


CONNECTICUT'S
CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM
A FIVE YEAR LOOK
AT TRENDS AND ISSUES
1982-1987



STATE OF CONNECTICUT
WILLIAM A. O'NEILL, GOVERNOR
OFFICE OF POLICY AND MANAGEMENT

MARCH, 1988

CR Sent
1-28-88

111007

OFFICE OF POLICY AND MANAGEMENT, JUSTICE PLANNING DIVISION

Research Staff:

Gerald F. Stowell, Chief of Research

Dolly Reed, Research Analyst

Gary Lukasewski, Research Analyst

Kevin Randolph, Planning Analyst

111007

111007

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by
Connecticut Office of Policy
and Management

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

CONNECTICUT'S CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM:

A FIVE YEAR LOOK AT TRENDS AND ISSUES

1982-1987

NCJRS

MAY 4 1988

ACQUISITIONS

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

OFFICE OF POLICY AND MANAGEMENT

ANTHONY A. MILANO, SECRETARY

WILLIAM H. CARBONE, UNDER SECRETARY

MARCH, 1988



STATE OF CONNECTICUT
OFFICE OF POLICY AND MANAGEMENT
JUSTICE PLANNING DIVISION

March 8, 1988

Dear Interested Parties:

I would like to bring to your attention this report on Connecticut's criminal justice system. Following an initial analysis of crime trends in the state, the remainder of the report is divided into chapters based upon different components of the system: law enforcement, judicial processing and corrections. There is a separate chapter on the juvenile justice system. At the end of each chapter is a summary of its highlights.

The final chapter summarizes findings from the previous chapters and makes recommendations for policy initiatives which can be used as a basis for guiding future budget, legislative and policy decisions affecting criminal justice issues in the future.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "William H. Carbone".

William H. Carbone
Under Secretary

WHC/drij

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	i
CHAPTER ONE	CRIME TRENDS IN CONNECTICUT 1
CHAPTER TWO	LAW ENFORCEMENT 19
CHAPTER THREE	JUDICIAL PROCESSING 28
CHAPTER FOUR	CORRECTIONS 34
CHAPTER FIVE	JUVENILE JUSTICE 45
CHAPTER SIX	SUMMARY AND POLICY ISSUES 59

INTRODUCTION

Crime is big business in Connecticut. About half a billion dollars in direct monetary loss has been suffered by Connecticut's citizens and businesses during the five year period from 1982 through 1986. Slightly more than one third of that value was ever recovered. The costs of human suffering can not be measured directly with a dollar figure, but the indirect costs of such things as medical care, lost wages, the costs of substitute care for dependents, and rehabilitation costs add up to a considerable sum.


The costs which state and local governments incur in protecting its citizens and enforcing laws, as well as prosecuting and punishing offenders have averaged over half a billion dollars annually for the years 1982 through 1986. The state's criminal justice budget is distributed among many different agencies: the Judicial Department, State Police, Correction Department, State's Attorney's Office, Public Defenders Office, Department of Children and Youth Services, and the Commission on Victim Services. The state's annual expenditures for criminal justice are shown by Figure i on the next page. There has been a 70 percent increase from 1981/82 to 1986/87. Law enforcement costs incurred by municipalities have averaged over 200 million dollars annually for the five year period. Other costs which must be considered are the costs for insuring life, health and property and the costs faced by citizens trying to protect themselves or cover losses.

This report will deal with the trends in crime and law enforcement in Connecticut during the last five years for which complete data is available. The effects of the changing crime rate and nature of criminal activities and number of persons arrested upon the area of the courts and corrections will be explored as well as the implications of these findings for the entire criminal justice community. The search for new sites for additional prison and jail facilities has brought to the public's attention that the present crisis in housing prisoners.

This strain is being felt upon all components of the criminal justice system and it is obvious that changes in policy and procedures and the expenditure of additional funds are needed. So that these changes may be made in a rational manner and that expenditures can be made with maximum effectiveness, the areas of crime, enforcement, prosecution, adjudication and disposition need to be explored in a thorough and rational manner. Maintaining the quality of life with regard to protection of citizens from criminal activities is a function of government which is becoming more expensive but must be done regardless of cost. Citizen demands for protection are becoming more specific. Enforcement of drunk driving laws, punishment for crimes against the family, and increased enforcement of drug laws are examples of recent citizen demands for surer and swifter justice.

Chapter one will cover the changing nature of crime in Connecticut during the last five years. Law enforcement, particularly as it pertains to clearing crimes by arrest, will be the subject of chapter two. Also covered will be the court and correctional systems, as well as a chapter on juvenile justice and a final chapter summarizing the highlights of these trends and discussing their implications for the criminal justice system as a whole in the coming years.

CHART XII
CONNECTICUT FUNDING FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE*
1981-1986
UP 70 PERCENT



Source: State Budget for Fiscal Years 1981-82 through 1986-87

*Includes Appropriations and Bond Authorizations

Figure i

CHAPTER ONE:

CRIME TRENDS IN CONNECTICUT




Figure 1.1

CRIME TRENDS IN CONNECTICUT

Although not all crimes are reported to or come to the attention of the police, the record of criminal activities which are reported by the local police agencies through the Uniform Crime Reporting system has become the most complete and reliable source of crime statistics available. Local police departments report crimes, arrests, and related activities to the Crimes Analysis Unit of the Connecticut State Police, who publish the data annually and forward it to the FBI, who compile crime data on a national level.

There are eight index offenses in the uniform crime report program: murder and non-negligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, and motor vehicle theft.

The sources of data for this section will be Crime in Connecticut, Annual Reports for 1982-1986, "Connecticut Quarterly Crime Statistics, 1987", and Crime in the U.S., Uniform Crime Reports, 1982-1986.

This section of the report will show the crime trends and the nature of this criminal activity in Connecticut for the five year period from 1982-1986. Limited data is also available for 1987. Data relating more specifically to police activity, such as crimes cleared and persons arrested, will be included in the section on law enforcement.

AFTER DECLINING IN 1983 AND 1984, THE NUMBER OF REPORTED INDEX OFFENSES HAS BEEN RISING FOR THE YEARS 1985 THROUGH 1987. (See Figure 1.1).




Figure 1.2




Figure 1.3

The number of REPORTED PROPERTY CRIMES FELL IN 1983 AND 1984, BUT HAS BEEN RISING ANNUALLY SINCE 1985. However, VIOLENT OFFENSES HAVE RISEN IN 1984, 1985, AND 1986, but may have declined slightly in 1987, as suggested by an estimate based on the first nine months of 1987. (See Figures 1.2, 1.3)

HOW DOES CRIME IN CONNECTICUT COMPARE TO CRIME IN THE COUNTRY AS A WHOLE, AND TO THE NEW ENGLAND REGION? Figure 1.4 shows crimes reported per 100,000 population for all seven index offenses for the United States, New England, and Connecticut. The crime rate has been rising in all three, and all have followed the same trend. However, THE UNITED STATES HAS THE HIGHEST RATE, NEW ENGLAND THE LOWEST, WITH CONNECTICUT IN THE MIDDLE. The gap between the United States and Connecticut appears to be widening.

Figure 1.5 (next page) shows the property crime rates for the United States, New England, and Connecticut. For 1982 and 1983, Connecticut's property rate equaled that of the country as a whole. In 1985 and 1986, the property rate dipped below the national rate. However, in 1986, the property crime rate in Connecticut once again comes very close to the nation's property crime rate. The New England property crime rate is considerably below that of the United States and Connecticut for all five years.

Figure 1.6 indicates the crime rate for violent crimes in the United States, New England and Connecticut. Both Connecticut and New England have violent crime rates which are significantly below the violent crime rate in the United States as a whole.




Figure 1.4




Figure 1.5




Figure 1.6

THE INCREASE IN THE PROPERTY CRIME RATE IN CONNECTICUT BETWEEN 1985 AND 1986 WAS SIGNIFICANT, while the United States and New England showed only slight gains. BOTH CONNECTICUT AND NEW ENGLAND SHOWED A MODEST INCREASE IN THE VIOLENT CRIME RATE IN 1986, compared to the increase in the United States.




Figure 1.7




Figure 1.8

As Figure 1.7 indicates, THE MOST FREQUENTLY OCCURRING PROPERTY OFFENSE IS LARCENY, with burglary occurring less than half as often and motor vehicle theft occurring about one sixth as frequently. Figure 1.8 indicates that THE VALUE OF PROPERTY TAKEN DURING THE COMMISSION OF A CRIME HAS BEEN INCREASING.




Figure 1.9




Figure 1.10

The number of burglaries declined in 1983 and 1984 from the high 1982 levels. Reported burglaries have been increasing modestly for the years 1985-1987. FIGURE 1.10 INDICATES AN INCREASING TENDENCY FOR BURGLARIES TO OCCUR BY UNLAWFUL ENTRY, WITHOUT USING FORCE TO GAIN ACCESS TO A BUILDING.




Figure 1.11




Figure 1.12

Although the number of larcenies reported dropped in 1983 and 1984, they began to increase again in 1985 and 1986 before declining slightly in 1987. THE NUMBER OF LARCENIES VALUED OVER \$200 HAS SHOWN A DRAMATIC INCREASE FOR THE YEARS 1984 THROUGH 1986 as indicated in Figure 1.12.




Figure 1.13




Figure 1.14

Motor vehicle thefts showed a dramatic decline in 1983 and 1984 before beginning to rise again in 1985. The increase for 1987 was steep. REPORTED PROPERTY CRIMES OUTNUMBER VIOLENT CRIMES BY ELEVEN TO ONE. (See Figure 1.14)




Figure 1.15




Figure 1.16

Figure 1.15 indicates that there are nearly eight robberies or aggravated assaults reported for each murder or rape, and that the number of aggravated assaults reported has surpassed the number of robberies. THERE HAS BEEN A DRAMATIC INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF MURDERS REPORTED IN 1985 AND 1986.




Figure 1.17




Figure 1.18

THE NUMBER OF RAPES REPORTED DROPPED IN 1983, BUT MADE BIG JUMPS IN 1984 AND 1987. Figure 1.18 indicates a decline in the number of robberies for 1983 and 1984 before slight increases in 1985 and 1986. The estimate for 1987 indicates a possible significant drop in the number of robberies reported.




Figure 1.19




Figure 1.20

AGGRAVATED ASSAULTS DECLINED IN 1983, BUT HAVE BEEN CLIMBING STEADILY SINCE. Figure 1.20 shows the type of weapon used in committing aggravated assaults. The biggest increase in type of weapon used is in the hands, fists, feet or other body parts and weapons other than firearms or knives.

IS CRIME IN CONNECTICUT DISTRIBUTED EVENLY THROUGHOUT THE STATE? High population density has been linked to an increased crime rate and Connecticut is no exception to this. Connecticut has no major metropolitan areas such as New York, Boston, Chicago, or Los Angeles, but it does have significantly higher crime rates in its three largest towns. Bridgeport, Hartford and New Haven make up only thirteen percent of the state's population, but account for more than thirty-one percent of all reported crimes in the state. Other factors which may be more prevalent in larger cities and which may be linked to higher crime rates are high levels of unemployment, poverty, high drop-out rates from school, overcrowded housing, and closer contact with the drug culture and other criminal elements.

FOR THE FIVE YEAR PERIOD 1982-1986, CONNECTICUT'S THREE LARGEST TOWNS HAD AN AVERAGE CRIME RATE THREE TIMES HIGHER THAN THE REMAINDER OF THE STATE. (See Figure 1.21). FOR VIOLENT CRIMES, THE RATE WAS EIGHT TIMES HIGHER IN THE THREE LARGEST TOWNS. The robbery rate was twelve times higher in the three largest towns and the murder rate was 8 and 1/2 times higher. Aggravated assaults occurred five times more frequently and rape four times more frequently in Hartford, New Haven and Bridgeport.

For the specific property crimes, motor vehicle theft was five times more likely to occur, burglary three times more likely, and larceny 2 and 1/2 times more likely to occur and be reported.




Figure 1.21




Figure 1.22




Figure 1.23

The crime rate for Connecticut's three largest towns decreased slightly in 1987; the crime rate for the remainder of the state increased slightly. For property crimes, the rate for the three largest towns decreased slightly, but increased for the remainder of the state.




Figure 1.24




Figure 1.25

THE GAP BETWEEN THE THREE LARGEST TOWNS AND THE REMAINDER OF THE STATE IN THE AREA OF VIOLENT CRIME CONTINUES TO WIDEN. The murder rate for the remainder of the state has been stable. For the three largest towns, the rate is much higher and subject to large changes. (See Figure 1.25.)




Figure 1.26




Figure 1.27

The rape rate for the three largest towns has been increasing since 1983, but the rate for the remainder of the state has been stable. Figure 1.27 indicates stable robbery rates for both the three largest towns and the remainder of the state.




Figure 1.28




Figure 1.29

THE GAP BETWEEN THE THREE LARGEST TOWNS AND THE REMAINDER OF THE STATE IN THE AGGRAVATED ASSAULT RATE HAS BEEN WIDENING DRAMATICALLY. (See Figure 1.28.) The three largest towns have had a slight decline in burglaries, but the remainder of the state has shown a slight increase.

Figure 1.30





Figure 1.31



The larceny rates for the three largest towns and the remainder of the state have been relatively stable for the five year period with only slight gains in 1985 and 1986. The motor vehicle theft rate is declining for the three largest towns but increasing for the remainder of the state.

Chapter One: Crime Trends in Connecticut

Summary of Highlights

- * After declining in 1983 and 1984, the number of reported index offenses has been rising for the years 1985 through 1987.
- * Reported property crimes fell in 1983 and 1984, but have been rising annually since 1985.
- * Violent offenses have risen in 1984, 1985, and 1986.
- * The rate of reported index offenses for Connecticut falls between the higher United States rate and the lower New England rate.
- * The rate of reported property offenses in Connecticut approaches that of the United States rate, both of which are much higher than the New England rate.
- * Connecticut and New England showed only modest increases in the violent crime rate, compared to the more significant increase in the violent crime rate in the United States as a whole.
- * The most frequently occurring property offense is larceny.
- * The value of property taken during the commission of a crime has been increasing.
- * There is an increasing tendency for burglaries to occur without the use of force to gain access to a building.
- * The number of larcenies valued over \$200 has shown a dramatic increase for the years 1984 through 1986.
- * Reported property crimes outnumber violent crimes eleven to one.
- * There has been a dramatic increase in the number of murders reported in 1985 and 1986.
- * The number of rapes reported made significant jumps in 1984 and 1987.
- * Aggravated assaults declined in 1983, but have been increasing since 1984.
- * Connecticut's three largest towns (Bridgeport, Hartford, New Haven) had an average crime rate three times greater than the remainder of the state. For violent offenses, the rate was eight times higher.
- * The gap between the three largest towns and the remainder of the state in the area of violent crime continues to widen.
- * The gap between the three largest towns and the remainder of the state in the aggravated assault rate has been widening dramatically.

CHAPTER TWO:

LAW ENFORCEMENT

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Connecticut has 169 towns and some additional boroughs ranging in size from around a thousand to nearly 150,000. Eighty-two towns do not operate their own police departments, but rely upon the Connecticut State Police to offer police protection. In 1986 there were 101 law enforcement agencies operating within Connecticut's borders. Of these, seven were operated by universities, and the remainder were operated by towns or boroughs. The largest of these agencies is the Hartford Police Department with a total of 592 full time employees. The smallest two agencies, which consist of six members each, are the University of Connecticut's Avery Point Campus, and the Stafford Springs Police Department.

Figure 2.1 shows the number of full time sworn police officers operating in the state during the five years from 1982 through 1986. After increasing significantly in 1983 and 1984, the number of full time sworn officers has increased only slightly since 1984. In 1986, there were a total of 6,780 full-time sworn police officers, and an additional 1,493 civilian personnel statewide. The total number of full-time law enforcement personnel for 1986 was 8,293.

Among the duties of the law enforcement officer is the enforcement of state and local laws and the protection of citizens from the acts of criminals. One measure of the effectiveness of law enforcement is the number or percent of reported crimes which are cleared (i.e. solved by arrest or other means.) Information about persons arrested has implications for the community and the local law enforcement agency, as well as those components of the criminal justice system which become involved following arrest.




Figure 2.1




Figure 2.2




Figure 2.3

ONLY ABOUT ONE IN FIVE REPORTED CRIMES IS EVER CLEARED. (See Figure 2.2.) Clearance rates for property crimes are consistently lower than for violent offenses. Both are relatively stable.




Figure 2.4




Figure 2.5

The clearance rate for larceny has been stable over the five years and is higher than for other property offenses. The clearance rate for burglaries has dropped slightly in 1986, but has risen steadily for motor vehicle theft. THE CLEARANCE RATE FOR MURDERS HAS DROPPED OVER THE FIVE YEAR PERIOD.




Figure 2.6




Figure 2.7

THE NUMBER OF PERSONS ARRESTED FOR ALL OFFENSES HAS INCREASED STEADILY OVER THE FIVE YEARS. The number of persons arrested for more serious crimes dropped in 1983 and 1984, but increased in 1985 and 1986.




Figure 2.8




Figure 2.9

As indicated by Figure 2.8, persons arrested for property offenses dipped in 1984, but increased both in 1985 and 1986. THE NUMBER OF PERSONS ARRESTED FOR VIOLENT OFFENSES increased slightly in 1983, plateaued for three years and then INCREASED DRAMATICALLY IN 1986.




Figure 2.10




Figure 2.11

For every person arrested for a violent offense, four are arrested for a property offense. PERSONS ARRESTED FOR DRUG OFFENSES HAVE BEEN INCREASING FOR THE ENTIRE FIVE YEAR PERIOD, and will continue to increase as the police continue their vigorous enforcement of drug laws.




Figure 2.12




Figure 2.13

The number of persons arrested for driving under the influence dropped in 1986 after three straight years of increases. The number of juveniles arrested for index offenses has declined steadily over the five year period. About fifteen percent of all persons arrested are under the age of sixteen.




Figure 2.14




Figure 2.15

The number of adults arrested for property offenses has increased; the number of juveniles arrested for property offenses has declined. The increase in juveniles arrested for violent offenses has been modest; THE INCREASE IN ADULTS ARRESTED FOR VIOLENT OFFENSES WAS DRAMATIC IN 1986.

Chapter Two: Law Enforcement

Summary of Highlights

- * The total number of full-time law enforcement personnel in Connecticut in 1986 was 8,293.
- * Only about one in five reported crimes is ever cleared.
- * The clearance rate for murders has dropped over the five year period.
- * For every person arrested for a violent offense, four are arrested for a property offense.
- * The number of persons arrested for all offenses has increased steadily since 1982.
- * The number of persons arrested for property offenses has been increasing since 1984.
- * The number of persons arrested for violent offenses increased dramatically in 1986.
- * The increase in adults arrested for violent offenses in 1986 was even more dramatic.
- * The number of persons arrested for drug offenses has been increasing over the five year period.
- * The number of persons arrested for driving under the influence dropped in 1986 after three straight years of increases.

The data for this chapter was obtained from Crime in Connecticut, Annual Reports, 1982-1986, Uniform Crime Reporting Program, Connecticut Department of Public Safety.

CHAPTER THREE:

JUDICIAL PROCESSING

PROSECUTION

In charge of the investigation and prosecution of all criminal matters in the superior court is the Division of Criminal Justice, located within the executive branch of state government. It is the duty of the Division of Criminal Justice to prosecute all crimes and offenses against the laws of the state and any ordinances, regulations and by-laws of any town or municipality. It will participate in all appellate, post-trial and post conviction proceedings.

The administrative head of the Division of Criminal Justice is the chief state's attorney, who is appointed for a term of five years by the Criminal Justice Commission. The Criminal Justice Commission, of which the Chief State's Attorney is also a member, has six other members nominated by the governor and appointed by the general assembly. The chief state's attorney has two deputy chief state's attorneys appointed for four year terms by the Criminal Justice Commission. There are twelve state's attorneys, one for each judicial district, and as many assistant state's attorneys and deputy assistant state's attorneys in each district as necessary to conduct the court's business.

Among the duties of the chief state's attorney are: to administer, direct, supervise, coordinate and control the operations of the division; to adopt and establish rules and guidelines; enter into contracts; conduct long-range planning, research and evaluations; staff development; coordinate activities with other agencies; receive and administer federal funds, and maintain accounting, budget and personnel matters. The chief state's attorney and state's attorneys may sign warrants and applications for grand jury investigations or extraditions. The chief state's attorney shall appoint four chief inspectors to assist the state's attorneys statewide with investigations concerning criminal offenses and in procuring evidence for the state. All law enforcement agencies are required to cooperate in investigations conducted by the Division of Criminal Justice.

Each state's attorney must present appropriate charges to the court, collect all forfeited bonds and fees owed, and issue subpoenas for witnesses. Each state's attorney may hire detectives to assist in the investigation of cases involving capital punishment or imprisonment in the Connecticut Correction Institution at Somers. In cases where a death has occurred, the state's attorneys office must identify and notify the next of kin of the victim regarding the arrest, arraignment, release from custody and all court proceedings of the defendant in the case. (Description of the Division of Criminal Justice summarized from Connecticut General Statutes 51-275a-51-288.)

PUBLIC DEFENDERS OFFICE

The Commission on Public Defender Services appoints the chief public defender and deputy chief public defender. The commission also appoints a public defender for each of the twelve judicial districts, a public defender to handle appellate matters, and as many assistant public defenders and deputy assistant public defenders for each district as the criminal or delinquency business of that court district requires.

The court will appoint a public defender, assistant public defender, or deputy assistant public defender to represent an indigent defendant in any of the following: a criminal action, a habeous corpus proceeding arising from a criminal matter, an extradition proceeding, or any delinquency matter. The public defender, assistant public defender, or deputy assistant public

defender must conduct a financial investigation to determine indigency.

The chief public defender supervises the deputy chief public defender, and all public defenders, assistant public defenders and deputy assistant public defenders. Other duties include the establishment of divisions, facilities and offices, and selection of other personnel deemed necessary for the efficient operation of the public defender services. (Description of Public Defender Services summarized from Connecticut General Statutes 51-284-51-300.)

COURTS

The Supreme Court, Appellate Court, Superior Court, and Probate Court make up Connecticut's judicial system. All courts except the Probate court are state funded. The governor nominates and the legislature appoints judges to the Supreme Court, Appellate Court and Supreme Court.

The Chief Justice presides over the Supreme Court and is responsible for the Judicial Department's operations. The Chief Justice also assigns panels, hears each appeal, selects a panel member to author the court's opinion and presides over Supreme Court conferences. The Chief Justice has authority to designate trial referees and appoint attorney trial referees.

The Appellate Court is the intermediate court of appeals. Generally, the Appellate Court hears matters not directly brought to the Supreme Court.

The Superior Court is Connecticut's sole trial court of general jurisdiction. It has four major divisions: criminal, civil, family, and housing. Connecticut is divided into twelve judicial districts and 21 geographic areas. Judicial district courts hear major criminal matters and major civil matters. The major criminal matters include A, B, and C felonies. Geographic area courts hear minor felony and motor vehicle cases. These cases include D felonies and misdemeanors. There are fifteen judicial court locations.

The Office of the Chief Court Administrator has developed time standards to govern the movement of criminal cases. It should take no longer than thirty days following arrest for a defendant to appear for his first appearance and plea at a GA court. It should take no longer than 60 days for a defendant to have his pre-trial hearing, court trial or jury trial after his arrest. In large judicial districts, courts should dispose of cases within a year. Courts in other judicial districts should dispose of cases within six months. Connecticut's Speedy Trial Law requires that criminal trials start within eight months for incarcerated defendants and within one year for non-incarcerated defendants.


Figure 3.1 (next page) shows the number of serious criminal cases added and disposed by Connecticut courts. Cases added increased 23 percent from FY 1981-82 to FY 1986-87. Cases disposed increased 13 percent in the same time period. The number of cases added exceeded the number disposed by over 400 in FY 86-87.

The number of less serious cases added, those handled by Part D of the Geographical Area locations, increased by 41 percent from 109,498 in FY 1981-82 to 154,345 cases in FY 1986-87. The number of less serious cases disposed increased 29 percent in the same period.

The substantial increase in the number of serious felony cases did not diminish a conviction rate of 70 percent for serious cases. Of those convicted of felonies, 60 percent were incarcerated.

The average length of sentence for convicted felons in Connecticut has not increased significantly since 1980, but sentence length for certain very serious offenders has increased substantially. For example, the average sentence length for robbery increased 73 percent from 1980 to 1984 and the

SUPERIOR COURT, STATE OF CONNECTICUT
 SERIOUS CRIMINAL CASES*
 ADDED AND DISPOSED
 1981/82 - 1986/87



*Capital, A, B and C Felonies

Figure 3.1

average sentence length for serious sexual assault in 1984 is four times the length in 1980. For drug offenses, the average sentence length increased 47% between 1984 and 1987 and the number of drug offenders incarcerated increased dramatically. Therefore, prison beds will not "turn over" quickly enough to accommodate the increasing number of persons incarcerated for serious felonies.

Computer projections based on Connecticut's population and arrest rates indicate a 4-5 percent increase in serious felony cases and a 23 percent increase in less serious criminal cases added to the court dockets by 1990. After 1990, the number of cases added may begin to decline, but will not return to 1986 levels until 1996 for serious felonies and sometime after the year 2000 for less serious criminal cases. This does not include motor vehicle cases. The number of motor vehicle cases disposed of also increased from 336,424 in FY 1980-81 to 530,380 in FY 1985-86, a 58 percent increase.

BAIL COMMISSION

The Bail Commission is a Judicial Department entity. The Bail Commission's primary purpose is to secure a defendant's presence in court if the defendant is charged with a bailable offense. Connecticut upgraded the Bail Commission in 1980. Through a comprehensive screening and release process, the proportion of accused people in jail dropped from 31 percent in 1980 to less than 20 percent in 1986. However, the proportion and the number of accused people in incarceration is increasing. In 1984, the average daily accused population was 900 people. In 1987, the average was approximately 1300 people. In 1987, the accused population fluctuated between 18.8 and 21.8 percent of the total population. In 1984, the fluctuation was between 16.9 and 17.6 percent of the total. Figure 3.2 shows increases in the number of bail interviewees accused of A, B or C felonies.

Bail Interviewees Accused of A, B, or C Felonies

Time Period	C Felony	B Felony	A Felony	Total
May 1982- April 1983	3307	3063	252	6622
May 1983- April 1984	3815	2705	242	7021
May 1984- April 1985	4015	2630	219	6900
Jan. 1986- Dec. 1986	4913	2877	258	8048

Figure 3.2

ADULT PROBATION

The Office of Adult Probation is also a Judicial Department entity. As of December 31, 1987, the Office of Adult Probation had over 45,000 people under its supervision. The average caseload is 258 people per officer. The average active caseload is 146 per officer. Officers spend an average of 23 minutes per month on an active case, four minutes per month on inactive cases.

Although not its statutory mandate, probation functions as the primary alternative to incarceration in Connecticut. Probation not only supervises offenders whose incarceration has been fully suspended, but offenders who have served the incarcerative portion of their sentence and have been released to the Office of Adult Probation (split sentence offenders.) Typically, split sentence offenders pose a greater public safety threat. Since the demise of parole, the Office of Adult Probation (OAP) has supervised increasing numbers of split sentence offenders. An increased caseload and inadequate probation resources have forced OAP to relax classification standards. The type of offender who may have been in the active caseload five years ago may be placed in the inactive caseload today. Those on inactive probation are not required to visit the probation officer, and only 65 percent of the active probationer's contacts with the probation officer involve face-to-face contact.

The Connecticut probation system is overloaded. OAP has managed to continue meeting the goal of providing investigative services in the form of pre-sentence investigations and does respond well to the need for court coverage, but has not had the resources to provide rehabilitative services to probationers. This situation is made worse by the fact that services outside of OAP are insufficient to meet the demand. Furthermore, with the exception of the Intensive Probation Program, the goal of supervising offenders in the community after referral by the courts is not being adequately met. Probation Officers have been assigned more cases than they can effectively supervise. There has been a deterioration of staff accountability and a breakdown in the probationer's accountability to the officers and to the court. Community protection is diminished because with present resources, it is not possible to provide the supervision services that the public generally associates with adult probation.

In FY 87-88, OAP received 40 additional probation officers, but each probation officer's caseload diminished only slightly. The Governor's 1988-89 budget includes funding for 50 additional probation officers. The large manpower increases will decrease caseloads so that they come closer to the national average. Additional officers will also help supervise an increasing number of serious felons on probation. The proportion of convicted felons on probation rose from 30 percent in 1977 to 44 percent in 1986. And probation failures rose from slightly over 12% in 1980-81 to 22 percent in 1985-86.

Figure 3.3 (next page) shows the increasing probation caseload for 1981 through 1987.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
TOTAL PROBATION CASELOAD
BY YEAR
1981/82 - 1986/87




Figure 3.3

Chapter Three: Judicial Processing

Summary of Highlights

- * The number of serious felony cases added to Superior Court has increased by 23 percent from FY 1981-82 to FY 1986-87. The number of serious felony cases disposed increased by thirteen percent.
- * The number of less serious cases added (those handled by the geographic area courts) increased by 41 percent from FY 1981-82 to FY 1986-87. The number disposed increased 29 percent.
- * The average sentence length for very serious offenders has substantially increased since 1980.
- * The number of drug offenders incarcerated is dramatically increasing.
- * The average sentence length for drug offenders is dramatically increasing.
- * The accused population is increasing as a proportion of the total population.
- * The primary alternative to incarceration, probation, is overloaded and supervisory capacity is strained.
- * The Office of Adult Probation is supervising an increasing number of very serious offenders.

Sources of data for this chapter include:

Report of the Connecticut Judicial Department, 1980-82, 1982-84, 1984-86.

Prison and Jail Overcrowding: A Report to the Governor and Legislature, The Prison and Jail Overcrowding Commission, January 1988.

Offender Based Transactional Statistics, Justice Planning Division, Office of Policy and Management, 1984.

Bail Commission

CHAPTER FOUR:

CORRECTIONS

OVERVIEW

Connecticut has a unified corrections system. All correctional facilities and many related community programs throughout the state are administered by the Department of Correction. Within the system are various kinds of facilities, each providing bedspace for distinct segments of the inmate population. They include: male and female, pre-trial and sentenced, and short term and long term individuals. Complementing the system of facilities is an extensive network of community programs. These programs both assist those making the transition to the community and serve clients as an alternative to incarceration. In recent years, both the correctional facilities and the community programs have experienced significant strain due to the tremendous growth in the inmate population. Considerable resources are now being added to the system by the state to maintain pace with the growing need. Even so, population projections by the Department of Correction indicate that the coming years will be quite challenging for the corrections system.

FACILITIES

The Department of Correction presently manages sixteen facilities in the system. There are three categories of facilities: facilities for sentenced offenders, community correctional centers, and detention centers. The first category includes six institutions or prisons which incarcerate individuals who are serving long term sentences for felony offenses; the second category includes seven correctional centers or jails whose primary populations are pre-trial inmates and offenders serving short term sentences; and the last category includes three facilities of which two are for holding pre-trial detainees and the other houses inmates convicted of driving while intoxicated. Four other major facilities are to be constructed by the state before the end of 1992. They include two correctional institutions and two correctional centers.

Facilities for sentenced offenders:

- A. CCI--Enfield This medium security facility was opened in 1960. In 1987, it had an average daily population of 470.
- B. CCI--Robinson This modern new medium security facility is located in Enfield and was opened in 1985. It had an average daily population of 644 in 1987.
- C. Gates Correctional Unit This recently constructed modular facility is located on the grounds of the Correctional Institution at Niantic. It houses male inmates with short sentences and had an average daily population of 204 in 1987.
- D. Manson Youth Institution This facility is for youthful male offenders, aged 16-19. Located in Cheshire, it opened in 1982. It had an average daily population of 441 in 1987.
- E. CCI--Niantic The state's sole facility for women, pre-trial and sentenced, was opened in 1918. During 1987, it averaged 385 women daily.

- F. CCI--Somers This is Connecticut's maximum security facility which opened in 1962. It is the system's largest institution and had an average daily population of 1,397 in 1987.
- G. North Central Prison and Classification Center Sited in Suffield, this major new 800 bed facility is scheduled to open in 1992. It will serve as a 500 bed medium security bed prison and a 300 bed central processing and classification unit. Besides housing inmates who are serving incarcerative sentences, this facility will serve as a central classification center. Offenders who enter the correctional system will be screened, evaluated and placed in the most appropriate facility or program according to their individual needs.
- H. Correctional Institution for Women The state of Connecticut intends to construct a modern 350 bed prison for women which would eventually replace the existing obsolete facility in Niantic. This new facility, to be located on the grounds of the present facility, will house all women inmates in the state, both pretrial and sentenced. It is expected to be completed in 1992.

Community Correctional Centers

- I. CCC--Bridgeport This jail, housing both sentenced and unsentenced inmates, contains some of the newest and oldest facilities. The new center opened in 1974; the old center opened in 1888, with a north wing which dates from 1958. All three buildings held an average of 834 inmates last year.
- J. CCC--Brooklyn This jail was built in 1850 and is located in rural northeastern Connecticut. During 1987, it held an average of 147 inmates each day. It is scheduled to close in 1992.
- K. CCC--Cheshire Cheshire serves as a reintegration center for offenders nearing release. This facility, which held an average of 620 inmates last year, was built in 1910 with an addition constructed in 1956.
- L. CCC--Hartford The newest of the centers, this facility was opened in 1977. Last year an average of 504 inmates daily were detained here.
- M. CCC--Litchfield This 1812 facility averaged 104 inmates during 1987.
- N. CCC--Montville Opened in 1957, this jail held an average 187 inmates during 1987.
- O. CCC--New Haven The second newest community correctional center opened in 1976 and last year detained an average of 489 inmates daily.
- P. Western Connecticut Correctional Center The state intends to construct a 400 bed medium security jail in Newtown which will

serve the western portion of the state for pretrial and short-term sentenced inmates. When opened in 1991, the new jail should reduce overcrowding pressure placed on the Bridgeport and New Haven Correctional Centers by cases from the Danbury, Waterbury and Torrington Courts.

- Q. Eastern Connecticut Correctional Center Site location for this new facility will be determined this year. Similar to the western correctional center in purpose and design, the 400 bed medium security jail will serve the eastern portion of the state for pretrial and short term sentenced inmates. It is expected to open in 1991.

Detention Centers and DWI facility:

- R. Morgan Street Detention Center This facility, the former Hartford Police Lockup, was leased from the city in March, 1983, to serve as a pre-trial detention facility to house persons through the first ten days of their detention. During 1987, it averaged 184 inmates daily. It is scheduled for demolition in 1991.
- S. Union Avenue Detention Center A similar contract with the New Haven Police Department was initiated in March 1984 to lease their lockup facility. Here, pre-trial detainees stay their first seven days. Last year, an average of 125 detainees were held daily.
- T. Camp Hartell Although this 100 bed facility in Windsor Locks is not a detention center, it is a specialized short term facility. It is leased by the state from the National Guard for dormitory style housing of offenders convicted of driving while intoxicated. The lease expires in 1990.

The preceding list of twenty correctional facilities is lettered from A to T. Each of these facilities is located on the map of Connecticut on the following page by its corresponding letter. Letter Q, for the eastern Connecticut Correctional Center, has been omitted because the site location for this new facility has not yet been determined.

COMMUNITY PROGRAMS

The Department of Correction maintains an extensive network of community programs and services. These programs assist inmates with furloughs from facilities prior to release, provide halfway house residences for newly released inmates, supervise those who are on home release, and offer employment, counseling and addiction services for other ex-inmates. Community programs play an important, two-fold role within the corrections system in that, not only are essential services provided for the clients, but these programs also serve as viable alternatives to incarceration. In this way, more institutional beds become available for the growing inmate population.

The two correctional community programs which have the greatest impact upon the inmate population involve halfway house facilities and the supervised home release program. The Department of Correction has twenty halfway house

facilities under contract which provide 300 beds. Supervised home release allows selected incarcerated offenders to be released directly to approved community living arrangements with varied amounts of supervision. On any given day, there are 500 clients participating in the program. These two programs save 800 beds per year for the prison system.

With effective management and increased resources for a wide range of community programs by the Department of Correction, the Bail Commission, Public Defender Services, Office of Adult Probation and other private agencies, more institutional beds would become available for the dangerous inmates.

INMATE POPULATION GROWTH

The number of persons incarcerated by the Connecticut Department of Correction has grown at an alarming rate over the past five years. In 1982, the average annual inmate population was 4,885. Since then, it has grown 38.8 percent to 6,780 as illustrated in Figure 4.1 (next page). The most significant population growth had occurred over the past two years when in 1986 and 1987 the annual increases were 10.4 and 8.2 percent, respectively. During this two year period, the inmate population grew in number by more than 1,100.

The inmate population is composed of two major subsets, the accused population who are awaiting disposition of their cases and the sentenced population who have been convicted and are serving a sentence. Figure 4.2 (page 41) presents these two components of the total inmate population for the past six years. For each year, the sentenced population increased steadily at a rate of 5 to 10 percent. The accused population decreased in 1982 and 1983 but subsequently increased in the following three years by 5, 15, and 21 percent. Presently, one in five of the total inmate population are being held in pre-trial detention.

THE OVERCROWDING PROBLEM

Throughout the United States, policy makers have been hard pressed to deal with the steadily growing crisis of prison and jail overcrowding. Connecticut is no exception. Despite a great deal of effort and expenditure of resources, the problem persists and is actually worsening.

Connecticut is in the midst of an unprecedented facility expansion program in an attempt to control the problem and avoid an emergency release of inmates. From late 1985 through 1987, 1,130 additional permanent beds have been made available to the Department of Correction. Sites have been identified for a new 800 bed prison and a 400 bed western jail. The site selection process is nearly complete for a 400 bed eastern jail. These projects, when completed in 1991 and 1992, will add 1,600 new beds to the system. These new construction projects, combined with alternative construction methods such as conversions, renovations, and expansions of existing facilities, will make a total of more than 3,000 new beds available to the Department of Correction by 1992, at a development cost of more than 300 million dollars. However, no one believes, and no other states have demonstrated, that the problem can be solved by building alone.

Connecticut continues to focus on alternatives to incarceration, as well as developing more beds. The alternative programs already in place provide an estimated savings of more than 2,000 prison beds per day, and further expansion is planned. A substantial and carefully coordinated expansion of resources in this area, while not guaranteeing a long term solution to

AVERAGE DAILY IN-HOUSE POPULATION BY YEAR

1982 - 1987




Figure 4.1




Figure 4.2

overcrowding, will at least expand our options sufficiently so that we are not faced with a situation of new facilities being overcrowded from the day they are opened. Clearly, in spite of these efforts, a crisis situation persists.

Using a sophisticated prison population projection model which simulates how the actual criminal justice system functions in Connecticut, the Department of Correction has been able to forecast the average annual inmate population to the year 2000. Based upon these projections, the Department must operate in a most effective manner in completing the construction of the four major new facilities and the expansion of the many community programs. Delays in either of these areas would transform the existing overcrowding problem into an emergency situation in which the early release of inmates would become necessary. The Department of Correction has, therefore, developed a provisional facility plan which will create interim bed spaces in the event of a crisis.

Figure 4.3 (next page) graphically presents the inmate population projections for the next thirteen years and how the facilities plan will maintain the system capacity above the projected populations. It must be noted that this plan implies a strict adherence to the construction timetable for each of the four major projects. It also assumes that the actual population for the coming years will not exceed the model's projections. In the event of slippage in the timetable or the actual population exceeding the projections, the state should be prepared to activate predetermined contingency bedspaces. In this way, the Department of Correction will be assured of functioning in a short run emergency until all new major facilities are opened.

INMATE PROFILE

Information from a random sample of 796 convicted offenders incarcerated by the Connecticut Department of Correction was collected from Bail Commission records in a study done by the Justice Planning Division of the Office of Policy and Management. Created from this data was a simple profile of the inmate population.

Nearly all of those incarcerated had a prior criminal record. Approximately 95 percent were males and 3/4 were younger than the age of 30 at the time of conviction. Nearly 2/3 were members of a minority group. The average effective incarcerative sentence for the entire sample was 18 months. Figure 4.4 on page 44 graphically presents these statistics in more detail.

INCARCERATED POPULATION AND CAPACITY BY YEAR
1987 - 2000






Figure 4.3

INMATE PROFILE


SEX



RACE / ETHNICITY



AGE



PRIOR RECORD




Figure 4.4

Chapter Four: Corrections

Summary of Highlights

- * The average daily inmate population increased 39% from 1982 to 1987.
- * Since 1986, the growth in inmate population has averaged 45 people per month.
- * The accused population has been increasing at a higher rate than the sentenced population.
- * Overcrowding in the correctional facilities and the community-based programs is becoming more serious.
- * Projections indicate steady and substantial increases in the inmate population through the early 1990's.
- * Emergency release of inmates will occur unless community program resources are expanded and the correctional facilities expansion program, which includes four major new facilities, is completed on time.
- * A profile of incarcerated offenders indicates that a majority are young males who have been convicted of prior offenses.

Sources of data for this chapter include:

Connecticut Department of Correction, Five Year Plan, 1986-1990, September 1986.

Prison and Jail Overcrowding: A Report to the Governor and Legislature, The Prison and Jail Overcrowding Commission, January 1988.

Offender Based Transactional Statistics, Justice Planning Division, Office of Policy and Management, 1984.

Connecticut Department of Correction

Bail Commission

CHAPTER FIVE:

JUVENILE JUSTICE

JUVENILE JUSTICE

The same criminal statutes which apply to adults also apply to juveniles. However, if a person is younger than sixteen when he breaks a law, he is subjected to a different set of procedures and sanctions than the adult population. Juvenile jurisdiction ends with the sixteenth birthday. Juveniles can not be convicted of a crime, but are adjudicated delinquent, regardless of the specific offense or offenses which brought them to court.

POLICE HANDLING

Police often handle juveniles differently from adults. Some departments have one or more youth officers who specialize in handling juvenile offenders. Some towns have juvenile review boards which advise police departments on how to handle many less serious cases in the community.

Juvenile cases must be proven beyond a reasonable doubt in court just as adult cases. Consequently, the quantity and quality of the police investigation and evidence gathering are just as critical in juvenile cases as adult cases. Juveniles have the same constitutional rights as adult suspects. For a statement from a child to be admissible in court, a parent or guardian must be present and the child must be advised of the following: the right to counsel; the right to have an attorney appointed if he can't afford one; the right to remain silent; and that any statement he makes may be used as evidence against him in court.

The police may handle a complaint against a juvenile without referral to the court by taking such actions as issuing a warning, making a referral to community services or releasing a juvenile into the custody of his parents. Or, the police may make a referral to the court. If a police officer believes the child's welfare or community protection is at risk, he may take a child accused of a delinquent act to one of the three state detention centers.

COURT PROCESSING

Superior Court, Juvenile Matters, accepts referrals for juveniles accused of a crime. Incoming cases are registered and assigned to a probation officer who screens them for inappropriate charges. Cases which are insufficient to pursue are dismissed and may be referred to a social service agency.

In delinquency matters, the State's Advocate Unit prosecutes most serious and contested cases. The Unit is under the jurisdiction of the Superior Court, Family Division, rather than the state's attorney's office, which handles adult criminal prosecutions. There are eight state's advocates. The unit consists of a chief state's advocate and seven state's advocates assigned to one or more judicial districts. A child referred to court on a criminal charge is entitled to defense counsel at all stages of the proceedings. The child can be represented privately, or by a public defender if he is indigent.

For first time misdemeanor offenses, an initial informal conference is held with the child and parents and a probation officer in which all are informed of the right to counsel and the right to silence. If the child admits to the charges at this initial hearing and other conditions warrant it, the case may be disposed of non-judicially by placement of the child under supervision for a period of time not to exceed three months. Cases which must

go before a judge are: A, B, or C felonies or a Serious Juvenile Offense*; a case which concerns theft or unlawful use of an automobile; a case which concerns the sale or intent to sell drugs; a child previously adjudicated delinquent or a child previously handled twice non-judicially; a child on probation or under judicial supervision; other appropriate reasons. For such court cases, a plea hearing is held. If the child admits to the offense at this point, a social history investigation is ordered for a dispositional hearing held at a later date. If the child denies the complaint against him, a trial is scheduled and the child must have an attorney representing him.

During the trial, the state's advocate (juvenile prosecutor) presents the case. If the evidence establishes beyond a reasonable doubt that the child has committed the acts alleged in the petition, then the judge will adjudicate the child delinquent and a social history investigation will be ordered for the disposition hearing. If the child is found not delinquent, the charges are erased. The judge may also dismiss the charges.

Under certain circumstances, a hearing will be held to consider transferring the child to the adult docket of Superior Court. If probable cause is found that the child committed the alleged offense, the court must transfer a child who is 14 or older and accused of murder, or a child accused of an A felony who had a previous adjudication for a class A felony, or a child accused of a B felony and previously adjudicated delinquent for two class A or B felonies. The court may transfer a child who is 14 or older and accused of an A, B, or C felony or a serious juvenile offense and previously adjudicated delinquent for a serious juvenile offense if the child is determined to be not amenable to treatment offered through the juvenile system.

DISPOSITIONS

At the disposition hearing, the court will decide how the child may be most effectively offered remedial guidance, protection and discipline in a manner compatible with the community's well-being. The alternatives include: dismissal with a warning, a form of court supervision, or commitment to the Department of Children and Youth Services for a period of up to two years, or up to four years for a serious juvenile offense.

Under court supervision, the child may remain in the community under special orders of the court and the child's progress is reviewed periodically by the court. He may be placed in a special program such as vocational probation. Probation is a legal status created by an order of the judge where the delinquent child is permitted to remain in his own home or in the physical custody of a relative or other fit person, subject to supervision by the court's probation officers and upon such terms as the judge determines. Probation generally involves a one-to-one relationship between the delinquent child and his probation officer. The court may, upon agreement of the parents, order the child placed in a private school or facility to be paid for by the parents.

All commitments to the Department of Children and Youth Services, except direct placements, enter Long Lane School, the Connecticut's only state-run residential facility for delinquent children. Within the first three weeks of a child's stay, a treatment plan is developed which includes a diagnosis of the child's problems and recommendations for the child's placement. If the

*In 1979, legislation was enacted which defined a serious juvenile offense and outlined special treatment for children referred as serious offenders. These offenses involve violence or the threat of violence.

child is placed in a facility outside Long Lane school, he is supervised by DCYS's parole services, who ensure that appropriate referrals and services are being made available to the child.

THE DATA

The information which will be used to examine the five year trends in juvenile justice are 1) the number juveniles arrested; 2) the number and type of referrals to court; and 3) demographic information about the juveniles referred to court. The focus of the data will be on juveniles entering the juvenile justice system, rather than on what happens while they are in the system and the outcome of their handling in the system.

JUVENILE ARRESTS

The segment of the population which falls under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court and is likely to break the law, those aged 5-15, has decreased by 12.5 percent from 1982 to 1986. (Those under the age of five are not likely to commit crimes.) The number of juveniles arrested for all offenses decreased by 10 percent in the same period of time. (See Figure 5.1 below.)




Figure 5.1




Figure 5.2




Figure 5.3

Juveniles arrested for part one index offenses decreased 16 percent from 1982 to 1986. The number of juveniles arrested for less serious offenses, the part two offenses, decreased only 6 percent.




Figure 5.4




Figure 5.5

The number of juveniles arrested for violent offenses climbed in 1985 and 1986, after declining in 1983 and 1984. Very few juveniles are ever arrested for murder--only 13 in a five year period.




Figure 5.6




Figure 5.7

The number of juveniles arrested for rape increased in 1983 and 1984 but declined in 1986. The number of juveniles arrested for robbery during the five year period fluctuated annually, with the yearly average at 263.




Figure 5.8




Figure 5.9

After a steep decline in 1983 and a modest drop in 1984, the number of juveniles arrested for aggravated assault made jumps in 1985 and 1986. The highest level during the five year period was seen in 1986. The number of juveniles arrested for property offenses dropped 18%.




Figure 5.10




Figure 5.11

Juvenile arrests for burglary dropped sharply in 1986 after fluctuating around 1500 for four years. The number of juveniles arrested for larceny has decreased by nearly 20 percent over the five year period.




Figure 5.12


Juvenile arrests for motor vehicle theft increased dramatically in 1985 and 1986 after reaching a low in 1984.

Because of the decline in the number of juveniles in the 5-15 age group, the number of juveniles being arrested has dropped over the five year period. Even though the overall number of juveniles being arrested is declining, the number of juveniles arrested for aggravated assault and motor vehicle theft has risen dramatically since 1984. The number of juveniles arrested for larceny dropped steadily over the five year period, but for burglary, the biggest drop was from 1985 to 1986. For murder and rape, there was an initial increase in arrests, with a drop only in 1986. Robbery showed only an up and down pattern for the five year period.

The distribution of juvenile crime throughout the state has followed the same pattern as adult crime. Juvenile arrests are more prevalent in Connecticut's three largest cities. In 1982, thirteen percent of Connecticut's juvenile population aged 5-15 resided in its three largest towns, Bridgeport, Hartford and New Haven. When the arrests of juveniles for the years 1982-1984 are combined, twenty two percent of all arrests were made by the three largest towns.

Twenty-four percent of juvenile arrests for part two offenses took place in Connecticut's three largest towns. For the more serious crimes, part one offenses, the percentage was slightly less at twenty-one percent. The arrest of juveniles for violent offenses is far more prevalent among Connecticut's larger cities than in the remainder of the state. For part one violent offenses (murder, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault), the three largest towns made half of the juvenile arrests. This is the same pattern established for violent offenses committed by the adult population. The graphs on the next page show the percentage of various types of juvenile arrests which took place in the three largest towns, as well as the percentage of each of the specific part one offenses which was made in the three largest towns.


Percent of Total Juvenile Arrests
Made by Connecticut's Three Largest Towns
Vs. the Remainder of the State
By Offense Type, 1982-1984



- * All includes all arrests of persons under the age of 16.
- * Part I offenses include murder, rape, robbery, assault, burglary, larceny and motor vehicle theft.
- * Part II offenses include all offenses except Part I offenses.
- * Violent Offenses include murder, rape, robbery and assault.
- * Property offenses include burglary, larceny and motor vehicle theft.

Figure 5.13

Percent of Part One Juvenile Arrests
Made by Connecticut's Three Largest Towns
Vs. the Remainder of the State
By Offense, 1982-1984



*Motor Vehicle Theft

Figure 5.14

Half of all juveniles arrested for violent offenses were arrested in the three largest towns. Only one of every four or five juvenile arrests for property offenses took place in Connecticut's three largest towns. The percent of juvenile arrests made in the three largest towns ranged from 22% for burglary and larceny to 86% for murder.




Figure 5.15




Figure 5.16

Figure 5.15 shows the number of cases added and disposed in juvenile court for the five year period FY 81-82 through FY 85-86. After dropping the first three years, the number of cases added has begun to climb. Figure 5.16 indicates that the number of cases which are handled judicially has outnumbered non-judicial cases in FY 1985-86 for the first time in the five year period.

After declining from FY 1981-82 to FY 1982-83, the number of juveniles admitted to detention has been climbing steadily since. The average length of stay and the average daily population have been climbing since FY 1983-84.

Admission to Detention

Year	Number Admitted	Average Length of Stay	Average Daily Population
1980/81	2,186	NA	NA
1981/82	1,908	NA	NA
1982/83	1,472	NA	NA
1983/84	1,482	4.7	19.1
1984/85	1,610	6.2	27.3
1985/86	1,848	7.3	37.0

An examination of the juveniles referred to juvenile court in FY 1985-86 reveals a profile of the juvenile offender, which is presented graphically by Figure 5.17 on the next page. Seventy-seven percent of the referrals are boys. Males also tend to be referred for far more serious offenses, as the following table reveals.

Juveniles Referred to Superior Court, Family Division
Percent By Sex, Type of Offense


	1985/86	
	Males	Females
Delinquency	82%	18%
SJO	88%	12%
FWSN	50%	50%
All Referrals	77%	23%

Looking at race or ethnicity, 59 percent of the referrals were white, 23 percent were black, thirteen percent were Hispanic, and five percent were other races. According to the 1980 census, the race/ethnicity of the juvenile population aged 7-15 was approximately 85 percent white, ten percent black, and six percent Hispanic.

Older children predominated among the juvenile caseload. Forty-one percent of the juveniles referred were fifteen at the time of the offense. Only five percent were younger than 11. Thirteen and fourteen year olds made up 42 percent of the referrals, while the remaining 12 percent referred were eleven and twelve year olds.

Eighty-five percent of the referrals were for a delinquency offense, including the eight percent serious juvenile offense referrals, while the remaining fifteen percent were for families with service needs, or status offenses.

PROFILE OF JUVENILE OFFENDER*



FWSN IS A FAMILIES WITH SERVICE NEEDS
 SJO IS A SERIOUS JUVENILE OFFENSE

*Profile of Juveniles Referred in 1985/86

Figure 5.17

Chapter Five: Juvenile Justice

Summary of Highlights

- * The number of juveniles aged 5-15 has been declining.
- * The overall number of juveniles arrested in Connecticut has been declining.
- * The number of juveniles arrested for violent offenses has been increasing since 1984.
- * Only thirteen juveniles have been arrested for murder in the five years from 1982 through 1986.
- * Arrests of juveniles for aggravated assault and motor vehicle theft have climbed dramatically since 1984.
- * Juvenile crime is more prevalent in Connecticut's three largest cities (Bridgeport, Hartford, and New Haven).
 - . Although only 13 percent of the state's youth population aged 5-15 resides in Connecticut's three largest cities, one out of every four or five juvenile arrests takes place there.
 - . Half of all juveniles arrested for part one violent offenses (murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault) were arrested in the three largest towns.
- * The number of delinquency cases added to Superior Court, Family Division has begun to climb again after reaching a low in FY 1983-84.
- * The number of juvenile court cases seen by a judge jumped by 11 percent in FY 1984-85.
- * The number of juveniles being held in detention has been increasing since reaching a low in FY 1982-83.
- * The average length of stay and the average daily population of juveniles held in detention has been increasing since FY 1983-84.
- * Most juvenile court referrals are males.
- * Males tend to be referred to court for more serious offenses than females.
- * Forty one percent of juveniles referred to court are 15 at the time of the offense. Only five percent are under the age of eleven.

Sources of data for this chapter include:

Crime in Connecticut, Annual Reports, 1982-1986
Report of the Connecticut Judicial Department, 1980-82, 1982-84, 1984-86.
State of Connecticut, Judicial Department, Superior Court--Juvenile
Matters, Biennial Report, 1984-1986.

CHAPTER SIX:

SUMMARY AND POLICY ISSUES

SUMMARY OF TRENDS

Crime is again rising--the number of reported index crimes has grown for three consecutive years (1985-1987). Violent crimes have increased since 1984. Even more importantly, the number of persons arrested in Connecticut has increased 37 percent since 1982. The number of persons arrested for part one index offenses jumped to its highest level in five years. There was an overall increase of 20 percent in the number of persons arrested for violent offenses over the five year period, and 17 percent of that increase took place between 1985 and 1986. In addition, there was a 44 percent increase in the number of persons arrested for drug offenses from 1982 to 1986, and persons arrested for driving under the influence increased 222 percent from 1982 to 1986. Even though the juvenile population is decreasing and the overall number of juveniles arrested is declining, the number of juveniles arrested for violent crime is increasing. This increase in persons arrested is significant because it marks an increase in persons coming into the criminal justice system.

Following arrest, accused persons must go through court processing. Serious felony cases added to the Superior Court caseload have increased 23 percent since FY 1981-82. Disposition of these cases increased 13 percent during the same period. For less serious offenses, the number of cases added has grown by 41 percent since FY 1981-82 while the number of cases disposed has increased 29 percent. There has also been a recent increase in the number of juveniles referred to the Family Division of Superior Court. Projections are that these increases will continue into the 1990's. In the last three years, dispositions have lagged behind cases added for both the serious felony and less serious criminal cases. If this trend continues, there is the risk of developing a serious backlog of criminal cases and slowing of the court process.

Following the increase in persons arrested and court cases added and disposed has come an increase in the number of persons placed on probation and incarcerated. The five year period from 1982-1987 has seen a 65 percent increase in the total probation caseload. Along with the increase in volume, there has been an increase in the seriousness of the offender on probation. The percent of cases which end up as probation failures has risen from 12 to 22 percent from 1982 to 1986. Even though probation staff was increased for FY 1987-88 and more increases are planned, the supervisory capacity of the probation department is still strained.

The average daily prison population increased 39 percent from 1982 to 1987. Since 1986, the growth in the inmate population has averaged 45 people per month. The accused population has been increasing at a higher rate than the sentenced population. Projections indicate steady, substantial increases through the early 1990's before leveling off near the end of the century.

Crime among both the juvenile and adult populations is more concentrated in the larger towns. This makes the strain on law enforcement and court processing in some jurisdictions even more severe than the state figures reveal.

The trends in criminal justice for the five year period can best be summed up by the use of one four letter word: more. More persons are being arrested for more serious offenses; more persons are being processed through the court system; more people are being placed on probation, particularly with more serious backgrounds; more people are being incarcerated.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- I. The criminal justice system is straining under the recent growth in caseloads. Maintaining the integrity of the system without diminishing public safety will require effort and resources to keep up with the demand for services in the areas of law enforcement, judicial processing and corrections services.
 - A. Connecticut must continue to support strong law enforcement activities throughout the state. The strain of processing increasing numbers of arrestees through the system should not discourage police departments from vigorous enforcement of Connecticut's laws.
 - B. Connecticut must continue its commitment to strengthen the level of services provided by the Office of Adult Probation. The state must continue to work toward its goal of lowering the caseload and increasing the amount of time available for supervision of probationers.
 - C. Connecticut must maintain its construction timetable for prisons and jails. Prison population projections through 1994 show Connecticut running dangerously close to statutory maximum population capacity levels. If Connecticut hits capacity and remains there for 30 consecutive days, state law requires automatic release of certain inmates. As of January 8, 1988, 7082 men and women were incarcerated in Connecticut correctional facilities. That is an increase of over 500 inmates from January, 1987. The prison population is growing at a fast rate. Connecticut must build more prison space just to keep pace. However, Connecticut can only prevent statutory inmate releases if it maintains the construction timetable. However, building new prisons and jails is both a lengthy and expensive process. It is clear that construction is only a partial solution.
 - D. Connecticut must make a commitment to expand and strengthen alternative incarceration programs. Alternative incarceration programs, which offer various levels of supervision for different kinds of offenders, alleviate the demand for some prison beds. The Governor's FY 1988-89 budget calls for \$4 million to enhance alternative programs. Such programs now allow 2,000 people a day who would be in prison to stay in the community under supervision. With respect to certain offenders, alternative programs are more economical than incarceration. The cost of housing an inmate for one year is about \$18,000. The cost of placing an offender in a high supervision alternative program may run as low as \$2,600 per year.

II. There must be a major policy shift away from focusing primarily on the exits of the criminal justice system to include examination of the various entry points into the system.

A. Connecticut must reexamine its juvenile justice system to look for ways to increase the court's ability to prevent juvenile offenders from entering the adult criminal justice system.

A study completed by the Justice Planning Division of the Connecticut Office of Policy and Management tracked all 14 and 15 year olds referred to juvenile court in 1977 into the adult criminal justice system. Approximately half of the juveniles had some contact with the adult system within five years of their sixteenth birthdays. The number could be higher if they were tracked for a longer period of time. Those juveniles who had lengthier, more serious juvenile careers also had more serious adult careers. It was found that all those juveniles in the sample of 5,600 who had three or more referrals to juvenile court ended up in the criminal justice system as adults. Fifty-eight percent of the children adjudicated delinquent ended up in the adult system. The prospects for rehabilitation after delinquency adjudication and placement in restrictive juvenile settings appear slim. Eighty-nine percent of males and 64 percent of females placed in the most restrictive juvenile setting, Long Lane School, ended up in the adult system. Therefore, strong intervention before such adjudication occurs, promises more hope of diverting juveniles from the criminal justice system. The time when the court's intervention efforts are most likely to have a deterrent effect may be after the first or second referral. The timing of the intervention may play a very important role in determining the effects of the court's actions.

B. Connecticut must identify the factors associated with a high risk of criminal behavior in order to develop programs which may reduce the number of high risk individuals becoming involved with crime.

It is quite clear from the information presented in this report that the crime rate, particularly the violent crime rate, is significantly higher in Connecticut's larger towns than it is in its suburbs and rural areas. The larger cities also have a higher proportion of other socio-economic ills which may be related to the higher crime rates. If Connecticut is to be able to reduce the flow of its citizens into the criminal justice system, it must not only examine these factors associated with high crime, but must also examine ways in which the state may address these problems either through policy changes or redistribution of resources.

III. Connecticut must increase the number of community-based treatment programs such as substance abuse treatment facilities, shelters, job training, remedial education, and residential treatment facilities for juveniles. The expansion of these support services available in the community should have a positive effect in the following areas:

reducing the number of accused who are in jail;

providing necessary support services for those placed on probation;

creating effective alternatives to incarceration;

providing follow-up and transitional services to those who are incarcerated to try to reduce their re-entry into the system.

A. Connecticut must provide more drug and alcohol treatment programs.

According to a recent report prepared by the Drug and Alcohol Abuse Criminal Justice Commission¹, approximately two thirds of a sample of arrestees were found to be under the influence of drugs or alcohol at the time of their arrest. At least 70 percent of Connecticut's incarcerated population was found to have a drug or alcohol problem. Alcohol and drug abuse are major factors in criminal activity. Currently there is an acute lack of treatment resources available to the community and the criminal justice system.

B. School based alcohol and drug prevention programs should be supported and expanded. Programs which help prevent children from becoming involved with drugs and alcohol at an early age should be considered an effective diversion from substance abuse and subsequent involvement in criminal behavior.

C. Connecticut must make a long term commitment to developing and using intermediate sanction programs.

Because of the strain in probation services and the severe overcrowding in the prison and jail system, there should be available to the criminal justice community a range of intermediate sanctions which are more restrictive than regular probation but less punitive than incarceration. They must be administered in a way which minimizes the risk to public safety. The Criminal Sanctions Task Force² recommends that a statute

¹The Drug and Alcohol Abuse Crisis within the Connecticut Criminal Justice System, prepared by the Drug and Alcohol Abuse Criminal Justice Commission (created by Public Act 87-374), released December 1, 1987.

²Criminal Sanctions Task Force Report, December, 1987.

be enacted to allow judges to sentence offenders directly to intermediate sanctions such as community service, intensive supervision, and various treatment programs. The Task Force recommends that a new unit be established within the Office of Adult Probation to administer the criminal sanctions programs, and that an advisory committee be established to assist in overseeing its operation and effectiveness. Also recommended are the expansion of current services to offenders and their families and creation of educational programs for court personnel, prosecutors and defense attorneys to improve their ability to use these programs.

IV. Connecticut must continue to support current efforts and encourage more communities to undertake community crime prevention programs.

There is a tendency for burglaries to be declining in the three largest towns, but increasing elsewhere (see page 16). Also, the increase in burglaries occurring without forced entry is accompanied by a similar decrease in the number of burglaries accomplished using forced entry (see page 6). Burglaries may be moving out of the larger cities and into suburban or rural areas where citizens may not be as vigilant about keeping their windows and doors locked.

Community crime prevention involves citizens joining law enforcement officials to ensure the safety of their homes, work places, and neighborhoods. "Neighborhood Watch," with ten million participants around the country, is perhaps the best known community crime prevention project. In Detroit, Michigan, this program may have reduced burglaries by 62 percent and all crimes by 55 percent in a three year period in a 4,200 block area covered by 200,000 volunteers. Other cities, counties, and towns have reported similar results, and many law enforcement professionals, including the Director of the FBI, point to citizen crime prevention activities as an important factor in curbing crime rates.

Crime prevention programs are only effective while they are being implemented. Since the effects don't last beyond the period of implementation, they must be sustained indefinitely. The state committment of resources for these community crime prevention programs should be maintained as long as they prove themselves to be effective in reducing crime.