

IN MONTANA

STATE DOOUMENTS COLLECTION

JUL 28 1992

MONTANA STATE LIBRARY 1515 E. 6th AVE. HELENA, MONTANA 59620 1990 ANNUAL REPORT

PLEASE RETUR

the of the

NOV 26 1998



CRIME IN MONTANA 1990 ANNUAL REPORT

Compiled by the

Statistical Analysis Center

Montana Board of Crime Control

Dr. Gordon Browder, Chairman

Montana Board of Crime Control 303 No. Roberts

Montana Board of Crime Control Members

Gordon Browder, Ph.D. Chairman Missoula

Ardith Aiken Mayor, City of Great Falls Great Falls

Craig Anderson Chief Probation Officer Glendive

Diane G. Barz Assistant U.S. Attorney Billings

Donald Bjertness Retired City Judge Billings

Bob Butorovich Sheriff Butte/Silver Bow Law Enforcement Butte Curt Chisholm Director Dept. of Institutions Helena

Hon. Royal Johnson State Representative Billings

John T. Flynn County Attorney Broadwater County Townsend

> Hon. Del Gage State Senator Cut Bank

Rick Later Sheriff Beaverhead County Dillon

> Rex Manuel Rancher Fairfield

Don Peterson County Commissioner Polson

Hon. Mary Lou Peterson State Representative Eureka

> John Pfaff, Jr. M.D. Whitefish

Hon. Marc Racicot Attorney General Helena

> Mike Shortell Police Chief Havre

Hon. Jean Turnage Chief Justice, Montana Supreme Court Helena

Staff Members Montana Board of Crime Control Statistical Analysis Center Edwin Hall, Administrator, Montana Board of Crime Control Bob Liffring, Statistician and MUCR Coordinator Dara Smith, Data Technician

STATE OF MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE BOARD OF CRIME CONTROL

Marc Racicot Attorney General



303 North Roberts Scott Hart Building Helena, MT 59620

Dear Reader:

This issue of <u>Crime in Montana - 1990 Annual Report</u> represents a departure and enlargement of the content of prior annual reports. While it still contains the traditional measures of crime incidence and rates, it has been expanded to include five contributed articles and analysis of crime data. I anticipate you will find these writings useful, thought provoking, insightful and even disquieting.

Dr. Doyle's article helps us understand the context of the statistics reported each year in <u>Crime in Montana</u>. Dr. Lee points out that we are not yet free of the disproportionate representation of minorities in the justice system. Sgt. Grady writes of shoplifting, its profile and prevention. Ms. McMorris contributes an article based on two victimization surveys and compares attitudes across a five year time span. Mr. Fisher describes the popular Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE) program in Montana. Thus, we've added a dimension to <u>Crime in Montana</u>, the analysis of Montana data by Montana professionals. It is our intention to continue to solicit and use articles of this type in order to continue to improve everyone's understanding of the justice system.

Sincerely,

Edwin L. Hall Administrator

Data used in the preparation of the publication was compiled by the staff of the Statistical Analysis Center of the Montana Board of Crime Control.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

General Crime Statistics for Montana	1
Juvenile Justice	19
Contributed Articles and Analyses	27
Understanding and Interpreting Crime Statistics by Daniel P. Doyle, Ph.D.	29
Racial Discrimination in the Juvenile Justice System of Montana	00
by Nella R. Lee, Ph.D	33
Shoplifting Profile by Sgt. Ken Grady	37
A Comparison of Attitudes toward the Criminal Justice System by Barbara McMorris	41
The Drug Abuse Resistance Education in Montana by Fred E. Fisher	43
Technical Appendices	45
Crime Reporting (MUCR) System	47
2. Population Estimates	51
3. Definitions of Terms used in this Report	53

Digitized by the Internet Archive in 2011 with funding from Montana State Library

http://www.archive.org/details/crimeinmontana1990mont

GENERAL CRIME STATISTICS FROM THE MONTANA UNIFORM CRIME REPORTING PROGRAM

Overview and Introduction

This report contains the most complete, up-to-date, and accurate information currently available about crime in the State of Montana. It is intended to address the informational needs of law enforcement administrators, planners, legislators, and local government officials.

The data and statistics presented below are initiated by the police departments, sheriff offices, and other criminal justice agencies throughout the state. These agencies provide basic information about each crime which is reported to them and about each arrest they make to the Montana Uniform Crime Reporting (MUCR) system. In turn, the MUCR program feeds data into the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) national Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program.

It is emphasized that the amount and type of crime reported in this document is based upon the number of reported offenses and does not measure those offenses unknown to the law enforcement community. Many crimes, for example, may go unreported because the victims are unaware they have been victimized or have themselves been participants in illegal activity.

At the same time, it is noted that many sociological and environmental factors influence the type and volume of criminal activity in a particular geographical area. These include the density and size of the community, demographic characteristics of the population, the economic status of the population, educational, recreational, and religious characteristics of the population, effective strength of local law enforcement agencies, policies of prosecuting officials and the courts and public attitudes toward laws and law enforcement. Many of these are beyond the ability of local law enforcement agencies to control.



Homicides + # Rapes + # Robberies
+ # Aggravated Assaults + # Burglaries
+ # Larcenies + # Motor Vehicle Thefts.

INCIDENCE OF MAJOR CRIMES IN MONTANA 1981-1990



1989-1990	COMPA	RISON	
	1989	1990	% Diff.
STATEWIDE INDEX	30,763	33,321	+8.3%

Statewide Crime Index

Because of their serious nature, their frequency of occurrence and the reliability of their reporting, the crimes of willful homicide, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny/theft, and motor vehicle theft are used as a gauge with which to measure the amount of crime and how much it increases or decreases over time. The crime index is the total number of these offenses that come to the attention of law enforcement agencies.

In 1990, a total of 33,321 major crimes was reported to local law enforcement officials in Montana. This number represents the first increase in the frequency of crimes occurring in the state since 1987. During the 1980's, the number of major crimes decreased an average of 1.6% per year. The 1990's have begun with a reversal of this trend. In 1990, the number of major crimes increased 8.3% over those reported in 1989.

Increases in the number of crimes committed in 1990 have been reported for homicide, rape, and assault three of the four so-called violent crimes. Similarly, increases were also registered in all of the property crimes except motor vehicle theft.

In 1990, 20.2% of the offenses reported were solved, being cleared by arrest or by exception. Of the \$18.3 Million of property lost, \$5.7 was recovered for an overall recovery rate of 31.0%. These statistics are roughly equivalent to those reported in previous years. CRIME RATE = 100,000 X Crime Index / Total Population

STATEWIDE CRIME RATE 1981-1990



STATISTICS ARE BASED WERE PROVIDED BY THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

1989-1990	COMPARISON		
	1989	1990	% Diff.
STATEWIDE CRIME RATE	3,816.7	4,170.0	+ 9.3%
NATIONAL CRIME RATE	5,741.0		

Statewide Crime Rate

The Crime Rate of a given area is defined as the number of index crimes per 100,000 population. By using rates per population, comparison can be made between jurisdictions of unequal populations. It should be noted that the rate only takes into consideration the population factor and does not incorporate any of the many other elements which may contribute to the amount of crime reported in a given community. The crime index is the total number of these offenses that are reported to law enforcement agencies.

The 1990 population figures used in this part of the report have been provided to the MUCR program by the U.S. Bureau of the Census through the Federal Bureau of Investigation. These are preliminary counts and are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount by the U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. The statewide figures for the last eleven years are enumerated in Appendix 2; the preliminary 1990 census data for individual counties and communities are shown in Table 8.

In 1990, Montana's crime rate was 4,170.0 major crimes per 100,000 population. Although this reflects the rise in the number of crimes reported to law enforcement, it still remains substantially below the national average.

HOMICIDE

Homicide is the willful, non-negligent killing of one human being by another. It includes murder and non-negligent manslaughter, but does not include justifiable homicide where an offender is killed by a police officer in the line of duty or a felon is killed by a private citizen.

In 1990, a total of 30 homicides was reported in the state. This represents an increase of 14.3% over the previous year (24). Throughout the 1980's, the number of homicides occuring in Montana fell into a narrow band between twenty and forty per year, with the highest occurring in 1981 (40) and the lowest in 1988 (21). In the first part of the decade, the number of homicides had been decreasing. That trend apparently stopped in 1988. In both 1989 and 1990 the number of homicides have increased over the previous year's total. Because the numbers are so small, however, one cannot say whether these differences between the years are statistically significant.

Of the 30 homicides reported in 1990, 20 were "solved" or "cleared" for a clearance rate of 67%. This is comparable with the national rate of 68%. Like the national statistics, Montana's clearance rate for homicides is consistantly higher than for other crimes. Montana's homicide rate for 1990 was 3.8 homicides per 100,000 population. The nation's comparable rate for 1989 was 8.7.

FORCIBLE RAPE

Rape is the carnal knowledge of a female forcibly and against her will. Both assaults and attempts to commit rape by force are included in this definition. Statutory rape (without force) and sexual assaults against males are classified as sexual offenses and are not counted under this classification.

A total of 159 cases of rape and attempted rape was reported to Montana law enforcement officials in 1990. Athough this was a 19.6% increase over the previous year's count of 133, the general trend over the last ten years has been downward.

Of the rapes reported, roughly 12% were classified as attempted rapes. In almost 90% of the cases, the victim was beaten or threatened to be beaten with the offenders hands, fists, or feet. Nonetheless in almost 10% of the cases a weapon was involved. These statistics are similar to those observed in previous years.

Fifty percent (51.6%) of the reported rapes were cleared by arrest or by exception. The national clearance rate was 52%.

The 1990 incidence of rape in Montana was 19.9 forcible rapes or attempts per 100,000 persons. This is about half the national (1989) rate of 38.1.











1982

No. Offenses

National Rate

State Rate

1981

1983

1984

1989-1990

1985

1988

YEAR

1989

24

3.1

8.7

1987

COMPARISON

1990

30

1988

1989

% Diff.

+25.0%

3.8 +22.6%

1990

4



ROBBERY



REPORTED ROBBERIES IN MONTANA

1989-1990	CON	PARIS	SON
	1989	1990	% Diff.
No. Offenses	137	153	+11.8%
State Rate	17.4	19.1	+ 9.8%
National Rate	233.0		

Robbery is the taking or attempting to take anything of value from the care, custody, or control of a person or persons by force or the threat of force or violence and/or putting the victim in fear. Robberv is a crime in which the element of personal confrontation between the victim and offender is present. Attempts to rob are included in the robbery count.

In 1990, there was a total of 153 robberies in Montana. This represents an increase of 11.7% from 1989 when 137 were reported. The state rate of 19.1 robberies per 100,000 population is about one-tenth of last year's national rate of 233.0. Montana's clearance rate of 32.7% is slightly better than the national average of 26%.

Over the last ten years, there has been a significant decrease in the number of robberies taking place in Montana. However, the reduction in robbery cases has appeared to have stopped in 1990. It is too early to tell whether or not the number of robberies in the state has reached its lowest point and now is beginning to rise again.

In approximately halt of the reported cases, the victim was beaten or threatened to be beaten; in 30% of the cases a firearm was used. Again these facts are consistant with the cases reported in previous years.

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT

Accravated assault is the unlawful attack by one person upon another for the purpose of inflicting severe or aggravated bodily injury. This type of assault is usually accompanied by the use of a weapon or by means likely to produce death or great bodily harm. Any assault which does not involve the use of a weapon and does not result in serious injury is classified as a simple assault and is reported under a separate crime category.

A total of 812 cases of aggravated assault was reported in Montana in 1990-an increase of more than one third over the number reported in the previous year.

During the decade of the 80's, the number and rate of assaults has decreased dramatically. Much of this drop, however, may be due to the way in which simple and aggravated assualts have been reported over the years. Between 1980 and 1985, 33% of all assaults were classified as aggravated; between 1987 and 1989, only 11% were similarly classified. In 1990, 12 percent of all assaults were serious enough to be considered aggravated.

Over half (53.0%) of the cases of aggravated assault reported in Montana in 1990 were cleared by arrest or by exception. Nationwide, 57% of these cases were cleared in 1989.

In one-third (32.4%) of the cases, the assault was a beating; in 25% of the cases, a firearm was used; and in another 25% of the cases, a knife or cutting instrument was used.



1989-1990 COMPARISON				
	1989	1990	% Diff	
No. Offenses	598	812	+35.8%	
State Rate	74.2	101.6	+36.9%	
National Rate	383.4			

REPORTED AGGRAVATED ASSAULTS IN MONTANA

BURGLARY



1989-1990	сом	PARISO	лс
	1989	1990	% Diff.
No. Offenses	5,401	5,257	-2.7 %
State Rate	670.1	657.9	-1.8%
National Rate	1,276.3		

REPORTED BURGLARIES IN MONTANA 1981-1990

Burglary is the unlawful entry of a structure to commit a felony or theft. The theft of items from a building is classified as burglary if it is accompanied by a breaking or unlawful entry (trespass) without breaking. If the building is open to the general public and the offender has legal access, it is considered a larceny.

A total of 5,257 burglaries was reported in Montana in 1990—slightly less than the number which was reported in 1989 (5,401). Unlike the other major crimes, the number of burglaries has continued to decrease since 1980. The 1990 state rate is slightly more than half of the 1989 national rate (657.9 burglaries per 100,000 population compared to 1276.3).

Of the seven major crimes, burglary is the most difficult for law enforcement to solve. Seldom, if ever, is there a witness to the crime itself. In Montana last year, most burglaries involved the breaking and entering of residential properties (58.3%). In 22% of these cases, the time of day in which the crime occurred is unknown; in over one-third (38.9%) of the cases, the crime took place sometime during the night. Consequently, the clearance rate (i.e. the proportion of cases cleared by arrest or by exception) for burglaries in Montana in 1990 was 13.5%. The national clearance rate in 1989 was 14%.

1981-1990

REPORTED LARCENIES IN MONTANA



1989-1990 COMPARISON				
	1989	1990	% Diff	
No. Offenses	22,652	25,103	+10.8%	
State Rate	2,810.0	3,141.5	+ 1.4%	
National Rate	3,171.3			

LARCENY/THEFT

Larceny is the unlawful taking, carrying, leading or riding away of property from the possession or constructive possession of another. Larceny includes such crimes as pickpocketing, purse snatching, shoplifting, theft from motor vehicles, and theft from buildings where forced entry is not involved. It does not include embezzlement, "con" games, forgery, or bad checks. Similarly, motor vehicle theft is not included in this category since it is considered a major crime by itself.

Larceny is the most common of the seven major offenses, constituting approximately three-fourths of all major crimes being reported. In 1990, a total of 25,103 thefts were reported in Montana.

The incident rate of thefts in Montana is approximately equal to the national rate. The 1990 state rate is 3,141.5 thefts per 100,000 population whereas the 1989 national rate was 3,171.3. In fact, throughout the 1980's Montana's experience rate with respect to larcenies have been literally the same as the comparable national rate.

Roughly one out of evey five crimes involving larcenies are solved. In 1990, 19.6 % of these crimes reported to police were cleared. Montana clearance rates are similar to the national experience. A total of \$7,870,430 worth of property was stolen in these crimes; \$940,902 was recovered. The overall property value recovery rate was 11.9%. Of the items stolen, 20.2% was recovered.

REPORTED MOTOR VEHICLE THEFTS IN MONTANA 1981-1990



1989-1990	СОМ	PARIS	DN NC
	1989	1990	% Diff.
No. Offenses	1,818	1,807	-0.6 %
State Rate	225.6	226.1	+0.2%
National Rate	630.4		

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT

Motor vehicle theft is defined as the theft or attempted theft of a vehicle which is self-propelled and runs on the surface and not on rails. It includes automobiles, trucks, buses, vans, motorcycles, and snowmobiles. It does not include motorboats, construction equipment, airplanes, and farming equipment.

In 1990, there was a total of 1,807 motor vehicles stolen in the state. This is almost the same number as was reported in 1989 when 1,818 were stolen. The state's rate for these types of offenses is still less than half of the national rate.

About two and one half times as many automobiles are stolen as are trucks. (59.8 % vs. 23.9%). Nationally 79% of the motor vehicles stolen are automobiles. Ten percent of the vehicles stolen in Montana are motorcycles.

The total value of the vehicles stolen in 1990 in Montana was \$4,676,392. The value of recovered vehicles was estimated at \$3,107,624. The average worth of these vehicles is estimated to be \$3,871. (The national average in 1989 was \$5,222.)

The recovery rate for motor vehicle theft is traditionally high—this year 67.4% of the vehicles and 66.4% of their reported value were recovered. On the downside, only 27.9% of the cases in Montana were cleared by arrest or by exception. (The national clearance rate for motor vehicle theft in 1989 was 15%.)

REPORTED DRUG OFFENSES IN MONTANA 1981-1990 NUMBER 2000 1500 1000 500 - - TREND NUMBER 1983 1981 1982 1984 1985 1986 1987 1988 1989 1990 YEAR

1989-1990 COMPARISON			
	1989	1990	% Diff
No. Offenses	1,325	1,414	+6.7%
State Rate	154.1	177.0	+14.9%
National Rate			

DRUG ABUSE VIOLATIONS

Drug abuse involves the unlawful possession, sale, use, cultivation, and manufacturing of controlled substances and narcotic drugs.

A total of 1,414 cases of drug abuse was reported in Montana in 1990, which is actually 6.7% more than the number which was reported in 1989 (1,325).

Drug Abuse is one of those crimes which seem to increase with increased police activity and surveillance. The increase in the number of drug abuse crimes observed in Montana roughly corresponds to the the federal government's War on Drugs and federal funding to local police agencies to fight the problem. Between 1984 and 1987, Montana reported about 1,000 cases of drug abuse annually. In 1988, 1989, and 1990, after local drug teams were funded and activated, the number increased to an average of 1,367 per year.

Forty-one percent of the drug offenses in Montana involve possession or use; another 21% involve possession of drug paraphernalia, and 22%, the sale or distribution of drugs. If one assumes drug paraphernalia is primarily associated with marijuana use, then 75.6% of the offenses involve marijuana. Cocaine is the second most common drug, involved in 4.4% of the cases, and amphetamines, in 2.8% of the cases.

Seventy percent of the drug offenses reported in Montana have resulted in an arrest in 1990.

600

REPORTED SEX OFFENSE CASES IN MONTANA 1981-1990



1989-1990 COMPARISON				
	1989	1990	% Diff	
No. Offenses	1,499	1,489	-0.7%	
State Rate National Rate	1,86.0	186.3	+0.2%	

SEX OFFENSES

Sex crimes include offenses against chastity, common decency, morals, and the like. Montana law lists four specific crimes: sexual assault, deviate sexual conduct, indecent exposure, and incest. Excluded under this category are forcible rape, prostitution, and commercial vice.

In 1990, there were 1,489 sex crimes other than rape and prostitution reported in Montana. This is literally the same number that was reported in 1989 (1,499).

The most frequent type of sex crime reported in 1990 was cases of physically molesting the victim. Five hundred seventeen (37.6%) of such cases were reported. These were followed by obscene phone calls (32.2%) and cases of indecent exposure (9.2%)

Limited victim data is available on these crimes. Four out of every five victims (81.9%) of these crimes are females with slightly less than half of these being juveniles (45.9% vs 54.0%). Most (60.5%) of the adult females were victimized by obscene phone calls, whereas 70.0% of the juvenile females were physically molested.

About one-fourth of all the sex crimes reported in Montana were cleared by arrest or by exception.



REPORTED CASES



DOMESTIC ABUSE

A person commits the offense of domestic abuse if he: (a) purposely or knowingly causes bodily injury to a family member or household member; or (b) purposely or knowingly causes reasonable apprehension of bodily injury in a family member or household member.

In 1990, 1,660 cases of domestic abuse was reported to local law enforcement authorities in Montana. Since domestic abuse was made a distinct crime in this state in 1987, the number of cases has risen dramatically. The increase in the number of cases this year was 17.6% over the 1989 level.

Domestic abuse is usually classified as a simple assault. In fact, it comprises approximately one-third of these crimes.

Because Montana law specifies that the offender be arrested in domestic abuse cases, the clearance rate is quite high compared to other cases of assault. In 1990, 71.1% of the cases were cleared.

Ninety percent of those arrested for domestic abuse are males. Men between the ages of 26 and 35 make up almost 40% of those arrested.

TABLE 1 1990 SUMMARY OF OFFENSES KNOWN TO LAW ENFORCEMENT

	OFFENSES REPORTED OR KNOWN BY POLICE	CLEARED BY ARREST	% ACTUAL OFFENSES CLEARED BY ARREST
Homicide	30	20	66.7
Rape	159	82	51.6
Robbery	153	50	32.7
Aggravated Assault	812	430	53.0
Total Violent	1154	583	50.4%
Burglary	5,257	709	13.5
Larceny	25,103	4,931	19.6
Motor Vehicle Theft	1,807	504	27.9
Total Property	. 32,167	6,144	19.1%
TOTAL PART I	. 33,321	6,726	20.2%
Negligent Manslaughter	3	3	100.0
Other Assaults	5,875	2,789	47.5
Domestic Abuse*	1,660	1,054	63.5
Arson	265	53	20.0
Forgery	998	306	30.7
Fraud	1,821	611	33.6
Embezzlement	51	24	47.1
Stolen Property	216	31	14.4
Weepere	12,009	1,340	11.2
Prostitution	420	57	80.3
Sex Offenses	1 489	360	24.2
Narcotics	1 414	990	70.0
Gambling	9	2	20.2
Offenses Against Family	544	91	16.7
DUI**	5,156	5,141	99.7
TOTAL PART II***	. 26,376	7,908	30.0%
GRAND TOTAL	. 59,697	14,634	24.5%

* Domestic abuse is considered part of simple assaults. Data from the Billings P.D. not included in Domestic Abuse Statistics.

** DUI's Reported to MUCR. DUI's are only recorded in MUCR as an arrest, thus clearance rates approach 100.0%.

*** Total includes liquor offenses, disorderly conduct, curfew and loitering violations, runaways, and other crimes which are not delineated in the table.

TABLE 2 COMPARISON OF CRIMINAL OFFENSES IN MONTANA 1989 AND 1990

OFFENSE	# REPORTE 1989	D # REPORTEI	D PERCENT CHANGE
Homicide	24	30	25.0
Rane	133	159	19.6
Robbery	137	153	11.7
Aggravated Assault	598	812	35.8
			29.4%
Burglary	5,401	5,257	- 2.7
Larceny	22,652	25,103	10.8
Motor Vehicle Theft	1,818	1,807	- 0.6
Total Property	29,871 .	32,167	7.7%
TOTAL PART I	30.763 .	33.321 .	8.3%
Negligent Manslaughter	0	3	
Other Assaults	5,463	5,875	7.5
Arson	255	265	3.9
Forgery	883	998	13.0
Fraud	1,763	1,821	3.3
Embezzlement	32	51	59.4
Stolen Property	120	216	80.0
Vandalism	10,700	12,009	12.2
Weapons	397	425	7.1
Prostitution	34	71	108.8
Sex Offenses	1,499	1,489	- 0.7
Narcotics	1,325	1,414	6.7
Gambling	27	9	- 66.7
Offenses Against Family	590	544	- 7.8
DUI	2,641	5,156	^A
TOTAL PART II**	23,088 .	26,376 .	14.2%
GRAND TOTAL	75,037 .	18,566 .	10.9%

The percentage increase in DUI's cannot be calculated because the 1990 figure contains figures from the Billings P.D. while the 1989 do not.

** Total includes liquor offenses, disorderly conduct, curfew and loitering violations, runaways, and other crimes which are not delineated in the table.

TABLE 3 PROPERTY LOSSES INCURRED IN CRIMES AGAINST PROPERTY (1990)

	AVERAGE	TOTAL	TOTAL	PERCENT
TYPE OF CRIME	LOSS	LOSS	RECOVERED	RECOVERED
Robbery	\$707	\$82,727	\$2,258	2.7%
Burglary	\$516	\$2,818,814	\$558,000	19.8%
Larceny	\$338	\$7,870,430	\$940,902	12.0%
M V Theft	\$3,871	\$4,676,392	\$3,107,624	66.4%
Vandalism	\$214	\$1,455,572	\$43,614	3.0%
Other	\$539	\$1,349,765	\$1,006,366	74.6%
Total	\$464	\$18,253,700	\$5,658,764	31.0%

* Table does not include \$4,933,697 property lost and \$1,952,807 property recovered in crimes reported to the Billings Police Department.

TABLE 4 FREQUENCY (%) OF USE OF VARIOUS WEAPONS IN THE COMMISSION OF VIOLENT CRIMES IN MONTANA (1990)

TYPE OF VIOLENT CRIME										
WEAPON	HOMICIDE	RAPE	ROBBERY	AG. ASSAULT	TOTAL					
_										
Firearm	68.2%	4.3%	29.5%	26.5%	25.0%					
Knife	4.5%	7.7%	17.4%	25.8%	21.9%					
Other										
Dangerous Weapon	4.5%	0.0%	6.7%	14.0%	11.1%					
Hands, Feet Etc.	18.2%	88.0%	46.7%	33.7%	14.2%					
Unknown	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%					

PERCENTAGE OF REPORTED OFFENSES CLEARED BY ARREST 1981 VS. 1990



AVERAGE ANNUAL PERCENTAGE CHANGE IN THE OCCURANCE RATE OF SELECTED OFFENSES--1981-1990

OFFENSE CATEGORY HOMICIDE RAPE ROBBERY AG. ASSAULT BURGLARY LARCENY MV THEFT SIMPLE ASSAULT VANDALISM SEX OFFENSES DRUG ABUSE --10%-5% 0% 5% 10% 15% 20% 25% 30% 35%

ANNUAL PERCENTAGE CHANGE

TABLE 5 COUNTY RANKINGS WITH RESPECT TO THEIR 1990 CRIME RATE*

County	1990 Crime Rate
Cascade	6906.8
Silver Bow	6378.7
Missoula	6308.5
Yellowstone	5965.4
Flathead	5812.4
Lewis & Clark	5310.0
Hill	4605.2
Deer Lodge	4514.5
State Average	4170.0
Broadwater	4129.0
Lake	3783.1
Big Horn	3475.3
Lincoln	3472.3
Fergus	3178.0
Park	3001.0
Roosevelt	3000.3
Meagher	2858.7
Valley	2840.2
Custer	2812.7
Richland	2696.9
Chouteau	2549.5
Granite	2511.8
Sweet Grass	2187.7
Phillips	2169.3

County	1990 Crime Rate
Powder River	2105.3
Ravalli	2035.2
Madison	2003.7
Carbon	1769.8
Liberty	1699.3
Sheridan	1648.4
Stillwater	1530.0
Toole	1506.1
Rosebud	1304.1
Wheatland	1246.7
Musselshell	1193.4
Pondera	994.9
Sanders	992.0
Mineral	965.3
Daniels	706.1
Blaine	460.8
Teton	398.7
Fallon	386.7
Treasure	228.8
Petroleum	192.7
McCone	175.7
Jetterson	75.6
Golden Valley	0.0

UNRANKED COUNTIES

Beaverhead Carter Dawson Gallatin Garfield Glacier Judith Basin Powell Prairie Wibaux

*Due to the manner in which the crime rate is calculated, it is not currently possible to say that the crime rate in one particular county is <u>significantly</u> higher or lower than another.

TABLE 6 COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICES RANKED WITH RESPECT TO THEIR 1990 CRIME RATES*

	1990
Agency**	Crime Rate
Butte\Silver Bow County S.O.	6378.7
Anaconda/Deer Lodge County S.O.	4514.5
Broadwater County S.O.	4129.0
Flathead County S.O.	4085.9
Big Horn County S.O.	3475.3
Lincoln County S.O.	3448.5
Roosevelt County S.O.	3000.3
Lake County S.O.	2987.1
Missoula County S.O.	2943.9
Meagher County S.O.	2858.7
Yellowstone County S.O.	2797.2
Granite County S.O.	2511.8
Lewis & Clark County S.O.	2412.6
Sweet Grass County S.O.	2187.7
Hill County S.O.	2187.0
Phillips County S.O.	2169.3
Powder River County S.O.	2105.3
Madison County S.Ó.	2003.7
Custer County S.O.	1977.8
Gascade County S.O.	1943.0
Beaverhead County S.O.	1849.8
Gallatin County S.O.	1796.2
Richland County S.O.	1764.0
Sheridan County S.O.	1733.4
Liberty County S.O.	1699.3
Chouteau County S.O.	1555.9
Stillwater County S.O.	1530.0
Toole County S.O.	1506.1
Daniels County S.O.	1438.8
Fergus County S.O.	1359.4
Ravalli County S.O.	1351.4
Rosebud County S.O.	1304.1
Pondera County S.O.	1270.5
Carbon County S.O.	1257.8
Wheatland County S.O.	1246.7
Musselshell County S.O.	1193.4
Sanders County S.O.	1102.0
Mineral County S.O.	965.3
Valley County S.O.	964.2
Park County S.O.	852.3
Dawson County S.O.	552.8
Blaine County S.O.	460.8
Teton County S.O.	398.7
Treasure County S.O.	228.8
Petroleum County S.O.	192.7
McCone County S.O.	175.7
Jefferson County S.O.	30.2
Fallon County S.O.	0.0
-	

Agencies Not Ranked Because of Insufficient Data:

Carter	Co.	S.O.	
Glacier	Co.	S.O.	
Judith	Basi	n Co	. S.O.
Prairie	Cou	nty S	6.O.

Garfield Co. S.O. Golden Valley Co. S.O. Powell Co. S.O. Wibaux County S.O.

TABLE 7 CITY POLICE DEPARTMENTS RANKED WITH RESPECT TO THEIR 1990 CRIME RATES*

1000

		1330
Agency	County	Crime Rate
Kalispell P.D.	Flathead	12310.2
Missoula P.D.	Missoula	9112.7
Great Falls P.D.	Cascade	8942.4
Polson P.D.	Lake	8650.6
Helena P.D.	Lewis & Clark	8058.9
West Yellowstone P.D.	Gallatin	7776.6
Hamilton P.D.	Ravalli	7600.0
Billings P.D.	Yellowstone	7325.8
Whitefish P.D.	Flathead	6776.6
Havre P.D.	Hill	6371.9
Eureka P.D.	Lincoln	6040.3
Livingston P.D.	Park	5521.6
Glasgow P.D.	Valley	5291.2
Lewistown P.D.	Fergus	4990.9
Fort Benton P.D.	Chouteau	4819.3
St. Ignatius P.D.	Lake	4370.2
Sidney P.D.	Richland	3680.3
Red Lodge P.D.	Carbon	3370.8
Miles City P.D.	Custer	3132.0
East Helena P.D.	Lewis & Clark	1690.5
Plentywood P.D.	Sheridan	1544.9
Columbia Falls P.D.	Flathead	1529.6
Laurel P.D.	Yellowstone	1389.4
Ronan P.D.	Ravalli	1098.9
Troy P.D.	Lincoln	1049.3
Baker P.D.	Fallon	660.1
Conrad P.D.	Pondera	657.2
Thompson Falls P.D.	Sanders	379.1
Boulder P.D.	Jefferson	304.0

Agencies Not Ranked Because of Insufficient Data: Bozeman P.D. Dillon P.D. Glendive P.D.

* Due to the manner in which the crime rate is calculated, it is not currently possible to say that the crime rate in one particular county is <u>significantly</u> higher or lower than another.

** Populations served by Sheriff's Offices are defined as those county's populations not served by city or municipal police departments.

TABLE 8 MAJOR OFFENSES REPORTED BY INDIVIDUAL AGENCIES

COUNTY AND ACENCY	1990 POP	CRIME	CRIME	HOMICIDE	DADE	DODDEDV	ACCALUT			MV
	PUP	INDEX	HAIE		FAPE	HUBBERT	ASSAULI	BUNGLANT		********
BEAVERHEAD								10		
Beaverhead S. O.	4433	82. XXX	1849.8	~~~~	×××	×××	1	12	63	6
TOTAL-	8424	82.	XXX	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	~~~~	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	~~~1	12	63	~~~6
BIG HORN	• .= .	•=-	,	•	•	Ť				-
Big Horn S. O.	11337	394.	3475.4	0	5	0	24	99	231	35
TOTAL	11337	394.	3475.4	0	5	0	24	99	231	35
Blaine S. O.	6728	31.	460.8	0	0	0	1	7	21	2
TOTAL	6728	31.	460.8	Õ	õ	Õ	1	7	21	2
BROADWATER	0040	407	4400.0	•					400	0
Broadwater S. U.	3318	137.	4129.0	0	1	0	3	21	103	9
CARBON	3310	137.	4123.0	Ŭ	'	Ū	9	21	100	5
Carbon S. O.	6122	77.	1257.8	1	0	0	0	26	50	0
Red Lodge	1958	66.	3370.8	0	0	0	2	11	51	2
CARTER	8080	143.	1769.8	1	0	0	2	37	101	2
Carter S. O.	1503	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	xxx
TOTAL	1503	0.	XXX	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CASCADE			10100		•					
Cascade S. O. Great Falls	22594	439.	1942.9	0	0	1	14	69 568	330	192
TOTAL	77691	5366.	6906.8	4	15	32	82	637	4388	208
CHOUTEAU										
Chouteau S. O.	3792	59.	1555.9	0	0	0	4	12	37	6
Fort Benton	1660	80.	4819.3	0	1	0	2	3	74	0
CUSTER	5452	139.	2343.3	0	1	Ū	0	15		0
Custer S. O.	3236	64.	1977.8	0	0	0	1	5	56	2
Miles City	8461	265.	3132.0	0	0	0	9	14	230	12
DANIELS	11697	329.	2727.2	0	0	0	10	19	286	14
Daniels S. O.	2266	16.	1438.9	0	0	0	1	3	12	0
TOTAL	2266	16.	1428.9	Ō	Ó	0	1	3	12	0
DAWSON								_		0
Dawson S. U. Glendive	4703	26. XXX	552.9 XXX	XXX	202	XXX	XXX	XXX	21 XXX	XXX
TOTAL-	9505	26.	XXX	0	0	0	0	5	21	0
DEER LODGE				-	-					
Deer Lodge S. O.	10278	464.	4514.5	0	0	0	10	147	290	17
FALLON	10278	464.	4514.5	0	0	0	10	147	290	17
Fallon S. O.	1285	0.	000.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baker	1818	12.	660.1	0	0	0	0	4	8	0
TOTAL	3103	12.	386.7	0	0	0	0	4	8	0
FERGUS Fergus S. O	6032	82	1359.4	0	0	0	1	10	68	3
Lewistown	6051	302.	4990.9	õ	1	1	i	41	245	13
TOTAL	12083	384.	3178.0	0	1	1	2	51	313	16
FLATHEAD	00004					_	40	007	4400	100
Flathead S. U.	39991	1634.	4085.9	0	24	5	16	287	1182	120
Whitefish	4368	296.	6776.6	ő	3	ŏ	2	36	245	10
Kalispell	11917	1467.	12310.2	Ő	6	5	24	123	1240	69
TOTAL	59218	3442.	5812.4	0	33	10	42	449	2707	201
Gallatin S O	26800	483	1706.2	1	2	0	16	104	332	28
Bozeman	22660	XXX	XXX	xxx	xxx	xxx	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
West Yellowstone	913	71.	7776.6	0	0	1	0	8	55	7
MSU Campus Polic	e**XXX	179	XXX	1	2	0	4	14	143	15
TOTAL	50463	733	XXX	1	2	1	16	112	387	35

FOOTNOTE: XXX--Agency did not report crime statistics to the MT Board of Crime Control. All numbers and statistics appearing in this table are based upon the UCR Hierarchial Rule.

TABLE 8 MAJOR OFFENSES REPORTED BY INDIVIDUAL AGENCIES (CONTINUED)

COUNTY AND AGENCY	1990 POP	CRIME	CRIME RATE	HOMICIDE	RAPE	ROBBERY	ASSAULT	BURGLARY	LARCENY	MV THEFT
********************	*******	********	*********	********	*******	**********	**********	**********	***********	*******
GARFIELD Garfield S. O. TOTAL	1589 1589	XXX 0	XXX XXX	XXX 0	XXX 0	XXX 0	XXX 0	XXX 0	XXX 0	XXX 0
GLACIER Glacier S. O. TOTAL	12121 12121	XXX 0	XXX XXX	XXX 0	XXX 0	XXX 0	XXX 0	XXX 0	XXX 0	XXX 0
GOLDEN VALLEY Golden Valley S. O. TOTAL	912 912	XXX 0	XXX XXX	XXX 0	XXX 0	XXX 0	XXX 0	XXX 0	XXX 0	XXX 0
GRANITE Granite S. O. TOTAL	2548 2548	64. 64.	2511.8 2511.8	0 0	0 0	0 0	1 1	20 20	38 38	5 5
HILL Hill S. O. Havre	7453 10201	163. 650.	2187.0 6371.9	0	2 0 2	0 3	6 7	30 32	115 581	10 26
JEFFERSON Jefferson S. O. Boulder	6623 1316	2. 4	30.2 303.9	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
TOTAL JUDITH BASIN	7939	6.	75.6	ŏ	ŏ	ő	i	2	3	ő
TOTAL-	2282	0	2097.1	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	0	0	0	0	0	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
Polson Ronan St. Ignatius	3283 1547 778	284. 17. 34.	8650.6 1098.9 4370.2	0	1 0 0	000	1 0 0	56 0 8	242 209 13 20	90 17 4 6
LEWIS & CLARK Lewis & Clark S. O.	21041	516.	2412.6	0	2	3 1 12	34	121	484 326	32
East Helena TOTAL	1538 47495	26. 2522.	1690.5 5310.0	0	0 5	0 14	0	228 3 352	1338 20 1904	3 104
Liberty S. O. TOTAL-	2295 2295	39. 39.	1699.4 1699.4	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	4 4	31 31	4 4
Lincoln S. O. Eureka Troy	15485 1043 953	534. 63. 10.	3448.5 6040.3 1049.3	1 0 0	4 0 0	2 1 0	18 3 1	109 15 5	362 38 4	38 6 0
MCCONE McCone S. O. TOTAL-	2276 2276	4. 4.	175.8 175.8	0	4 0 0	0 0	0	3	404 1 1	44 0 0
MADISON Madison S. O. TOTAL-	5989 5989	120. 120.	2003.7 2003.7	1 1	0 0	0	4	26 26	78 78	11 11
Meagher S. O. TOTAL-	1819 1819	52. 52.	2858.7 2858.7	0 0	1 1	0 0	1 1	4 4	44 44	2 2
Mineral S. O. TOTAL-	3315 3315	32. 32.	965.3 965.3	0 0	1 1	0 0	3 3	5 5	22 22	1 1
Missoula S. O. Missoula TOTAL	35769 42918 78687	1053. 3911. 4964.	2973.9 9112.7 6308.5	1 5 6	10 30 40	4 13 17	37 83 120	211 469 680	729 3151 3880	61 160 221
MUSSELSHELL Musselshell S. O. TOTAL PARK	4106 4106	49. 49.	1193.4 1193.4	0 0	0 0	0 0	0	27 27	19 19	3 3
Park S. O. Livingston TOTAL-	7861 6701 14562	67. 370. 437.	852.3 5521.6 3001.0	0 0 0	0 1 1	0 1 1	0 8 8	20 43 63	41 300 341	6 17 23

FOOTNOTE: XXX-Agency did not report crime statistics to the MT Board of Crime Control. All numbers and statistics appearing in this table are based upon the UCR Hierarchial Rule.

TABLE 8 MAJOR OFFENSES REPORTED BY INDIVIDUAL AGENCIES (CONTINUED)

COUNTY AND AGENCY POP INDEX HATE HOMOLDE HATE HOBBERY ASSAULT BURGLARY DARLENY PETROLEUM TOTAL- 519 1. 192.7 0 0 0 0 1 0 PHILLIPS TOTAL- 5163 112. 2169.3 0 0 2 7 38 59 TOTAL- 5163 112. 2169.3 0 0 2 7 38 59 PONDERA Pondera S. O. 3542 45. 1270.5 0 0 0 0 4 14 TOTAL 6433 64. 994.9 0 0 0 12 45 POWDER RIVER Powder River S. O. 2090 44. 2105.3 0 0 3 5 36 POWELL Powell S. O. 3242 XXX	MV
PETROLEUM Petroleum S. O. 519 1. 192.7 0 0 0 0 0 1 TOTAL 519 1. 192.7 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 PHILLIPS Phillips S. O. 5163 112. 2169.3 0 0 2 7 38 59 ONDERA	*****
Petroleum S. O. 519 1. 192.7 0 0 0 0 0 1 TOTAL 519 1. 192.7 0 0 0 0 1 0 PHILLIPS	
Phillips S. O. 5163 112. 2169.3 0 0 2 7 38 59 PONDERA	0
PONDERA Pondera S. O. 3542 45. 1270.5 0 0 0 0 8 31 Conrad 2891 19. 65.2 0 0 0 0 4 14 TOTAL 6433 64. 994.9 0 0 0 0 12 45 POWDER RIVER Powder River S. O. 2090 44. 2105.3 0 0 0 3 5 36 POWELL TOTAL 2090 44. 2105.3 0 0 0 3 5 36 POWELL TOTAL 2090 44. 2105.3 0 0 0 3 5 36 POWELL TOTAL 2090 44. 2105.3 0 0 0 0 3 5 36 POWELL TOTAL 2090 44. 2105.3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Deer Lodge 3378 XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX XX	6
Conrad 2891 19. 65.2 0 0 0 0 4 14 TOTAL 6433 64. 994.9 0 0 0 0 12 45 POWDER RIVER - - - - - - - - - 45 Powder River S. O. 2090 44. 2105.3 0 0 0 3 5 36 TOTAL 2090 44. 2105.3 0 0 0 3 5 36 POWELL -	6
POWDER RIVER Powder River S. O. 2090 44. 2105.3 0 0 0 3 5 36 TOTAL 2090 44. 2105.3 0 0 0 3 5 36 POWELL	1 7
POWder Hver S. O. 2090 44. 2105.3 0 0 0 3 5 36 TOTAL 2090 44. 2105.3 0 0 0 3 5 36 POWELL Powell S. O. 3242 XXX	•
Powell S. O. 3242 XXX <	ő
Deer Lodge 3378 XXX XXX <th< td=""><td>∞</td></th<>	∞
TOTAL 6620 XXX 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 PRAIRIE Prairie S. O. 1383 XXX XXX <td< td=""><td>XXX</td></td<>	XXX
Prairie S. O. 1383 XXX	
TOTAL 1383 XXX XXX 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	xxx
BAVALLI	0
Ravalli S. O. 22273 301. 1351.4 0 0 1 14 48 224	14
Hamilton 2737 208. 7599.6 0 0 0 3 17 180	8
TOTAL 25010 509. 2035.2 0 0 1 17 65 404 RICHLAND	22
Richland S. O. 5499 97, 1763.9 1 0 0 5 18 66	7
Sidney 5217 192. 3680.3 0 1 1 3 15 159	13
TOTAL 10716 289. 2696.9 1 1 1 1 8 33 225	20
ROUSEVELT Roosevelt S. O. 10999 330 3000.3 0 0 0 12 89 207	22
TOTAL 10999 330. 3000.3 0 0 0 12 89 207	22
ROSEBUD	
Rosebud S. O. 10505 137. 1304.1 0 0 0 0 24 104	9
SANDERS	3
Sanders S. O. 7350 81. 1102.0 0 1 0 4 32 34	10
Thompson Falls 1319 5. 379.0 0 0 0 0 1 4	0
TUTAL 8669 86. 992.0 0 1 0 4 33 38 SHERIDAN	10
Sheridan S. O. 2596 45. 1733.4 0 0 0 1 17 26	1
Plentywood 2136 33. 1544.9 0 0 0 0 5 27	1
TOTAL 4732 78. 1859.7 0 0 0 1 22 53	2
SILVER BOW Butte /Silver Bow 33941 2165 6378.7 0 1 8 109 359 1583	105
TOTAL 33941 2165. 6378.7 0 1 8 109 359 1583	105
STILLWATER	
Stillwater S. O. 6536 100. 1529.9 0 0 1 0 24 65	10
SWEET GRASS	10
Sweet Grass S. O. 3154 69. 2187.7 0 0 0 0 23 46	0
TOTAL 3154 69. 2187.7 0 0 0 0 23 46	0
IEIUN Tetop S O 6271 25 2087 0 0 0 2 9 13	1
TOTAL 6271 25. 398.7 0 0 0 2 9 13	1
TOOLE	
Toole S. O. 5046 76. 1506.1 0 0 0 5 19 45	7
TOTAL 5046 /6. 1506.1 0 0 0 5 19 45	
Treasure S. O. 874 2. 228.8 0 0 0 0 1 0	1
TOTAL 874 2. 228.8 0 0 0 0 1 0	1
VALLEY	2
Glasgow 3572 189 5291.1 0 1 1 1 31 143	12
TOTAL 8239 234. 2840.2 1 1 1 1 54 161	15

FOOTNOTE: XXX-Agency did not report crime statistics to the MT Board of Crime Control. All numbers and statistics appearing in this table are based upon the UCR Hierarchial Rule.

TABLE 8 MAJOR OFFENSES REPORTED BY INDIVIDUAL AGENCIES (CONTINUED)

COUNTY AND AGENCY	1990 POP	CRIME INDEX	CRIME RATE	HOMICIDE	RAPE	ROBBERY	ASSAULT	BURGLARY	LARCENY	MV THEFT
	********	*********	*********		********					
Wheetland S O	2246	28	1246 7	0	0	0	1	6	21	0
TOTAL -	2246	20.	1246.7	ő	õ	õ	1	ã	21	ő
WIRALIX	2240	20.	1240.7	0	Ŭ	Ŭ		U	2.	Ŭ
Wibaux S O	1191	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
TOTAL-	1191	XXX	XXX	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
YELLOWSTONE										
Yellowstone S. O.	26634	745.	2797.2	4	2	7	19	159	496	58
Billings	81151	5945.	7325.9	7	33	47	96	1089	4304	369
Laurel	5686	79.	1389.4	0	0	0	2	6	65	6
TOTAL	113471	6769.	6183.4	11	35	54	117	1254	4865	433
STATEWIDE TOTALS	799065	33321.	4170.0	30	159	153	812	5257	25103	1807

FOOTNOTE: XXX-Agency did not report crime statistics to the MT Board of Crime Control. All numbers and statistics appearing in this table are based upon the UCR Hierarchial Rule.

** MSU Campus Police statistics are not included in the sub-totals and total calculations.

*** In addition, the following towns have police departments but crime statistics are incorporated into the county sheriff's crime statistics: Chinook, Harlem, Fromberg, Joliet, Ekalaka, Belt, Cascade, Three Forks, Manhattan, Belgrade, Browning, Cut Bank, Drummond, Whitehall, Circle, Terry, Stevenville, Pinesdale, Darby, Farview, Hot Springs, Plains, Columbus, Choteau, Fairfield, and Opheim.

JUVENILE JUSTICE

Montana's Juvenile Justice System

Montana' s Juvenile Justice System allows youth to be given consideration not available to adults and, at the same time, denies them some of the constitutional rights that adults have. In Youth Court, juveniles are found to be "delinquent" or "in need of supervision", but are not "convicted" of specific crimes. In this sense then, a Youth Court is part of each District Court, but operates as a civil rather than a criminal process.

A youth may be found to be Delinquent only if he has committed an act which is criminal for an adult. Burglary, assault, or shoplifting can all lead to a finding of Delinquency. Youth in Need of Supervision (YINS) are those

GENERAL YOUTH COURT ACTIVITY--1990



Source: JPIS Year End Report, 1990

youth who have committed non-criminal acts such as running away, being "ungovernable" or violating curfew. These are only "crimes" because of the youth's age. They are commonly referred to as "status" offenses.

General Activity

The activities of Montana's Youth Courts and Juvenile Probation Offices is typically measured in four components:

1. <u>The Number of Cases</u>—the number of <u>individual</u> <u>youth</u> who become involved with the juvenile justice system for some reason, criminal or not. In 1990, 4,721 youth were processed by Youth Courts in Montana. About two-thirds of the cases were males.

2. <u>The Number of Referrals</u>—the number of youth <u>encounters</u> with the juvenile justice system. An individual can be referred more than once during the year. In 1990, Youth Courts and Probation Offices handled 6,010 referrals.

3. <u>The Number of Offenses</u>—the number of <u>crimes</u> attributed to youths who have been referred to the system. In 1990, Montana had 8,155 criminal and status offenses reported to probation offices which were attributed to juveniles.

4. <u>The number of detentions</u>—the number of <u>times</u> <u>youths are confined</u> awaiting court action. Because youth facilities are not generally available in Montana, this usually means being locked up in the local jail. During the course of a year, a single youth may be confined more than once. In 1990, 231 youth were detained 278 times.

Although 4,721 youths, or cases, were handled by Youth Courts in Montana in 1990, it must be emphasized that they only constitute 4% of the youth estimated to be at risk in the state.

The caseload on the juvenile justice system in Montana appears to have peaked in 1986 when 5,601 cases, 7,215 referrals, and 9,925 juvenile offenses were reported. The graph on the next page shows that since that time, there has been a gradual decrease in all of these measures. The 1990 statistics show only very small decreases in reported cases, referrals, and offenses from the previous years. The

TABLE 9 1990 SUMMARY OF JUVENILE REFERALS (DELINQUENCY CASES)

REASON FOR REFERRAL	NUMBER OF CASES	PERCENT	RATE PER 1000 POP. <u>AT RISK</u>
CRIMES AGAINST PERSONS			
Homicide	1	0.0	0.0
Rape	16	0.4	0.1
Robbery	2	0.0	0.0
Aggravated Assault	22	0.6	0.2
Simple Assault	299	7.9	2.6
Other Person Offenses	3	0.1	0.0
	. 343	9.1%	2.9/0
CRIMES AGAINST PROPERTY			
Burglary	206	5.5	1.8
Larceny	1.550	41.0	13.3
Motor Vehicle Theft	123	3.3	1.1
Arson and Vandalism	568	15.0	4.9
Stolen Property Offenses	31	0.8	0.3
Trespassing	248	6.6	2.1
Other Property Offenses	52	1.4	0.4
Total Property	2,778	73.5%	19.1%
OFFENSES ACAINST THE DUDUC OD			
Weapons	22	0.6	0.2
Sex Offenses	75	2.0	0.2
Driving Under the Influence	8	0.2	0.0
Disturbing the Peace	219	5.8	1.9
Escape, Contempt, Probation, etc.	76	2.0	0.7
Traffic Crimes	30	0.8	0.0
Other Offenses Against Public Ord	ler 139	3.7	1.2
Total Public Order	. 569	15.1	4.9%
DRUG OFFENSES	00	0.4	0.0
Substance Abuse	89	2.4	0.8
Total Diug Olienses		∠.4	0.0%
GRAND TOTAL	3,779	100.0%	32.5%

GENERAL YOUTH COURT ACTIVITY 1982-1990



Source: JPIS Year End Reports

number of pre-trial detentions had actually increased 11% from 1989.

Roughly 80% (81.3%) of the youth involved with the probation system were involved a single time during the year. Thirteen percent had two encounters; 3.7%, three encounters; 0.9%, four encounters, and 0.7%, five or more encounters. Again, the overwhelming majority of Montana's youth who have had an encounter with the system, have only one.

It is the repetitive cases which become the more serious offenders. There were 1.4 offenses reported for every case handled. While repeaters accounted for 18.7% of the referrals, they were also responsible for 33.3% of the offenses reported.

The 278 pre-trial detentions which occurred in 1990 constituted 4.6% of all Juvenile Probation referrals; the 231 youth, 4.9% of all cases handled.

Rate of Referral by Age and Sex

The rate of referral per 1,000 youth at risk for each age and sex can be used to identify critical age-sex groups and predict potential changes in Youth Court activities.

In general, the same pattern can be observed from year to year. This year, 1990, is no different. For both sexes, the referral rate generally shows up as an increasing straight line from about age 12 through 15. For females, the rate peaks at age 15, levels off at age 16, and then shows a decrease at age 17. For males, it continues to increase in the 15, 16, and 17-year old age group. Over the last three years, a definite decrease in the referral rate can be seen across all age groups. In 1985, for example, the referral rate for 17-year old

RATE OF REFERRAL PER 1,000 YOUTH BY AGE AND SEX--1990





TABLE 10 1990 SUMMARY OF JUVENILE REFERALS (STATUS CASES)

REASON FOR REFERRAL	NUMBER OF CASES	PERCENT	RATE PER 1000 POP. AT RISK
Runaways	343	15.7	2.9
Curfew/Loitering	380	17.4	3.3
Ungovernable	353	16.2	3.0
Liquor	1,042	47.7	9.0
Other Status Offenses	66	3.0	0.6
TOTAL STATUS OFFENSES	2,184	100.0%	18.8

TABLE 11 COMPARISON OF JUVENILE DELIQUENCY OFFENSES IN MONTANA 1989 AND 1990

OFFENSE	# REPORTED 1989	# REPORTED 1990	PERCENT CHANGE
Crimes Against Persons	347	343	-1.1%
Crimes Against Property	2,945	2,778	-5.7%
Crimes Against Public Order	764	569	-25.5%
Drug Offenses	94	89	-5.3%
Total Delinquent	4,150	3,779	8.9%
Status Offenses	2,615	2,184	- 16.5%
Total Juvenile Offenses	6,854	6,010	12.3%

males was 187.5, in 1988, 178.4; in 1989, 164.9; and in 1990, 134.4.

In 1990, there were 67.8 referrals for each 1,000 males, and 35.9 referrals for each 1,000 females. Seventeen year old males experienced the highest rate. They accounted for 811 referrals (20.1% of the male total and 13.4% of the overall total) for a rate of 134.4 referrals per 1,000 population. For females, the fifteen year old group experienced the highest rate—66.2 referrals per 1,000 population. This group has 394 encounters which make up 20.0% of the total female referrals.

Source of Referral

Law enforcement authorities are the primary referral source for delinquent youth in Montana. In 1990, police departments and sheriff's offices accounted for 94.3% of all referrals. Over the years, local law enforcement has traditionally provided the bulk of referrals to the juvenile justice system. The remaining 5.7% is composed of a wide variety of referral sources including the State Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks, tribal courts, parents, and school officials.

Reason for Referral

Currently five major categories or reasons for referral make up the total number of referrals to the Youth Court:

1) <u>Crimes against persons</u> include criminal homicide, forcible rape, robbery, and both aggravated and simple assault. In 1990, the juvenile justice system handled 343 referrals which involved crimes against persons.



Total number of referrals made = 6010

NUMBER OF REFERRALS BY MAJOR CATEGORY (1983-1990)



2) Property crimes include burglary, larceny, motor vehicle theft, arson and vandalism, receiving and possessing stolen property, and trespassing. In 1990, Montana youth were referred 2,778 times for property crimes.

3) Offenses against the public order include weapon offenses, sex offenses, driving under the influence of intoxicants, disturbing the peace (disorderly conduct), traffic crimes, and court and justice system offenses (escape, contempt, probation, and parole violations). In 1990, 569 referrals for offenses against public order were processed.

4) Status offenses include those offenses which strictly pertain to juveniles. They include runaways, curfew violations, ungovernable, and liquor violations. In 1990, there were 2,184 referrals made for these offenses in Montana.

5) Drug offenses. In 1990, 89 referrals were made for substance abuse in the state.

As indicated above, most juvenile referrals in Montana are primarily for property crimes (46.2% in 1990) or for status offenses (36.3% in 1990). Referrals for offenses against public order accounted for 9.4% and crimes against persons for 5.7%. Drug offenses were involved only 1.5% of the time.

Crimes against property and those against public order have both been on the decrease since 1987. Crimes against persons, drug abuse offenses, and status offenses hit a high in 1988 and have decreased slightly in the last year.

Referral Offenses

The twelve most frequent types of specific offenses which result in a referral to youth court accounted for approximately 80% of all the referrals made in 1990. These 12 offenses make up 78.7% of the male referrals and 86.3% of the female referrals.

Although the top twelve offenses are the same for either sex, their ranking is different. The most common reason for a juvenile to appear in youth court still remains illegal possession or a liquor violation. The use of alcohol by Montana's youth accounts for 17% of the juvenile referrals in Montana. Otherwise there are significant differences in the type of offenses committed by the two sexes. Males, for example, tend to be more involved in property crimes (misdemeanor theft, shoplifting, criminal mischief or vandalism, and burglary) whereas a substantial proportion of the females are referred for status offenses (curfew, ungovernable, and runaways).

The Number of Detentions and Their Trend

The number of pre-trial youth detentions which occurred in Montana during the last seven years can be separated in to the major types of offenders-status offenders and delinguents. In both cases, the number has dropped dramatically in recent years. The total number of youth detentions in 1990 was 278, up from 240 in 1989.

About 20% of the detentions involved status offenders. Slightly over half of these status offenders were runaways.

It is a major goal of the Youth Services Advisory Council to eventually reduce the detention of status offenders to

Offenses Committed by Montana

Offenses Committed by Montana Female Juveniles--1990







Source: JPIS Year End Reoporta 1990

zero. A major impediment to attaining this goal lies in the small numbers of youth involved and the vastness of the geographical area to be covered. These two problems combine to prevent effective and cost efficient solutions from being developed. Most of the status offenders currently being held are now generally held less than 24 hours or are residents of other jurisdictions (i.e. runaways).

The general trend in youthful detentions is downward for all types of referrals.

Disposition of Juvenile Offenders

Considering that 80% of the youths appearing before youth court are first offenders, the punishment meted out by the court seems appropriate. Overall, it seems there is bias toward leniency. Over 30% of the juvenile cases in 1990 resulted in a warning (11.9%), a workorder (10.2%), or probation (12.6%). Boys are more apt to be sentenced to probation or work whereas girls would get a warningalthough these differences are slight and probably not statistically significant. Restitution is also heavily used-presumably in cases of property crime. About 8% of all juvenile cases are disposed of by demanding restitution.

There is a difference in the percentage of cases institutionalized. Proportionally, more than twice as many boys are sent to Pines Hills (1.2%) as are girls sent to Mountain View (0.5%). Overall, 1% of the cases result in the youth being institutionalized.

There also seems a tendency for judges in district courts to customize the sentences wherever possible. Individual court programs are used in sentencing juveniles in almost 10 percent of the cases appearing before them.



EIGHT YEAR TREND IN DETENTION BY TYPE OF OFFENDER 1983-1990





zero. A major impediment to attaining this goal lies in the small numbers of youth involved and the vastness of the geographical area to be covered. These two problems combine to prevent effective and cost efficient solutions from being developed. Most of the status offenders currently being held are now generally held less than 24 hours or are residents of other jurisdictions (i.e. runaways).

The general trend in youthful detentions is downward for all types of referrals.

Disposition of Juvenile Offenders

Considering that 80% of the youths appearing before youth court are first offenders, the punishment meted out by the court seems appropriate. Overall, it seems there is bias toward leniency. Over 30% of the juvenile cases in 1990 resulted in a warning (11.9%), a workorder (10.2%), or probation (12.6%). Boys are more apt to be sentenced to probation or work whereas girls would get a warningalthough these differences are slight and probably not statistically significant. Restitution is also heavily used-presumably in cases of property crime. About 8% of all juvenile cases are disposed of by demanding restitution.

There is a difference in the percentage of cases institutionalized. Proportionally, more than twice as many boys are sent to Pines Hills (1.2%) as are girls sent to Mountain View (0.5%). Overall, 1% of the cases result in the youth being institutionalized.

There also seems a tendency for judges in district courts to customize the sentences wherever possible. Individual court programs are used in sentencing juveniles in almost 10 percent of the cases appearing before them.



EIGHT YEAR TREND IN DETENTION BY TYPE OF OFFENDER 1983-1990



Contributed Articles & Analyses

Understanding and Interpreting Crime Statistics by Daniel P. Doyle, Ph.D.

Racial Discrimination in the Juvenile Justice System Of Montana by Nella R. Lee, Ph.D.

> Shoplifting Profile by Sgt. Ken Grady

A Comparison of Attitudes toward the Criminal Justice System by Barbara McMorris

The Drug Abuse Resistance Education Program in Montana by Fred E. Fisher



Understanding and Interpreting Crime Statistics

by Daniel P. Doyle, Ph.D.

Dr. Daniel P. Doyle is currently an assistant professor of sociology teaching in the criminology program at the University of Montana. He received his bachelor's degree from U.C.L.A. and his masters and doctorial degrees at the University of Washington. In recent years he has done research on the causes of intercity differences in crime, the criminal victimization of older persons, and the escalation of disputes into violent encounters.

Introduction

Many of the crime statistics in this publication are presented in a way that allows comparisons to be made-comparisons with regard to the amount of crime in different jurisdictions, comparisons with regard to relative frequency of different types of crime, or comparisons with regard to changes in the amount of crime in a given area down through the years. While such comparisons can be very useful in charting general crime trends, it must be noted that these comparisons need to be done with great caution. By taking the crime statistics presented at face value, it is easy to jump to conclusions that may not be warranted. It is important to be aware of the limitations of crime statistics before using such statistics to draw conclusions regarding which communities have the most crime or whether crime is increasing or decreasing. The purpose of this essay is to explain how crime statistics are derived and to discuss some of their limitations so that the reader can better interpret the information presented in Crime in Montana.

The Calculation of Crime Statistics

Throughout most of this publication, two types of crime statistics are presented: the number of reported offenses (the incidence of crime) and the number of reported offenses per 100,000 population (the rate of crime). The incidence of crime is simply the total number of offenses recorded. For example, the incidence of homicide for the state of Montana as a whole in 1990 is 30. The crime index presented for each jurisdiction in Table 8 is the incidence of homicide,

rape, robbery, assault, burglary, larceny, and motor vehicle theft within a given jurisdiction. It is calculated by simply adding up the number of reported offenses of these seven types that occurred in a given jurisdiction.

While it is important to know the incidence of crime, the incidence statistics do not help us to understand where one area has more or less crime than another or whether crime is going up or down. It is not surprising, for example, that the Billings Police Department has recorded more burglaries than has the Miles City Police Department since Billings has a population that is nearly ten times as large as Miles City. The calculation of crime rates facilitates comparisons between jurisdictions of unequal population or comparisons across time in a given jurisdiction when the population of that area has changed. The rate of crime (or crime rate) is based on a ratio of the incidence of crime over the appropriate population for the rate. Thus the rate of robbery for Montana as a whole is derived by dividing the total number of reported robberies in the state (153) by the population of the state (799,065). The results of this calculation (0.00019) has traditionally been multiplied by 100,000 for convenience in presentation. Thus, the statewide robbery rate for 1990 is 19.14 per 100,000 population.

From the above discussion it should be clear that most statistics presented in <u>Crime in Montana</u> are based on one or both of two pieces of information—the incidence of crimes reported in a given area and the population of a given area. There are difficulties involved in deriving accurate estimates of each of these two pieces of information. Each will be discussed in turn below.

THE COMPONENTS OF BURGLARY CRIME STATISTICS FOR TWO MONTANA COMMUNITIES



Problems with Estimating the incidence of Crime

It is impossible to know the true incidence of crime in Montana or in any particular county, city, or town in the state. By its very nature, crime is the kind of activity that those who commit it (and sometimes even those who are victimized by it) try to keep secret. The incidence of crime in a given area is estimated by adding up the number of crimes in that area that become known to the police. Crimes become known to the police in a variety of ways. In the vast majority of cases, the victim of the crime or a witness contacts the police. Sometimes, by much less frequency, the police uncover crime in the course of routine patrol or a proactive investigation.

The fact that the estimates of the incidence of crime are based primarily on crimes reported to the police by victims or witnesses is problematic. For a variety of reasons, people do not always report crimes to the police. In fact the U.S. Department of Justice estimates that only about 1/3 of serious crimes are ever reported. Some crime victims fear retaliation if they report. Others are reluctant to report a crime committed by a family member or acquaintance. Others may not want to report a crime if it occurred while the victim was engaged in a criminal activity. Others believe that reporting the crime is not worth the time and trouble involved. Still other victims may not even realize that they have been victimized. And sometimes the victim may feel (or fear being made to feel) embarrassed or ashamed. For all of these reasons and more, the majority of offenses never become known to the police and thus never become part of the official incidence statistics.

If the proportion of crimes reported to the police is consistent across all jurisdictions, the fact that there is significant underreporting would be less troublesome. But it is not known if this is the case. It is very possible that the proportion of crimes reported varies by community. This means that if the incidence of crime recorded for one community is higher than that in a second community, it may not be due to there being more crime in the first than the second. It is entirely possible that the two communities have the same incidence of crime or even that there is more crime in the second community if those in the first community are more likely to report crimes to the police.

The fact that some crimes are uncovered by the police also leads to problems when trying to estimate the true incidence of crime. Due to differences in available resources, local police may be more or less able to carry out the kinds of patrol activities or investigations that are likely to uncover certain kinds of crime. Because they are unlikely to be reported by the participants, prostitution, drug offenses, and illegal gambling are examples of crimes that are often discovered only through proactive investigation by the police. It is entirely possible that one community may record a higher incidence of certain crimes than a second not because the true incidence is higher in the first community but rather because the police in the first community have been more able to seek out the crimes. It is ironic that police departments that institute special enforcement efforts focusing on a particular crime often wind up showing a higher incidence of that crime in the statistics because, compared to other police departments, they have been more effective in ferreting out occurrences of the crime.

In addition to the problems cited to this point, it should be noted that the incidence of crime in a given community will be affected by a host of other factors that are largely outside of the control of the police or local officials. Criminologists have long known that certain aspects of community structure can inflate or deflate the incidence of crime in the area. For example, most serious crimes are committed by relatively young males. Further, the typical victim of a serious crime is also relatively young. This means that communities comprised of a relatively high proportion of persons in their late teens and twenties would be expected to exhibit a higher incidence of crime. Other factors that tend to be associated with an increase in criminal victimization include: a high proportion of males; a high proportion of low-income, minority persons; a large amount of population turnover; and high rates of unemployment.

Problems with Estimating the Appropriate Population

The fact that crime rates are calculated by dividing the incidence of recorded crime in an area by the population of that area introduces another set of difficulties, especially if we want to compare crime rates across different communities or across different points in time. The problem lies in the fact that it is often difficult to estimate what population base should be used as the denominatior of the equation. Problems arise because the exact number of residents in an area is often not known. Further, even if we do know the number of residents in an area, this figure may not accurately reflect the number of potential criminals and victims located there at any given point in time. Because population is the denominator in the formula used to calculate crime rates, underestimating population will result in an overestimation of the crime rate while overestimating population will result in an underestimation of the crime rate.

The population estimates used in <u>Crime in Montana</u> are provided by the Federal Bureau of Investigation based on the decennial census carried out by the U.S. Bureau of the Census (See Appendix 2). Questions have been raised with regard to the accuracy of the 1990 census as well as those carried out in earlier years. It appears that there has been a significant undercount of the population of Montana. Again, what makes this especially troublesome is the fact that the undercount may be more serious in some communities than in others. Nationally, officials from larger cities have claimed that the undercount is a more serious problem for cities because of the presence of greater numbers of illegal aliens, transcients, and homeless persons who are less likely to have been included in the census count. This also might be the case in the larger cities in Montana. But an argument could also be made

that undercounting is a serious problem in the isolated rural areas of Montana.

Since a complete census is conducted only every ten years, the population estimates for the noncensus years are based on an extrapolation from the population figures of earlier years. While this procedure will usually result in fairly accurate figures for the state as a whole, it does introduce more error into the calculation of crime rates, especially within local communities that are experiencing relatively rapid population growth or loss.

Even if the population figures based on the census are fairly accurate, another problem results from the fact that those counted in the census, the resident population, may represent only a portion of potential criminals and victims present in the community. Some communities serve as regional centers that attract many people on a day to day basis who are not actual residents. The city of Missoula is a good example. While its resident population is just under 43,000, the number of persons actually in the city (and thus potential criminals or victims) is probably much larger. Missoula attracts people from throughout werstern Montana and beyond who go there to attend the University of Montana, shop in the mall and other shopping districts, to get medical care that is not available elsewhere, etc. Interstate 90 also brings many nonresidents into Missoula every day. The same may be true of several other cities in Montana. Something similar can happen in many of the state's smaller towns that experience a large influx of tourists. In many of these places, the crime rate is artificially inflated because the actual number of persons at risk of victimiazation is much higher than the census figures would lead one to believe.

Conclusion

Statistics on the incidence and rates of crime provide useful information for the public, for reserarchers, and for criminal justice professionals. But the limitations of such statistics must be kept in mind. Such official statistics provide a good starting point but a more thorough understanding of crime requires a more thorough analysis. If a particular community exhibits an unusually high rate of a specific crime, it is necessary to investigate further in order to understand why that might be the case. Perhaps it would be advisable to look closely at the characteristics of the community and to interview local officials. If statistics show a large increase in crime in a particular area, it would be advisable to examine whether the increase is real or is a function of an increase in reporting or an increase in police activity. Conducting victim surveys can increase understatnding of those crimes that never come to the attention of the police. Clearly crime is an important problem that detracts from the quality of life in Montana. If progress is to be made in solving the crime problem, our understanding of its dimensions must go beyond the superficial.



Racial Discrimination in the Juvenile Justice System of Montana

by Nella R. Lee, Ph.D.

Dr. Lee received the Ph.D. in Criminal Justice from Rutgers University and was the S. I. Newhouse Fellow at the S. I. Newhouse Center for Law & Justice, Rutgers University. Dr. Lee's research has been in the area of effects of Western legalism on Native cultures, and the role of cultural assimilation linked to social disorganization. She is currently teaching at Montana State University in Bozeman.

Racial discrimination in both the adult and juvenile justice system has been the subject of research for at least four decades. Over representation of minority populations have been found at every stage of criminal processing. There appears to be even more discrimination in the juvenile justice system than in the adult system (Pope 1990).

Pope (1984) found that for black youth crime, race effects were far more pronounced in processing juveniles than adults. McCarthy and Smith (1986) found an amplification effect for minority youths processed through the juvenile system. That is, initial screening decisions were not discriminatory, but later decisions were. Amplification effects have also been reported by Fenwick (1982) and Fagan, et al (1987). Other researchers have found distinct patterns of disposition depending on the juvenile court jurisdiction and organizational setting (Aday 1986).

Race influences initial detention decisions and whether a youth is detained influences all subsequent decisions, because detained youth receive the most severe dispositions (Frazier & Cochran 1986). This finding is supported, as well, by Bortner & Reed (1985), Marshall & Thomas (1983), Thornberry & Christenson (1984), and Frazier & Bishop (1985).

Most of these research findings relate to Black and Hispanic youth, but there is evidence that American Indians also experience differential treatment in the justice system. In South Dakota, American Indians comprise only 6.5% of the general population but account for approximately 33% of the prison population. In Montana, American Indians comprise 4.7% of the general population but account for 20% of the prison population. From 1950 to

Comparison of Juvenile Referral Rates Between Indians and Non-Indians

FIGURE 1



Year

Race

Source: Juvenile Probation Info System Statewide Statistics--Montana 1987-1989

34

1968, the American Indian arrest rate was three times that of blacks and ten times that of whites (Taft 1981). A study of American Indians in the Minnesota justice system found that 22% of whites arrested were held while 43% of American Indians were held. The same percentage was displayed in conviction rates. In sentencing, 51% of whites received probation, compared to 32% of American Indians (Benjamin & Nam Kim 1979). While Native Americans experience far higher arrest rates, conviction rates, and longer sentences, they are much less involved in violent or felony property offenses (Benjamin & Nam Kim 1979; Peak 1989).

all others, and statistical differences of means tests applied to the two data groups.

The results are statistically significant and show racial disparity, not only in arrest rates, but also at other points in the process. This disparity may be a product of amplification effects reterred to earlier, but further research needs to be conducted to clarify this issue.

Native Americans are arrested more often than non-Natives (1.2 times), are arrested for status offenses more often (1.5 times), are less likely to be diverted (1.2 times), are less likely to be sheltered (1.3 times), are locked up more often (2.0 times), are prosecuted more often (1.2



Source: Juvenile Probation Into System

Statewide Statistics--Montana 1987-1989

FIGURE 2 Comparison of Criminal Offenses

Source: Juvenile Propation Info System

CURFEW VIOLATIONS

UNGOVERNABLE

The foregoing discussion of racial discrimination is meant to demonstrate various ways in which the justice system metes out disparate treatment. The juvenile justice system in Montana is no exception where Native Americans are concerned. The patterns of discrimination are strikingly similar to those found by other researchers in different states.

The research undertaken by the Montana Crime Control Board encompassed three years of data (1987-1989) on all juveniles processed through the system. Data items included arrest offenses, diversion, prosecution, disposition, and institutionalization. Data were categorized into two groups of juveniles by race, i.e., Native Americans and

times), are prosecuted as status offenders more often (2.0 times), are less likely to be returned as a runaway (2.6 times), are given probation less often (1.4 times), and are given private agency commitment more often (2.2 times).

It would appear from the data that outcomes of arrest for Native American youth are more serious than for non-Natives, yet arrests and prosecution for delinquent acts are almost identical for the two groups.

The significant area of racial discrimination is in status offenses and processing of status offenders. Once arrested, Native Americans are disproportionately processed through the system. This speaks to the issue of amplification, but it may be related to juvenile court jurisdiction and



1.43

1.66

1.5

2

4

6

ANNUAL NO. OF REFERRALS/1000 POP

BACE INDIANS MON-INDIANS

8

10

0.67

0.35

3.74

FIGURE 3

Statewide Statistics--Montana 1987-1989

OTHER

FIGURE 4 Comparison of Different Types of Disposition in Juvenile Cases



SOURCE: Juvenile Probation Info System Statewide Statistics--Montana 1987-1989

organizational settings, as well, since judicial districts in Montana showed marked differences in amounts of racial discrimination from the point of arrest on.

It appears that some judicial districts are more punitive in disposition of status offenders than other judicial districts, and this leads to over representation of Native American juveniles in lock-up and prosecution rates. It also leads to less use of probation as a sanction for Natives. While this research is very preliminary, it does provide statistical support that race effects exist in the juvenile justice system. Further efforts to identify direct and indirect effects of race at specific decision points need to be undertaken, especially for those arrested as status offenders.



Shoplifting Profile

by Sgt. Ken Grady, Great Falls Police Department

Ken Grady has been a law enforcement officer in Great Falls for the past eighteen years. He is a graduate of the College of Great Falls majoring in Sociology and has been involved with Crime Prevention for the last twelve years. He has done extensive work with businesses to assist in their shrinkage problems and has taught eight-hour seminars in the State of Montana on the subject. He is currently conducting seminars through the Great Falls Vocational Institute on shoplifting.

Shoplifting is an interesting area because it involves people of all ages, whether they be young or old, rich or poor, male or female. This is one of the reasons it makes it difficult for the businesses to identify the shoplifter by appearance. It is estimated nationwide that one of fifty to sixty customers that enter a store will take an item without paying for it. There is no doubt that this statistic is in the general area of what shoplifters are doing in the state of Montana.

However, there are a number of things that the business can do to reduce its losses. A well educated sales staff is the best prevention you can have. A sales staff that knows body language, such as body and head movements, knows how and when to greet the customers as they enter the store, and knows how to approach customers when the need arises. This is the best place to start, with the employee and their understanding of what to do.

Management must meet regularly at staff meetings and devote a portion of their meetings to discuss theft. The employee needs to be reminded over and over so they know that this is also part of their daily work even though customer service is number one.

I read an article some years past where a store owner had placed small signs throughout his business. The signs stated "Keep Watching." The store owner stated this worked very well for his employees to read when stacking shelves and assisting the customers. These signs worked on the subconscious and without actually knowing, was continual education. The proprietor at this store stated that this simple message did reduce his

REPORTED SHOPLIFTING INCIDENTS IN MONTANA



SOURCE: 1982-1989 MUCR Data

shrinkage. So you can see that constant reminders are important in keeping the employee aware of the importance of reducing losses.

Let us drop back a few years and look at merchandising and how it has changed over the years. Around 1900, the customers would enter the store and someone would almost always wait on them. This changed and became a thing of the past when Frank Woolworth of the Five and Ten Stores started the first open store if you wish. This was where customers were allowed to better see and touch items on counters. The idea behind this move was that store personnel need not be there when the customers shopped for the goods. This removed the barriers between the customer and the merchandise. Woolworth also knew there would be risks involved with this type of self service and the temptation to steal would be greater. He felt the volume of business and the profit margin would be high to overcome the losses of theft. He was right as his businesses flourished throughout the U.S.

In the early days of the neighborhood corner grocery, we found some of the same things. The customer would bring in a list of goods they needed and the proprietor or his wife would assist in filling the order. Many times the counter was located so most of the goods were positioned conveniently for the owner and not the customer. This lessened the temptation to steal. You know the owner and the owner knew you on a first name basis. It wasn't until after the 1930s that super markets started to emerge throughout the country. This gave the customer an opportunity to browse and touch and self service was on its way to stay. This again enhanced the temptation to steal.

MOST FREQUENT ITEMS STOLEN BY SHOPLIFTERS



FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY AGE AND SEX FOR PERSONS ARRESTED FOR MISDEMEANOR THEFT



SOURCE: 1989 MUCR

As a result of these changes and continual changes that we see today, there is a need to understand what the business can do legally and what they cannot do. This is certainly a business concern and should be. However, it is not that difficult to understand the law and what the employee, management, and security must do today to survive using lawful decisions.

What we found out in Great Falls through a statistical study may not be different in the State of Montana. Some of the following information came from a study that was done in 1989 concerning 600 arrests for shoplifting. The reasons we were give by people that took items is as follows and in order:

- o I wanted something for nothing
- o The store can afford it
- o It is easy

This gives us some background on why people take things in stores that have no intention of paying for them. If we look at where people conceal items, it is not as complicated as business people may think. The following locations are where the shoplifter placed the item and they are in order:

- o In pocket
- o Under clothing
- o Purse
- o Shopping Bag

Other statistics that are most interesting for the merchant and to aid them in apprehensions or prevention are as follows:

o The average value of merchandise stolen was \$13.00.

- o The average number of items recovered per apprehension was 2.2 items.
- o The total apprehensions under 30 years of age was 65%.
- o The total apprehensions over 60 years of age was 8%.
- o Adults Arrested: Male--53%; Female--47%.
- o Juveniles Arrested: Male--62%; Female--38%.

Another interesting area that is helpful to the business is to find out some information from the shoplifter why he or she did what they did. So many times this has been forgotten and this information is invaluable for the merchant for him to make the necessary adjustment within his own business. The following information can be asked and more often than not the shoplifter will tell you.

- o Why did you shoplift in this store?
- o Why did you take this particular item?
- o Why take the inexpensive items and not the expensive ones?
- o Was this store easy to refund an item?
- o Where are people shoplifting and why?
- o Where are people not shoplifting and why?

Apprehending shoplifters whether it be external or internal can be interesting and challenging. There is nothing more intriguing than people and why they do the things they do. Law enforcement is in a unique position to help, and we need to work with the businesses because we are their support in this community effort.

PROFILE OF TIMES DURING THE WEEK WHEN SHOPLIFTING INCIDENTS OCCUR BY TYPE OF STORE VICTIMIZED



SOURCE: 1989 MUCR

Chart starts with Monday midnight. It ends at Sunday, Midnight. Each day has 6 4-hour periods. "1" is the period between Midnight and 3 a.m.



A

Comparison of Attitudes toward the Criminal Justice System

by Barbara McMorris

Barbara McMorris is a University of Montana Sociology Student. This study was part of her senior research project.

In 1982 and then again in 1988, the Montana Board of Crime Control conducted public opinion and victimization surveys. This study compares the results of these surveys and notes the differences which occurred over the six years between them. Particularly of interest are measures of respondents' perceptions of crime issues and the criminal justice system.1

Respondents in both 1982 and 1988 were asked to respond to the question: "Compared to five years ago, how effective do you feel the court system in Montana is today?" The answers are displayed in Figure 1. Because the question asks the respondents to compare the effectiveness of the court system to five years ago, only those respondents who had lived in Montana for five or more years were used for this figure, yielding a total of 372 respondents for 1982 and 570 for 1988. These results show that, in 1982, almost 53 percent of this sample of Montanans felt the court system was less effective compared to five years ago previous. The biggest change occurred in the percentage reporting the courts are less effective. The percentage dropped from 53 percent in 1982 to 34 percent in 1988. In effect, public opinion, as determined by these two surveys, demonstrates that attitudes toward the court system have improved over time.

This change in attitudes over time can also be seen in respondents' perceptions of Montana's law enforcement, although attitudes are more positive than toward the court system. Using the same strategy as in Figure 1, attitudes toward the effectiveness of Montana law enforcement were compared for the survey years 1982 and 1988 in Figure 2.

FIGURE 1 ATTITUDES TOWARD THE EFFECTIVENESS OF MONTANA'S COURT SYSTEM IN 1982 AND 1988



¹ In addition, statistical analyses were performed on the raw data available from the 1988 survey to discover what social characteristics significantly influenced repondents' attitudes toward crime and criminal justice in Montana. The more important factors included sex, age, victimization, and criminal justice experience as predictors of repondents' answers to questions concerning the effectiveness of our court system and law enforcement, as well as statements determining opinions toward judges' sentencing and victim restitution.

About 34 percent of those surveyed in 1982 thought that Montana's law enforcement was more effective than five years ago, while 43 percent of 1988 respondents felt the effectiveness of law enforcement had stayed the same. Only 20.5 percent of the 1988 sample of Montanans indicated that law enforcement was less effective, compared to 28 percent of the 1982 sample. These results may be reflecting a positive change in the public's attitudes toward the police and other law enforcement agencies over time, although the 1988 data still show that the majority of people are not finding law enforcement more effective.

As shown in Figure 3, respondents in both surveys were asked to give their opinions on the statement: "Judges give appropriate sentences to most criminals." Respondents were asked to respond to four forced-choice categories which were given by the interviewer. The results in Figure 3, with sample sizes of 416 in 1982 and 525 in 1988, show that opinions have improved over time. The majority of responses in 1982 were negative toward sentencing practices, with 65 percent (46.5 + 18 percent) of this sample of Montanans disagreeing with the statement. On the other hand, opinions were more divided in 1988 with almost 43 percent of those surveyed agreeing and 39.4 percent disagreeing with the opinion that judges give appropriate sentences.

Figure 4 shows the results of comparing 1982 and 1988 respondents' opinions on the statement: "Convicted offenders should be required to make financial reimbursement to their victims or their victims' families." Opinions in both years advocated offenders being required to pay restitution to their victims, although 59 percent of respondents in 1988 strongly agreed with the statement compared to only 46 percent in 1982. This suggests that Montanans in 1988 felt even more strongly than 1982 repondents that criminals should be required to make restitution to their victims or their victims' families.





FIGURE 2 ATTITUDES TOWARD THE EFFECTIVENESS OF MONTANA LAW ENFORCEMENT IN 1982 AND 1988



Source: MBCC VICTIMIZATION SURVEY 1982 and 1988

FIGURE 4 COMPARISON OF ATTITUDES IN 1982 & 1988 ABOUT OFFENDER RESTITUTION



Source: MBCC VICTIMIZATION SURVEY 1982 and 1988

42

Source: MBCC VICTIMIZATION SURVEY 1982 and 1988

The Drug Abuse Resistance Education Program in Montana

by Fred E. Fisher

Fred E. Fisher is the Drug Prevention Education Coordinator for the Montana Department of Justice. He is the statewide coordinator for the D.A.R.E. program. He has a background in both substance abuse counseling and mental health. Most recently, Fisher was a program evaluator for standards and quality assurance with the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Division of the Department of Institutions. He is a Certified Chemical Dependency Counselor.

Drug abuse and its attendant human tragedy is a problem that many Montanans associate with the large urban centers. Many of us would like to believe that we live in a place where these problems do not occur. The fact is that the patterns of alcohol and drug abuse in rural areas parallel those in urban areas. In 1990, a study entitled Rural Drug Abuse: Prevalence, Relation to Crime and Programs was published by the General Accounting Office at the request of Montana Senator Max Baucus and other members of the United States Senate. The study found that total substance abuse (including alcohol) rates in rural states is nearly as high as in non-rural states. Not surprisingly, the study also revealed that alcohol is by far the most widely abused substance. Finally, the study informs us that what distinguishes between rural and non-rural areas is that prevalence rates for some drugs (such as cocaine) appear to be lower in rural areas, while prevalence rates for other drugs (such as inhalants) may be higher.

In the battle against illegal drugs and the problems associated with alcohol abuse, law enforcement personnel from the administrator to the cop on the beat understand that interdiction and enforcement alone will not solve the problem. The President's National Drug Control Strategy calls for attacking the drug problem with a comprehensive strategy. Prevention and education programs are a critical component of this comprehensive strategy. Prevention and education programs must combine accurate knowledge of the effects of alcohol and drug use with a focus on enhancing personal growth and development. Additionally, these efforts must target youth at a critical stage-before they ever start using drugs, alcohol or tobacco.

In response to many of these considerations, the Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.) program was developed in 1983 by the Los Angeles Unified School District in conjunction with the Los Angeles Police Department. Using the lastest research on effective prevention, D.A.R.E. targets fifth and sixth graders with a seventeen week program instructed by a uniformed law enforcement officer. The program addresses knowledge, attitudes, skills and behavior in a detailed manner that allows students to do more than "just say no." Students are instructed on understanding consequences, the importance of making informed decisions, respect for individual differences, alternatives to chemical abuse, and the importance of rules in a free society. Students are also taught how to manage stress and resist peer pressure to use illegal drugs, alcohol and tobacco.

In 1989, the Montana Board of Crime Control (MBCC), utilizing Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act grants provided approximately \$400,634 in seed money to fourteen law enforcement agencies throughout the state to initiate D.A.R.E. programs. (See Fig. 1 for location of these projects) These agencies received a commitment for one-hundred percent funding for a period of three years from MBCC. During the first year it was estimated that the program reached approximately7,500 fifth and sixth graders.

In 1990, MBCC utilized Anti-Drug Abuse Act grant money to expand the D.A.R.E. program to six additional project sites throughout the state. (See Fig. 1 for location of these projects) The Board allocated \$153,032 to



MONTANA DARE PROJECTS

fund these additonal programs. A twenty-five percent hard cash match was required to obtain these start-up funds. The projects, in turn, received a commitment for four years of grant funding from MBCC. Also, MBCC utilized Drug Free Schools and Communities Act grants to fund two new D.A.R.E. projects in 1990.

In June, 1990 the Attorney General's Office hired a Drug Prevention Education Coordinator. The coordinator's duties include on-going technical assistance and support for the D.A.R.E. projects in Montana. Then too, the Montana D.A.R.E. Officers Association applied to MBCC and received a start-up grant from Anti-Drug Abuse Act funds in July, 1990. Finally, during the Fall, 1990 the Beaverhead County D.A.R.E. project was intiated utilizing Anti-Drug Abuse Act funds. There are now twenty-one D.A.R.E. projects throughout the state. These projects will reach approximately 10,000 fifth and sixth graders throughout the state. Approximately forty law enforcement officers have completed the rigorous eighty hour training course required to instruct the program.

As D.A.R.E. heads into its third year in Montana, continued growth is expected. MBCC is encouraging existing projects to train additional officers. Additional officers will allow the projects to provide back-up support for the program and enable the project to expand if necessary. Schools, law enforcement agencies, service clubs and parent groups throughout the state have expressed interest in D.A.R.E. MBCC recently received several grant applications for start-up funds to initiate new D.A.R.E. projects. Also, many communities are working with existing D.A.R.E. programs to bring D.A.R.E. into previously unserved schools. D.A.R.E. advisory groups are also being formed throughout the state to enhance the program through citizen involvement in public awareness, education and fundraising efforts. Additionally, law enforcement and school administrators and local govenment leaders are working very hard to develop the capacity to absorb the programs into local department budgets once the federal grant money runs out. Additionally, the 52nd Montana Legislature passed a bill creating a check-off on the state income tax form to allow people to make contributions to the D.A.R.E. program.

As thirteen of the D.A.R.E. projects enter their last full year of grant funding, it is essential to involve the entire community in the program. Citizens must send a clear message about the importance of D.A.R.E. to their local government officials and school boards. The abilities and skills imparted by the program assist students to recognize risks, consider the consequences and act responsibly. D.A.R.E. is more than an alcohol and drug education program. D.A.R.E. encourages and enhances the development of a sense of community through its unique ability to bring people together. The importance of this partnership between youth, parents, schools, and law enforcement cannot be overstated.

Technical Appendices

1. The Montana Uniform Crime Reporting (MUCR) Program

2. Population Estimates

3. Definitions of Terms used in this Report



Appendix 1 The Montana Uniform Crime Reporting (MUCR) Program

History

A national Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program came into existence in 1930 as a result of the recognition of the need for a nationwide and uniform compilation of law enforcement statistics. The Committee of Uniform Crime Records of the International Association of Chiefs of Police developed the UCR concept, and Congress passed legislation on June 11, 1930 authorizing the FBI to act as the clearinghouse for crime information. In the late 1960's, with the availability of funds from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, individual states began assuming much of the responsibility for direct collection of the UCR data.

Montana became involved in the national UCR reporting program in September 1978, when the FBI transferred data collection responsibility from its UCR reporting division to the Montana Board of Crime Control's Criminal Justice Data Center. This transfer has enhanced crime data collection by giving the state more control over crime reporting, closer contact with local law enforcement agencies, and more detailed information about crime on the local and state level.

The effort started on a trial basis. It involved selected individual police agencies in various parts of the state filing a simple tabulated report every month. Limited statistics were able to be generated from these reports thus providing only a vague picture of the nature of crime in Montana.

The Montana Uniform Crime Reporting (MUCR) system evolved from this initial program. Because it was computer based, it could handle detailed information. In MUCR, every participating agency now provides basic information about each crime reported to them and about each person arrested.

Throughout its existence, the Montana Uniform Crime Reporting program has been voluntary. Consequently, some local agencies have chosen not to participate in the program and some report only for part of the year. In an effort to make the reporting effort as convenient as possible for local agencies, a variety of modalities are used in data entry. These include paper forms, the Department of Justice's teletype system (CJIN), personal computer diskettes, and large computer tapes. The chart below indicates the number of agencies in Montana participating in the MUCR program by type of data entry employed.

In 1990, 78 of the 89 (87.6%) law enforcement agencies in the state contributed to MUCR. These agencies together serve approximately 93% of the state's population. However, this does not include Native Americans who live on Indian Reservations in the State. None of the Tribal Police Departments on the Indian Reservations participate in the program. Likewise, the Montana Highway Patrol does not submit data to MUCR.

DIFFERENT METHODS OF DATA ENTRY USED IN THE MUCR PROGRAM



METHOD OF DATA SUBMISSION

48

The overall objectives of the Montana Uniform Crime Reporting Program are:

1. To inform the Governor, Attorney General, Legislature, other governmental officials and the public as to the nature and magnitude of the crime problem in Montana.

2. To provide law enforcement administrators with criminal statistics for administrative and operational use.

3. To determine who commits crime by age, sex, and race in order to find the proper focus for crime prevention and enforcement.

4. To provide a base of data and statistics to help measure the work load of the criminal justice system.

5. To provide a base of data and statistics for research to improve the efficiency, effectiveness and performance of criminal justice agencies.

General Overview

MUCR complies with guidelines and definitions established by the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI's) national Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program.

Two distinct data base systems make up MUCR. The <u>Offense and Activity</u> system contains information about the types of crimes being committed, unfounded and actual offenses, property stolen and/or recovered by type and value, time and location of offenses, the status of each case, and the number of law enforcement officers killed or assaulted. The <u>Arrest/Custody</u> component records the types of arrests made, and the sex, race, and age of each person arrested. In 1986 the Arrest/Custody system was expanded to collect information on people being held in jails throughout the state.

The transfer of responsibility for data collection from the FBI to the MUCR system has encouraged local law enforcement participation because the MUCR system provides contributors with both monthly and annual summaries of data for the <u>Offense and Activity</u> and <u>Arrest/Custody</u> information systems.

In addition to the monthly reports to contributors, other reports and publications are compiled using MUCR Data. These include the annual <u>Crime in Montana</u> publication and a variety of special reports requested by private and public groups. MUCR data is also sent to the FBI for inclusion in the annual FBI publication <u>Crime in the United States.</u>

MUCR and UCR Crime Classification System

Reporting uniformity between law enforcement agencies depends upon the proper classification of offenses by the agencies. The MUCR system follows the basic guidelines for classifying offenses as formulated by the Uniform Crime Reporting Section of the FBI. It must be emphasized that the following classifications are not meant to be legal definitions of offenses. The classifications differ considerably in some cases from the legal definitions as they are written in the Montana Code Annotated. For example, MUCR defines forcible rape in terms of a female victim. Under Montana Law, the victim of a rape may be of either sex. In MUCR reports, the FBI classification system and definitions are used so that the different crimes which are counted all refer to the same type of crime and measure the same thing.

In MUCR, the various crimes are divided into several categories. Seven crimes are recognized as being the most serious crimes in our society and the most likely to be reported to law enforcement. These are called the Seven Major Crimes, or the Part I Offenses. By convention,

MUCR CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM
OF DIFFERENT CRIMES
Part I Crimes-The Seven Major Crimes
Crimes of Violence
Homicide
Rape
Robbery
Aggravated Assault
Burglary
Larceny/Theft
Motor Vehicle Theft
Part II Crimes
Other (Simple) Assaults
Arson
Forgery and Counterfeiting
Fraud
Embezzlement Stales Present:
Vandalism
Weapons Violations
Prostitution
Sex Olfenses
Drug Abuse Complian
Offenses Against the Family
Data is collected on the following Part II Crimes,
but statistics are not normally generated on them:
Liquor Violations
Disorderly Conduct
Other (Kidnapping, Trespass, etc)
Curfew Violations
Kunaways
Part III Crimes—Police Activities
Traffic Crimes
Traffic Accidents involving Fatalities
Traffic Accidents involving Property Damage
Accident Information including Suicides Missing Per-
sons, and the discovery of Dead Bodies
Animal Problems
Recovery of Property and Motor Vehicles
Police Assistance Activities
Insecure Premises/Security
Public Safety

MUCR also divides these crimes into two separate categories: Crimes of Violence and Crimes Against Property. Most of <u>Crime in Montana</u> is dedicated to the reporting and analysis of these Part I Crimes.

Part II Offenses encompass other crimes which, although serious, are not as serious as any of the Seven Major Crimes. Although data is collected on all of the Part II Crimes, summary statistics are not normally generated on some of these crimes. These primarily involve offenses committed by juveniles and are reported elsewhere (in the Juvenile Probation Information System, for example).

Part III Offenses involve police activities which are primarily public service functions rather than criminal offenses. Because of funding limitations, data on Part III Offenses are not processed by the MUCR Program for agencies submitting paper forms to MUCR. Agencies using automated input have Part III Offenses summarized for their private use, but the state program does not normally examine any Part III Offenses.

Data Quality and Sources of Error

Over the years, the data collection effort has improved to the the point that the accuracy of data is at the 95% level. The major source of error encountered in estimating statewide rates comes from non-reporting or non-participating agencies.

Some of the errors encountered in the data received involved misinterpretation of the definitions of the various crimes. This is particularly evident in the assault statistics in the early years where the difference between simple and aggravated assaults were confused by many agencies. Through use and training, much of this problem has disappeared.

The following possible sources of error have also been identified:

1) The possible introduction of duplicate records when the original record is modified in a month different from when it was entered.

A cursory examination of the 1990 data base showed 3.8% of the incidents of forcible rapes reported were actually duplicate records where the incident was cleared in a month different from the one in which it was reported.

2) Entering Arrest information without a comparable offense.

Since the MUCR system has no way to identify what offenses are related to what arrests, the amount of error introduced in this way cannot be assessed at this time.

 The differences in reporting policies between agencies. Some agencies may report multiple offenses more diligently than others.

The magnititude of error introduced because of this reason cannot be addressed at this time.

All data entering the MUCR System is subjected to extensive edits. Some corrections can be made without contacting the originating agency. In other cases, the agency is contacted and asked to re-check and validate the information submitted.

One idiosyncracy of the national system is the use of the hierarchy rule. This rule comes into play when an incident involves two or more crimes. For example, a victim may be murdered during a robbery. In such a case, the hierarchy rule states that only the more serious crime should be counted.

To be compatible with national statistics, the MUCR program employs the hierarchy rule in reporting the Crime Index, the Crime Rate, and the number of the seven major crimes reported in <u>Crime in Montana</u>. As a result, 379 (1.2%) of the Part I offenses reported in Montana in 1990 were not reported. The hierarchy rule has <u>not</u> been used in reporting any of the Part II Offenses.

One agency, Billings Police Department, submits only summary data to the MUCR program. As a result, detailed analyses within major criminal offenses cannot include this agency's data. Consequently, all percentages describing the partitioning of the major crimes in the state do <u>not</u> include Billings Data.

The Future of MUCR

The FBI and the National Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) have recently initiated a joint effort to upgrade the national UCR Program. Over the past several years an extensive effort has been made between these two Federal agencies and the various state programs dealing with UCR. The FBI's UCR program has not been changed since its inception in the 1930's.

The UCR program has always been known as a summary reporting system wherein the various police agencies around the country supply summary data to the FBI which is then published in the annual publication known as <u>Crime</u> in the United States. Although this publication has been known as an excellent resource document, it was felt that something more was needed. Thus, the background leading to the "Enhanced UCR Program" which will be expanded from the summary based system to an Incident Based Sytem called NIBRS for National Incident Based Reporting System.

The concept of the new NIBRS program is to capture information relating to an incident and be able to link various components together providing a clearer picture of what is happening with crime across the country. The new system will add information relating to the victim as well as the offender, which has never been a part of the UCR program. This new information should provide the public as well as law enforcement with an improved concept in the nature of criminal incidents.

Montana is one of seventeen (17) states participating in the program with the FBI and BJS. In February 1991, a number of local Montana law enforcement agencies began submitting data using new NIBRS/MUCR format.

The basic conversion strategy is to go from a computer mainframe environment to a personal computer environment. It is anticipated that the process of conversion will be slow. During the interim, the State of Montana will maintain two separate and sometimes duplicative data collection systems. For national statistics, information will be submitted in both formats. For statewide statistics, the NIBRS data will be converted into the MUCR format before it is summarized.



Appendix 2 Population Estimates

Population estimates are used in this report to calculate the crime rates for the state and various geographical areas using MUCR data, to calculate the percentage of youths who become involved with the Juvenile Justice System and the rates of referral to Youth Courts.

Where MUCR data is used, the estimates for the population is provided by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The statewide population estimates are shown in Chart 1. Population estimates for each county, sheriff office jurisdiction and municipality served by various police departments participating in the MUCR program can be seen in Table 3 in the main text.

This year's population statistics used in this report are based upon preliminary census data, and at the time of publication, is subject to revision by the Bureau of the Census.

In the analysis of juvenile data, age/sex estimates provided by John M. McQuiston, Director of the Center for Population Research at the University of Montana, have been used. These estimates were prepared in 1984 using 1980 Census Data to project the population growth for the state to 1990. No attempt was made to estimate age/sex groups for any geographical area within the state. In making these projections, a net-migration figure of .003 per year was used. The estimates of the number of youth aged between 9 and 17, defined as the "group at risk" when addressing the Juvenile Court System, in Montana in 1990 is shown in Table 2 on the next page.

STATEWIDE POPULATION ESTIMATES 1980-1990*

1980	786,415
1981	792,000
1982	801,000
1983	817,000
1984	824,000
1985	825,000
1986	819,000
1987	809,000
1988	804,000
1989	806,000
990	799.065**

* Based on Population figures provided by the Bureau of the Census through the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

1

**The 1990 population counts are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The United States Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct this counts at this time.

TABLE 1 1990 JUVENILE POPULATION IN MONTANA WHICH IS AT RISK

AGE	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
9	7,205	7,258	14,463
10	7,328	7,006	14,334
11	6,917	6,580	13,497
12	6,665	6,291	12,956
13	6,541	6,189	12,730
14	6,401	6,072	12,473
15	6,335	5,952	11,287
16	6,129	5,612	11,741
17	6,033	5,820	11,853
TOTAL	59,554	56,780	116,334

Appendix 3 Definitions of Terms used in this Report

Aggravated assault is the unlawful attack by one person upon another for the purpose of inflicting severe or aggravated bodily injury. This type of assault is usually accompanied by the use of a weapon or by means likely to produce death or great bodily harm. Any assault which does not involve the use of a weapon and does not result in serious injury is classified as a simple assault and is reported under a separate crime category. (MUCR)

Arrest is the taking of a person into custody in the manner authorized by law.

Burglary is the unlawful entry of a structure to commit a felony or theft. The theft of items from a building is classified as burglary if it is accompanied by a breaking or unlawful entry (trespass) without breaking. If the building is open to the general public and the offender has legal access to it, it is considered a larceny. (MUCR)

Case is an individual youth who became involved with the juvenile justice system for any reason, criminal or not. (JPIS)

Clearance is a term used by a law enforcement agency to indicate the status of a reported crime. An offense can be cleared by arrest, cleared by exception, unfounded or discontinued. (MUCR)

Cleared by Arrest—An offense is considered cleared when the law enforcement agency has identified an offender, gathered sufficient evidence, filed a charge, and he is actually taken into custody. (MUCR)

Cleared by Exception—An offense is considered to be cleared by exception when all the conditions for clearance by arrest are satisfied, but because of extenuating circumstances the offender cannot be arrested and prosecuted. For example, the offender may be dead or already in prison. (MUCR)

Crime Index = # Homicides + # Rapes + # Robberies + # Aggravated Assaults + # Burglaries + # Larcenies + # Motor VehicleThefts. (MUCR)

Crime Rate = 100,000 X Crime Index / Total Population. (MUCR)

Crimes against persons include criminal homicide, forcible rape, robbery, and both aggravated and simple assault. (JPIS)

Delinquent—A juvenile charged with a criminal offense. (JPIS)

Detention is a juvenile referral in which the end result is custody in an adult jail or secure detention facility. (JPIS)

Domestic Abuse—A person commits the offense of domestic abuse if he: (a) purposely or knowingly causes bodily injury to a family member or household member; or (b) purposely or knowingly causes reasonable apprehension of bodily injury in a family member or household member. (MUCR)

Driving under the influence (DUI) involves driving or operating any vehicle or common carrier while drunk or under the influence of liquor or narcotics. In Montana, a person having a Blood-Alcohol level of .01 or greater is defined as being under the influence of alcohol. (MUCR)

Drug abuse involves the unlawful possession, sale, use, cultivation, and manufacturing of controlled substances and narcotic drugs. (MUCR)

Homicide is the willful, non-negligent killing of one human being by another. It includes murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, but does not include justifiable homicides where an offender is killed by a police officer in the line of duty or a felon is killed by a private citizen. (MUCR)

Index Crime—one of the seven major crimes used to compute the Crime Index. See Crime Index. (MUCR)

Juvenile—a person not yet an adult for the purpose of criminal law. (JPIS)

Larceny is the unlawful taking, carrying, leading or riding away of property from the possession or constructive possession of another. Larceny includes such crimes as pickpocketing, purse snatching, shoplifting, theft from motor vehicles, and theft from buildings where forced entry is not involved. It does not include embezzlement, "con" games, forgery, or bad checks. Similarly, motor vehicle theft is not included in this category since it is considered a major crime by itself. (MUCR)

Motor vehicle theft is defined as the theft or attempted theft of a vehicle which is self-propelled and runs on the surface and not on rails. It includes automobiles, trucks, buses, vans, motorcycles, and snowmobiles. It does not include motorboats, construction equipment, airplanes, and farming equipment. (MUCR)

Offense is an infraction of a law. (MUCR and JPIS)

Offenses agaInst the public order include weapon offenses, sex offenses, driving under the influence of intoxicants, disturbing the peace (disorderly conduct), traffic crimes, and court and justice system offenses (e.g. escape, contempt, probation, and parole violations). (JPIS)

Part I Offense—one of the seven crimes recognized as being the most serious crime in our society and the most likely to be reported to law enforcement. Same as index crimes. See Crime Index. (MUCR)

Property crimes include burglary, larceny, motor vehicle theft, arson and vandalism, receiving and possessing stolen property, and trespassing. (JPIS)

Rape is the carnal knowledge of a female forcibly and against her will. Both assaults and attempts to commit rape by force are included in this definition. Statutory rape (without force) and sexual assaults against males are classified as sexual offenses and are not counted under this classification. (MUCR)

Referral is the assignment of a juvenile case to a probation officer. An individual case can be referred more than once during the year. (JPIS) **Robbery** is the taking or attempting to take anything of value from the care, custody, or control of a person or persons by force or the threat of force or violence and/or putting the victim in fear. Robbery is a crime in which the element of personal confrontation between the victim and offender is present. Attempts to rob are included in the robbery count. (MUCR)

Sex offenses include offenses against chastity, common decency, morals, and the like. Montana law lists four specific crimes: sexual assault, deviate sexual conduct, indecent exposure, and incest. Excluded under this category are forcible rape, prostitution, and commercial vice. (MUCR)

Status offenses include those offenses which strictly pertain to juveniles. They include runaways, curfew violations, ungovernable, and liquor violations. (JPIS)

Status Offender— juvenile charged with a status offense. (JPIS)

54



600 copies of this public document were published at an estimated cost of \$2.92 per copy, for a total cost of \$1,750.00, which includes \$1,750.00 for printing and \$.00 for distribution.