
HAMPTON-NEWPORT NEWS COMMUNITY CRIMINAL JUSTICE BOARD

OFFICIAL MEMBERSHIP

RANDY HILDEBRANDT

*Assistant City Manager, Newport News
CCJB Chair*

TIMOTHY CLANCY

Attorney at Law

HOWARD CULLUM

Director, H-NN Community Services Board

JUDGE NELSON DURDEN

8th Judicial District, Juvenile & Domestic

JUDGE AUNDRIA FOSTER

7th Judicial District, Juvenile & Domestic

JUDGE E.L. HUBBARD

7th Judicial Circuit

JUDGE C. EDWARD KNIGHT, III

8th Judicial District

PATRICIA MASSENBURG

Hampton Chief Magistrate

CHIEF DENNIS MOOK

City of Newport News

SHERIFF B. J. ROBERTS

City of Hampton

CHIEF THOMAS TOWNSEND

City of Hampton

MICHAEL MONTEITH

*Assistant City Manager, Hampton
CCJB Chair Elect (effective July 1, 2001)*

DAVID COFFEY

Thomas Nelson Community College

LINDA CURTIS

Hampton Commonwealth's Attorney

JUDGE TIMOTHY S. FISHER

7th Judicial District

HOWARD GWYNN

Newport News Commonwealth's Attorney

SYLVIA JOHNSON

Citizen Representative

JAMES MACDOUGALL

Citizen Representative

ROBERT MOODY

Attorney at Law

SHERIFF C.E. MOORE

City of Newport News

JUDGE WILFORD TAYLOR, JR.

8th Judicial Circuit

JOHN WILLIAMS

Newport News Chief Magistrate

STAFF

TRACEY L. JENKINS

Director

Hampton-Newport News Criminal Justice Agency

C. REGINALD ALSON

Juvenile Justice Planner

Hampton-Newport News Community Criminal Justice Board

All members and staff work with one or more Board Subcommittees

BOARD SUB-COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Mary Allen, Hampton Court Services Unit *
Devon Beverly, Community Services Board ^
Dianne Carter, Attorney at Law *
Cindy Carlson, Hampton Coalition for Youth *
Louisa Concessi, Commonwealth Attorney's Office *
Walter Credle, Hampton Social Services *
Walter Dean, Newport News Court Services Unit *
Linda Deans, Hampton City Schools *
Decelia Dozier, Newport News Social Services *
Theodore Fitzgerald, Peninsula ASAP ^
Morton "Timp" Hecht, Community Services Board *+
Reynold Jordan, Newport News Social Services *
Frank Kowaleski, Hampton Roads Reg. Academy ^
Jane Moreland, Newport News Public Schools *
Mike Mulkey, Attorney at Law *
Larry Robinson, Newport News Juvenile Justice Services *
Curt Schaffer, Hampton Police Dept. *
B.B. Underwood, 7th Judicial Circuit Court Clerk +
Clark Walden, Hampton Probation & Parole ^
Rosanne Walters, Newport News Office of Youth Development *
Lt. Elvia Williams, Newport News Police Dept.* (past)
Lester Wingrove, Newport News Probation & Parole^+

Judge Verbena Askew, 7th Judicial Circuit ^+
Col. Karen Bowden, Hampton Sheriff's Dept.^
Mark Calhoun, Newport News Police Dept. ^*+
Cecil Collier, Criminal Justice Agency ^
Judge H. Vincent Conway, 7th Judicial Circuit +
Cynthia Cummings-Mitchell, Peninsula Day Reporting Center ^+
Tom Dempsey, Christopher Newport University ^
Shauna Epps, Hampton Court Services Unit *
Patty Gilbertson, Community Services Board ^+
Rev. Preston Jordan *
Ernest Madison, Newport News Juvenile Justice Services *
Judge Joan T. Morris, 7th Judicial District +
Valerie Muth, Commonwealth Attorney's Office +
Wanda Rogers, Hampton Social Services *
James Thomas, Hampton Court Services Unit *
Cpt. Janice Thurman, Newport News Police Dept. *
Dee Vantree-Keller, Hampton Commonwealth Attorney's Office * (past)
Natale Ward, Newport News Drug Court Program ^+
Julie White, Criminal Justice Agency ^+
Cressondra Willis, Newport News Commonwealth Attorney's Office *

Bold denotes ex-officio member
* - Juvenile Justice Subcommittee

^ - Adult Offender Issues Subcommittee
+ - Newport News Drug Court Advisory Committee

PAST BOARD MEMBERS

Judge W. C. Andrews, III, 8th Judicial District (former)
Judge Verbena M. Askew, 7th Judicial Circuit
Judge Ronald E. Bensten, 7th Judicial District, Juvenile & Domestic Relations
Timothy Chandler, Hampton Chief Magistrate (former)
Chief William Corvello, Newport News Police Department (former)
Judge R. W. Curran, 7th Judicial Circuit
Andrew Dawkins, Citizen Representative
Judge N.T. Durden, 8th Judicial District, Juvenile & Domestic Relations
Judge Walter J. Ford, 8th Judicial Circuit (former)
Alvin Fox, Attorney at Law
Judge Robert Frank, 7th Judicial Circuit (former)
Chuck Hall, Director (former), Hampton-Newport News Community Services Board
R.J. Hamlin, Thomas Nelson Community College
Judge James H. Harvell, III, 7th Judicial District
Sheriff Clay Hester, Newport News (former)
Judge Christopher W. Hutton, 8th Judicial Circuit
Judge Henry D. Kashouty, 8th Judicial District (former)
Judge L. R. Lerner, 8th Judicial District, Juvenile & Domestic Relations (former)
Chief Pat Minetti, Hampton Police Department (former)
Judge J. T. Morris, 7th Judicial District
Alan Pack, Newport News Chief Magistrate (former)
Judge Albert W. Patrick, III, 8th Judicial District
Judge D. F. Pugh, 7th Judicial District
George Wallace, Hampton Assistant City Manager (former)

ADDITIONAL STAFF SUPPORT

Clyde E. Cristman, Director (former), Hampton-Newport News Criminal Justice Agency
Sherree Davis, Criminal Justice Planner (temporary), Hampton-Newport News Criminal Justice Agency
James E. Husband, Criminal Justice Planner (former), Hampton-Newport News Criminal Justice Board
Kerri Sporer, Administrative Assistant, Hampton-Newport News Criminal Justice Agency

VIRGINIA COMMUNITY CRIMINAL JUSTICE BOARDS

In 1994, the Virginia General Assembly passed legislation resulting in the creation of local Community Criminal Justice Boards (CCJBs) throughout the Commonwealth. These boards, created in accordance with §53.1-183 of the *Code of Virginia*, include a variety of key criminal justice and community stakeholders. Each CCJB, by law, must include the following mandatory members: a judge from each court (Circuit, General District, and Juvenile & Domestic Relations), a chief magistrate, a chief of police, a sheriff, an attorney for the Commonwealth, a public defender or an attorney experienced in defense, a local educator, and a community services board administrator. As of July 1, 2000, each Board is also required to include a member from each governing body (or a city or county manager, administrator, executive, or assistant or deputy) represented by a CCJB.

Participation on these boards is vital to the success of addressing crime and criminal behavior in the community and meeting the responsibilities outlined for CCJBs in the *Code of Virginia*. Board members, and the local government, are accountable to the community for ensuring public safety. Members and the local government also have an interest in ensuring that crime prevention and punishment options are designed, implemented, and operated in a coordinated, efficient, and effective manner to accomplish their objectives. Because of this, the *Code of Virginia* does not allow for representatives to be appointed in the place of mandatory members.

Responsibilities

The *Code of Virginia* defines several broad responsibilities for CCJBs:

1. Advise on the development and operation of local pretrial services and community-based probation programs and services pursuant to §19.2-152.2 and §53.1-181.1 for use by the courts in diverting offenders from local correctional facility placements;
2. Assist community agencies and organizations in establishing and modifying programs and services for offenders on the basis of an objective assessment of the community's needs and resources;
3. Evaluate and monitor community programs, services and facilities to determine their impact on offenders;
4. Develop and amend the criminal justice plan in accordance with guidelines and standards set forth by the Department of Criminal Justice Services and oversee the development and amendment of the community-based corrections plan as required by §53.1-82.1 for approval by participating local governing bodies;
5. Review the submission of all criminal justice grants regardless of the source of funding [effective July 1, 2000];
6. Facilitate local involvement and flexibility in responding to the problem of crime in their communities; and
7. Do all things necessary or convenient to carry out the responsibilities expressly given in [the authorizing legislation].

§53.1-184 *Code of Virginia*

Concern has been raised in some areas about judicial participation on CCJBs, mostly as their participation relates to the duties of the Board. Many of the concerns have revolved around interpretations of these responsibilities. Though the CCJBs were intended to be advisory in nature, the *Code of Virginia* gave CCJBs the responsibility of *providing* for the development and operation of certain programs. This has been interpreted by many to put the CCJB in an operational, as opposed to advisory, capacity. In order to reduce this concern, the law was changed effective July 1, 2000 to specifically state *advise* on the development and operation certain program (see §53.1-184(1) of the *Code of Virginia*).

Statewide Impact

As a whole, CCJBs are proving to be valuable resources for Virginia localities. By virtue of the membership, CCJBs are positioned to have positive impacts on local criminal justice systems by simply increasing communication among the members. These boards also provide a direct link from state, federal, and other criminal justice entities to communities. Furthermore, through the development of coordinated criminal justice plans, CCJBs position the localities they represent to receive substantial state and federal funding.

The Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services and its oversight board, the Criminal Justice Services Board, comprise the Commonwealth's criminal justice planning arm. These entities have recognized the importance and potential of local CCJBs. Grant opportunities, training events, and other activities sponsored by the Department have referenced, and even targeted, local CCJBs.

In April of 1997 the Department and the Criminal Justice Services Board published *Community-Oriented Justice: Strategies for Virginia*. This publication, which serves as the Commonwealth's long-range criminal justice plan, includes many references to local CCJBs throughout. Of particular note are the specific statewide goals, objectives, and strategies referencing CCJBs. A specific goal of the Commonwealth's plan is to *develop locally-based, system-wide approaches for dealing with criminal justice issues using Community Criminal Justice Boards (CCJBs)*. References to CCJBs are made in three of the five major plan categories: Community Enhancement and Cooperative Efforts; Program Support; and Training and Education.

Community-Oriented Justice: Strategies for Virginia was designed to provide localities with strategies to use in their local criminal justice planning efforts. Developed around the philosophy of community-oriented justice, the plan almost caters to efforts that local CCJBs have been engaging in around the state.

Virginia's CCJBs have also received a great deal of national attention. Presentations and information on CCJBs have been provided to national, and even international, audiences such as the American Correctional Association, the International Community Corrections Association, and the National Judicial College.

HAMPTON-NEWPORT NEWS COMMUNITY CRIMINAL JUSTICE BOARD

The Hampton-Newport News Community Criminal Justice Board (H-NNCCJB) began its work in 1995 and has often been held up to others as a "model" effort. Many other CCJBs replicated the original bylaws and Council resolutions of the H-NNCCJB. In addition, H-NNCCJB members and associates have traveled throughout the Commonwealth and country to share their experiences.

Since its first meetings, the H-NNCCJB has taken a broad approach to its responsibilities. In 1997 the H-NNCCJB adopted a mission statement and set to work on identifying critical issues impacting the public safety of Hampton and Newport News. The H-NNCCJB also identified various focus areas, objectives, and strategies aimed at improving the quality of life in the two cities through improved and coordinated criminal justice services.

Progress has been made in accomplishing various objectives and strategies the H-NNCCJB identified between 1996 and 2000. Of particular note are the:

- Establishment and grant funding for a Criminal Justice Planner position
- Establishment of a standing Juvenile Justice Subcommittee
- Development of a broad-based juvenile mapping strategy
- Establishment and grant funding for a drug court program
- Establishment and grant funding for a Juvenile Justice Planner position
- Establishment of a standing Adult Offender Issues Subcommittee
- Establishment of a standing Technology Subcommittee

Mission

In 1997 the H-NNCCJB adopted a mission statement to reflect the purpose and direction of the Board. This statement was developed after the Board identified key issues considered to be of importance to the criminal justice community and the roles that the Board determined it could play. The mission statement was reviewed and reaffirmed by the Board in 1999.

The mission of the Hampton-Newport News Community Criminal Justice Board is to facilitate the efforts of the community and criminal justice system to reduce crime and delinquency.

Critical Issues

Utilizing a nominal group process, the collective experience of members was used to frame the key issues of importance to the criminal justice community during the H-NNCCJB's first retreat in 1996. In particular, Board members identified what they considered to be the most important issues that would affect public safety and impact the criminal justice system in Hampton and Newport News between 1997 and 2007. Those issues are:

1. The increase in juvenile crime
2. The demands on the educational system
3. The struggle between prevention and intervention
4. Drugs (in general; the proliferation of; and the acceptance of drug use)
5. The growth in the criminal population
6. Limited jail space
7. The lack of community involvement
8. An inability to effectively treat drug addicts due to limited programming
9. Budgetary restraints
10. Changing demographics in the general and criminal populations

Focus Areas & Strategies

The first retreat of the H-NNCCJB also resulted in the identification of nearly sixty action and outcome statements that the Board felt would prepare the two communities to address the critical issues and improve the local criminal justice systems' functioning. The identified actions and outcomes were later categorized into five primary focus areas, which tie to the accomplishment of the Board's mission statement. The five focus areas are:

1. Effective and efficient adult offender programming

We cannot ignore that fact that a large population of adults, convicted of criminal behavior, lives in our communities. It is also an undeniable reality that the majority of offenders residing in one of our local jails, or sent to the state prison system, will return to these same communities. It is important that we are able to provide adequate jail space, as well as have adequate supervision options in the community. It is also important to remember that each of these individuals may be under repeat supervision, be unemployed, be illiterate, have children, have substance abuse problems, have other mental or health problems, or have social attitude issues that have led to a long history of problems. With so many possible issues, it would be in the best interest of the community if the programming available for this population were developed and delivered in a manner that accounts for effectiveness and efficiencies. If delivered properly, community and jail-based programming for adult offenders **can** reduce recidivism and increase the likelihood that the children of adult offenders avoid criminal activity.

2. Juvenile crime and justice issues

The number of juveniles from our communities arrested, held in detention, or placed under state supervision is also large. These children will not only be in our communities for supervision or return following some form of incarceration, but they may very well become the adults under supervision in the future. It is just as important that adequate space and appropriate supervision options are available for juveniles. These children may also be under repeat supervision, be illiterate, have children, have substance abuse problems, have other mental or health problems, have volatile family situations, or be developing social attitude issues that can lead to a long history of problems. It is important to be aware of the needs of these children and build on the strengths they possess. Programming should be developed in a manner that accounts for effectiveness and efficiencies. If delivered properly, appropriate programming **can** improve the future of these children.

3. Crime prevention

Crime prevention has typically been considered the responsibility of law enforcement and has been viewed in a limited scope. The recent resurgence of community-oriented policing has broadened the views of many in respect to crime prevention. Many more are realizing that, in reality, crime prevention comes in many forms. Law enforcement and prevention methods such as environmental design,

adequate lighting, and law enforcement visibility, should continue to be supported, as they are very effective. However, it is important to embrace other methods of crime prevention. Enhanced education and awareness strategies and improved marketing of the realities and downside of certain activities should be employed at every opportunity. In addition, assets building in individuals and communities and effective supervision and programming for the convicted population can have a dramatic impact on preventing new crime.

4. System improvement

Each member of the criminal justice community has commented at one time or another that the so-called “criminal justice system” is anything but a system. In order to have a true impact on public safety, the elements of the “system” must work together. In working together, the various elements also increase the overall effectiveness and efficiency of various efforts. Planning, communication, and evaluation are key elements of system improvement. By embracing these elements, localities are better equipped to obtain resources, make use of limited resources, and to make sure that the use of those resources benefits as many as possible.

5. Community awareness/involvement

Community awareness and involvement is essential to the success of any large-scale effort – especially when one recognizes that the “community” includes government officials, legislators, voters, victims, witnesses, parents, students, and even offenders. Identifying where each community group fits into the development and delivery of criminal justice planning and implementation efforts is a key element.

The various actions and outcomes were then sorted into objective and strategy statements tied to each of the focus areas. Additional outcomes and strategies were added throughout 1998, 1999, and 2000 as the H-NNCCJB explored several of the key issues and set to work on developing new strategies and achieving outcomes.

Future Directions

This document represents the first formal publication of the H-NNCCJB’s plan. Therefore, it includes much of the Board’s history and reports on outcomes and strategies previously identified that have been realized. The H-NNCCJB has gone through many changes in the past several years and will undergo more in the future. It is the intent that the H-NNCCJB review the plan annually to identify the priorities for the year and make revisions and updates as needed. In all of its endeavors, the H-NNCCJB will keep its mission of facilitating the efforts of the community and criminal justice system to reduce crime and delinquency its top priority.

The Hampton-Newport News Community Criminal Justice Board's criminal justice plan draws largely on the experience and expertise of its members who represent a broad spectrum of government and community service agencies. The criminal justice data collected and analyzed for this report is reflective of the key measurable criminal justice issues facing the community, as identified by the group. When viewing the Board's objectives, and strategies to address those objectives, now and for the future, it should be noted that planning is a data driven enterprise, and that data findings serve as the foundation for implementing programmatic proposals as outlined in this plan and subsequent updates.

Many of strategies already identified actually involve collecting data that is currently limited or unavailable. As the data collection and evaluation projects are completed, the Cities of Hampton and Newport News will strengthen their ability to make sound, strong programmatic recommendations; thereby improving the utilization of limited local resources and increasing the likelihood of procuring state and federal funds.

CRIME & ARRESTS

The Cities of Hampton and Newport News have strong arrest data, which provide much insight into crime rates and arrest trends, as well as the policies and practices of the localities. Each city uses its own case management and reporting system and both jurisdictions have been migrating to conform with the National Incident Based Reporting System (NIBERS). However, each city is required to report activity to the Virginia State Police in a like manner. The annual State Police report, *Crime in Virginia*, was used to provide reliable comparison data for the area.

Between 1990 and 1999 both Cities experienced an overall decrease in crime rates and arrests. This is encouraging, especially in light of the fact that the combined population of both Cities increased during the same period by 7.6% (see Appendix, Chart 1).

Crime Rates

Between 1990 and 1999, the overall incidence of crimes per 1,000 population dropped for the area. However, there are significant differences in the rate of decline for the two cities. The rate declined by 29% in Hampton, but Newport News experienced a decline of only 5.2%. The difference in the overall decreased rates is primarily due to two periods during which Hampton experienced significant drops in crime rates, and Newport News experienced increases (see Appendix, Chart 2).

The reasons for the differences in crime rate declines are difficult to determine through standard data variable examination. Both Cities have increased their overall number of sworn law enforcement officers, Newport News doing so more than Hampton; Newport News has increased their number of officers by almost 40%, Hampton only by 27%. With the overall increases in sworn officers, both cities have significantly enhanced the ratio of officers to population. However, as with the total number of officers, Newport News has a greater ratio than Hampton; Newport News has 1 officer for every 482 citizens, Hampton only 1 for every 530 (see Appendix, Tables 1 and 2).

In comparison to national crime rates, Hampton and Newport News are on par with rates of 5.4% and 5.2% respectively for 1998 (the national rate for 1998 was 5.1%). However, in comparison with state crime rates, Hampton and Newport News are high, even though both localities engaged in higher than average police deployment strategies. During 1998, the state crime rate was only 3.9%; the number of sworn officers statewide increased by only 22%. In 1999 the Governor's New Partnership Commission's report *Crime in the Commonwealth* reported that Hampton and Newport News ranked very high among the 136 Virginia localities for both violent and property crime rates (see Appendix, Tables 3 and 4).

Arrests

The decreases in crime rates have led to a logical decrease in actual arrests. Total arrests for the area declined between 1990 and 1999, with significant drops in 1993 and 1999. Furthermore, both Hampton and Newport News experienced a dramatic decline in the number of arrests per 1,000 population. In 1990, both Cities had approximately 75 arrests per 1,000 population. By 1999, the arrest rates had dropped to 58/1,000 in Hampton and 45/1,000 in Newport News.

Adult Arrests

Between 1990 and 1999 the number of adult arrests declined almost 29% for the area. Newport News experienced the most significant decline of the two with an almost 36% reduction in arrests (Hampton had an almost 20% reduction). Statewide, adult arrests decreased 47% during the ten-year period. When examining the type of arrests, Newport News shows a 42% decrease in arrests for Part I offenses; whereas Hampton shows only a 12% decrease. Decreases in arrests for Part II offenses are similar in both localities. (See Appendix, Chart 3) (Due to changes in statewide data reporting, comparisons for Part I and Part II offenses are unavailable.)

A comparison of arrests for Part I offenses in Hampton and Newport News shows that the two cities have almost identical breakdowns of arrests by offense (see Appendix, Charts 4 and 5). In comparing arrests for Part II offenses, an overall similar parallel is noted. However, there are a few interesting differences indicative of enforcement and reporting practices for Part II offenses:

- Hampton classifies a much higher percentage of arrests than Newport News as "All Other" (37% vs. 25% in 1999)
- The largest percentage of arrests in both cities is for assaults; however, Newport News reports a much higher percentage of arrests than Hampton (20% vs. 14% in 1999)
- Newport News reports a significantly higher percentage of arrests for possession of drugs than Hampton (18% vs. 6% in 1999); however, Hampton reports a higher percentage of arrests for sale and manufacture of drugs than Newport News (7% vs. 5%)
- Hampton reports a higher percentage of DUI than Newport News (8% vs. 6%)
- Hampton reports a higher percentage of fraud than Newport News (4% vs. 1%)

(See Appendix, Tables 5 and 6)

Despite the relatively high proportion of arrests for driving under the influence (DUI) in both cities, arrests for DUI decreased significantly between 1990 and 1999 (by 75% in Newport News and by 48% in Hampton). Another interesting note is the shift in arrests for drug possession versus sale in Hampton. Between 1990 and 1995, more arrests for possession than for sale occurred annually. Beginning in 1996, Hampton has reported more arrests for drug sales than possession. (See Appendix, Tables 5 and 6)

Juvenile Arrests

Unlike adult arrests, arrests of juveniles began a rapid ascent in 1995, which only recently began to reverse. The reverse has been dramatic, with an almost 20% decrease in arrests within one year for the area. Though the local arrest decline is encouraging, it lags behind statewide statistics. Statewide, juvenile arrests decreased almost 30% during the ten-year period.

The overall patterns of arrests have been slightly different for the two cities and the dramatic decrease in arrests in 1999 is due to a change in arrests in Hampton. Hampton experienced a decrease of almost 38% in juvenile arrests between 1998 and 1999. Newport News however, experienced an 11% decrease in juvenile arrests in 1998 followed by an increase in of 7% in 1999. (See Appendix, Chart 6)

While the patterns of arrest for violent crime have been similar between Hampton and Newport News, the patterns of arrests for Part II offenses have been quite different. Until 1997, Hampton reported a higher number of juvenile arrests for Part II offenses than Newport News. This trend clearly reversed in 1999 when the number of juvenile arrests for Part II offenses dropped in Hampton and Newport News continued its trend of increased juvenile arrests for Part II offenses.

A comparison of Part I offenses in Hampton and Newport News shows that the two cities are quite a bit different in regard to the breakdown of certain arrests by offense (see Appendix, Charts 7 and 8). These differences may be indicative of enforcement and reporting practices:

- Hampton has a significantly higher percentage of arrests for larceny than Newport News (76% vs. 44% in 1999)
- Newport News has a much higher percentage of arrests for burglary (19% vs. 9% in 1999)

- Newport News has a significantly higher percentage of arrests for motor vehicle theft than Hampton (19% vs. 5% in 1999)

(See Appendix, Tables 7 and 8)

As noted, there are some indications that enforcement and reporting practices may differ. The 1999 robbery figure for Hampton is 60% less than what was reported in 1998. The 1999 burglary figure reported by Hampton is 51% less than what was reported in 1998.

As with adult arrests, there are a few interesting differences in juvenile arrests for Part II offenses indicative of enforcement and reporting practices:

- Newport News classifies a much higher percentage of arrests than Hampton as “All Other” (36% vs. 12% in 1999) – this is the reverse of what is noted previously for adult arrests
- Hampton classifies a much higher percentage of arrests for other assaults than Newport News (16% vs. 8% in 1999)
- Newport News classifies a much higher percentage of arrests for curfew and loitering than Hampton (16% vs. 11% in 1999)
- Hampton reports a significantly higher percentage of runaway apprehensions than Newport News (32% vs. 17% in 1999)

(See Appendix, Tables 7 and 8)

The Governor’s New Partnership Commission’s report *Crime in the Commonwealth* reported that statewide, juveniles were arrested at a much higher rate than adults for all property crimes (double the rate for burglary and larceny and triple to quadruple the rate for motor vehicle theft and arson).

In comparison to national and state juvenile arrest figures, the area demonstrates a similar pattern which may indicate that the tough enforcement and punishment strategies adopted in the early to mid-1990 are having an impact on juvenile crime. However, a comparison of these trends with age-prone population figures may reveal an aging-out factor.

Illegal Drugs

Illegal drugs remain a problem within the cities of Hampton and Newport News despite increased enforcement efforts. Between 1990 and 1999 the number of adult drug arrests increased by 114% for the area, the majority (59%) for possession. The number of juvenile drug arrests increased a staggering 380% during the same ten-year period. The trend for drug arrests continues to increase, despite overall decreases in arrests. (See Appendix, Charts 9 and 10)

An interesting difference in enforcement and reporting procedures appears when viewing adult arrests by each city. Of all drug arrests in the area for possession, 79% were in Newport News, with only 21% in Hampton. However, in regard to arrests for sale and manufacture, 55% were in Hampton, with 45% in Newport News.

Though arrests for drug offenses continues to increase, arrests for crimes typically associated with drug use have decreased (see Appendix, Charts 11 and 12). Whether this is a result of enforcement and reporting practices or actual decreases in specific crimes cannot be determined with the information at hand.

This area has experienced a slightly different trend than the state in regard to adult arrests for drug offenses. The state, consistent with the nation, experienced its most significant growth in drug arrests between 1994 and 1995. However, this area’s growth spiked in 1992, 1994, and again in 1998. Juvenile arrests have experienced similar spike patterns.

In 1998 the Hampton-Newport News Community Criminal Justice Board developed a comprehensive review of drug use, arrest, punishment, and treatment issues. Refer to that report for additional data.

CRIMINAL PROCESSING TRENDS

Criminal processing data is limited in comparison to arrest data. Furthermore, it is difficult to draw direct cause and effect relations between the two due to how the data is tracked and reported. However, intake and court

data do provide important information regarding procedures and local practices. Overall, the declining crime and arrest rates have had no visible impact on criminal processing trends – as both intake and court activity have increased over the past several years.

Point of Intake

Magistrates

Despite the overall downward trends in crime rates and arrests experienced in both Hampton and Newport News, the trends within the offices of the Magistrate do not clearly correspond. Between 1990 and 1999, Hampton has seen a 30% decrease in magistrate processes and transactions, which is in line with the reduced crime and arrest trends. However, Newport News has actually experienced a 10% increase in magistrate processes and transactions. (See Appendix, Chart 13; Tables 9 and 10)

Delinquency Intakes

Intakes through the Court Service Units of the area closely parallel the juvenile arrest trends. In a three year period, intakes in Hampton declined by 7% and intakes in Newport News declined almost 29% (see Appendix, Chart 13). A review of intake by offense reveals that, despite the dramatic decline in juvenile arrests between 1998 and 1999, there has been little change in the distribution of offense type (see Appendix, Table 11).

Compared with state data, Hampton and Newport News do show a significantly higher percentage of intakes for status offenses, larceny, and assault. The area also has higher representations of probation, parole, and supervision violations, narcotics, and trespassing. (See Appendix, Table 12)

Courts

The decreasing crime and arrest rates have had little impact on the Courts within Hampton and Newport News. Overall, the Courts have actually seen an increase in activity. Part of this may be attributed to extended continuances or longer trial periods, which tend to have a snowball effect on court caseloads.

Circuit Court

The Circuit Courts of both cities have seen a tremendous increase in workload. Between 1990 and 1999 criminal cases increased approximately the same amount in both cities (60% in Hampton and 54% in Newport News). Civil cases on the other hand decreased for both cities, though at a much different rate (33% in Hampton and 4% in Newport News). (See Appendix, Chart 14)

A contributor to the workload has been a decrease in time to case conclusion. In 1990, an overwhelming majority of criminal cases were concluded within five months. By 1999, these figures had dropped, most significantly in Hampton (from 81% to 71% in Newport News; from 93% to 52% in Hampton). In part this may be due to the increase in jury trials. Both cities experienced this change; however, Hampton did so at a higher rate. (See Appendix, Tables 14 and 15)

General District Court

Information available for General District Court activity reveals a few interesting differences between Hampton and Newport News. Between 1990 and 1999, Hampton actually experienced a 14% decrease in new cases. However, during the same period, Newport News experienced an increase of 20% in new cases. The primary contributors to these differences appear to be in practices regarding traffic and civil cases. While Hampton reports a 27% decrease in traffic cases for the period, Newport News reports a 20% increase. Newport News also reports a 33% increase in civil cases. (See Appendix, Charts 15 and 16)

Continuances continue to be high for General District Court in both cities; fluctuating between 33% and 39% in Hampton and between 26% and 29%. Overall, Hampton does seem to be making some progress in reducing continuances as they have reported an overall decrease of 6% between 1990 and 1999. Conversely, continuances in Newport News increased 34% between 1990 and 1999. (See Appendix, Tables 15 and 16) These continuance rates are likely contributors to the jail and pretrial populations discussed later.

Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court

There has been a dramatic increase in Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court activity since 1990 for Hampton and Newport News, far outpacing the increase in arrest and intake activity. Between 1990 and 1999, the number of new juvenile cases increased a staggering 51% in Hampton and 94% in Newport News (see Appendix, Chart 17 and Tables 17 and 18). Domestic cases increased as well, but at much different rates. In Hampton, domestic cases increased by 28%. However, Newport News reports a 112% increase in domestic cases during the ten year period. (See Appendix, Chart 18 and Tables 19 and 20)

These figures are indications that more cases are landing on the steps of the Court, as opposed to being dropped at the arrest or intake stages. In part this may be due to stronger local enforcement practices. It can also be attributed to harsher laws regarding juveniles and how they are processed through intake; as well as mandatory arrests for domestic violence.

CUSTODY AND SUPERVISION

As with criminal processing, the declining rates of crime and arrest have had no visible impact on custody and supervision. Each of the facilities and agencies providing custody and supervision for Hampton and Newport News are experiencing population increases. There is also a general opinion of those in charge of these facilities and agencies that the population is becoming increasingly difficult to manage due to the variety and severity of needs the population demonstrates.

Readily available data regarding population specifics for facilities and agencies providing custody and supervision is difficult to come by. The various facilities and agencies track information in different formats and some have more data than others. For this reason, many of the objectives and strategies outlined in the Criminal Justice Plan focus on data collection and evaluation efforts.

Juvenile Detention

There is one secure juvenile detention facility serving Hampton and Newport News. Between 1997 and 1999, the number of admissions to detention has increased 10% (see Appendix, Chart 19). During the same period, new delinquency cases to court increased less than 9%. Regardless of the growth rate, the facility has steadily held more than double its capacity for the past several years.

Detention placements from Newport News outpace placements from Hampton at a rate of 2 to 1. However, the difference in the number of new delinquency cases to court is not as wide. When compared to new delinquency cases, the placement rate in Newport News is over 12%, but less than 7% in Hampton. In regard to case distribution, Hampton and Newport News show similar patterns, though with some specific differences in regard to the most frequent offenses:

- Newport News places a higher percentage of parole, probation, and supervision violators in detention than Hampton (22% vs. 17% in 1999)
- Hampton places a higher percentage of assault cases in detention than Newport News (21% vs. 14% in 1999)
- Failure to appear and status offenses rank as two of Newport News' most frequent offenses for detention; however, they do not rank highly in Hampton

(See Appendix, Tables 21 and 22)

Overall, the percentages of increased admissions to detention for the area is reflective of statewide figures. The distribution is similar to statewide figures in many areas. However, there are some specific differences, which may be indicative of local enforcement practices.

- In both cities, detention ratios for narcotics violations exceed the state average of 4%
- Newport News' 5% detention ratio of status offenses exceeds the state's 2% average ratio
- The detention ratio of probation and parole violators is lower in both Hampton and Newport News than the state's average ratio

(See Appendix, Table 23)

Jails

Hampton and Newport News have four jail facilities at their disposal; including the beds at the Hampton Roads Regional Jail (HRRJ) which was recently completed to help alleviate some of the crowded conditions at the local city jails. Within three years, the HRRJ reached its capacity and now operates slightly above capacity. The Newport News City jail is the most severely crowded facility of the four; operating at 200% or more of its capacity. (See Appendix, Chart 20)

The exact causes for the continuing high populations are difficult to determine with the data readily available. However, it would be a fair assumption to say that part of the reason for crowded conditions is that defendants are spending more time in jail. Their pretrial time is extended because they cannot bond out, or they are serving more local jail time. In part, this is due to recent bail reform legislation, which established a "rebuttable presumption of guilt" for defendants with certain criminal backgrounds.

During the past year, awaiting trial admissions to jail actually decreased by 5% in Newport News. However, at the point of pretrial screening, more defendants were still available for investigation purposes (over 58% as opposed to 55.5%). Though not facing the same crowded conditions, the Hampton jail is experiencing a similar pattern of longer awaiting trial periods. The number of admissions awaiting trial to the Hampton jail actually increased in the past year by approximately 5%. At the point of pretrial screening, the increase in those still available for investigation purposes increased from 45% to almost 58%. (See Appendix, Charts 21 and 22)

Pretrial Services

Over the past several years, the provision of pretrial services has grown in Hampton and Newport News. The number of investigations conducted annually for the Court has grown to over 6,000 per year (see Appendix, Chart 23). The impact of crowded jail conditions and new legislation has also extended to pretrial. Investigations are often not completed in time because crowded jail conditions make access difficult at times. The result is additional work for the jails, courts, and pretrial.

Another impact of the crowded conditions and new legislation has been the significant increase in bond hearing investigations this past year. In Hampton, bond-hearing investigations for pretrial services has increased 129%. Bond hearing investigations increased 114% in Newport News. This is considered to be a direct result of the bail reform legislation. (See Appendix, Chart 24)

Placements under pretrial supervision have stabilized somewhat during the past few years. However, the average daily caseload has continued to rise. This is due to the length of time defendants remain under supervision. In Hampton, pretrial cases typically remain under supervision longer than the Supreme Court's recommended levels. A review of cases for a specific time frame revealed that continuances were the primary cause of the extended length of supervision. (See Appendix, Chart 25)

There have been several references throughout the previous sections regarding continuances and bail reform legislation. Clearly, each of these has had an impact on various elements of the local criminal justice system and may justify closer examination. The statewide impact of bail reform is still undetermined.

Community Corrections (Local Probation)

Placements to local probation, the Community Corrections Division (CCD) increased dramatically during the first years of the Comprehensive Community Corrections Act for Local-Responsible Offenders. However, recent figures show a possible leveling trend. Regardless, placements to CCD have approached 3,000 per year for the past two years with approximately 65% from Newport News and 35% from Hampton. (See Appendix, Chart 26)

The most noted change in CCD caseloads has been the steady increase in the average daily caseload. In 1997 the caseload averaged 619. By the end of fiscal year 2000, the caseload averaged almost 1,400. (See Appendix, Chart 27) The increase in placements and the types of cases have led to the increased daily caseload. Legislation and court needs have resulted in a high number of domestic violence cases and more substance abuse cases.

Between 1998 and 1999 alone, the percentage of adult cases from Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court has risen from 9% of all placements to 23%. Many of these cases, as well as other sent to CCD, are accompanied by substance abuse problems that require attention. In the last year, placements in substance abuse counseling increased by almost 53%.

State Probation and Parole

Placements to state probation have increased slightly in both Hampton and Newport News. Between 1998 and 1999, Newport News reported a 4% increase in probation placements and Hampton reported an 11% increase. Releases to parole, however, have declined 51% in the last three years. The decline in parole is due largely to a much reduced state parole grant rate and interpretation of legislation regarding post-release supervision. (See Appendix, Charts 28 and 29)

A change in the law effective July 1, 2000 may result in a steady increase in the state probation population residing in Hampton and Newport News; the law has been modified to require a period of post-release supervision for all state responsible offenders.

Focus Area I: Effective & Efficient Adult Offender Programming

OBJECTIVES	STRATEGIES	TARGET DATES	LEAD AGENCIES	STATUS
I-1 Reduced substance abuse and related crime (outcome identified: 1997)	I-1.1 Identify the impact of drug offenses on the local criminal justice system (strategy developed: 1997)	1997-1998	HNNCCCJB	1998 – Report of impact of drug offenses completed
	I-1.2 Establish drug court program (strategy developed: 1997)	1998	NNDC Planning Team	1998 – Newport News Drug Court Program established
	I-1.3 Expand drug court programming (strategy developed: 1999)	2000-2001	Varies	1999 – NNDC program expanded to accept drug-involved offenders 2000 – Hampton Drug Court Planning Team established
	I-1.4 Conduct drug screens on all part I felon arrestees (strategy developed: 1998)	None	H-NNCCJB	1998 – Evaluation of logistics and costs resulted in a determination that this strategy was not feasible to implement
	I-1.5 Conduct substance abuse assessments on drug-involved offenders and provide appropriate treatment (strategy developed: 1998)	2000	H-NNCCJB HNNCJA P&P	1999 – Pilot screening, assessment, and treatment project developed 1999 – HNNCCJB agreed to seek funding to support pilot project 1999 – HNNCCJB endorsed the use of only licensed treatment providers 2000 – Initiation of legislated screening and assessment process on all felons and certain misdemeanants
	I-1.6 Evaluate the capacity of substance abuse services (strategy developed: 1998)	1998-1999	H-NNCCJB	1999 – Completed
	I-1.7 Develop plan of treatment strategies (strategy developed: 1998)	TBD	TBD	No action
	I-1.8 Develop guidelines and evaluation criteria for outsourcing licensed contractors (strategy developed: 1998)	TBD	TBD	No action
I-2 Cataloged and evaluated offender programming options (outcome identified: 1996)	I-2.1 Inventory all local correctional options, the corresponding service providers, the included services and offender populations that receive services (strategy developed: 1996)	1998-2001	H-NNCCJB	1998 – Substance abuse services cataloged
	I-2.2 Evaluate impact of Newport News Drug Court Program (strategy developed: 1998)	2000	H-NNCJA CNU	In progress

OBJECTIVES	STRATEGIES	TARGET DATES	LEAD AGENCIES	STATUS
	I-2.3 Evaluate jail treatment programming (strategy developed: 2000)	2001	HNNCSB	Pending
	I-2.4 Evaluate the gap in services for psychotherapeutic drugs of abuse (strategy developed: 1998)	TBD	TBD	No action
	I-2.5 Evaluate domestic violence programming (strategy developed: 1996)	TBD	TBD	No action
	I-2.6 Evaluate facilities and programs through an analysis of the history of offenders, criminogenic tendencies, and treatment needs / develop profile (strategy adapted from DCJS plan)	TBD	TBD	No action
I-3 Continuity of services (outcome identified: 1996)				
I-4 Reduced barriers to reintegration (outcome identified: 1996)				
I-5 Expanded programming to include allow for appropriate supervision and treatment of offenders as identified in "what works" research (outcome identified: 1996/2000)				

Focus Area II: Juvenile Crime & Justice Issues

OBJECTIVES	STRATEGIES	TARGET DATES	LEAD AGENCIES	STATUS
II-1 Reduced substance abuse and related crime (outcome identified: 1996)	II-1.1 Conduct drug screens on juvenile offenders (strategy developed: 1998)	None	H-NNCCJB	1998 – Evaluation of logistics and costs resulted in a determination that this strategy is not feasible to implement
	II-1.2 Perform substance abuse assessments on drug-involved offenders and provide appropriate treatment (strategy developed: 1998)	2000	H-NNCCJB CSUs	1999 – Pilot screening, assessment, and treatment project developed 1999 – HNNCCJB agreed to seek funding to support pilot project 1999 – HNNCCJB endorsed the use of only licensed treatment providers 2000 – Initiation of legislated screening and assessment process on all felons and certain misdemeanants
	II-1.3 Evaluate the capacity for substance abuse services (strategy developed: 1998)	1998-1999	H-NNCCJB	1999 - Completed
	II-1.4 Develop plan of treatment strategies (strategy developed: 1998)	TBD	TBD	No action
	II-1.5 Develop guidelines and evaluation criteria for outsourcing licensed contractors (strategy developed: 1998)	TBD	TBD	No action
	II-1.6 Educate youth and community on dangers of substance abuse (strategy developed: 2000)	TBD	TBD	No action
II-2 Catalog and evaluate juvenile offender programming options (outcome identified: 1996)	II-2.1 Inventory all juvenile correctional options, the corresponding service providers, the included services and offender populations that receive services, funding sources (strategy developed: 1996)	1998-2001	HNNCJA	1998 – Substance abuse services cataloged 2000 – Completion pending
	II-2.2 Evaluate facilities and programs through an analysis of the history of offenders, criminogenic tendencies, and treatment needs / develop profile (strategy adapted from DCJS plan)	TBD	TBD	No action
II-3 Continuity of services (outcome identified: 1996)				
II-4 Improved efficiency and effectiveness of the use of the region's juvenile justice resources	II-4.1 Evaluate the juvenile detention center population and how the facility is utilized (strategy developed: 2000)	2000-2001	HNNCCJB	2000 – Evaluation RFP in development

OBJECTIVES	STRATEGIES	TARGET DATES	LEAD AGENCIES	STATUS
(outcome identified: 2000)	II-4.2 Develop a profile of stakeholder views concerning the use of juvenile detention (strategy developed: 2000)	2000-2001	HNNCCJB	Pending
	II-4.3 Evaluate minority overrepresentation in the juvenile detention facility for purposes of developing recommendations for change (strategy developed: 2000)	TBD	HNNCCJB	No action
	II-4.4 Evaluate the community-based programming options available for juvenile offenders (strategy developed: 2000)	TBD	HNNCCJB	No action
II-5 Appropriate supervision and treatment for juveniles as identified in "what works" research (outcome identified: 2000)				
II-6 Coordinated implementation of best practices aimed at reducing crime and recidivism (outcome identified 1996/2000)	II-6.1 Establish aftercare/reintegration programs for youth transitioning from correctional facilities to the community (strategy developed: 2000)	TBD	TBD	No action
	II-6.2 Develop mentoring programs for at-risk youth and their families (strategy developed: 2000)	TBD	TBD	No action
	II-6.3 Provide early interventions for youth who have committed minor offenses and may be at-risk for committing more serious offenses (strategy developed: 2000)	TBD	TBD	No action
	II-6.4 Provide targeted services to serious and habitual offenders (strategy developed: 2000)	TBD	TBD	No action
	II-6.5 Establish juvenile assessment center (strategy developed: 1998)	1999	H-NNCCJB	1999 – Review of assessment centers conducted and determined not to be appropriate for the area as defined
II-7 Improved communications among agencies involved in youth programming, education, services, and corrections	II-7.1 Provide information sharing between schools and other community agencies and correctional facilities (strategy developed: 1998)	Ongoing	H-NNCCJB	Ongoing

OBJECTIVES	STRATEGIES	TARGET DATES	LEAD AGENCIES	STATUS
(outcome identified: 2000)	II-7.2 Promote information sharing between schools and other community agencies and corrections facilities regarding general issues and those specific to delinquent youth (strategy developed: 1998)	Ongoing	H-NNCCJB	Ongoing
	II-7.3 Determine the shared data needs among the various stakeholders and develop a strategy to ensure that those needs are met (strategy developed: 2000)	2000-2001	H-NNCCJB	2000 – In progress

Focus Area III: Crime Prevention

OBJECTIVES	STRATEGIES	TARGET DATES	LEAD AGENCIES	STATUS
III-1 Coordinated implementation of existing and new programs for at-risk populations (outcome identified: 1996)				
III-2 Reduced impact of drug trafficking (outcome identified: 1996/1999)				
III-3 Address unemployment (outcome identified: 1996)	III-3.1 Promote job and entrepreneurship training in at-risk neighborhoods (strategy developed: 2000)	TBD	TBD	No action
	III-3.2 Expand employment assistance to ex-offenders reintegrating into the community (strategy developed: 2000)			
	III-3.3 Develop partnerships with employers for employing ex-offenders and other hard to place individuals (strategy developed: 2000)			
III-4 Positive reinforcement programming for youth (outcome identified: 1996)	III-4.1 Support positive youth development initiatives (strategy developed: 2000)	Ongoing	H-NNCCJB	1999 – H-NNCCJB JJSC expanded to include youth development coordinators 2000 – Youth asset survey results presented
	III-4.2 Ensure availability of programs and services for students during at-risk periods (strategy developed: 2000)	TBD	TBD	No action
III-5 Increased and improved prevention programming (outcome identified: 1996)	III-5.1 Provide services for children of inmates (strategy developed: 1996)	TBD	TBD	No action
	III-5.2 Examine “school report card” indicators of violence and controlled substance abuse violations on school grounds, utilizing GIS mapping (strategy developed: 2000)	TBD	TBD	No action
	III-5.3 Inventory and evaluate existing school-based programs (strategy developed: 2000)	TBD	TBD	No action
	III-5.4 Establish and strengthen programs to combat school truancy (strategy developed: 1999)	1999-		1999 – “Keeping Kids in School” Steering Committee in Newport News

OBJECTIVES	STRATEGIES	TARGET DATES	LEAD AGENCIES	STATUS
III-6 Developed set of "core values" to be included in all criminal justice treatment and prevention programs (outcome identified 1996/1999)	III-6.1 Identify the basic "core values" that are paramount to successful criminal justice programming (strategy developed: 1999)	TBD	H-NNCCJB	No action
	III-6.2 Require that the identified "core values" be included in all criminal justice treatment and prevention programming (strategy developed: 1999)	TBD	H-NNCCJB	No action

Focus Area IV: System Improvement

OBJECTIVES	STRATEGIES	TARGET DATES	LEAD AGENCIES	STATUS
IV-1 Coordinated criminal justice planning (outcome identified: 1996)	IV-1.1 Develop a local criminal justice planning unit within the Hampton-Newport News Criminal Justice Agency to coordinate research and planning efforts (strategy developed: 1996)	1998	HNNCJA	1997 – Criminal Justice Planner 1998 – Juvenile Justice Planner 1998 – Agreement w/CNU for drug court study
	IV-1.2 Establish a criminal justice project review procedure for the H-NNCCJB (strategy developed: 1999)	2000	H-NNCCJB	Pending
	IV-1.3 Establish city and H-NNCCJB policies whereby all criminal justice-related projects correspond with the priorities of the H-NNCCJB plan (strategy developed: 1999)	2000	H-NNCCJB	Pending
	IV-1.4 Establish city policies whereby all criminal justice-related projects are reviewed by the H-NNCCJB and allowed to advance only if approved by the Board (strategy developed: 1999)	2000	H-NNCCJB	Pending
	IV-1.5 Develop and utilize subcommittees of the H-NNCCJB to enhance the ability of the Board to accomplish objectives (strategy developed: 1996)	Ongoing	H-NNCCJB	1997 – Criminal Information Systems (informal) 1997 – Newport News Drug Court Planning Team (temporary) 1997 – Juvenile Justice Subcommittee 1998 – Substance Abuse Assessment & Treatment Subcommittee (temporary) 1999 – Adult Offender Issues Subcommittee 2000 – Technology Subcommittee 2000 – Hampton Drug Court Planning Team (temporary) 2000 – Drug Court Advisory Committee
VI-2 Improved and increased communication among elements of the local criminal justice system (outcome identified: 1996)	IV-2.1 Develop a “shared vision” among key criminal justice stakeholders through the development of a mission statement and identification of key issues (strategy developed: 1996)	1997	H-NNCCJB	1996 – Key issues identified 1997 – Mission statement developed 2000 – Plan published Annually – Review and update
	IV-2.2 Build a H-NNCCJB Website with links to local criminal justice stakeholders (strategy developed: 1998)	2000	H-NNCJA	Pending
	IV-2.3 Develop shared computer networks (strategy developed: 1996)	See IV-4	See IV-4	See IV-4

OBJECTIVES	STRATEGIES	TARGET DATES	LEAD AGENCIES	STATUS
	IV-2.4 Develop a comprehensive video arraignment/conferencing strategy (strategy developed: 1999)	Begin 2000	HRRJ	1999 – Grant developed but not funded 2000 – Meetings held regarding future 2000 - CNU assisting in new application and strategy
IV-3 Active role in criminal justice legislative activities that impact Hampton and Newport News (outcome identified: 1996)	IV-3.1 Create and promote local legislative agendas specific to criminal justice needs (strategy developed: 2000)	Annually	H-NNCCJB	Pending
	IV-3.2 Review criminal justice legislation for local impact (strategy developed: 2000)	Annually	H-NNCCJB	Pending
	IV-3.3 Meet with local legislators regarding local impact of criminal justice legislation (strategy developed: 2000)	Annually	H-NNCCJB	Pending
IV-4 Shared computer networks among elements of the local criminal justice system (outcome identified: 1996)	IV-4.1 Develop a network for the HNNCJA that links both cities (strategy developed: 1997)	1998-2000	HNNCJA	1998 – Computer replacements & upgrades installed 1999 – All CJA offices linked to central server 1999 – Internal e-mail system established 1999 – Case management system installed 2000 – Wireless relay established
	IV-4.2 Link the Newport News Drug Court Program to the HNNCJA for case management system utilization (strategy developed: 1999)	1999-2000	HNNCJA NNDCP	1999 – Equipment installed 2000 – Full connection completed
	IV-4.3 Identify common GIS software for all local criminal justice practitioners (strategy developed: 1998)	1998-2000	HNNCJA	1998 – NNPd, HPD, H-NN City Planning all using same software 1998 – GIS workstations installed with juvenile justice practitioners & planner 1998 – GIS training conducted 2000 – H-NNCSB added to scope of project
IV-5 Identified and closed gaps in the local criminal justice system (outcome identified: 1996)	IV-5.1 Set standards for continuance of treatment services (strategy developed: 1996)	TBD	TBD	No action
	IV-5.2 Develop and execute evaluation priorities (strategy developed: 1996)	Ongoing	H-NNCCJB	2000 – Juvenile Detention Population Evaluation 2001 – Jail Population Evaluation
IV-6 Increased speed of judicial process (outcome identified: 1996)	IV-6.1 Provide demographic and status data to courts (strategy developed: 1996)	TBD	TBD	No action
	IV-6.2 Monitor effects of bail reform on local jails and processes (strategy developed: 1999)	2000	HNNCJA	1999/2000 - Quarterly reviews of data provided to CCJB and DCJS

OBJECTIVES	STRATEGIES	TARGET DATES	LEAD AGENCIES	STATUS
IV-7 Increased funding resources (outcome identified: 1996)	IV-7.1 Develop outlines of planning strategy ideas, evaluation ideas, and local programming needs in anticipation of expected grant opportunities (strategy developed: 2000)	2000-2001	HNNCJA	Pending
	IV-7.2 Develop master list of foundations, grant agencies, and other potential sources of funding (strategy developed: 2000)	2001	HNNCJA	Pending
IV-8 Enhanced court effectiveness (outcome identified: 1998)	IV-8.1 Provide enhanced education to judiciary and members of the local bar associations (strategy developed: 1998)	TBD	TBD	No action
	IV-8.2 Strengthen sentencing through graduated sanctions, rewards, and consistency (strategy developed: 1998)	TBD	TBD	No action
	IV-8.3 Seek "buy-in" to the strengthened approach (strategy developed: 1998)	TBD	TBD	No action
IV-9 Effective utilization of resources (outcome identified 2000)	IV-9.1 Require all new criminal justice programs that involve on-going funding to include an evaluation component (strategy developed: 2000)	TBD	TBD	No action

Focus Area V: Community Awareness & Involvement

OBJECTIVES	STRATEGIES	TARGET DATES	LEAD AGENCIES	STATUS
V-1 Involved and educated public on criminal justice planning strategies (outcome identified: 1996/1999)	V-1.1 Identify “public” and determine level of involvement in planning and implementation (strategy developed: 1999)	2000	H-NNCCJB	2000 – Groups identified and process begun
	V-1.2 Hold criminal justice summit (strategy developed: 1996)	TBD	H-NNCCJB	No action
	V-1.3 Hold town hall meetings (strategy developed: 1996)	TBD	H-NNCCJB	No action
	V-1.4 Include military representation on H-NNCCJB and in subcommittees (strategy developed: 2000)	2000	H-NNCCJB	2000 – Revised bylaws pending
	V-1.5 Survey victims for information to assist in framing outcomes related to increased effectiveness of victim witness programming (strategy developed: 2000)	TBD	H-NNCCJB	No action
	V-1.6 Survey business owners for information to assist in framing crime prevention strategies and outcomes (strategy developed: 2000)	TBD	H-NNCCJB	No action
	V-1.7 Survey youth for information to assist in framing crime prevention strategies and outcomes (strategy developed: 2000)	TBD	H-NNCCJB	No action
V-2 Informed City Councils (outcome identified: 2000)	V-2.1 Provide reports of H-NNCCJB activities to City Councils (strategy developed: 2000)	Annually	H-NNCCJB	No action
	V-2.2 Provide reports of criminal justice program activities to H-NNCCJB and City Councils (strategy developed: 2000)	Annually	Varies	No action
V-3 Informed General Assembly (outcome identified: 1999)	V-3.1 Provide report of H-NNCCJB and criminal justice program activities to local legislators and key legislative committee members (strategy developed: 2000)	Annually	H-NNCCJB	No action
	V-3.2 Invite local legislators and key legislative committee members to H-NNCCJB events (strategy developed: 2000)	Ongoing	H-NNCCJB	2000 – Legislators invited to special JJSC retreat re: detention reform
V-4 Increased effectiveness of victim witness programming (outcome identified: 1996)				

OBJECTIVES	STRATEGIES	TARGET DATES	LEAD AGENCIES	STATUS
V-5 Expanded community-based approaches to crime prevention (outcome identified: 1996)	V-5.1 Expand Neighborhood Watch and Minute Man Task Force programs (strategy developed 1996)	TBD	TBD	No action
	V-5.2 Emphasize the importance of full reporting of crime by the community (strategy adapted from DCJS plan)	TBD	TBD	No action