



**New Jersey
Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI)
2016 Annual Data Report**

State of New Jersey
Office of the Attorney General
Juvenile Justice Commission

Chris Christie, Governor
Kim Guadagno, Lt. Governor
Christopher S. Porrino, Attorney General
Kevin M. Brown, Executive Director
Jennifer LeBaron, Ph.D., Deputy Executive Director

June 2017

Acknowledgments

The Juvenile Justice Commission would like to thank Joelle Kenney, Manager, JDAI & System Reform Unit for her excellent work in authoring the JDAI Annual Data Report. The JJC would also like to thank all of the staff of the JJC's JDAI & System Reform Unit for their assistance in acquiring and maintaining the data required to not only produce this report, but to ensure that JDAI continues to be a data and results driven initiative. We also thank the staff in each county who help to maintain detention system data. We hope that our JDAI and system reform partners at the state and local level find the report's contents useful as a tool for guiding ongoing juvenile justice system improvement efforts.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	i
• Background	i
• Genesis of JDAI in New Jersey: The Need for Innovation	i
• JDAI Vision & Philosophy: Why Does This Matter?	i
• The Purpose of Detention and JDAI Core Strategies	ii
• Impressive Results Lead to New Jersey’s Designation as a “Model State”	ii
• Substantial Cost-Savings Realized	ii
• Improved Conditions of Confinement for Detained Youth	iii
• JDAI: A Model of Governmental Cooperation	iii
• Purpose of the JDAI Annual Data Report & Summary of Key Findings	iii
• How Were These Results Achieved?	v
Summary of Changes in Key Detention Utilization Indicators	1
• Table 1. Summary of Changes in Key Detention Utilization Indicators, Pre-JDAI vs. 2016	1
Average Daily Population (ADP) in Detention	1
• Table 2. ADP in Detention	2
• Figure 1. ADP in Detention, Pre-JDAI vs. 2016	2
Admissions to Detention	3
• Table 3. Admissions to Detention	3
• Figure 2. Percentage of Youth Detained for New Delinquency Charges (2016)	4
• Table 4. Nature of Current Offense/Lead Reason for Detention	6
• Table 5. Degree of Current Offense/Lead Reason for Detention (2016)	7
• Table 6. Number of Youth Admitted to Detention for VOPs	7
• Figure 3. Youth Admitted to Detention for VOPs, Pre-JDAI vs. 2016	8
• Table 7. Number of Youth Admitted to Detention for FTAs	8
• Figure 4. Youth Admitted to Detention for FTAs, Pre-JDAI vs. 2016	9
• Table 8. Number of Youth Admitted to Detention for All Other Violations (Including ATD Violations) or for Non-Delinquency Events	9
• Table 9. For Youth Admitted on a Violation Only, Degree of Most Serious Immediate Underlying Offense (MSUO) – 2015 vs. 2016	10
• Table 10. For Youth Admitted on a Violation Only, Where MSUO is 4 th Degree or Less, Degree of Most Serious Prior Adjudication – 2015 vs. 2016	11
• Figure 5. For Youth Admitted on a Violation Only, Where MSUO and MSPA is 4 th Degree or Less – 2015 vs. 2016	12
• Table 11. Detention Admission Process	13
Detention Departures & Length of Stay (LOS)	14
• Table 12. Average (Mean) LOS in Detention	14
• Table 13. Median LOS in Detention	15
• Table 14. Youth Remaining in Detention for 60 Days or More	15
• Table 15. Average LOS by Departure Type	17-18

• Table 16. Changes in ALOS for Primary Departure Types	19
• Table 17. Nature of Departures from Detention	20-21
Public Safety Outcomes	22
• Table 18. Detention Alternative Outcomes	22
• Table 19. Total Juvenile Arrests	23
• Table 20. Juvenile Arrests for Index Offenses	23
Minority Youth in Detention	24
• Table 21. ADP of Minority Youth in Detention	24
• Table 22. Average (Mean) LOS in Detention for Minority Youth	25
• Table 23. Average (Mean) LOS in Detention for White Youth	25
• Table 24. Difference in Average (Mean) LOS Between Minority Youth & White Youth	26
• Table 25. Median LOS in Detention for Minority Youth	26
• Table 26. Median LOS in Detention for White Youth	27
• Table 27. Difference in Median LOS Between Minority Youth & White Youth	27
• Table 28. Percentage of Minority Youth Remaining in Detention 60 Days or More	28
• Table 29. Percentage of White Youth Remaining in Detention 60 Days or More	28
• Table 30. Difference in LOS of 60+ Days Between Minority Youth & White Youth	29
• Table 31. % of Detention ADP Comprised of Minority Youth	30
• Table 32. % of Detention Admissions Comprised of Minority Youth	30
• Table 33. Minority Overrepresentation in Detention	31
Girls in Detention	32
• Table 34. ADP of Girls in Detention	32
• Table 35. Girls Admitted to Detention	33
• Table 36. % of Detention Admissions Comprised of Girls	33
• Table 37. Average (Mean) LOS for Girls in Detention	34
Beyond Detention: Incarceration as a Disposition	35
• Table 38. One-Year Trends in Admissions to Detention Commitment Programs	35
• Table 39. Degree of Most Serious Offense for Which Admitted to Commitment Status	36
• Table 40. For Youth Admitted on a VOP/Other Violation, Degree of Most Serious Prior Adjudication	36
• Table 41. Location Prior to Admission to Commitment Status	36
• Table 42. Length of Commitment Term Ordered	37
• Table 43. Additional Dispositions Ordered in Conjunction with Commitment	37
• Table 44. Commitments to State Custody with the JJC Upon Disposition	38
Supplemental Data Tables	39
• Table 45. Monthly Detention ADP, by Site	39
• Table 46. Monthly Detention Alternative ADP, by Site	39
• Table 47. Monthly Detention Admissions, by Site	40
• Table 48. Monthly Detention Alternative Admissions, by Site	40
• Table 49. 4-Month Detention ALOS, by Site	41

• Table 50. 4-Month Detention Alternative ALOS, by Site	41
• Table 51. Statewide Detention Capacity & Utilization	42
• Table 52. Atlantic Annual Trends	43
• Table 53. Camden Annual Trends	44
• Table 54. Essex Annual Trends	45
• Table 55. Monmouth Annual Trends	46
• Table 56. Hudson Annual Trends	47
• Table 57. Mercer Annual Trends	48
• Table 58. Union Annual Trends	49
• Table 59. Bergen Annual Trends	50
• Table 60. Burlington Annual Trends	51
• Table 61. Ocean Annual Trends	52
• Table 62. Somerset Annual Trends	53
• Table 63. Passaic Annual Trends	53
• Table 64. Middlesex Annual Trends	54
• Table 65. Cumberland Annual Trends	54
• Table 66. Warren Annual Trends	55
• Table 67. Gloucester Annual Trends	55
• Table 68. Cape May Annual Trends	56
• Table 69. Sussex Annual Trends	56

Endnotes

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

In 2004 the Annie E. Casey Foundation selected New Jersey to be among the first states to replicate the nationally recognized Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI). JDAI was developed in response to national trends reflecting a drastic increase in the use of secure detention for juveniles despite decreases in juvenile arrests, and the resulting overcrowding of youth detention centers nationwide. The goal of this systems-change initiative is to create more effective and efficient processes surrounding the use of detention. To that end, JDAI works to reduce the number of youth unnecessarily or inappropriately held in secure detention, while maintaining public safety and ensuring youth appear for scheduled court dates. JDAI also works to redirect resources toward successful reform strategies and to improve conditions of confinement in detention facilities for those youth who require this most secure level of supervision.

Genesis of JDAI in New Jersey: The Need for Innovation

In the 1990s New Jersey experienced the same drastic increase in the use of secure, institutional detention for youth, despite decreases in juvenile delinquency, faced by much of the nation. For example, in the 10-year period of 1993-2002 juvenile arrests for “index” offenses (i.e., the most serious offenses) in New Jersey decreased by 44.8%, and overall juvenile arrests decreased by 24.7%. However, during the same 10-year period average daily population in detention increased by 37.7%. These changes led to serious overcrowding in New Jersey’s county-operated detention facilities. For example, in 1996 New Jersey’s detention facilities were operating at 166% of approved capacity. Government’s response to the problem at that time was to increase the number of detention beds. After millions of dollars spent, and a resulting 56% increase in detention capacity over just a few-year period, the adage rang true: “If you build it, they will come.” By 2002, even after the detention building-boom in New Jersey, more than half of the detention centers in the state remained overcrowded, with the five most overcrowded facilities operating at anywhere from 122% to 223% of capacity.

JDAI Vision & Philosophy: Why Does This Matter?

JDAI is premised on the Annie E. Casey Foundation’s philosophy that all youth involved in the juvenile justice system should have opportunities to develop into healthy, productive adults as a result of policies, practices, and programs that maximize their chances for personal transformation, protect their legal rights, reduce their likelihood of unnecessary or inappropriate incarceration, and minimize the risks they pose to their communities. Detention is a focus for several reasons.

- Negative Impact of Secure Detention. Research has shown that juvenile detention has critical, long-lasting consequences for court-involved youth. Youth who are detained are more likely than their non-detained counterparts to be formally charged, adjudicated, and committed to an institution. Detention disrupts connections in school, services, and families. Over the long-haul, the detention experience negatively impacts educational and employment levels. As such, detention should be reserved for the most serious, most chronic youthful offenders.
- Historical Lack of Public Safety Results. Detention is a stronger predictor of recidivism among juveniles than many other factors. Detention system reform helps the entire juvenile justice system more accurately identify which youth really need to be confined in order to minimize risks to the community, and holds the system accountable for public safety results.
- Opportunity to Improve the Juvenile Justice System as a Whole. Recognizing that detention reform is an entryway to overall system reform, JDAI was designed to make the entire juvenile justice system smarter, fairer, more efficient, and more effective. The kinds of changes a jurisdiction makes to safely reduce reliance on detention should influence how other parts of the system operate.

The Purpose of Detention and JDAI Core Strategies

The statutory purpose of detention is to temporarily hold youth who pose a serious risk of reoffending or a risk of flight, while their cases are pending final court disposition. To help ensure detention is used according to this purpose, and to otherwise assist jurisdictions in accomplishing their reform goals, JDAI provides a framework for conducting a thorough, data-driven examination of the detention system, and for using that information to develop strategies for system improvement. This proven approach to systems-change has demonstrated across numerous jurisdictions in the nation that reliance on secure detention can be reduced safely, and outcomes for youth improved, through implementation of JDAI's eight core strategies. These eight core strategies are:

- (1) Building the collaboration and leadership required for the challenging work of system reform,
- (2) Relying on data to inform juvenile justice policy and program development,
- (3) Implementing effective, objective detention admissions policies and practices,
- (4) Enhancing available alternatives to secure detention,
- (5) Reducing unnecessary delays in case processing and corresponding length of stay (LOS) in detention,
- (6) Focusing on challenges presented by "special populations," including youth detained for violations of probation and warrants, and youth awaiting dispositional placement,
- (7) Identifying strategies to reduce racial disparities in the detention system, and
- (8) Ensuring detention facilities present conditions of confinement that meet basic constitutional, statutory, and professional standards, and striving to meet best-practice standards.

Impressive Results Lead to New Jersey's Designation as a "Model State"

The Juvenile Justice Commission (JJC) is the lead agency for JDAI in New Jersey, providing the management and staffing infrastructure integral to New Jersey's success as a JDAI site. The New Jersey Judiciary is a critical partner in this work, and with the JJC, has provided the leadership needed to achieve the success that has brought New Jersey national recognition. As of 2016, 18 counties were actively participating in JDAI in New Jersey including: Atlantic, Camden, Essex, Hudson, Monmouth, Bergen, Burlington, Mercer, Ocean, Union, Passaic, Somerset, Middlesex, Cumberland, Warren, Gloucester, Cape May, and Sussex. While nationally JDAI is operational in nearly 300 local jurisdictions spanning 40 states, New Jersey is the only state to be designated a national model for detention reform by the Casey Foundation. This designation was bestowed upon NJ in late 2008 as a result of the impressive outcomes New Jersey has achieved since JDAI inception. New Jersey receives funding from the Casey Foundation to support JDAI, and to specifically conduct two-day working sessions with delegations from other states interested in replicating New Jersey's JDAI success. To date, delegations from fifteen states have participated in New Jersey's JDAI Model Site Program.

Substantial Cost-Savings Realized

Consistent with the national JDAI experience, significant cost-savings have been realized as the result of JDAI in New Jersey. The excess space created by significant population reductions has allowed several counties to close their detention centers and house their youth in other counties' facilities. At the start of JDAI, there were 17 detention centers operating in New Jersey; today there are nine. The eight counties closing their detention centers entered into agreements with other counties to house their detained youth. These shared-services agreements have resulted in approximately \$21 million in annual cost savings for the sending counties and substantial revenue increases for the receiving counties.

Nationally, in established JDAI sites detention reform has proven to be a springboard for broader juvenile justice system change and related cost-savings. Research indicates that detained youth are more likely to be committed to state custody at the point of disposition than non-detained youth with similar charges and delinquency history. It is reasonable to assume, then, that a reduction in the number of youth held in detention would lead to a reduction in the number of youth committed to state custody, typically the

costliest of all dispositional placements. In New Jersey this has proven to be the case. Across the 18 JDAI sites active in 2016, commitments to the JJC had been cut by more than three-quarters, dropping by 82.3%, with 855 fewer youth committed to state custody in 2016 alone, as compared to each site's pre-JDAI year. Decreasing commitments to state custody through JDAI has allowed the JJC to reduce expenditures by almost \$7 million over the past several fiscal years.

Improved Conditions of Confinement for Detained Youth

Overcrowding in detention centers leads to serious problems, including an increased risk of violent incidents and injury to youth and staff, and an increase in liability. In 2002, just prior to New Jersey's designation as a JDAI site, detention centers in nine of NJ's current JDAI sites were overcrowded, with the most overcrowded detention center operating at 223% of capacity. Today, not a single site is operating an overcrowded detention center. In recent years, annual conditions of confinement evaluations conducted for each detention center by the JJC reveal positive results, finding that these facilities are on the whole in compliance with state regulations and standards.

JDAI: A Model of Governmental Cooperation

JDAI has earned the support of government at both the state and local level, and exemplifies the best of interagency and intergovernmental collaboration. The Attorney General's Office and the Administrative Office of the Courts have been instrumental in developing and supporting JDAI. At the state level, the New Jersey Council on Juvenile Justice System Improvement, whose members are jointly appointed by the JJC Executive Director and the Administrative Director of the New Jersey Courts, oversees JDAI and considers statewide policy and practice reforms, such as the detention Risk Screening Tool. At the local level, County Councils on Juvenile Justice System Improvement are directly responsible for implementing local reform strategies, exhibiting remarkable collaboration and innovation. The JJC provides the staffing for both the state and local councils.

Purpose of the JDAI Annual Data Report & Summary of Key Findings

As indicated above, reliance on data to inform policy and program development is key among JDAI's core strategies. Through the JDAI process, jurisdictions use data to examine the detention process to determine where opportunities for improvement exist, and to measure the impact of any reforms implemented. The JDAI Annual Data Report documents annual trends along key indicators of detention utilization, including admissions, length of stay (LOS), and average daily population (ADP). Note that the purpose of the JDAI Annual Data Report is to illustrate the overall impact of JDAI as a statewide initiative. County-specific needs continue to drive the various, additional analyses used for system-diagnosis at the local level.

The Annual Data Report provides information regarding 18 New Jersey JDAI sites active throughout 2016, and documents impressive changes in local detention systems – changes that are consistent with the application of JDAI core strategies and with the goal of safely reducing the unnecessary detention of New Jersey's kids. For example:

- Comparing the year prior to JDAI in each site to the current year, across all 18 sites average daily population has decreased by -67.9%. On any given day, there were 559 fewer youth in secure detention, with youth of color accounting for 89.3% of this drop.
- Comparing the year prior to JDAI in each site to 2016, collectively across sites more than seven-thousand (7,884) fewer youth were admitted to detention, a decrease of -76.1%. This annual figure translates into tens of thousands fewer youth removed from their homes and placed in secure detention since JDAI implementation.
- Since JDAI implementation, the number of youth admitted to detention for noncompliance with the rules of probation dropped -79.4%. Additionally, youth admitted to detention for failing to appear in court decreased by -77.4%, and the number of youth admitted for other violations, rule noncompliance, or non-delinquency matters dropped by -54.0%.

- The number of girls in detention on any given day has decreased by -83.4% across the 18 sites.
- Accounting for changing demographics in the general youth population, across sites minority overrepresentation in detention has decreased by -6.0 percentage points since JDAI implementation.
- In 2016, an average of just 2.6% of youth were discharged from a detention alternative program as the result of a new delinquency charge, an indicator that JDAI public safety goals are being met.
- Similarly, Uniform Crime Report figures indicate that in 2015 (the most recent year for which the Uniform Crime Report is available), juvenile arrests were down in all 18 sites as compared to each site's pre-JDAI year, for a total reduction of -63.7%. Arrests for the more serious "index" offenses are down -60.4%. These changes provide additional evidence that JDAI public safety goals are being met.
- Finally, as noted above, across sites commitments to state custody with the JJC as a disposition are down -82.3%.

Of note is that a core principle of JDAI is recognizing that no matter how well the current system is operating, there is always room for improvement. The purpose of this report is not only to highlight the accomplishments of New Jersey's JDAI sites, but to look for areas where we can continue to grow. While the accomplishments of New Jersey's JDAI sites to-date are indeed substantial, the report's findings indicate there are opportunities to continue to improve the juvenile justice system.

For example, 14 of the 18 sites have experienced an increase in average (mean) length of stay since JDAI implementation. Averaging across sites, the mean length of stay in detention has increased by +8.7 days and the percentage of youth remaining in detention for 60 days or more has increased by an average of +3.6 percentage points across sites. Additionally, the gap in length of stay between youth of color and white youth remains. In 2016, averaging across sites the mean length of stay in detention for youth of color was 13.8 days longer than that for white youth. Similarly, the percentage of youth of color remaining in detention longer than 60 days is +7.6 percentage points higher than that for white youth. On the other hand, averaging across sites, median LOS for youth of color was actually -5.0 days less than that for white youth; however, this is due to both a slight decrease in median LOS for minority youth and a substantial increase in LOS for white youth.

In light of the substantial achievements made by JDAI sites in terms of reducing unnecessary admissions to detention, an intentional focus on length of stay and related case processing issues, with an emphasis on further diagnosing and addressing potential disparities in this area, continues to be an area warranting further examination. Reducing length of stay in detention for youth of color presents an opportunity for reducing disproportionate minority confinement, too.

Additionally, it is important for JDAI sites to consider the interconnection between departure types and length of stay. Jurisdictions that release a greater proportion of appropriate youth from detention to detention alternatives, and do so in a timely manner, have shorter overall lengths of stay. For example, in Atlantic, 63.5% of detained youth are released to a detention alternative, and these youth remain in detention for only 8.6 days, resulting in Atlantic having an overall LOS (25.1 days) that is less than the all-sites average (37.2 days). Conversely, in Ocean, only 27.3% of detained youth are released to a detention alternative, and these youth remain in detention for 28.0 days, resulting in Ocean having an overall LOS (53.5 days) that is much longer than the all-sites average (37.2 days). This example illustrates how increasing the use of detention alternatives, and/or expediting detention alternative placement, are both strategies for reducing length of stay in detention.

Finally, while JDAI sites have achieved remarkable results in terms of reducing reliance on detention for youth charged with violations and low-level offenses, it seems there may be additional opportunities for improvement in this area. For example, in 2016, across sites, of youth detained on a violation only, 34.2%

(270 youth) had an offense of the 4th degree or less as the most serious, immediate underlying offense. Of these youth, (61.5%, 166 youth) had an offense of the 4th degree or less as the most serious prior adjudication in their entire court history; 27 of these youth had no prior adjudications. While these figures represent small reductions over 2015, continuing to focus on developing strategies to reduce detention for this population of low-level offenders, who are often “low-risk, high-need,” seems warranted, in light of their very limited delinquency history.

How Were These Results Achieved?

As described above, it is through the implementation of JDAI’s eight core strategies that sites accomplish the goal of reducing reliance on detention, while maintaining public safety. Examples of the types of policy, practice, and programming changes implemented among New Jersey’s JDAI sites that align with these core strategies are: 1) the implementation of the detention Risk Screening Tool to guide admissions; 2) the creation of an array of probation interventions for addressing non-compliance short of filing a violation of probation and requesting a warrant to detention; 3) improved court notification procedures that increase court appearance rates and reduce warrants to detention for failure to appear (FTA); 4) practices that differentiate between reasons for non-appearance in court, and where appropriate, use alternatives to issuing FTA warrants, such as “day time” warrants and rescheduling hearings, in instances where youth have not in fact absconded; and 5) developing a more robust continuum of detention alternatives that provides the supports necessary to assist youth in meeting release conditions.

Additionally, each year the Juvenile Justice Commission prepares a report on “Influence and Leverage Measures” that identifies the specific reforms implemented that year – reforms that have yielded the substantial changes in detention utilization illustrated in the present report. This report indicates that during the most recent annual reporting period alone, more than 100 policy, practice, and programming changes and other substantive activities were implemented in furtherance of JDAI goals, spanning all eight JDAI core strategies and all New Jersey JDAI counties.

SUMMARY OF CHANGES IN KEY DETENTION UTILIZATION INDICATORS

Table 1 summarizes changes in the key indicators of detention utilization, before and after JDAI. These three indicators include admissions, average length of stay (ALOS), and average daily population (ADP). Of course, ADP is a function of how many youth are admitted to detention and how long each youth stays, so a primary purpose of Table 1 is to illustrate the interaction between the detention utilization indicators. Each of the three indicators will be discussed further in subsequent sections of the report.

As Table 1 reveals, four sites experienced a decrease in all three detention utilization indicators since JDAI implementation (Atlantic, Bergen, Burlington, and Cape May). All 18 sites experienced a decrease in admissions, four sites experienced a decrease in ALOS, and all 18 sites saw a decrease in ADP.

TABLE 1. SUMMARY OF CHANGES IN KEY DETENTION UTILIZATION INDICATORS, PRE-JDAI^a VS. 2016

	Admissions		ALOS		ADP	
	Kids	%	Days	%	Kids	%
Atlantic	-352	-75.1%	-3.8	-13.1%	-25.7	-75.4%
Camden	-1375	-81.9%	+20.3	+95.3%	-57.7	-61.0%
Essex	-1931	-78.5%	+5.8	+15.1%	-187.2	-76.8%
Monmouth	-410	-80.9%	+20.5	+67.7%	-31.3	-78.3%
Hudson	-958	-78.4%	+4.9	+17.0%	-59.1	-68.2%
Mercer	-696	-80.6%	+19.5	+71.2%	-38.0	-63.3%
Union	-395	-73.4%	+14.6	+50.7%	-21.9	-55.9%
Bergen	-160	-65.5%	-0.5	-1.8%	-12.2	-60.1%
Burlington	-192	-67.6%	-9.3	-33.8%	-15.2	-74.5%
Ocean	-159	-66.3%	+18.7	+53.7%	-13.7	-57.8%
Somerset	-98	-77.8%	+17.9	+75.2%	-6.5	-72.2%
Passaic	-573	-69.5%	+12.4	+41.5%	-40.7	-58.0%
Middlesex	-274	-61.0%	+3.8	+10.7%	-22.1	-52.5%
Cumberland	-194	-77.9%	+5.5	+16.4%	-21.6	-79.1%
Warren	-23	-74.2%	+22.8	+96.6%	-1.1	-47.8%
Gloucester	-57	-57.6%	+16.8	+98.2%	-1.5	-34.1%
Cape May	-10	-37.0%	-31.3	-74.7%	-2.4	-77.4%
Sussex	-24	-63.2%	+18.4	+142.6%	-1.2	-54.5%
TOTAL	-7884	-76.1%	+8.7	+30.5%	-559.1	-67.9%

AVERAGE DAILY POPULATION (ADP) IN DETENTION


On any given day in 2016, across the 18 JDAI sites there were 559 fewer kids in secure detention centers than there were prior to JDAI implementation, a decrease of -67.9%, with all sites experiencing a decrease. As indicated in Table 2, the number of youth held in detention has dropped by more than 70% in Cumberland (-79.1%), Monmouth (-78.3%), Cape May (-77.4%), Essex (-76.8%), Atlantic (-75.4%), Burlington (-74.5%), and Somerset (-72.2%). Collectively, reductions continued over the past year, with combined ADP down -8.1%, and with Cape May (-50.0%), Sussex (-50.0%), Burlington (-42.2%), Cumberland (-34.5%), Essex (-31.0%), and Union (-27.3%) experiencing the largest reductions. However, six sites experienced a one-year increase in ADP, with the largest increases occurring in Mercer (+37.5%) and Passaic (+32.3%).

^a Pre-JDAI years are as follows: 2003 (Atlantic, Camden, Essex, Monmouth, Hudson); 2005 (Mercer, Union, Bergen, Burlington, Ocean); 2008 (Somerset, Passaic); 2009 (Middlesex, Cumberland, Warren); 2011 (Gloucester, Cape May); 2012 (Sussex).

TABLE 2. ADP IN DETENTION

	Pre-JDAI	2015	2016	1-Year Change		Pre-Post Change	
				<i>Kids</i>	%	<i>Kids</i>	%
Atlantic	34.1	10.5	8.4	-2.1	-20.0%	-25.7	-75.4%
Camden	94.6	31.8	36.9	+5.1	+16.0%	-57.7	-61.0%
Essex	243.6	81.7	56.4	-25.3	-31.0%	-187.2	-76.8%
Monmouth	40.0	8.5	8.7	+0.2	+2.4%	-31.3	-78.3%
Hudson	86.7	28.0	27.6	-0.4	-1.4%	-59.1	-68.2%
Mercer	60.0	16.0	22.0	+6	+37.5%	-38.0	-63.3%
Union	39.2	23.8	17.3	-6.5	-27.3%	-21.9	-55.9%
Bergen	20.3	8.4	8.1	-0.3	-3.6%	-12.2	-60.1%
Burlington	20.4	9.0	5.2	-3.8	-42.2%	-15.2	-74.5%
Ocean	23.7	11.0	10.0	-1.0	-9.1%	-13.7	-57.8%
Somerset	9.0	2.4	2.5	+0.1	+4.2%	-6.5	-72.2%
Passaic	70.2	22.3	29.5	+7.2	+32.3%	-40.7	-58.0%
Middlesex	42.1	16.8	20.0	+3.2	+19.0%	-22.1	-52.5%
Cumberland	27.3	8.7	5.7	-3.0	-34.5%	-21.6	-79.1%
Warren	2.3	1.4	1.2	-0.2	-14.3%	-1.1	-47.8%
Gloucester	4.4	3.6	2.9	-0.7	-19.4%	-1.5	-34.1%
Cape May	3.1	1.4	0.7	-0.7	-50.0%	-2.4	-77.4%
Sussex	2.2	2.0	1.0	-1.0	-50.0%	-1.2	-54.5%
TOTAL¹	823.2	287.3	264.1	-23.2	-8.1%	-559.1	-67.9%

FIGURE 1. ADP IN DETENTION, PRE-JDAI VS. 2016



ADMISSIONS TO DETENTION

Comparing the year prior to JDAI in each site to 2016, across all sites more than seven thousand (7,884) fewer youth were admitted to detention this year, a decrease of -76.1%. Admissions decreased in all 18 sites, with Camden (-81.9%), Monmouth (-80.9%), and Mercer (-80.6%) seeing admissions drop by more than 80%. Downward trends continued over the past year, with admissions collectively down -11.5%; Warren (-63.7%), Sussex (-46.2%), Gloucester (-32.3%), Bergen (-26.5%), and Burlington (-25.8%), experienced the largest one-year decreases. Five sites saw one-year increases, with Monmouth (+34.7%), Cape May (+21.4%), and Mercer (+21.0%), experiencing the largest increases.

TABLE 3. ADMISSIONS TO DETENTION

	Pre-JDAI	2015	2016	1-Year Change		Pre-Post Change	
				Kids	%	Kids	%
Atlantic	469	134	117	-17	-12.7%	-352	-75.1%
Camden	1679	356	304	-52	-14.6%	-1375	-81.9%
Essex	2460	703	529	-174	-24.8%	-1931	-78.5%
Monmouth	507	72	97	+25	+34.7%	-410	-80.9%
Hudson	1222	275	264	-11	-4.0%	-958	-78.4%
Mercer	863	138	167	+29	+21.0%	-696	-80.6%
Union	538	146	143	-3	-2.1%	-395	-73.4%
Bergen	249	117	86	-31	-26.5%	-163	-65.5%
Burlington	284	124	92	-32	-25.8%	-192	-67.6%
Ocean	240	70	81	+11	+15.7%	-159	-66.3%
Somerset	126	35	28	-7	-20.0%	-98	-77.8%
Passaic	825	242	252	+10	+4.1%	-573	-69.5%
Middlesex	449	188	175	-13	-6.9%	-274	-61.0%
Cumberland	249	69	55	-14	-20.3%	-194	-77.9%
Warren	31	22	8	-14	-63.7%	-23	-74.2%
Gloucester	99	62	42	-20	-32.3%	-57	-57.6%
Cape May	27	14	17	+3	+21.4%	-10	-37.0%
Sussex	38	26	14	-12	-46.2%	-24	-63.2%
TOTAL	10,355	2793	2471	-322	-11.5%	-7884	-76.1%


Nature of Admissions. The purpose of juvenile detention is to temporarily hold youth who pose a serious risk to public safety or risk of flight while their cases are pending final court disposition. JDAI sites continue to work to a) ensure detention is used according to this purpose, b) minimize reliance on detention for lesser offenses and rule violations, c) increase compliance with court-ordered conditions, and d) decrease rates of failure to appear in court. Examining the reasons why youth are admitted to detention, including the most serious charge faced by detained youth, is one primary indicator of progress toward these goals.

New Delinquency Charges. As illustrated in Figure 2, in 2016, 67.5% of youth were admitted to detention as a result of new delinquency charges. However, this figure varied widely across sites, ranging from just 37.5% in Warren to 82.5% in Union. Table 4 indicates that multi-year trends also vary, with nine sites experiencing increases in the percentage of youth detained for new delinquency charges since JDAI implementation, and nine sites seeing decreases. Finally, Table 5 indicates that the percentage of youth detained for the most serious offenses – those of the 1st or 2nd degree – was 48.8% across sites. However, this figure also varied widely, from just 28.6% in Sussex to 73.2% in Monmouth.

VOPs. As described in Table 6 and Figure 3, since JDAI implementation there has been a remarkable reduction in reliance on detention for youth who are non-compliant with the conditions of probation. Comparing 2016 to each site's pre-JDAI year, admissions to detention for violations of probation (VOPs) have decreased by more than three-quarters (-79.4%), with 17 sites experiencing pre vs. post JDAI

decreases. Monmouth has experienced the largest decrease (-94.7%), and six additional sites have experienced decreases of 80% or more: Somerset (-91.3%), Atlantic (-88.9%), Warren (-87.5%), Camden (-86.3%), Cumberland (-85.7%), and Union (-81.4%). Reductions over the past year continued, with VOP admissions down -7.9% across sites collectively. The largest one-year decreases occurred in Cumberland (-54.5%), Warren (-50.0%), Middlesex (-48.0%), Sussex (-42.9%) and Somerset (-42.9%). Finally, while 14.6% of detention admissions were the result of a VOP across sites collectively in 2016, this figure varied widely, from a low of 6.0% in Essex to a high of 30.9% in Ocean (Table 4).

FIGURE 2. PERCENTAGE OF YOUTH DETAINED FOR NEW CHARGES (2016)



FTAs. Table 7 and Figure 4 indicate that JDAI sites have also experienced a remarkable decrease in admissions to detention for warrants issued for failure to appear at a scheduled court proceeding (FTA). Since JDAI implementation, FTA admissions have decreased -77.4% across sites, with FTA admissions down by more than 80% in Union (-96.8%), Atlantic (-91.9%), Monmouth (-88.6%), Essex (-87.4%), and Mercer (-85.4%). Collectively, sites experienced an increase over the past year, with FTA admissions up +2.2% across sites. The largest one-year increases occurred in Hudson (+128.6%), Bergen (+100.0%), and Cape May (+100.0%). Once again, Table 4 reveals that the percentage of all admissions comprised of youth admitted for FTAs varies across sites. While across sites collectively, just 7.5% of detention admissions were for FTAs in 2016, this figure ranged from zero in Sussex to 25.0% in Warren and 20.0% in Cumberland.

Other Violations and Non-Delinquent Events. A review of Table 8 reveals that admissions to detention for all other violations and non-delinquency events have also decreased since JDAI implementation. Such admissions are down by -54.0% across sites, with five sites experiencing decreases of 80% or more: Union and Somerset (-100.0%), Hudson (-86.1%), Cumberland (-85.7%) and Monmouth (-82.1%). Note that pre vs. post JDAI increases in this category for some sites can be largely explained by the increased availability and utilization of alternative to detention (ATD) programs, since this category includes ATD violations. An important trend to monitor, then, is the one-year change, with such admissions decreasing by -14.2% collectively. The largest one-year decreases occurred in Union and Somerset (-100.0% each), while the largest one-year increases occurred in Ocean (+300.0%) and Sussex (+100.0%).

Admissions for Violations with Lower-Level Underlying Offenses. Tables 9 and 10 and Figure 5 describe the prior history of youth admitted to detention for violations (VOPs, FTAs, detention alternative violations, etc.). Table 9 indicates that in 2016, of youth detained on a violation only, 34.2% (270 youth) had an offense of the 4th degree or less as the most serious, immediate underlying offense. This is down slightly from 2015, where 35.2% (301) of youth detained on a violation had an underlying offense of the 4th degree or less. Similarly, Table 10 indicates that of these youth admitted on a violation with an underlying offense of the 4th degree or less, 61.5% (166 youth) had an offense of the 4th degree or less as the most serious prior adjudication in their entire court history; 27 of these youth had no prior adjudications. Again, this is down slightly from 2015 (65.8%, 198 youth; 32 with no prior adjudications). Figure 5 illustrates that 12 sites experienced one-year decreases in the number of youth detained on a violation with histories limited

to offenses of the 4th degree or less. However, six sites experienced increases, with the most notable increases occurring in Bergen (+11 kids, +366.7%) and Passaic (+17 kids, +130.8%).

Admission Process. Finally, Table 11 provides basic information regarding the process by which youth are admitted to detention. By far the most common process for admitting youth to detention is via a call placed to Family Court Intake Services, with 71.4% of all admissions occurring via this route in 2016. There is variation across sites, however. For example, court remands accounted for 16.6% of all admissions to detention across sites in 2016, but this figure ranged from a low of 3.1% in Monmouth to highs of 41.3% in Burlington and 37.7% in Middlesex. Additionally, the percentage of all admissions occurring via court remand has increased since JDAI implementation.

TABLE 4. NATURE OF CURRENT OFFENSE/LEAD REASON FOR DETENTION

	Delinquency Charges			VOP			FTA			ATD Violation			Other Violation or Non-Delinquency Event ²			Other Reason ³		
	^b Pre	2015	2016	Pre	2015	2016	Pre	2015	2016	Pre	2015	2016	Pre	2015	2016	Pre	2015	2016
ATL	59.5%	60.4%	60.7%	19.2%	11.2%	8.5%	7.9%	3.7%	2.6%	10.4%	23.9%	26.5%	1.5%	0.7%	1.7%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%
CAM	62.8%	59.8%	53.6%	25.6%	17.1%	19.4%	8.8%	8.1%	11.8%	0.7%	10.7%	11.5%	1.9%	3.9%	3.6%	0.2%	0.3%	0.0%
ESX	83.9%	81.7%	77.5%	4.4%	4.1%	6.0%	9.7%	4.7%	5.7%	0.7%	8.5%	10.4%	1.0%	0.1%	0.4%	0.3%	0.9%	0.0%
MON	56.0%	69.4%	80.4%	29.6%	6.9%	8.2%	8.7%	11.1%	5.2%	5.3%	11.1%	4.1%	0.2%	1.4%	1.0%	0.2%	0.0%	1.0%
HUD	75.2%	70.5%	69.3%	10.3%	10.5%	17.0%	2.7%	2.5%	6.1%	6.8%	8.0%	4.9%	5.0%	8.4%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
MER	78.1%	75.4%	73.7%	11.4%	13.0%	13.2%	5.6%	5.1%	4.2%	2.0%	4.3%	6.0%	2.4%	1.4%	0.0%	0.6%	0.7%	3.0%
UNI	68.6%	66.4%	82.5%	24.0%	24.0%	16.8%	5.8%	4.8%	0.7%	0.4%	3.4%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%
BERG	72.3%	70.9%	64.0%	18.9%	10.3%	18.6%	8.0%	4.3%	11.6%	0.8%	9.4%	4.7%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	4.3%	1.2%
BURL	52.5%	66.1%	56.5%	24.6%	19.4%	17.4%	12.0%	4.8%	8.7%	0.7%	8.1%	16.3%	8.1%	1.6%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	1.1%
OCE	47.5%	34.3%	46.9%	28.8%	40.0%	30.9%	10.8%	21.4%	7.4%	3.3%	2.9%	13.6%	7.1%	1.4%	1.2%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%
SOM	46.0%	51.4%	67.9%	36.5%	20.0%	14.3%	10.3%	17.1%	17.9%	1.6%	8.6%	0.0%	5.6%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
PASC	61.2%	72.3%	63.9%	20.8%	9.9%	16.3%	11.4%	9.9%	12.7%	4.0%	6.2%	6.7%	2.5%	0.8%	0.4%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%
MIDSX	61.7%	52.1%	66.3%	33.9%	39.9%	22.3%	3.6%	3.7%	5.7%	0.7%	3.7%	2.3%	0.2%	0.5%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%
CUMB	63.1%	52.2%	63.6%	14.1%	15.9%	9.1%	10.8%	24.6%	20.0%	6.0%	7.2%	5.5%	5.2%	0.0%	1.8%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%
WAR	45.2%	68.2%	37.5%	25.8%	9.1%	12.5%	16.1%	13.6%	25.0%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	3.2%	0.0%	25.0%	9.7%	0.0%	0.0%
GLO	75.8%	79.0%	64.3%	5.1%	11.3%	16.7%	6.1%	3.2%	4.8%	9.1%	4.8%	11.9%	3.0%	1.6%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	2.4%
CAPE	66.7%	50.0%	47.1%	18.5%	21.4%	17.6%	7.4%	7.1%	11.8%	7.4%	0.0%	17.6%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	5.9%
SUSX	57.9%	73.1%	64.3%	34.2%	26.9%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	7.1%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
TOTAL	69.7%	68.7%	67.5%	16.9%	14.0%	14.6%	7.9%	6.5%	7.5%	2.7%	8.2%	8.5%	2.3%	1.9%	1.3%	0.4%	0.6%	0.5%

^b Pre-JDAI years are as follows: 2003 (Atlantic, Camden, Essex, Monmouth, Hudson); 2005 (Mercer, Union, Bergen, Burlington, Ocean); 2008 (Somerset, Passaic); 2009 (Middlesex, Cumberland, Warren); 2011 (Gloucester, Cape May); 2012 (Sussex).

TABLE 5. DEGREE OF CURRENT OFFENSE/LEAD REASON FOR DETENTION (2016)

	1 st / 2 nd	3 rd	4 th / DP	Other
Atlantic	51.3%	6.8%	2.6%	39.3%
Camden	37.5%	12.2%	3.9%	46.4%
Essex	56.3%	18.3%	2.8%	22.5%
Monmouth	73.2%	7.2%	0.0%	19.6%
Hudson	52.3%	12.5%	4.5%	30.7%
Mercer	62.9%	9.0%	1.8%	26.3%
Union	56.6%	16.1%	9.8%	17.5%
Bergen	37.2%	18.6%	8.1%	36.0%
Burlington	31.5%	19.6%	5.4%	43.5%
Ocean	30.9%	13.6%	2.5%	53.1%
Somerset	46.4%	17.9%	3.6%	32.1%
Passaic	46.0%	15.9%	2.0%	36.1%
Middlesex	42.3%	14.9%	8.6%	34.3%
Cumberland	40.0%	23.6%	0.0%	36.4%
Warren	37.5%	0.0%	0.0%	62.5%
Gloucester	31.0%	21.4%	11.9%	35.7%
Cape May	47.1%	0.0%	0.0%	52.9%
Sussex	28.6%	28.6%	7.1%	35.7%
TOTAL	48.8%	14.6%	4.0%	32.5%

TABLE 6. NUMBER OF YOUTH ADMITTED TO DETENTION FOR VOPs

	Pre-JDAI ⁴	2015	2016	1-Year Change		Pre-Post Change	
				Kids	%	Kids	%
Atlantic	90	15	10	-5	-33.3%	-80	-88.9%
Camden	430	61	59	-2	-3.3%	-371	-86.3%
Essex	108	29	32	+3	+10.3%	-76	-70.4%
Monmouth	150	5	8	+3	+60.0%	-142	-94.7%
Hudson	126	29	45	+16	+55.2%	-81	-64.3%
Mercer	98	18	22	+4	+22.2%	-76	-77.6%
Union	129	35	24	-11	-31.4%	-105	-81.4%
Bergen	47	12	16	+4	+33.3%	-31	-66.0%
Burlington	70	24	16	-8	-33.3%	-54	-77.1%
Ocean	69	28	25	-3	-10.7%	-44	-63.8%
Somerset	46	7	4	-3	-42.9%	-42	-91.3%
Passaic	172	24	41	+17	+70.8%	-131	-76.2%
Middlesex	152	75	39	-36	-48.0%	-113	-74.3%
Cumberland	35	11	5	-6	-54.5%	-30	-85.7%
Warren	8	2	1	-1	-50.0%	-7	-87.5%
Gloucester	5	7	7	0	0.0%	+2	+40.0%
Cape May	5	3	3	0	0.0%	-2	-40.0%
Sussex	13	7	4	-3	-42.9%	-9	-69.2%
TOTAL	1753	392	361	-31	-7.9%	-1392	-79.4%

FIGURE 3. YOUTH ADMITTED TO DETENTION FOR VOPs, PRE-JDAI VS. 2016




TABLE 7. NUMBER OF YOUTH ADMITTED TO DETENTION FOR FTAs

	Pre-JDAI	2015	2016	1-Year Change		Pre-Post Change	
				<i>Kids</i>	%	<i>Kids</i>	%
Atlantic	37	5	3	-2	-40.0%	-34	-91.9%
Camden	147	29	36	+7	+24.1%	-111	-75.5%
Essex	239	33	30	-3	-9.1%	-209	-87.4%
Monmouth	44	8	5	-3	-37.5%	-39	-88.6%
Hudson	33	7	16	+9	+128.6%	-17	-51.5%
Mercer	48	7	7	0	0.0%	-41	-85.4%
Union	31	7	1	-6	-85.7%	-30	-96.8%
Bergen	20	5	10	+5	+100.0%	-10	-50.0%
Burlington	34	6	8	+2	+33.3%	-26	-76.5%
Ocean	26	15	6	-9	-60.0%	-20	-76.9%
Somerset	13	6	5	-1	-16.7%	-8	-61.5%
Passaic	94	24	32	+8	+33.3%	-62	-66.0%
Middlesex	16	7	10	+3	+42.9%	-6	-37.5%
Cumberland	27	17	11	-6	-35.3%	-16	-59.3%
Warren	5	3	2	-1	-33.3%	-3	-60.0%
Gloucester	6	2	2	0	0.0%	-4	-66.7%
Cape May	2	1	2	+1	+100.0%	0	0.0%
Sussex	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
TOTAL	822	182	186	4	+2.2%	-636	-77.4%

FIGURE 4. YOUTH ADMITTED TO DETENTION FOR FTAs, PRE-JDAI VS. 2016




TABLE 8. NUMBER OF YOUTH ADMITTED TO DETENTION FOR ALL OTHER VIOLATIONS (INCLUDING ATD VIOLATIONS) OR FOR NON-DELINQUENCY EVENTS⁵

	Pre-JDAI	2015	2016	1-Year Change		Pre-Post Change	
				Kids	%	Kids	%
Atlantic	56	33	33	0	0.0%	-23	-41.1%
Camden	43	52	46	-6	-11.5%	+3	+7.0%
Essex	43	61	57	-4	-6.6%	+14	+32.6%
Monmouth	28	9	5	-4	-44.4%	-23	-82.1%
Hudson	144	45	20	-25	-55.6%	-124	-86.1%
Mercer	38	8	10	+2	+25.0%	-28	-73.7%
Union	9	5	0	-5	-100.0%	-9	-100.0%
Bergen	2	12	4	-8	-66.7%	+2	+100.0%
Burlington	25	12	15	+3	+25.0%	-10	-40.0%
Ocean	25	3	12	+9	+300.0%	-13	-52.0%
Somerset	9	4	0	-4	-100.0%	-9	-100.0%
Passaic	54	17	18	+1	+5.9%	-36	-66.7%
Middlesex	4	8	7	-1	-12.5%	+3	+75.0%
Cumberland	28	5	4	-1	-20.0%	-24	-85.7%
Warren	1	2	2	0	0.0%	+1	+100.0%
Gloucester	12	4	5	+1	+25.0%	-7	-58.3%
Cape May	2	2	3	+1	+50.0%	+1	+50.0%
Sussex	3	0	1	+1	>100.0%	-2	-66.7%
TOTAL	526	282	242	-40	-14.2%	-284	-54.0%

^c Percent change from a value of 0 cannot be calculated, however any increase from 0 is an increase of at least 100%.

TABLE 9. FOR YOUTH ADMITTED ON A VIOLATION ONLY, DEGREE OF MOST SERIOUS IMMEDIATE UNDERLYING OFFENSE (MSUO)⁶ – 2015 VS. 2016

	1 st / 2 nd		3 rd		4 th		DP / PDP				Violation, etc.									
	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016								
Atlantic	45.3%	24	60.9%	28	35.8%	19	28.3%	13	3.8%	2	2.2%	1	11.3%	6	8.7%	4	3.8%	2	0.0%	0
Camden	12.7%	18	17.0%	24	53.5%	76	48.2%	68	3.5%	5	7.1%	10	14.1%	20	10.6%	15	16.2%	23	17.0%	24
Essex	52.0%	64	37.8%	45	32.5%	40	50.4%	60	3.3%	4	5.0%	6	1.6%	2	2.5%	3	10.6%	13	4.2%	5
Monmouth	27.3%	6	0.0%	0	18.2%	4	33.3%	6	9.1%	2	27.8%	5	18.2%	4	38.9%	7	27.3%	6	0.0%	0
Hudson	17.3%	14	11.1%	9	35.8%	29	44.4%	36	17.3%	14	19.8%	16	18.5%	15	17.3%	14	11.1%	9	7.4%	6
Mercer	9.1%	3	10.3%	4	39.4%	13	38.5%	15	21.2%	7	12.8%	5	27.3%	9	20.5%	8	3.0%	1	17.9%	7
Union	27.7%	13	32.0%	8	34.0%	16	48.0%	12	12.8%	6	4.0%	1	14.9%	7	16.0%	4	10.6%	5	0.0%	0
Bergen	31.0%	9	3.3%	1	48.3%	14	40.0%	12	17.2%	5	10.0%	3	0.0%	0	23.3%	7	3.4%	1	23.3%	7
Burlington	9.5%	4	23.1%	9	38.1%	16	56.4%	22	28.6%	12	15.4%	6	14.3%	6	2.6%	1	9.5%	4	2.6%	1
Ocean	6.5%	3	11.6%	5	47.8%	22	44.2%	19	17.4%	8	4.7%	2	17.4%	8	27.9%	12	10.9%	5	11.6%	5
Somerset	11.8%	2	66.7%	6	35.3%	6	22.2%	2	17.6%	3	11.1%	1	5.9%	1	0.0%	0	29.4%	5	0.0%	0
Passaic	15.4%	10	13.2%	12	49.2%	32	37.4%	34	10.8%	7	15.4%	14	12.3%	8	13.2%	12	12.3%	8	20.9%	19
Middlesex	7.8%	7	19.0%	11	54.4%	49	41.4%	24	16.7%	15	19.0%	11	18.9%	17	15.5%	9	2.2%	2	5.2%	3
Cumberland	24.2%	8	20.0%	4	33.3%	11	50.0%	10	12.1%	4	10.0%	2	27.3%	9	10.0%	2	3.0%	1	10.0%	2
Warren	28.6%	2	40.0%	2	14.3%	1	40.0%	2	28.6%	2	0.0%	0	28.6%	2	20.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
Gloucester	15.4%	2	14.3%	2	61.5%	8	57.1%	8	15.4%	2	7.1%	1	7.7%	1	21.4%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
Cape May	33.3%	2	28.6%	2	50.0%	3	42.9%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	16.7%	1	28.6%	2
Sussex	14.3%	1	0.0%	0	57.1%	4	40.0%	2	28.6%	2	20.0%	1	0.0%	0	40.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
TOTAL	22.4%	192	21.8%	172	42.4%	363	44.1%	348	11.7%	100	10.8%	85	13.4%	115	13.2%	104	10.0%	86	10.3%	81

TABLE 10. FOR YOUTH ADMITTED ON A VIOLATION ONLY, WHERE MSUO IS 4TH DEGREE OR LESS, DEGREE OF MOST SERIOUS PRIOR ADJUDICATION (MSPA) – 2015 VS. 2016

	1 st / 2 nd		3 rd		4 th		DP / PDP		No Prior Adjudications											
	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016										
Atlantic	0.0%	0	20.0%	1	40.0%	4	40.0%	2	10.0%	1	0.0%	0	30.0%	3	0.0%	0	20.0%	2	40.0%	2
Camden	8.3%	4	10.2%	5	45.8%	22	63.3%	31	14.6%	7	10.2%	5	22.9%	11	10.2%	5	8.3%	4	6.1%	3
Essex	52.6%	10	42.9%	6	15.8%	3	21.4%	3	5.3%	1	0.0%	0	5.3%	1	7.1%	1	21.1%	4	28.6%	4
Monmouth	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	8.3%	1	16.7%	2	16.7%	2	8.3%	1	75.0%	9	66.7%	8	0.0%	0	8.3%	1
Hudson	15.8%	6	2.8%	1	26.3%	10	22.2%	8	31.6%	12	44.4%	16	21.1%	8	25.0%	9	5.3%	2	5.6%	2
Mercer	0.0%	0	5.0%	1	17.6%	3	55.0%	11	23.5%	4	20.0%	4	41.2%	7	15.0%	3	17.6%	3	5.0%	1
Union	33.3%	6	20.0%	1	22.2%	4	0.0%	0	16.7%	3	20.0%	1	22.2%	4	60.0%	3	5.6%	1	0.0%	0
Bergen	16.7%	1	5.9%	1	33.3%	2	11.8%	2	16.7%	1	35.3%	6	0.0%	0	35.3%	6	33.3%	2	11.8%	2
Burlington	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	13.6%	3	50.0%	4	59.1%	13	25.0%	2	18.2%	4	12.5%	1	9.1%	2	12.5%	1
Ocean	0.0%	0	10.5%	2	4.8%	1	5.3%	1	42.9%	9	21.1%	4	42.9%	9	57.9%	11	9.5%	2	5.3%	1
Somerset	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	33.3%	3	0.0%	0	33.3%	3	0.0%	0	22.2%	2	0.0%	0	11.1%	1	100.0%	1
Passaic	17.4%	4	6.7%	3	26.1%	6	26.7	12	21.7%	5	35.6%	16	30.4%	7	24.4%	11	4.3%	1	6.7%	3
Middlesex	2.9%	1	0.0%	0	8.8%	3	8.7%	2	35.3%	12	39.1%	9	47.1%	16	30.4%	7	5.9%	2	21.7%	5
Cumberland	0.0%	0	16.7%	1	21.4%	3	50.0%	3	21.4%	3	33.3%	2	21.4%	3	0.0%	0	35.7%	5	0.0%	0
Warren	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	25.0%	1	0.0%	0	25.0%	1	0.0%	0	25.0%	1	0.0%	0	25.0%	1	100.0%	1
Gloucester	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	66.7%	2	0.0%	0	33.3%	1	25.0%	1	0.0%	0	75.0%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
Cape May	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	100.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
Sussex	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	33.3%	1	100.0%	2	33.3%	1	0.0%	0	33.3%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
TOTAL	10.6%	32	8.1%	22	23.6%	71	30.4%	82	26.9%	81	25.9%	70	28.2%	85	25.6%	69	10.6%	32	10.0%	27

FIGURE 5. YOUTH ADMITTED ON A VIOLATION ONLY, WHERE MSUO AND MSPA IS 4TH DEGREE OR LESS, 2015 VS. 2016




TABLE 11. DETENTION ADMISSION PROCESS

	Processed Through Intake			Court Remand ⁷			Transfer from Other Secure Facility/Jurisdiction			Other Process ⁸		
	Earliest ^d	2015	2016	Earliest	2015	2016	Earliest	2015	2016	Earliest	2015	2016
ATL	86.4%	88.8%	90.6%	8.3%	5.2%	7.7%	3.0%	3.0%	1.7%	2.3%	3.0%	0.0%
CAM	78.7%	57.3%	70.1%	21.3%	33.4%	17.1%	0.0%	3.4%	1.0%	0.0%	5.9%	11.5%
ESX	86.7%	79.5%	80.7%	10.9%	11.4%	12.9%	2.3%	6.8%	5.9%	0.1%	2.3%	0.6%
MON	82.9%	80.6%	91.8%	6.7%	13.9%	3.1%	3.7%	5.6%	0.0%	6.7%	0.0%	5.2%
HUD	93.0%	79.6%	74.2%	6.3%	19.3%	11.7%	0.7%	1.1%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	12.9%
MER	94.1%	65.9%	81.4%	4.5%	18.8%	8.4%	1.2%	5.8%	1.8%	0.2%	9.4%	8.4%
UNI	97.2%	86.3%	70.6%	1.1%	10.3%	7.7%	1.1%	3.4%	5.6%	0.6%	0.0%	16.1%
BERG	50.7%	58.1%	46.5%	27.5%	23.1%	24.4%	2.2%	8.5%	5.8%	19.6%	10.3%	23.3%
BURL	65.2%	58.9%	50.0%	28.0%	32.3%	41.3%	5.7%	3.2%	6.5%	1.1%	5.6%	2.2%
OCE	33.5%	57.1%	55.6%	21.1%	15.7%	22.2%	0.5%	14.3%	4.9%	44.9%	12.9%	17.3%
SOM	90.5%	51.4%	53.6%	0.0%	14.3%	17.9%	9.5%	34.3%	17.9%	0.0%	0.0%	10.7%
PASC	72.6%	76.4%	65.9%	27.0%	18.6%	20.6%	0.4%	2.9%	1.2%	0.0%	2.1%	12.3%
MIDSX	66.4%	52.7%	45.7%	32.3%	37.2%	37.7%	0.0%	3.2%	3.4%	1.3%	6.9%	13.1%
CUMB	77.0%	69.6%	81.8%	11.9%	13.0%	14.5%	1.6%	0.0%	3.6%	9.5%	17.4%	0.0%
WAR	90.3%	54.5%	75.0%	0.0%	9.1%	25.0%	9.7%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	27.3%	0.0%
GLO	91.9%	77.4%	78.6%	1.0%	12.9%	16.7%	2.0%	0.0%	4.8%	5.1%	9.7%	0.0%
CAPE	53.8%	78.6%	76.5%	42.3%	21.4%	17.6%	3.8%	0.0%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
SUSX	47.4%	50.0%	57.1%	47.4%	38.5%	14.3%	2.6%	0.0%	14.3%	2.6%	11.5%	14.3%
TOTAL	82.0%	71.3%	71.4%	14.5%	19.3%	16.6%	1.6%	4.8%	3.5%	2.0%	4.5%	8.5%

^d Admission process was not a variable measured in most sites' pre-JDAI data, and therefore the data is reported for the "earliest full-year of data available." Those years are: 2005 (Atlantic, Camden, Monmouth); 2006 (Essex, Union); 2007 (Hudson); 2008 (Mercer, Bergen, Ocean, Somerset, Passaic); 2009 (Burlington, Middlesex, Warren); 2011 (Gloucester); and 2012 (Cumberland, Cape May, Sussex).

DETENTION DEPARTURES & LENGTH OF STAY (LOS)

Overall Length of Stay. Table 12 indicates that in 2016, across sites average length of stay (ALOS) in detention ranged from a low of 10.6 days in Cape May to a high of 53.5 days in Ocean. Averaging across the 18 sites there has been a collective increase of +8.7 days (+30.5%) in average length of stay since JDAI implementation. Three sites have experienced increases of 20 days or more: Warren (+22.8 days, +96.6%), Monmouth (+20.5 days, +67.7%), and Camden (+20.3 days, +95.3%). Four sites have seen decreases in ALOS since JDAI implementation, with Cape May (-31.3 days, -74.7%) and Burlington (-9.3 days, -33.8%) experiencing the largest decreases. Over the past year, ALOS is also up across sites (+3.8 days, +11.4%); four sites saw a one-year decrease, with the largest decrease occurring in Cape May (-35.4 days, -77.0%). On the other hand, fourteen sites saw one-year increases in ALOS, with the largest increases occurring in Monmouth (+27.0 days, +113.4%) and Somerset (+23.4 days, +127.9%).

TABLE 12. AVERAGE (MEAN) LOS IN DETENTION⁹

	Pre-JDAI	2015	2016	1-Year Change		Pre-Post Change	
				Days	%	Days	%
Atlantic	28.9	23.8	25.1	+1.3	+5.5%	-3.8	-13.1%
Camden	21.3	33.5	41.6	+8.1	+24.2%	+20.3	+95.3%
Essex	38.5	39.8	44.3	+4.5	+11.3%	+5.8	+15.1%
Monmouth	30.3	23.8	50.8	+27.0	+113.4%	+20.5	+67.7%
Hudson	28.9	41.5	33.8	-7.7	-18.6%	+4.9	+17.0%
Mercer	27.4	40.6	46.9	+6.3	+15.5%	+19.5	+71.2%
Union	28.8	57.4	43.4	-14.0	-24.4%	+14.6	+50.7%
Bergen	27.4	23.9	26.9	+3.0	+12.6%	-0.5	-1.8%
Burlington	27.5	25.6	18.2	-7.4	-28.9%	-9.3	-33.8%
Ocean	34.8	47.0	53.5	+6.5	+13.8%	+18.7	+53.7%
Somerset	23.8	18.3	41.7	+23.4	+127.9%	+17.9	+75.2%
Passaic	29.9	34.8	42.3	+7.5	+21.6%	+12.4	+41.5%
Middlesex	35.6	33.7	39.4	+5.7	+16.9%	+3.8	+10.7%
Cumberland	33.6	38.5	39.1	+0.6	+1.6%	+5.5	+16.4%
Warren	23.6	26.6	46.4	+19.8	+74.4%	+22.8	+96.6%
Gloucester	17.1	17.7	33.9	+16.2	+91.5%	+16.8	+98.2%
Cape May	41.9	46.0	10.6	-35.4	-77.0%	-31.3	-74.7%
Sussex	12.9	27.9	31.3	+3.4	+12.2%	+18.4	+142.6%
SITE AVG¹⁰	28.5	33.4	37.2	+3.8	+11.4%	+8.7	+30.5%

Table 13 describes median length of stay in detention, i.e., the number of days within which 50% of all youth are released from detention. In 2016, median LOS ranged from a low of two days in Cape May, to a high of 20 days in Ocean and 19 days in Somerset. In terms of trends, prior to JDAI, across sites the median LOS averaged 12.1 days, fortunately decreasing to 11.4 days by 2016 (-5.8%). However, individual sites varied, with eight sites experiencing a decrease, nine sites seeing an increase, and one sites remaining unchanged. The largest pre vs. post JDAI increase in median LOS was experienced by Somerset (+10 days, +111.1%), while the largest decrease occurred in Cape May (-28 days, -93.3%). The largest one-year decreases occurred in Cape May (-17 days, -89.5%) and Union (-12 days, -42.9%), while two sites saw one-year increases of one week or more (Mercer and Somerset).

Finally, with regard to the percentage of youth who remain in detention for 60 days or more, Table 14 reveals that this LOS indicator has also increased over the years. Pre-JDAI the site average for youth with these lengthier stays was 14.4%, which increased to 18.0% by 2016. The largest increases occurred in Warren (+21.1 percentage points), Somerset (+18.8 percentage points), and Camden (+17.3 percentage points), and the largest decreases occurred in Cape May (-15.5 percentage points) and Burlington (-10.4 percentage points).

TABLE 13. MEDIAN LOS IN DETENTION

	Pre-JDAI	2015	2016	1-Year Change		Pre-Post Change	
				Days	%	Days	%
Atlantic	11	5	3	-2	-40.0%	-8	-72.7%
Camden	11	17	17	0	0.0%	+6	+54.5%
Essex	10	5	6	+1	+20.0%	-4	-40.0%
Monmouth	14	6	8	+2	+33.3%	-6	-42.9%
Hudson	7	16	10	-6	-37.5%	+3	+42.9%
Mercer	11	8	15	+7	+87.5%	+4	+36.4%
Union	9	28	16	-12	-42.9%	+7	+77.8%
Bergen	15	8	11	+3	+37.5%	-4	-26.7%
Burlington	11	9	7	-2	-22.2%	-4	-36.4%
Ocean	23	30	20	-10	-33.3%	-3	-13.0%
Somerset	9	8	19	+11	+137.5%	+10	+111.1%
Passaic	14	12	17	+5	+41.7%	+3	+21.4%
Middlesex	15	15	16	+1	+6.7%	+1	+6.7%
Cumberland	7	7	7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Warren	10	15	9	-6	-40.0%	-1	-10.0%
Gloucester	6	8	8	0	0.0%	+2	+33.3%
Cape May	30	19	2	-17	-89.5%	-28	-93.3%
Sussex	5	14	14	0	0.0%	+9	+180.0%
SITE AVG	12.1	12.8	11.4	-1.4	-10.9%	-0.7	-5.8%

TABLE 14. YOUTH REMAINING IN DETENTION 60 DAYS OR MORE

	Pre-JDAI	2015	2016	1-Year Change		Pre-Post Change	
				Percentage Points	Percentage Points	Percentage Points	Percentage Points
Atlantic	15.5%	12.6%	13.0%	+0.4	-2.5		
Camden	6.5%	18.7%	23.8%	+5.1	+17.3		
Essex	21.2%	20.7%	19.2%	-1.5	-2.0		
Monmouth	15.8%	13.7%	16.8%	+3.1	+1.0		
Hudson	17.7%	25.5%	21.8%	-3.7	+4.1		
Mercer	13.0%	19.6%	21.4%	+1.8	+8.4		
Union	15.5%	28.4%	20.3%	-8.1	+4.8		
Bergen	14.2%	12.2%	9.6%	-2.6	-4.6		
Burlington	16.1%	13.3%	5.7%	-7.6	-10.4		
Ocean	22.6%	32.4%	18.2%	-14.2	-4.4		
Somerset	7.1%	9.4%	25.9%	+16.5	+18.8		
Passaic	16.3%	20.2%	21.2%	+1.0	+4.9		
Middlesex	17.3%	12.2%	20.0%	+7.8	+2.7		
Cumberland	16.7%	21.5%	18.5%	-3.0	+1.8		
Warren	6.2%	13.6%	27.3%	+13.7	+21.1		
Gloucester	9.9%	10.7%	21.3%	+10.6	+11.4		
Cape May	22.2%	40.0%	6.7%	-33.3	-15.5		
Sussex	5.4%	12.0%	12.5%	+0.5	+7.1		
SITE AVG	14.4%	18.7%	18.0%	-0.7	+3.6		

ALOS By Departure Type. Table 15 provides more specific information regarding average length of stay (ALOS), describing ALOS based on the circumstances of release from detention, and points to wide variation across sites. For example, for youth released from secure detention to a detention alternative/shelter in 2016, across sites ALOS averaged 14.8 days, however this ranged from a low of less than one week in Cape May (4.1 days) and Burlington (5.6 days), to a high of about one month in Gloucester (29.8 days) and Ocean (28.0 days). Across sites, ALOS for youth released to a parent/home pre-dispositionally averaged 11.5 days, but ranged from a low of 2.0 days in both Cape May and Warren to a high of 41.7 days in Monmouth and 34.0 days in Ocean. Finally, ALOS for youth released to serve a disposition/to a dispositional placement averaged 63.3 days across sites, but ranged from a low of 37.0 days in Burlington to a high of 93.0 days in Cape May.

In order to shed light on the nature of the increase in overall LOS reported earlier, Table 16 reports changes in ALOS over time for the two most frequently occurring departure types. In terms of changes pre vs. post JDAI by county, ten sites experienced increases in ALOS for youth released to a detention alternative and eight sites experienced decreases, for a collective increase of +0.9 days (+6.5%). Changes ranged from an increase of +16.9 days in Gloucester (+131.0%), to a decrease of -18.2 days in Burlington (-76.5%). Regarding youth released from detention to a disposition, 14 sites experienced an increase in ALOS and four sites experienced a decrease, for a collective increase of +14.2 days (+28.9%). Changes ranged from an increase of +45.6 days in Camden (+197.4%) to a decrease in Burlington of -24.7 days (-40.0%).

Nature of Departures. Table 17 indicates that sites vary in terms of the percentage of youth released from detention to a detention alternative. Across all sites, in 2016, 45.2% of detained youth were released from detention to an alternative, up from 34.0% in the earliest recorded year for each site. However, the percentage of youth released to a detention alternative ranges from a low of 25.0% in Sussex and 27.3% in Ocean, to highs of 63.5% in Atlantic and 55.8% in Monmouth.

Taken together, the first three columns/categories of Table 17 (i.e., Detention Alternative/Shelter + Parent/Other Adult/ROR + Other Service Agency/Plcmt) represent an approximate gauge of the percentage of youth released from detention prior to final dispositional placement. This gauge indicates that in 2016, across sites 55.7% of all youth were released from detention pre-dispositionally. Sites vary substantially in terms of the proportion of youth released pre-dispositionally from detention, ranging from 32.5% in Ocean and 37.5% Sussex, to three-quarters or more in Atlantic (76.6%) and Monmouth (75.8%).

In 2016 the proportion of youth released via a transfer to jail or upon bail – typically as a result of a waiver – ranged from zero in Cape May and Sussex to 14.8% in Somerset. Finally, the proportion of youth released from secure detention upon dismissal, court diversion, upon closing/inactivating the case, or because no charges were filed, ranged from zero in nine sites to a high of 6.8% in Burlington.

TABLE 15. AVERAGE LOS BY DEPARTURE TYPE^{11, 12}

	Detention Alternative, Shelter (Pre-Dispo Placement)			Parent, Other Adult, ROR (Pre-Dispo)			Other Service Agency/Placement (Pre-Dispo)			Dispositional Placement		
	Earliest ^e	2015	2016	Earliest	2015	2016	Earliest	2015	2016	Earliest	2015	2016
ATL	11.8	9.9	8.6	6.0	6.3	26.2	14.2	5.3	25.3	59.2	66.1	45.9
CAM	11.7	13.3	8.4	11.6	12.2	13.2	20.0	8.0	12.1	23.1	56.6	68.7
ESX	7.5	7.8	8.5	4.5	4.5	4.8	28.9	42.8	33.6	58.0	77.1	87.9
MON	12.7	10.0	12.5	8.4	2.3	41.7	16.1	28.6	29.5	44.2	46.2	41.2
HUD	5.4	9.6	11.7	4.4	10.6	12.3	5.4	48.4	30.7	60.7	70.5	65.7
MER	13.3	11.0	12.4	4.5	2.6	3.1	5.3	4.4	51.4	45.1	66.6	87.2
UNI	13.1	15.0	14.5	6.8	12.6	8.8	6.0	67.0	28.0	42.5	59.5	65.6
BERG	13.5	15.0	12.1	4.8	3.2	5.8	*	46.0	6.0	43.5	38.1	49.8
BURL	23.8	10.3	5.6	9.6	4.0	4.0	24.7	17.7	12.3	61.7	46.5	37.0
OCE	18.7	30.2	28.0	21.1	3.0	34.0	22.1	18.0	54.3	47.3	58.9	41.0
SOM	18.1	8.3	26.1	6.6	3.7	6.8	1.5	18.0	43.5	44.1	38.6	46.0
PASC	8.9	11.3	10.1	6.7	1.7	10.7	19.3	*	58.0	49.6	68.1	66.3
MIDSX	15.7	17.8	23.0	29.9	14.0	6.3	37.5	10.8	65.8	42.0	49.5	55.2
CUMB	23.6	14.1	12.0	5.2	12.4	7.2	23.5	43.0	13.0	77.0	101.8	86.0
WAR	13.7	11.9	23.2	9.7	*	2.0	29.8	47.0	*	43.0	47.6	80.7
GLO	12.9	13.1	29.8	4.1	13.0	7.2	26.0	9.0	16.3	49.4	45.6	63.2
CAPE	21.0	26.5	4.1	9.0	*	2.0	16.5	4.5	2.5	51.8	69.5	93.0
SUSX	4.8	7.3	16.3	5.7	14.0	*	14.5	16.0	2.0	41.9	50.6	59.6
SITE AVG	13.9	13.5	14.8	8.8	7.5	11.5	18.3	25.6	28.5	49.1	58.7	63.3

^e Departure type was not a variable measured in most sites' pre-JDAI data, and therefore the data is reported for the "earliest full-year of data available." Those years are: 2005 (Atlantic, Camden, Monmouth, Mercer, Bergen, Ocean, Burlington); 2006 (Essex, Hudson); 2008 (Union, Somerset, Passaic); 2009 (Middlesex, Cumberland, Warren); 2011 (Gloucester, Cape May); 2012 (Sussex).

TABLE 15. AVERAGE LOS BY DEPARTURE TYPE (Continued from Prior Page)

	Jail, Bail, and/or Upon/After Waiver			Other YDC or Other Authorities			Dismissed, Diverted, Similar			Time Served		
	Earliest	2015	2016	Earliest	2015	2016	Earliest	2015	2016	Earliest	2015	2016
ATL	42.5	178.0	218.3	23.7	7.0	100.5	7.0	*	*	*	*	*
CAM	75.5	172.5	175.8	6.5	15.8	20.7	*	17.9	6.8	*	*	*
ESX	128.3	676.7	864.6	8.7	20.9	44.1	16.1	18.1	44.9	81.9	84.1	84.5
MON	93.0	*	517.8	16.2	*	29.0	*	3.0	*	*	9.0	748.0
HUD	200.9	263.3	214.5	11.0	1.8	3.3	16.2	57.6	52.8	*	31.0	34.0
MER	333.3	847.0	369.0	8.8	12.8	26.7	16.6	9.0	84.7	*	36.0	*
UNI	209.8	538.6	341.2	7.7	4.4	26.2	13.1	44.1	12.4	*	*	*
BERG	137.4	112.3	4.0	27.5	3.6	4.8	3.0	*	13.0	58.5	*	25.5
BURL	13.1	105.9	6.0	7.4	12.7	12.3	15.0	2.0	17.7	*	18.0	*
OCE	43.7	127.0	454.0	18.9	13.7	8.0	16.9	2.0	*	41.8	70.0	60.4
SOM	276.7	*	115.3	3.4	5.8	*	*	2.0	*	22.0	*	13.0
PASC	126.0	235.7	464.0	6.1	4.0	9.4	7.9	42.2	32.0	73.0	*	*
MIDSX	115.9	309.0	115.5	15.5	5.6	5.8	16.7	31.3	7.7	*	*	29.0
CUMB	259.8	149.3	240.0	8.9	*	2.0	36.6	*	*	28.0	*	*
WAR	*	*	148.0	7.5	*	*	50.0	*	*	*	17.0	*
GLO	2.0	*	47.0	2.0	1.0	4.7	60.3	*	*	*	*	*
CAPE	72.5	*	*	1.0	19.0	8.7	*	*	*	*	*	*
SUSX	*	*	*	2.0	19.0	5.0	*	3.0	*	*	*	*
SITE AVG	133.2	309.7	268.4	10.2	9.8	19.5	21.2	19.4	30.2	50.9	37.9	142.1

TABLE 16. CHANGES IN ALOS FOR PRIMARY DEPARTURE TYPES

	Release to Detention Alternative, Shelter				Release to Dispositional Placement			
	1-Year Change		Earliest to Post Change		1-Year Change		Earliest to Post Change	
	<i>Days</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Days</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Days</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Days</i>	<i>%</i>
Atlantic	-1.3	-13.1%	-3.2	-27.1%	-20.2	-30.6%	-13.3	-22.5%
Camden	-4.9	-36.8%	-3.3	-28.2%	+12.1	+21.4%	+45.6	+197.4%
Essex	+0.7	+9.0%	+1.0	+13.3%	+10.8	+14.0%	+29.9	+51.6%
Monmouth	+2.5	+25.0%	-0.2	-1.6%	-5.0	-10.8%	-3.0	-6.8%
Hudson	+2.1	+21.9%	+6.3	+116.7%	-4.8	-6.8%	+5.0	+8.2%
Mercer	+1.4	+12.7%	-0.9	-6.8%	+20.6	+30.9%	+42.1	+93.3%
Union	-0.5	-3.3%	+1.4	+10.7%	+6.1	+10.3%	+23.1	+54.4%
Bergen	-2.9	-19.3%	-1.4	-10.4%	+11.7	+30.7%	+6.3	+14.5%
Burlington	-4.7	-45.6%	-18.2	-76.5%	-9.5	-20.4%	-24.7	-40.0%
Ocean	-2.2	-7.3%	+9.3	+49.7%	-17.9	-30.4%	-6.3	-13.3%
Somerset	+17.8	+214.5%	+8.0	+44.2%	+7.4	+19.2%	+1.9	+4.3%
Passaic	-1.2	-10.6%	+1.2	+13.5%	-1.8	-2.6%	+16.7	+33.7%
Middlesex	+5.2	+29.2%	+7.3	+46.5%	+5.7	+11.5%	+13.2	+31.4%
Cumberland	-2.1	-14.9%	-11.6	-49.2%	-15.8	-15.5%	+9.0	+11.7%
Warren	+11.3	+95.0%	+9.5	+69.3%	+33.1	+69.5%	+37.7	+87.7%
Gloucester	+16.7	+127.5%	+16.9	+131.0%	+17.6	+38.6%	+13.8	+28.0%
Cape May	-22.4	-84.5%	-16.9	-80.5%	+23.5	+33.8%	+41.2	+79.5%
Sussex	+9.0	+123.3%	+11.5	+239.6%	+9.0	+17.8%	+17.7	+42.2%
SITE AVG	+1.3	+9.6%	+0.9	+6.5%	+4.6	+7.8%	+14.2	+28.9%

TABLE 17. NATURE OF DEPARTURES FROM DETENTION (Continued on Next Page)

	Detention Alternative, Shelter (Pre-Dispo Placement)			Parent, Other Adult, ROR (Pre-Dispo)			Other Service Agency/Placement (Pre-Dispo)			Dispositional Placement		
	Earliest	2015	2016	Earliest	2015	2016	Earliest	2015	2016	Earliest	2015	2016
ATL	52.6%	69.6%	63.5%	6.6%	2.2%	9.6%	1.5%	3.0%	3.5%	32.7%	23.0%	19.1%
CAM	38.7%	48.6%	39.5%	6.5%	3.6%	5.5%	4.3%	1.1%	2.3%	47.1%	40.7%	46.0%
ESX	37.9%	50.2%	52.0%	33.2%	8.7%	11.7%	0.3%	1.4%	1.9%	22.2%	30.0%	27.6%
MON	40.6%	50.7%	55.8%	17.9%	4.1%	7.4%	5.0%	6.8%	12.6%	31.0%	35.6%	15.8%
HUD	29.5%	38.0%	48.5%	26.2%	4.4%	3.0%	1.4%	8.0%	2.3%	33.0%	39.1%	32.7%
MER	28.6%	42.7%	45.5%	21.4%	13.3%	7.6%	0.4%	3.5%	7.6%	43.1%	33.6%	30.3%
UNI	27.2%	18.9%	45.9%	21.9%	4.7%	4.1%	0.7%	1.4%	1.4%	37.1%	52.7%	33.1%
BERG	32.1%	47.2%	41.0%	14.6%	4.1%	6.0%	0.0%	2.4%	1.2%	33.3%	30.1%	41.0%
BURL	18.5%	41.4%	39.8%	40.3%	1.6%	5.7%	5.7%	4.7%	6.8%	27.5%	26.6%	35.2%
OCE	21.8%	8.5%	27.3%	8.6%	5.6%	1.3%	3.7%	9.9%	3.9%	40.7%	59.2%	51.9%
SOM	33.9%	34.4%	29.6%	37.0%	9.4%	18.5%	1.6%	6.3%	7.4%	18.9%	34.4%	25.9%
PASC	42.5%	52.3%	43.2%	2.7%	2.9%	2.4%	1.2%	0.0%	0.8%	47.8%	36.2%	45.6%
MIDSX	15.5%	38.1%	38.8%	17.7%	5.0%	3.6%	0.9%	5.0%	3.0%	54.5%	39.2%	42.4%
CUMB	23.4%	44.6%	27.8%	34.9%	29.2%	37.0%	5.2%	1.5%	1.9%	23.0%	18.5%	27.8%
WAR	21.9%	54.5%	45.5%	28.1%	0.0%	18.2%	12.5%	18.2%	0.0%	28.1%	22.7%	27.3%
GLO	33.7%	71.4%	34.0%	34.7%	5.4%	12.8%	5.9%	3.6%	6.4%	15.8%	16.1%	31.9%
CAPE	22.2%	26.7%	53.3%	3.7%	0.0%	6.7%	7.4%	13.3%	13.3%	48.1%	53.3%	6.7%
SUSX	51.4%	24.0%	25.0%	16.2%	4.0%	0.0%	10.8%	4.0%	12.5%	18.9%	40.0%	43.8%
TOTAL	34.0%	45.3%	45.2%	20.7%	3.2%	7.3%	2.0%	3.2%	3.2%	35.4%	34.8%	34.6%

TABLE 17. NATURE OF DEPARTURES FROM DETENTION (Continued from Prior Page)

	Jail, Bail, and/or Upon/After Waiver			Other YDC or Other Authorities			Dismissed, Diverted, Similar			Time Served		
	Earliest	2015	2016	Earliest	2015	2016	Earliest	2015	2016	Earliest	2015	2016
ATL	1.0%	0.7%	2.6%	5.1%	0.7%	1.7%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
CAM	1.9%	1.6%	2.9%	1.5%	2.2%	2.3%	0.0%	2.2%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ESX	1.1%	1.2%	1.3%	1.5%	2.2%	2.1%	2.2%	3.6%	2.3%	1.7%	2.6%	0.8%
MON	2.4%	0.0%	4.2%	3.1%	0.0%	3.2%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	1.1%
HUD	1.9%	1.1%	0.8%	1.4%	4.0%	5.3%	4.7%	5.1%	6.4%	0.0%	0.4%	1.1%
MER	0.7%	1.4%	2.1%	2.9%	2.8%	4.8%	3.0%	0.7%	2.1%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%
UNI	2.1%	3.4%	3.4%	8.5%	12.2%	8.8%	2.5%	6.8%	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
BERG	2.0%	3.3%	1.2%	16.7%	13.0%	6.0%	0.4%	0.0%	1.2%	0.8%	0.0%	2.4%
BURL	2.3%	5.5%	1.1%	4.4%	16.4%	4.5%	1.3%	2.3%	6.8%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%
OCE	4.5%	2.8%	3.9%	5.3%	8.5%	5.2%	3.7%	1.4%	0.0%	11.5%	4.2%	6.5%
SOM	2.4%	0.0%	14.8%	5.5%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	3.7%
PASC	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	4.9%	3.2%	3.2%	2.5%	3.6%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%
MIDSX	2.9%	1.7%	3.6%	7.0%	8.8%	6.1%	1.6%	2.2%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%
CUMB	2.0%	6.2%	3.7%	6.7%	0.0%	1.9%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%
WAR	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	6.2%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.5%	0.0%
GLO	1.0%	0.0%	2.1%	5.9%	3.6%	12.8%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
CAPE	14.8%	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%	6.7%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
SUSX	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	24.0%	12.5%	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
TOTAL	1.7%	1.7%	2.3%	3.3%	5.0%	4.1%	2.1%	2.7%	2.5%	0.6%	1.0%	0.7%

PUBLIC SAFETY OUTCOMES

Detention Alternative Outcomes. Detention alternatives are short-term placements for youth who would otherwise remain in detention while their cases are pending in court. The primary purpose of detention alternatives is to provide supervision and basic supports to youth, in order to minimize the likelihood that youth will be charged with a new delinquency offense while awaiting the disposition of their current case. Alternatives also help to ensure youth appear at each required court hearing.

Table 18 describes outcomes for youth supervised via detention alternatives by reporting the nature of departures from alternative placement. In 2016, across the 18 sites, the vast majority of youth were released from detention alternatives following successful completion. Averaging across sites, 82.8% of youth were released successfully, though success rates ranged from 64.3% in Ocean to 100.0% in Sussex. Importantly, the percentage of youth removed from a detention alternative as the result of a new delinquency charge is small, averaging just 2.6% across sites, and keeping below 10.0% in all sites (ranging from zero in Mercer, Ocean, Somerset, Cumberland, Warren, Cape May and Sussex to 8.0% in Essex and 6.4% in Hudson). Finally, in 2016, 14.1% of youth were removed from alternative programs for rule violations (no new charges), ranging from a low of zero in Cape May to a high of 35.7% in Ocean.

TABLE 18. DETENTION ALTERNATIVE OUTCOMES

	Successful Completion			New Charges			Violation/Non-Compliance		
	Earliest [†]	2015	2016	Earliest	2015	2016	Earliest	2015	2016
ATL	70.6%	63.7%	70.3%	9.5%	8.8%	1.0%	19.9%	26.5%	28.7%
CAM	81.4%	73.1%	78.4%	4.3%	3.1%	1.0%	14.3%	23.8%	20.6%
ESX	78.1%	75.7%	75.8%	6.7%	8.6%	8.0%	15.2%	15.6%	16.2%
MON	78.0%	79.7%	89.0%	6.6%	9.3%	2.4%	15.4%	10.9%	8.5%
HUD	81.3%	87.3%	86.5%	9.4%	3.6%	6.4%	9.4%	9.1%	7.1%
MER	77.6%	92.9%	89.8%	2.4%	0.6%	0.0%	20.0%	6.5%	10.2%
UNI	83.3%	73.2%	76.6%	3.3%	5.6%	6.3%	13.3%	21.1%	17.1%
BERG	90.1%	91.4%	86.8%	1.0%	0.9%	5.3%	8.9%	7.8%	7.9%
BURL	83.0%	80.2%	80.0%	4.3%	7.9%	4.7%	12.8%	11.9%	15.3%
OCE	72.3%	84.2%	64.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	27.7%	15.8%	35.7%
SOM	52.6%	84.6%	88.9%	10.5%	0.0%	0.0%	36.8%	15.4%	11.1%
PASC	82.3%	84.6%	83.0%	2.0%	1.5%	2.2%	15.7%	13.9%	14.8%
MIDSX	78.7%	84.8%	86.8%	4.3%	5.1%	5.3%	17.0%	10.1%	7.9%
CUMB	68.8%	73.0%	81.0%	1.3%	8.1%	0.0%	29.9%	18.9%	19.0%
WAR	83.3%	54.5%	83.3%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	16.7%	36.4%	16.7%
GLO	90.6%	81.3%	82.8%	3.8%	3.1%	3.4%	5.7%	15.6%	13.8%
CAPE	*	100.0%	87.0%	*	0.0%	0.0%	*	0.0%	13.0%
SUSX	93.7%	84.4%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	15.6%	0.0%
SITE AVG	79.2%	80.5%	82.8%	4.1%	4.2%	2.6%	16.8%	15.3%	14.6%

Juvenile Arrests. JDAI seeks to eliminate the unnecessary use of secure detention for youth who do not pose a serious public safety risk. In addition to the detention alternative outcomes reported above, another indicator of whether JDAI is meeting public safety goals is the change in the number of youth arrested for juvenile delinquency offenses. Juvenile arrests – both overall, and for the more serious “index” offenses, as defined by the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s Uniform Crime Report – represent the most consistently reported and readily available measure of juvenile crime.¹³ Table 19 indicates that total juvenile arrests have decreased substantially since JDAI implementation in all 18 sites. Across sites, total juvenile arrests have decreased by -63.7%. Additionally, Table 20 reveals that arrests for the more serious “index” offenses are down in all 18 sites, for a total reduction of -60.4%.

[†] Outcomes were not measured prior to JDAI, so data is reported for the earliest full-year of data available: 2006 (Atlantic, Camden, Essex, Monmouth); 2008 (Hudson, Burlington, Ocean); 2009 (Mercer); 2010 (Union, Bergen, Somerset); 2011 (Middlesex, Warren, Cumberland); 2012 (Passaic, Sussex); 2013 (Gloucester); 2014 (Cape May – reported in the 2014 column only).

TABLE 19. TOTAL JUVENILE ARRESTS

	Pre-JDAI	2014	2015 ^g	1-Year Change		Pre-Post Change	
				#	%	#	%
Atlantic	2809	975	712	-263	-27.0%	-2097	-74.7%
Camden	8511	3583	2885	-698	-19.5%	-5626	-66.1%
Essex	6208	2440	1942	-498	-20.4%	-4266	-68.7%
Monmouth	3931	1599	1536	-63	-3.9%	-2395	-60.9%
Hudson	3612	1360	1189	-171	-12.6%	-2423	-67.1%
Mercer	3888	1241	1090	-151	-12.2%	-2798	-72.0%
Union	3145	1021	1117	+96	+9.4%	-2028	-64.5%
Bergen	4729	1900	1559	-341	-17.9%	-3170	-67.0%
Burlington	2607	1464	1286	-178	-12.2%	-1321	-50.7%
Ocean	3321	989	920	-69	-7.0%	-2401	-72.3%
Somerset	1762	641	598	-43	-6.7%	-1164	-66.1%
Passaic	3894	2250	1918	-332	-14.8%	-1976	-50.7%
Middlesex	2781	1210	1305	+95	+7.9%	-1476	-53.1%
Cumberland	1457	694	601	-93	-13.4%	-856	-58.8%
Warren	368	182	174	-8	-4.4%	-194	-52.7%
Gloucester	1334	622	529	-93	-15.0%	-805	-60.3%
Cape May	716	537	505	-32	-6.0%	-211	-29.5%
Sussex	351	198	226	+28	+14.1%	-125	-35.6%
TOTAL	55,424	22,906	20,092	-2814	-12.3%	-35,332	-63.7%

TABLE 20. JUVENILE ARRESTS FOR INDEX OFFENSES

	Pre-JDAI	2014	2015	1-Year Change		Pre-Post Change	
				#	%	#	%
Atlantic	845	236	220	-16	-6.8%	-625	-74.0%
Camden	1001	488	410	-78	-16.0%	-591	-59.0%
Essex	1088	797	596	-201	-25.2%	-492	-45.2%
Monmouth	834	375	340	-35	-9.3%	-494	-59.2%
Hudson	1096	267	246	-21	-7.9%	-850	-77.6%
Mercer	641	314	265	-49	-15.6%	-376	-58.7%
Union	450	288	246	-42	-14.6%	-204	-45.3%
Bergen	796	314	252	-62	-19.7%	-544	-68.3%
Burlington	448	269	268	-1	-0.4%	-180	-40.2%
Ocean	569	213	173	-40	-18.8%	-396	-69.6%
Somerset	353	106	109	+3	+2.8%	-244	-69.1%
Passaic	737	395	315	-80	-20.3%	-422	-57.3%
Middlesex	913	411	425	+14	+3.4%	-488	-53.5%
Cumberland	475	183	171	-12	-6.6%	-304	-64.0%
Warren	81	47	46	-1	-2.1%	-35	-43.2%
Gloucester	335	98	128	+30	+30.6%	-207	-61.8%
Cape May	207	135	84	-51	-37.8%	-123	-59.4%
Sussex	60	48	37	-11	-22.9%	-23	-38.3%
TOTAL	10,929	4984	4331	-653	-13.1%	-6598	-60.4%

^g 2015 is the most recent year for which arrest figures are available.

MINORITY YOUTH IN DETENTION

Average Daily Population (ADP). On any given day in 2016, across JDAI sites there were 499 fewer youth of color in detention than prior to JDAI implementation, a decrease of -67.1% (Table 21). Youth of color account for 89.3% of the total drop in ADP. The number of minority youth in secure detention has dropped by about three-quarters or more in four sites: Cape May (-80.0%), Cumberland (-78.9%), Essex (-77.0%), and Sussex (-76.9%).

TABLE 21. ADP OF MINORITY YOUTH IN DETENTION

	Pre-JDAI	2015	2016	1-Year Change		Pre-Post Change	
				<i>Kids</i>	%	<i>Kids</i>	%
Atlantic	30.6	10.3	8.2	-2.1	-20.4%	-22.4	-73.2%
Camden	79.9	28.0	31.1	+3.1	+11.1%	-48.8	-61.1%
Essex	242.6	81.5	55.9	-25.6	-31.4%	-186.7	-77.0%
Monmouth	29.8	7.3	8.6	+1.3	+17.8%	-21.2	-71.1%
Hudson	82.5	26.5	26.4	-0.1	-0.4%	-56.1	-68.0%
Mercer	57.6	15.7	21.7	+6.0	+38.3%	-35.9	-62.3%
Union	38.4	23.5	16.9	-6.6	-28.1%	-21.5	-56.0%
Bergen	16.1	6.8	7.5	+0.7	+10.3%	-8.6	-53.4%
Burlington	13.4	8.2	3.9	-4.3	-52.4%	-9.5	-70.9%
Ocean	10.6	6.2	6.1	-0.1	-1.6%	-4.5	-42.5%
Somerset	7.4	1.6	2.4	+0.8	+50.0%	-5.0	-67.6%
Passaic	67.2	20.5	28.2	+7.7	+37.6%	-39.0	-58.0%
Middlesex	34.3	15.7	18.5	+2.8	+17.8%	-15.8	-46.1%
Cumberland	25.7	7.1	5.4	-1.7	-23.9%	-20.3	-78.9%
Warren	1.1	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.0%	+0.1	+9.1%
Gloucester	2.7	3.1	1.9	-1.2	-37.8%	-0.8	-29.6%
Cape May	2.0	0.3	0.4	+0.1	+33.3%	-1.6	-80.0%
Sussex	1.3	0.8	0.3	-0.5	-62.5%	-1.0	-76.9%
TOTAL	743.2	264.3	244.5	-19.8	-7.5%	-498.7	-67.1%

Length of Stay (LOS). Tables 22, 23, and 24 report average (mean) length of stay trends for minority youth and white youth across the 18 JDAI sites. Averaging across sites, mean LOS for minority youth in 2016 was 38.9 days, 13.8 days longer than that for white youth (25.1 days). Unfortunately, this gap has increased since JDAI implementation, when minority youth remained in detention 11.1 days longer than white youth. In 2016, average LOS for minority youth was longer than that for white youth in 14 sites, with the largest gap occurring in Ocean, where minority youth remained in detention an average of 50.1 days longer than white youth. Conversely, in Somerset, white youth remained in detention an average of 67.8 days longer than minority youth.

Tables 25, 26, and 27 describe the number of days within which half of all youth are released from detention. Averaging across sites, median LOS for minority youth in 2016 was 12.0 days, which is actually 5.0 days less than the median LOS for white youth (17.0 days). The trend has reversed since before JDAI implementation, when median LOS for minority youth was +3.6 days longer than that for white youth. Finally, in 2016, median LOS for minority youth was shorter than that for white youth in six sites, while median LOS was longer for white youth in eleven sites.

Finally, Tables 28, 29, and 30 describe the percentage of youth who remain in detention for 60 days or more. In 2016, the site average for the percentage of minority youth with these lengthier stays was 18.6%, 7.6 percentage points higher than for white youth (11.0%). For this measure of length of stay, the gap between minority youth and white youth has decreased by -0.1 percentage points since JDAI implementation. Finally, in 2016, in 14 sites a larger percentage of minority youth remained in detention for more than 60 days, as compared to white youth.

TABLE 22. AVERAGE (MEAN) LOS IN DETENTION FOR MINORITY YOUTH

	Pre-JDAI	2015	2016	1-Year Change		Pre-Post Change	
				Days	%	Days	%
Atlantic	30.8	25.0	26.3	+1.3	+5.2%	-4.5	-14.6%
Camden	22.8	35.0	44.3	+9.3	+26.6%	+21.5	+94.3%
Essex	39.0	40.1	44.9	+4.8	+12.0%	+5.9	+15.1%
Monmouth	35.1	24.2	54.8	+30.6	+126.4%	+19.7	+56.1%
Hudson	30.2	41.5	33.9	-7.6	-18.3%	+3.7	+12.3%
Mercer	27.9	41.4	47.6	+6.2	+15.0%	+19.7	+70.6%
Union	29.6	58.3	44.8	-13.5	-23.2%	+15.2	+51.4%
Bergen	28.0	24.2	27.2	+3.0	+12.4%	-0.8	-2.9%
Burlington	27.7	26.9	18.0	-8.9	-33.1%	-9.7	-35.0%
Ocean	35.5	39.2	77.6	+38.4	+98.0%	+42.1	+118.6%
Somerset	26.5	22.5	36.7	+14.2	+63.1%	+10.2	+38.5%
Passaic	30.9	35.5	43.9	+8.4	+23.7%	+13.0	+42.1%
Middlesex	39.0	35.7	40.9	+5.2	+14.6%	+1.9	+4.9%
Cumberland	35.7	33.8	40.4	+6.6	+19.5%	+4.7	+13.2%
Warren	29.5	26.9	50.3	+23.4	+87.0%	+20.8	+70.5%
Gloucester	18.7	19.9	35.9	+16.0	+80.4%	+17.2	+92.0%
Cape May	45.3	37.7	6.6	-31.1	-82.5%	-38.7	-85.4%
Sussex	29.3	28.9	26.5	-2.4	-8.3%	-2.8	-9.6%
SITE AVG	31.2	33.2	38.9	+5.7	+17.2%	+7.7	+24.7%

TABLE 23. AVERAGE (MEAN) LOS IN DETENTION FOR WHITE YOUTH

	Pre-JDAI	2015	2016	1-Year Change		Pre-Post Change	
				Days	%	Days	%
Atlantic	19.0	4.6	10.2	+5.6	+121.7%	-8.8	-46.3%
Camden	15.3	26.0	30.0	+4.0	+15.4%	+14.7	+96.1%
Essex	12.9	2.2	8.6	+6.4	+291.0%	-4.3	-33.3%
Monmouth	22.1	22.2	20.4	-1.8	-8.1%	-1.7	-7.7%
Hudson	15.8	41.8	32.3	-9.5	-22.7%	+16.5	+104.4%
Mercer	18.3	18.2	21.0	+2.8	+15.4%	+2.7	+14.8%
Union	16.6	32.6	14.0	-18.6	-57.1%	-2.6	-15.7%
Bergen	25.4	22.3	24.9	+2.6	+11.7%	-0.5	-2.0%
Burlington	27.1	14.0	18.7	+4.7	+33.6%	-8.4	-31.0%
Ocean	34.3	53.8	27.5	-26.3	-48.9%	-6.8	-19.8%
Somerset	16.7	7.8	104.5	+96.7	+1239.7%	+87.8	+525.7%
Passaic	17.7	24.8	22.9	-1.9	-7.7%	+5.2	+29.4%
Middlesex	25.4	20.4	27.7	+7.3	+35.9%	+2.3	+9.1%
Cumberland	14.0	57.3	3.0	-54.3	-94.8%	-11.0	-78.6%
Warren	18.9	25.0	7.0	-18.0	-72.0%	-11.9	-63.0%
Gloucester	15.0	11.9	28.5	+16.6	+139.5%	+13.5	+90.0%
Cape May	37.7	53.3	15.1	-38.2	-71.7%	-22.6	-60.0%
Sussex	9.1	27.2	36.0	+8.8	+32.4%	+26.9	+295.6%
SITE AVG	20.1	25.9	25.1	-0.8	-3.1%	+5.0	+24.9%

TABLE 24. DIFFERENCE IN AVERAGE (MEAN) LOS BETWEEN MINORITY YOUTH & WHITE YOUTH

	Minority Average LOS is Greater Than (+) or Less Than (-) White LOS by (in Days):		
	Pre-JDAI	2015	2016
Atlantic	+11.8	+20.4	+16.1
Camden	+7.5	+9.0	+14.3
Essex	+26.1	+37.9	+36.3
Monmouth	+13.0	+2.0	+34.4
Hudson	+14.4	-0.3	+1.6
Mercer	+9.6	+23.2	+26.6
Union	+13.0	+25.7	+30.8
Bergen	+2.6	+1.9	+2.3
Burlington	+0.6	+12.9	-0.7
Ocean	+1.2	-14.6	+50.1
Somerset	+9.8	+14.7	-67.8
Passaic	+13.2	+10.7	+21.0
Middlesex	+13.6	+15.3	+13.2
Cumberland	+21.7	-23.5	+37.4
Warren	+10.6	+1.9	+43.3
Gloucester	+3.7	+8.0	+7.4
Cape May	+7.6	-15.6	-8.5
Sussex	+20.2	+1.7	-9.5
SITE AVG	+11.1	+7.3	+13.8

TABLE 25. MEDIAN LOS IN DETENTION FOR MINORITY YOUTH

	Pre-JDAI	2015	2016	1-Year Change		Pre-Post Change	
				Days	%	Days	%
Atlantic	13	6	4	-2	-33.3%	-9	-69.2%
Camden	14	19	17	-2	-10.5%	+3	+21.4%
Essex	10	6	6	0	0.00%	-4	-40.0%
Monmouth	17	6	8	+2	+33.3%	-9	-53.0%
Hudson	7	16	8	-8	-50.0%	+1	+14.3%
Mercer	11	10	15	+5	+50.0%	+4	+36.4%
Union	9	27	16	-11	-40.7%	+7	+77.8%
Bergen	15	8	11	+3	+37.5%	-4	-26.7%
Burlington	10	10	8	-2	-20.0%	-2	-20.0%
Ocean	23	27	27	0	0.0%	+4	+17.4%
Somerset	9	13	19	+6	+46.2%	+10	+111.1%
Passaic	15	12	17	+5	+41.7%	+2	+13.3%
Middlesex	16	14	17	+3	+21.4%	+1	+6.3%
Cumberland	7	5	9	+4	+80.0%	+2	+28.6%
Warren	7	13	19	+6	+46.2%	+12	+171.4%
Gloucester	6	7	6	-1	-14.3%	0	0.0%
Cape May	35	8	4	-4	-50.0%	-31	-88.6%
Sussex	6	14	5	-9	-64.3%	-1	-16.7%
SITE AVG	12.8	12.3	12.0	-0.3	-2.4%	-0.8	-6.3%

TABLE 26. MEDIAN LOS IN DETENTION FOR WHITE YOUTH

	Pre-JDAI	2015	2016	1-Year Change		Pre-Post Change	
				Days	%	Days	%
Atlantic	6	4	1	-3	-75.0%	-5	-83.3%
Camden	7	9	16	+7	+77.8%	+9	+128.6%
Essex	2	2	5	+3	+150.0%	+3	+150.0%
Monmouth	8	12	8	-4	-33.3%	0	0.0%
Hudson	4	5	15	+10	+200.0%	+11	+275.0%
Mercer	6	4	24	+20	+500.0%	+18	+300.0%
Union	6	37	6	-31	-83.8%	0	0.0%
Bergen	9	14	13	-1	-7.1%	+4	+44.4%
Burlington	14	5	6	+1	+20.0%	-8	-57.1%
Ocean	22	34	17	-17	-50.0%	-5	-22.7%
Somerset	8	8	105	+97	+1212.5%	+97	+1212.5%
Passaic	5	13	14	+1	+7.7%	+9	+180.0%
Middlesex	14	16	15	-1	-6.3%	+1	+7.1%
Cumberland	7	23	3	-20	-87.0%	-4	-57.1%
Warren	10	17	7	-10	-58.8%	-3	-30.0%
Gloucester	6	9	27	+18	+200.0%	+21	+350.0%
Cape May	27	58	2	-56	-96.6%	-25	-92.6%
Sussex	5	16	19	+3	+18.8%	+14	+280.0%
SITE AVG	9.2	17.9	17.0	-0.9	-5.0%	+7.8	+84.8%

TABLE 27. DIFFERENCE IN MEDIAN LOS BETWEEN MINORITY YOUTH & WHITE YOUTH

	Minority Median LOS is Greater Than (+) or Less Than (-) White Median LOS by (in Days):		
	Pre-JDAI	2015	2016
Atlantic	+7	+2	+3
Camden	+7	+10	+1
Essex	+8	+4	+1
Monmouth	+9	-6	0
Hudson	+3	+11	-7
Mercer	+5	+6	-9
Union	+3	-10	+10
Bergen	+6	-6	-2
Burlington	-4	+5	+2
Ocean	+1	-7	+10
Somerset	+1	+5	-86
Passaic	+10	-1	+3
Middlesex	+2	-2	+2
Cumberland	0	-18	+6
Warren	-3	-4	+12
Gloucester	0	-2	-21
Cape May	+8	-50	+2
Sussex	+1	-2	-14
SITE AVG	+3.6	-5.6	-5.0

TABLE 28. PERCENTAGE OF MINORITY YOUTH REMAINING IN DETENTION 60 DAYS OR MORE

	Pre-JDAI	2015	2016	1-Year Change	Pre-Post Change
				<i>Percentage Points</i>	<i>Percentage Points</i>
Atlantic	17.1%	13.4%	13.2%	-0.2%	-3.9%
Camden	7.3%	19.9%	25.9%	+6.0%	+18.6%
Essex	21.5%	20.8%	19.5%	-1.3%	-2.0%
Monmouth	19.7%	14.3%	17.9%	+3.6%	-1.8%
Hudson	18.5%	26.0%	21.6%	-4.4%	+3.1%
Mercer	13.2%	19.6%	22.0%	+2.4%	+8.8%
Union	16.0%	29.4%	21.3%	-8.1%	+5.3%
Bergen	14.1%	12.9%	9.7%	-3.2%	-4.4%
Burlington	17.2%	13.9%	6.1%	-7.8%	-11.1%
Ocean	24.3%	27.3%	25.0%	-2.3%	+0.7%
Somerset	8.7%	13.0%	24.0%	+11.0%	+15.3%
Passaic	17.0%	20.7%	22.5%	+1.8%	+5.5%
Middlesex	20.0%	13.3%	20.5%	+7.2%	+0.5%
Cumberland	17.5%	21.2%	19.2%	-2.0%	+1.7%
Warren	14.3%	15.8%	30.0%	+14.2%	+15.7%
Gloucester	10.9%	14.6%	23.5%	+8.9%	+12.6%
Cape May	26.7%	28.6%	0.0%	-28.6%	-26.7%
Sussex	14.3%	10.0%	12.5%	+2.5%	-1.8%
SITE AVG	16.6%	18.6%	18.6%	0.0%	+2.0%

TABLE 29. PERCENTAGE OF WHITE YOUTH REMAINING IN DETENTION 60 DAYS OR MORE

	Pre-JDAI	2015	2016	1-Year Change	Pre-Post Change
				<i>Percentage Points</i>	<i>Percentage Points</i>
Atlantic	6.8%	0.0%	11.1%	+11.1%	+4.3%
Camden	3.0%	12.1%	15.0%	+2.9%	+12.0%
Essex	8.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-8.0%
Monmouth	9.1%	11.8%	9.1%	-2.7%	0.0%
Hudson	9.8%	16.7%	25.0%	+8.3%	+15.2%
Mercer	9.3%	20.0%	0.0%	-20.0%	-9.3%
Union	6.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-6.9%
Bergen	14.5%	9.1%	9.1%	0.0%	-5.4%
Burlington	14.0%	7.7%	4.5%	-3.2%	-9.5%
Ocean	21.2%	36.8%	10.8%	-26.0%	-10.4%
Somerset	2.9%	0.0%	50.0%	+50.0%	+47.1%
Passaic	7.8%	12.5%	5.3%	-7.2%	-2.5%
Middlesex	9.0%	4.3%	15.8%	+11.5%	+6.8%
Cumberland	8.3%	23.1%	0.0%	-23.1%	-8.3%
Warren	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.00%
Gloucester	8.7%	0.0%	15.4%	+15.4%	+6.7%
Cape May	16.7%	50.0%	14.3%	-35.7%	-2.4%
Sussex	3.3%	13.3%	12.5%	-0.8%	+9.2%
SITE AVG	8.9%	12.1%	11.0%	-1.1%	+2.1%

TABLE 30. DIFFERENCE IN LOS OF 60+ DAYS BETWEEN MINORITY YOUTH & WHITE YOUTH

	% Minority Youth With ALOS of 60+ Days is Greater Than (+) or Less Than (-) White Youth by (in Percentage Points):		
	Pre-JDAI	2015	2016
Atlantic	+10.3	+13.4	+2.1
Camden	+4.3	+3.8	+10.9
Essex	+13.5	+6.2	+19.5
Monmouth	+10.6	+7.8	+8.8
Hudson	+8.7	-21.4	-3.4
Mercer	+3.9	-1.9	+22.0
Union	+9.1	+20.8	+21.3
Bergen	-0.4	+14.6	+0.6
Burlington	+3.2	+9.3	+1.6
Ocean	+3.1	-0.4	+14.2
Somerset	+5.8	+9.0	-26.0
Passaic	+9.2	+2.5	+17.2
Middlesex	+11.0	-9.5	+4.7
Cumberland	+9.2	+8.2	+19.2
Warren	+14.3	+13.0	+30.0
Gloucester	+2.2	-3.3	+8.1
Cape May	+10.0	+29.4	-14.3
Sussex	+11.0	+15.8	0.0
SITE AVG	+7.7	+6.5	+7.6

Disproportionality. The findings in Table 21 indicate remarkable decreases in the number of minority youth in detention since JDAI implementation. Moreover, while a gap between minority youth and white youth remains for two of the three LOS indicators described above, the gap has narrowed on two of three indicators since JDAI implementation. And, for median LOS, the trend is now reversed, with minority youth having a shorter median LOS than white youth. The next question is whether these changes have had any impact on disproportionality. Table 31 indicates that since JDAI implementation, across sites the percentage of ADP comprised of minority youth has remained essentially flat, up +0.5 percentage points. In terms of detention admissions, Table 32 indicates that across sites, the percentage of all admissions comprised of minority youth is up +3.0 percentage points.

At the same time, however, Table 33 points to shifting demographics in the general youth population over time. Pre-JDAI, minority youth comprised 42.9% of the total youth population in the 18 sites. In the most recent year for which data are available (2015), across sites minority youth comprised 49.4% of the total youth population. While overrepresentation remains evident in all 18 sites, for the sites as a collective the gap has decreased by -6.0 percentage points. Again, though, changes over time and current figures vary across sites. For example, overrepresentation of minority youth, i.e., the difference between the percentage of minority youth in the general population vs. detention, currently ranges from 14.9 percentage points in Sussex to 76.1 points in Warren.

TABLE 31. % OF DETENTION ADP COMPRISED OF MINORITY YOUTH

	Pre-JDAI	2015	2016	1-Year Change <i>Percentage Points</i>	Pre-Post Change <i>Percentage Points</i>
Atlantic	89.7%	98.6%	97.4%	-1.2	+7.7
Camden	84.5%	88.0%	84.2%	-3.8	-0.3
Essex	99.6%	99.4%	99.1%	-0.3	-0.5
Monmouth	74.5%	85.8%	95.7%	+9.9	+21.2
Hudson	95.1%	94.8%	95.5%	+0.7	+0.4
Mercer	96.0%	98.5%	98.7%	+0.2	+2.7
Union	98.1%	99.0%	98.1%	-0.9	0.0
Bergen	79.4%	81.4%	92.3%	+10.9	+12.9
Burlington	65.6%	90.9%	75.8%	-15.1	+10.2
Ocean	44.4%	56.7%	61.2%	+4.5	+16.8
Somerset	81.9%	69.8%	95.3%	+22.5	+13.4
Passaic	95.6%	92.0%	96.0%	+4.0	+0.4
Middlesex	81.6%	93.3%	92.3%	-1.0	+10.7
Cumberland	94.4%	81.2%	95.0%	+13.8	+0.6
Warren	49.5%	88.1%	97.8%	+9.7	+48.3
Gloucester	62.3%	87.2%	65.8%	-21.4	+3.5
Cape May	64.7%	22.5%	52.9%	+30.4	-11.8
Sussex	58.0%	41.5%	29.9%	-11.6	-28.1
TOTAL	90.3%	92.0%	90.8%	-1.2	+0.5

TABLE 32. % OF DETENTION ADMISSIONS COMPRISED OF MINORITY YOUTH

	Pre-JDAI	2015	2016	1-Year Change <i>Percentage Points</i>	Pre-Post Change <i>Percentage Points</i>
Atlantic	84.6%	92.5%	92.3%	-0.2	+7.7
Camden	79.5%	84.3%	78.9%	-5.4	-0.6
Essex	98.5%	99.0%	98.5%	-0.5	0.0
Monmouth	62.7%	73.6%	90.7%	+17.1	+28.0
Hudson	93.9%	96.4%	93.9%	-2.5	0.0
Mercer	94.6%	96.4%	97.6%	+1.2	+3.0
Union	94.6%	97.3%	97.2%	-0.1	+2.6
Bergen	78.3%	82.1%	87.2%	+5.1	+8.9
Burlington	66.2%	87.9%	75.0%	-12.9	+8.8
Ocean	44.6%	50.0%	46.9%	-3.1	+2.3
Somerset	69.8%	71.4%	96.4%	+25.0	+26.6
Passaic	91.9%	94.6%	92.5%	-2.1	+0.6
Middlesex	75.1%	88.8%	88.6%	-0.2	+13.5
Cumberland	89.6%	85.5%	92.7%	+7.2	+3.1
Warren	45.2%	90.9%	87.5%	-3.4	+42.3
Gloucester	54.5%	77.4%	61.9%	-15.5	+7.4
Cape May	55.6%	42.9%	52.9%	+10.0	-2.7
Sussex	18.4%	42.3%	42.9%	+0.6	+24.5
TOTAL	86.2%	90.2%	89.2%	-1.0	+3.0

TABLE 33. MINORITY OVERREPRESENTATION IN DETENTION

Minority Representation in Total Youth Population vs. Minority Representation in Detention

	Pre-JDAI			Post-JDAI			Change in Gap: Pre vs. Post JDAI
	Minority Representation in Youth Pop ^h	Minority Representation in Detention ⁱ	Percentage Point Difference/Gap	Minority Representation in Youth Pop.	Minority Representation in Detention	Percentage Point Difference/Gap	
Atlantic	44.4%	89.7%	+45.3	53.0%	97.4%	+44.4	-0.9
Camden	40.4%	84.5%	+44.1	50.1%	84.2%	+34.1	-10
Essex	69.2%	99.6%	+30.4	70.8%	99.1%	+28.3	-2.1
Monmouth	22.1%	74.5%	+52.4	27.7%	95.7%	+68.0	+15.6
Hudson	75.6%	95.1%	+19.5	79.5%	95.5%	+16.0	-3.5
Mercer	45.6%	96.0%	+50.4	56.6%	98.7%	+42.1	-8.3
Union	54.2%	98.1%	+43.9	60.1%	98.1%	+38.0	-5.9
Bergen	35.1%	79.4%	+44.3	43.4%	92.3%	+48.9	+4.6
Burlington	28.6%	65.6%	+37.0	35.2%	75.8%	+40.6	+3.6
Ocean	15.5%	44.4%	+28.9	19.4%	61.2%	+41.8	+12.9
Somerset	34.3%	81.9%	+47.6	45.8%	95.3%	+49.5	+1.9
Passaic	58.2%	95.6%	+37.4	63.5%	96.0%	+32.5	-4.9
Middlesex	52.1%	81.6%	+29.5	63.0%	92.3%	+29.3	-0.2
Cumberland	54.0%	94.4%	+40.4	63.4%	95.0%	+31.6	-8.8
Warren	17.3%	49.5%	+32.2	21.7%	97.8%	+76.1	+43.9
Gloucester	22.9%	62.3%	+39.4	24.7%	65.8%	+41.1	+1.7
Cape May	17.7%	64.7%	+47.0	21.0%	52.9%	+31.9	-15.1
Sussex	13.8%	58.0%	+44.2	15.0%	29.9%	+14.9	-29.3
TOTAL	42.9%	90.3%	+47.4	49.4%	90.8%	+41.4	-6.0

^h Percent of population ages 10-17 years, source: OJJDP Statistical Briefing Book. Post-JDAI population figures are based on 2015, the most recent year for which data are available.

ⁱ Figures are based on detention ADP for the pre-JDAI years noted earlier and the post-JDAI year of 2016.

GIRLS IN DETENTION

As described in Table 34, the average daily population of girls in detention has dropped substantially across the 18 JDAI sites. Comparing each site's pre-JDAI year to 2016, on any given day there were 67 fewer girls in detention, a decrease of -83.4%. Ten sites have experienced a decrease of 90% or more: Atlantic (-100.0%), Monmouth (-100.0%), Union (-100.0%), Ocean (-100.0%), Somerset (-100.0%), Passaic (-100.0%), Warren (-100.0%), Cumberland (-91.3%), Essex (-91.0%) and Bergen (-90.0%). Two sites, however, have experienced increases (Sussex, +100.0%; Gloucester, +33.3%). Reductions in the number of girls in detention continued over the past year, with ADP down -27.3% across sites collectively.

Table 35 reveals that in 2016, more than one-thousand (1,268) fewer girls were admitted to detention as compared to each site's pre-JDAI year, a decrease of -81.7%. The largest decreases occurred in Warren (-100.0%) and Monmouth (-94.7%). Again, reductions continued over the past year, with the number of girls admitted to detention down -16.0% across sites. However, four sites experienced one-year increases: Cape May (+50.0%), Hudson (+35.0%), Passaic (+5.6%), and Middlesex (+4.2%). Table 36 indicates that the percentage of all admissions comprised of girls has decreased slightly, by -3.5 percentage points, since JDAI implementation. However, the percentage of all admissions comprised of girls varies widely. Across sites, in 2016, 11.5% of all admissions were comprised of girls, but this ranged from zero in Warren to about one-quarter in Sussex (28.6%).

Finally, Table 37 indicates that in 2016, length of stay for girls in detention ranged from just 4.1 days in Atlantic to 52.2 days in Cumberland. Averaging across sites, length of stay in detention for girls has increased, by +0.9 days, since JDAI implementation (+4.5%). Three sites have experienced increases in length of stay of 20 days or more for girls: Sussex (+46.3 days, +578.8%), Cumberland (+26.3 days, +101.5%), and Camden (+25.4 days, +166.0%). Conversely, average length of stay for girls has dropped by more than 20 days since JDAI implementation in Atlantic (-20.2 days, -83.1%).

TABLE 34. ADP OF GIRLS IN DETENTION

	Pre-JDAI	2015	2016	1-Year Change		Pre-Post Change	
				<i>Kids</i>	%	<i>Kids</i>	%
Atlantic	4.0	0.3	0.0	-0.3	-100.0%	-4	-100.0%
Camden	15.4	4.6	4.6	0.0	0.0%	-10.8	-70.1%
Essex	20.0	3.0	1.8	-1.2	-40.0%	-18.2	-91.0%
Monmouth	4.2	0.3	0.0	-0.3	-100.0%	-4.2	-100.0%
Hudson	6.7	1.9	1.5	-0.4	-21.1%	-5.2	-77.6%
Mercer	4.5	1.3	1.2	-0.1	-7.7%	-3.3	-73.3%
Union	0.9	1.0	0.0	-1.0	-100.0%	-0.9	-100.0%
Bergen	3.0	0.6	0.3	-0.3	-50.0%	-2.7	-90.0%
Burlington	4.0	1.1	1.0	-0.1	-9.1%	-3	-75.0%
Ocean	3.1	1.7	0.0	-1.7	-100.0%	-3.1	-100.0%
Somerset	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0%	-1.2	-100.0%
Passaic	4.3	0.5	0.0	-0.5	-100.0%	-4.3	-100.0%
Middlesex	3.1	0.6	1.4	+0.8	+133.3%	-1.7	-54.8%
Cumberland	4.6	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.0%	-4.2	-91.3%
Warren	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0%	-0.2	-100.0%
Gloucester	0.3	0.2	0.4	+0.2	+100.0%	+0.1	+33.3%
Cape May	0.6	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.0%	-0.3	-50.0%
Sussex	0.2	0.5	0.4	-0.1	-20.0%	+0.2	+100.0%
TOTAL	80.3	18.3	13.3	-5.0	-27.3%	-67.0	-83.4%

TABLE 35. GIRLS ADMITTED TO DETENTION

	Pre-JDAI	2015	2016	1-Year Change		Pre-Post Change	
				<i>Kids</i>	%	<i>Kids</i>	%
Atlantic	67	15	8	-7	-46.7%	-59	-88.1%
Camden	376	59	44	-15	-25.4%	-332	-88.3%
Essex	335	77	61	-16	-20.8%	-274	-81.8%
Monmouth	76	5	4	-1	-20.0%	-72	-94.7%
Hudson	140	20	27	+7	+35.0%	-113	-80.7%
Mercer	104	19	16	-3	-15.8%	-88	-84.6%
Union	41	12	12	0	0.0%	-29	-70.7%
Bergen	43	14	10	-4	-28.6%	-33	-76.7%
Burlington	56	20	15	-5	-25.0%	-41	-73.2%
Ocean	47	23	16	-7	-30.4%	-31	-66.0%
Somerset	23	4	4	0	0.0%	-19	-82.6%
Passaic	72	18	19	+1	+5.6%	-53	-73.6%
Middlesex	67	24	25	+1	+4.2%	-42	-62.7%
Cumberland	72	9	9	0	0.0%	-63	-87.5%
Warren	5	0	0	0	0.0%	-5	-100.0%
Gloucester	13	9	7	-2	-22.2%	-6	-46.2%
Cape May	7	2	3	+1	+50.0%	-4	-57.1%
Sussex	8	8	4	-4	-50.0%	-4	-50.0%
TOTAL	1552	338	284	-54	-16.0%	-1268	-81.7%

TABLE 36. % OF DETENTION ADMISSIONS COMPRISED OF GIRLS

	Pre-JDAI	2015	2016	1-Year Change		Pre-Post Change	
				<i>Percentage Points</i>		<i>Percentage Points</i>	
Atlantic	14.3%	11.2%	6.8%	-4.4		-7.5	
Camden	22.4%	16.6%	14.5%	-2.1		-7.9	
Essex	13.6%	11.0%	11.5%	+0.5		-2.1	
Monmouth	15.0%	6.9%	4.1%	-2.8		-10.9	
Hudson	11.5%	7.3%	10.2%	+2.9		-1.3	
Mercer	12.1%	13.8%	9.6%	+4.2		-2.5	
Union	7.6%	8.2%	8.4%	+0.2		+0.8	
Bergen	17.3%	12.0%	11.6%	-0.4		-5.7	
Burlington	19.7%	16.1%	16.3%	+0.2		-6.1	
Ocean	19.6%	32.9%	19.8%	-13.1		+0.2	
Somerset	18.3%	11.4%	14.3%	+2.9		-4.0	
Passaic	8.7%	7.4%	7.5%	+0.1		-1.2	
Middlesex	14.9%	12.8%	14.3%	+1.5		-0.6	
Cumberland	28.9%	13.0%	16.4%	+1.4		-12.5	
Warren	16.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0		-16.1	
Gloucester	13.1%	14.5%	16.7%	+2.2		+3.6	
Cape May	25.9%	14.3%	17.6%	+3.3		-8.3	
Sussex	21.1%	30.8%	28.6%	-2.2		+7.5	
TOTAL	15.0%	12.1%	11.5%	-0.6		-3.5	

TABLE 37. AVERAGE (MEAN) LOS FOR GIRLS IN DETENTION

	Pre-JDAI	2015	2016	1-Year Change		Pre-Post Change	
				Days	%	Days	%
Atlantic	24.3	10.2	4.1	-6.1	-59.8%	-20.2	-83.1%
Camden	15.3	30.2	40.7	+10.5	+34.8%	+25.4	+166.0%
Essex	26.4	16.2	31.8	+15.6	+96.3%	+5.4	+20.5%
Monmouth	22.3	21.4	6.3	-15.1	-70.6%	-16.0	-71.8%
Hudson	15.6	36.8	17.6	-19.2	-52.2%	+2.0	+12.8%
Mercer	15.9	26.8	26.3	-0.5	-1.9%	+10.4	+65.4%
Union	17.2	36.8	27.3	-9.5	-25.8%	+10.1	+58.7%
Bergen	26.3	17.3	10.0	-7.3	-42.2%	-16.3	-62.0%
Burlington	26.2	10.4	16.1	+5.7	+54.8%	-10.1	-38.6%
Ocean	24.6	30.7	27.9	-2.8	-9.1%	+3.3	+13.4%
Somerset	21.0	2.5	5.3	+2.8	+112.0%	-15.7	-74.8%
Passaic	20.0	21.3	12.1	-9.2	-43.2%	-7.9	-39.5%
Middlesex	19.1	12.6	20.5	+7.9	+62.7%	+1.4	+7.3%
Cumberland	25.9	16.1	52.2	+36.1	+224.2%	+26.3	+101.5%
Warren	13.8	*	*	*	*	*	*
Gloucester	7.4	9.3	15.7	+6.4	+68.8%	+8.3	+112.2%
Cape May	31.0	80.0	35.3	-44.7	-55.9%	+4.3	+13.9%
Sussex	8.0	16.6	26.6	+37.7	+227.1%	+46.3	+578.8%
SITE AVG	20.0	23.2	20.9	-2.4	-9.9%	+0.9	+4.5%

BEYOND DETENTION: INCARCERATION AS A DISPOSITION

While JDAI focuses on the pre-disposition detention system first and foremost, it does so with the understanding that improvements to the detention system can serve as a starting point for broader changes in the overall juvenile justice system. Research indicates that detained youth are more likely to be committed to state custody or otherwise incarcerated at the point of disposition than non-detained youth with similar charges and delinquency history. One measure of JDAI's broader influence, then, is the impact on the use of detention commitment programs and commitment to state custody as dispositions.

Detention 60-Day Commitment Programs.¹⁴ Of the JDAI sites described in this report, ten house youth in centers that currently operate 60-day commitment programs approved by the Juvenile Justice Commission. Tables 38-43 provide information regarding the use of the detention commitment program by these sites. Over the past year, the use of detention as a disposition dropped -19.2% across the ten sites, with decreases seen in seven sites. In 2016, the use of short-term incarceration in the detention center as a disposition was most common in Ocean (26 admissions) followed by Middlesex (24 admissions), however, in both of these sites detention commitments decreased over the past year. Cumberland experienced the largest one-year increase in detention commitments (+9 kids, +450.0%).

Across sites, the most serious offense for which youth were admitted to the detention commitment program was most commonly a violation of probation (56.0%), followed by 3rd degree offenses (15.5%). Very few youth were admitted for an offense of the first or second degree (11.9%). Disorderly persons offenses accounted for 6.0% of the youth incarcerated in detention as a disposition. Similarly, Table 40 indicates that of all youth disposed to incarceration in detention as a disposition for a violation only, 14.0% had a disorderly persons offense as the most serious prior adjudication.

Table 41 reveals that the vast majority of youth were home/in the community prior to admission to incarceration in the detention center as a disposition (69.0%). Table 42 indicates that the majority of youth were sentenced to terms of 31-60 days (56.0%). Finally, as described in Table 43, for most youth (52.4%), commitment to the detention center was more or less the sole disposition, while 39.3% of the dispositions included a term of community-based probation, and 6.0% included a subsequent residential placement.

TABLE 38. ONE-YEAR TRENDS IN ADMISSIONS TO DETENTION COMMITMENT PROGRAM

	2015	2016	1-Year Change	
			<i>Kids</i>	<i>%</i>
BER	8	12	+4	+50.0%
CUMB	2	11	+9	+450.0%
HUD	1	2	+1	+100.0%
MIDSX	39	24	-15	-38.5%
MON	1	0	-1	-100.0%
OCE	32	26	-6	-18.8%
SOM	5	2	-3	-60.0%
SUSX	6	2	-4	-66.7%
UNI	4	3	-1	-25.0%
WAR	6	2	-4	-66.7%
TOTAL	104	84	-20	-19.2%

TABLE 39. DEGREE OF MOST SERIOUS OFFENSE FOR WHICH ADMITTED TO COMMITMENT STATUS¹⁵

	1st/2 nd		3 rd		4 th		DP		VOP		Other Violation		TOTAL	
BER	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	8.3%	1	8.3%	1	83.3%	10	0.0%	0	100.0%	12
CUMB	0.0%	0	9.1%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	90.9%	10	0.0%	0	100.0%	11
HUD	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	2	0.0%	0	100.0%	2
MIDSX	29.2%	7	12.5%	3	12.5%	3	8.3%	2	37.5%	9	0.0%	0	100.0%	24
MON	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
OCE	7.7%	2	19.2%	5	7.7%	2	7.7%	2	46.2%	12	11.5%	3	100.0%	26
SOM	50.0%	1	50.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	2
SUSX	0.0%	0	100.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	2
UNI	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	3	0.0%	0	100.0%	3
WAR	0.0%	0	50.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	50.0%	1	0.0%	0	100.0%	2
TOTAL	11.9%	10	15.5%	13	7.1%	6	6.0%	5	56.0%	47	3.6%	3	100.0%	84

TABLE 40. FOR YOUTH ADMITTED ON A VOP/OTHER VIOLATION, DEGREE OF MOST SERIOUS PRIOR ADJUDICATION

	1st/2 nd		3 rd		4 th		DP		TOTAL	
BER	0.0%	0	50.0%	5	40.0%	4	10.0%	1	100.0%	10
CUMB	0.0%	0	40.0%	4	50.0%	5	10.0%	1	100.0%	10
HUD	50.0%	1	50.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	2
MIDSX	0.0%	0	66.7%	6	33.3%	3	0.0%	0	100.0%	9
MON	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
OCE	20.0%	3	33.3%	5	20.0%	3	20.0%	3	100.0%	14 ⁱ
SOM	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
SUSX	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
UNI	66.7%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	33.3%	1	100.0%	3
WAR	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	100.0%	1
TOTAL	12.0%	6	42.0%	21	30.0%	15	14.0%	7	100.0%	49

TABLE 41. LOCATION PRIOR TO ADMISSION TO COMMITMENT STATUS

	Detention		Home (Pre-Dispo)		ATD/Shelter (Pre-Dispo)		Other ¹⁶		TOTAL	
BER	20.5%	3	66.7%	8	8.3%	1	0.0%	0	100.0%	12
CUMB	0.0%	0	90.9%	10	9.1%	1	0.0%	0	100.0%	11
HUD	100.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	2
MIDSX	16.7%	4	83.3%	20	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	24
MON	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
OCE	34.6%	9	50.0%	13	0.0%	0	15.4%	4	100.0%	26
SOM	0.0%	0	50.0%	1	50.0%	1	0.0%	0	100.0%	2
SUSX	0.0%	0	100.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	2
UNI	0.0%	0	66.7%	2	33.3%	1	0.0%	0	100.0%	3
WAR	0.0%	0	100.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	2
TOTAL	21.4%	18	69.0%	58	4.8%	4	4.8%	4	100.0%	84

ⁱ One youth was admitted to the commitment program for a motor vehicle violation. This case was excluded from the table because the youth had no prior adjudications (n= 49).

TABLE 42. LENGTH OF COMMITMENT TERM ORDERED

	1-15 Days		16-30 Days		31-60 Days		61+ Days		TOTAL	
BER	0.0%	0	25.0%	3	75.0%	9	0.0%	0	100.0%	12
CUMB	54.5%	6	36.4%	4	9.1%	1	0.0%	0	100.0%	11
HUD	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	2	0.0%	0	100.0%	2
MIDSX	8.3%	2	29.2%	7	62.5%	15	0.0%	0	100.0%	24
MON	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
OCE	15.4%	4	19.2%	5	65.4%	15	0.0%	0	100.0%	26
SOM	0.0%	0	50.0%	1	50.0%	1	0.0%	0	100.0%	2
SUSX	0.0%	0	100.0%	2	100.0%	2	0.0%	0	100.0%	2
UNI	0.0%	0	33.3%	1	66.7%	2	0.0%	0	100.0%	3
WAR	50.0%	1	50.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	2
TOTAL	15.5%	13	28.6%	24	56.0%	47	0.0%	0	100.0%	84

TABLE 43. ADDITIONAL DISPOSITIONS ORDERED IN CONJUNCTION WITH COMMITMENT

	Residential Program		Day Program, EM, JISP, Similar		Standard Probation		None of the Above		TOTAL	
BER	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	16.7%	2	83.3%	10	100.0%	12
CUMB	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	9.1%	1	90.9%	10	100.0%	11
HUD	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	2	100.0%	2
MIDSX	16.7%	4	0.0%	0	70.8%	17	8.3%	2	100.0%	24
MON	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
OCE	3.8%	1	4.2%	1	26.9%	7	69.2%	18	100.0%	26
SOM	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	2	0.0%	0	100.0%	2
SUSX	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	2	0.0%	0	100.0%	2
UNI	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	33.3%	1	66.7%	2	100.0%	3
WAR	0.0%	0	50.0%	1	50.0%	1	0.0%	0	100.0%	2
TOTAL	6.0%	5	2.4%	2	39.3%	33	52.4%	44	100.0%	84

Commitments to State Custody with the JJC. Table 44 reports changes in commitments of youth to the Juvenile Justice Commission since JDAI implementation. Reduced reliance on detention pre-dispositionally has in fact led to reduced reliance on commitments to state custody as a disposition. Across sites, commitments to the JJC have decreased by -82.3%, a change that is in direct proportion to the reduction in admissions to detention reported earlier (-76.1%). Reductions in commitments to the JJC of 80% or more have occurred in six sites, with Monmouth (-100.0%), Camden (-91.3%), and Hudson (-90.7%) experiencing the largest decreases. Two sites experienced increases since JDAI implementation (one youth each), Gloucester (+33.3%) and Sussex (100.0%). Regarding one-year trends, eight sites experienced an increase in JJC commitments between 2015 and 2016, with the largest increases occurring in Gloucester (+4 kids, >+100.0%) and Cumberland (+7 kids, +175.0%).

TABLE 44. COMMITMENTS TO STATE CUSTODY WITH THE JUVENILE JUSTICE COMMISSION UPON DISPOSITION

	Pre-JDAI	2015	2016	1-Year Change		Pre-Post Change	
				<i>Kids</i>	%	<i>Kids</i>	%
Atlantic	45	8	9	+1	+12.5%	-36	-80.0%
Camden	378	46	33	-13	-28.3%	-345	-91.3%
Essex	121	46	25	-21	-45.7%	-96	-79.3%
Monmouth	34	5	0	-5	-100.0%	-34	-100.0%
Hudson	118	13	11	-2	-15.4%	-107	-90.7%
Mercer	67	19	27	+8	+42.1%	-40	-59.7%
Union	89	16	10	-6	-37.5%	-79	-88.8%
Bergen	14	11	4	-7	-63.6%	-10	-71.4%
Burlington	10	3	5	+2	+66.7%	-5	-50.0%
Ocean	23	7	4	-3	-42.9%	-19	-82.6%
Somerset	5	1	2	+1	+100.0%	-3	-60.0%
Passaic	53	13	21	+8	+61.5%	-32	-60.4%
Middlesex	51	11	14	+3	+27.3%	-37	-72.6%
Cumberland	24	4	11	+7	+175.0%	-13	-54.2%
Warren	2	1	1	0	0.0%	-1	-50.0%
Gloucester	3	0	4	+4	^k >100.0%	+1	+33.3%
Cape May	1	5	1	-4	-80.0%	0	0.0%
Sussex	1	2	2	0	0.0%	+1	+100.0%
TOTAL	1039	211	184	-27	-12.8%	-855	-82.3%

^k Percent change from a value of 0 cannot be calculated, however any increase from 0 is an increase of at least 100%.

TABLE 45. 2016 MONTHLY DETENTION ADP, BY SITE

	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL
Essex	77.2	74.4	68.0	66.2	60.4	60.8	51.5	56.2	47.1	40.0	37.9	36.3	56.4
Camden	33.4	38.4	39.1	36.0	38.8	47.8	44.9	42.2	31.0	27.6	33.9	30.5	36.9
Passaic	30.1	30.0	34.8	29.2	30.3	32.7	26.0	31.6	31.4	28.7	24.7	23.9	29.5
Hudson	27.5	35.4	35.3	23.3	19.5	23.3	23.6	24.6	34.1	31.3	28.7	25.4	27.6
Mercer	14.2	16.7	13.5	14.0	17.0	22.2	24.8	28.0	26.4	26.9	31.0	27.8	22.0
Middlesex	21.3	19.7	17.2	12.0	14.7	17.3	22.6	22.7	23.0	22.0	22.5	24.9	20.0
Union	21.8	21.7	17.3	17.8	19.0	18.7	16.1	15.4	15.0	16.1	13.6	14.7	17.3
Ocean	9.8	9.7	9.2	8.3	9.1	9.1	9.6	8.9	8.1	12.1	14.6	11.8	10.0
Monmouth	6.6	9.9	10.1	10.2	8.5	8.4	8.9	9.3	10.3	7.4	8.1	6.5	8.7
Atlantic	8.5	7.8	10.9	15.8	16.4	16.5	12.7	10.3	9.4	11.5	11.2	12.1	8.4
Bergen	5.3	5.5	6.9	8.1	7.9	10.8	10.8	9.0	9.4	6.2	8.5	8.6	8.1
Cumberland	9.2	8.2	7.7	4.4	4.1	4.3	2.5	4.5	3.3	5.6	8.0	6.5	5.7
Burlington	2.5	2.0	1.9	5.2	7.9	8.0	9.7	8.2	5.2	3.4	2.0	5.8	5.2
Gloucester	6.1	5.2	4.7	3.3	2.9	1.6	2.8	4.0	4.0	0.4	0.1	0.2	2.9
Somerset	3.5	4.2	1.5	0.6	2.0	2.1	1.7	3.6	4.0	1.5	3.2	2.7	2.5
Warren	3.1	4.5	2.0	2.0	1.4	1.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	1.2
Sussex	2.7	3.2	3.4	0.8	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.9	1.0	1.0
Cape May	1.1	1.1	1.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.6	0.2	0.1	1.3	2.3	0.7
TOTAL	283.9	297.6	284.5	257.9	260.0	284.6	269.2	279.1	261.9	241.4	250.2	241.0	264.1

TABLE 46. 2016 MONTHLY DETENTION ALTERNATIVE ADP, BY SITE

	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL
Essex	56.1	64.6	63.3	54.6	55.7	59.1	54.0	47.3	48.5	53.3	65.5	40.2	55.1
Hudson	46.8	37.5	38.4	37.5	40.8	45.9	47.6	57.6	44.4	42.4	46.6	58.9	45.9
Passaic	44.7	49.4	63.1	58.4	45.0	49.3	44.7	41.0	30.8	32.5	39.0	42.0	45.0
Camden	32.3	32.3	33.5	36.6	31.6	24.8	27.7	29.8	34.1	32.5	26.9	40.1	31.8
Middlesex	29.6	29.6	25.9	27.0	32.1	32.3	32.7	30.5	29.4	29.2	29.4	31.9	30.0
Atlantic	19.9	17.1	20.0	28.4	25.3	20.1	17.7	12.8	11.0	14.4	12.8	14.6	17.8
Mercer	17.3	17.7	14.4	14.4	18.5	21.8	19.1	13.7	16.9	12.8	14.2	24.1	17.1
Monmouth	10.7	8.1	6.7	6.8	14.5	10.9	10.6	13.9	18.0	19.1	17.0	13.4	12.4
Union	5.3	4.9	9.3	14.6	17.4	13.1	10.4	12.2	7.7	8.0	13.5	21.1	11.5
Cumberland	5.1	3.4	5.1	9.3	9.1	10.7	9.7	8.0	8.6	7.3	12.6	14.6	8.6
Burlington	13.2	10.3	10.3	5.8	6.1	6.4	8.0	4.9	9.0	0.0	9.9	9.9	8.5
Bergen	3.3	5.1	5.5	6.3	7.6	7.0	7.6	9.3	11.0	8.4	15.3	14.5	8.4
Ocean	2.9	4.4	4.2	4.0	5.4	5.1	6.0	3.5	3.9	3.5	2.6	3.6	4.1
Gloucester	5.4	5.8	1.4	1.4	5.3	2.9	2.8	4.0	4.2	3.8	5.0	3.7	3.8
Cape May	4.3	6.3	6.5	6.5	3.7	3.3	2.4	3.8	1.3	0.0	2.1	2.2	3.6
Warren	1.9	1.0	4.7	4.3	3.0	4.7	4.4	3.1	3.5	2.3	1.3	1.3	3.0
Somerset	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.8	1.0	1.0	0.7	0.6	1.1	4.6	3.5	1.6	1.3
Sussex	4.5	4.2	2.2	1.4	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.3	1.0	0.5	0.0	0.1	1.2
TOTAL	303.3	302.2	314.5	318.1	322.2	318.5	306.4	296.3	284.4	274.6	317.2	337.8	309.1

TABLE 47. 2016 MONTHLY DETENTION ADMISSIONS, BY SITE

	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL
Essex	42	46	51	32	52	38	49	51	39	56	36	37	529
Camden	28	25	25	26	27	39	16	26	13	25	36	18	304
Hudson	27	35	15	16	21	28	22	24	22	14	19	21	264
Passaic	29	22	20	14	27	26	22	23	18	17	18	16	252
Middlesex	15	13	17	13	14	19	28	10	13	7	15	11	175
Mercer	17	10	11	14	17	18	11	16	9	13	19	12	167
Union	13	7	16	19	17	13	14	10	5	12	9	8	143
Atlantic	6	5	19	9	10	8	6	12	10	14	13	5	117
Monmouth	6	9	8	9	10	9	11	9	7	2	9	8	97
Burlington	8	5	5	15	10	9	11	4	8	6	2	9	92
Bergen	5	8	7	4	6	12	11	9	5	4	7	8	86
Ocean	8	3	3	5	9	7	5	9	9	9	13	1	81
Cumberland	5	4	1	5	4	5	3	8	4	5	5	6	55
Gloucester	3	2	2	5	2	5	8	2	5	5	1	2	42
Somerset	3	3	2	3	0	2	2	4	1	4	3	1	28
Cape May	2	2	1	2	0	0	1	2	2	1	3	1	17
Sussex	3	1	3	1	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	1	14
Warren	2	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	8
TOTAL	222	203	206	192	229	238	221	219	170	196	210	165	2471

TABLE 48. 2016 MONTHLY DETENTION ALTERNATIVE ADMISSIONS, BY SITE

	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL
Essex	38	47	39	37	41	35	38	36	37	48	30	30	456
Camden	32	43	35	29	41	31	20	31	39	18	42	58	419
Hudson	22	27	27	21	38	35	23	35	25	28	22	35	338
Passaic	29	22	33	6	28	27	19	32	16	36	14	27	289
Mercer	15	16	16	13	11	21	12	12	8	12	11	15	162
Union	7	9	14	15	16	7	10	11	8	9	17	13	136
Atlantic	7	4	12	8	10	8	4	6	6	14	9	3	91
Burlington	10	10	8	7	6	5	7	5	6	9	5	9	87
Middlesex	12	5	6	4	10	7	9	5	7	6	4	4	79
Monmouth	4	7	6	8	10	10	5	10	4	5	6	4	79
Bergen	3	6	7	5	5	2	8	7	7	12	9	6	77
Cumberland	3	1	6	3	4	3	2	3	2	0	1	3	31
Ocean	3	5	0	3	3	2	1	3	3	1	4	1	29
Gloucester	1	2	0	3	1	3	5	1	0	3	0	2	21
Cape May	2	3	2	1	1	1	1	4	0	3	2	0	20
Warren	0	5	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	12
Somerset	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	3	1	0	10
Sussex	1	3	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	9
TOTAL	189	216	211	166	255	201	165	203	171	208	178	212	2345

TABLE 49. 2016 4-MONTH DETENTION ALOS, BY SITE (IN DAYS)

	Jan-Apr	May-Aug	Sep-Dec	TOTAL
Ocean	75.7	54.1	36.2	53.5
Monmouth	35.8	16.3	94.7	50.8
Mercer	23.8	46.5	73.5	46.9
Warren	25.5	88.8	2.0	46.4
Essex	52.2	52.9	28.6	44.3
Union	63.4	15.6	29.9	43.4
Passaic	31.3	42.2	54.0	42.3
Somerset	52.6	43.5	32.8	41.7
Camden	36.8	43.6	44.2	41.6
Middlesex	39.6	37.2	42.5	39.4
Cumberland	72.6	30.3	6.6	39.1
Gloucester	58.3	18.6	26.3	33.9
Hudson	35.8	25.6	39.0	33.8
Sussex	48.0	2.7	4.0	31.3
Bergen	23.4	33.2	17.6	26.9
Atlantic	21.9	40.5	8.1	25.1
Burlington	13.1	22.8	16.8	18.2
Cape May	17.1	2.7	3.5	10.6
Site Avg	40.4	34.3	31.1	37.2

TABLE 50. 2016 4-MONTH DETENTION ALTERNATIVE ALOS, BY SITE (IN DAYS)

	Jan-Apr	May-Aug	Sep-Dec	TOTAL
Atlantic	70.9	86.5	38.5	67.0
Cape May	79.6	59.0	63.8	66.3
Cumberland	41.9	50.9	104.8	60.9
Gloucester	93.3	23.6	80.4	59.2
Ocean	33.7	86.7	48.7	55.4
Middlesex	48.7	54.6	58.1	53.8
Sussex	70.0	48.3	28.0	52.8
Monmouth	43.7	40.0	70.3	49.5
Hudson	50.5	46.3	44.8	47.2
Passaic	45.1	46.2	36.7	43.9
Warren	47.8	49.6	28.3	41.9
Essex	42.7	38.6	42.8	41.4
Somerset	58.0	54.0	34.3	41.3
Mercer	30.5	40.8	34.2	35.7
Camden	32.1	35.6	33.7	34.0
Burlington	33.7	31.7	34.5	33.4
Union	22.8	29.2	32.7	28.5
Bergen	20.2	26.2	31.9	27.1
Site Avg	48.1	47.1	47.0	46.6

TABLE 51. 2016 STATEWIDE DETENTION CAPACITY & UTILIZATION

Detention Center^a	Total 2016 (YTD) ADP^b In Detention Center	Approved Capacity^c	ADP as % of Capacity	Has Been Approved for a Commitment Program?	Multi-Jurisdiction Facility?
Atlantic	14.8	27	54.8%		X
Bergen	13.8	20	69.0%	X	^d X
Burlington	10.6	24	44.2%		X
Camden	41.9	61	68.7%		X
Essex	87.1	242	36.0%		X
Middlesex	54.7	100	54.7%	X	X
Morris	7.1	43	16.5%	X	X
Ocean	15.5	30	51.7%	X	
Union	40.2	76	52.9%	X	X
TOTAL	278.9	669	41.7%	5 Programs	8 Multi-Jurisdiction

^a The focus of this table is the “detention center” and not the “county,” so population figures reflect all youth in the facility listed, regardless of sending county/county of residence. This table includes all detention centers operational as of January 1, 2016, regardless of whether the facility is located in a JDAI site.

^b Average daily population in this table includes all youth in the building, including those in post-disposition detention commitment programs and federal holds (where applicable).

^c “Capacity” refers to JJC approved capacity in an operational facility as of December, 2016. NOTE: not all facilities are presently staffed for full capacity, i.e., some facilities that have populations well-below approved capacity are staffed to accommodate the actual, lower population.

^d Bergen houses females from Union and Hudson counties.

TABLE 52. ATLANTIC ANNUAL TRENDS

	ADP				Admissions			ALOS							
	ADP	Minority	Female	High	Monthly	Minority	Female	Total	1-5 Days	60+ Days	M	F	W	B	H
DET 03	34.1	89.7%	11.7%	47	39.1	84.6%	14.3%	28.9	34.2%	15.5%	29.6	24.3	19.0	31.0	33.4
04	30.5	90.5%	14.4%	44	37.3	84.1%	20.1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
05	30.4	91.5%	11.3%	45	36.1	87.8%	16.4%	27.9	33.8%	16.3%	29.1	21.3	25.3	29.2	25.6
06	24.8	89.1%	4.8%	43	34.4	85.5%	15.7%	21.8	40.0%	11.7%	24.0	7.3	17.0	23.2	21.3
07	30.3	93.9%	10.5%	43	36.8	90.2%	12.9%	24.0	40.5%	13.1%	24.8	19.5	15.5	26.5	16.4
08	24.4	88.2%	11.0%	39	27.9	83.9%	11.3%	28.4	29.6%	17.2%	29.0	23.3	20.7	30.4	24.7
09	16.3	88.3%	14.0%	26	22.0	86.7%	17.4%	23.4	42.5%	13.0%	24.5	17.9	21.4	23.3	28.1
10	19.4	91.0%	11.6%	32	18.8	89.4%	11.5%	28.5	40.4%	18.3%	28.4	29.0	14.1	29.7	31.5
11	18.3	97.9%	6.7%	30	13.1	91.1%	11.5%	39.8	39.4%	29.1%	41.4	28.3	35.1	40.1	45.2
12	13.8	95.6%	1.7%	21	13.2	92.4%	7.0%	34.8	34.4%	21.2%	36.9	8.7	9.9	40.5	19.8
13	15.2	91.4%	6.3%	21	11.4	84.7%	12.4%	39.3	38.7%	27.0%	42.1	17.9	20.1	51.6	15.6
14	15.2	93.8%	5.1%	22	11.3	88.1%	13.3%	42.9	42.2%	27.4%	46.6	20.2	25.7	45.5	45.0
15	10.5	98.6%	3.0%	21	11.2	92.5%	11.2%	23.8	51.9%	12.6%	25.0	10.2	4.6	24.1	33.9
16	8.4	97.4%	0.3%	19	9.8	92.3%	6.8%	25.1	58.3%	13.0%	26.8	4.1	10.2	27.1	22.9
ATD 03	21.0	81.2%	6.4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
04	19.6	83.2%	14.1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
05	24.7	86.8%	15.2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
06	26.3	86.6%	15.4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
07	23.5	88.9%	11.5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
08	22.3	83.4%	10.1%	-	16.8	82.7%	9.9%	39.9	5.9%	17.6%	40.0	38.8	41.8	39.8	39.4
09	22.4	79.5%	14.7%	-	17.7	86.3%	16.0%	38.7	9.2%	18.4%	40.2	32.0	48.1	37.4	36.0
10	20.3	88.8%	8.3%	-	12.3	85.7%	8.2%	45.3	5.5%	24.8%	46.7	28.9	39.7	45.0	47.0
11	16.6	87.5%	7.7%	-	9.5	82.5%	9.6%	52.5	9.6%	38.3%	52.4	54.1	38.1	57.1	50.3
12	18.8	89.7%	5.5%	-	9.9	89.9%	5.0%	62.3	3.7%	42.2%	62.1	67.2	70.4	60.7	66.6
13	14.8	81.4%	17.3%	-	9.3	82.9%	14.4%	48.8	9.5%	31.4%	50.6	34.8	42.5	56.5	33.8
14	12.2	83.2%	12.1%	-	8.4	88.1%	18.8%	49.1	12.0%	24.1%	42.8	39.4	59.5	40.2	37.0
15	15.0	91.7%	3.0%	-	10.0	89.2%	7.5%	44.6	14.7%	31.4%	45.2	36.6	32.8	40.7	57.1
16	17.8	90.1%	1.3%	-	7.6	89.1%	3.0%	67.0	4.0%	42.6%	68.6	13.0	65.5	67.4	55.4

TABLE 53. CAMDEN ANNUAL TRENDS

	ADP				Admissions			ALOS							
	ADP	Minority	Female	High	Monthly	Minority	Female	Total	1-5 Days	60+ Days	M	F	W	B	H
DET 03	94.6	84.5%	16.3%	131	139.9	79.5%	22.4%	21.3	34.5%	6.5%	23.0	15.3	15.3	22.4	23.6
04	78.9	85.5%	13.1%	113	134.5	80.4%	18.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
05	61.5	84.7%	8.9%	82	107.4	83.7%	13.7%	18.5	37.8%	5.7%	19.5	12.3	16.6	19.3	18.2
06	47.6	85.7%	9.0%	68	87.4	85.5%	13.0%	17.4	38.7%	5.3%	18.1	12.2	18.2	17.1	17.7
07	44.7	89.2%	6.5%	72	66.6	90.4%	12.3%	20.1	38.8%	7.2%	21.2	12.1	21.0	19.5	21.7
08	49.9	89.5%	8.0%	65	54.6	89.5%	12.4%	28.7	37.0%	13.8%	30.2	18.8	30.1	29.7	24.7
09	46.7	91.9%	9.2%	61	44.6	86.5%	15.0%	32.9	31.8%	19.9%	35.0	20.5	22.9	35.6	31.2
10	41.2	88.2%	16.1%	55	41.8	82.9%	13.9%	31.6	31.7%	17.1%	31.2	33.6	22.2	34.9	30.6
11	40.4	89.3%	9.3%	50	32.3	85.8%	11.9%	38.2	24.2%	23.7%	38.7	35.1	26.8	40.2	41.8
12	39.8	85.0%	7.5%	53	32.8	81.5%	10.9%	37.9	24.3%	23.8%	39.5	24.4	29.4	37.6	46.0
13	43.5	86.4%	9.7%	56	34.8	83.5%	10.6%	38.0	25.7%	24.7%	38.3	36.0	31.9	36.3	48.2
14	48.5	90.0%	11.2%	61	37.2	85.4%	14.8%	41.1	26.8%	25.1%	43.1	28.5	30.0	42.6	46.3
15	31.8	88.0%	14.6%	46	29.7	84.3%	16.6%	33.5	33.2%	18.7%	34.2	30.2	26.0	33.7	39.2
16	36.9	84.2%	12.4%	51	25.3	78.9%	14.5%	41.6	34.4%	23.8%	41.7	40.7	30.0	45.4	42.1
ATD 09	53.3	83.3%	19.5%	-	41.4	82.9%	20.1%	37.5	11.3%	20.6%	38.6	32.6	36.6	37.1	39.3
10	39.8	80.7%	14.0%	-	37.7	80.3%	16.8%	32.4	14.1%	14.1%	32.1	33.7	28.2	34.8	29.7
11	41.1	81.3%	19.0%	-	34.7	79.3%	19.7%	36.0	9.8%	20.2%	37.2	31.2	33.1	32.6	49.3
12	36.9	78.9%	17.9%	-	31.1	81.2%	18.0%	35.1	9.1%	17.7%	34.9	36.2	38.9	33.7	36.2
13	38.3	78.2%	10.9%	-	29.8	79.3%	12.3%	40.3	7.3%	20.5%	41.1	34.7	40.6	42.1	32.6
14	42.9	83.1%	19.3%	-	30.0	83.1%	18.9%	42.7	12.4%	22.7%	42.3	44.4	43.9	44.5	35.0
15	35.9	75.8%	11.7%	-	31.5	81.7%	18.3%	39.1	11.6%	18.0%	33.3	23.5	47.9	24.9	30.5
16	31.8	74.8%	19.1%	-	34.9	78.8%	18.6%	34.0	11.2%	15.8%	35.0	29.9	37.8	32.9	31.0

TABLE 54. ESSEX ANNUAL TRENDS

	ADP				Admissions			ALOS							
	ADP	Minority	Female	High	Monthly	Minority	Female	Total	1-5 Days	60+ Days	M	F	W	B	H
DET 03	243.6	99.6%	8.2%	308	205.0	98.5%	13.6%	38.5	43.4%	21.2%	40.3	26.4	12.9	40.8	26.8
04	171.0	99.5%	6.5%	224	167.8	97.8%	12.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
05	138.5	99.6%	5.6%	191	155.9	98.1%	12.6%	30.0	51.9%	17.9%	32.2	12.6	12.9	30.8	26.3
06	115.1	99.1%	6.4%	156	178.7	97.7%	10.1%	20.6	55.2%	11.8%	21.4	13.3	13.1	20.9	19.9
07	128.6	98.9%	4.1%	151	166.2	97.4%	8.6%	22.9	54.4%	14.3%	24.1	11.1	14.1	23.8	17.5
08	114.7	98.7%	6.6%	132	123.3	97.7%	9.9%	27.6	49.3%	16.7%	28.5	18.9	11.5	28.1	26.3
09	113.2	99.7%	5.7%	142	107.8	98.6%	9.5%	33.0	49.9%	20.0%	34.6	17.1	7.9	32.7	40.2
10	100.0	99.5%	7.3%	117	99.3	98.6%	11.0%	30.9	50.8%	18.0%	31.3	27.7	12.3	30.7	38.8
11	79.0	99.2%	4.5%	102	76.6	98.9%	8.4%	35.5	53.1%	16.9%	37.1	18.1	26.9	36.0	30.9
12	70.6	99.8%	3.2%	91	72.8	98.5%	10.1%	28.6	58.5%	16.6%	30.9	7.0	4.4	30.0	18.3
13	73.6	99.9%	5.4%	105	73.5	98.9%	12.6%	28.1	60.1%	13.9%	30.0	15.2	4.9	28.7	25.0
14	83.0	99.5%	5.0%	105	62.8	99.2%	12.9%	39.7	52.0%	20.4%	43.0	17.3	13.4	41.6	24.9
15	81.7	99.4%	3.7%	104	58.6	99.0%	11.0%	39.8	50.2%	20.7%	42.7	16.2	2.2	41.8	19.8
16	56.4	99.1%	3.2%	83	44.1	98.5%	11.5%	44.3	48.9%	19.2%	45.9	31.8	8.6	46.6	28.1
ATD 06	97.6	-	-	-	64.9	98.1%	-	39.7	3.5%	20.0%	40.2	33.0	20.0	40.1	39.5
07	125.3	-	-	-	82.1	98.2%	7.2%	37.7	7.9%	18.9%	37.8	35.5	23.2	37.4	42.4
08	105.7	95.6%	10.8%	-	82.3	98.2%	9.4%	40.9	2.7%	20.7%	41.0	41.0	31.6	39.6	50.3
09	125.3	93.0%	10.2%	-	87.8	98.5%	8.6%	42.9	2.4%	24.0%	42.6	45.7	37.3	42.8	44.1
10	115.2	93.8%	6.8%	-	84.8	97.4%	10.0%	40.2	3.2%	20.3%	40.4	38.5	37.0	40.3	39.6
11	96.1	99.0%	9.3%	-	59.9	98.5%	9.9%	41.9	2.0%	22.3%	42.7	35.1	56.3	41.6	43.2
12	89.8	95.8%	10.1%	-	58.1	98.3%	9.9%	42.9	2.8%	20.5%	43.8	33.3	56.0	42.2	46.8
13	89.8	97.4%	10.0%	-	53.2	99.1%	13.8%	45.2	5.7%	24.7%	45.5	44.0	44.1	44.5	52.0
14	71.3	94.7%	13.8%	-	46.3	98.6%	12.6%	46.0	3.8%	24.5%	46.3	44.2	64.6	45.9	44.9
15	66.4	94.4%	11.2%	-	43.6	98.9%	12.6%	46.7	18.6%	81.4%	47.7	41.1	23.3	47.1	46.0
16	55.1	96.4%	12.2%	-	38.0	97.4%	12.3%	41.4	12.0%	24.0%	42.6	30.9	32.4	41.6	43.3

TABLE 55. MONMOUTH ANNUAL TRENDS

	ADP				Admissions			ALOS							
	ADP	Minority	Female	High	Monthly	Minority	Female	Total	1-5 Days	60+ Days	M	F	W	B	H
DET 03	40.0	74.5%	10.5%	50	42.3	62.7%	15.0%	30.3	27.5%	15.8%	31.7	22.3	22.1	34.7	37.4
04	39.5	69.6%	11.9%	54	47.4	64.0%	13.7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
05	24.9	80.4%	15.4%	36	33.9	69.8%	16.7%	23.9	34.6%	10.7%	24.3	21.8	18.2	27.8	19.9
06	22.2	80.6%	13.8%	37	33.8	72.7%	17.7%	19.6	33.8%	7.1%	20.3	16.2	13.3	21.2	29.8
07	21.8	84.3%	12.7%	31	28.3	76.8%	14.7%	23.5	41.1%	11.3%	24.3	18.9	15.8	27.6	19.8
08	27.9	90.9%	4.5%	44	23.8	80.1%	14.0%	30.6	35.6%	16.4%	33.7	12.8	17.1	34.5	45.1
09	25.7	90.4%	6.9%	40	22.6	79.3%	13.8%	37.5	30.1%	20.1%	40.3	17.4	17.2	43.5	37.5
10	18.6	83.8%	7.9%	28	15.1	71.8%	14.4%	37.2	31.4%	22.9%	40.2	20.5	17.8	42.3	66.4
11	12.2	84.1%	9.0%	22	11.3	73.3%	12.6%	29.2	27.9%	17.6%	30.1	22.6	19.9	31.8	41.3
12	8.5	81.4%	9.6%	16	8.0	76.0%	20.8%	37.0	28.6%	21.4%	42.5	15.7	20.5	41.3	75.4
13	11.2	85.3%	2.0%	21	8.3	71.0%	14.0%	40.2	36.1%	26.8%	45.7	5.3	20.1	48.9	33.9
14	6.8	83.6%	1.2%	16	8.4	79.2%	5.9%	26.5	46.0%	13.0%	27.8	6.2	22.6	22.7	51.3
15	8.5	85.8%	3.3%	14	6.0	73.6%	6.9%	23.8	47.9%	13.7%	23.9	21.4	22.2	27.7	19.3
16	8.7	95.7%	0.8%	14	8.1	90.7%	4.1%	50.8	45.3%	16.8%	52.8	6.3	20.4	50.3	81.9
ATD 03	11.4	57.0%	7.9%	-	5.9	59.2%	9.9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
04	11.6	63.8%	15.5%	-	6.0	68.1%	12.5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
05	7.7	68.8%	3.9%	-	6.0	73.6%	5.6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
06	13.6	75.0%	14.0%	-	9.1	72.5%	13.8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
07	25.0	73.1%	11.0%	-	15.8	84.1%	11.1%	50.7	1.5%	24.6%	50.5	51.5	44.8	53.5	56.5
08	15.5	72.4%	8.1%	-	11.9	72.7%	11.2%	38.9	4.0%	22.5%	39.7	30.9	43.8	36.7	35.8
09	19.8	73.1%	5.8%	-	12.7	70.4%	7.2%	39.8	1.4%	17.4%	41.0	26.0	29.8	45.0	37.7
10	11.1	57.2%	7.9%	-	7.4	55.1%	10.1%	49.6	6.7%	22.5%	52.5	20.8	50.4	42.4	108.2
11	9.9	65.4%	12.7%	-	7.8	66.0%	11.7%	41.1	4.5%	22.5%	40.0	50.9	44.6	38.6	53.7
12	7.6	65.1%	24.2%	-	5.3	65.1%	30.2%	42.2	3.0%	24.2%	44.5	37.0	43.1	38.9	66.3
13	8.3	69.7%	5.1%	-	6.2	71.6%	10.8%	49.0	9.2%	34.2%	51.2	32.0	51.8	47.8	51.8
14	12.3	80.6%	6.4%	-	5.5	89.4%	10.6%	59.6	1.9%	39.6%	60.6	50.0	70.8	57.6	57.8
15	10.5	73.2%	7.0%	-	5.6	79.4%	8.8%	59.3	6.3%	34.4%	62.0	28.0	74.8	58.2	42.2
16	12.4	79.8%	8.2%	-	6.6	87.3%	8.9%	49.5	8.7%	56.5%	49.4	54.9	51.6	44.7	62.0

TABLE 56. HUDSON ANNUAL TRENDS

	ADP				Admissions			ALOS							
	ADP	Minority	Female	High	Monthly	Minority	Female	Total	1-5 Days	60+ Days	M	F	W	B	H
DET 03	86.7	95.1%	7.7%	116	101.8	93.9%	11.5%	28.9	43.9%	17.7%	30.6	15.6	15.8	34.9	22.5
04	79.2	94.6%	9.2%	112	105.8	94.1%	10.2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
05	66.2	95.7%	5.8%	94	86.3	95.0%	8.3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
06	74.3	96.9%	4.6%	102	83.4	96.9%	7.1%	28.0	57.4%	15.9%	28.4	22.2	27.3	32.6	22.4
07	63.1	98.4%	3.7%	97	83.4	96.4%	9.7%	23.3	66.8%	14.2%	24.6	10.5	8.9	29.3	16.2
08	60.8	97.8%	5.6%	86	78.9	95.6%	10.7%	24.4	61.5%	11.2%	25.6	14.1	10.8	34.2	12.2
09	62.3	98.9%	7.2%	84	51.3	95.1%	14.9%	32.6	50.1%	18.2%	35.6	15.6	9.1	40.0	23.5
10	39.3	96.2%	6.1%	55	39.8	94.8%	11.9%	29.6	55.4%	14.3%	30.5	23.0	8.3	38.4	19.8
11	38.4	95.9%	5.4%	62	43.6	95.8%	12.2%	28.5	58.4%	12.9%	31.3	10.1	36.0	32.4	19.5
12	43.1	96.7%	7.2%	56	40.6	95.5%	10.1%	38.2	41.7%	16.1%	40.0	22.0	20.9	40.5	37.1
13	30.4	98.0%	8.6%	43	37.0	98.4%	13.0%	29.8	52.5%	13.7%	31.8	15.5	31.7	36.2	22.8
14	30.2	97.4%	7.4%	44	28.4	97.1%	11.4%	34.6	44.0%	16.8%	36.3	21.3	25.2	42.8	22.6
15	28.0	94.8%	6.9%	37	22.9	96.4%	7.3%	41.5	35.8%	25.5%	42.0	36.8	41.8	40.9	40.7
16	27.6	95.5%	5.2%	44	22.0	93.9%	10.2%	33.8	40.6%	21.8%	35.4	17.6	32.3	40.0	25.2
ATD 08	72.9	-	15.4%	-	47.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
09	58.6	93.0%	14.0%	-	37.0	94.2%	15.7%	44.0	4.4%	23.1%	43.7	45.2	43.4	46.2	41.2
10	65.9	91.8%	13.1%	-	39.1	91.9%	14.6%	48.5	3.1%	29.1%	49.8	40.8	46.7	46.5	50.7
11	57.7	96.4%	16.6%	-	41.5	95.8%	17.8%	39.4	3.3%	17.4%	40.8	33.1	39.4	40.7	38.6
12	61.5	84.1%	9.7%	-	41.9	93.8%	15.3%	49.0	2.0%	28.0%	49.3	46.9	43.5	51.3	48.1
13	47.5	93.9%	12.1%	-	36.0	95.4%	12.4%	45.4	2.1%	28.0%	45.7	42.5	34.1	48.2	44.2
14	30.5	97.5%	12.9%	-	24.8	96.6%	13.1%	41.1	2.4%	23.2%	41.5	40.9	29.2	41.3	41.1
15	40.8	93.4%	13.3%	-	25.2	94.7%	15.2%	43.0	3.3%	21.8%	43.1	42.3	60.9	36.3	46.1
16	45.9	91.3%	12.0%	-	28.2	91.0%	11.5%	47.2	2.4%	28.6%	47.2	49.2	40.3	47.5	49.3

TABLE 57. MERCER ANNUAL TRENDS

	ADP				Admissions			ALOS							
	ADP	Minority	Female	High	Monthly	Minority	Female	Total	1-5 Days	60+ Days	M	F	W	B	H
DET 05	60.0	96.0%	7.5%	80	71.9	94.6%	12.1%	27.4	36.2%	13.0%	28.9	15.9	18.3	28.5	21.2
06	61.2	94.2%	10.4%	80	65.3	93.5%	14.8%	30.9	36.9%	15.1%	32.9	19.4	17.5	30.9	44.2
07	55.8	98.0%	9.1%	85	63.8	93.5%	12.5%	24.1	39.2%	11.1%	25.0	18.4	11.6	26.1	16.8
08	42.5	97.3%	6.7%	57	48.2	93.6%	12.3%	26.5	41.8%	10.2%	27.6	17.7	12.9	28.5	19.1
09	29.8	95.5%	3.7%	42	34.3	90.3%	11.5%	27.0	43.3%	9.7%	29.2	10.2	7.7	28.4	33.8
10	25.0	97.4%	9.1%	36	25.3	92.4%	18.4%	28.7	39.2%	13.7%	31.9	13.8	6.4	31.8	20.4
11	25.7	94.2%	8.4%	35	22.8	90.8%	10.6%	32.4	35.4%	14.0%	33.1	27.2	23.7	35.9	15.9
12	23.7	98.5%	4.0%	34	18.5	93.7%	14.0%	34.2	39.5%	15.0%	37.5	12.2	12.1	38.1	27.3
13	29.6	96.6%	4.7%	42	16.3	90.3%	14.8%	47.3	34.2%	22.1%	52.8	12.4	19.2	53.4	42.0
14	27.0	100.0%	8.0%	39	14.8	98.3%	20.2%	55.0	37.1%	26.9%	63.5	22.8	1.7	62.4	24.3
15	16.0	98.5%	8.4%	23	11.5	96.4%	13.8%	40.6	46.9%	19.6%	42.6	26.8	18.2	42.2	35.7
16	22.0	98.7%	5.3%	34	13.9	97.6%	9.6%	46.9	39.3%	21.4%	48.8	26.3	21.0	49.5	24.2
ATD 08	-	-	-	-	12.8	91.6%	9.1%	27.5	8.7%	8.7%	26.8	33.7	24.8	27.1	31.7
09	-	-	-	-	11.3	90.4%	11.0%	24.9	5.6%	6.4%	25.3	21.7	19.2	24.8	30.8
10	12.6	-	-	-	10.2	88.5%	14.8%	24.3	10.6%	3.8%	23.8	28.0	16.6	24.5	29.4
11	19.8	-	-	-	14.1	90.5%	10.7%	32.7	13.5%	12.8%	32.9	31.7	23.9	31.2	48.2
12	22.3	-	-	-	15.3	90.2%	15.3%	40.3	10.9%	16.8%	42.6	25.7	33.5	42.6	35.4
13	17.7	-	-	-	12.3	90.5%	20.4%	40.1	15.0%	21.6%	42.7	28.8	51.2	39.9	35.1
14	18.3	90.0%	21.1%	-	12.3	92.6%	23.6%	41.6	9.3%	28.6%	45.6	29.6	56.9	39.1	44.1
15	26.9	97.5%	15.0%	-	14.8	98.9%	14.0%	45.7	7.6%	24.5%	46.0	39.1	29.5	45.8	40.5
16	17.1	94.2%	4.9%	-	13.5	92.5%	11.9%	35.7	13.6%	17.9%	38.1	19.3	20.2	37.3	29.7

TABLE 58. UNION ANNUAL TRENDS

	ADP				Admissions			ALOS							
	ADP	Minority	Female	High	Monthly	Minority	Female	Total	1-5 Days	60+ Days	M	F	W	B	H
DET 05	39.2	98.1%	2.4%	55	45.0	94.6%	7.6%	28.8	33.5%	15.5%	29.8	17.2	16.6	29.9	29.0
06	26.3	96.1%	2.9%	42	40.2	96.3%	10.8%	21.5	41.5%	11.5%	23.2	6.6	29.9	20.5	25.1
07	28.3	97.8%	1.6%	44	38.8	95.9%	7.5%	19.2	44.2%	7.6%	20.3	5.4	9.3	20.1	17.8
08	32.0	97.4%	5.4%	47	36.5	94.5%	11.0%	26.2	36.4%	13.8%	27.8	13.0	11.5	27.0	26.9
09	34.5	91.9%	4.9%	54	35.1	95.5%	10.9%	29.9	42.5%	15.7%	31.8	15.6	41.3	28.5	32.6
10	30.0	96.3%	3.9%	43	29.7	96.1%	8.7%	32.5	36.5%	18.4%	34.8	3.9	23.8	33.9	28.7
11	26.2	97.8%	4.3%	56	23.1	95.7%	9.0%	33.6	32.8%	17.4%	34.4	26.0	17.0	34.2	34.8
12	42.9	98.0%	5.7%	54	16.3	93.9%	9.2%	58.3	18.0%	43.5%	29.1	48.6	25.2	61.8	56.6
13	32.1	97.3%	11.3%	54	14.7	94.9%	10.2%	62.5	21.2%	26.4%	65.7	33.6	32.1	58.5	85.7
14	26.0	97.1%	9.6%	39	14.3	96.5%	12.3%	62.4	23.3%	28.2%	60.4	76.6	65.3	64.0	60.8
15	23.8	99.0%	4.3%	30	12.2	97.3%	8.2%	57.4	22.3%	28.4%	59.7	36.8	32.6	66.5	37.0
16	17.3	98.1%	4.2%	26	11.9	97.2%	8.4%	43.4	34.5%	20.3%	45.0	27.3	14.0	43.1	54.5
ATD 10	25.1	96.5%	8.1%	-	12.5	96.0%	9.9%	52.1	1.3%	28.0%	50.5	67.4	37.0	53.2	52.0
11	17.0	91.7%	9.1%	-	12.8	91.4%	8.6%	47.3	12.2%	29.7%	47.3	47.0	38.8	49.2	43.3
12	10.9	87.3%	7.2%	-	7.3	90.5%	14.3%	47.8	9.0%	32.6%	50.8	26.4	58.4	45.4	54.0
13	8.0	95.2%	19.6%	-	6.8	96.3%	39.6%	41.2	0.0%	10.3%	43.9	30.9	46.6	34.0	72.6
14	8.7	88.7%	9.8%	-	7.8	89.2%	15.1%	29.8	9.5%	9.5%	31.6	19.0	35.9	31.3	18.7
15	6.1	99.4%	1.7%	-	5.3	93.8%	4.7%	51.2	15.5%	25.4%	52.3	22.6	22.4	47.3	40.3
16	11.5	97.7%	10.6%	-	11.3	92.6%	13.2%	28.5	11.6%	9.8%	30.9	14.4	19.7	25.8	36.2

TABLE 59. BERGEN ANNUAL TRENDS

	ADP				Admissions			ALOS							
	ADP	Minority	Female	High	Monthly	Minority	Female	Total	1-5 Days	60+ Days	M	F	W	B	H
DET 05	20.3	79.4%	14.7%	32	20.8	78.3%	17.3%	27.4	30.1%	14.2%	27.6	26.3	25.4	25.4	31.0
06	12.2	88.2%	13.3%	21	10.6	82.7%	12.6%	38.1	34.1%	23.0%	38.5	35.8	34.7	40.3	38.4
07	8.9	80.3%	11.3%	15	9.8	78.0%	11.9%	26.5	37.2%	17.7%	26.6	25.7	23.0	30.2	25.4
08	12.6	87.4%	12.3%	22	11.5	81.2%	10.9%	25.1	37.8%	14.3%	24.2	32.9	13.5	29.6	24.8
09	10.0	78.4%	8.6%	18	12.0	77.8%	14.6%	27.0	41.0%	14.4%	28.5	18.7	28.5	28.9	17.3
10	10.7	80.6%	6.5%	19	9.3	78.4%	9.0%	34.5	32.1%	22.6%	35.7	21.0	37.0	36.9	32.4
11	9.4	75.1%	23.4%	18	9.6	80.0%	13.0%	31.1	27.2%	15.8%	27.9	53.9	40.5	30.5	20.8
12	6.4	86.7%	14.6%	13	7.8	88.2%	11.8%	26.5	31.6%	16.8%	25.9	29.9	36.3	21.5	29.9
13	8.1	76.0%	13.4%	15	8.6	76.7%	18.4%	31.0	27.6%	20.4%	32.6	24.1	30.3	32.0	33.2
14	8.1	80.8%	14.4%	17	8.6	81.6%	17.5%	27.3	45.0%	16.0%	28.2	23.5	31.6	30.7	20.3
15	8.4	81.4%	7.6%	14	9.8	82.1%	12.0%	23.9	42.3%	12.2%	24.7	17.3	22.3	26.5	22.3
16	8.1	92.3%	4.1%	11	7.2	87.2%	11.6%	26.9	34.9%	9.6%	28.9	10.0	24.9	31.1	25.1
ATD 09	29.3	-	-	-	16.7	52.6%	7.9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	28.9	-	-	-	16.7	78.7%	7.9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	14.8	-	-	-	9.7	72.4%	11.2%	59.9	5.9%	17.6%	60.7	52.1	58.4	45.8	73.9
12	18.0	79.9%	9.2%	-	10.1	71.1%	11.6%	61.9	2.8%	38.5%	63.1	50.1	60.1	60.7	66.3
13	19.1	77.8%	11.4%	-	9.9	70.4%	17.3%	53.1	0.8%	31.1%	57.4	32.7	44.9	59.4	50.5
14	18.1	67.3%	8.7%	-	12.7	70.4%	10.5%	38.3	0.0%	27.0%	38.6	36.3	37.2	34.6	39.7
15	12.3	79.5%	11.8%	-	9.8	63.2%	13.7%	43.5	3.4%	73.3%	44.7	28.7	37.3	49.6	42.5
16	8.4	60.0%	21.4%	-	6.4	68.8%	14.3%	27.1	5.3%	2.6%	27.8	23.1	27.5	25.7	30.1

TABLE 60. BURLINGTON ANNUAL TRENDS

	ADP				Admissions			ALOS							
	ADP	Minority	Female	High	Monthly	Minority	Female	Total	1-5 Days	60+ Days	M	F	W	B	H
DET 05	20.4	65.6%	19.6%	34	23.7	66.2%	19.7%	27.5	36.6%	16.1%	27.8	26.2	27.1	29.1	13.3
06	12.9	69.4%	21.0%	21	19.3	73.6%	25.1%	20.8	43.8%	11.2%	22.2	16.6	23.8	19.8	22.1
07	25.1	76.4%	16.5%	40	27.1	74.2%	16.9%	25.6	30.9%	14.0%	25.3	27.0	25.9	26.0	17.7
08	18.0	79.1%	8.2%	29	23.7	73.9%	10.9%	25.0	31.0%	10.6%	25.6	20.9	18.2	27.5	27.1
09	18.9	72.0%	11.8%	32	23.3	68.8%	17.9%	23.8	27.2%	10.8%	25.4	16.3	22.1	25.9	9.1
10	16.0	81.2%	14.0%	34	18.3	77.2%	17.8%	26.3	31.7%	14.5%	26.7	23.8	22.5	29.1	17.1
11	9.4	85.7%	14.9%	14	11.4	78.8%	15.3%	23.4	38.8%	11.2%	23.1	24.5	19.5	23.1	31.2
12	10.8	84.6%	14.8%	18	12.3	77.7%	16.9%	27.5	41.5%	14.1%	28.6	22.1	18.8	31.2	23.0
13	12.8	82.2%	15.5%	23	12.8	83.0%	17.6%	27.3	43.0%	15.2%	27.6	25.8	24.4	23.0	63.1
14	11.7	85.8%	5.8%	22	13.2	86.1%	16.5%	29.9	40.6%	12.9%	33.8	9.7	29.6	31.2	16.6
15	9.0	90.9%	11.7%	22	10.3	87.9%	16.1%	25.6	39.1%	13.3%	28.4	10.4	22.3	26.5	22.3
16	5.2	75.8%	18.6%	11	7.7	75.0%	16.3%	18.2	40.9%	5.7%	18.6	16.1	18.7	19.5	5.1
ATD 08	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30.8	0.0%	4.3%	32.2	22.4	26.2	32.3	*
09	-	-	-	-	4.3	57.7%	9.6%	33.9	0.0%	9.1%	35.6	21.2	32.9	34.2	*
10	5.6	-	-	-	3.3	75.0%	12.5%	40.6	6.9%	13.8%	42.9	26.0	42.1	42.4	37.0
11	10.9	-	-	-	8.7	75.0%	6.7%	37.4	9.3%	18.6%	37.2	39.9	37.9	37.4	39.7
12	18.1	-	-	-	11.8	76.8%	14.1%	43.6	7.5%	22.4%	45.9	27.7	38.5	44.8	30.7
13	16.6	69.3%	7.5%	-	11.0	71.2%	6.1%	42.8	4.7%	24.4%	42.9	41.6	46.3	41.6	54.4
14	15.6	80.3%	6.7%	-	11.4	86.1%	12.4%	47.0	5.3%	24.1%	50.4	20.3	78.4	41.3	30.0
15	11.4	77.9%	9.3%	-	8.8	78.1%	11.4%	38.6	9.9%	15.8%	39.6	22.5	33.3	40.4	22.5
16	8.5	68.3%	18.6%	-	7.3	73.6%	25.3%	33.4	15.3%	12.9%	34.3	28.9	32.8	33.4	35.0

TABLE 61. OCEAN ANNUAL TRENDS

	ADP				Admissions			ALOS							
	ADP	Minority	Female	High	Monthly	Minority	Female	Total	1-5 Days	60+ Days	M	F	W	B	H
DET 05	23.7	44.4%	13.1%	33	20.0	44.6%	19.6%	34.8	23.5%	22.6%	37.3	24.6	34.2	35.7	36.1
06	20.3	38.7%	10.0%	32	16.0	39.6%	15.6%	44.9	16.7%	28.8%	45.6	42.1	38.0	52.5	60.0
07	24.2	46.2%	10.7%	38	19.4	40.8%	15.0%	38.6	21.0%	22.2%	41.5	17.5	33.3	41.7	48.0
08	21.7	44.9%	13.9%	40	15.4	37.8%	19.5%	31.7	23.1%	14.3%	33.6	21.9	27.5	32.1	51.0
09	18.2	59.2%	6.2%	32	14.9	52.5%	12.8%	34.8	23.5%	22.6%	37.3	24.6	34.2	35.7	36.1
10	12.5	51.2%	11.7%	23	11.9	36.4%	16.8%	44.9	16.7%	28.8%	45.6	42.1	38.0	52.5	60.0
11	13.3	48.4%	13.7%	22	10.7	34.4%	18.8%	38.5	15.7%	19.7%	41.3	26.6	27.0	82.0	35.8
12	13.0	30.3%	6.8%	21	13.1	35.0%	14.0%	32.5	20.8%	16.1%	34.6	19.8	36.5	17.9	31.1
13	13.0	44.2%	9.5%	21	11.3	39.0%	16.9%	34.7	20.0%	19.3%	37.6	20.1	34.2	39.2	29.6
14	9.9	42.9%	13.2%	19	8.3	38.0%	24.0%	36.3	22.3%	20.2%	41.3	18.6	31.9	41.9	49.1
15	11.0	56.7%	15.3%	16	5.8	50.0%	32.9%	47.0	28.2%	32.4%	54.4	30.7	53.8	35.2	57.5
16	10.0	61.2%	11.2%	16	6.8	46.9%	19.8%	53.5	15.6%	18.2%	60.2	27.9	27.5	66.6	115.2
ATD 08	-	-	-	-	8.0	42.7%	25.0%	48.1	12.9%	22.8%	51.6	36.4	55.5	37.4	49.3
09	-	-	-	-	7.4	40.4%	22.5%	33.5	14.3%	13.1%	34.2	31.2	32.1	38.4	31.0
10	-	-	-	-	6.3	28.9%	22.4%	37.3	13.7%	20.5%	38.9	30.9	34.3	34.0	56.5
11	6.9	37.6%	13.4%	-	5.4	36.9%	12.3%	41.6	8.0%	29.3%	42.2	38.1	37.2	56.6	41.8
12	8.9	34.9%	7.2%	-	5.1	41.0%	14.8%	44.5	15.6%	29.7%	47.6	25.4	49.9	25.1	44.3
13	5.3	32.7%	12.7%	-	5.2	32.3%	22.6%	38.5	6.9%	19.0%	40.1	32.9	40.0	34.6	45.7
14	3.0	46.2%	24.7%	-	2.8	45.5%	18.2%	30.1	5.4%	13.5%	27.6	40.4	31.1	30.5	29.0
15	2.5	74.0%	33.4%	-	1.7	60.0%	35.0%	48.9	0.0%	26.3%	48.7	49.5	29.8	50.8	73.6
16	4.1	46.7%	20.6%	-	2.4	55.2%	17.2%	55.4	9.1%	18.2%	39.0	92.5	52.6	85.0	26.3

TABLE 62. SOMERSET ANNUAL TRENDS

	ADP				Admissions			ALOS							
	ADP	Minority	Female	High	Monthly	Minority	Female	Total	1-5 Days	60+ Days	M	F	W	B	H
DET 08	9.0	81.9%	12.9%	14	10.5	69.8%	18.3%	23.8	39.4%	7.1%	24.5	21.0	16.7	32.2	14.8
09	7.6	75.8%	7.1%	15	9.5	80.7%	13.2%	20.9	47.0%	7.0%	21.7	15.4	35.1	19.8	12.0
10	6.3	77.1%	4.4%	13	6.9	72.3%	13.3%	28.3	32.2%	8.0%	30.9	10.8	19.5	41.0	15.1
11	5.6	71.2%	4.0%	12	5.4	70.8%	7.7%	26.3	35.5%	8.1%	27.1	17.4	20.8	12.4	82.4
12	4.0	65.7%	4.0%	8	3.5	78.6%	14.3%	30.0	37.2%	14.0%	30.8	24.0	16.3	32.0	54.4
13	2.8	85.4%	10.5%	6	2.8	84.8%	9.1%	75.6	42.4%	21.2%	82.3	27.5	192.6	72.8	8.0
14	3.1	84.5%	2.5%	7	3.1	75.7%	8.1%	29.8	42.5%	17.5%	31.4	10.3	19.7	35.7	29.8
15	2.4	69.8%	0.7%	6	2.9	71.4%	11.4%	18.3	37.5%	9.4%	20.6	2.5	7.8	22.6	24.4
16	2.5	95.3%	0.8%	7	2.3	96.4%	14.3%	41.7	25.9%	25.9%	48.0	5.3	104.5	33.4	51.2
ATD 10	2.6	88.5%	5.1%	-	1.9	82.6%	4.3%	36.7	5.3%	10.6%	36.7	*	23.4	44.8	35.4
11	2.1	80.0%	2.9%	-	1.7	81.0%	4.8%	39.4	13.6%	18.2%	38.7	55.0	29.0	44.7	25.0
12	1.4	95.1%	1.4%	-	1.3	100.0%	6.7%	30.8	0.0%	14.3%	32.9	6.0	26.0	31.3	*
13	2.6	92.0%	1.6%	-	1.3	81.3%	6.7%	39.9	0.0%	13.3%	41.6	16.0	26.0	46.9	36.5
14	5.7	89.2%	0.0%	-	1.3	80.0%	0.0%	43.3	7.7%	23.1%	43.3	*	39.0	35.4	55.5
15	1.6	71.0%	0.0%	-	1.0	58.3%	0.0%	49.5	7.7%	23.1%	49.5	*	53.8	67.0	30.0
16	1.3	73.4%	4.9%	-	0.8	50.0%	10.0%	41.3	0.0%	25.0%	43.7	22.0	28.7	43.0	*

TABLE 63. PASSAIC ANNUAL TRENDS

	ADP				Admissions			ALOS							
	ADP	Minority	Female	High	Monthly	Minority	Female	Total	1-5 Days	60+ Days	M	F	W	B	H
DET 08	70.2	95.6%	6.1%	97	68.8	91.9%	8.7%	29.9	36.9%	16.3%	30.8	20.0	17.7	32.7	28.7
09	48.1	94.0%	7.0%	70	42.7	92.0%	9.2%	36.0	29.5%	19.6%	36.5	31.4	30.8	35.0	38.4
10	41.2	94.9%	3.5%	59	46.5	93.7%	9.1%	28.1	35.7%	12.5%	29.6	12.3	26.3	31.8	23.4
11	46.4	95.9%	2.2%	59	38.7	93.8%	6.9%	33.9	37.0%	18.5%	35.7	10.7	17.3	34.5	36.3
12	25.5	93.5%	1.6%	40	25.5	93.5%	7.8%	40.0	36.5%	12.6%	42.0	16.6	80.6	41.0	31.9
13	25.3	97.1%	4.3%	39	24.9	94.6%	6.7%	36.6	38.5%	19.7%	37.6	20.7	27.6	41.9	30.9
14	21.5	94.0%	8.0%	37	23.3	93.6%	11.1%	27.1	41.6%	15.3%	28.2	19.1	13.4	30.2	26.0
15	22.3	92.0%	2.3%	33	20.2	94.6%	7.4%	34.8	39.1%	20.2%	35.7	21.3	24.8	38.8	32.1
16	29.5	96.0%	2.0%	39	21.0	92.5%	7.5%	42.3	30.0%	21.2%	44.7	12.1	22.9	45.6	42.3
ATD 12	-	-	-	-	28.3	94.1%	8.0%	48.5	1.6%	31.1%	48.9	43.1	41.2	48.4	49.2
13	35.1	90.6%	13.7%	-	27.4	92.4%	10.6%	40.6	7.3%	24.1%	41.4	33.8	36.0	39.9	42.5
14	36.8	93.3%	19.2%	-	25.3	94.7%	9.2%	48.2	3.7%	28.7%	48.7	36.6	30.4	46.0	53.1
15	51.5	91.5%	13.9%	-	23.6	92.2%	10.6%	50.3	5.2%	25.6%	48.7	62.5	35.0	53.5	45.2
16	45.0	96.4%	12.3%	-	24.1	92.8%	14.4%	43.9	9.3%	51.0%	44.5	40.3	26.1	39.2	51.4

TABLE 64. MIDDLESEX ANNUAL TRENDS

	ADP				Admissions			ALOS							
	ADP	Minority	Female	High	Monthly	Minority	Female	Total	1-5 Days	60+ Days	M	F	W	B	H
DET 09	42.1	81.6%	7.3%	-	37.4	75.1%	14.9%	35.6	30.9%	17.3%	38.7	19.1	25.4	34.6	46.2
10	39.9	85.2%	8.0%	-	33.3	76.5%	13.8%	35.9	30.0%	18.4%	38.9	17.5	23.9	41.8	37.1
11	23.4	87.3%	8.9%	-	24.9	82.6%	14.4%	32.3	29.0%	15.3%	34.2	20.8	23.3	42.3	27.4
12	25.2	88.7%	9.0%	40	25.4	83.6%	17.7%	32.7	39.2%	18.9%	36.1	16.3	25.8	39.3	31.7
13	11.7	95.3%	7.7%	27	12.3	85.8%	18.9%	28.7	18.4%	13.5%	32.3	12.4	11.8	31.1	26.8
14	17.2	95.4%	4.7%	27	14.0	85.7%	11.3%	32.2	26.8%	15.9%	34.2	17.4	12.1	37.0	37.6
15	16.8	93.3%	3.9%	26	15.7	88.8%	12.8%	33.7	30.9%	12.2%	37.0	12.6	20.4	22.3	50.8
16	20.0	92.3%	6.9%	29	14.6	88.6%	14.3%	39.4	26.1%	20.0%	42.6	20.5	27.7	31.6	47.0
ATD 11	-	-	-	-	7.4	79.8%	14.6%	47.8	12.8%	13.8%	52.0	21.6	-	-	-
12	10.8	-	-	-	5.6	83.6%	23.9%	41.7	6.5%	25.8%	46.3	33.8	39.1	49.7	35.3
13	11.6	88.0%	7.9%	-	7.5	90.0%	11.1%	44.2	7.4%	24.5%	45.6	31.9	61.2	43.4	35.5
14	25.6	90.5%	4.9%	-	10.8	80.8%	9.2%	41.9	5.8%	20.0%	43.3	27.0	38.4	48.3	32.1
15	33.8	96.7%	9.1%	-	7.8	87.2%	19.7%	53.6	4.8%	32.3%	56.8	21.8	33.8	50.0	58.5
16	30.0	96.1%	7.7%	-	6.6	86.1%	13.9%	53.8	5.8%	31.8%	60.5	16.7	29.4	50.7	62.4

TABLE 65. CUMBERLAND ANNUAL TRENDS

	ADP				Admissions			ALOS							
	ADP	Minority	Female	High	Monthly	Minority	Female	Total	1-5 Days	60+ Days	M	F	W	B	H
DET 09	27.3	94.4%	17.0%	40	20.8	89.6%	28.9%	33.6	44.4%	16.7%	36.8	25.9	14.0	37.3	31.6
10	22.3	92.3%	10.8%	38	17.8	87.8%	22.5%	36.0	46.2%	18.3%	41.2	18.7	23.2	37.0	40.7
11	18.1	93.6%	5.9%	28	15.6	90.9%	16.6%	30.8	50.0%	14.6%	34.4	12.6	25.5	33.1	27.0
12	11.1	94.6%	9.0%	17	10.5	92.1%	29.4%	30.0	45.4%	13.8%	37.8	8.1	20.7	27.2	41.9
13	9.9	95.9%	12.4%	19	10.8	87.6%	16.3%	23.6	47.2%	14.2%	24.7	18.0	4.5	28.0	19.4
14	10.3	89.8%	9.3%	20	7.7	90.2%	17.4%	48.4	28.7%	24.1%	54.0	21.4	21.7	61.5	30.4
15	8.7	81.2%	4.3%	13	5.8	85.5%	13.0%	38.5	44.6%	21.5%	41.7	16.1	57.3	35.7	30.9
16	5.7	65.8%	13.0%	11	4.6	92.7%	16.4%	39.1	50.0%	18.5%	36.1	52.2	3.0	43.3	35.8
ATD 12	6.9	91.9%	20.5%	-	4.8	91.4%	29.3%	44.1	5.2%	24.1%	49.5	28.4	23.3	47.2	37.0
13	8.2	92.9%	17.6%	-	4.8	89.7%	19.0%	42.8	5.9%	21.6%	46.4	29.5	28.3	41.5	47.9
14	8.6	89.5%	7.5%	-	3.4	92.7%	12.2%	78.9	12.8%	56.4%	84.1	43.2	98.5	97.8	44.9
15	5.8	82.0%	18.3%	-	3.4	75.6%	4.9%	52.9	5.6%	30.6%	49.9	77.8	42.9	65.5	36.2
16	8.6	72.7%	12.9%	-	2.6	87.1%	19.4%	60.9	0.0%	42.9%	50.2	24.0	47.3	46.7	47.0

TABLE 66. WARREN ANNUAL TRENDS

	ADP				Admissions			ALOS							
	ADP	Minority	Female	High	Monthly	Minority	Female	Total	1-5 Days	60+ Days	M	F	W	B	H
DET 09	2.3	49.5%	8.2%	7	2.6	45.2%	16.1%	23.6	28.1%	6.2%	25.4	13.8	18.9	35.7	6.7
10	3.0	37.9%	16.0%	7	3.4	39.0%	12.2%	26.5	21.1%	13.2%	25.2	35.0	25.1	31.3	13.0
11	2.3	42.0%	0.0%	5	2.3	39.3%	0.0%	31.9	22.6%	16.1%	31.9	*	32.2	28.6	7.7
12	3.2	72.2%	0.2%	9	2.5	60.0%	3.3%	33.2	31.0%	17.2%	34.3	3.0	29.1	48.8	13.2
13	1.2	64.5%	5.7%	3	1.3	20.0%	13.3%	40.1	29.4%	17.6%	43.7	12.5	14.1	89.0	231.0
14	1.4	49.4%	0.0%	4	1.2	42.9%	0.0%	33.2	0.0%	18.2%	33.2	*	35.3	36.7	8.0
15	1.4	88.1%	0.0%	5	1.8	90.9%	0.0%	26.6	22.7%	13.6%	26.6	*	25.0	21.0	43.4
16	1.2	97.8%	0.0%	7	0.7	87.5%	0.0%	46.4	27.3%	27.3%	46.4	*	7.0	13.0	141.0
ATD 11	2.8	18.7%	0.0%	-	0.9	16.7%	0.0%	88.3	8.3%	50.0%	88.3	*	96.8	14.0	160.0
12	3.4	23.3%	22.6%	-	1.5	22.2%	22.2%	72.7	0.0%	42.9%	77.7	60.3	78.8	14.0	68.5
13	2.1	26.6%	27.0%	-	0.8	11.1%	11.1%	74.9	0.0%	54.5%	64.5	102.7	69.4	99.5	22.0
14	0.8	18.6%	0.0%	-	0.4	50.0%	0.0%	59.0	16.7%	50.0%	59.0	*	81.3	24.0	5.0
15	2.0	83.8%	0.0%	-	1.3	80.0%	0.0%	33.5	0.0%	9.1%	33.5	*	50.0	31.9	14.0
16	3.0	68.6%	9.0%	-	1.0	33.3%	16.7%	41.9	0.0%	25.0%	39.3	36.0	40.1	44.6	*

TABLE 67. GLOUCESTER ANNUAL TRENDS

	ADP				Admissions			ALOS							
	ADP	Minority	Female	High	Monthly	Minority	Female	Total	1-5 Days	60+ Days	M	F	W	B	H
DET 11	4.4	62.3%	7.2%	11	8.3	54.5%	13.1%	17.1	44.6%	9.9%	18.5	7.4	15.0	19.0	16.3
12	3.8	53.6%	8.8%	9	6.8	48.8%	9.8%	16.4	41.8%	6.3%	16.4	17.0	15.5	14.4	48.0
13	6.8	69.4%	5.2%	11	7.0	54.8%	17.9%	29.2	39.5%	13.6%	34.5	7.6	16.2	42.0	14.3
14	3.2	48.0%	3.4%	8	4.6	47.3%	9.1%	21.2	28.3%	5.0%	22.3	9.6	21.1	22.4	12.3
15	3.6	87.2%	6.0%	7	5.2	77.4%	14.5%	17.7	35.7%	10.7%	19.2	9.3	11.9	22.8	2.8
16	2.9	65.8%	13.0%	7	3.5	61.9%	16.7%	33.9	40.4%	21.3%	36.5	15.7	28.5	37.3	25.3
ATD 13	7.1	56.5%	23.8%	-	4.0	50.0%	27.1%	63.1	0.0%	62.3%	65.9	47.4	57.7	69.8	95.0
14	5.5	50.9%	18.0%	-	4.4	52.8%	3.8%	39.9	7.7%	19.2%	40.1	35.5	34.3	48.2	25.3
15	4.6	85.9%	14.1%	-	3.5	76.2%	9.5%	47.5	0.0%	25.8%	49.0	39.8	33.3	53.3	51.5
16	3.8	73.1%	5.1%	-	1.8	76.2%	9.5%	59.2	3.4%	41.4%	60.6	21.0	45.4	60.1	64.0

TABLE 68. CAPE MAY ANNUAL TRENDS

	ADP				Admissions			ALOS							
	ADP	Minority	Female	High	Monthly	Minority	Female	Total	1-5 Days	60+ Days	M	F	W	B	H
DET 11	3.1	64.7%	18.0%	6	2.3	55.6%	25.9%	41.9	7.4%	22.2%	35.9	39.6	37.7	36.2	70.5
12	1.9	48.5%	29.7%	5	2.2	42.3%	38.5%	31.2	3.7%	14.8%	35.7	20.6	15.3	46.6	19.3
13	3.7	42.8%	35.1%	7	2.8	44.1%	26.5%	36.9	13.9%	13.9%	34.7	43.6	34.7	39.5	40.3
14	2.6	46.8%	26.2%	6	2.3	60.7%	25.0%	33.1	33.3%	11.1%	28.1	44.9	53.4	15.0	31.5
15	1.4	22.5%	18.1%	4	1.2	42.9%	14.3%	43.6	26.7%	40.0%	43.6	80.0	53.3	36.2	41.5
16	0.7	52.9%	43.9%	3	1.4	52.9%	17.6%	10.6	66.7%	6.7%	4.4	35.3	15.1	5.2	9.0
ATD 14	3.2	40.9%	28.9%	-	1.8	50.0%	27.3%	65.6	0.0%	37.5%	70.8	53.0	76.9	51.9	54.5
15	1.6	35.4%	5.8%	-	0.8	20.0%	10.0%	79.1	0.0%	50.0%	85.3	36.0	51.5	163.5	*
16	3.6	28.6%	9.7%	-	1.7	40.0%	15.0%	66.3	8.7%	47.8%	68.7	41.5	73.4	73.7	8.0

TABLE 69. SUSSEX ANNUAL TRENDS

	ADP				Admissions			ALOS							
	ADP	Minority	Female	High	Monthly	Minority	Female	Total	1-5 Days	60+ Days	M	F	W	B	H
DET 12	2.2	58.0%	10.0%	7	3.2	18.4%	21.1%	12.9	56.8%	5.4%	14.1	8.0	9.1	*	29.3
13	1.5	24.9%	9.1%	4	2.5	6.7%	16.7%	27.1	41.9%	3.2%	30.5	13.0	13.2	157.3	*
14	1.1	34.6%	1.7%	4	1.6	31.6%	10.5%	29.0	44.4%	22.2%	32.1	4.5	28.1	*	31.4
15	2.0	41.5%	25.0%	7	2.3	42.3%	30.8%	27.9	20.0%	12.0%	32.3	16.6	27.2	28.9	*
16	1.0	29.9%	40.5%	5	1.2	42.9%	28.6%	31.3	43.8%	12.5%	41.5	26.6	36.0	26.5	*
ATD 12	2.9	16.8%	15.5%	-	2.8	11.8%	23.5%	29.3	12.5%	9.4%	31.3	21.0	26.9	*	53.0
13	2.6	25.9%	12.6%	-	2.6	16.1%	9.8%	24.3	6.3%	3.1%	23.1	31.0	23.7	38.0	16.7
14	3.8	7.4%	10.3%	-	2.8	9.1%	24.2%	27.0	12.5%	6.3%	31.0	15.0	26.3	49.0	4.0
15	3.8	11.1%	30.1%	-	2.7	12.5%	31.3%	32.4	12.1%	21.5%	36.0	22.6	32.8	28.0	28.0
16	1.2	22.4%	51.6%	-	0.8	22.2%	22.2%	52.8	0.0%	41.7%	51.2	57.3	53.0	78.0	10.0

Notes

General Notes.

If and when data modifications or updates occur, previously distributed reports are not adjusted and redistributed. Instead, subsequent reports are adjusted to reflect the most recently verified data. The research & reform specialist working with each site can provide clarification regarding any data changes in a given site.

ADP figures for any county with a cap or restriction on daily population during any given time period include youth held out-of-county, i.e., reflect total youth from that county in secure detention. Note that LOS figures for counties under such a cap/restriction reflect the length of stay in secure detention, including time spent in-county and out-of-county

¹ Because each cohort of JDAI sites has a different pre-JDAI year, pre-JDAI all-sites figures do not reflect numbers from one specific year. All-sites pre-JDAI figures are therefore derived by tallying figures from each individual site's pre-JDAI year (currently 2003, 2005, 2008, 2009, 2011, or 2012 depending on the site).

² "Other Violation or Non-Delinquent Event" includes situations such as municipal warrants; violation of a deferred disposition; violation of drug court; return to detention from an alternative for family issues, equipment problems, or other issues not directly related to the youth's non-compliant behavior; violation of diversion; violations of other court-ordered conditions that are not clearly a VOP or detention alternative violation; program violations where no VOP is filed; violations where the exact nature is unknown; contempt of court on a non-delinquency matter; and status offenses/family crisis matters.

³ "Other Reason" includes out-of-state warrants, parole warrants, detainers, and temporary detention (transfer from other secure facility) for the purpose of testifying at a trial or appearing in court.

⁴ Prior to the annual report of 2011, in the original cohort of sites, pre-JDAI (2003) figures that relied on case-level data for analysis were based on a 4-month sample of cases. In 2011 staff worked to build complete case-level data sets for these sites for their pre-JDAI year, in order to allow for better analysis of pre vs. post JDAI changes. In Hudson, however, in accordance with detention record-retention rules, admission/departure logbooks had been destroyed by 2011, and since in 2003 Hudson did not have an electronic means of otherwise maintaining case-level data, a full-year case-level data file could not be built. As such, Hudson's pre-JDAI figures in Tables 6-8 are extrapolated based on the original 4-month sample. For example, in the 4-month sample for 2003, 10.3% of admissions were for VOPs, and 10.3% of 1222 total annual admissions is 126, the extrapolated estimate for total VOP admissions in Hudson in 2003. Similarly, for 47 of Essex's 2460 admissions in 2003, a review of records in 2011 could not determine the type of act/lead reason for admission, and so the same method is used for these 47 cases.

⁵ Includes detention alternative violations; municipal warrants; violation of a deferred disposition; violation of drug court; return to detention from an alternative for family issues, equipment problems, or other issues not directly related to the youth's non-compliant behavior; violation of diversion; violations of other court-ordered conditions that are not clearly a VOP or detention alternative violation; program violations where no VOP was filed; violations where the exact nature is unknown; contempt of court on a non-delinquency matter; and status offenses/family crisis matters.

⁶ If the current offense is a VOP or other violation of a disposition, this reflects the most serious adjudicated offense for which the youth is currently on probation. If the current offense is an FTA, ATD violation, or other violation of the terms of pre-dispositional release, this reflects the most serious offense of all open pending charges at the time of the admission to detention.

⁷ Court remand includes youth remanded to detention at any point in the case process. Note that this includes youth previously in the community or on a detention alternative who have not been charged with a new offense or violation, but who are remanded upon adjudication to await disposition, or upon disposition to await placement. In other words, the primary reason for the remand is tied to the case process, and not to *new* behavior of the youth. However, when this occurs, the "Nature of Offense/Lead Reason for Detention" for which the youth is detained is recorded as the charge for which the youth was newly adjudicated or disposed

⁸ "Other" admission process includes situations such as youth admitted directly on a warrant to detain or from a detention alternative (without a call to/processing via intake services); youth brought directly to the detention center by an alternative program on a violation (without a warrant); extradition from out-of-state; return on detainer from a hospital/mental health facility pre-disposition; via the prosecutor's office; and a few cases where the exact nature of the admission process is unknown.

⁹ Length of stay is calculated based on youth departing detention during the time period of interest, and for each youth, LOS is the number of days between and including the departure date and the admission date.

¹⁰ Length of Stay: All-Site Average - Beginning with the 2010 Annual Report, all-site figures are now derived by adding up each site's LOS figure, and dividing by the number of sites. Previously, within a cohort of sites, each youth's length of stay was summed and divided by the total number of youth. The "youth-based" ALOS and "site-based" ALOS yield similar,

though not exactly the same, results. This change occurred as the result of the ongoing addition of new JDAI sites, which resulted in totals for each cohort of sites being replaced with a single, all-sites total or average, and factors related to how data are maintained for each cohort of sites.

¹¹ Departure Type Clarification

“Detention Alternative/Shelter” includes youth released to detention alternatives/alternative supervision/shelter a) prior to the final case disposition or b) at/post-disposition, but prior to final dispositional placement (i.e., released to alternative supervision to await placement availability). Situation b) occurs infrequently, and as such is not reported as its own category in this report.

“Other Service Agency/Placement (pre-dispo)” includes youth released to a hospital; mental health/diagnostic facility; DCP&P custody; treatment or dispositional program, pre-dispositionally; or youth released to their dispositional placement prior to the date of final disposition.

“Jail, Bail, Upon/After Waiver” includes youth who were transferred to the jail for any reason (waiver, adult charges filed in criminal, adult charges pending at time of admission, age, etc.), youth who made bail or who were ROR after adult charges were filed in criminal court, and youth who were otherwise released upon or after waiver.

“Other Authorities” include youth released to the custody of out-of-state authorities (typically youth admitted on out-of-state warrants); BICE (immigration); JJC parole or secure facility (typically following admission for a parole warrant); or the police (typically when it is determined youth was in fact an adult).

“Similar” in the “dismissed/diverted” category includes cases where no charges were formally filed in court; the case was closed or inactivated with no further action, including cases where probation was terminated; cases where a youth, having been admitted as a sanction for drug-court noncompliance, was returned home to continue with drug court; cases where no indictment was returned for a youth waived to adult court (and the charges were not reopened in juvenile court); and youth that had been admitted on a status offense or family crisis matter.

“Other” cases are those where the circumstances of release could not be clearly determined, or rare cases that do not fall into any of the above categories. NOTE: In light of the very small number of cases that fall into this category, cases categorized as “other” are not included in the Departure Type tables.

¹² For counties with a 60-day commitment program, data regarding departures and LOS pertain to youth leaving/LOS in the detention center on “detention status.” In other words, if a youth in the detention center pre-dispositionally is ultimately disposed to the detention commitment program, the “departure date” used in the youth’s LOS calculation is the date the youth’s status changed from “detention” to “disposed/commitment,” and the departure type will be recorded as “dispositional placement.”

¹³ Other crime indicators, based on reports of crime (as opposed to arrests for crime), show decreases over the past decade, too. For example, the total crime index for the state of New Jersey, which is the count of index offenses *reported* to the police (murder, rape, robbery, burglary, aggravated assault, larceny-theft, and motor vehicle theft), reflects decreases in crime since 2003. And, since 2003 the percent of reported crime cleared by arrest has remained the same. For example, in 2003 there were 252,149 reported index offenses, and 19.2% were cleared by arrest. In 2012, there were 207,355 reported index offenses (a large decrease), and 20.1% were cleared by arrest.

¹⁴ Refers only to those JDAI sites that house youth in detention centers which have been approved by the Juvenile Justice Commission to operate 60-day commitment programs as a dispositional option.

¹⁵ This does not include duplicate admissions of youth disposed to a term of weekends or to clusters of non-consecutive days in detention. (Example: a youth ordered to serve 4 weekends is counted as one admission, not 4.)

¹⁶ Includes youth whose disposition included a term of commitment in detention followed by conditional release, who then violated the terms of release, and were subsequently returned to serve out the remainder of their commitment term in detention.