Circuits. In the Fifth Circuit, the percentages of all diversions of Caucasians were below their percentage in the youth population (19.8%) in both 2015 (7%) and 2016 (5%). No overrepresentation was seen in Filipinos or Samoans/Part Samoans for diversion.

Table 3-1a Diversion rates by type of offense and Circuit for 2015 (duplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Total diversions	3,129	1635	301	989	204
<i>Diversion rates</i> ²	24.1	18.4	18.8	53.7	29.7
Type of Offense					
<i>Person</i>	24 (0.8%)	7 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)	17 (1.7%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Drug</i>	95 (3.0%)	24 (1.5%)	6 (1.9%)	65 (6.5%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Sex</i>	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Person NC</i>	28 (0.9%)	7 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)	20 (2.0%)	1 (0.9%)
<i>Property</i>	158 (5.0%)	85 (5.2%)	3 (1.0%)	70 (7.1%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Status</i>	2,738 (87.5%)	1,498 (91.6%)	289 (96.0%)	749 (75.7%)	202 (99.0%)
<i>Other</i>	86 (2.7%)	14 (0.8%)	3 (1.0%)	68 (6.8%)	1 (0.5%)

Table 3-2a Diversion rates by type of offense and Circuit for 2016 (duplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Total diversions	3,809	2,127	340	1,076	266
<i>Diversion rates</i> ²	29.4	24.2	21.3	58.2	38.6
Type of Offense					
<i>Person</i>	33 (0.9%)	8 (0.4%)	5 (1.5%)	20 (1.8%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Drug</i>	128 (3.3%)	40 (1.9%)	5 (1.5%)	82 (7.6%)	1 (0.4%)
<i>Sex</i>	3 (0.1%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (8.2%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Person NC</i>	42 (1.1%)	9 (0.4%)	3 (0.9%)	30 (2.8%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Property</i>	198 (5.2%)	108 (5.1%)	9 (2.6%)	79 (7.3%)	2 (0.7%)
<i>Status</i>	3,305 (86.8%)	1947 (91.54%)	315 (92.6%)	780 (72.5%)	263 (98.9%)
<i>Other</i>	100 (2.6%)	14 (0.6%)	3 (0.9%)	83 (7.7%)	0 (0.0%)

Table 3-3a Diversion rates by type of offense and Circuit 2017 (duplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Total diversions	2,837	1,599	141	858	239
<i>Diversion rates</i> ²	21.9	18.2	8.8	46.4	34.6
Type of Offense					
<i>Person</i>	11 (0.4%)	3 (0.2%)	2 (1.4%)	4 (0.5%)	2 (0.8%)
<i>Drug</i>	72 (2.5%)	15 (0.9%)	3 (2.1%)	53 (6.2%)	1 (0.4%)
<i>Sex</i>	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Person NC</i>	14 (0.5%)	1 (0.6%)	1 (0.7%)	9 (1.5%)	3 (1.2%)
<i>Property</i>	87 (3.7%)	43 (2.7%)	1 (0.7%)	43 (5.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Status</i>	2,602 (91.7%)	1,529 (95.6%)	130 (92.2%)	712 (82.9%)	231 (96.6%)
<i>Other</i>	51 (1.8%)	8 (0.5%)	4 (2.8%)	37 (4.3%)	2 (0.8%)

Table 3-1b Diversion counts by gender, age, ethnicity, and Circuit for 2015 (unduplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Gender					
<i>Female</i>	738 (45.7%)	423 (46.9%)	72 (40.9%)	223 (46.6%)	20 (33.3%)
<i>Male</i>	877 (54.3%)	478 (53.1%)	104 (59.1%)	255 (53.4%)	40 (66.7%)
Total	1,615 (100%)	901 (100%)	176 (100%)	478 (100%)	60 (100%)
Age					
10	11 (0.7%)	5 (0.6%)	1(0.6)	5 (1.1%)	0 (0%)
11	21 (1.3%)	12 (1.3%)	2 (1.1%)	7 (1.5%)	0 (0%)
12	73 (4.5%)	38 (4.2%)	10 (5.7%)	24 (5.2%)	1 (1.7%)
13	132 (8.2%)	69 (7.7%)	15 (8.5%)	48 (10.0%)	0 (0%)
14	251 (15.5%)	144 (16.0%)	30 (17.1%)	73 (15.3%)	4 (6.7%)
15	364 (22.5%)	192 (21.3%)	38 (21.6%)	117 (24.5%)	17 (23.8%)
16	390 (24.2%)	224 (24.9%)	37 (21.0%)	109 (22.8%)	20 (33.3%)
17	373 (23.1%)	217 (24.1%)	43 (27.4%)	95 (19.9%)	18 (30.0%)
Total	1,615 (100%)	901 (100%)	176 (100%)	478 (100%)	60 (100%)
Ethnicity					
<i>African American</i>	24 (1.5%)	12 (1.3%)	2 (1.1%)	10 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Caucasian</i>	152 (9.4%)	46 (5.1%)	33 (18.75%)	69 (14.4%)	4 (6.7%)
<i>Chinese</i>	2 (0.1%)	2 (0.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Filipino</i>	134 (8.3%)	85 (9.4%)	17 (9.6%)	31 (6.5%)	1 (1.7%)
<i>Hawaiian</i>	540 (33.4%)	327 (36.3%)	56 (31.8%)	128 (26.8%)	29 (48.3%)
<i>Japanese</i>	30 (1.8%)	15 (1.6%)	4 (2.3%)	10 (2.1%)	1 (1.7%)
<i>Korean</i>	4 (0.2%)	4 (0.44%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Latino/ Hispanic</i>	33 (2.0%)	15 (1.6%)	3 (1.7%)	15 (3.1%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Mixed Race</i>	113 (7.0%)	93 (10.3%)	6 (3.4%)	9 (1.9%)	5 (8.3%)
<i>Native American</i>	5 (0.3%)	1 (0.1%)	1 (0.6%)	3 (0.6%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Other Asian/Mixed Asian</i>	21 (1.3%)	19 (2.1%)	1 (0.6%)	1 (0.2%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Other Pacific Islander (PI)/Mixed PI</i>	137 (8.5%)	107 (11.9%)	7 (3.9%)	21 (4.4%)	2 (3.3%)
<i>Samoan</i>	29 (1.8%)	25 (2.8%)	1 (0.7%)	3 (0.6%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Unknown</i>	391 (24.2%)	150 (16.6%)	45 (25.6%)	178 (37.2%)	18 (30.0%)
Total	1,615 (100%)	901 (100%)	176 (100%)	478 (100%)	60 (100%)

Table 3-2b Diversion counts by gender, age, ethnicity, and Circuit for 2016 (unduplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Gender					
<i>Female</i>	822 (45.0%)	535 (49.6%)	65 (33.7%)	197 (40.0%)	25 (39.7%)
<i>Male</i>	1,005 (55.0%)	544 (50.4%)	128 (66.3%)	295 (60.0%)	38 (60.3%)
Total	1,827 (100%)	1,079 (100%)	193 (100%)	492 (100%)	63 (100%)
Age					
10	16(0.9%)	6 (0.6%)	4 (2.1%)	4 (0.8%)	2 (3.2%)
11	35(1.9%)	20(1.9%)	5(2.6%)	10(2.0%)	0(0%)
12	86(4.7%)	47(4.4%)	12(6.2%)	25(5.1%)	2(3.2%)
13	168(9.2%)	97(9.0%)	15(7.8%)	54(11.0%)	2(3.2%)
14	270(14.8%)	163(15.0%)	27(14.0%)	75(15.2%)	5(7.9%)
15	387(21.2%)	237(22.0%)	42(21.8%)	94(19.1%)	14(22.1%)
16	448(24.5%)	252(23.4%)	43(22.3%)	133(27.0%)	20(31.8%)
17	417(22.8%)	257(27.8%)	45(23.3%)	97(19.7%)	18(28.6%)
Total	1,827 (100%)	1,079 (100%)	193 (100%)	492 (100%)	63 (100%)
Ethnicity					
<i>African American</i>	32 (1.75%)	27 (2.5%)	1 (0.5%)	4 (0.8%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Caucasian</i>	156 (8.5%)	66 (6.1%)	29 (15.0%)	58 (11.8%)	3 (4.7%)
<i>Chinese</i>	4 (0.2%)	4 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Filipino</i>	115 (6.3%)	67 (6.2%)	22 (11.4%)	23 (4.7%)	3 (4.7%)
<i>Hawaiian</i>	536 (29.3%)	352 (32.6%)	55 (28.5%)	104 (28.5%)	25 (39.7%)
<i>Japanese</i>	21 (1.1%)	14 (1.3%)	1 (1.5%)	6 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Korean</i>	7 (0.4%)	6 (0.6%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.6%)
<i>Latino/ Hispanic</i>	28 (1.5%)	16 (1.5%)	2 (1.0%)	9 (1.8%)	1 (1.6%)
<i>Mixed Race</i>	107 (5.8%)	82 (7.6%)	13 (6.7%)	5 (1.0%)	7 (1.1%)
<i>Other Asian/Mixed Asian</i>	24 (1.3%)	18 (1.7%)	5 (2.6%)	1 (0.2%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Other Pacific Islander/Mixed PI</i>	157 (8.6%)	114 (10.6%)	21 (10.9%)	20 (4.01%)	2 (3.2%)
<i>Samoan</i>	38 (2.1%)	35 (3.2%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (0.6%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Unknown</i>	602 (32.9%)	278 (25.8%)	44 (22.8%)	259 (52.6%)	21 (33.3%)
Total	1,827 (100%)	1,079 (100%)	193 (100%)	492 (100%)	63 (100%)

Table 3-3b Diversion counts by gender, age, ethnicity, and Circuit for 2017 (unduplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Gender					
<i>Female</i>	618 (44.7%)	415 (47.0%)	28 (45.9%)	141 (39.1%)	34 (43.6%)
<i>Male</i>	764 (55.3%)	468 (53.0%)	33 (54.1%)	220 (60.9%)	43 (56.4%)
Total	1,383 (100%)	883 (100%)	61 (100%)	361 (100%)	77 (100%)*
Age					
10	11(0.8%)	7(0.8%)	0(0%)	3(0.8%)	1(1.3%)
11	18(1.3%)	11(1.3%)	0(0%)	6(1.7%)	1(1.3%)
12	55(4.0%)	37 (4.2%)	0(0%)	15(4.2%)	3(3.9%)
13	106(7.7%)	67(7.6%)	4(6.6%)	35(9.7%)	0(0%)
14	205(14.8%)	121(13.7%)	12(19.7%)	64(17.7%)	8(10.3%)
15	307(22.2%)	206(23.3%)	10(16.4%)	69(19.1%)	22(28.2%)
16	380(27.5%)	234(26.5%)	21(34.5%)	105(29.1%)	20(25.6%)
17	307(21.8%)	200(22.7%)	14(23.0%)	64(17.7%)	23(29.5%)
Total	1,383 (100%)	883 (100%)	61 (100%)	361 (100%)	77 (100%)
Ethnicity					
<i>African American</i>	30 (2.2%)	26 (2.9%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Caucasian</i>	146 (10.5%)	65 (7.3%)	12 (19.7%)	55 (15.2%)	14 (17.9%)
<i>Chinese</i>	7 (0.5%)	6 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Filipino</i>	106 (7.6%)	62 (7.0%)	7 (11.5%)	22 (6.1%)	15 (19.2%)
<i>Hawaiian</i>	555 (40.1%)	383 (43.3%)	24 (39.3%)	129 (35.7%)	19 (24.3%)
<i>Japanese</i>	28 (2.0%)	14 (1.6%)	1 (1.6%)	10 (2.8%)	3 (3.8%)
<i>Korean</i>	4 (0.3%)	4 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Latino/ Hispanic</i>	20 (1.4%)	13 (1.5%)	1 (1.6%)	6 (1.6%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Mixed Race</i>	92 (6.6%)	74 (8.3%)	6 (9.8%)	9 (2.5%)	3 (3.8%)
<i>Native American</i>	4 (0.9%)	3 (0.3%)	0 (.00%)	1 (0.3%)	0 (.00%)
<i>Other Asian/Mixed Asian</i>	20 (1.4%)	19 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Other Pacific Islander/Mixed PI</i>	122 (8.8%)	97 (10.9%)	3 (4.9%)	22 (6.1%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Samoan</i>	39 (2.8%)	34 (3.8%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (1.4%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Unknown</i>	210 (15.2%)	83 (9.4%)	7 (11.5%)	96 (26.6%)	24 (30.8%)
Total	1,383 (100%)	883 (100%)	61 (100%)	361 (100%)	78 (100%)

* Fifth Circuit had one unknown gender for year 2017.

Petition (Formally Handled)

The number of petition cases in the State totaled to 2,875 in 2015, with a petition rate of 22.1 per 1000 youth in 2015. The rates across the Circuits varied greatly (Table 4-1a, 4-2a, 4-3a). The Fifth Circuit had the highest rates in 2015 (39.6) and 2016 (49.3). In 2017, the Second Circuit had the highest rate (51.5), and the First Circuit had the lowest rate. Petition rates remained similar Statewide in 2016 (22.8) and 2017 (21.0). In the Third Circuit, petition rates also decreased across the three years from 34.5 in 2015 to 29.1 in 2016 and then to 28.7 in 2017.

Type of Offense

Statewide and in the Fifth Circuit showed other offenses to have the largest percentages in the petition phase across all three years. The Fifth Circuit followed a similar pattern for all the years with the exception of 2017 in which status and other types of offenses both had the same high percentage in petition (Table 4-3a). Property offenses followed for the First Circuit for all three years. For the Fifth Circuit, the second highest type of offense in petition for years 2016 and 2017 is person offense. The growth of person offenses from 2015 showed the percentage increase to almost tripled in 2016 and remained the second highest in 2017 (Table 4-1a, 4-2a, 4-3a). In the Second Circuit, the largest type of offense in the petition phase was status offenses for years 2015 and 2017 and second in 2016. In addition, the percentage difference between the highest type of offense in 2016 (property offenses) and status offenses was miniscule (.3%). The Third Circuit showed a large percentage of petitions for status offenses in all three years. In particular as shown in the 2017 percentages, almost 50% of petitions were for status offenses. Other type of offenses was the highest in 2015 and then moved to second highest in the latter years for the Third Circuit.

Gender

More males were formally handled than females for all three years (Tables 4-1b, 4-2b, 4-3b). The First and Fifth Circuits showed the largest gender differences across the three years. In particular, the Fifth Circuit showed differences between the genders to be 36% for all three years and in 2017, the difference was as large as 48%.

Age

Statewide percentage showed age 15 to 17 accounted for over two thirds of all petitions for all three years both Statewide and across all four Circuits (Tables 4-1b, 4-2b, 4-3b).

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 the Third Circuit for both 2016 and 2017, where the unknown ethnic group accounted for the highest percentage (Tables 4-1b, 4-2b, 4-3b). The unknown category in ethnic group had the

second largest percentage of petitions, with the majority of them from the Third Circuit (more than 40%). 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 data³, showed a slight overrepresentation of Hawaiians/Part Hawaiians in the First Circuit for 2015 and 2016 but underrepresentation for the neighboring Circuits. As a result, no overrepresentation was seen Statewide. 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.

Table 4-1a Petition rates by type of offense and Circuit for 2015 (duplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Total petitions	2,875	1,375	592	636	272
<i>Petition rates</i> ²	22.1	15.5	36.9	34.5	39.6
Type of Offense					
<i>Person</i>	327 (11.4%)	213 (15.5%)	48 (8.1%)	50 (7.8%)	16 (5.9%)
<i>Drug</i>	229 (7.9%)	50 (3.6%)	85 (14.3%)	72 (11.3%)	22 (8.1%)
<i>Sex</i>	82 (2.8%)	26 (1.9%)	22 (3.7%)	20 (3.1%)	14 (5.1%)
<i>Person NC</i>	255 (8.9%)	137 (9.9%)	46 (7.8%)	43 (6.7%)	29 (10.6%)
<i>Property</i>	554 (19.3%)	260 (18.9%)	116 (19.6%)	139 (21.8%)	39 (14.3%)
<i>Status</i>	528 (18.4%)	194 (14.1%)	154 (26.0%)	144 (22.6%)	36 (13.2%)
<i>Other</i>	900 (31.3%)	495 (36.0%)	121 (20.4%)	168 (26.4%)	116 (42.6%)

Table 4-2a Petition rates by type of offense and Circuit for 2016 (duplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Total petitions	2,954	1,346	729	539	340
<i>Petition rates</i> ²	22.8	15.3	45.6	29.1	49.3
Type of Offense					
<i>Person</i>	341 (11.5%)	206 (15.3%)	41 (5.6%)	37 (6.8%)	57 (16.7%)
<i>Drug</i>	222 (7.5%)	61 (4.5%)	70 (9.6%)	61 (11.3%)	30 (8.8%)
<i>Sex</i>	41 (1.4%)	21 (1.5%)	7 (0.9%)	8 (1.5%)	5 (1.5%)
<i>Person NC</i>	254 (8.6%)	123 (9.1%)	51 (7.0%)	34 (6.3%)	46 (13.5%)
<i>Property</i>	622 (21.0%)	279 (20.7%)	206 (28.2%)	99 (18.4%)	38 (11.2%)
<i>Status</i>	679 (22.9%)	263 (19.5%)	204 (27.9%)	162 (30.0%)	50 (14.7%)
<i>Other</i>	795 (26.9%)	393 (29.2%)	150 (20.6%)	138 (25.6%)	114 (33.5%)

Table 4-3a Petition rates by type of offense and Circuit for 2017 (duplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Total petitions	2,711	1,104	823	531	253
<i>Petition rates</i> ²	21.0	12.5	51.5	28.7	36.7
Type of Offense					
<i>Person</i>	240 (8.8%)	129 (11.6%)	45 (5.5%)	24 (4.5%)	42 (16.6%)
<i>Drug</i>	210 (7.7%)	39 (3.5%)	121 (14.7%)	34 (6.4%)	16 (6.3%)
<i>Sex</i>	59 (2.2%)	29 (2.6%)	4 (0.5%)	18 (3.4%)	8 (3.1%)
<i>Person NC</i>	171 (6.3%)	73 (6.6%)	52 (6.3%)	25 (4.7%)	21 (8.3%)
<i>Property</i>	507 (18.7%)	253 (22.9%)	169 (20.5%)	67 (12.6%)	18 (7.1%)
<i>Status</i>	814 (30.0%)	225 (20.4%)	256 (31.1%)	259 (48.8%)	74 (29.2%)
<i>Other</i>	710 (26.2%)	356 (32.2%)	176 (21.4%)	104 (19.6%)	74 (29.2%)

Table 4-1b Petition counts by gender, age and ethnicity, and Circuit for 2015 (unduplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Gender					
<i>Female</i>	434 (33.6%)	173 (33.6%)	92 (32.2%)	128 (38.2%)	41 (26.1%)
<i>Male</i>	859 (66.4%)	342 (66.4%)	194 (67.8%)	207 (61.8%)	116 (73.9%)
Total	1,293 (100%)	515 (100%)	286 (100%)	335 (100%)	157 (100%)
Age					
<i>10</i>	9 (0.7%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.4%)	6 (1.8%)	2 (1.3%)
<i>11</i>	13 (1%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.7%)	5 (1.5%)	6 (3.8%)
<i>12</i>	54 (4.2%)	15 (2.9%)	12 (4.2%)	21 (6.3%)	6 (3.8%)
<i>13</i>	107 (8.3%)	29 (5.6%)	30 (10.5%)	39 (11.6%)	9 (5.7%)
<i>14</i>	152 (0%)	62 (12%)	40 (14%)	41 (12.2%)	9 (5.7%)
<i>15</i>	269 (20.8%)	123 (23.9%)	51 (17.8%)	69 (20.6%)	26 (16.6%)
<i>16</i>	345 (26.7%)	145 (28.2%)	72 (25.2%)	90 (26.9%)	38 (24.2%)
<i>17</i>	344 (26.6%)	141 (27.4%)	78 (27.3%)	64 (19.1%)	61 (38.9%)
Total	1293 (100%)	515 (100%)	286 (100%)	335 (100%)	157 (100%)
Ethnicity					
<i>African American</i>	19 (1.5%)	11 (2.1%)	3 (1.0%)	4 (1.2%)	1 (0.6%)
<i>Caucasian</i>	109 (8.4%)	26 (5.0%)	35 (12.2%)	35 (10.4%)	13 (8.2%)
<i>Chinese</i>	1 (0.1%)	1 (0.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Filipino</i>	58 (4.5%)	21 (4.1%)	16 (5.6%)	13 (3.9%)	8 (5.1%)
<i>Hawaiian</i>	434 (33.6%)	194 (37.7%)	106 (37.1%)	80 (23.9%)	54 (34.4%)
<i>Japanese</i>	14 (1.1%)	10 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (0.9%)	1 (0.6%)
<i>Korean</i>	2 (0.1%)	2 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Latino/ Hispanic</i>	17 (1.3%)	5 (0.9%)	7 (2.4%)	5 (1.5%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Mixed Race</i>	105 (8.1%)	61 (11.8%)	24 (8.4%)	6 (1.8%)	14 (8.9%)
<i>Native American</i>	1 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Other Asian/Mixed Asian</i>	14 (1.1%)	13 (2.5%)	1 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Other Pacific Islander/Mixed PI</i>	116 (9.0%)	77 (14.9%)	11 (3.8%)	25 (7.4%)	3 (1.9%)
<i>Samoan</i>	21 (1.6%)	19 (3.7%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.6%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Unknown</i>	382 (29.5%)	75 (14.5%)	83 (29.0)	161 (48.1%)	63 (40.1%)
Total	1,293 (100%)	515 (100%)	286 (100%)	335 (100%)	157 (100%)

Table 4-2b Petition counts by gender, age, ethnicity and Circuit for 2016 (unduplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Gender					
<i>Female</i>	425 (33.6%)	177 (33.3%)	84 (30.3%)	111 (37.0%)	53 (33.5%)
<i>Male</i>	842 (66.4%)	355 (66.7%)	193 (69.7%)	189 (63.0%)	105 (66.4%)
Total	1,267 (100%)	532 (100%)	277 (100%)	300 (100%)	158 (100%)
Age					
10	10 (0.8%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.4%)	9 (3%)	0 (0%)
11	19 (1.5%)	0 (0%)	6 (2.2%)	10 (3.3%)	3 (1.9%)
12	64 (5.1%)	24 (4.5%)	16 (5.8%)	16 (5.3%)	8 (5.1%)
13	126 (9.9%)	56 (10.5%)	30 (10.8%)	28 (9.3%)	12 (7.6%)
14	164 (0%)	91 (17.1%)	30 (10.8%)	27 (9%)	16 (10.1%)
15	260 (20.5%)	101 (19%)	58 (20.9%)	67 (22.3%)	34 (21.5%)
16	301 (23.8%)	123 (23.1%)	51 (18.4%)	86 (28.7%)	41 (26%)
17	323 (25.5%)	137 (25.8%)	85 (30.7%)	57 (19%)	44 (27.9%)
Total	1267 (100%)	532 (100%)	277 (100%)	300 (100%)	158 (100%)
Ethnicity					
<i>African American</i>	6 (0.4%)	5 (0.9%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Caucasian</i>	72 (5.7%)	19 (3.6%)	30 (10.8%)	16 (5.3%)	7 (4.4%)
<i>Chinese</i>	1 (0.1%)	1 (0.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Filipino</i>	68 (5.3%)	20 (3.7%)	21 (7.6%)	17 (5.7%)	10 (6.3%)
<i>Hawaiian</i>	363 (28.6%)	159 (29.9%)	91 (32.8%)	53 (17.7%)	60 (37.9%)
<i>Japanese</i>	8 (0.6%)	3 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (1.0%)	2 (1.7%)
<i>Korean</i>	3 (0.2%)	2 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.6%)
<i>Latino/ Hispanic</i>	16 (1.2%)	3 (0.5%)	6 (2.1%)	7 (2.3%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Mixed Race</i>	90 (7.1%)	52 (9.7%)	14 (5.0%)	7 (2.3%)	17 (10.7%)
<i>Native American</i>	1 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Other Asian/Mixed Asian</i>	10 (0.9%)	8 (1.5%)	2 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Other Pacific Islander/Mixed PI</i>	119 (9.9%)	81 (15.2%)	17 (6.1%)	20 (6.7%)	1 (0.6%)
<i>Samoan</i>	29 (2.3%)	26 (4.9%)	1 (0.3%)	2 (0.6%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Unknown</i>	481 (37.9%)	153 (28.7%)	95 (34.3%)	173 (57.6%)	60 (37.9%)
Total	1,267 (100%)	532 (100%)	277 (100%)	300 (100%)	158 (100%)

Table 4-3b Petition counts by gender, age, ethnicity, and Circuit for 2017 (unduplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Gender					
<i>Female</i>	455 (36.4%)	148 (33.9%)	103 (33.4%)	149 (41.3%)	55 (37.9%)
<i>Male</i>	796 (63.6%)	289 (66.1%)	205 (66.6%)	212 (58.7%)	90 (62.1%)
Total	1251 (100%)	437 (100%)	308 (100%)	361 (100%)	145 (100%)
Age					
10	32 (2.6%)	0 (0%)	5 (1.6%)	23 (6.4%)	4 (2.8%)
11	36 (2.9%)	0 (0%)	3 (1%)	31 (8.6%)	2 (1.4%)
12	85 (6.8%)	20 (4.6%)	14 (4.6%)	42 (11.6%)	9 (6.2%)
13	119 (9.5%)	45 (10.3%)	34 (11%)	26 (7.2%)	14 (9.7%)
14	197 (0%)	81 (18.5%)	42 (13.6%)	55 (15.2%)	19 (13.1%)
15	250 (20%)	101 (23.1%)	55 (17.9%)	68 (18.8%)	26 (17.9%)
16	284 (22.7%)	105 (24%)	82 (26.6%)	65 (18%)	32 (22.1%)
17	248 (19.8%)	85 (19.5%)	73 (23.7%)	51 (14.1%)	39 (26.9%)
Total	1251 (100%)	437 (100%)	308 (100%)	361 (100%)	145 (100%)
Ethnicity					
<i>African American</i>	10 (0.1%)	4 (0.9%)	2 (0.6%)	4 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Caucasian</i>	80 (6.4%)	12 (2.7%)	30 (9.7%)	28 (7.7%)	10 (6.9%)
<i>Chinese</i>	1 (0.1%)	1 (0.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Filipino</i>	73 (5.8%)	22 (5.0%)	24 (7.8%)	11 (3.0%)	16 (11.0%)
<i>Hawaiian</i>	417 (33.3%)	167 (38.2%)	132 (42.8%)	69 (19.1%)	49 (33.8%)
<i>Japanese</i>	7 (0.5%)	2 (0.4%)	1 (0.3%)	3 (0.8%)	1 (0.7%)
<i>Korean</i>	1 (0.1%)	1 (0.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Latino/ Hispanic</i>	22 (1.7%)	2 (0.4%)	10 (3.2%)	10 (2.7%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Mixed Race</i>	106 (8.4%)	51 (11.6%)	28 (9.1%)	6 (1.6%)	21 (14.5%)
<i>Native American</i>	1 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Other Asian/Mixed Asian</i>	14 (1.1%)	12 (2.7%)	1 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.7%)
<i>Other Pacific Islander/Mixed PI</i>	132 (10.5%)	87 (19.9%)	29 (9.4%)	16 (4.4%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Samoan</i>	19 (1.5%)	16 (3.6%)	1 (0.3%)	2 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Unknown</i>	368 (29.4%)	60 (13.7%)	50 (16.2%)	211 (58.4%)	47 (32.4%)
Total	1,251 (100%)	437 (100%)	308 (100%)	361 (100%)	145 (100%)

Detention

The number of detention cases in the State totaled to 552, with a detention rate of 4.2 per 1000 youth in 2015. In 2016, the total number of detention cases in the State was 556, resulting in a rate of 4.3 per 1,000 youth. In 2017, the total number of detention cases was 417, resulting in a rate of 3.2 per 1,000 youth.

The First Circuit had over 80% of all detention across the three years. Detention rates in the First Circuit were higher than the State rate. Detention rates in the neighboring Circuits were all lower than the State rate. Detention rates were lowest in the Fifth Circuit in 2015 (1.2), and then in the Third Circuit in 2017 (.06).

Type of Offense

Statewide and all four Circuits showed percentages for other type of offenses as the highest in the detention phase across all three years (ranged 62.85% in 2015 to 78.2% in 2017 Statewide). Person or property was the second highest depending on year and Circuit (Table 5-1a, 5-2a, 5-3a). The few cases for sex or drug type of offenses were almost all in the First Circuit.

Gender

More males were formally handled than females for all three years (Tables 5-1b, 5-2b, 5-3b). The First Circuit showed the largest gender difference across the three years, with differences between the genders of over 40% for all three years.

Age

For both Statewide and across four Circuits, the data showed 16 or 17 as the modal age for all three years for having the highest percentages in detention (Tables 5-1b, 5-2b, 5-3b). Additionally, ages 15 to 17 accounted for over 80% of all detention cases across the three years.

Ethnicity

For both Statewide and across the four Circuits, Hawaiian youth had the highest percentage of detentions (around 45%) compared to other ethnic groups for all three years. Either other Pacific Islanders or Mixed Race was the second highest. The First and Third Circuits have other Pacific Islanders as the second highest while the Second and Fifth Circuits show Mixed Race as the second highest.

Comparing detention rates to their respective ethnic proportions in the youth population based on the 2010 census data³ showed a clear overrepresentation of Hawaiian/Part Hawaiians in the system Statewide (detention percentage of 45% vs. population percentage of 33%), and across the four Circuits, in particular, the Third and Fifth. Nevertheless, the total number of detention cases were small in those two Circuits; hence, interpretation of such data warrants caution.

No overrepresentation of African Americans or Samoans/Part Samoans 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.

Table 5-1a Detention rates by type of offense and Circuit for 2015 (duplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Total detentions	552	463	29	52	8
<i>Detention rates</i> ²	4.2	5.2	1.8	2.8	1.2
Type of Offense					
<i>Person</i>	103 (19.0%)	101 (22.1%)	1 (3.4%)	2 (3.8%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Drug</i>	4 (0.7%)	4 (0.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Sex</i>	9 (16.4%)	9 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Person NC</i>	10 (1.8%)	7 (1.5%)	1 (3.4%)	2 (3.8%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Property</i>	41 (7.6%)	39 (8.4%)	2 (6.9%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (12.5%)
<i>Status</i>	3 (0.5%)	3 (0.6%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Other</i>	371 (65.6%)	289 (64.4%)	25 (86.2%)	48 (92.3%)	7 (87.5%)

Table 5-2a Detention rates by type of offense and Circuit for 2016 (duplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Total detentions	556	477	31	36	12
<i>Detention rates</i> ²	4.3	5.4	1.9	1.9	1.7
Type of Offense					
<i>Person</i>	119 (21.4%)	112 (23.5%)	4 (12.9%)	2 (5.5%)	1 (8.3%)
<i>Drug</i>	10 (1.8%)	9 (1.9%)	1 (3.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Sex</i>	6 (1.1%)	5 (1.0%)	1 (3.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Person NC</i>	13 (2.3%)	11 (2.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.8%)	1 (8.3%)
<i>Property</i>	58 (10.4%)	48 (10.1%)	9 (29.0%)	1 (2.8%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Status</i>	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Other</i>	349 (62.9%)	291 (61.1%)	16 (51.6%)	32 (88.9%)	10 (83.3%)

Table 5-3a Detention rates by type of offense and Circuit for 2017 (duplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Total arrests	417	352	37	11	17
<i>Detention rates</i> ²	3.2	4.0	2.3	0.6	2.5
Type of Offense					
<i>Person</i>	40 (9.6%)	38 (10.9%)	1 (2.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (5.9%)
<i>Drug</i>	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Sex</i>	5 (1.2%)	5 (1.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Person NC</i>	4 (0.9%)	4 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Property</i>	42 (10.1%)	35 (9.9%)	6 (16.2%)	1 (9.1%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Status</i>	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Other</i>	326 (78.2%)	270 (76.7%)	30 (81.1%)	10 (90.9%)	16 (94.1%)

Table 5-1b Detention counts by gender, age, and ethnicity by Circuit for 2015 (unduplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Gender					
<i>Female</i>	92 (30.7%)	67 (29.5%)	9 (34.6%)	13 (34.2%)	3 (37.5%)
<i>Male</i>	207 (69.2%)	160 (70.5%)	17 (65.4%)	25 (65.8%)	5 (62.5%)
Total	299 (100%)	227 (100%)	26 (100%)	38 (100%)	8 (100%)
Age					
12	3 (1.0%)	3 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
13	9 (3.0%)	8 (3.5%)	1 (3.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
14	23 (7.7%)	14 (6.17%)	5 (19.2%)	4 (10.5%)	0 (0.0%)
15	68 (22.7%)	58 (25.5%)	4 (15.4%)	4 (10.5%)	2 (25.0%)
16	100 (33.4%)	72 (31.7%)	10 (38.4%)	16 (42.1%)	2 (25.0%)
17	96 (32.1%)	72 (31.7%)	6 (23.1%)	14 (36.8%)	4 (50.0%)
Total	299 (100%)	227 (100%)	26 (100%)	38 (100%)	8 (100%)
Ethnicity					
<i>African American</i>	6 (2.0%)	6 (2.6%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Caucasian</i>	24 (8.0%)	15 (6.6%)	5 (19.2%)	4 (10.5%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Chinese</i>	1 (0.3%)	1 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Filipino</i>	14 (4.7%)	11 (4.8%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (7.9%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Hawaiian</i>	136 (45.5%)	100 (44.0%)	13 (50.0%)	17 (44.7%)	6 (75.0%)
<i>Japanese</i>	5 (1.7%)	5 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Latino/Hispanic</i>	3 (1%)	1 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (5.2%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Mixed Race</i>	38 (12.7%)	29 (12.8%)	5 (19.2%)	3 (7.9%)	1 (12.5%)
<i>Other Asian/Mixed Asian</i>	3 (1.0%)	3 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Other Pacific Islander (PI) /Mixed PI</i>	45 (15.0%)	39 (17.2%)	2 (7.7%)	4 (10.5%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Samoan</i>	8 (2.7%)	8 (3.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>Unknown</i>	16 (5.3%)	9 (3.9%)	1 (3.8%)	5 (13.1%)	1 (12.5%)
Total	299 (100%)	227 (100%)	26 (100%)	38 (100%)	8 (100%)

Table 5-2b Detention counts by gender, age, and ethnicity by Circuit for 2016 (unduplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Gender					
<i>Female</i>	88 (29.2%)	71 (29.3%)	3 (14.3%)	10 (34.5%)	4 (44.4%)
<i>Male</i>	213 (70.8%)	171 (70.7%)	18 (85.7%)	19 (65.5%)	5 (55.6%)
Total	301 (100%)	242 (100%)	21 (100%)	29 (100%)	9 (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	4 (1.3%)	4 (1.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
13	10 (3.3%)	10 (4.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
14	32 (0%)	29 (12%)	2 (9.5%)	0 (0%)	1 (11.1%)
15	56 (18.6%)	40 (16.5%)	10 (47.6%)	5 (17.2%)	1 (11.1%)
16	88 (29.2%)	67 (27.7%)	3 (14.3%)	14 (48.3%)	4 (44.4%)
17	111 (36.9%)	92 (38%)	6 (28.6%)	10 (34.5%)	3 (33.3%)
Total	301 (100%)	242 (100%)	21 (100%)	29 (100%)	9 (100%)
Ethnicity					
<i>African American</i>	3 (1%)	3 (1.2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Caucasian</i>	17 (5.7%)	14 (5.8%)	1 (4.8%)	2 (6.9%)	0 (0%)
<i>Chinese</i>	1 (0.3%)	1 (0.4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Filipino</i>	16 (5.3%)	13 (5.4%)	0 (0%)	3 (10.3%)	0 (0%)
<i>Hawaiian</i>	134 (44.5%)	96 (39.7%)	19 (90.5%)	11 (37.9%)	8 (88.9%)
<i>Japanese</i>	4 (1.3%)	3 (1.2%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.5%)	0 (0%)
<i>Korean</i>	1 (0.3%)	1 (0.4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Latino/Hispanic</i>	3 (1%)	2 (0.8%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.5%)	0 (0%)
<i>Mixed Race</i>	34 (11.3%)	32 (13.2%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.5%)	1 (11.1%)
<i>Other Asian/Mixed Asian</i>	5 (1.7%)	5 (2.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Other Pacific Islander (PI) /Mixed PI</i>	59 (19.6%)	54 (22.3%)	1 (4.8%)	4 (13.8%)	0 (0%)
<i>Samoan</i>	13 (4.3%)	12 (5%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.5%)	0 (0%)
<i>Unknown</i>	11 (3.7%)	6 (2.5%)	0 (0%)	5 (17.2%)	0 (0%)
Total	301 (100%)	242 (100%)	21 (100%)	29 (100%)	9 (100%)

Table 5-3b Detention counts by gender, age, and ethnicity by Circuit for 2017 (unduplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Gender					
<i>Female</i>	56 (29.6%)	39 (27.1%)	7 (28%)	5 (50%)	5 (50%)
<i>Male</i>	133 (70.4%)	105 (72.9%)	18 (72%)	5 (50%)	5 (50%)
Total	189 (100%)	144 (100%)	25 (100%)	10 (100%)	10 (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	1 (0.5%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
13	8 (4.2%)	8 (5.6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
14	18 (0%)	14 (9.7%)	3 (12%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)
15	43 (22.8%)	33 (22.9%)	6 (24%)	1 (10%)	3 (30%)
16	58 (30.7%)	47 (32.6%)	8 (32%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)
17	61 (32.3%)	41 (28.5%)	8 (32%)	6 (60%)	6 (60%)
Total	189 (100%)	144 (100%)	25 (100%)	10 (100%)	10 (100%)
Ethnicity					
<i>African American</i>	3 (1.6%)	2 (1.4%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)
<i>Caucasian</i>	11 (5.8%)	8 (5.6%)	3 (12%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Chinese</i>	1 (0.5%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Filipino</i>	9 (4.8%)	8 (5.6%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)
<i>Hawaiian</i>	86 (45.5%)	55 (38.2%)	16 (64%)	7 (70%)	8 (80%)
<i>Japanese</i>	1 (0.5%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Korean</i>	1 (0.5%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Latino/Hispanic</i>	2 (1.1%)	0 (0%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Mixed Race</i>	20 (10.6%)	16 (11.1%)	2 (8%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)
<i>Other Asian/Mixed Asian</i>	4 (2.1%)	4 (2.8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Other Pacific Islander (PI) /Mixed PI</i>	42 (22.2%)	40 (27.8%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Samoan</i>	5 (2.7%)	5 (3.5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Unknown</i>	4 (2.1%)	3 (2.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)
Total	189 (100%)	144 (100%)	25 (100%)	10 (100%)	10 (100%)

Adjudications

In 2015, adjudications for the State of Hawaii totaled 936 and the adjudication rate per 1,000 youth was 7.2 (Table 6-1a). The total number of adjudications increased to 1,305 at a rate of 10.1 per 1,000 youth in 2016. In 2017, the total number of adjudications was 1,179 at a rate of 9.1. The adjudication rates for the four Circuits varied greatly (Tables 6-1a, 6-2a, 6-3a). The Second Circuit had the highest rates for both 2016 (18.5) and 2017 (19.8) but not 2015, where the Fifth Circuit had the highest rate at 11.9. The Third Circuit rate remained similar across those three years at around 10. The First Circuit had the lowest rates for all three years: 5.8 in 2015, 7.5 in 2016, and 6.8 in 2017.

Type of Offense

Statewide, property and status offenses were the highest types of offenses in adjudication, accounting for over 40% for all three years. This pattern was also observed in the First Circuit, where property offenses were the highest, followed by status offenses. In the Third Circuit, other type of offenses was the highest in both 2015 and 2016. In 2017, status was the highest type of offenses which accounted for over 40% in adjudication. Property was the third highest in adjudication and drug offenses was fourth highest for all three years (Tables 6-1a, 6-2a, 6-3a).

For the Second Circuit, the largest type of offense was status in 2015 and 2016 but not 2017 where property type of offenses was the largest. Status, property, and other types of offenses were the top three offenses for the Second Circuit. In the Fifth Circuit, other type of offenses was the largest group, which accounted for about 48% across the three years. Property and non-contact person offenses were the next top two types of offenses.

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. The Second 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 differentiation ranged from 28% to 42%. The First Circuit had the largest difference for 2016 (44%) and 2017 (38%) while the Fifth Circuit had the largest in 2015 (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 the First Circuit, where age 15 had the largest percentage for 2015 (Table 6-1b).

Race/Ethnicity

For all three years, Hawaiians/Part Hawaiians make up the largest percentage of adjudications for each Circuit for all three years except for the Third Circuit, where unknown group had the largest adjudicated across those three years (Table 6-1b, 2b, 3b). The unknown group had the second largest adjudicated cases in 2017 Statewide. Other Pacific Islander, Mixed Race, and Caucasian/Filipino were the next largest ethnic/ racial groups both Statewide and across all Circuits.

In comparing adjudication rates to their respective ethnic proportions in the youth population based on the 2010 census data³, overrepresentation of Hawaiians/Part Hawaiians was shown for the First Circuits (37% vs. 29.5% respectively) but underrepresented in all the neighboring Circuits. No overrepresentation of African Americans or Samoans/Part Samoans 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.

Table 6-1a Adjudication rates by type of offense and by Circuit for 2015 (duplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Total arrests	936	511	157	186	82
<i>Adjudication rates</i> ²	7.2	5.8	9.8	10.1	11.9
Type of Offense					
<i>Person</i>	138 (14.7%)	110 (21.5%)	12 (7.6%)	10 (5.4%)	6 (7.3%)
<i>Drug</i>	58 (6.2%)	27 (5.3%)	12 (7.6%)	13 (7%)	6 (7.3%)
<i>Sex</i>	15 (1.6%)	8 (1.6%)	6 (3.8%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0%)
<i>Person NC</i>	85 (9.1%)	61 (11.9%)	7 (4.5%)	10 (5.4%)	7 (8.5%)
<i>Property</i>	224 (23.9%)	142 (27.8%)	28 (17.8%)	43 (23.1%)	11 (13.4%)
<i>Status</i>	226 (24.2%)	126 (24.7%)	54 (34.4%)	40 (21.5%)	6 (7.3%)
<i>Other</i>	190 (20.3%)	37 (7.2%)	38 (24.2%)	69 (37.1%)	46 (56.1%)

Table 6-2a Adjudication rates by type of offense and Circuit for 2016 (duplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Total arrests	1,305	662	298	223	118
<i>Adjudication rates</i> ²	10.1	7.5	18.5	12.4	17.1
Type of Offense					
<i>Person</i>	185 (14.2%)	132 (19.9%)	29 (9.8%)	13 (5.7%)	11 (9.3%)
<i>Drug</i>	91 (7%)	38 (5.7%)	24 (8.1%)	23 (10%)	6 (5.1%)
<i>Sex</i>	29 (2.2%)	17 (2.6%)	4 (1.4%)	6 (2.6%)	2 (1.7%)
<i>Person NC</i>	132 (10.1%)	83 (12.5%)	21 (7.1%)	11 (4.8%)	17 (14.4%)
<i>Property</i>	305 (23.4%)	170 (25.7%)	74 (25%)	45 (19.7%)	16 (13.6%)
<i>Status</i>	304 (23.3%)	163 (24.6%)	80 (27%)	54 (23.6%)	7 (5.9%)
<i>Other</i>	259 (19.9%)	59 (8.9%)	64 (21.6%)	77 (33.6%)	59 (50%)

Table 6-3a Adjudication rates by type of offense and Circuit for 2017 (duplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Total arrests	1,179	598	316	193	72
<i>Adjudication rates</i> ²	9.1	6.8	19.8	10.4	10.4
Type of Offense					
<i>Person</i>	120 (10.2%)	93 (15.6%)	13 (4.1%)	8 (4.2%)	6 (8.3%)
<i>Drug</i>	90 (7.6%)	21 (3.5%)	42 (13.3%)	17 (8.8%)	10 (13.9%)
<i>Sex</i>	21 (1.8%)	8 (1.3%)	1 (0.3%)	8 (4.2%)	4 (5.6%)
<i>Person NC</i>	87 (7.4%)	51 (8.5%)	16 (5.1%)	11 (5.7%)	9 (12.5%)
<i>Property</i>	338 (28.7%)	198 (33.1%)	106 (33.5%)	25 (13%)	9 (12.5%)
<i>Status</i>	337 (28.6%)	162 (27.1%)	84 (26.6%)	84 (43.5%)	7 (9.7%)
<i>Other</i>	186 (15.8%)	65 (10.9%)	54 (17.1%)	40 (20.7%)	27 (37.5%)

Table 6-1b Adjudication counts by gender age ethnicity 2015 (unduplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Gender					
<i>Female</i>	185 (34.1%)	90 (34.2%)	38 (34.2%)	38 (38.8%)	19 (27.1%)
<i>Male</i>	357 (65.9%)	173 (65.8%)	73 (65.8%)	60 (61.2%)	51 (72.9%)
Total	542 (100%)	263 (100%)	111 (100%)	98 (100%)	70 (100%)
Age					
10	1 (0.2%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
11	3 (0.6%)	0 (0%)	2 (1.8%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)
12	11 (2%)	7 (2.7%)	2 (1.8%)	2 (2%)	0 (0%)
13	34 (6.3%)	15 (5.7%)	2 (1.8%)	13 (13.3%)	4 (5.7%)
14	58 (10.7%)	23 (8.8%)	19 (17.1%)	12 (12.2%)	4 (5.7%)
15	131 (24.2%)	74 (28.1%)	18 (16.2%)	22 (22.5%)	17 (24.3%)
16	141 (26%)	73 (27.8%)	23 (20.7%)	25 (25.5%)	20 (28.6%)
17	163 (30.1%)	71 (27%)	44 (39.6%)	23 (23.5%)	25 (35.7%)
Total	542 (100%)	263 (100%)	111 (100%)	98 (100%)	70 (100%)
Ethnicity					
<i>African American</i>	10 (1.9%)	6 (2.3%)	1 (0.9%)	2 (2%)	1 (1.4%)
<i>Caucasian</i>	36 (6.6%)	14 (5.3%)	6 (5.4%)	8 (8.2%)	8 (11.4%)
<i>Chinese</i>	1 (0.2%)	1 (0.4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Filipino</i>	19 (3.5%)	8 (3%)	5 (4.5%)	5 (5.1%)	1 (1.4%)
<i>Hawaiian</i>	198 (36.5%)	103 (39.2%)	41 (36.9%)	29 (29.6%)	25 (35.7%)
<i>Japanese</i>	5 (0.9%)	5 (1.9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Korean</i>	2 (0.4%)	2 (0.8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Latino/Hispanic</i>	7 (1.3%)	1 (0.4%)	3 (2.7%)	3 (3.1%)	0 (0%)
<i>Mixed Race</i>	52 (9.6%)	28 (10.7%)	10 (9%)	3 (3.1%)	11 (15.7%)
<i>Native American</i>	1 (0.2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)
<i>Other Asian/Mixed Asian</i>	8 (1.5%)	8 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Other Pacific Islander (PI) /Mixed PI</i>	58 (10.7%)	46 (17.5%)	4 (3.6%)	5 (5.1%)	3 (4.3%)
<i>Samoan</i>	7 (1.3%)	6 (2.3%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)
<i>Unknown</i>	138 (25.5%)	35 (13.3%)	41 (36.9%)	41 (41.8%)	21 (30%)
Total	542 (100%)	263 (100%)	111 (100%)	98 (100%)	70 (100%)

Table 6-2b Adjudication counts by gender, age, ethnicity, and Circuit 2016 (unduplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Gender					
<i>Female</i>	204 (28.9%)	90 (27.6%)	42 (24.1%)	46 (38.7%)	26 (30.2%)
<i>Male</i>	501 (71.1%)	236 (72.4%)	132 (75.9%)	73 (61.3%)	60 (69.8%)
Total	705 (100%)	326 (100%)	174 (100%)	119 (100%)	86 (100%)
Age					
10	2 (0.3%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.6%)	1 (0.8%)	0 (0%)
11	6 (0.9%)	0 (0%)	5 (2.9%)	1 (0.8%)	0 (0%)
12	26 (3.7%)	8 (2.5%)	6 (3.5%)	7 (5.9%)	5 (5.8%)
13	70 (9.9%)	34 (10.4%)	19 (10.9%)	12 (10.1%)	5 (5.8%)
14	90 (12.8%)	53 (16.3%)	22 (12.6%)	12 (10.1%)	3 (3.5%)
15	142 (20.1%)	61 (18.7%)	34 (19.5%)	24 (20.2%)	23 (26.7%)
16	179 (25.4%)	87 (26.7%)	34 (19.5%)	39 (32.8%)	19 (22.1%)
17	190 (27%)	83 (25.5%)	53 (30.5%)	23 (19.3%)	31 (36.1%)
Total	705 (100%)	326 (100%)	174 (100%)	119 (100%)	86 (100%)
Ethnicity					
<i>African American</i>	5 (0.7%)	3 (0.9%)	1 (0.6%)	1 (0.8%)	0 (0%)
<i>Caucasian</i>	36 (5.1%)	14 (4.3%)	13 (7.5%)	5 (4.2%)	4 (4.7%)
<i>Filipino</i>	45 (6.4%)	15 (4.6%)	15 (8.6%)	8 (6.7%)	7 (8.1%)
<i>Hawaiian</i>	245 (34.8%)	112 (34.4%)	67 (38.5%)	22 (18.5%)	44 (51.2%)
<i>Japanese</i>	4 (0.6%)	1 (0.3%)	0 (0%)	3 (2.5%)	0 (0%)
<i>Korean</i>	3 (0.4%)	2 (0.6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.2%)
<i>Latino/Hispanic</i>	11 (1.6%)	3 (0.9%)	5 (2.9%)	3 (2.5%)	0 (0%)
<i>Mixed Race</i>	57 (8.1%)	31 (9.5%)	12 (6.9%)	3 (2.5%)	11 (12.8%)
<i>Native American</i>	1 (0.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.8%)	0 (0%)
<i>Other Asian/Mixed Asian</i>	6 (0.9%)	5 (1.5%)	1 (0.6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Other Pacific Islander (PI) /Mixed PI</i>	81 (11.5%)	56 (17.2%)	11 (6.3%)	14 (11.8%)	0 (0%)
<i>Samoan</i>	15 (2.1%)	12 (3.7%)	1 (0.6%)	2 (1.7%)	0 (0%)
<i>Unknown</i>	196 (27.8%)	72 (22.1%)	48 (27.6%)	57 (47.9%)	19 (22.1%)
Total	705 (100%)	326 (100%)	174 (100%)	119 (100%)	86 (100%)

Table 6-3b Adjudication counts by gender, age, ethnicity, and Circuit 2017 (unduplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Gender					
<i>Female</i>	205 (33%)	86 (31.5%)	55 (31.6%)	49 (38.9%)	15 (30.6%)
<i>Male</i>	417 (67%)	187 (68.5%)	119 (68.4%)	77 (61.1%)	34 (69.4%)
Total	622 (100%)	273 (100%)	174 (100%)	126 (100%)	49 (100%)
Age					
10	3 (0.5%)	0 (0%)	3 (1.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
11	8 (1.3%)	0 (0%)	2 (1.2%)	6 (4.8%)	0 (0%)
12	21 (3.4%)	6 (2.2%)	8 (4.6%)	6 (4.8%)	1 (2%)
13	46 (7.4%)	23 (8.4%)	13 (7.5%)	8 (6.4%)	2 (4.1%)
14	82 (13.2%)	44 (16.1%)	17 (9.8%)	12 (9.5%)	9 (18.4%)
15	144 (23.2%)	71 (26%)	34 (19.5%)	31 (24.6%)	8 (16.3%)
16	174 (28%)	68 (24.9%)	53 (30.5%)	36 (28.6%)	17 (34.7%)
17	144 (23.2%)	61 (22.3%)	44 (25.3%)	27 (21.4%)	12 (24.5%)
Total	622 (100%)	273 (100%)	174 (100%)	126 (100%)	49 (100%)
Ethnicity					
<i>African American</i>	5 (0.8%)	2 (0.7%)	1 (0.6%)	2 (1.6%)	0 (0%)
<i>Caucasian</i>	32 (5.1%)	5 (1.8%)	13 (7.5%)	11 (8.7%)	3 (6.1%)
<i>Filipino</i>	36 (5.8%)	17 (6.2%)	12 (6.9%)	4 (3.2%)	3 (6.1%)
<i>Hawaiian</i>	197 (31.7%)	104 (38.1%)	59 (33.9%)	18 (14.3%)	16 (32.7%)
<i>Japanese</i>	2 (0.3%)	1 (0.4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)
<i>Korean</i>	1 (0.2%)	1 (0.4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Latino/Hispanic</i>	9 (1.5%)	1 (0.4%)	4 (2.3%)	4 (3.2%)	0 (0%)
<i>Mixed Race</i>	44 (7.1%)	20 (7.3%)	14 (8.1%)	3 (2.4%)	7 (14.3%)
<i>Other Asian/Mixed Asian</i>	7 (1.1%)	6 (2.2%)	1 (0.6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Other Pacific Islander/Mixed PI</i>	78 (12.5%)	57 (20.9%)	11 (6.3%)	10 (7.9%)	0 (0%)
<i>Samoan</i>	12 (1.9%)	10 (3.7%)	0 (0%)	2 (1.6%)	0 (0%)
<i>Unknown</i>	199 (32%)	49 (18%)	59 (33.9%)	72 (57.1%)	19 (38.8%)
Total	622 (100%)	273 (100%)	174 (100%)	126 (100%)	49 (100%)

Probation

The total number of cases in probation were 272 for 2015, 275 for 2016 and 371 for 2017 (Tables 7-1a, 7-2a, and 7-3a). The probation rate Statewide was 2.4 per 1,000 in 2015, 2.1 in 2016 and 2.9 in 2017. The Fifth Circuit had the highest probation rates across the three years (6.1, 4.8 and 6.8 respectively). The First and Second Circuits had the lowest probation rates for years 2015 and 2016 (below 2). While the First Circuit probation rate remained low compared to other Circuits, the Second Circuit probation rate increased exponentially in 2017 (6.8).

Type of Offense

Statewide, property offenses had the highest percentage in 2016 (25.8%) and 2017 (30.7%) but not 2015, where other type of offenses had the highest (33.8%). Person, non-contact person, and drug were the next top three types of offenses. In the First Circuit, person type of offenses was the highest in both 2016 and 2017 (36.1% and 31.0%), and property in 2015 (31.8%). In the Third Circuit, property or other types of offenses were the top two across three years except in 2017 where drug type of offenses was the highest (28.3%),

The First Circuit had the majority of sex offenses in probation, accounting for over 30% or more of all sex offense probation cases in the State⁴. The Third Circuit consistently showed drug offenses as one of the top three in probation for each year. In the Fifth Circuit, other type of offenses had the highest percentage, accounting for over half of all probation cases within this Circuit in both 2015 and 2016, and then decreased by a little over 20% by 2017.

Gender

Males made up over two thirds (68% for 2015; 73% for 2016 and 74% for 2017) of the probation population Statewide and across all four Circuits (Tables 7-1b, 2b, 3b). The largest gender difference was seen in the Second Circuit, where there was a difference of over 50% in both 2015 and 2016. However, data should be interpreted with caution as the total number of probations in this Circuit was small across those three years.

Age

From 2015 to 2017, the modal youth age at probation Statewide and for the Third Circuit was 16 or 17 years old. Over 80% of all probation cases were made up of youth ages 14 and older. The majority of probation cases under age 14 (over 50%) were from the First Circuit⁶.

⁶ Sum of ages 10-13 per Circuit/Sum of ages 10-13 for the State

Ethnicity

All three years indicated Hawaiians/Part Hawaiians to have the largest percentage in probation (ranging from about 38-48%) Statewide and for each Circuit except for the Third Circuit where the unknown group was the largest group in 2015 and 2016. The high percentage of unknown race influenced Statewide percentages for these years in which unknown race was the second highest.

Identifying race greatly improved in 2017 as Second, Third, and Fifth Circuits no longer showed unknown race. While the First Circuit still showed 3% of unknown race in 2017, it's still a significant decrease from previous years. In 2017, each Circuit showed the Mixed Race group as either second or third highest following Hawaiians/Part Hawaiians in probation percentages. Other racial/ ethnic groups that were in the top three were: other Pacific Islander/ Mixed Pacific Islander (First and Third Circuits), Caucasian (Second Circuit), Filipino (same percentage as Mixed Race) in the Fifth Circuit. It's also important to note that Filipino and Samoans had the same percentage as the Mixed Race group for the First Circuit.

In comparing probation rates to their respective ethnic proportions in the youth population based on the 2010 census data³, some ethnic groups showed overrepresentation in the system depending on the year and Circuit. The data showed a striking overrepresentation of Hawaiians/Part Hawaiians in the system both Statewide (probation percentages of 38.2-48.1% vs. population percentage of 32.8%), and in the First (37.5-44.4% vs. 29.5% respectively), Second (between 52.3-75.0% vs. 36.5% respectively) and Fifth (between 54.4% -62.5% vs. 36.1% respectively) Circuits. However, the Third Circuit probation rates of Hawaiians/Part Hawaiians were below their population proportions for all three years.

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

Table 7-1a Probation rates by type of offense and Circuit for 2015 (duplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Total probations	272	129	20	81	42
<i>Probation rates</i> ²	2.1	1.5	1.2	4.4	6.1
Type of Offense					
<i>Person</i>	44 (16.2%)	30 (23.3%)	2 (10%)	6 (7.4%)	6 (14.3%)
<i>Drug</i>	24 (8.8%)	7 (5.4%)	1 (5%)	14 (17.3%)	2 (4.8%)
<i>Sex</i>	10 (3.7%)	6 (4.7%)	3 (15%)	1 (1.2%)	0 (0%)
<i>Person NC</i>	27 (9.9%)	14 (10.9%)	0 (0%)	9 (11.1%)	4 (9.5%)
<i>Property</i>	72 (26.5%)	41 (31.8%)	6 (30%)	17 (21%)	8 (19.1%)
<i>Status</i>	3 (1.1%)	1 (0.8%)	1 (5%)	1 (1.2%)	0 (0%)
<i>Other</i>	92 (33.8%)	30 (23.3%)	7 (35.0%)	33 (40.7%)	22 (52.4%)

Table 7-2a Probation rates by type of offense and Circuit for 2016 (duplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Total probations	275	147	29	66	33
<i>Probation rates</i> ²	2.1	1.7	1.8	3.6	4.8
Type of Offense					
<i>Person</i>	71 (25.8%)	53 (36.1%)	4 (13.8%)	10 (15.2%)	4 (12.1%)
<i>Drug</i>	30 (10.9%)	13 (8.8%)	5 (17.2%)	10 (15.2%)	2 (6.1%)
<i>Sex</i>	14 (5.1%)	8 (5.4%)	2 (6.9%)	3 (4.6%)	1 (3%)
<i>Person NC</i>	25 (9.1%)	16 (10.9%)	1 (3.5%)	4 (6.1%)	4 (12.1%)
<i>Property</i>	71 (25.8%)	38 (25.9%)	10 (34.5%)	18 (27.3%)	5 (15.2%)
<i>Status</i>	1 (0.4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.5%)	0 (0%)
<i>Other</i>	63 (22.9%)	19 (12.9%)	7 (24.1%)	20 (30.3%)	17 (51.5%)

Table 7-3a Probation counts by type of offense, and Circuit for 2017 (duplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Total probations	371	183	106	35	47
<i>Probation rates</i> ²	2.9	2.1	6.6	1.9	6.8
Type of Offense					
<i>Person</i>	77 (20.8%)	58 (31.7%)	8 (7.6%)	2 (5.7%)	9 (19.2%)
<i>Drug</i>	36 (9.7%)	10 (5.5%)	14 (13.2%)	10 (28.6%)	2 (4.3%)
<i>Sex</i>	21 (5.7%)	9 (4.9%)	1 (0.9%)	8 (22.9%)	3 (6.4%)
<i>Person NC</i>	45 (12.1%)	23 (12.6%)	8 (7.6%)	3 (8.6%)	11 (23.4%)
<i>Property</i>	114 (30.7%)	52 (28.4%)	45 (42.5%)	9 (25.7%)	8 (17%)
<i>Status</i>	14 (3.8%)	0 (0%)	13 (12.3%)	1 (2.9%)	0 (0%)
<i>Other</i>	64 (17.3%)	31 (16.9%)	17 (16%)	2 (5.7%)	14 (29.8%)

Table 7-1b Probation counts by gender, age, ethnicity, by Circuit for 2015 (unduplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Gender					
<i>Female</i>	87 (32.1%)	44 (34.4%)	4 (20%)	28 (34.6%)	11 (26.2%)
<i>Male</i>	184 (67.9%)	84 (65.6%)	16 (80%)	53 (65.4%)	31 (73.8%)
Total	271 (100%)	128 (100%)	20 (100%)	81 (100%)	42 (100%)
Age					
<i>10</i>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>11</i>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>12</i>	2 (0.7%)	2 (1.6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>13</i>	14 (5.2%)	7 (5.5%)	1 (5%)	2 (2.5%)	4 (9.5%)
<i>14</i>	34 (12.6%)	11 (8.6%)	7 (35%)	11 (13.6%)	5 (11.9%)
<i>15</i>	70 (25.8%)	42 (32.8%)	4 (20%)	18 (22.2%)	6 (14.3%)
<i>16</i>	85 (31.4%)	40 (31.3%)	4 (20%)	26 (32.1%)	15 (35.7%)
<i>17</i>	66 (24.4%)	26 (20.3%)	4 (20%)	24 (29.6%)	12 (28.6%)
Total	271 (100%)	128 (100%)	20 (100%)	81 (100%)	42 (100%)
Ethnicity					
<i>African American</i>	2 (0.7%)	1 (0.8%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.2%)	0 (0%)
<i>Caucasian</i>	18 (6.6%)	7 (5.5%)	2 (10%)	8 (9.9%)	1 (2.4%)
<i>Chinese</i>	1 (0.4%)	1 (0.8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Filipino</i>	7 (2.6%)	5 (3.9%)	0 (0%)	2 (2.5%)	0 (0%)
<i>Hawaiian</i>	116 (42.8%)	52 (40.6%)	15 (75%)	23 (28.4%)	26 (61.9%)
<i>Japanese</i>	4 (1.5%)	3 (2.3%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.2%)	0 (0%)
<i>Latino/Hispanic</i>	2 (0.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (2.5%)	0 (0%)
<i>Mixed Race</i>	21 (7.8%)	13 (10.2%)	0 (0%)	4 (4.9%)	4 (9.5%)
<i>Native American</i>	1 (0.4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.2%)	0 (0%)
<i>Other Asian/Mixed Asian</i>	5 (1.9%)	5 (3.9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Other Pacific Islander/Mixed PI Samoan</i>	26 (9.6%)	21 (16.4%)	1 (5%)	3 (3.7%)	1 (2.4%)
<i>Unknown</i>	5 (1.9%)	4 (3.1%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.2%)	0 (0%)
Total	63 (23.3%)	16 (12.5%)	2 (10%)	35 (43.2%)	10 (23.8%)
Total	271 (100%)	128 (100%)	20 (100%)	81 (100%)	42 (100%)

Table 7-2b Probation counts by gender, age, ethnicity, and Circuit for 2016 (unduplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Gender					
<i>Female</i>	70 (26.2%)	36 (25%)	5 (18.5%)	18 (28.6%)	11 (33.3%)
<i>Male</i>	197 (73.8%)	108 (75%)	22 (81.5%)	45 (71.4%)	22 (66.7%)
Total	267 (100%)	144 (100%)	27 (100%)	63 (100%)	33 (100%)
Age					
<i>10</i>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>11</i>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>12</i>	7 (2.6%)	4 (2.8%)	1 (3.7%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.1%)
<i>13</i>	27 (10.1%)	15 (10.4%)	3 (11.1%)	4 (6.4%)	5 (15.2%)
<i>14</i>	41 (15.4%)	26 (18.1%)	2 (7.4%)	11 (17.5%)	2 (6.1%)
<i>15</i>	59 (22.1%)	32 (22.2%)	6 (22.2%)	11 (17.5%)	10 (30.3%)
<i>16</i>	66 (24.7%)	35 (24.3%)	6 (22.2%)	18 (28.6%)	7 (21.2%)
<i>17</i>	67 (25.1%)	32 (22.2%)	9 (33.3%)	19 (30.2%)	7 (21.2%)
Total	267 (100%)	144 (100%)	27 (100%)	63 (100%)	33 (100%)
Ethnicity					
<i>African American</i>	3 (1.1%)	2 (1.4%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.6%)	0 (0%)
<i>Caucasian</i>	8 (3%)	3 (2.1%)	0 (0%)	4 (6.4%)	1 (3%)
<i>Filipino</i>	13 (4.9%)	5 (3.5%)	1 (3.7%)	4 (6.4%)	3 (9.1%)
<i>Hawaiian</i>	102 (38.2%)	54 (37.5%)	18 (66.7%)	12 (19.1%)	18 (54.6%)
<i>Japanese</i>	3 (1.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (4.8%)	0 (0%)
<i>Korean</i>	2 (0.8%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)
<i>Latino/Hispanic</i>	2 (0.8%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.6%)	0 (0%)
<i>Mixed Race</i>	27 (10.1%)	15 (10.4%)	4 (14.8%)	5 (7.9%)	3 (9.1%)
<i>Other Asian/Mixed Asian</i>	2 (0.8%)	2 (1.4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Other Pacific Islander/Mixed PI</i>	38 (14.2%)	28 (19.4%)	2 (7.4%)	8 (12.7%)	0 (0%)
<i>Samoan</i>	8 (3%)	5 (3.5%)	0 (0%)	3 (4.8%)	0 (0%)
<i>Unknown</i>	59 (22.1%)	28 (19.4%)	2 (7.4%)	22 (34.9%)	7 (21.2%)
Total	267 (100%)	144 (100%)	27 (100%)	63 (100%)	33 (100%)

Table 7-3b Probation counts by gender, age, ethnicity, and Circuit for 2017 (unduplicated)

	<i>State</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Fifth</i>
Gender					
<i>Male</i>	52 (27.5%)	25 (25.3%)	14 (31.8%)	6 (27.3%)	7 (29.2%)
<i>Female</i>	137 (72.5%)	74 (74.8%)	30 (68.2%)	16 (72.7%)	17 (70.8%)
Total	189 (100%)	99 (100%)	44 (100%)	22 (100%)	24 (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	1 (0.5%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
13	14 (7.4%)	8 (8.1%)	3 (6.8%)	1 (4.6%)	2 (8.3%)
14	19 (10.1%)	13 (13.1%)	2 (4.6%)	1 (4.6%)	3 (12.5%)
15	51 (27%)	29 (29.3%)	9 (20.5%)	6 (27.3%)	7 (29.2%)
16	65 (34.4%)	30 (30.3%)	21 (47.7%)	7 (31.8%)	7 (29.2%)
17	39 (20.6%)	18 (18.2%)	9 (20.5%)	7 (31.8%)	5 (20.8%)
Total	189 (100%)	99 (100%)	44 (100%)	22 (100%)	24 (100%)
Ethnicity					
<i>African American</i>	1 (0.5%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Caucasian</i>	14 (7.4%)	4 (4%)	7 (15.9%)	2 (9.1%)	1 (4.2%)
<i>Filipino</i>	13 (6.9%)	6 (6.1%)	2 (4.6%)	2 (9.1%)	3 (12.5%)
<i>Hawaiian</i>	91 (48.2%)	44 (44.4%)	23 (52.3%)	9 (40.9%)	15 (62.5%)
<i>Japanese</i>	2 (1.1%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (4.2%)
<i>Korean</i>	2 (1.1%)	2 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Latino/Hispanic</i>	5 (2.7%)	1 (1%)	3 (6.8%)	1 (4.6%)	0 (0%)
<i>Mixed race</i>	18 (9.5%)	6 (6.1%)	5 (11.4%)	4 (18.2%)	3 (12.5%)
<i>Other Asian/Mixed Asian</i>	2 (1.1%)	2 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Other Pacific Islander/Mixed PI</i>	31 (16.4%)	23 (23.2%)	4 (9.1%)	3 (13.6%)	1 (4.2%)
<i>Samoan</i>	7 (3.7%)	6 (6.1%)	0 (0%)	1 (4.6%)	0 (0%)
<i>Unknown</i>	3 (1.6%)	3 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Total	189 (100%)	99 (100%)	44 (100%)	22 (100%)	24 (100%)

HYCF

In 2015 HYCF mandates for the State of Hawaii totaled 64, at a rate of 0.5 per 1,000 youth (Table 8-1a). In 2016, the total number was 63, at a rate of 0.5 per 1,000 youth. In 2017, a visible decrease was seen (n=43) at a rate of 0.3 per 1,000 youth.

Type of Offense

2015 through 2017

Statewide, other type of offenses accounted for a third or higher of the offenses in HYCF placement across all three years (range: 33.3% to 47.4%), followed by property (ranges: 28.1% to 39.5%) and person (ranges 16.3% to 25.4%) types of offenses.

Gender

Throughout the three years, between 68%-83% of the cases in HYCF were males. The differences in percentages between males and females ranged from approximately 40% to over 60% of all HYCF placements.

Age

Ages represented in HYCF ranged from 14 to 17, with over 90% in the age group 15 to 17. From 2015 to 2017, the modal was 17 years old. Age 16 had the second highest percentages for those three years. Age 14 represented the least percentage in HYCF (range: 3% to 6%).

Race/Ethnicity

All three years indicated Hawaiians/Part Hawaiians to have the largest percentage of HYCF placements, from 47.4% in 2015 to 40.0% in 2016 and 55.6% in 2017. In comparison to the youth population of the State of Hawaii according to the 2010 census, Hawaiians/part Hawaiians were overrepresented in HYCF relative to their proportion in the population for years 2015 and 2017. Samoans were also overrepresented in 2016 and 2017 in HYCF.

Table 8-1a HYCF rates by type of offense for 2015, 2016 and 2017 (duplicated)

	2015	2016	2017
Total HYCF	64	63	43
<i>HYCF rates²</i>	0.5	0.5	0.3
Type of Offense			
<i>Other</i>	22 (34.4%)	21 (33.3%)	12 (27.9%)
<i>Property</i>	18 (28.1%)	20 (31.8%)	17 (39.5%)
<i>Person</i>	12 (18.8%)	16 (25.4%)	7 (16.3%)
<i>Person NC</i>	6 (9.4%)	3 (4.8%)	2 (4.7%)
<i>Drug</i>	6 (9.4%)	2 (3.2%)	2 (4.7%)
<i>Sex</i>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (7%)
<i>Status</i>	0 (0%)	1 (1.6%)	0 (0%)

Table 8-1b HYCF counts by gender, age, ethnicity for 2015, 2016 and 2017 (unduplicated)

	2015	2016	2017
Gender			
<i>Male</i>	26 (68.4%)	28 (80%)	30 (83.3%)
<i>Female</i>	12 (31.6%)	7 (20%)	6 (16.7%)
Total	38 (100%)	35 (100%)	36 (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%)	2 (5.6%)
14	2 (5.3%)	2 (5.7%)	1 (2.8%)
15	7 (18.4%)	5 (14.3%)	3 (8.3%)
16	13 (34.2%)	13 (37.1%)	14 (38.9%)
17	16 (42.1%)	15 (42.9%)	16 (44.4%)
Total	38 (100%)	35 (100%)	36 (100%)
Ethnicity			
<i>African American</i>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (5.6%)
<i>Caucasian</i>	4 (10.5%)	2 (5.7%)	3 (8.3%)
<i>Chinese</i>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Filipino</i>	3 (7.9%)	1 (2.9%)	1 (2.8%)
<i>Hawaiian</i>	18 (47.4%)	14 (40%)	20 (55.6%)
<i>Japanese</i>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Korean</i>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Latino/ Hispanic</i>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Mixed Race</i>	3 (7.9%)	2 (5.7%)	3 (8.3%)
<i>Native American</i>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Other</i>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (2.8%)
<i>Other Asian/ Mixed Asian</i>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Other Pacific Islander/ Mixed Pacific Islander</i>	1 (2.6%)	3 (8.6%)	4 (11.1%)
<i>Samoan</i>	1 (2.6%)	6 (17.1%)	2 (5.6%)
<i>Unknown</i>	8 (21.1%)	7 (20%)	0 (0%)
Total	38 (100%)	35 (100%)	36 (100%)

Transfer or waiver to adult court

A total of five juveniles made up a total of 11 waivers to adult court across the three years. Among the 11 waivers, five were in 2015, resulting in a rate of 0.04 per 1,000 youth. The total number of waivers in 2016 was one, resulting in a rate of 0.01 per 1,000 youth². The total number of waivers in 2017 was five, resulting in a rate of 0.04 per 1,000 youth (Table 8-1a).

Among the five waivers in 2015, one was from the First Circuit and the other four were from the Fifth Circuit. All waivers in both 2016 and 2017 were from the First Circuit. Four of the five juveniles were males. Two of them were Hawaiian /Part Hawaiian, one Samoan, one Filipino and one other Pacific Islander. One was 16 years old and the other four were 17 years old.

Table 9-1a Waiver to adult court was reported for youth ages 10-17 during 2015, 2016 and 2017 (duplicated)

	2015	2016	2017
Total Waivers	5	1	5
<i>Waiver rates</i> ²	0.04	0.01	0.04
Type of Offense			
<i>Drug</i>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Person</i>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Property</i>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (80%)
<i>Sex</i>	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Status</i>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Person NC</i>	1 (20%)	1 (100%)	1 (20%)
<i>Other</i>	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Table 9-1b Waiver to adult court reported for youth ages 10-17 during 2015, 2016 and 2017 (unduplicated)

	2015	2016	2017
Gender			
Male	2 (0%)	1 (100%)	2 (100%)
Female	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Total	2 (100%)	1 (100%)	2 (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	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
17	1 (50%)	1 (100%)	2 (100%)
Total	2 (100%)	1 (100%)	2 (100%)
Ethnicity			
Caucasian	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Hawaiian	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
African American	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Chinese	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Filipino	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)
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 PI	0 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)
Samoan	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Other	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Unknown	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Total	2 (100%)	1 (100%)	2 (100%)

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. However, improvements over the years were shown in the results of detention, probation, and HYCF points of contact in which unknown ethnicities decreased tremendously with most of the Circuits having no unknown by 2017. While improvements were shown in ethnicity reporting for all Circuits by 2017, phases such as arrests, referrals, diversion, petition, and adjudication still showed a noticeable percentage of ethnicities that were unknown. This is problematic as shown in referrals and petitions, unknown ethnicities accounted for a substantial proportion in particular for the Third and Fifth Circuits across the years .

Consistent Processing Through the Juvenile Justice System

It 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 Circuits. 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 Circuits 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 Circuits when it comes to reporting data accurately and using data for strategic planning.

Missing Detention and Arrest Data

A large percentage of detention data were missing (i.e., no information on charge or Circuit). Detention data by Circuit and type of offenses were missing for all three years. Thus, the type of offenses committed in detention was not known and from which Circuit.

The full FY 2017 data from the Fifth Circuit wasn't available and thus arrest rate was not calculated. Given that the data is half of FY 2017, results are not reflective of the full year and thus a concern with interpretation.

Issues with Data files and timing of report

Raw data files provided for the analysis has been a challenge with regards to cleaning and interpretation to be analysis ready. The data received while much improved from previous years still required time to understand the coding and

descriptions, and in several instances information for several phases was in referral. What is worthy to note is that diversion at the arrest stage or before the referral stage may not necessarily be captured thus omitting valuable information to better understand diversion.

Other issues such as coding of the variables was difficult to decipher. While they make sense to internal Juvenile Justice System, they are not intuitive for external researchers. Codebooks were provided by JJIS on variables. However some of the charges in the datasets were not easily recognizable and were not included in the codebooks. A recommendation to address this concern is in addition to the codebooks that someone from the courts be identified for external researchers to directly contact to clarify information on the datasets not in the codebooks. Another recommendation is for all the datasets to include major categories for all the charges. This would save a lot of time as external researchers are not familiar with the vast amount of charges. Additionally, given the extensive work that is required for the crime analysis, another important recommendation is to assure that external researchers who are contracted to do the crime analysis be given ample time (no less than 5 months) to complete the report. This type of analysis should be given ample time due to the complexity of the data and most importantly its purpose.

Recommended Problem Statement

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

1. Status Offense

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 in diversion, subsequent phases (petition and adjudication) continue to show status offenses as either the highest or second highest for the Second and Third Circuits for all three years. In 2017, status offenses in petition were the highest in the Second, Third, and Fifth Circuits. In addition, the Third Circuit showed that almost half (49%) of the petition cases were for status offenses. Further examination of reasons why a large number of status offenses continue on to the petition phase is recommended.

Improvements from previous crime analysis are shown in the current report showing a markedly decreased percentage of status offenses to either zero or one in probation with the exception of the Second Circuit in 2017. This is worth monitoring as status offense was the 3rd highest in probation for this Circuit in 2017.

What is also worthy to note is the percentage of status offenses that are in diversion. Across the three years, status offenses in the First, Second, and Fifth Circuits accounted for over 90% of diversions with percentages for the Third Circuit ranging from about 73% to 83%. This is a marked increase from crime analysis of the Hawaii Juvenile Justice System in previous years.

2. Type of Offenses

Property offenses was consistently among the top two and three for the First and Second Circuits, across all years, for arrest, referrals, diversion, petition, detention, and probation. Adjudication for all Circuits except the Fifth showed status offenses as having one of the top three percentages across all years with property and other types of offenses. In the detention phase, the highest category of offense was other for all Circuits across the years. The percentage of other types of offense category ranged from 51% to 94% across the different Circuits. The Fifth Circuit showed a particularly high percentage of arrests due to drug offenses followed by the Second and Third Circuits for all three years.

As mentioned, a large percentage of diversions were for status offenses. The second or third was for drug offenses as shown in the First, Second, and Third Circuits. Further exploration is recommended to examine substance abuse services available for these Circuits.

3. Overrepresentation

Hawaiian/ Part Hawaiian youth continue to make up a large proportion in all the decision points of Hawaii's juvenile justice system. While they were not overrepresented in arrests, they were overrepresented in subsequent phases of the system with exception of the Third Circuit for probation. Filipinos were overrepresented in various stages but only in the Fifth Circuit. Caucasians in 2017 were overrepresented in arrests but were not in subsequent phases. Samoans were still overrepresented in some phases for the First Circuit, in particular HYCF.

4. Mixed Pacific Islander ethnic category

This ethnic grouping is worth a closer examination as the data in certain phases shows an overrepresentation for certain years. This ethnic grouping doesn't provide relevant information on the specific Pacific Islander ethnic group who are experiencing difficulties within the JJS.

5. System Improvements

The Second, Third, and Fifth Circuits' rates of arrests, referrals, petitions, adjudications per 1000 youth were two to three times more than the First Circuit, an issue that was also seen in the previous crime analysis report. In many instances, they surpass the State rates. This is worth a closer examination as the youth populations of these respective Circuits are less than the First Circuit.

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 with the exception of probation and HYCF for most of the Circuits. Ethnic identification in probation and HYCF improved in 2017 in which most of the cases had an identified ethnic. This is a problem as per Family Court procedures; the referral phase requires a birth certificate to verify demographic information such as ethnicity.

5. Prevention

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 report, the age groups of 16 to 17 years old 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.

6. Gender

In diversion, the Fifth Circuit had the largest percentage difference for all three years while the First Circuit showing the least. In subsequent phases (petition, adjudication, probation, HYCF) gender difference increased rapidly. Diversion phase had the lowest gender difference for all phases. The Fifth Circuit consistently showed the largest percentage difference between the gender, depending on the year for all phases except detention, probation, and HYCF. The First Circuit showed the largest difference in detention for all three years and the Second Circuit with probation.

Appendix 1. The total number of youth population ages 10-17 years and population proportions of selected ethnic/racial groups

	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>

Appendix 2. American Community Survey (ACS), 2015-2016, for the State of Hawai'i and for each County

	Population of 10-17 years old	State	Honolulu	Maui County, Hawaii	Hawaii County, Hawaii	Kauai County, Hawaii	State	Honolulu County, Hawaii	Maui County, Hawaii	Hawaii County, Hawaii	Kauai County, Hawaii
2015	Population Female	63123	42837	7975	8962	3349	129968	88625	16051	18424	6868
2015	Population Male	66845	45788	8076	9462	3519					
2016	Population Female	62744	42515	7915	8961	3353	129395	88025	15970	18502	6898
2016	Population Male	66651	45510	8055	9541	3545					