

1-1-2008

# Maine Department of Corrections Annual Juvenile Recidivism Report

Susan Pate

*University of Southern Maine, Muskie School of Public Service*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.usm.maine.edu/justice>

---

## Recommended Citation

Pate, S. (2008). Maine department of corrections annual juvenile recidivism report. Portland, ME: University of Southern Maine, Muskie School of Public Service, Maine Statistical Analysis Center and the Maine Department of Corrections.

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Cutler Institute for Health & Social Policy at USM Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Justice Policy by an authorized administrator of USM Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [jessica.c.hovey@maine.edu](mailto:jessica.c.hovey@maine.edu).

# RECIDIVISM

**MAINE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS  
ANNUAL JUVENILE RECIDIVISM REPORT  
MARCH 2008**

---

**MAINE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS CENTER  
<http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/justicersearch>**

## **Annual Maine Juvenile Recidivism Report**

Issued by the Maine Department of Corrections,  
Division of Juvenile Services, and produced  
By the Muskie School of Public Service,  
Maine Statistical Analysis Center

Author  
Susan Pate

March 2008

### **ABOUT THE MAINE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS CENTER (SAC)**

The Maine Statistical Analysis Center (SAC) operates as a collaborative service of the University of Southern Maine's Muskie School of Public Service and the Maine Department of Corrections. The SAC is partially supported by the Bureau of Justice Statistics and is part of a network of member SACs maintained and coordinated by the Justice Research and Statistics Association.

The SAC collects, analyzes, and disseminates criminal justice data and information to criminal justice professionals, policy makers, researchers, students, advocates, and the public. The Maine SAC is working toward becoming the repository and clearinghouse not only for completed projects, but also for works-in-progress by researchers, students, policy analysts, and practitioners.

### **ABOUT THE MUSKIE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC SERVICE**

The Muskie School of Public Service educates leaders, informs public policy, and strengthens civic life through its graduate degree programs, research institutes and public outreach activities. By making the essential connection between research, practice, and informed public policy, the School is dedicated to improving the lives of people of all ages, in every county in Maine and every state in the nation.

This report is available on the Maine Criminal Justice Statistical Analysis Center Website at

<http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/justiceresearch> and Maine Department of Corrections website at <http://www.maine.gov/corrections/juvenile/index.htm>

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	<b>1</b>
Defining Recidivism	
Key Findings	
<b>2. ANNUAL REPORT</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3. METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>3</b>
Research Questions	
Data	
Offense Characteristics	
Challenges	
<b>4. 2005 COHORT</b>	
<b>JUVENILE DEMOGRAPHICS</b>	<b>4</b>
• Graph 1: Gender of juveniles adjudicated for the first time in 2005	
• Graph 2: Age of juveniles adjudicated for the first time in 2005	
• Graph 3: Race of juveniles adjudicated for the first time in 2005	
<b>OFFENSES</b>	<b>5</b>
• Table 1: The offenses first time juvenile offenders were adjudicated for in 2005	
• Graph 4: Offense class and type of adjudicated offenses in 2005	
• Graph 5: Type of offense based on the number of offenses for which a juvenile was first adjudicated in 2005	
• Graph 6: Class of offense based on the number of offenses for which a juvenile was adjudicated in 2005	
<b>COUNTIES</b>	<b>7</b>
• Table 2: The rate of juveniles adjudicated for the first time in 2005 by county per 1,000 population	
• Graph 7: The number of offenses by county for first time adjudications in 2005	
• Table 3: The percentage of adjudications by type of offense for each county in 2005	
<b>RECIDIVISM RATE</b>	<b>10</b>
• Table 4: The number of recidivists per group	
• Table 5: The number and percentage of juveniles who recidivated within one year of their first adjudication in 2005 by gender, Group 1	
• Table 6: Percentage of recidivists by age in 2005, Group 1	
• Graph 8: Percentage of recidivists by race in 2005, Group 1	
• Table 7: Severity of offense at first adjudication compared to severity of offense at second adjudication	
• Graph 9: Recidivism rates by counties in 2005, Group 1	
• Table 8: The number and percentage of juveniles who recidivated within one year of their first adjudication in 2005 by gender, Group 2	
• Table 9: Percentage of recidivists by age in 2005, Group 2	
• Graph 10: Percentage of recidivists by race in 2005, Group 2	
• Table 10: Recidivism rates by county in 2005, Group 2	

- Table 11: The number and percentage of juveniles who recidivated within one year of their first adjudication in 2005 by gender, Group 3
- Table 12: Percentage of recidivists by age in 2005, Group 3

## 5. TRENDS 2000-2005

<b>FIRST TIME OFFENDERS AND OFFENSES</b>	<b>16</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Graph 11: The number of juveniles adjudicated for the first time by age, 2000-2005</li> <li>• Table 13: The number of juveniles adjudicated for the first time, 2000-2005</li> <li>• Graph 12: The number of offenders and offenses for first time adjudications, 2000-2005</li> <li>• Table 14: Race of juveniles adjudicated for the first time, 2000-2005</li> <li>• Graph 13: The type of offenses juveniles were first time adjudicated, 2000-2005</li> <li>• Graph 14: Class of offenses for first time adjudications, 2000-2005</li> </ul>	
<b>COUNTIES</b>	<b>19</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Table 15: The rate of juveniles adjudicated for the first time by county, 2000-2005</li> <li>• Table 16: The number of offenses for first time juvenile adjudications by county, 2000-2005</li> <li>• Table 17: The number of first time adjudications for felony offenses by county, 2000-2005</li> </ul>	
<b>RECIDIVISM RATES</b>	<b>22</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Table 18: Recidivism Rates for Cohorts 2000-2005 at 1, 2, and 3 years</li> </ul>	
<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>APPENDIX I: DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE SERVICES CASE MANAGEMENT</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>APPENDIX II: GLOSSARY OF TERMS</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>APPENDIX III: CIVIL OFFENSES FOR 2005 COHORT</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>APPENDIX IV: OFFENSE LISTING BY TYPE FOR 2005 COHORT</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>APPENDIX V: COUNTY LEVEL DATA (2000 – 2005)</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	<b>43</b>

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Juvenile Recidivism Report is the latest in a series of juvenile recidivism reports that began with the 1998 Baseline Report. The purpose of this report is to gain a better understanding of first time juvenile offenders, the crimes they are adjudicated for, how soon they recidivate, and to continue to measure juvenile recidivism over time. This report was developed by the University of Southern Maine's Muskie School of Public Service for the Maine Department of Corrections (MDOC) Division of Juvenile Services (DJS).

DJS has a long standing tradition of tracking juvenile recidivism. Beginning with the 1998 Baseline Report, information on juvenile recidivism has been collected, analyzed, and disseminated. The Baseline Report examined the 1998 cohort of juveniles who were adjudicated for the first time (hereafter referred to as first time juvenile offenders) from January 1 through December 31, 1998. Each year following 1998, a Juvenile Recidivism Report has been produced to follow an additional cohort of juvenile offenders in order to measure recidivism rates and juvenile crime characteristics over time.

This report examines statewide and county level data, as well as type and severity of offenses, age, gender, and race characteristics of juveniles who were adjudicated for the first time in 2005. In addition, this report examines trends in first time adjudications and recidivism for the 2000 through 2005 cohorts including trends at the state and county level, type and severity of offenses committed, and age, gender, and race characteristics.

### Defining Recidivism

Across the country, states use a number of different measures of recidivism, including re-arrest, re-adjudication, and re-commitment rates.<sup>1</sup> For the purpose of this report, recidivism is defined as *any individual who records a first adjudication date in Maine's juvenile court system for offenses committed before the age of 18 and records a second adjudication date for a new offense in Maine's juvenile court system or Maine's adult court system*. The way recidivism is measured in this report represents a change from previous reports.<sup>2</sup>

Adjudication occurs when a court makes a finding in a juvenile case that the allegations contained in a petition are supported beyond a reasonable doubt. Juveniles who recorded a subsequent adjudication for a new offense are classified as recidivists. DJS has chosen re-adjudication as its measure of recidivism because re-adjudication counts only those juveniles whose subsequent contact with the juvenile justice system results in a court finding that the allegations contained in a petition are supported beyond a reasonable doubt.

Maine's juvenile recidivism rate is measured by the occurrence of a new, subsequent offense leading to second adjudication at one, two, and three year marks. The rate is calculated by dividing the number of juveniles in the 2005 cohort that were re-adjudicated within one year by the total number of juveniles adjudicated for the first time in 2005.

Some juveniles may be adjudicated for more than one offense, either for the same incident<sup>3</sup>, or for different incidences. This does not affect the recidivism rate.

In addition to determining the recidivism rate for the overall cohort, this report also provides the recidivism rate for two subgroups within the cohort: (1) those juveniles adjudicated for a felony or misdemeanor offense at first adjudication and at subsequent adjudication, and (2) those juveniles whose first adjudication was for a civil offense only.

Most recidivism studies use a longitudinal cohort method to evaluate re-offending. A cohort is a group of individuals who share certain characteristics, such as being adjudicated during a specific year. For this report, a cohort was tracked each calendar year for a follow-up period and subsequent adjudications were measured to allow for long-term trend analysis.

For the first time, this report captures those juveniles who moved into the adult criminal justice system. Adjudication data for these juveniles was collected<sup>4</sup>, analyzed, and included in the 2005 cohort recidivism rates. This will affect the recidivism rates at the one, two, and three year mark as well as other trend data. The 2005 cohort and future cohorts will include those juveniles who have moved into the adult criminal justice system. While general comparisons are made between recidivism rates for the 2005 cohort and previous cohorts, true comparisons are not possible since those juveniles in the 2005 cohort were tracked into the adult system.

---

<sup>1</sup>Snyder & Sickmund, 2006

<sup>2</sup>The 1998-2001, 2002-2003, and 2004 Recidivism Reports defined recidivism as "any individual recording a second adjudication date in the state of Maine's juvenile court system for offenses committed before the age of 18".

<sup>3</sup>An incident is a discrete occurrence or happening (Garner, 2006).

<sup>4</sup>MDOC provided Maine Department of Public Safety (MDPS) with the names of juveniles that would have turned 18 within one year of first adjudication. MDPS provided the Muskie School with criminal history records for the identified juveniles.



## Key findings

- The 1,316 first time juvenile offenders in 2005 were adjudicated for 2,317 offenses. Thirty-five percent of the cohort was adjudicated for 63% of these offenses.
- The one-year recidivism rate increased significantly to 27%, compared with the 2004 recidivism rate of 18%. When the juveniles tracked into the adult system were removed from analysis, the overall recidivism rate was still substantially higher than previous years at 24%.
- Of those juveniles who recidivated within one year of their first adjudication, the average (mean) time between first adjudication and date of offense leading to a second adjudication was 5.8 months and the median was five months.
- Between 2004 and 2005 there was a 42% decrease in the overall number of felony adjudications for person offenses.
- There was a substantial difference between counties among first time juvenile offenders with felony offenses<sup>5</sup> ranging from a low of 2% in Knox County to a high of 46% in Oxford County.
- Statewide, civil offenses constituted 14% of all offenses. Additionally, fourteen percent of the cohort was adjudicated for a civil offense only.
- The overall rate of first time adjudications for the entire state in 2005 was 8.4 per 1,000 juveniles ages 10-18. This varied by county and ranged from a high of 14.0 per 1,000 in Androscoggin and Sagadahoc counties to 4.9 per 1,000 in Oxford County.
- Of the juvenile recidivists in the 2005 cohort, those juveniles who were first adjudicated for a civil offense (s) exclusively, not only had the highest recidivism rate, but almost two-thirds of these juveniles were re-adjudicated for a more serious offense.
- The number of first time juvenile offenders adjudicated for drug/alcohol offenses has risen significantly since 2000. In 2005, the percentage of drug/alcohol offenses accounted for 22% of all offenses, whereas in 2000 only 9% of all offenses were drug/alcohol offenses.
- While there was a 13% decrease in the number of male juveniles adjudicated for the first time between 2000 and 2005, there was an 18% increase in the number of females. Between 2004 and 2005, there was a slight decrease (1%) in the number of male juveniles and a 14% increase in the number of females adjudicated for the first time.
- Between 2000 and 2005, the number of younger first time offenders (10-15 years old) declined by 36% and the number of older first time offenders (16-18 years old) increased by 28%.

## 2. ANNUAL REPORT

This report provides a detailed profile of first time juvenile offenders in Maine between January 1, 2005 and December 31, 2005 and the offenses for which they were adjudicated. Data on these juveniles are reported at the county level and stratified by crime types, class, gender, age, and race. The recidivism rate is determined, and first offenses are compared to recidivating offenses. Results from the 2005 cohort are then compared to the 2000 through 2004 cohorts and examined for trends.

This report also follows the 2005 cohort for one year after first adjudication to determine a recidivism rate after one year. Two and three year recidivism rates are reported for the applicable cohorts. In future reports, the 2005 cohort will be followed for three years to examine recidivism at one, two, and three years from first adjudication.

---

<sup>5</sup>A felony is a serious crime, usually punishable by confinement for more than one year. Less serious crimes are called misdemeanors, and are usually punishable by fine, probation, or a brief term of confinement in a juvenile facility (Garner, 2006).



### 3. METHODOLOGY

#### Research Questions

This report seeks to provide findings for the following questions:

- What are the demographic features of first time juvenile offenders in 2005?
- What is the proportion of felonies among first time juvenile offenders in 2005 and what type of offenses are they adjudicated for?
- Of all first time juvenile offenders in 2005, how many committed a new offense within one year that led to a subsequent adjudication?
- Of juvenile offenders first adjudicated for a felony or misdemeanor offense, how many committed a new felony or misdemeanor offense within one year that led to a subsequent adjudication?
- Of juvenile offenders first adjudicated for a civil offense only, how many committed a new offense within one year that led to a subsequent adjudication?
- What are the similarities and differences between counties in relation to rate of juveniles adjudicated for the first time, number of offenses at first time adjudications, proportion of felonies and drug/alcohol offenses, and recidivism rates?
- What are the trends in recidivism rates for the 2000 through 2005 cohorts?
- How does the 2005 cohort compare to the 2000-2004 cohorts?

#### Data

The 2005 cohort marks the second cohort in which the Maine Corrections Information System (CORIS)<sup>6</sup> is the sole data source for adjudicated juveniles in Maine. The 2005 cohort consists of all juveniles aged 10 through 18<sup>7</sup> who recorded a first adjudication date in Maine between January 1, 2005 and December 31, 2005, and follows them for one year after they were first adjudicated. Only those juveniles who were adjudicated for the first time in 2005 are included in the analysis. In other words, juveniles who have been previously adjudicated, juveniles who were arrested for an act, but were not brought before a court, or who were brought before a court but not found to have committed the act, are not included in the analysis. Further, a single adjudication represents one incident, which may be comprised of multiple offenses since a juvenile can be charged with multiple offenses stemming from one incident.

#### Offense Characteristics

In addition to recidivism rates, the 2005 report examines type and severity of first offenses and recidivating offenses for the entire cohort. Appendix IV reports the complete listing of offenses included in each category. DJS reports four offense types: **Person, Property, Drugs, and Other**.

Offense class is also examined. Offense classes are labeled A-E and V in descending order of severity. All class A, B, and C crimes are felonies, D and E crimes are misdemeanors, and V crimes are civil. This is the first annual report in which V crimes or civil offenses are separated from misdemeanors. In the past, due to small numbers, civil offenses were combined with misdemeanor offenses. In 2003, due to changes in Maine law, specific drug and alcohol offenses were added under juvenile crimes; however, the sanctions for these offenses did not change in that Maine law prohibits the detention or the commitment to a DOC juvenile correctional facility for these offenses.<sup>8</sup> In other words, criminal consequences cannot be assigned to these offenses. For the purposes of this report, these offenses are referred to as civil. See Appendix III for a complete listing of civil offenses for the 2005 cohort.

#### Challenges

In 2003, MDOC adopted a department wide information system known as CORIS. During this transition it was difficult to assess the accuracy and completeness of the first adjudications in 2003, which may cause some discrepancies in the trend section of this report. This may also partially explain why the 2003 cohort differs significantly from other cohorts.

The 2005 report is the second year for which CORIS is the main data source. While CORIS is believed to provide more complete and accurate information, there still may be variations between 2005 and previous years. While comparisons among the years can still be made, it should be remembered that the change in data collection systems may account for some trend differences. To address this challenge and opportunity, the MDOC arranged for the development and implementation of a quality control protocol in each of the four DJS regions. Project assistants were hired on a temporary basis to ensure the accuracy, quality, and completeness of all data variables analyzed in this report. The assistants cleaned data in the CORIS system to enable future analysis of the 2005 and 2006 cohorts. The Department has invested in further data quality efforts through providing standardized training and business practices for all community clerical staff.

<sup>6</sup>CORIS is an electronic database that also serves as a case management system for juvenile and adult corrections officers. CORIS has the capacity to record all juvenile referrals, petitions to court, diversions, probations, adjudications, and commitments.

<sup>7</sup>The offense (s) for which the juvenile was adjudicated occurred before the age of 18.

<sup>8</sup>Maine Criminal Statutes, Title 15, Chapter 503, Section 3103

4. 2005 COHORT


Juvenile Demographics

The following graphs provide a profile of all first time juvenile offenders<sup>9</sup> adjudicated in the state of Maine in the year 2005. During this period a total of 1,316 juveniles were adjudicated for the first time.


Graphs 1 & 2 summarize the demographics (gender and age) of first time juvenile offenders in 2005. Seventy-one percent of these juveniles were male and 72% were between the ages of 15-17. Between 2004 and 2005, there was a slight decrease (1%) in the number of male juveniles and a 14% increase in the number of females adjudicated for the first time.

The average (mean) age for the entire cohort was 15.8. There was little difference in the mean and median age for males and females.<sup>10</sup>

**GRAPH 1: GENDER OF JUVENILES ADJUDICATED FOR THE FIRST TIME IN 2005 (n = 1,316)**




**GRAPH 2: AGE OF JUVENILES ADJUDICATED FOR THE FIRST TIME IN 2005 (n = 1,316)**



The racial breakdown for juveniles adjudicated for the first time in 2005 is shown in Graph 3. Ninety-two percent of these juveniles were white, while all other races<sup>11</sup> comprised 8% of the cohort. In 2005, approximately 97% of Maine's population ages 10-18 was white<sup>12</sup>, indicating a disproportionate number of juveniles identified as a race other than white were adjudicated for this age group.

**GRAPH 3: RACE OF JUVENILES ADJUDICATED FOR THE FIRST TIME IN 2005 (n = 1,316)**



<sup>9</sup>First time juvenile offenders are those juveniles who were adjudicated for the first time in 2005.

<sup>10</sup>The median indicates the middle value; half are above it and half are below it.

<sup>11</sup>All other races includes Black/African American, American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Other/Mixed.

<sup>12</sup>Easy Access to Juvenile Populations: 1990-2006; <http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/ojstatbb/ezapop/default.asp>

**Offenses**

The 1,316 first time juvenile offenders in 2005 were adjudicated for 2,317 offenses. Thirty-five percent of the cohort was adjudicated for 63% of these offenses. In other words, a little more than a third of first time offenders were adjudicated for almost two-thirds of the offenses. The number of offenses per adjudication ranged from 1 to 25. Sixty-five percent of the cohort was adjudicated for only one offense, 20% were adjudicated for two offenses, and 15% were adjudicated for three or more offenses. Compared to 2004, slightly more juveniles are being adjudicated for only one offense.

Table 1 summarizes the class and type of offenses of first time adjudications in 2005. In past reports, civil offenses or, class V offenses, were added into misdemeanor offenses instead of being treated as a separate offense class. Due to the rising number of V offenses, they were pulled out in this report and treated as a separate category. The most common civil offenses in the cohort were Minor Possessing Liquor and Possessing Marijuana. For a complete list of civil offenses, see Appendix III.

Property offenses were the leading type of adjudicated offense at 53%, but drug/alcohol offenses increased 23% between 2004 and 2005. While there was an increase in the number of adjudications for drug/alcohol offenses, findings from Maine Youth Drug and Alcohol Use Survey (MYDAUS) Technical Report 2006<sup>13</sup> showed a decrease in the lifetime use of alcohol as well as use within the past 30 days.<sup>14</sup> Further research examining the different law enforcement practices and prosecutorial processes/decisions is needed to better understand the increase in adjudications for drug/alcohol offenses, given the fact that fewer juveniles are reporting drug and alcohol use.


**TABLE 1: THE OFFENSES FIRST TIME JUVENILE OFFENDERS WERE ADJUDICATED FOR IN 2005**

Type of Offense	Class of Offense			Total	Percentage
	Felony	Misdemeanor	Civil		
Person	60	433	0	493	21%
Property	224	1,013	0	1,237	53%
Drug/Alcohol	37	143	329	509	22%
Other	9	68	1	78	3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>1,657</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>2,317</b>	
<b>Percentage</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>14%</b>		

Graph 4 highlights the breakdown of offense class by offense type. Of all first time adjudications involving a felony offense in 2005, 68% were property offenses, 18% were person offenses, 11% were drug/alcohol offenses. Most notable between 2004 and 2005 was a 42% decrease in the number of felony adjudications for person offenses, 103 and 60 respectively.

Of the adjudications involving a misdemeanor offense in 2005, 61% were property offenses, 26% were person offenses, and 9% were drug/alcohol offenses. As a result of separating out civil offenses, misdemeanor drug/alcohol offenses decreased 61% between 2004 and 2005. With the exception of one offense, drug/alcohol offenses made up all of the civil violations.

**GRAPH 4: OFFENSE CLASS AND TYPE OF ADJUDICATED OFFENSES 2005 (n = 2,317)**



<sup>13</sup>Technical Report, Office of Substance Abuse, Maine Department of Health and Human Services, Maine Youth Drug and Alcohol Use Survey, December 2006


<sup>14</sup>Between 2004 and 2006, the lifetime use of alcohol decreased 5.9%, alcohol use within the past 30 days decreased 2.4%, the lifetime use of marijuana decreased 7.1%, and marijuana use within the past 30 days decreased 4.7%. Civil offenses made up 65% of all drug/alcohol offenses.

Graph 5 presents the type and class of offenses based on whether a juvenile was adjudicated for one offense or multiple offenses. For juveniles adjudicated for one offense, there was a fairly even distribution between the various types of offenses, with 37% adjudicated for property offenses, 26% adjudicated for person offenses and 34% adjudicated for drug/alcohol offenses.

There was greater variance between the types of adjudicated offenses for juveniles adjudicated for multiple offenses. Almost two-thirds of the juveniles adjudicated for multiple offenses were adjudicated for property offenses (63%), followed by person offenses (19%), and drug/alcohol offenses (15%).

Juveniles adjudicated for only one offense were much more likely to be adjudicated for a drug/alcohol offense or person offense than a juvenile adjudicated for multiple offenses. Juveniles adjudicated for multiple offenses were much more likely to be adjudicated for a property offense and much less likely to be adjudicated for a drug/alcohol offense.


**GRAPH 5: TYPE OF OFFENSE BASED ON THE NUMBER OF OFFENSES FOR WHICH A JUVENILE WAS ADJUDICATED IN 2005 (n = 2,317)**



As shown in Graph 6, juveniles adjudicated for multiple offenses were twice as likely to be adjudicated for a felony offense while those juveniles adjudicated for one offense were twice as likely to be adjudicated for a civil offense. Between 2004 and 2005, there was a 27% decrease in the number of adjudicated felonies for juveniles adjudicated for multiple offenses.

Most noteworthy is that 21% of those juveniles adjudicated for one offense, were adjudicated for a civil offense. Further analysis reveals that this group represents 14% of the 2005 cohort.

**GRAPH 6: CLASS OF OFFENSE BASED ON THE NUMBER OF OFFENSES FOR WHICH A JUVENILE WAS ADJUDICATED IN 2005 (n = 2,317)**



**Counties<sup>15</sup>**

Table 2 shows the relationship between first time adjudications and county population. Rates are used to demonstrate the proportion of adjudications by county. Sagadahoc County and Androscoggin County had the highest rate of adjudications, while Oxford County had the lowest.

Cumberland and York Counties, the two most populous counties fell below the state average and showed a slight rate change between 2004 and 2005. Washington and Franklin counties, the two least populous counties were above the state average.

The statewide rate of adjudication decreased slightly between 2004 and 2005. In addition, seven counties showed a decrease in rate, five counties showed an increase, and four counties showed no change. Sagadahoc County had the largest increase in rate of adjudication, whereas Lincoln, Aroostook, and Knox Counties had the largest decreases.

**TABLE 2: THE RATE OF JUVENILES ADJUDICATED FOR THE FIRST TIME IN 2005  
BY COUNTY PER 1,000 POPULATION (RANKED FROM HIGHEST TO LOWEST RATE)**

County	Adjudicated Juveniles	Juvenile Population 10—18 <sup>16</sup>	Rate <sup>17</sup> per 1,000 Population	Percentage Change from 2004—2005
Sagadahoc	64	4,588	14.0	67%
Androscoggin	175	12,972	13.5	2%
Hancock	76	6,146	12.4	6%
Washington	48	3,886	12.4	44%
Penobscot	171	17,538	9.8	26%
Somerset	60	6,295	9.5	8%
Franklin	35	3,749	9.3	-3%
Piscataquis	18	2,001	9.0	-13%
Waldo	43	4,666	9.2	1%
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>1,316</b>	<b>157,697</b>	<b>8.4</b>	<b>-7%</b>
York	188	24,834	7.6	-8%
Knox	33	4,457	7.4	-50%
Kennebec	98	14,510	6.8	-14%
Cumberland	214	32,638	6.6	-4%
Aroostook	53	8,564	6.2	-54%
Lincoln	19	4,015	4.7	-57%
Oxford	21	6,838	3.1	-39%

<sup>15</sup>Counties were determined based on court docket numbers. In most cases, the county in which a juvenile is adjudicated is the same county in which the offense was committed.


<sup>16</sup>Easy Access to Juvenile Populations: 1990-2006; <http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/ojstarbb/ezapop/default.asp>

<sup>17</sup>The rate was calculated by dividing the number of juveniles adjudicated by the total juvenile population and multiplying by 1,000.

Graph 7 displays county level data on the proportion of offenses by offense class. Statewide, felony offenses accounted for 14% of all offenses, 72% were misdemeanor offenses, and 14% were civil offense.

While Oxford County had the lowest rates of first time adjudications (see Table 2), it had the highest percentage of felony offenses. Androscoggin County had the highest rate of first time adjudications, but one of the lowest percentages of felony offenses. Knox County had the highest percentage of adjudications for civil offenses (27%) and the lowest number of adjudications for felony offenses (2%). Additional analysis on the seven counties that were above the state average for adjudications of felony offenses, shows felony offenses primarily consisted of property offenses.

**GRAPH 7: TYPE OF OFFENSES BY COUNTY FOR FIRST TIME ADJUDICATIONS IN 2005**



Further analysis by county showed a range in the proportion of first time adjudications for each type of offense (Table 3). Although adjudications for property offenses account for 53% of all offenses statewide, there was a range of 27% to 70% at the county level. The counties with the highest proportion of first adjudications for property offenses were Oxford (70%) and Hancock (70%).

The proportion of adjudications for person offenses ranged from 8% (Hancock) to 36% (Piscataquis).

The proportion of first adjudications for drug and alcohol offenses ranged from 14% to 42%. Knox County had the highest proportion of juveniles whose first adjudication involved a drug/alcohol offense. Of the adjudications for drug/alcohol offenses in Knox County, 64% were civil offenses. Additional county level analysis showed civil drug/alcohol offenses ranged from 25% in Franklin County to 93% in Washington County. As mentioned earlier, civil offenses made up 65% of statewide drug/alcohol offenses.

**TABLE 3: THE PERCENTAGE OF ADJUDICATIONS BY TYPE OF OFFENSE, 2005**

County	Property	County	Person	County	Drug/ Alcohol
Oxford	70%	Piscataquis	36%	Knox	42%
Hancock	70%	Waldo	33%	Aroostook	32%
Kennebec	63%	Lincoln	29%	Waldo	31%
Somerset	62%	Knox	29%	York	27%
Penobscot	60%	Androscoggin	27%	Lincoln	26%
Androscoggin	55%	York	27%	Sagadahoc	24%
Washington	55%	Sagadahoc	26%	Piscataquis	23%
Franklin	55%	Washington	24%	Franklin	23%
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>53%</b>	Cumberland	23%	Cumberland	22%
Cumberland	52%	Aroostook	22%	<b>Statewide</b>	<b>22%</b>
Aroostook	47%	<b>Statewide</b>	<b>21%</b>	Penobscot	21%
Sagadahoc	45%	Kennebec	20%	Hancock	20%
York	42%	Franklin	19%	Androscoggin	18%
Piscataquis	39%	Penobscot	15%	Somerset	18%
Lincoln	36%	Oxford	14%	Washington	17%
Waldo	28%	Somerset	14%	Oxford	16%
Knox	27%	Hancock	8%	Kennebec	14%



Recidivism Rate

Recidivism rates are calculated for the overall cohort as well as two additional groups within the cohort: those juveniles whose most serious offense at first adjudication and re-adjudication was a felony or misdemeanor, and those juveniles whose most serious offense at first adjudication was civil. The definition of recidivism remains the same *any individual who records a first adjudication date in Maine's juvenile court system for offenses committed before the age of 18 and records a second adjudication date for a new offense in Maine's juvenile court system or Maine's adult court system.*

**Group 1** includes the number of recidivists for the entire 2005 cohort regardless of the offense (s) at first adjudication and re-adjudication.

**Group 2** consists of those juveniles in Group 1 whose most severe offense at first adjudication and re-adjudication was a felony or misdemeanor.

**Group 3** is comprised of the juveniles in Group 1 whose most severe offense at first adjudication was a civil, rather than a criminal offense.

Table 4 shows the number of recidivists in each group. Forty-three juveniles in Group 1 were excluded from Groups 2 and 3 because the most serious offense at first adjudication was a felony or misdemeanor, but their most severe offense at re-adjudication was civil.

**TABLE 4: THE NUMBER OF RECIDIVISTS PER GROUP**

	<b>Group 1</b>	<b>Group 2</b>	<b>Group 3</b>
<b>Number of recidivists</b>	353	250	60

**GROUP 1***Recidivists for the entire cohort regardless of the severity of offenses at first adjudication and re-adjudication*

Table 5 shows the recidivism rate and number of juveniles re-adjudicated for a new offense committed within one year of their first adjudication by gender.<sup>18</sup> Of the juveniles in the 2005 cohort, a total of 353 had recidivated at one-year for a recidivism rate of 27%, an increase of 50% over the 2004 recidivism rate of 18%.<sup>19</sup> The recidivism rate was 23% for females and 29% for males. Males made up 75% of juvenile recidivists. Compared to 2004, in which both genders had recidivism rates of 18%, there was a significant increase for both genders.

The average (mean) time between first adjudication and date of offense connected to second adjudication was 5.8 months.

As mentioned earlier, 2005 recidivism rates are the first to include tracking youth into the adult system. The increase seen in both genders and the overall recidivism rate is partly due to tracking juveniles into the adult system. When the juveniles tracked into the adult system were removed from analysis, the overall recidivism rate was still substantially higher than previous years at 24%. The recidivism rates by gender did not change when these juveniles were removed.

**TABLE 5: THE NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF JUVENILES WHO RECIDIVATED WITHIN ONE YEAR OF THEIR ADJUDICATION IN 2005 BY GENDER, GROUP 1 (n = 353)**

	<b>Males</b>	<b>Females</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Number of recidivists</b>	266	87	353
<b>Recidivism rate at 1 year</b>	29%	23%	27%

The number and percentage of recidivists by age group is displayed in Table 6. Sixty-six percent of the recidivists were ages 15 -17 at the time of the offense connected to their second adjudication. The average age for males who recidivated was 16 and age 15 for females.

**TABLE 6: PERCENTAGE OF RECIDIVISTS BY AGE IN 2005, GROUP 1 (n = 353)**

<b>Age</b>	<b>Recidivists</b>	<b>% of Recidivist</b>
12	9	3%
13	26	7%
14	48	14%
15	85	24%
16	83	24%
17	62	18%
18-19	40	11%
<b>Total</b>	<b>353</b>	<b>101%*</b>


\*Due to rounding, the total percentage is higher than 100.

<sup>18</sup>Only re-adjudications for offenses that occurred after the first adjudication date were used in analysis.

<sup>19</sup>The recidivism rate was calculated by dividing the number of juveniles who recidivated within one year by the total number of juveniles adjudicated for the first time in 2005, multiplied by 100.

Graph 8 provides the racial breakdown of juveniles who recidivated within one year of their first adjudication. The racial breakdown is similar to that of the overall cohort (see graph 3). Ninety-three percent of these juveniles were white and 7% were of another race.

**GRAPH 8: PERCENTAGE OF RECIDIVISTS BY RACE IN 2005, GROUP 1 (n = 353)**



The 353 juvenile recidivists were adjudicated for 598 offenses at re-adjudication. Thirty-two percent of the recidivists were adjudicated for 60% of all offenses. The number of offenses at re-adjudication ranged from 1 to 12. Sixty-eight percent of the recidivists were adjudicated for only one offense, 20% were adjudicated for two offenses, and 12% were adjudicated for three or more offenses.

Table 7 examines the changes in severity of offense at first adjudication and offenses connected to re-adjudication. Juveniles whose most severe offense at first adjudication was a misdemeanor made up the largest subgroup of recidivists (69%). Juveniles whose offense at first adjudication was a felony showed the largest decline (75%) in offense severity between first adjudication and re-adjudication. The greatest increase in offense severity at re-adjudication occurred with juveniles whose most severe offense was a civil offense at first adjudication (63%).

It is not surprising that juveniles adjudicated for a felony offense at first adjudication showed the largest decline in offense severity because the offense severity would have stayed the same or decreased at re-adjudication. Similarly, for those juveniles adjudicated for a civil offense at first adjudication the offense severity would either stay the same or increase at re-adjudication, so it is reasonable to expect this group to show the largest increase in offense severity.

It is interesting that juveniles whose most severe offense at first adjudication was a misdemeanor offense, showed the least amount of change. While 28% of this group was re-adjudicated for either a more or less severe offense, 72% continue to re-offend at the same level of offense severity as seen at their first adjudication.


Looking at the patterns of re-offending with a more severe offense, it appears as if juveniles at greatest risk of being re-adjudicated for a more severe offense are those juveniles who were first adjudicated for a civil offense. Juveniles whose first adjudication was for a misdemeanor offense are not making much movement in either direction.

**TABLE 7: SEVERITY OF OFFENSE AT FIRST ADJUDICATION COMPARED TO SEVERITY OF OFFENSE AT SECOND ADJUDICATION (n = 353)**

Most Severe Offense at 1 <sup>st</sup> Adjudication	Number of Juveniles	Most Severe Offense at 2 <sup>nd</sup> Adjudication		
		Felony	Misdemeanor	Civil
<b>Felony</b>	51 (14%)	13 (25%)	28 (55%)	10 (20%)
<b>Misdemeanor</b>	242 (69%)	34 (14%)	175 (72%)	33 (14%)
<b>Civil</b>	60 (17%)	5 (8%)	33 (55%)	22 (37%)

Graph 9 shows the recidivism rates by county. At the county level, recidivism rates ranged from a low of 8% in Sagadahoc and Washington counties to a high of 37% in Somerset County. More research is needed to understand the difference in recidivism rates among counties.

**GRAPH 9: RECIDIVISM RATES BY COUNTY IN 2005, GROUP 1 (N = 353)**



**GROUP 2**

*Those juveniles in Group 1 whose first adjudication and re-adjudication involved a felony or misdemeanor*

At one year, a total of 250 first time juvenile offenders in 2005 had recidivated, for a one-year recidivism rate of 23%.<sup>20</sup> Table 8 shows the number of juveniles who recidivated within one year of first adjudication and the recidivism rate by gender. The recidivism rate for females was 17% and 20% for males. Males made up 74% of juvenile recidivists in Group 2. When the juveniles tracked into the adult system were removed from analysis, the overall recidivism rate dropped to 20%.

The average (mean) time between first adjudication and date of offense connected to the second adjudication was 5.7 months.

**TABLE 8: THE NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF JUVENILES WHO RECIDIVATED WITHIN ONE YEAR OF THEIR FIRST ADJUDICATION IN 2005 BY GENDER, GROUP 2 (n = 250)**

	Males	Females	Total
<b>Number of recidivists</b>	186	64	250
<b>Recidivism rate at 1 year</b>	24%	20%	23%

The number and percentage of recidivists by age group is displayed in Table 9. Twenty-eight percent of the recidivists were age 16 at the time of the offense connected to their second adjudication. The average age of recidivists was 16.2.

**TABLE 9: PERCENTAGE OF RECIDIVISTS BY AGE IN 2005, GROUP 2 (n = 250)**

Age	Recidivists	% of Recidivist
12-13	18	7%
14	28	11%
15	48	19%
16	70	28%
17	44	18%
18-19	42	17%
<b>Total</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>100%</b>

As seen in Graph 10, the racial breakdown of juveniles who recidivated are similar to the overall cohort (see Graph 3) and Group 1 (see Graph 8).

**GRAPH 10: PERCENTAGE OF RECIDIVISTS BY RACE IN 2005, GROUP 2 (n = 250)**




Table 10 shows the recidivism rates by county. At the county level, recidivism rates ranged from a low of 3% in Sagadahoc County to a high of 37% in Somerset County. More research is needed to understand the difference in recidivism rates among counties.

**TABLE 10: RECIDIVISM RATES BY COUNTY IN 2005, GROUP 2**

County	Group 1 (n = 353)	Group 2 (n = 250)
Somerset	37%	37%
Androscoggin	35%	34%
Piscataquis	29%	31%
Knox	24%	26%
Kennebec	25%	25%
Lincoln	26%	24%
Cumberland	30%	24%
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>23%</b>
Penobscot	28%	22%
Franklin	26%	20%
York	26%	20%
Waldo	23%	18%
Oxford	24%	18%
Hancock	24%	15%
Aroostook	23%	14%
Washington	8%	5%
Sagadahoc	8%	3%

<sup>20</sup>The recidivism rate was calculated by dividing the number of juveniles whose most serious offense at first adjudication and re-adjudication was a felony or misdemeanor by the total number of juveniles whose most severe offense at first adjudication was a felony or misdemeanor multiplied by 100.

**GROUP 3**

*Includes juveniles in Group 1 if their most severe offense at first adjudication was a civil offense*

At one year, a total of 60 first time juvenile offenders in 2005 had recidivated, for a one-year recidivism rate of 29%.<sup>21</sup> When the juveniles tracked into the adult system were removed from analysis, the overall recidivism rate dropped to 23%.

Table 11 shows the number of juveniles who recidivated within one year of first adjudication and the recidivism rate by gender. The recidivism rate for females was 16% and 34% for males. Males made up 85% of juvenile recidivists in Group 3. Of the three groups, not only does Group 3 have the highest recidivism rate, but almost two-thirds of these juveniles were re-adjudicated for a more serious offense (see Table 7).

The average (mean) time between first adjudication and date of offense connected to second adjudication was 5.7 months and the median was five months. There is no virtually no difference in mean when broken down by gender; however the median for males was five months whereas for females it was six months.

**TABLE 11: THE NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF JUVENILES WHO RECIDIVATED WITHIN ONE YEAR OF THEIR FIRST ADJUDICATION IN 2005 BY GENDER, GROUP 3 (n = 60)**

	<b>Males</b>	<b>Females</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Number of recidivists</b>	51	9	60
<b>Recidivism rate at 1 year</b>	34%	16%	29%

The number and percentage of recidivists by age group is displayed in Table 12. Twenty-eight percent of the recidivists were age 15 at the time of the offense connected to their second adjudication, with 17 year olds following close behind at 25%. The average age of recidivists was 16.0.

**TABLE 12: PERCENTAGE OF RECIDIVISTS BY AGE 2005, GROUP 3 (n = 60)**

<b>Age</b>	<b>Recidivists</b>	<b>% of Recidivist</b>
12-14	7	12%
15	17	28%
16	12	20%
17	15	25%
18-19	9	15%
<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100%</b>

Raw numbers and percentages for juveniles in racial categories other than white were too small to publicly report due to risk of identification. Compared to Groups 1 and 2, juveniles in racial categories other than white were much less likely to be adjudicated for civil offenses only.

Recidivism rates are not reported by county because raw numbers were too small and significantly distort recidivism rates for most counties.

<sup>21</sup>The recidivism rate was calculated by dividing the number of juveniles whose most serious offense at first adjudication was civil regardless of the most severe offense at re-adjudication by the total number of juveniles whose most severe offense at first adjudication was a civil multiplied by 100.

5. TRENDS: 2000 THROUGH 2005


First Time Offenders and Offenses

*As noted in the Challenges section under the Methodology, data migration to CORIS occurred in 2003. For this reason, the 2003 data may not be as complete as the data collected for other cohorts included in this report.*

The number of first time offenders decreased by 6% between 2000 and 2005 (Graph 11). While there was a 13% decrease in the number of male juveniles adjudicated for the first time between 2000 and 2005, there was an 18% increase in the number of females.

With the exception of 2003, the number of first time juvenile offenders declined gradually from 2000 to 2004. As mentioned earlier, the 2003 data may have been compromised by data migration challenges to CORIS, so it is difficult to determine whether the decline in juvenile offenders occurred through 2004 with a slight increase in 2005 or if the actual increase in first time offenders began in 2004.

**GRAPH 11: THE NUMBER OF JUVENILES ADJUDICATED FOR THE FIRST TIME, 2000 – 2005**



There has also been a significant change in the age demographic of first time juvenile offenders between 2000 and 2005 (Table 13). Over this span, the number of younger first time offenders (10-15 years old) declined by 36% and the number of older first time offenders (16-18 years old) increased 28%.

Starting in 2004, there was a significant increase in 18 year old first time offenders. Between 2000 and 2003, 18 year olds comprised anywhere from 1% to 3% of first time juvenile offenders. By contrast, in 2004 and 2005, 18 year olds comprised approximately 10% and 9% respectively, of first time juvenile offenders. Further research is needed to determine if this increase is due to policy and/or practice changes on the state and/or county level.


**TABLE 13: THE NUMBER OF JUVENILES ADJUDICATED FOR THE FIRST TIME BY AGE, 2000 – 2005**

Age	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Change from 2000-2005
10-13	204	156	149	99	88	88	-57%
14	244	202	196	147	166	157	-36%
15	287	305	265	222	264	228	-21%
16	306	333	338	283	314	355	16%
17	306	323	355	301	316	366	20%
18	46	37	16	18	126	122	165%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,393</b>	<b>1,356</b>	<b>1,319</b>	<b>1,070</b>	<b>1,274</b>	<b>1,316</b>	<b>-6%</b>



While there was a 6% decrease in the number of juveniles adjudicated for the first time; the number of offenses for which these juveniles were adjudicated increased by 14% (Graph 12). In other words, fewer juveniles were adjudicated for more offenses. However, between 2004 and 2005 there was a 3% increase in number of first time adjudications and a little less than 1% decline in number of offenses for which they were adjudicated.

**GRAPH 12: THE NUMBER OF OFFENDERS AND OFFENSES FOR FIRST TIME ADJUDICATIONS, 2000-2005**



The racial breakdown of first time juvenile offenders between 2000 and 2005 is shown in Table 14. Between 2000 and 2005, the number of juveniles in a racial category other than white almost doubled. This should not automatically be seen as a situation that is worsening, particularly given the fact the number of unknowns<sup>22</sup> has dropped since 2000. Improvement in data quality and completeness may be uncovering an existing situation. The population of juveniles in racial categories other than white has increased slightly during this time, but the population increases do not account for such large increases in first time adjudication rates.

**TABLE 14: RACE OF JUVENILES ADJUDICATED FOR THE FIRST TIME, 2000 – 2005**

Race	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
White	94%	95%	95%	94%	95%	92%
All Other Races	3%	4%	4%	6%	5%	8%
Unknown	3%	1%	1%	<1%	<1%	<1%

Graph 13 shows the variance in the type of offenses connected to first time adjudications from 2000 to 2005. Property offenses have always accounted for the majority of first time adjudications for juveniles. There has been a gradual but slight decline in property offenses since 2002.

The percentage of person offenses has decreased significantly since 2000. Between 2000 and 2002 there was a steady decrease in person crimes which leveled off between 2002 and 2004 and declined again in 2005 reaching a low of 21%.


First time adjudications for drug and alcohol offenses have more than doubled since 2000, exceeding person offenses in 2005. If the trend holds, drug/alcohol offenses will continue to increase at a moderate rate and property and person offenses should continue to decline. Given the current trend, person offenses will most likely decline at a faster rate than property offenses.

Findings from the Maine Youth Drug and Alcohol Use Survey (MYDAUS) Technical Report 2006<sup>23</sup>, indicate the overall lifetime alcohol use rate among Maine’s 6<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> grade students has dropped consistently over the past decade – from 70.7% in 1995 to 47.7% in 2006. Further research examining the different law enforcement practices and prosecutorial processes/decisions is needed to better understand the increase in adjudications for drug/alcohol offenses, given the fact that fewer juveniles are reporting drug and alcohol use.

<sup>22</sup>Unknown means no race was identified in CORIS.

<sup>23</sup>Technical Report, Office of Substance Abuse, Maine Department of Health and Human Services, Maine Youth Drug and Alcohol Use Survey, December 2006


**GRAPH 13: THE TYPE OF OFFENSES JUVENILES WERE FIRST ADJUDICATED, 2000 – 2005**



Graph 14 illustrates the change in the severity of first offenses between 2000 through 2005. The severity of offenses has fluctuated slightly due to the number of offenses in which the severity was not known from year to year. Specifically, the number of offenses in which the class was unknown between 2000 and 2003 makes it difficult to interpret how much the severity of offenses has changed since 2000, but even when the unknowns are taken into account, there has not been any significant increase in the severity of offenses since 2001. There were no “unknowns” in the 2005 data.

This is the first report in which civil offenses were separated out from misdemeanor offenses. Given that in 2005, 65% of all drug/alcohol offenses were civil, it is highly probable that the proportion of civil offenses will continue to increase if drug/alcohol offenses continue to rise as well.

**GRAPH 14: CLASS OF OFFENSES FOR FIRST TIME ADJUDICATIONS, 2000 – 2005**



Counties

Table 15 shows the rate per 1,000 juveniles adjudicated for the first time by county and cohort. From 2000 to 2005, Androscoggin County had the highest average rate of first time adjudication at 10.5 per 1,000 juveniles, while Oxford County had the lowest at 4.9. The statewide rate for first time adjudications remained relatively steady from 2000 to 2005 with a 1% decrease over this period. Ten counties had increased rates of adjudication between 2000 and 2005 while six counties showed a decrease. Hancock County showed the largest increase (77%) between 2000 and 2005, while Oxford County showed the largest decrease (46%).

**TABLE 15: THE RATE OF JUVENILES ADJUDICATED FOR THE FIRST TIME BY COUNTY RANKED HIGHEST TO LOWEST, 2000 - 2005 (RATE PER 1,000)**

County	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Average Rate from 2000-2005	Percent Change from 2000-2005
Hancock	7.0	6.3	10.2	8.3	10.3	12.4	9.1	77%
Sagadahoc	9.1	11.6	14.0	5.2	7.6	14.0	10.3	54%
Washington	8.2	5.6	4.2	3.7	7.6	12.4	7.0	51%
Piscataquis	6.4	9.2	8.0	9.3	9.2	9.0	8.5	41%
Penobscot	7.6	7.6	6.9	5.1	6.6	9.8	7.3	29%
Androscoggin	10.9	10.1	9.0	7.3	11.7	14.0	10.5	28%
Franklin	8.5	12.4	7.0	5.8	8.0	9.3	8.5	9%
York	7.0	8.1	8.1	6.8	7.5	7.6	7.5	9%
Waldo	8.7	12.0	7.1	5.6	8.2	9.2	8.5	6%
Somerset	9.3	8.2	10.5	5.9	9.4	9.5	8.8	2%
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>7.9</b>	<b>8.4</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>-1%</b>
Cumberland	8.4	6.1	7.3	7.1	6.1	6.6	6.9	-21%
Kennebec	9.5	9.2	8.7	6.6	6.9	6.8	8.0	-28%
Lincoln	6.6	7.5	2.8	4.8	9.9	4.7	6.1	-29%
Aroostook	9.5	11.0	8.4	6.1	11.6	6.2	8.8	-35%
Knox	12.4	9.2	10.0	10.4	13.2	7.4	10.4	-40%
Oxford	5.7	5.9	5.5	4.6	4.6	3.1	4.9	-46%

Table 16 shows the number of offenses for which juveniles were adjudicated for the first time by county and cohort. Between 2000 and 2005, eleven counties showed an increase in the number of offenses for first time adjudications, while five counties showed a decrease. Statewide, there was a 14% increase in the number of offenses. Aroostook County showed the largest decrease (34%), while Hancock County had the largest increase (230%). A closer look at the data revealed that in 2005 three juveniles in Hancock County were each adjudicated for 25 offenses, accounting for 75 of the county's total offenses. It is important to remember that in the 2005 cohort, the number of offenses for which a juvenile was adjudicated ranged from 1 to 25.

**TABLE 16: THE NUMBER OF OFFENSES FOR FIRST TIME JUVENILE ADJUDICATIONS BY COUNTY, 2000-2005**

County	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Average from 2000-2005	% Change from 2000-2005
Hancock	61	57	105	85	110	201	103	230%
Penobscot	215	212	206	128	190	333	214	55%
Androscoggin	196	164	161	115	263	264	194	35%
Sagadahoc	75	81	103	32	58	100	75	33%
York	234	280	280	262	328	286	278	22%
Franklin	44	63	57	31	41	53	48	21%
Piscataquis	26	35	32	33	32	30	31	15%
Somerset	92	99	117	63	108	106	98	15%
Washington	78	37	25	23	53	88	51	13%
Kennebec	226	211	239	143	260	232	219	3%
Waldo	70	92	62	44	74	72	69	3%
Cumberland	356	291	374	331	367	318	340	-11%
Lincoln	45	45	17	28	132	31	50	-31%
Knox	87	55	75	70	104	59	75	-32%
Oxford	55	63	60	43	42	37	50	-33%
Aroostook	163	155	116	105	171	107	136	-34%
Unknown	0	0	11	15	0	0	4	---
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>2,038</b>	<b>1,953</b>	<b>2,040</b>	<b>1,551</b>	<b>2,333</b>	<b>2,317</b>	<b>2,039</b>	<b>14%</b>

Table 17 highlights the percentage of felony offenses by county by cohort. Most counties fluctuated between 2000 and 2005. Androscoggin County consistently had one of the lowest proportions of felony offenses between 2000 and 2005, while Somerset County consistently had one of the highest proportions of felony offenses. Several counties showed a decrease between 2000 and 2005 with Knox County showing the largest decrease (88%). Oxford and Piscataquis Counties showed the most significant increases in the proportion of felony offenses between 2000 and 2005, 188% and 109% respectively.

From 2000 to 2005, eight counties showed a decrease in the proportion of first time adjudications for felony offenses, six counties showed an increase, and two counties remained the same. The state average for the proportion of felony offenses dropped 13% between 2000 and 2005.

More research is needed to determine the differences in prosecutorial practices among counties. Prosecutorial practices have a significant impact on the type and class of offenses for which a juvenile may be adjudicated. For example, one prosecution unit may decide to only pursue misdemeanors while another may choose to pursue the most severe offenses. Small numbers can also account for large increases or decreases in percentages.

**TABLE 17: THE PERCENTAGE OF FIRST TIME ADJUDICATIONS  
FOR FELONY OFFENSES BY COUNTY, 2000-2005**

County	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	% Change from 2000-2005
Oxford	16%	17%	7%	37%	10%	46%	188%
Piscataquis	11%	34%	19%	6%	28%	23%	109%
Penobscot	9%	11%	10%	9%	12%	13%	44%
Hancock	21%	21%	10%	20%	27%	25%	19%
Kennebec	18%	24%	20%	15%	26%	19%	6%
Somerset	34%	41%	35%	40%	33%	35%	3%
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>-13%</b>
York	13%	10%	5%	13%	20%	10%	-23%
Androscoggin	7%	4%	3%	3%	9%	5%	-29%
Washington	33%	32%	40%	13%	28%	21%	-36%
Aroostook	23%	17%	12%	20%	22%	13%	-43%
Sagadahoc	28%	17%	22%	9%	31%	10%	-64%
Lincoln	22%	27%	12%	11%	21%	7%	-68%
Waldo	33%	26%	11%	14%	16%	10%	-70%
Knox	16%	9%	9%	11%	9%	2%	-88%
Cumberland	7%	13%	11%	7%	13%	7%	No change
Franklin	23%	21%	30%	6%	10%	23%	No change

**Recidivism Rates**

The recidivism rate at one year was 27% for the 2005 cohort (Table 19). The two year recidivism rate fluctuated slightly between 2000 and 2004, but has increased since 2003. The three year recidivism rate gradually declined between 2000 and 2003.

As mentioned earlier, unlike previous cohorts, the 2005 cohort was tracked into the adult criminal justice system. While general comparisons are made between recidivism rates for the 2005 cohort and previous cohorts, true comparisons are not possible since only those juveniles in the 2005 cohort were tracked into the adult system.

**TABLE 18: RECIDIVISM RATES FOR COHORTS 2000-2005 AT 1, 2 AND 3 YEARS**

<b>Rate</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>
<b>1 year</b>	269(19%)	236(17%)	245(19%)	184(17%)	227(18%)	353 (27%)
<b>2 years</b>	428(31%)	393(29%)	369(26%)	255(24%)	352 (28%)	
<b>3 years</b>	507(36%)	456(34%)	413(31%)	317(30%)		

## REFERENCES

Division of Juvenile Services, Maine Department of Corrections. (2007). Taking Measure.

Easy Access to Juvenile Populations: 1990-2006. Retrieved on October 4, 2007 from <http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/ojstatbb/ezapop/default.asp>

Federico, J.M. (2003). Maine Criminal Statutes 2003-2004 Edition. Swan Island Press, Bowdoinham, ME

Federico, J.M. (2004). Maine Criminal Statutes 2004-2005 Edition. Swan Island Press, Bowdoinham, ME

Federico, J.M. (2005). Maine Criminal Statutes 2005-2006 Edition. Swan Island Press, Bowdoinham, ME

Garner, Bryan A. (Ed.). (2006). Black's Law Dictionary (3<sup>rd</sup> pocket edition). St. Paul, MN: Thomson/West.

Office of Substance Abuse, Maine Department of Health and Human Services. (2006). Maine Youth Drug and Alcohol Use Survey Technical Report.

Snyder, H. & Sickmund, M. (2006). Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 2006 National Report. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Program. National Center for Justice. Pittsburg, PA.



**APPENDIX I: DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE SERVICES CASE MANAGEMENT**

The Maine Department of Corrections is the agency of state government responsible for the incarceration and community supervision of adult and juvenile offenders. The Division of Juvenile Services resides within MDOC and is responsible for the provision of correctional services to Maine's juvenile offenders. The mission of DJS is:


***To promote public safety by ensuring that juvenile offenders are provided with education, treatment and other services that teach skills and competencies; strengthen pro-social behaviors and require accountability to victims and communities (Division of Juvenile Services, 2007).***

There are four field services regions in Maine that respond to juvenile crime and provide services known to be effective in reducing recidivism among juvenile offenders. DJS has two secure facilities to serve juvenile who cannot be served in the community. Mountain View Youth Development Center (MVYDC) is located in Charleston, Maine, and serves juveniles from Northern and Eastern Maine. Long Creek Youth Development Center (LCYDC) is located in South Portland serves juveniles from Central and Southern Maine.

The responsibilities of DJS field services span the entire juvenile justice system. These responsibilities begin when a juvenile is charged by police with committing a crime and end when a juvenile is discharged from DJS aftercare supervision. Field services operations are conducted throughout the state and are available 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

Juvenile Community Corrections Officers (JCCOs) serve as the correctional case managers for juveniles who are under supervision of the Division regardless of their status with the legal system. Youth under supervision of the Division may be<sup>24</sup>:

- On a supervised conditional release following a detention request decision,
- Detained in a juvenile facility awaiting a court hearing,
- On informal adjustment as a diversion from the court,
- On probation,
- Committed to a juvenile facility, or
- On community reintegration (aftercare) status following release from a juvenile facility.



## APPENDIX II: GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Here are some user friendly definitions that could be helpful for discussing juvenile recidivism issues.

**Adjudication** - Adjudication is the court process that determines (judges) if the juvenile committed the act for which he or she is charged. The term “adjudicated” is analogous to “convicted” and indicates that the court concluded the juvenile committed the act.

**Aggravated assault** - Unlawful intentional inflicting of serious bodily injury with or without a deadly weapon, or unlawful intentional attempting or threatening of serious bodily injury or death with a deadly or dangerous weapon. The term is used in the same sense as in the Uniform Crime Report (UCR) Crime Index. It encompasses conduct included under the statutory names aggravated assault and battery, aggravated battery, assault with intent to kill, assault with intent to commit murder or manslaughter, atrocious assault, attempted murder, felonious assault, and assault with a deadly weapon.

**Arson** - Intentional damaging or destruction by means of fire or explosion of the property of another without the owner’s consent, or of any property with intent to defraud, or attempting the above acts.

**Burglary** - Unlawful entry or attempted entry of any fixed structure, vehicle, or vessel used for regular residence, industry, or business, with or without force, with intent to commit a felony or larceny. The term is used in the same sense as in the UCR Crime Index.

**Cohort** - A group of subjects on whom data is being collected as they "march forward in time" (In ancient Rome, a cohort was a group of foot soldiers).

**Disorderly conduct** - Unlawful interruption of the peace, quiet, or order of a community, including offenses called disturbing the peace, vagrancy, loitering, unlawful assembly, and riot.

**Operating under the influence** - Driving or operating any vehicle or common carrier while drunk or under the influence of liquor or narcotics.

**Drug abuse violations** - State and/or local offenses relating to the unlawful possession, sale, use, growing, and manufacturing of narcotic drugs. The following drug categories are specified: opium or cocaine and their derivatives (morphine, heroin, codeine); marijuana; synthetic narcotics - manufactured narcotics that can cause true addiction (Demerol, methadone); and dangerous non-narcotic drugs (barbiturates, Benzedrine).

**Forcible rape**, Maine legal term for this offense is **Gross Sexual Assault** - Sexual intercourse or attempted sexual intercourse with a female against her will by force or threat of force. (Statutory offenses are excluded.) The term is used in the same sense as in the UCR Crime Index. Some states have enacted gender-neutral rape or sexual assault statutes that prohibit forced sexual penetration of either sex. Data reported by these states do not distinguish between forcible rape of females as defined above and other sexual assaults.

**Forgery and counterfeiting** - Making, altering, uttering, or possessing, with intent to defraud, anything false in the semblance of that which is true. Attempts are included.

**Fraud** - Fraudulent conversion and obtaining money or property by false pretenses. Included are confidence games and bad checks, except forgeries and counterfeiting.

**Intake decision** - The decision made by Juvenile Community Corrections Officers that results in a case either being handled informally at the intake level or being petitioned and scheduled for an adjudicatory or waiver hearing.

**Judicial decision** - The decision made in response to a petition that asks the court to adjudicate the youth.

**Judicial disposition** - Definite action taken as a result of adjudication regarding a particular case after the judicial decision is made, include the following categories:

- Placement - Cases in which youth were placed in a correctional facility for delinquents
- Probation - Cases in which youth were placed on court-ordered probation.
- Dismissed - Cases dismissed (including those warned, counseled, and released) with no further action anticipated.
- Miscellaneous - A variety of actions not included above. This category includes fines, restitution and community services, referrals outside the court for services with minimal or no further court involvement anticipated, and dispositions coded as "Other" by the reporting courts.

**Juvenile** – Any person who has not attained the age of 18 years.

**Larceny-theft** (except motor vehicle theft) - The unlawful taking, carrying, leading, or riding away of property from the possession or constructive possession of another. Examples are thefts of bicycles or automobile accessories, shoplifting, pocket-picking, or the stealing of any property or article that is not taken by force and violence, or by fraud. Attempted larcenies are included. Embezzlement, "con" games, forgery, worthless checks, etc., are excluded.

**Manner of handling** - A general classification of case processing within the court system.

- Petitioned (formally handled) - Cases that appear on the official court calendar in response to the filing of a petition or other legal instrument requesting the court to adjudicate the youth delinquent or to bind over the youth to criminal court for processing as an adult.
- Non-petitioned (informally handled) - Cases that Juvenile Community Corrections Officers screen for adjustment without the filing of a formal petition.

**Motor vehicle theft** - Unlawful taking, or attempted taking, of a self-propelled road vehicle owned by another, with the intent to deprive the owner of it permanently or temporarily.

**Murder and non-negligent manslaughter** - Intentionally causing the death of another without legal justification or excuse, or causing the death of another while committing or attempting to commit another crime. Deaths caused by negligence, attempts to kill, suicides, accidental deaths, and justifiable homicides are excluded.

**Obstruction of justice** - All unlawful acts committed with intent to prevent or hinder the administration of justice, including law enforcement, judicial, and correctional functions. Examples include contempt, perjury, bribing witnesses, failure to report a crime, and nonviolent resisting of arrest.

**Petition** - A document filed in court alleging that a juvenile is a delinquent and asking that the court assume jurisdiction over the juvenile or asking that an alleged delinquent be bound over to criminal court for prosecution as an adult.

**Placement facility type** - Identifies whether a juvenile placement facility is publicly or privately owned/operated.

- Public facilities - Facilities operated by state or local government agencies in which the employees working daily in the facilities and directly with the residents are state or local government employees.

- Private facilities - Facilities operated by private nonprofit or for-profit corporations or organizations in which the employees working daily in the facilities and directly with the residents are employees of the private corporation or organization.

**Placement status** – Identifies categories of juveniles held in residential placement facilities.

- Committed - Includes juveniles in placement in the facility as part of a court-ordered disposition. Committed juveniles include those whose cases have been adjudicated and disposed in juvenile court.
- Detained - Includes juveniles held prior to adjudication while awaiting an adjudicatory or probation revocation hearing in juvenile court, as well as juveniles held after adjudication while awaiting disposition or awaiting placement elsewhere. Also includes juveniles awaiting bind over hearings to adult criminal court.

**Population/target population** - The total group of people who are represented by the random selection of members, usually connoting the whole population but possibly connoting the population of any subset, e.g., women.

**Property Crime Index** - Includes burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson.

**Robbery** - Unlawful taking or attempted taking of property that is in the immediate possession of another by force or the threat of force.

**Sample** - A subset of subjects from the population of all who have a particular characteristic, such as a disease

**Sex offenses** (except forcible rape, prostitution, and commercialized vice) - Statutory rape and offenses against chastity, common decency, morals, and the like. Attempts are included.

**Simple assault** - Unlawful threatening, attempted inflicting, or inflicting of less than serious bodily injury, in the absence of a deadly weapon. The term is used in the same sense as in UCR reporting. Simple assault is often not distinctly named in statutes since it consists of all assaults not explicitly named and defined as serious.

**Stolen property** - (buying, receiving, possessing) - Buying, receiving, or possessing stolen property, including attempts.

**Statistic** - A number computed from data on one or more variables.

**Statistical Analysis** - Analyzing collected data for the purposes of summarizing information to make it more usable and/or making generalizations about a population based on a sample drawn from that population.

**Trespassing** - Unlawful entry or attempted entry of the property of another with the intent to commit a misdemeanor, other than larceny, or without intent to commit a crime.

**Vandalism** - Destroying or damaging, or attempting to destroy or damage, the property of another without the owner's consent, or public property, except by burning.

**Weapons offenses** - Unlawful sale, distribution, manufactures, alteration, transportation, possession, or use of a deadly or dangerous weapon, or accessory, or attempt to commit any of these acts.

**APPENDIX III: CIVIL OFFENSES FOR 2005 COHORT  
(ORDERED MOST FREQUENT TO LEAST FREQUENT)**

Minor possessing liquor

Possessing marijuana

Minor consuming liquor

Sale and use of drug paraphernalia

Illegal transportation of liquor by minor

Possession of drug paraphernalia

Illegal transportation of drugs by minor

Permit minors to consume liquor

Possession of fireworks

## APPENDIX IV: 2005 OFFENSE LISTING BY TYPE

**Person:**

Aggravated assault  
 Assault  
 Assault on an officer  
 Criminal Threatening  
 Criminal Threatening with Dangerous Weapon  
 Disorderly conduct  
 Driving to endanger  
 Gross sexual assault  
 Harassment  
 Harassment by telephone  
 Indecent Conduct  
 Manslaughter  
 Reckless conduct  
 Refusing to submit to arrest or detention  
 Robbery  
 Sexual abuse of a minor  
 Stalking  
 Terrorizing  
 Unlawful sexual contact  
 Violation of a protective order

**Property:**

Aggravated criminal mischief  
 Aggravated criminal trespass  
 Arson  
 Burglary  
 Burglary of a motor vehicle  
 Criminal mischief  
 Criminal trespass  
 Cultivating marijuana  
 Desecration and defacement  
 Endangering the welfare of a child  
 Failure to control or report a dangerous fire  
 Forgery  
 Interference with cemetery or burial ground  
 Misuse of credit identification  
 Negotiate a worthless instrument  
 Possession or transfer of burglar's tools  
 Theft by deception  
 Theft by receiving stolen property  
 Theft by unauthorized taking or transfer  
 Theft by unauthorized use of property  
 Theft of lost, mislaid, or misdelivered property  
 Theft of services

**Drugs/Alcohol:**

Acquiring drugs by deception  
 Aggravated furnishing of scheduled drugs  
 Allowing minor to possess or consume liquor  
 Allowing minor to consuming liquor

Allowing minor to posses liquor  
 Furnishing liquor to a minor  
 Illegal possession of liquor by a minor  
 Illegal transportation of drugs by a minor  
 Minor consuming liquor  
 Minor possessing liquor  
 Minor transporting liquor  
 Operating ATV while under the influence  
 Operating snowmobile while under influence while under 21  
 Operating while under influence – injury or death, prior  
 Operating while under the influence  
 Possession of marijuana  
 Possession of drug paraphernalia  
 Possession of hypodermic apparatuses  
 Sale and use of drug paraphernalia  
 Stealing drugs  
 Unlawful furnishing of scheduled drugs  
 Unlawful possession of scheduled drugs  
 Unlawful trafficking in scheduled drugs

**Other:**

Attempting to commit a class A or B crime  
 Attempting to commit a Class D or E Crime  
 Attempting to elude an officer  
 Carrying a concealed weapon  
 Conspiracy to commit a class C crime  
 Criminal attempt  
 Criminal conspiracy  
 Cruelty to animals  
 Eluding an officer  
 Failure to give correct name and address to officer  
 Failure to disperse  
 False public alarm or report  
 Hindering apprehension or prosecution  
 Interference with constitutional rights  
 Obstructing government administration  
 Obstructing public ways  
 Obstructing report of a crime  
 Operating vehicle without a license  
 Possessing sexually explicit material  
 Possession of fireworks  
 Refusing to sign criminal summons  
 Trafficking in dangerous knives  
 Unlawful transfer of a handgun to a minor  
 Unsworn falsification  
 Violation condition of release



## APPENDIX V: COUNTY LEVEL DATA (2000 – 2005)

## FIRST OFFENSES BY CLASS, TYPE, AND COUNTY, 2000

County	Class/Type	Person	Property	Drugs/Alcohol	Other	Total
<b>Androscoggin</b>	Felony	5	9	0	0	14
	Misdemeanor	47	88	15	6	156
	Unknown	9	14	3	0	26
	<b>Total</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>196</b>
<b>Aroostook</b>	Felony	8	27	1	2	38
	Misdemeanor	30	62	17	2	111
	Unknown	1	5	7	0	14*
	<b>Total</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>163*</b>
<b>Cumberland</b>	Felony	12	13	1	0	26
	Misdemeanor	73	116	17	6	212
	Unknown	55	60	1	2	118
	<b>Total</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>356</b>
<b>Franklin</b>	Felony	4	5	0	1	10
	Misdemeanor	6	24	2	0	32
	Unknown	0	2	0	0	2
	<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>Hancock</b>	Felony	5	7	1	0	13
	Misdemeanor	19	19	5	3	46
	Unknown	0	2	0	0	2
	<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>Kennebec</b>	Felony	5	34	0	1	40
	Misdemeanor	38	101	31	13	183
	Unknown	0	0	3	0	3
	<b>Total</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>226</b>
<b>Knox</b>	Felony	4	9	1	0	14
	Misdemeanor	27	34	7	4	72
	Unknown	0	1	0	0	1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>Lincoln</b>	Felony	5	5	0	0	10
	Misdemeanor	8	19	3	3	33
	Unknown	0	0	1	1	2
	<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Oxford</b>	Felony	4	5	0	0	9
	Misdemeanor	13	31	1	1	46
	Unknown	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>Penobscot</b>	Felony	6	13	1	0	20
	Misdemeanor	40	105	31	5	181
	Unknown	2	5	4	3	14
	<b>Total</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>215</b>

County	Class/Type	Person	Property	Drugs/Alcohol	Other	Total
<b>Piscataquis</b>	Felony	1	2	0	0	<b>3</b>
	Misdemeanor	4	10	5	2	<b>21</b>
	Unknown	0	0	2	0	<b>2</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Sagadahoc</b>	Felony	4	16	1	0	<b>21</b>
	Misdemeanor	13	32	4	1	<b>50</b>
	Unknown	1	3	0	0	<b>4</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>Somerset</b>	Felony	8	22	1	0	<b>31</b>
	Misdemeanor	17	35	2	1	<b>55</b>
	Unknown	2	3	1	0	<b>6</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>92</b>
<b>Waldo</b>	Felony	6	17	0	0	<b>23</b>
	Misdemeanor	9	29	3	1	<b>43*</b>
	Unknown	2	2	0	0	<b>4</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>70*</b>
<b>Washington</b>	Felony	8	17	1	0	<b>26</b>
	Misdemeanor	12	36	2	1	<b>51</b>
	Unknown	0	1	0	0	<b>1</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>York</b>	Felony	10	17	2	1	<b>30</b>
	Misdemeanor	63	77	11	8	<b>159</b>
	Unknown	20	20	1	4	<b>45</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>234</b>

\* One case unknown type

## FIRST OFFENSES BY CLASS, TYPE, AND COUNTY, 2001

County	Class/Type	Person	Property	Drugs/Alcohol	Other	Total
<b>Androscoggin</b>	Felony	2	2	0	2	<b>6</b>
	Misdemeanor	49	80	19	2	<b>150</b>
	Unknown	3	4	1	0	<b>8</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>164</b>
<b>Aroostook</b>	Felony	6	15	4	1	<b>26</b>
	Misdemeanor	33	60	32	3	<b>128</b>
	Unknown	0	0	0	0	<b>1*</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>155*</b>
<b>Cumberland</b>	Felony	11	24	1	1	<b>37</b>
	Misdemeanor	87	96	44	18	<b>245</b>
	Unknown	0	9	0	0	<b>9</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>291</b>
<b>Franklin</b>	Felony	4	8	1	0	<b>13</b>
	Misdemeanor	11	25	14	0	<b>50</b>
	Unknown	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>Hancock</b>	Felony	4	8	0	0	<b>12</b>
	Misdemeanor	9	28	7	1	<b>45</b>
	Unknown	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>Kennebec</b>	Felony	2	41	6	1	<b>50</b>
	Misdemeanor	41	85	28	2	<b>156</b>
	Unknown	1	3	1	0	<b>5</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>211</b>
<b>Knox</b>	Felony	2	2	0	1	<b>5</b>
	Misdemeanor	20	20	9	1	<b>50</b>
	Unknown	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>Lincoln</b>	Felony	7	5	0	0	<b>12</b>
	Misdemeanor	8	15	9	0	<b>32</b>
	Unknown	0	1	0	0	<b>1</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Oxford</b>	Felony	0	9	2	0	<b>11</b>
	Misdemeanor	16	33	3	0	<b>52</b>
	Unknown	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>Penobscot</b>	Felony	3	15	2	4	<b>24</b>
	Misdemeanor	54	89	41	4	<b>188</b>
	Unknown	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>212</b>

County	Class/Type	Person	Property	Drugs/Alcohol	Other	Total
<b>Piscataquis</b>	Felony	0	12	0	0	<b>12</b>
	Misdemeanor	6	14	2	0	<b>22</b>
	Unknown	1	0	0	0	<b>1</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Sagadahoc</b>	Felony	2	12	0	0	<b>14</b>
	Misdemeanor	12	37	9	2	<b>60</b>
	Unknown	0	3	3	1	<b>7</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>Somerset</b>	Felony	5	31	1	4	<b>41</b>
	Misdemeanor	12	42	3	0	<b>57</b>
	Unknown	0	1	0	0	<b>1</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>Waldo</b>	Felony	4	18	1	1	<b>24</b>
	Misdemeanor	21	31	14	2	<b>68</b>
	Unknown	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>92</b>
<b>Washington</b>	Felony	5	5	2	0	<b>12</b>
	Misdemeanor	9	14	1	1	<b>25</b>
	Unknown	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>York</b>	Felony	10	15	1	3	<b>29</b>
	Misdemeanor	77	28	55	9	<b>239</b>
	Unknown	3	7	1	1	<b>12</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>280</b>

\* One case unknown type

## FIRST OFFENSES BY CLASS, TYPE, AND COUNTY, 2002

County	Class/Type	Person	Property	Drugs/Alcohol	Other	Total
<b>Androscoggin</b>	Felony	3	1	0	0	4
	Misdemeanor	51	65	8	4	128
	Other	10	14	5	0	29
	<b>Total</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>161</b>
<b>Aroostook</b>	Felony	2	10	1	1	14
	Misdemeanor	30	47	17	1	95
	Other	1	3	3	0	7
	<b>Total</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>116</b>
<b>Cumberland</b>	Felony	19	20	1	2	42
	Misdemeanor	78	198	43	10	329
	Other	0	3	0	0	3
	<b>Total</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>374</b>
<b>Franklin</b>	Felony	4	13	0	0	17
	Misdemeanor	3	26	10	1	40
	Other	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>Hancock</b>	Felony	2	9	0	0	11
	Misdemeanor	22	46	18	2	88
	Other	1	3	1	1	6
	<b>Total</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>105</b>
<b>Kennebec</b>	Felony	4	44	0	1	49
	Misdemeanor	31	125	31	3	190
	Other	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>239</b>
<b>Knox</b>	Felony	2	5	0	0	7
	Misdemeanor	11	22	27	2	62
	Other	3	1	2	0	6
	<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>Lincoln</b>	Felony	1	1	0	0	2
	Misdemeanor	6	6	1	0	13
	Other	0	0	1	1	2
	<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Oxford</b>	Felony	1	2	1	0	4
	Misdemeanor	10	38	7	0	55
	Other	0	0	1	0	1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Penobscot</b>	Felony	5	15	0	0	20
	Misdemeanor	40	94	37	8	179
	Other	0	4	2	1	7
	<b>Total</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>206</b>

County	Class/Type	Person	Property	Drugs/Alcohol	Other	Total
<b>Piscataquis</b>	Felony	0	6	0	0	<b>6</b>
	Misdemeanor	8	9	7	1	<b>25</b>
	Other	1	0	0	0	<b>1</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Sagadahoc</b>	Felony	7	14	1	1	<b>23</b>
	Misdemeanor	19	43	10	5	<b>77</b>
	Other	2	0	1	0	<b>3</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>Somerset</b>	Felony	9	31	1	0	<b>41</b>
	Misdemeanor	12	56	5	3	<b>76</b>
	Other	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>Waldo</b>	Felony	4	2	0	1	<b>7</b>
	Misdemeanor	11	34	6	4	<b>55</b>
	Other	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Washington</b>	Felony	3	6	1	0	<b>10</b>
	Misdemeanor	3	8	3	1	<b>15</b>
	Other	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>York</b>	Felony	1	10	1	1	<b>13</b>
	Misdemeanor	73	131	52	8	<b>264</b>
	Other	1	1	1	0	<b>3</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>280</b>

\*Eleven cases had no county listed

## FIRST OFFENSES BY CLASS, TYPE, AND COUNTY, 2003

County	Class/Type	Person	Property	Drugs/Alcohol	Other	Total
<b>Androscoggin</b>	Felony	0	0	1	2	<b>3</b>
	Misdemeanor	3	4	23	31	<b>61</b>
	Other	5	5	11	30	<b>51</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>115</b>
<b>Aroostook</b>	Felony	1	0	3	17	<b>21</b>
	Misdemeanor	7	0	17	47	<b>71</b>
	Other	6	0	2	5	<b>13</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>105</b>
<b>Cumberland</b>	Felony	2	2	6	12	<b>22</b>
	Misdemeanor	50	11	88	160	<b>309</b>
	Other	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>331</b>
<b>Franklin</b>	Felony	0	0	0	2	<b>2</b>
	Misdemeanor	13	2	4	10	<b>29</b>
	Other	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Hancock</b>	Felony	1	0	1	15	<b>17</b>
	Misdemeanor	10	4	10	36	<b>60</b>
	Other	1	0	1	6	<b>8</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>Kennebec</b>	Felony	0	0	3	19	<b>22</b>
	Misdemeanor	20	1	24	75	<b>120</b>
	Other	0	0	1	0	<b>1</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>143</b>
<b>Knox</b>	Felony	0	1	2	5	<b>8</b>
	Misdemeanor	15	6	13	28	<b>62</b>
	Other	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Lincoln</b>	Felony	0	0	1	2	<b>3</b>
	Misdemeanor	4	0	9	6	<b>19</b>
	Other	3	0	1	2	<b>6</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Oxford</b>	Felony	0	0	3	13	<b>16</b>
	Misdemeanor	3	2	8	13	<b>26</b>
	Other	0	0	1	0	<b>1</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Penobscot</b>	Felony	0	0	3	8	<b>11</b>
	Misdemeanor	26	1	36	53	<b>116</b>
	Other	0	0	1	0	<b>1</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>128</b>

County	Class/Type	Person	Property	Drugs/Alcohol	Other	Total
<b>Piscataquis</b>	Felony	0	0	0	2	<b>2</b>
	Misdemeanor	8	2	5	16	<b>31</b>
	Other	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Sagadahoc</b>	Felony	0	1	1	1	<b>3</b>
	Misdemeanor	7	2	5	15	<b>29</b>
	Other	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Somerset</b>	Felony	1	0	6	18	<b>25</b>
	Misdemeanor	1	0	15	22	<b>38</b>
	Other	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>Waldo</b>	Felony	0	0	3	3	<b>6</b>
	Misdemeanor	2	1	13	21	<b>37</b>
	Other	1	0	0	0	<b>1</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>Washington</b>	Felony	0	0	0	3	<b>3</b>
	Misdemeanor	5	0	2	12	<b>19</b>
	Other	1	0	0	0	<b>1</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>York</b>	Felony	0	1	8	24	<b>33</b>
	Misdemeanor	50	9	43	126	<b>228</b>
	Other	1	0	0	0	<b>1</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>262</b>

\*Fifteen cases had no offense type listed



## FIRST OFFENSES BY CLASS, TYPE, AND COUNTY, 2004

County	Class/Type	Personal	Property	Drugs/Alcohol	Other	Total
<b>Androscoggin</b>	Felony	10	14	1	0	<b>25</b>
	Misdemeanor	97	113	23	3	<b>236</b>
	Other	0	1	1	0	<b>2</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>263</b>
<b>Aroostook</b>	Felony	4	21	12	1	<b>38</b>
	Misdemeanor	23	55	50	4	<b>132</b>
	Other	0	1	0	0	<b>1</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>171</b>
<b>Cumberland</b>	Felony	12	24	7	5	<b>48</b>
	Misdemeanor	70	179	47	20	<b>316</b>
	Other	0	2	1	0	<b>3</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>367</b>
<b>Franklin</b>	Felony	1	2	1	0	<b>4</b>
	Misdemeanor	8	17	12	0	<b>37</b>
	Other	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Hancock</b>	Felony	2	26	1	1	<b>30</b>
	Misdemeanor	14	36	28	0	<b>78</b>
	Other	0	2	0	0	<b>2</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>110</b>
<b>Kennebec</b>	Felony	16	48	2	1	<b>67</b>
	Misdemeanor	22	137	22	12	<b>193</b>
	Other	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>260</b>
<b>Knox</b>	Felony	5	4	0	0	<b>9</b>
	Misdemeanor	17	45	22	10	<b>94</b>
	Other	0	1	0	0	<b>1</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>104</b>
<b>Lincoln</b>	Felony	0	27	0	0	<b>27</b>
	Misdemeanor	8	63	28	4	<b>103</b>
	Other	0	2	0	0	<b>2</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>132</b>
<b>Oxford</b>	Felony	0	4	0	0	<b>4</b>
	Misdemeanor	7	26	3	1	<b>37</b>
	Other	0	0	1	0	<b>1</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Penobscot</b>	Felony	2	16	3	1	<b>22</b>
	Misdemeanor	45	85	32	4	<b>166</b>
	Other	0	1	1	0	<b>2</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>190</b>

County	Class/Type	Personal	Property	Drugs/Alcohol	Other	Total
<b>Piscataquis</b>	Felony	1	8	0	0	<b>9</b>
	Misdemeanor	2	10	10	0	<b>22</b>
	Other	0	0	1	0	<b>1</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Sagadahoc</b>	Felony	8	9	1	0	<b>18</b>
	Misdemeanor	17	12	9	2	<b>40</b>
	Other	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>Somerset</b>	Felony	4	29	3	0	<b>36</b>
	Misdemeanor	15	45	8	3	<b>71</b>
	Other	0	1	0	0	<b>1</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>108</b>
<b>Waldo</b>	Felony	7	4	1	0	<b>12</b>
	Misdemeanor	18	28	13	0	<b>59</b>
	Other	0	1	2	0	<b>3</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>Washington</b>	Felony	6	5	3	1	<b>15</b>
	Misdemeanor	14	16	8	0	<b>38</b>
	Other	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>York</b>	Felony	25	35	4	1	<b>65</b>
	Misdemeanor	84	103	55	15	<b>257</b>
	Other	0	5	1	0	<b>6</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>328</b>

## FIRST OFFENSES BY CLASS, TYPE, AND COUNTY, 2005

County	Class/Type	Person	Property	Drugs/Alcohol	Other	Total
<b>Androscoggin</b>	Felony	2	5	6	0	13
	Misdemeanor	68	139	17	2	226
	Civil	0	0	25	0	25
	<b>Total</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>264</b>
<b>Aroostook</b>	Felony	3	8	3	0	14
	Misdemeanor	20	42	8	0	70
	Civil	0	0	23	0	23
	<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>107</b>
<b>Cumberland</b>	Felony	9	13	2	1	25
	Misdemeanor	62	155	14	8	239
	Civil	0	0	54	0	54
	<b>Total</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>318</b>
<b>Franklin</b>	Felony	1	7	3	1	12
	Misdemeanor	9	22	6	1	38
	Civil	0	0	3	0	3
	<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>Hancock</b>	Felony	2	48	1	0	51
	Misdemeanor	13	93	7	4	117
	Civil	0	0	33	0	33
	<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>201</b>
<b>Kennebec</b>	Felony	6	30	9	1	46
	Misdemeanor	39	117	12	8	176
	Civil	0	0	10	0	10
	<b>Total</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>232</b>
<b>Knox</b>	Felony	1	0	0	0	1
	Misdemeanor	16	16	9	1	42
	Civil	0	0	16	0	16
	<b>Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>Lincoln</b>	Felony	2	0	0	0	2
	Misdemeanor	7	11	4	3	25
	Civil	0	0	4	0	4
	<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Oxford</b>	Felony	1	15	1	0	17
	Misdemeanor	4	11	1	0	16
	Civil	0	0	4	0	4
	<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Penobscot</b>	Felony	13	27	3	1	44
	Misdemeanor	38	172	17	11	238
	Civil	0	0	51	0	51
	<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>333</b>

<b>County</b>	<b>Class/Type</b>	<b>Personal</b>	<b>Property</b>	<b>Drugs/Alcohol</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Piscataquis</b>	Felony	2	5	0	0	<b>7</b>
	Misdemeanor	9	7	1	1	<b>18</b>
	Civil	0	0	5	0	<b>5</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Sagadahoc</b>	Felony	0	5	4	1	<b>10</b>
	Misdemeanor	26	40	10	4	<b>80</b>
	Civil	0	0	10	0	<b>10</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Somerset</b>	Felony	3	33	1	0	<b>37</b>
	Misdemeanor	13	32	15	5	<b>65</b>
	Civil	0	0	3	1	<b>4</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>106</b>
<b>Waldo</b>	Felony	5	2	0	0	<b>7</b>
	Misdemeanor	19	18	8	6	<b>51</b>
	Civil	0	0	14	0	<b>14</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Washington</b>	Felony	3	15	0	0	<b>18</b>
	Misdemeanor	18	33	1	4	<b>56</b>
	Civil	0	0	14	0	<b>14</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>York</b>	Felony	7	11	4	4	<b>26</b>
	Misdemeanor	72	105	13	10	<b>200</b>
	Civil	0	0	60	0	<b>60</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>286</b>

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The annual MDOC Juvenile Recidivism Report was produced through a cooperative agreement between the Maine Department of Corrections, Juvenile Services Division and the Maine Statistical Analysis Center at the Edmund S. Muskie School of Public Service, University of Southern Maine.

***Maine Department of Corrections, Division of Juvenile Services***

Bartlett Stoodley	Mark Boger
Roxy Hennings	Ginger Jackson
Renna Hegg	David Barrett
Linda Maher	Susan Colson
Tom Furman	Christine Ross
Daniel Harfoush	Carolyn Chandler
Kathleen Pressley	Jane Lenentine
Bernadette Luxton	Terri Higgins
Cynthia Brann	Sherry Judd
Pauline Ayers	

***USM Muskie School of Public Service, Maine Statistical Analysis Center***

Report Author

Susan Pate

Quality Control

Michelle Ouellette  
Tina Aubut  
Sue Shier  
Janet Begert  
Patricia Connolly  
Kerri Dill  
Catherine Duclos  
Crystal McLellan

Peer Review/Editing

Carmen Dorsey  
George Shaler  
Mark Rubin  
Erica King  
Becky Noréus  
Janet Begert  
Sheri Moulton

Funding provided by the Maine Department of Corrections, Division of Juvenile Services  
For more information about this report, call (207) 287-4378

© Maine Department of Corrections

