

U.S. STATE JUVENILE JUSTICE STATUTORY INDEX

Phase I - Expanded 10-State Research Edition

Version 0.4

Independent continuation of the August 1, 2025 two-state sample

Research Cutoff Date: February 2026
Publication Date: August 10, 2026

Prepared by

Hanna Kotyk

Comparative Legal Researcher and Policy Author
Juvenile Justice Innovation Initiative LLC

Publication Status, Research Integrity, and Use Notice

Status. This document is a separate ten-state continuation of the two-state sample dated August 1, 2025. It records Phase I of the U.S. State Juvenile Justice Statutory Index and combines statutory mapping with selected institutional and implementation references for New York, Texas, Michigan, California, Florida, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Colorado, and Washington.

Purpose. The Index provides a structured comparative research tool for scholars, legal professionals, universities, law clinics, researchers, educators, and organizations studying juvenile justice. It may also support state-specific legal mapping, professional education, and policy analysis.

Limitations. Version 0.4 is a Phase I research map focused on five foundational categories: age and jurisdiction, diversion, adult-court routing, restorative justice or family-group processes, and data reporting. It is not a comprehensive crosswalk of all twelve Model Act modules, is not legal advice, and does not replace official statutes, administrative rules, court decisions, agency guidance, or local implementation research. Current law should be verified before jurisdiction-specific reliance.

Attribution and permitted use. Copyright © 2026 Hanna Kotyk. Permission is granted to quote, reproduce, distribute, teach, discuss, and adapt this document for noncommercial academic, educational, legal-research, professional-training, governmental, and public-policy purposes, provided that Hanna Kotyk is credited and material changes are identified. Commercial republication requires written permission.

Development Record

Version / milestone	Date	Development output
v0.3	August 1, 2025	Two-state sample covering New York and Texas; narrative summaries were drafted and citations were identified for later validation.
Research expansion checkpoint	February 2026	Ten-state Phase I research snapshot developed using the same five categories as the original sample; statutory and institutional source mapping expanded.
v0.4 publication edition	August 10, 2026	Publication-formatted research edition with a separated research cutoff date, source directory, Model Act comparison notes, and verification protocol.

Principal Changes From v0.3

- Expanded coverage from two states to ten states selected to reflect geographic, statutory, and institutional variation.
- Replaced provisional descriptions with statutory citations and selected official institutional sources.
- Retained the original five comparative categories to preserve continuity while identifying this edition as Phase I.
- Distinguished judicial waiver, excluded jurisdiction, direct file, indictment, Youth Part, and youthful-offender procedures where applicable.
- Clarified that negative findings concerning restorative justice or FGC are limited to the core statutes and official sources reviewed for this edition.
- Added a Model Act comparison column to support teaching, legal research, and jurisdiction-specific analysis.

CONTENTS

Publication Status, Research Integrity, and Use Notice.....	1
Development Record and Principal Changes From v0.3.....	1
Phase I Scope, Methodology, and Comparative Summary.....	2
1. New York (NY).....	4
2. Texas (TX).....	5
3. Michigan (MI).....	6
4. California (CA).....	7
5. Florida (FL).....	8
6. Illinois (IL).....	9
7. Pennsylvania (PA).....	10
8. Massachusetts (MA).....	11
9. Colorado (CO).....	12
10. Washington (WA).....	13
Cross-State Research Findings and Model Act Alignment.....	14
Official Sources and Verification Protocol.....	15

Phase I Scope and Methodology

Methodological element	Approach
Primary-source orientation	The Index prioritizes official state statutes, court or agency publications, official data dashboards, and government research materials.
Comparative categories	Each state is reviewed across age and jurisdiction, diversion, transfer to adult court, restorative justice or family-group processes, and data reporting.
Research cutoff and publication date	Research cutoff: February 2026. Publication date: August 10, 2026. Current law may differ and must be rechecked before reliance.
Scope boundary	The Index is a structured research map, not a substitute for a complete state-code crosswalk, jurisdiction-specific constitutional memorandum, or local implementation study.
Model Act comparison	The comparison column identifies whether the state approach generally aligns with, partially aligns with, or differs materially from Draft 4.0 of the Model Juvenile Justice Act for States.
Phase I scope	This edition covers five foundational categories and does not claim to be a complete twelve-module or fifty-state statutory crosswalk. Selected institutional sources are included to show implementation and data context.

Ten-State Comparative Snapshot

State	Age / jurisdiction	Diversion	Adult-court pathway	Restorative justice	Data / KPIs
New York	Generally 12-17; specified serious offenses for ages 7-11	Adjustment before petition	Youth-part / removal pathways	Programmatic/local	Strong state data infrastructure
Texas	10-16 at offense; continuing jurisdiction rules	Deferred prosecution	Judicial certification/waiver	Programmatic/local	TJJD statewide systems
Michigan	Conduct before 18; no general minimum in core jurisdiction text	Consent calendar	Waiver at 14+; designated proceedings	Programmatic/local	Expanding standardized court data
California	Generally 12-17; narrow under-12 exceptions	Informal supervision	Judicial transfer under WIC § 707	Programmatic/local	OpenJustice/JCPSS

State	Age / jurisdiction	Diversion	Adult-court pathway	Restorative justice	Data / KPIs
Florida	Under 7 barred except forcible felony; generally under 18	Civil citation / prearrest diversion	Waiver, direct file, indictment	Programmatic/local	JJIS and public dashboards
Illinois	Conduct before 18; no general minimum in core provision	Station adjustment	Excluded jurisdiction and transfer	Programmatic/local	IDJJ reports and PbS
Pennsylvania	Delinquent child generally 10+ and under 18	Informal adjustment	Transfer both directions; excluded acts	Balanced and restorative justice policy	State court dashboards
Massachusetts	Delinquent child 12-17; youthful offender 14-17	Court and prosecutor diversion	Youthful-offender procedure	State statutory RJ framework	JJPAD data system
Colorado	Under 18; multiple age-specific thresholds	Prefiling/postfiling diversion	Direct filing and transfer provisions	RJ integrated into diversion	State justice reports/data
Washington	Under 18; ages 8-under12 subject to capacity presumption	Broad statutory diversion	Decline hearing and adult-jurisdiction exceptions	Explicit RJ referral authority	DCYF dashboards

How to Read the Snapshot

- The age column is a research shorthand and should be read together with each state's detailed definition, capacity rules, offense exceptions, and continuing-jurisdiction provisions.
- “Programmatic/local” means that restorative practices were identified in official or institutional programming, but no universal statewide juvenile FGC entitlement was identified within the core statutes and official sources reviewed for this edition.
- Adult-court pathways are not interchangeable: waiver, decline, excluded jurisdiction, direct file, indictment, and youthful-offender procedures impose different decision-makers and safeguards.
- Data availability does not by itself establish comparability. State definitions, counting units, privacy rules, and reporting periods must be mapped before cross-state quantitative analysis.

Scope reminder. This snapshot is designed to orient comparative research; the state sections and linked official sources control over the abbreviated entries above.

1. New York (NY)

Family Court Act age reform, pre-petition adjustment, youth-part removal mechanisms, and multi-agency data reporting.

Research category	Verified statutory / institutional summary	Key authority	Model Act comparison
Age of jurisdiction	A juvenile delinquent is generally a person at least 12 and under 18. The statute also identifies specified serious acts for children over 7 and under 12. Children under 12 outside those exceptions may be routed to differential-response services rather than delinquency adjudication.	N.Y. Fam. Ct. Act § 301.2; N.Y. Soc. Serv. Law § 458-o	Partially aligned. Draft 4.0 prefers a general minimum age of 14, with a transitional option of 12.
Diversion / adjustment	Probation may conduct an adjustment process before a juvenile delinquency petition is filed. The adjustment process can include conferences, services, and efforts to resolve the matter without formal adjudication.	N.Y. Fam. Ct. Act § 308.1	Aligned in function, though Draft 4.0 creates a stronger statewide presumption, written denial reasons, and review.
Transfer / adult-court routing	New York uses juvenile-offender and adolescent-offender pathways in superior-court youth parts, with statutory mechanisms for removal to Family Court. The system is not a simple single waiver model.	N.Y. Crim. Proc. Law arts. 722, 725; §§ 722.22, 722.23	Materially different. Draft 4.0 rejects automatic or prosecutorial routing and requires an individualized judicial waiver hearing.
Restorative justice / FGC	Court-supported community dispute-resolution centers and local programs may provide youth-focused restorative practices. The reviewed statewide core statutes do not establish a universal juvenile family-group-conferencing entitlement.	N.Y. Unified Court System, Community Dispute Resolution Centers	Partial alignment through program availability; Draft 4.0 supplies uniform voluntariness, confidentiality, facilitator, and agreement safeguards.
Data reporting / KPIs	New York publishes juvenile justice profiles, trend tables, and performance metrics through state criminal-justice agencies. Data infrastructure is comparatively developed but remains distributed across agencies and program types.	N.Y. Division of Criminal Justice Services juvenile justice data resources	Broadly aligned with Draft 4.0's emphasis on disaggregated public reporting and continuous evaluation.

Primary official sources

- [New York Family Court Act § 301.2 - Definitions](#)
- [New York Family Court Act § 308.1 - Adjustment process](#)
- [New York Social Services Law § 458-o - Differential response programs](#)
- [New York Criminal Procedure Law § 722.22 - Removal of juvenile-offender action](#)
- [New York Criminal Procedure Law § 722.23 - Removal of adolescent-offender action](#)
- [New York Unified Court System - Community Dispute Resolution Centers](#)
- [New York DCJS - Juvenile Justice Profiles](#)
- [New York DCJS - Juvenile Justice Performance Metrics](#)

Verification note: This section records a comparative research snapshot using the official sources listed below. Current statutes, court rules, case law, agency guidance, and local implementation should be rechecked before jurisdiction-specific reliance.

2. Texas (TX)

Age ten threshold, deferred prosecution, judicial certification, and statewide juvenile justice information systems.

Research category	Verified statutory / institutional summary	Key authority	Model Act comparison
Age of jurisdiction	For Title 3 of the Family Code, a “child” generally means a person at least 10 and under 17, or a person under 18 concerning conduct committed before age 17. Continuing-jurisdiction provisions may apply after the initial age threshold.	Tex. Fam. Code § 51.02	Differs from Draft 4.0’s preferred minimum age of 14 and transitional option of 12.
Diversion / deferred prosecution	Deferred prosecution permits voluntary supervision, services, and conditions without adjudication for an authorized period. Prosecutors and juvenile probation departments play central screening roles.	Tex. Fam. Code § 53.03	Functionally aligned, but Draft 4.0 would strengthen statewide eligibility standards, fee protections, and review of denials.
Transfer / adult-court routing	A juvenile court may waive exclusive jurisdiction and certify a child for criminal proceedings after a hearing when statutory age, offense, probable-cause, and welfare factors are satisfied.	Tex. Fam. Code § 54.02	Partially aligned because a judicial hearing is required; Draft 4.0 is narrower and prohibits nonjudicial transfer mechanisms.
Restorative justice / FGC	Restorative and victim-accountability practices exist in local probation and community programs. No single universal statewide juvenile FGC mandate was identified within the core Family Code provisions and official sources reviewed for this edition.	Local juvenile probation and community programming; state program resources	Partial alignment at the program level, without Draft 4.0’s uniform statutory safeguards.
Data reporting / KPIs	TJJD publishes statewide data, legislative reports, and research; the Juvenile Case Management System supports local case information and statewide reporting.	Texas Juvenile Justice Department data resources; JCMS	Strong alignment with the Model Act’s data-governance objectives, subject to privacy and cross-agency consistency.

Primary official sources

- [Texas Family Code § 51.02 - Definitions](#)
- [Texas Family Code § 53.03 - Deferred prosecution](#)
- [Texas Family Code § 54.02 - Waiver of jurisdiction and certification](#)
- [Texas Juvenile Justice Department - Data and Statistics](#)
- [Texas Juvenile Justice Department - Research and Legislative Reports](#)
- [Texas Juvenile Justice Department - Juvenile Case Management System](#)

Verification note: This section records a comparative research snapshot using the official sources listed below. Current statutes, court rules, case law, agency guidance, and local implementation should be rechecked before jurisdiction-specific reliance.

3. Michigan (MI)

Family-division jurisdiction, consent calendar, waiver and designated proceedings, and developing statewide data standards.

Research category	Verified statutory / institutional summary	Key authority	Model Act comparison
Age of jurisdiction	The family division generally has jurisdiction over offenses committed by a person before age 18. The core jurisdiction provision does not state a single general minimum age; separate competency, custody, and service provisions contain age-specific rules.	Mich. Comp. Laws § 712A.2	Different from Draft 4.0, which states a preferred minimum age and alternative transition option.
Diversion / consent calendar	If formal jurisdiction is unnecessary, the court may place a case on a nonpublic consent calendar with an agreed case plan. Successful completion leads to closure without formal adjudication.	Mich. Comp. Laws § 712A.2f	Substantially aligned in purpose. Draft 4.0 adds a broader diversion presumption and standardized denial review.
Transfer / adult-court routing	Traditional waiver may be sought for a juvenile age 14 or older accused of a felony. Michigan also authorizes designated proceedings for specified or prosecutor-designated cases, creating multiple adult-sentencing pathways.	Mich. Comp. Laws §§ 712A.4, 712A.2d	Materially broader than Draft 4.0, which permits transfer only after a narrow individualized judicial hearing.
Restorative justice / FGC	Restorative practices appear in school guidance, grant-supported programming, and community initiatives. No universal statewide FGC entitlement was identified within the Juvenile Code provisions and official sources reviewed for this edition.	Michigan Department of Education and MDHHS restorative-program resources	Partial alignment through programmatic practice; Draft 4.0 provides a statutory framework.
Data reporting / KPIs	Michigan is implementing expanded juvenile-justice court-data requirements and maintains state program information through MDHHS and the State Court Administrative Office.	SCAO juvenile justice data requirements; MDHHS juvenile justice resources	Directionally aligned with Draft 4.0's uniform data standards, public reporting, and research access.

Primary official sources

- [Michigan Compiled Laws § 712A.2 - Family division jurisdiction](#)
- [Michigan Compiled Laws § 712A.2f - Consent calendar](#)
- [Michigan Compiled Laws § 712A.4 - Waiver of jurisdiction](#)
- [Michigan Compiled Laws § 712A.2d - Designated proceedings](#)
- [Michigan Department of Health and Human Services - Juvenile Justice](#)
- [Michigan Department of Education - Restorative Justice Practices](#)
- [Michigan State Court Administrative Office - New Juvenile Justice Data Collection Requirements](#)

Verification note: This section records a comparative research snapshot using the official sources listed below. Current statutes, court rules, case law, agency guidance, and local implementation should be rechecked before jurisdiction-specific reliance.

4. California (CA)

Minimum-age protections, probation-led informal supervision, judicial transfer, and statewide OpenJustice data.

Research category	Verified statutory / institutional summary	Key authority	Model Act comparison
Age of jurisdiction	Welfare and Institutions Code § 602 generally covers persons ages 12 through 17. A child under 12 may be within delinquency jurisdiction only for specified homicide and serious sexual offenses identified by statute.	Cal. Welf. & Inst. Code § 602	Partial alignment. California's general threshold of 12 matches Draft 4.0's transition option but is below its preferred age of 14.
Diversion / informal supervision	Probation may place a youth under informal supervision without filing a petition or may refer the youth to services under statutory conditions. County implementation varies.	Cal. Welf. & Inst. Code § 654	Aligned in diversion function; Draft 4.0 seeks more uniform eligibility, proportional conditions, and review.
Transfer / adult-court routing	Transfer to criminal court occurs through a judicial transfer hearing under § 707. California no longer uses prosecutorial direct file as the primary route after Proposition 57.	Cal. Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 707, 707.5	Closer to Draft 4.0 than direct-file systems, but statutory eligibility and burden details remain different.
Restorative justice / FGC	Counties, schools, and community organizations operate restorative programs. The reviewed statewide juvenile code does not establish a universal FGC requirement with uniform procedures.	County and local restorative-justice programs; state policy resources	Partial alignment at the program level.
Data reporting / KPIs	The California Department of Justice operates the Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System and publishes juvenile justice data through OpenJustice.	California DOJ, Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System	Strong institutional foundation for Draft 4.0-style baseline and disparity analysis.

Primary official sources

- [California Welfare and Institutions Code § 602 - Delinquency jurisdiction](#)
- [California Welfare and Institutions Code § 654 - Informal supervision](#)
- [California Welfare and Institutions Code § 707 - Transfer hearing](#)
- [California Welfare and Institutions Code § 707.5 - Return to juvenile court in specified circumstances](#)
- [California DOJ - Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System context](#)
- [California DOJ - Juvenile Justice in California](#)

Verification note: This section records a comparative research snapshot using the official sources listed below. Current statutes, court rules, case law, agency guidance, and local implementation should be rechecked before jurisdiction-specific reliance.

5. Florida (FL)

Age-seven floor with an exception, statewide civil citation, multiple adult-court routes, and detailed DJJ dashboards.

Research category	Verified statutory / institutional summary	Key authority	Model Act comparison
Age of jurisdiction	A child younger than seven generally may not be arrested, charged, or adjudicated delinquent for conduct occurring before age seven, unless the conduct is a statutorily defined forcible felony. Chapter 985 otherwise generally addresses persons under 18.	Fla. Stat. §§ 985.03, 985.031	Materially different from Draft 4.0's preferred age of 14 and transitional age of 12.
Diversion / prearrest citation	Florida authorizes civil citation and other prearrest diversion alternatives. State law also requires data reporting on use of prearrest citations for eligible first-time misdemeanor conduct.	Fla. Stat. §§ 985.12, 985.126	Strong operational alignment with diversion goals; Draft 4.0 would broaden uniformity and judicial review protections.
Transfer / adult-court routing	Florida uses several pathways, including judicial waiver, prosecutorial direct file, and indictment for specified offenses.	Fla. Stat. §§ 985.556, 985.557, 985.56	Substantially different. Draft 4.0 prohibits direct file and statutory exclusion and requires individualized judicial waiver.
Restorative justice / FGC	Restitution, accountability, civil citation, and local restorative practices appear within programs, but the reviewed Chapter 985 provisions do not create a universal statewide FGC process.	Florida DJJ diversion and local program materials	Partial programmatic alignment.
Data reporting / KPIs	Florida's Juvenile Justice Information System supports the Delinquency Profile, prearrest-citation dashboard, Comprehensive Accountability Reports, and other statewide and local indicators.	Florida Department of Juvenile Justice data resources	Strong alignment with Draft 4.0's emphasis on public metrics and system-level evaluation.

Primary official sources

- [Florida Statutes § 985.03 - Definitions](#)
- [Florida Statutes § 985.031 - Age limitation](#)
- [Florida Statutes § 985.12 - Civil citation and prearrest diversion](#)
- [Florida Statutes § 985.126 - Diversion data reporting](#)
- [Florida Statutes § 985.556 - Waiver of juvenile court jurisdiction](#)
- [Florida Statutes § 985.557 - Direct filing of an information](#)
- [Florida DJJ - Delinquency Profile](#)
- [Florida DJJ - Reports and Data](#)

Verification note: This section records a comparative research snapshot using the official sources listed below. Current statutes, court rules, case law, agency guidance, and local implementation should be rechecked before jurisdiction-specific reliance.

6. Illinois (IL)

Juvenile-court jurisdiction before age 18, station adjustment, excluded jurisdiction, and department performance reporting.

Research category	Verified statutory / institutional summary	Key authority	Model Act comparison
Age of jurisdiction	Article V generally permits delinquency proceedings for conduct committed before a minor's eighteenth birthday. The core jurisdiction provision does not state a single general minimum age, although separate detention and disposition provisions contain age thresholds.	705 Ill. Comp. Stat. 405/5-120	Different from Draft 4.0's express minimum-age framework.
Diversion / station adjustment	Law enforcement may use station adjustment for eligible matters, with conditions and limits set by the Juvenile Court Act and local policy.	705 Ill. Comp. Stat. 405/5-301	Functionally aligned with prepetition diversion, but Draft 4.0 calls for a stronger statewide presumption and review process.
Transfer / adult-court routing	Illinois retains excluded-jurisdiction categories and judicial transfer provisions for specified serious cases.	705 Ill. Comp. Stat. 405/5-130, 5-805	Materially broader than Draft 4.0, especially where jurisdiction is excluded without the Model Act's individualized waiver standard.
Restorative justice / FGC	Restorative and community-mediation practices are implemented through local programs, courts, schools, and service organizations. No universal juvenile FGC mandate was identified within the core Article V provisions and official sources reviewed for this edition.	Local restorative and community mediation programs	Partial alignment through local practice.
Data reporting / KPIs	IDJJ publishes annual, quarterly, demographic, educational, and program reports and participates in Performance-based Standards for institutional improvement.	Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice data and PbS resources	Broad alignment with Draft 4.0's facility-performance and public-reporting concepts.

Primary official sources

- [705 ILCS 405/5-120 - Exclusive jurisdiction](#)
- [705 ILCS 405/5-301 - Station adjustment](#)
- [705 ILCS 405/5-130 - Excluded jurisdiction](#)
- [Illinois Juvenile Court Act - Transfer provisions including 5-805](#)
- [Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice - Data and Reports](#)
- [Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice - Quarterly Reports](#)
- [Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice - Performance-based Standards](#)

Verification note: This section records a comparative research snapshot using the official sources listed below. Current statutes, court rules, case law, agency guidance, and local implementation should be rechecked before jurisdiction-specific reliance.

7. Pennsylvania (PA)

Age-ten delinquency threshold, informal adjustment, two-way transfer provisions, and balanced-and-restorative-justice policy.

Research category	Verified statutory / institutional summary	Key authority	Model Act comparison
Age of jurisdiction	A “delinquent child” is a child age 10 or older who committed a delinquent act and needs treatment, supervision, or rehabilitation. Certain serious acts are excluded from the definition and routed through criminal proceedings unless transferred back.	42 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 6302	Differs from Draft 4.0’s preferred minimum of 14 and transition option of 12.
Diversion / informal adjustment	A matter may be resolved through informal adjustment under juvenile probation and court supervision, subject to statutory and procedural limits.	42 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 6323; Pa. R.J.C.P. 312	Functionally aligned; Draft 4.0 adds uniform presumption, denial reasons, review, and fee protections.
Transfer / adult-court routing	Pennsylvania provides transfer from juvenile to criminal proceedings and transfer from criminal proceedings back to juvenile court. Some offenses are initially excluded from the juvenile definition.	42 Pa. Cons. Stat. §§ 6355, 6322, 6302	Materially broader than Draft 4.0’s single judicial-waiver pathway.
Restorative justice / FGC	The Juvenile Act expressly incorporates balanced and restorative justice, emphasizing community protection, accountability, and competency development.	42 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 6301	Strong policy alignment, though Draft 4.0 specifies more detailed voluntary conferencing safeguards.
Data reporting / KPIs	Pennsylvania courts publish juvenile-court and related justice dashboards and reports, supporting statewide trend and caseload analysis.	Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts dashboards	Broad alignment with transparent data and evaluation goals.

Primary official sources

- [42 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 6302 - Definitions](#)
- [42 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 6323 - Informal adjustment](#)
- [42 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 6322 - Transfer from criminal proceedings](#)
- [42 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 6355 - Transfer to criminal proceedings](#)
- [42 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 6301 - Short title and purposes / balanced and restorative justice](#)
- [Pennsylvania Courts - Research and Statistics Dashboards](#)

Verification note: This section records a comparative research snapshot using the official sources listed below. Current statutes, court rules, case law, agency guidance, and local implementation should be rechecked before jurisdiction-specific reliance.

8. Massachusetts (MA)

Age twelve jurisdiction, statutory diversion, youthful-offender procedure, restorative justice, and JJPAD oversight.

Research category	Verified statutory / institutional summary	Key authority	Model Act comparison
Age of jurisdiction	A delinquent child is generally a child between 12 and 18 who commits a qualifying offense. A youthful offender is generally a person who committed specified serious conduct between ages 14 and 18 and meets additional statutory criteria.	Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 119, § 52	The age-12 threshold matches Draft 4.0's transition option but is below its preferred minimum of 14.
Diversion	Juvenile courts and district attorneys may divert eligible children to community supervision or rehabilitative services. The statute includes eligibility, assessment, confidentiality, and completion provisions.	Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 119, § 54A	Substantially aligned with diversion objectives and structured safeguards.
Transfer / adult-court routing	Massachusetts primarily uses the youthful-offender procedure within Juvenile Court rather than a conventional broad waiver system. Separate provisions address murder and adult-sentencing consequences.	Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 119, §§ 52, 54, 72B	Different architecture. Draft 4.0 uses judicial waiver to adult court but also includes youth-specific sentencing safeguards.
Restorative justice / FGC	Chapter 276B establishes a voluntary community-based restorative-justice framework and defines restorative-justice practices.	Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 276B	Strong alignment with Draft 4.0's voluntary, informed, community-based approach.
Data reporting / KPIs	The Juvenile Justice Policy and Data Board and its Data Subcommittee maintain statewide reports, dashboards, and recommendations on data quality and outcomes.	Massachusetts JJPAD resources	Strong alignment with independent evaluation, cross-agency data, and public reporting.

Primary official sources

- [Massachusetts General Laws ch. 119, § 52 - Definitions](#)
- [Massachusetts General Laws ch. 119, § 54A - Diversion](#)
- [Massachusetts General Laws ch. 119, § 54 - Complaints and youthful-offender indictment](#)
- [Massachusetts General Laws ch. 119, § 72B - Murder cases involving youth](#)
- [Massachusetts General Laws ch. 276B - Restorative justice](#)
- [Massachusetts Juvenile Justice System - Data and Outcomes for Youth](#)
- [Massachusetts Juvenile Justice Policy and Data Board](#)

Verification note: This section records a comparative research snapshot using the official sources listed below. Current statutes, court rules, case law, agency guidance, and local implementation should be rechecked before jurisdiction-specific reliance.

9. Colorado (CO)

Age-specific juvenile-code rules, prefiling and postfiling diversion, direct-file/transfer statutes, and restorative-justice integration.

Research category	Verified statutory / institutional summary	Key authority	Model Act comparison
Age of jurisdiction	Colorado's juvenile code principally addresses individuals under 18 and contains multiple age-specific rules, including provisions beginning at age 10 for several delinquency procedures. The exact age rule should be verified for the issue, offense, and procedural stage being studied.	Colo. Rev. Stat. tit. 19, arts. 2.5 and 2.5-6	Differs from Draft 4.0's preferred minimum age of 14 and transitional option of 12.
Diversion	Diversion may occur before filing or after filing as an alternative to formal adjudication, through programs operated by district attorneys, governmental units, or nongovernmental providers.	Colo. Rev. Stat. § 19-2.5-402	Substantially aligned in structure; Draft 4.0 adds statewide presumptions and uniform denial-review safeguards.
Transfer / adult-court routing	Colorado retains direct-filing and judicial-transfer provisions for specified cases, subject to statutory age and offense requirements.	Colo. Rev. Stat. §§ 19-2.5-801, 19-2.5-802	Materially different because Draft 4.0 prohibits prosecutorial direct file and requires a single judicial-waiver model.
Restorative justice / FGC	Colorado law and statewide program policy integrate restorative justice into diversion and allow restorative options within community-based juvenile responses.	Colo. Rev. Stat. § 19-2.5-402; 2021 Colo. Sess. Laws ch. 136	Strong programmatic alignment, with Draft 4.0 adding uniform confidentiality and participation safeguards.
Data reporting / KPIs	Colorado publishes juvenile-justice system overviews and data through state public-safety and legislative research resources. Data are distributed across agencies and programs.	Colorado Division of Criminal Justice and General Assembly research resources	Directionally aligned; Draft 4.0 would standardize cross-system fields and annual public reporting.

Primary official sources

- [Colorado Revised Statutes - Title 19, Children's Code](#)
- [Colorado Senate Bill 21-059 / recodified Juvenile Justice Code](#)
- [Colorado Senate Bill 21-066 - Restorative justice in juvenile diversion](#)
- [Colorado Senate Bill 24-006 - Juvenile diversion programs](#)
- [Colorado General Assembly - Colorado Juvenile Justice Systems overview](#)
- [Colorado Division of Criminal Justice - Relative Rate Index resources](#)

Verification note: This section records a comparative research snapshot using the official sources listed below. Current statutes, court rules, case law, agency guidance, and local implementation should be rechecked before jurisdiction-specific reliance.

10. Washington (WA)

Under-eighteen jurisdiction, rebuttable capacity rules for younger children, statutory diversion, explicit restorative referrals, and public dashboards.

Research category	Verified statutory / institutional summary	Key authority	Model Act comparison
Age of jurisdiction	The Juvenile Justice Act generally defines a juvenile as an individual under 18 who is not under adult-court jurisdiction. Children ages eight and under twelve are presumed incapable of committing crime unless the presumption is rebutted by proof of sufficient capacity.	Wash. Rev. Code §§ 13.40.020, 9A.04.050	Partially aligned. The capacity presumption protects younger children but does not establish Draft 4.0's categorical preferred minimum age.
Diversion	Complaints are screened for filing or diversion. The statute requires or authorizes diversion for defined categories and permits diversion agreements, counseling, services, and community-based responses.	Wash. Rev. Code §§ 13.40.070, 13.40.080	Strong operational alignment, though Draft 4.0 adds uniform review, fee, duration, and completion protections.
Transfer / adult-court routing	Juvenile court may decline jurisdiction after a hearing under § 13.40.110. Separate provisions establish adult-court jurisdiction for specified offenses and circumstances.	Wash. Rev. Code §§ 13.40.110, 13.04.030	Partially aligned where a decline hearing occurs, but adult-jurisdiction exceptions are broader than Draft 4.0.
Restorative justice / FGC	Washington expressly authorizes referrals to community-based restorative justice, mediation, or reconciliation programs and recognizes restorative justice within community-based rehabilitation.	Wash. Rev. Code §§ 13.40.070, 13.40.020, 13.40.080	Strong alignment with restorative availability; Draft 4.0 provides additional procedural safeguards.
Data reporting / KPIs	DCYF publishes Juvenile Rehabilitation dashboards covering admissions, releases, population, recidivism, employment, mental health access, disparity measures, and room confinement.	Washington DCYF Juvenile Rehabilitation Dashboards	Strong alignment with Draft 4.0's outcome, disparity, and confinement reporting model.

Primary official sources

- [Washington RCW 13.40.020 - Definitions](#)
- [Washington RCW 9A.04.050 - Capacity of children to commit crime](#)
- [Washington RCW 13.40.070 - Screening, diversion, and restorative referrals](#)
- [Washington RCW 13.40.080 - Diversion agreements](#)
- [Washington RCW 13.40.110 - Decline hearing](#)
- [Washington RCW 13.04.030 - Juvenile court jurisdiction and exceptions](#)
- [Washington DCYF - Juvenile Rehabilitation Dashboards](#)
- [Washington DCYF - Juvenile Rehabilitation Annual Fact Sheet](#)

Verification note: This section records a comparative research snapshot using the official sources listed below. Current statutes, court rules, case law, agency guidance, and local implementation should be rechecked before jurisdiction-specific reliance.

Cross-State Research Findings and Model Act Alignment

Age boundaries remain highly fragmented.

The ten states use different minimum-age rules, definitions, capacity presumptions, exceptions, and upper-age mechanisms. The Model Act's preferred age of fourteen is therefore a normative reform proposal rather than a description of current national uniformity.

Diversion exists in every reviewed jurisdiction, but access and structure differ.

The states use adjustment, deferred prosecution, consent calendars, civil citation, station adjustment, informal supervision, and other mechanisms. Draft 4.0's contribution is a common architecture for eligibility, written reasons, review, voluntariness, proportional conditions, time limits, and completion.

Adult-court routing is the most structurally divergent category.

Some states rely primarily on judicial waiver; others retain excluded jurisdiction, youthful-offender procedures, direct filing, indictment, or multiple overlapping pathways. Draft 4.0 intentionally proposes a narrower individualized judicial model.

Restorative justice ranges from express statutory authorization to local practice.

Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Washington, and Colorado provide comparatively visible statewide statutory or policy foundations. Other states rely more heavily on local or programmatic implementation.

Data capacity is substantial but fragmented.

All ten states publish some official data, yet definitions, units of analysis, privacy rules, and reporting frequency vary. Cross-state comparison requires a common data dictionary and transparent limitations.

Modular research is practical.

A state can compare a single module - such as diversion, transfer, records, or data - without treating the Model Act as a universal code. This supports law-school clinics, university courses, legal scholarship, professional education, and commissioned state-specific research.

Recommended Next Research Outputs

- State-specific statutory crosswalks for selected jurisdictions, showing every Model Act section against current state law.
- A focused transfer-to-adult-court comparison covering eligibility, burdens of proof, decision-maker, appellate review, and sentencing consequences.
- A diversion implementation matrix covering eligibility, fees, duration, admissions, victim participation, completion, and record consequences.
- A records-relief supplement addressing sealing, expungement, repository notices, commercial background-check data, and remedies.
- A common juvenile-justice data dictionary for age, race and ethnicity, disability, geography, decision points, confinement, recidivism, education, and reentry.

Verification Protocol and Research Maintenance

Protocol element	Standard
Source hierarchy	Official statutory text; official court rules and opinions where necessary; state agency guidance and dashboards; official legislative or administrative research.
Verification record	Each entry should retain the source title, URL, date accessed, date last substantively reviewed, and any unresolved issue.
Amendment monitoring	States should be rechecked at least annually and whenever a major juvenile-justice bill, judicial decision, or agency reorganization occurs.
Change classification	Updates should be labeled as technical, substantive, implementation-related, data-related, or source-link changes.
Version control	Published versions should retain stable dates and archived copies. Later corrections should receive a new version number or a clearly dated corrigendum.

Protocol element	Standard
Research integrity	A historical research cutoff and a publication date are separate events. This edition therefore identifies both fields independently and does not present the publication-formatted file as proof that the same file existed on the research cutoff date.

Suggested Citation

Hanna Kotyk, U.S. State Juvenile Justice Statutory Index: Phase I - Expanded 10-State Research Edition, Version 0.4 (research cutoff Feb. 2026; published August 10, 2026).

Document Control

Current version	v0.4
Research cutoff date	February 2026
Relationship to v0.3	Separate continuation of the August 1, 2025 two-state sample; the original v0.3 remains a distinct archival document.
Publication date	August 10, 2026

Prepared by Hanna Kotyk | Research cutoff: February 2026 | Publication date: August 10, 2026