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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This analysis of current and projected workload for the Institutional Removal Program (IRP) was conducted at the request of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). The study was developed in response to a 2002 program audit conducted by the Department of Justice (DOJ) Office of the Inspector General (OIG). The results will help to facilitate the pending transfer of the IRP program from the ICE Office of Investigations to the Office of Detention and Removal Operations (DRO).

The IRP was established in 1988 under the name “Institutional Hearing Program” by the legacy Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS). The program objective has remained constant – to identify criminal aliens in custody in federal, state, and local jails and prisons; to target those aliens who are eligible for removal; and to complete the judicial and administrative review proceedings necessary to obtain a final order of removal before the aliens are released. When properly executed, the IRP process saves resources by eliminating the need for ICE to detain the aliens prior to removal.

However, successful IRP program operations require a sufficient number of agents to identify and process criminal aliens, as well as cooperation and accurate information from jails and prisons. This presents ICE with unique challenges, particularly at the state and local levels in locations with extremely high admissions volume.

This study was designed to identify the largest proportion of IRP workload possible while remaining manageable in scope and duration. As such, ICE requested record-level data on non-U.S. citizen admissions from all 50 state Departments of Corrections (DOCs) and from 63 local jails, which were targeted based on the expected volume of foreign-born admissions. By quantifying the workload for these locations and subsequently obtaining the resources needed to process the workload, ICE intends to direct its attention to those areas where the IRP program can have the greatest impact.

- Of the 50 DOCs and 63 jails, 36 DOCs and 45 jails provided usable data for the study, including seven of the ten largest public jails in the nation.
- A total of 8,134,087 inmate admission records were received, of which 1,766,341 were reported as being foreign-born at booking and 1,032,166 contained either missing or indeterminate values for place of birth.¹
- For purposes of the study, “IRP workload” was defined as inmates reported to be foreign-born at the time of admission. Admission records containing missing or indeterminate values for place of birth were not counted.

Although the participation rate was fairly high, the process of requesting data illustrated some of the challenges to successful IRP program operations. For example, several locations engaged in minimal correspondence with ICE in response to inquiries and ultimately did not provide data. Others indicated they could not participate due to staff time constraints or difficulty obtaining approval from decision-makers. Also, the collected data lacked uniformity and required considerable manipulation before they were suitable for analysis. For example, manual effort was required on thousands of records to convert free-text entry fields into uniform coded values. Because of the study’s focused scope, issues of non-participation and data quality could not be addressed; however, they present considerable obstacles to a comprehensive national workload assessment.

The collected data were used to estimate the current IRP workload, analyze the current foreign-born inmate composition (by nationality, offense severity, age, and gender), and forecast future workload for fiscal year (FY) 2004 through FY 2007.

¹ The collected data received could not be fully validated for accuracy. Data fields indicating place of birth are generally populated using information available from prior records and information self-reported by inmates at the time of booking. Thus, errors in the reported place of birth data are possible both from data entry and from inaccurate self-reporting. For example, aliens who falsely reported U.S. citizenship at the time of booking could not be identified based on the data received.
The analysis produced the following key findings for the locations that provided data for the study:  

- A total of 382,466 foreign-born inmates were admitted in FY 2003, 346,152 to jails and 36,314 to DOCs.  

- By FY 2007, a total of 379,445 foreign-born admissions are projected for the same jails (a 9.6% increase) and 40,554 for the DOCs (an 11.7% increase).

- The largest concentration of foreign-born jail admissions is found in California, Texas, Florida, Arizona, New York, Illinois, and Georgia. The jails located in these seven states accounted for 90% of the FY 2003 workload and are projected to account for 89% of the FY 2007 workload.

- Mexican-born inmates represent the largest concentration of foreign-born jail and DOC inmates (59.6%). Inmates from El Salvador, Guatemala, and Jamaica represent the next three largest cohorts.

- 58.3% of foreign-born jail inmates remain in custody for three days or less; 83% remain in custody for 30 days or less.

- 32.5% of foreign-born DOC inmates remain in custody for six months or less; 51.8% serve sentences of one or more years.

- 6.2% of foreign-born inmates are charged with Index crimes, 14.1% are charged with drug crimes, and 79.7% are charged with other violations.

Full results are summarized in Chapter 5. Appendix C presents the forecast and workload composition results in detail for each DOC and local jail. The process used to select the statistical methodology is described in detail in Appendix B.

---

2 A full listing of locations that provided data is presented in Chapter 3.  
3 These figures include jail inmates from six DOCs that have integrated prison/jail systems: Alaska, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Rhode Island, and Vermont. The DOC records therefore include the total jail and prison populations.  
4 The proportion of DOC inmates in custody six months or less is likely inflated by the data from the six DOCs with integrated prison/jail systems, because the DOC records include jail inmates with relatively short lengths of stay.  
5 Index crimes refer to serious crimes as defined by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) Crime Index and include murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, motor vehicle theft, and arson.
CHAPTER 1. BACKGROUND

Introduction
This study was conducted at the request of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), Department of Homeland Security (DHS), to quantify the workload for the Institutional Removal Program in state and local detention facilities throughout the United States. This section of the report describes the IRP and its goals in 2004, and the history leading up to the study, including the 2002 program audit by the Department of Justice (DOJ) Office of the Inspector General (OIG).

Program Description
The Institutional Removal Program (IRP) was first established in 1988 under the name “Institutional Hearing Program” under the legacy Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS). Despite the name change, the mission has remained the same for 16 years – to identify foreign-born inmates upon their admission to federal, state, or county detention and incarceration systems; to further identify the subset of foreign-born inmates that are eligible for removal (deportation); and to complete the judicial and administrative review proceedings necessary for removal prior to the completion of the aliens’ sentences. The system is dependent upon collaboration between personnel at the detention facilities and ICE agents working on the IRP program.6 Local personnel identify foreign-born inmates and notify the agents, who arrange for review at the proper time so that inmates can be processed before they are released from local custody.

Since the program’s inception it has been managed by the Office of Investigations. Plans are currently under review to transfer program management and resources to the Office of Detention and Removal Operations (DRO). The results of this study will assist the program transition.

Program Audit
In September 2002, the DOJ OIG conducted an audit of the IRP to determine whether the program was

1) Effectively managed (and responding appropriately to the 1996 changes in immigration laws)
2) Successfully identifying all potential candidates for the IRP

and to determine if

3) Failures to identify and remove inmates under the IRP ultimately resulted in recidivism and future incarceration costs.

The audit focused on the effectiveness of the program at the state and local levels, recognizing that inmate identification is more difficult in local facilities. Difficulties are caused by high numbers of admissions, shorter lengths of stay, and no mandatory reporting policy to ICE.7

The OIG audit examined records associated with 545 inmates identified by facility officials as being foreign-born at six locations - California Department of Corrections, Florida Department of Corrections, Fresno County Jail (CA), Kern County Jail (CA), Broward County Jail (FL), and Dade County Jail (FL). The study showed that IRP coverage, measured by the number of foreign-born inmates interviewed at the local facilities in question, was minimal. At the state level, the IRP had kept pace with the intakes in FY 1999 and FY 2000, but in FY 2001 the INS failed to identify, interview, and process 19% of foreign-born inmates at state facilities in California. The conclusion from this portion of the audit was that INS was not properly managing the IRP and had not successfully identified all potential candidates for the IRP. Furthermore, INS could not quantify the magnitude of the potential national workload; consequently, there was no basis for requesting increased staff or improving program operations.

---

6 The agents working on the program presently include Immigration Enforcement Agents (IEAs) and Criminal Investigators.
7 Specific details on this audit were taken from the audit itself, Report No. 02-41, Office of the Inspector General.
The audit also found that once inmates were targeted, IRP cases were not always processed in a timely manner (prior to inmate release from state or local custody). A review of 151 IRP inmates in INS custody found that unnecessary detention in ICE facilities (i.e., due to causes that could have been avoided) while cases were concluded cost approximately $1.1 million, almost doubling the $1.2 million in legitimate detention costs (costs associated with unavoidable delays deemed outside of ICE control), bringing the total IRP detention costs for those 151 individuals to $2.3 million. The audit estimated that the nationwide cost of IRP-related detention might be as high as $200 million annually. Any reduction in the need for detention by more efficient and timely processing of inmates through the IRP process could save millions in associated detention costs.

The result of this audit was a recommendation to the legacy INS Commissioner to:

1) Determine the total foreign-born inmate population at the county, state, and federal levels.
2) Determine the staffing needed to fully cover the foreign-born inmate population.
3) Ascertain the risks associated with not providing full coverage.
4) Strengthen program management by specifically accounting for program expenses and dedicating resources to the program.
5) Request that the Office of Justice Programs change current State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (SCAAP) grant provisions to require, as a condition of funding, the full cooperation of all state and local facilities in the IRP effort (much of the data collected for SCAAP grant funds is data that could help identify candidates for the IRP).

Beyond the OIG audit, DHS is continually examining national security threats, including the illegal entry of criminal aliens and the pursuit of absconders who do not report for deportation hearings. The events of September 11, 2001 raised the awareness of these and other immigration-related initiatives and highlighted the risks against which the initiatives are intended to guard. In the subsequent era of increased enforcement, the IRP has emerged as one mechanism already in place that can be used to counter national security threats by identifying criminal aliens already in custody. With an accurate assessment of the program workload, ICE can begin to take steps to further improve the effectiveness of the IRP as part of a comprehensive national security strategy.

Summary
The request for this analysis of national IRP workload was a direct result of the 2002 program audit and its findings that the IRP was not successfully identifying all appropriate candidates for removal. This analysis represents considerable progress in identifying the magnitude of the IRP workload, and it provides the foundation for subsequent estimates of personnel resources, proposals for timely processing of cases, and overall program improvement.

---

8 “Failures in the IRP process within INS’s control included (1) incomplete or inadequate casework; (2) untimely requests for travel documents; (3) failure to accommodate for delays in the hearing process; (4) failure to timely initiate and complete IRP casework; and (5) the use of inappropriate removal procedures. Factors beyond the INS’s direct control included countries that, through design or incompetence, delay the issuance of travel documents and countries that refuse to take back their citizens.” This quote and other relevant material from the OIG Report No. 02-41, Findings and Recommendations, 2. The INS Incurs Millions Annually to Detain Criminal Aliens Due to Failures in the IRP Process.

9 Factors outside of ICE control included delays caused by the country of origin and countries that refused to repatriate citizens, OIG Report No. 02-41, Findings and Recommendations, 2. The INS Incurs Millions Annually to Detain Criminal Aliens Due to Failures in the IRP Process.

10 SCAAP provides federal payments to states and localities that incur costs for holding undocumented criminal aliens, under specific time limits and conditions. Each incarceration period must exceed 72 hours or consist of at least four consecutive days.
CHAPTER 2. SCOPE OF SERVICES

Introduction
Chapter 1 described the IRP program, its goals, and the need for an estimate of the overall program workload to permit ICE to develop accurate and defensible funding and staffing estimates. This chapter will explore the scope of the workload analysis task described in this report.

Scope of Services
The scope of this project consisted of the four primary tasks listed below:

1. Collect original, record level data on foreign-born inmates from detention facilities, including such items as age, gender, type of offense, and average length of stay.
2. Compile foreign-born inmate data into a comprehensive project database.
3. Apply historical foreign-born inmate data to forecast future IRP workload.
4. Produce report of project findings.

These tasks provided the basic structure and direction for the project. Additional supporting tasks were identified as part of the original scope based on the needs presented by ICE. The following sections summarize the project tasks completed as part of the study.

Project Administration, Working Group, and Reporting
Administrative oversight for the project was provided by a working group, including at least eight ICE personnel who participated to varying degrees throughout the project. The ICE personnel included the Contracting Officer’s Technical Representative, a statistician with expert knowledge of detention data, two agents who have worked directly on the IRP program, and other key program and management personnel. The working group also included personnel from Fentress Incorporated, the justice consulting firm hired to perform the study. Appriss Incorporated, which maintains a network of detention-related data and contractual ties with many of the facilities targeted for data collection, served as a subcontractor for the study.

Throughout the project, the working group held monthly meetings to update ICE on new findings, discuss procedural issues requiring resolution, and make general decisions regarding methodology. Additional methodology meetings were held as needed to bring key personnel into detailed discussions concerning project data, forecasting methods, and other quantitative issues. Fentress provided ICE with weekly progress reports during the data collection phase, bi-monthly status reports of all project activities, and two cost analyses at appropriate intervals during the project.

Define IRP Workload
One of the challenges of this study was to define “workload” as it would be quantified for both data collection and future projections. At its most restrictive, IRP workload consists only of those offenders taken into the program who are verified as being removable. At its least restrictive, IRP workload includes all foreign-born inmates and those of unknown national origin admitted to state or local facilities, who must be researched and/or interviewed to determine whether they are removable. For purposes of this analysis, to most closely reflect the subset of inmates on which the IRP program is intended to focus, the working group defined IRP workload as all foreign-born facility admissions. This issue will be discussed in more detail as it relates to the strategic approach and statistical analyses in Chapter 4.

Identify Foreign-Born Admissions
For this study, foreign-born inmates were identified based on information given at booking. Some of this information may not be accurate because inmates are not always truthful in answering booking questions. However, because booking data provide the basis for identifying potential IRP interviews, those data were considered to be an appropriate source of estimated IRP workload. Additional details of the Data Collection phase of the study are included in Chapter 3.
Refine the Scope of Data Collection
The original project scope targeted the 50 state DOCs and 50 largest county jails (in terms of average daily population, or ADP). Early in the project, the working group determined that at least some of the 50 largest county jails are not in regions that typically exhibit a high concentration of removable aliens for IRP. After analyzing jail population data and also considering SCAAP grant levels, the working group substituted several county jails in the top 50 with jails whose ADP ranked between 50 and 100 but were likely to have higher concentrations of foreign-born inmates. The final data collection list included 50 of the 100 largest county jails, 13 additional jails (included as backup sites if some of the targeted 50 did not participate) and all 50 State Departments of Corrections. A detailed description of the decision-making process and the ensuing data collection efforts are included in Chapter 3.

Develop Workload Breakdowns
IRP program experts indicated that, particularly in facilities with a high volume of foreign-born detainees, regular program operations necessarily focus on specific segments of the inmate population. The working group identified several breakdowns (by length of stay in custody [LOS], by age cohorts, by offense type, by country of birth) to describe and differentiate key segments of the IRP workload. As ICE requests future staffing levels and allocates staff across its Field Offices, these breakdowns can be used in a variety of ways, such as to identify essential language skills for personnel assignments, note trends in offenders’ age and gender for specialized personnel or housing needs, focus on violent or drug offenders, or develop a “fast track” process to target those with shorter lengths of stay than the typical IRP process (see below for details on the reasoning behind this concept). The methodology for generating these breakdowns is described in greater detail in Chapter 4; the resulting summary information can be found in Chapter 5. Facility-specific details can be found in Appendix C of this report.

Develop Breakdowns by Length of Stay (LOS)
In both Federal Prisons and State Departments of Corrections the inmates in question are sentenced, and the window of time for ICE to interview and identify IRP candidates is sufficient for accurate processing to take place. However, this is not the case in local jails. Based on the data collected for this study, approximately 55% of all local jail detainees are released within 72 hours of booking. This short period provides little time for the IRP targeting and interview process to take place. Rapid targeting of foreign-born inmates provides the opportunity for the IRP process to work, so that inmates’ immigration status can be assessed and, if necessary, removal proceedings can commence, even if the individual in question is released from jail pending disposition of their criminal case. There is no mandate requiring local jails to report foreign-born intakes to ICE, so ICE agents must either proactively check the booking records to determine if any new bookings include potentially removable aliens, or they must rely on local personnel to alert them voluntarily when potential IRP candidates arrive at the jail.

To help ICE personnel assess the time in custody for potential IRP candidates, the collected admissions data were aggregated according to meaningful LOS values, so that ICE personnel will be able to assess options for targeting the large number of inmates who are released from custody within a few days. Details of the increments and the methodology used for these breakdowns are included in Chapter 4 of this report. The summary results are in Chapter 5, and the facility-specific information can be found in Appendix C.

Links between Workload and the Timing of the IRP Process
Several factors can affect the total IRP workload and the program’s ultimate effectiveness. First, the level of participation and collaboration of personnel working at local detention facilities can affect the promptness and thoroughness of notification of ICE personnel when foreign-born inmates are booked in. Second, a low number of personnel available to screen intakes and identify potentially removable aliens can reduce the number of properly identified and processed inmates, even when notification is prompt. Finally, the duration of time required for the complete IRP process to occur, including interviews, hearings, and administrative review, can stretch out longer than the remaining sentence, so that the inmate may be released from custody before the process is completed. Each of these points in the process serves as a valve, either widening to increase the thoroughness of the program, or narrowing to limit the eventual outcome. The timing of targeting inmates may play a significant role in the inability to capture potential workload, particularly in jails where the length of stay is less than 72 hours for a majority of inmates.
Having the correct ratio of personnel to workload is essential in not only targeting inmates, but also ensuring they are processed in a timely fashion. The audit conducted by the OIG found that there was a significant cost associated with slow, or untimely, processing of IRP cases. That same study found that in California, the correct personnel to workload ratio existed in 2000; by 2002, however, the ratio had shifted such that the staffing was insufficient to support the workload. As a result, many cases were not identified by IRP personnel or were not processed in a timely fashion once they were identified. This situation is an example of what happens when workload outstrips staffing levels. If adequate personnel are not provided to work the number of cases in a jurisdiction, either fewer cases will be processed completely, or the length of time for each case to be processed will stretch out over time, and a backlog will begin to accumulate.

This study is a starting point in the application of actual booking data to support program needs, budget requests, and management decisions. As such, no time weightings were assigned to the inmate data and no estimates were made of what proportion of those initially interviewed would be processed and removed via the IRP. The study’s goal is to quantify total workload levels in the targeted locations. Further study would be required to analyze the workload in terms of urgency and minimum processing time, as well as to estimate the proper number of agents and administrative personnel needed to maintain the program in each location.

**Summary**

The scope of this study was to collect record-level data from the 50 state DOCs and from 63 county jails that were targeted on the basis of having the largest potential IRP workload. The collected historical data were analyzed and used to develop forecasts of future IRP workload. A working group consisting of ICE and Fentress personnel was formed to make decisions, track progress of various project tasks, and direct development of the final deliverable. "Workload" for this study was defined as admission to a detention facility of any person of foreign birth as reported at the time of intake.

The working group identified key breakdowns of workload by age, gender, length of stay, and severity of offense to provide additional information that will be helpful in defining the nature of the workload, in addition to its magnitude. The current and forecasted total workload can be used to estimate staffing needs, develop budget requests, and allocate staff. The information provided by the workload breakdowns can be used to refine and improve the program, using methods such as:

- Targeting drug or violent offenders over misdemeanant cases,
- Providing personnel with appropriate language skills,
- Creating an expedited screening process for pre-trial inmates likely to bail or bond out within 24 hours,
- Targeting certain regions of the country for volume, type of offense, or security reasons,
- Determining where detention facilities are needed, and if those facilities should have extra capacity for females or juveniles.

The current and projected IRP workload estimates generated by this study were tailored to assist ICE in establishing defensible resource needs for the IRP program.
CHAPTER 3. DATA COLLECTION

Introduction
This chapter summarizes the process for selecting the facilities included in this study, as well as the process involved in requesting and collecting data. All documents that facilitated data collection mentioned in this section are displayed in Appendix A.

Data Collection Approach

Facility Selection
The project scope was designed with the realization that detailed data could not be collected from all of the nation’s state prisons and local jails. Even designing and implementing a representative sample to produce a national estimate would require an effort larger than the current study. Also, ICE determined early in the process that record-level admissions data were needed for the analysis (as opposed to summary data). Consequently, the working group developed an approach to collect record-level data from a subset of facilities. The subset was designed to target as large a proportion of IRP workload as possible from a manageable number of facilities.

In reaching this decision, the working group considered several alternatives. Options included collecting data from the largest jails in terms of ADP, the most populous regions, or the facilities receiving the largest amount of SCAAP grant funds. Following discussions of these criteria, the working group selected the final approach, which employed as selection criteria a combination of ADP (from the Bureau of Justice Statistics), the county-level percentage of foreign-born residents (from the U.S. Census), and the amount of SCAAP funds disbursed.

ADP remained the primary criterion for inclusion in the study. The top 50 county jails in terms of ADP were identified first. Then, the Census and SCAAP data were used to identify locations ranked within the top 50 that were likely to have low percentages of foreign-born inmates, and also locations outside the top 50 that were likely to have high percentages of foreign-born inmates. Based on this assessment, seven locations in the top 50 were replaced by locations from outside the top 50. In addition, 13 additional “backup” locations were added to the list, given the likelihood that not all locations would provide data. Thus, a total of 63 county jails were targeted for data collection.

At this point, a final list of target facilities was created, which included all fifty state-operated Departments of Corrections (DOCs) and the 63 county jails. Several privately owned facilities (e.g., The GEO Group, Corrections Corporation of America) serving the jurisdictions on the list were also added. Finally, as the project progressed and additional contacts were made, a few additional locations with readily available data (e.g., Jefferson County, KY) were added. The final list of targeted facilities included 122 locations -- 51 DOCs (including two in California) and 71 local jails. The local jails are listed in Table 3-1.

11 The following seven locations were removed from the list: Allegheny County, PA; Baltimore City, MD; Fulton County, GA; Hamilton County, OH; Orleans Parish, LA; Shelby County, TN; and York County, PA.
### Table 3-1. List of Local Jails and Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACILITY / ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Alameda County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bernalillo County Jail</td>
<td>NM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bexar County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Broward County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Broward County Work Release Center - Wackenhut</td>
<td>FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 City of Philadelphia Prison System</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Clark County Detention Center</td>
<td>NV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Cobb County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Contra Costa County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Cook County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Cuyahoga County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Dallas County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Davidson County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 De Kalb County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Denver Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 El Paso County Detention Facility</td>
<td>TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Essex County Department of Public Safety</td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Franklin County Community-Based Corrections</td>
<td>OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Franklin County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Fresno County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Harris County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Hennepin County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Hillsborough County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Hudson County Corrections Center</td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Jacksonville Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Jefferson County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Kern County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 King County Dept. of Adult Detention</td>
<td>WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Maricopa County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Marion County Jail II - C.C.A.</td>
<td>IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Marion County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Mecklenburg County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Miami Dade County Correct. &amp; Rehab. Dept.</td>
<td>FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Milwaukee County House of Corrections</td>
<td>WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Milwaukee County Jail</td>
<td>WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Monterey County Jail</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Montgomery County Jail</td>
<td>MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Multnomah County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Nashville-Davidson Metro Detention Facility - C.C.A.</td>
<td>TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 New York City Department of Corrections</td>
<td>NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Oklahoma County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Orange County Corrections Department</td>
<td>FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Orange County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Palm Beach County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Passaic County Jail</td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Pierce County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Pima County Jail</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Pinellas County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Plymouth County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Reeves County Law Enforcement Center</td>
<td>TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Reeves County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Riverside County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Sacramento County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 Salt Lake County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>UT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 San Diego County Correctional Alternatives, Inc.</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 San Diego County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 San Francisco County Sheriff's Dept.</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 San Mateo County Jail</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 Santa Clara County Department of Corrections</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 Suffolk County - Riverhead Facility</td>
<td>NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 Suffolk County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 Tarrant County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 Travis County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 Tulare County Sheriff's Office - County Civic Center</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Ventura County Jail</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 Wayne County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 Yakima County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 Yuma County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Fields

This study collected similar information to the data collected each year via the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) to aid in distributing SCAAP grant funds. However, ICE had determined that the goals of this study required collection of additional details beyond the fields collected by BJA for SCAAP (which primarily consist of name and the dates of admission and release). The working group decided that the following data fields would be requested from each location:
• Facility name
• Unique inmate identifier (e.g., booking number, jacket number, FBI number, Social Security number, etc.)
• Basic demographic information (name, gender, date of birth/age)
• Foreign-born indicator (e.g., place of birth, nationality, U.S. citizen/non-citizen, etc.)
• Potential proxies for foreign-born status (e.g., ethnicity, language spoken/written/read, etc.)
• Length of stay (requires booking date and release date/current date, plus estimated release date if sentenced – the working group preferred to calculate LOS “in-house” for consistency)
• Severity of offense (e.g., most severe arresting/sentencing offense)

The working group created a spreadsheet file containing sample data that displayed these fields and a sample of the type of data that would ideally populate each field. This sample data set is shown in Appendix A.

Some facility contacts expressed concerns about data confidentiality and preferred not to reveal Social Security numbers and/or inmate names. Since neither of those items was essential to the analytical approach, those data sets were accepted with an alternate unique identifier for each inmate.

Timeframe and Admissions
The working group requested five years of daily historical admissions data, corresponding to the federal fiscal year. Wherever possible, the working group collected facility admissions of foreign-born inmates, regardless of the length of stay, beginning on October 1, 1998 and continuing through the present. This decision was based on the fact that the IRP workload, as discussed in Chapter 2, is driven by the rate of facility admissions rather than the number of inmates in custody at any given time. In the case of long-term sentenced facilities (prisons and local sentenced facilities), the working group requested a snapshot of all foreign-born inmates in custody on October 1 of the initial year, and for all subsequent admissions leading up to the current time.

For some facilities, recent changes in information systems/vendors, changes to data intake and archiving methods, or other technological issues made it impossible to collect five years of historical data. In such cases, the working group requested the maximum amount of available historical data possible. If less than one full year of data was available, the location was eliminated from the study. Chapters 4 and 5 discuss analytical strategies used for developing forecasts based on the collected historical data.

Appriss, Inc. Role
Under the guidance of the working group, Fentress worked in conjunction with Appriss, Inc. (Appriss) to collect the data. Appriss developed, constructed, and supports the nationwide VINE database. This database pulls data from jail and prison booking and release systems, giving Appriss staff access (with permission) to the data needed for the IRP study in locations that participate with VINE.

At the outset of the data collection phase, twenty locations were identified where technological limitations, existing Appriss contacts, or other resource considerations made it more appropriate for Appriss staff to collect the data and send it to Fentress. These locations were assigned to Appriss for data collection. During the course of data collection, several locations were added to the Appriss list and some were removed. The 22 locations (20 jails and two DOCs) where Appriss maintained the primary responsibility for data collection are noted in Table 3-2.

For these locations, Appriss staff made contacts, gained approval, established the technological interface (if necessary), and pulled the data. Appriss also assisted with data cleaning and preliminary analysis of several additional data sets. For all locations not on the Appriss list, Fentress staff made contacts, gained approval, and facilitated transfer of the data either to ICE or Fentress.

12 VINE – Victim Information and Notification Everyday – a system that allows crime victims across the country to obtain real-time information about criminal cases and the custody status of offenders 24 hours a day.
Overview of Data Collection Process
On March 6, 2004, an initial project introduction letter was sent from the Director of ICE Detention and Removal Operations to the director/warden of each facility on the targeted data collection list. The letter explained the goals of the study and introduced Fentress as the firm conducting the study on behalf of ICE. This letter advised that Fentress (or Appriss) staff would be making follow-up telephone calls to the addressees, and provided the Contracting Officer’s Technical Representative’s (COTR) contact information to address questions. A sample of this letter is included in Appendix A.

As a follow-up to the initial letter, an e-mail message was sent by the COTR reiterating the project goals and asking for participation. ICE also provided Fentress and Appriss staff with a letter of authorization naming the staff working on the project and providing specific assurance that ICE had approved all named staff to access project data.

Fentress began making telephone calls during the last week of March. An initial round of calls produced successful commitment to the project from several locations. For many other locations, though, initial contacts delegated responsibility for handling the request to other contacts or even other organizations (depending on local arrangements governing the storage and release of admissions data). For most locations that did not provide data soon after the initial request letter, numerous follow-up phone calls and e-mails were necessary to achieve an outcome, and in some cases the outcome was a declination to provide data.

Telephone and e-mail contact continued until July 16th, a date the working group had identified as the end of correspondence and follow-up. During the period of correspondence, additional materials were developed to assist with the documentation required by some locations to release data. For example, an “assurance of confidentiality” was sent in letter or e-mail form to locations that had expressed concern that recognizable record-level data should not be revealed in the final report or used for purposes other than this study. Also, in some locations, the data request had to be submitted to a local criminal justice committee or county information technology department. In each case, Fentress and/or Appriss staff responded as appropriate to steer each data request to a definitive outcome. To organize and track all data requests and follow-up processes, Fentress developed a database application containing locations, names, contact information, and summaries of phone and e-mail correspondence. Weekly reports from the database were sent to ICE to keep working group members apprised of the data collection progress.

Results - Data Collected
Overall, the data collection effort was very successful, yielding a higher response rate than anticipated, given the relatively short timeframe. A total of 81 of the 122 targeted locations (36 DOCs and 45 local jails) provided usable data for the study. A total of 93 locations provided data in response to ICE's request. However, data from 12 locations could not be used for various reasons, noted in Table 3-2.

Table 3-2 identifies the locations that provided usable data (including the amount of data provided and fields included), indicates the reason for non-participation (if available) and presents other pertinent comments about the data collection process.

---

13 A total of 93 locations provided data in response to ICE’s request. However, data from 12 locations could not be used for various reasons, noted in Table 3-2.
### Table 3-2. Summary of Data Collected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACILITY / ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Submitted Usable Data</th>
<th># Years Provided</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernalillo County Jail</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited or no response to requests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bexar County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Appriss site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward County Work Release Center - Wackenhut</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private facility - Limited or no response to requests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Philadelphia Prison System</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark County Detention Center</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobb County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Did not submit usable data by cut-off date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Appriss site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Appriss site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Did not submit usable data by cut-off date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson County Sheriff's Department - Admin.</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Appriss site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeKalb County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Willing to participate; however, does not collect place of birth information at time of booking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso County Detention Facility</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appriss site. Declined to participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex County Department of Public Safety</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Appriss site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin County Community-Based Corrections</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private facility - Limited or no response to requests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Willing to participate; however, does not collect place of birth information at time of booking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACILITY / ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Submitted Usable Data</td>
<td># Years Provided</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Offense</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson County Corrections Center</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Appriss site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>KY</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Appriss site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County Dept. of Adult Detention</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Appriss site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submitted data that was not usable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion County Jail II - C.C.A.</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private facility - admission data included in Marion County Jail data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecklenburg County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami Dade County Correct. &amp; Rehab. Dept.</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Declined to participate. Concerns on resources needed to pull the data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee County House of Corrections</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee County Jail</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey County Jail</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Declined to participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County Jail</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited or no response to requests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multnomah County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville-Davidson Metro Detention Facility - C.C.A.</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private facility - Limited or no response to requests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City Department of Corrections</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Appriss site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County Corrections Department</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Appriss site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Appriss site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passaic County Jail</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Appriss site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Local Jails

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACILITY / ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Submitted Usable Data</th>
<th># Years Provided</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pima County</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeves County Law Enforcement Center</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private facility - Limited or no response to requests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeves County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Willing to participate. Requested on-site assistance that could not be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited or no response to requests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Did not submit usable data by cut-off date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appriss site. Submitted data that was not usable. Does not collect place of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Correctional Alternatives, Inc.</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private facility - Limited or no response to requests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco County Sheriff's Dept.</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Willing to participate, but city maintains booking records. Data not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo County</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Declined to participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County Department of Corrections</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk County - Riverhead Facility</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Appriss site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited or no response to requests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appriss site. Limited or no response to requests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Appriss site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulare County Sheriff's Office - County Civic Center</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Appriss site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura County</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakima County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuma County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACILITY / ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Submitted Usable Data</td>
<td># Years Provided</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Offense</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama Department of Corrections</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Department of Corrections</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Department of Corrections</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Did not submit usable data by cut-off date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas Department of Corrections</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Department of Corrections</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Youth &amp; Adult Correctional Agency</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private facility - initial communication not well received. Facility not pursued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Department of Corrections</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut Department of Corrections</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submitted data that was not usable. Does not collect place of birth information at booking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware Department of Corrections</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Department of Corrections</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Department of Corrections</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii Department of Public Safety</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Department of Corrections</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Department of Corrections</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Did not submit usable data by cut-off date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Department of Corrections</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submitted data that was not usable. Does not collect place of birth information at booking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa Department of Corrections</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas Department of Corrections</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky Department of Corrections</td>
<td>KY</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Dept. of Public Safety &amp; Corrections</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submitted data that was not usable. Does not collect place of birth information at booking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine Department of Corrections</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Department of Public Safety &amp; Correctional Services</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submitted data that was not usable. Does not collect place of birth information at booking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Departments of Corrections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACILITY / ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Submitted Usable Data</th>
<th># Years Provided</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Department of Corrections</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submitted data that was not usable. Does not collect place of birth information at booking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Department of Corrections</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Department of Corrections</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Department of Corrections</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri Department of Corrections</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana Department of Corrections</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska Department of Corrections</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada Department of Corrections</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire Department of Corrections</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey Department of Corrections</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Submitted data that was not usable. Does not collect place of birth information at booking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico Department of Corrections</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Department of Correctional Services</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Appriss site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina Department of Corrections</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submitted data that was not usable. Does not collect place of birth information at booking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota Department of Corrections &amp; Rehabilitation</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Department of Rehabilitation &amp; Corrections</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submitted data that was not usable. Does not collect place of birth information at booking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma Department of Corrections</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Department of Corrections</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania Department of Corrections</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island Department of Corrections</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submitted data that was not usable. Does not collect place of birth information at booking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina Department of Corrections</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota Department of Corrections</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Department of Corrections</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Department of Criminal Justice</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submitted data that was not usable. Does not collect place of birth information at booking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Departments of Corrections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACILITY / ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Submitted Usable Data</th>
<th># Years Provided</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utah Department of Corrections</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appriss site. Submitted data that was not usable. Does not collect place of birth information at booking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont Department of Corrections</td>
<td>VT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Department of Corrections</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Department of Corrections</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia Division of Corrections</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Willing to participate; however, does not collect place of birth information at booking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Corrections</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming Department of Corrections</td>
<td>WY</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 3-2 shows, seven of the ten largest public jails in the United States participated, providing a large volume of workload data from strategic locations for the IRP.\textsuperscript{14} As the table also indicates, several locations whose workload is not reflected in the study were willing to participate but could not provide data for various reasons (e.g., they could not expend staff time to meet the data request timeframe, etc.). Also, some locations provided data that ultimately could not be used for various reasons (e.g., missing key fields for most or all records, etc.) With additional time, it is likely that usable data could be gathered from some of the locations that are not presently reflected in the study results. Conversely, some non-participating locations (particularly in California) requested that ICE fund staff time required to extract the data; ICE indicated that funds were not available for this purpose and those locations declined to participate.

The challenges faced by staff in attempting to gain approval and collect data for this study underscore the difficulty inherent in conducting a comprehensive data collection effort reliant on cooperation from state and local entities. Although there are reporting and data quality requirements for reimbursement programs such as SCAAP, no such requirements extend to efforts such as this study. Consequently, substantial staff time is frequently required to gain approval from decision-makers, and even if data are provided, considerable additional staff time is required to overcome the lack of data standardization. These issues and dynamics also hinder agents responsible for the day-to-day operations of the IRP program. The lack of cooperation from local facilities and lack of data standardization are two key barriers to the successful identification of potentially removable aliens.

Of the data sets that were received for the project, most were generally of moderate to high quality, containing the necessary fields to develop counts of foreign-born inmates. As Table 3-2 shows, a majority of locations provided offense data, length of stay information, gender, and place of birth. However, some locations could not provide one or more of these key fields, and in almost all data sets there were instances of missing, inaccurate, or inconsistent data. For example, several data sets contained free-text entry fields for the nationality/place-of-birth field and/or for the offense type field. Considerable time-consuming manual data manipulation was required to convert free-text entry fields into coded values that could provide useful results.

Finally, it should be noted that the data received from DOCs and jails could not be fully validated for accuracy. Data fields indicating place of birth are generally populated using information available from prior records as well as information self-reported by inmates at the time of booking. Particularly the self-reported information is likely to contain inaccuracies.\textsuperscript{15} In addition, the project data are subject to data entry errors (particularly in free-text fields). Cursory analysis was used to correct obvious errors, but the level of scrutiny was necessarily lower than a program audit or validation exercise.

\textbf{Data Cleaning and Analysis}

Despite the lack of uniformity and the additional work needed to manage the free-text fields, the overall volume and quality of data were sufficient to conduct the intended analyses. Over 8 million records were received in various formats (e.g., database extracts, Excel files, text files, hard copies, etc.) Although only foreign-born records were requested, the records received included a combination of native-born, foreign-born and indeterminate records. Indeterminate records include both null values (i.e., empty field for place of birth) and non-null values for which the place of birth (as reported at the time of booking) could not be conclusively identified (i.e., values such as “xx” or “refused” were entered in the place of birth field).

\textsuperscript{14} The ten largest public jails in order of ADP are: Los Angeles County Jail, New York City Department of Corrections, Cook County Jail, Maricopa County Jail, City of Philadelphia Prison System, Miami-Dade Correction and Rehabilitation Department, Harris County Jail, Dallas County Jail, Broward County Jail, and San Bernardino County Jail. Miami-Dade did not participate. San Bernardino and Dallas counties were willing to participate, but the data could not be included for various reasons.

\textsuperscript{15} For example, inmates may give a false location or refuse to answer the question. Also, foreign-born inmates who report themselves at booking to be U.S. citizens, and for whom the booking data reflect the false claim, are not included in the study. This factor could cause the current and future IRP workload figures to be somewhat conservative.
As the data sets arrived, the data were imported into a database (hard copies were scanned and imported) and compiled into increments corresponding to the federal fiscal year (October 1 to September 30). Calculations of length of stay (i.e., release date minus booking date) and age (i.e., booking date minus birth date) were also completed for each record. Place of birth and offense severity, if available, were assessed and converted into standardized coded values and marked with an indicator. Duplicate data entries were removed to prepare the data sets for analysis.

The cleaned data sets were subsequently used to calculate the current IRP workload, forecast the future workload, and analyze the foreign-born inmate composition by nationality of origin, severity of offense, age, and gender. Details of these analyses are presented in Chapter 4 and summary results can be found in Chapter 5.

Summary
This study was designed to request and gather record-level data from all 50 state DOCs and a subset of local jails designed to target the largest proportion of IRP workload possible given the project budget and timeframe. ICE requested data from 51 DOCs and 63 local jails via a coordinated effort of mail, telephone and e-mail contact and follow-up. Of these, 36 DOCs and 45 local jails provided usable data in response.

Data collection and related correspondence lasted a total of five months, during which staff spent considerable time following up with contacts, establishing new contacts, and providing information to DOCs and jails to gain approval and offer guidance on the proper format in which to provide data. Some locations readily participated and provided data quickly, and many contacts benefited from the contact with the project team and the information provided on the IRP program and current study. However, the overall challenges faced and time required to collect data underscore the difficulty inherent in conducting a comprehensive data collection effort reliant on cooperation from state and local entities.

A total of 1,766,341 foreign born records were received from DOCs and local jails. Once received, the data sets were cleaned and prepared for analysis, a process that often required considerable manual manipulation to convert free-text entry fields into uniform coded values. Cursory analysis was used to correct obvious errors, but the data could not be fully validated for accuracy. The cleaned data sets were subsequently used to calculate the current IRP workload, forecast the future workload, and analyze the foreign-born inmate composition by nationality of origin, severity of offense, age, and gender.
CHAPTER 4. DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction
Previous chapters described the scope and the goals of the study and the approach used to collect data from DOCs and local jails. This chapter details the strategic and analytical approaches to achieving the goals and analyzing the data. The Strategic Approach section describes key details of how data sets were manipulated and analyzed to generate forecasts that would meet the project’s goals. The Methodology section summarizes the statistical methodology used for generating the forecasts of IRP workload. The strategies and methods presented were chosen carefully and collaboratively by the working group, and considered the demands of the study, limitations of the data, and planned applications of the results. Additional details about the process used to select the statistical methodology can be found in Appendix B.

Analytical Plan
The definition of IRP workload and other project goals described in Chapter 2 provided a solid starting point for developing a strategic approach to the analysis. The more precise definition of workload confirmed that the model should be based on foreign-born facility admissions, which drive the IRP workload. The working group also agreed that the current workload should be aggregated for presentation based on meaningful inmate characteristics (e.g., length of stay, offense, age and gender) as discussed in Chapter 2. The amount of data received and the program budget cycle helped determine the forecasting timeframe, which extends from FY 2004 – FY 2007. The following sections discuss key issues that arose and decisions that were made as data were analyzed to develop forecasting models.

Treatment of Records with Unknown Place of Birth
The working group originally intended to include in the definition of IRP workload both confirmed foreign-born inmates with those of unknown national origin. The rationale, confirmed by IRP program experts, was that all such admissions generate a degree of workload for the agents. (For example, in cases where national origin is unknown or an inmate refused to provide it, agents must research names, social security numbers, addresses, and other details to either include or exclude such individuals from further processing).

As the study unfolded, however, it became apparent that the booking systems in a small number of facilities returned extremely high numbers of records with no entries for place of birth (in the most extreme case, up to 90% of all admission records). IRP program experts examined additional internal data sources in an attempt to reduce the number of unknown records in these data sets; however, no consistent quantitative approach could be identified to reduce the number of “null” records to a realistic level. Because the data from some locations systematically excluded place of birth for a high percentage of records, the working group decided not to include such records as historical IRP workload.

This decision was subsequently extended to records where the field denoting place of birth was non-null, but was populated with information precluding a rational conclusion that the individual was identified at booking as being foreign-born (e.g., cryptic codes such as “xx” that were likely used to bypass the field on a data entry screen). The exclusion of null and non-null records where place of birth was indeterminate preserves the consistency of the analytical approach for all facilities and ensures that the current and projected workload values are based on actual records reported as foreign-born. However, it is also likely that the resulting workload figures are conservative, because many legitimately foreign-born inmate records were likely excluded due to data limitations.

Analysis of Historical Workload Composition
Data for each DOC and jail were analyzed and forecasted independently. To assist ICE in understanding the composition of each facility’s workload, analysis was conducted of the FY 2003 foreign-born population to illustrate the breakdown by nationality (country of origin), offense (FBI Index offenses, drug offenses, and all others); length of stay (0-3; 4-5; 6-10; 11-30; 31-60; 61-90; 91-120; 121-150; and 150+ days), age, and gender. FY 2003 was used consistently for all data sets because some facilities were only able to supply one year of data, meaning that an approach incorporating older data would be inconsistent across locations.
The resulting percentages provide useful information on the current workload composition and can be combined with the workload forecasts to estimate the future workload for pertinent inmate groups (e.g., Index crime offenders, inmates with long/short lengths of stay, etc.).\textsuperscript{16} This information could assist ICE in resource planning, requests, and allocation. For example, the composition of inmate nationality can show which languages are prominent in each facility, and the proportion of males versus females can provide information on separate detention needs. Perhaps most importantly, the analysis of length of stay provides information on the various windows of time available to capture increasing proportions of the total IRP workload (i.e., before inmates are released on bond, processed through fast-track court proceedings, or otherwise leave custody).\textsuperscript{17}

Summary results can be found in Chapter 5. Detailed results for each facility are presented in Appendix C.

\textbf{Levels of Workload Aggregation}

Current IRP workload was estimated using monthly foreign-born admissions for each facility. The monthly historical observations were used to develop future workload projections, as described in the Methodology section of this chapter and in Appendix B. The working group decided that the current and projected workload should be summarized at both the state and ICE Field Office levels, as resource decisions are most often based on information aggregated at these levels.

First, the facility-level workload was aggregated to the state level, separately for local jails and DOCs (see below for the rationale behind presenting the workload separately). Second, the workload was aggregated from the facility and state levels to the 22 ICE Field Office boundaries, reflecting the geographic regions to which resources are assigned.\textsuperscript{18} Figure 4-1 displays the Field Office boundaries.

\textsuperscript{16} This approach would require the assumption that the current workload composition will remain fixed in the future.

\textsuperscript{17} An addendum to this study (to be completed in November 2004) will analyze the extent to which inmates identified at the county jail level (with potentially short lengths of stay, and thus little time for identification and processing via IRP) are likely to eventually be admitted to a DOC, which would provide considerably more time for identification and processing.

\textsuperscript{18} The 22 ICE Field Offices are located in: Atlanta, Baltimore, Boston, Buffalo, Chicago, Dallas, Denver, Detroit, El Paso, Houston, Los Angeles, Miami, Newark, New Orleans, New York City, Phoenix, Seattle, San Francisco, San Antonio, San Diego, St. Paul, and Washington, DC.
The Field Office workload totals can be used to facilitate the analysis of staffing and other resource needs required to manage the workload in each Field Office (e.g., using workload-to-staff ratios). One of ICE’s goals in defining the project scope was to quantify the largest proportion of IRP workload possible in a manageable number of locations. Aggregating the current and projected workload by Field Office addresses this goal and presents the results in a form that will aid ICE in requesting the resources needed to address the identified workload.

Separate DOC and Jail Workloads at the State level
Two alternatives were considered for aggregating current and projected IRP workload at the state level. The first was to use the collected data to develop overall statewide estimates (i.e., that would include workload at facilities not included in the study). The second was to present only the collected data for the locations within each state without attempting to estimate the larger pool of statewide IRP workload.

In addressing this issue, the related topic arose of whether DOC and local jail facilities should be analyzed together or separately. The working group determined that they should be analyzed separately because the inmate populations differ between jails and DOCs in important ways. For example, jails house a mix of pre-trial and sentenced inmates, while DOCs house only sentenced inmates, often with sentences greater than one year. Also, the two factors that drive IRP workload (number of admissions and length of stay) differ considerably between jails and DOCs. Jails have an inherently higher rate of admissions and shorter length of stay for all detainees (including foreign-born inmates) than state DOCs. DOCs, by contrast, typically have larger
total populations (since many sentenced inmates remain in custody for years) and lower rates of admission. For these reasons, the jail and DOC populations did not lend themselves to collective analysis.\footnote{As mentioned previously, a report addendum analyzing the relationship between jail and DOC workload will be completed in November 2004. One possible implication of the difference in jail/DOC workload is specialization of duties for agents working on the IRP program. Particularly in high-volume locations, a separate process may be needed to identify jail inmates with short lengths of stay who are not likely to subsequently serve longer sentences in the state DOC.}

Outside of the complications inherent in an aggregated analysis, the team saw sufficient disparity of workload at the jails and DOCs to perceive the possibility that in the future ICE may see benefits to separating the staff working the two types of facilities in high volume jurisdictions. The separate analysis of the two facility types permits ICE the flexibility of considering the workloads separately, leaving the possibility open for future staffing to be more specifically targeted to fit the demands of these two very different populations.

Regarding the two alternatives for obtaining statewide results, one key factor is that jail jurisdictions correspond to city or county boundaries, while DOCs serve an entire state. Also, the study, by design, consisted of a non-statistical subset of jails, and not all states were represented in the subset. Consequently, using the study results to produce statewide estimates that would include facilities not included in the study would have required extensive mathematical extrapolation of historical jail data to create historical statewide workload values to combine with the DOC workload values. Even if this approach were chosen, the fact that the subset of facilities is not a statistical sample would call the results into question.

Given these factors, the working group decided to present statewide results using only the data collected for the study. Consequently, the current and projected workload values (particularly for states that are not represented in the subset) are likely to be smaller than the “total” IRP workload (i.e., all foreign-born admissions at every state DOC and local jail).

\textbf{Forecasting Methodology}

This section summarizes the statistical approach to data analysis and forecasting. The process described was developed in accordance with ICE’s goals for the workload analysis and to provide the most accurate workload projections possible, given the limitations of the data. Details of the statistical approach and methods used are contained in Appendix B.

\textit{Historical and Forecast Timeframes}

As discussed in Chapter 2, five years of data (60 monthly data points) were requested; however, many locations submitted less than the full five years of data. Data sets providing a minimum of 12 months were included in the analysis and forecasts were developed using the data provided. Of those locations providing fewer than five years of data, the majority of data sets contained observations covering all of FY 2003.\footnote{For those locations where the data did not cover all of FY 2003, FY 2002 data were used to calculate workload composition percentages.}

For most locations, FY 2004 was treated as a future data point. However, some locations provided more than one quarter of data for FY 2004. Where possible, these FY 2004 data were used to develop the workload forecasts. These locations are identified in the summary tables in Chapter 5.

Given the limited historical data, the working group determined that the forecast for each facility should extend from FY 2004 through FY 2007. This includes in the forecast period at least one full fiscal year (FY 2007) for which budget processes have not yet begun. Consideration was given to extending the projections through FY 2011, which would correspond with the entire budget and resource planning timeframe. However, the quantity of historical data available for the project was not sufficient to produce statistical forecasts extending through FY 2011.\footnote{If necessary, planning estimates through FY 2011 can be generated by using simple trend analysis (e.g., average annual growth, etc.) to extend the project forecasts from the end of FY 2007 through the end of FY 2011.} The mathematical approach used to produce the workload projections is summarized in the \textit{Methodology} section of this chapter and details are included in Appendix B. Forecast results are summarized in Chapter 5 and presented in detail in Appendix C.
Forecasting Approach
At the outset of the project, three forecasting techniques were considered: qualitative, regression, and time-series. Five main factors were taken into consideration when choosing the forecasting technique:

- Project time frame
- Limited historical data
- Explanatory power
- Minimizing forecast error
- Weighting of recent data points

Time-series forecasting was selected as the approach for estimating IRP on the basis that it satisfied the greatest number of these factors. Time series analysis is well suited to limited historical data, identifies patterns and anomalies within data series (e.g., seasonality, outliers, etc.) and has the flexibility to weight recent observations to account for level shifts and other factors. Most importantly, time series is not reliant on the collection or forecasting of additional independent variables. Although regression provides explanatory power (assuming the correct independent variables are identified), the project was not designed as an explanatory analysis, and the identification and collection of independent predictors could not be accomplished within the project scope or timeframe. Therefore, the working group determined that time series is the appropriate technique for developing IRP workload forecasts.

Eight time-series techniques were used to develop the forecasts. Each data series was forecasted using each of the eight methods. Depending on the characteristics of each data series, including volatility, trend, and seasonality, one of the eight time-series forecasts was chosen. The final forecast for each series was selected based upon the statistical “goodness-of-fit” measures generated by each method, as well as qualitative review of the forecasts for reasonableness.

Confidence intervals were calculated for each forecast at the 5% and 95% levels.

Detailed discussion on the selection process and forecasting methodologies, including the strengths and weaknesses of each forecasting technique considered, factors taken into consideration when choosing the forecasting technique, and characteristics of each time-series method are described in Appendix B. The forecast results are summarized in Chapter 5 and shown in detail for each location in Appendix C.

Supplementing Historical Data with SCAAP Data
As mentioned previously, the data collected for this study are similar to the data provided to BJA to support SCAAP funding, but the study data reflect a larger proportion of foreign-born inmates. Some locations provided fewer than the requested five years of data (FY 1999 – FY 2003). However, SCAAP data are available for this time frame and, as such, were used to supplement the forecasting process for several facilities.

The primary reason for using the SCAAP data is that at least two full years of data are needed to analyze the seasonality component in a time-series forecast. In this study, seven locations supplied less than two years of data. To produce all eight time series forecasts for seven of these locations, the working group decided to supplement the study data with monthly SCAAP data.

To do this, a time-series forecast was first generated using historical SCAAP data, the availability of which ranges from three to five years of monthly data. Then, an average percentage change between the FY 2003 monthly SCAAP data and the collected admission data were computed. The percentage change was applied to

---

22 The goodness-of-fit measures included the root mean squared error (RMSE), mean absolute deviation (MAD), and mean absolute percent error (MAPE). See Appendix B for further details.
23 SCAAP data reflect foreign-born inmates who have been in custody for at least four days and meet a charge severity threshold. The study data include all foreign-born inmate admissions regardless of length of stay or charge.
24 Three other locations (Cobb County, GA; Jacksonville, FL; and Montana DOC) also submitted less than two full years of data. However, these locations do not submit data for SCAAP, so the approach could not be applied. Forecasts were developed using simple trend analysis.
the forecast values (from the SCAAP forecast) to adjust for the disparity between the SCAAP data and the collected admissions data.\textsuperscript{25}

Because this is a non-statistical adjustment, the 5% and 95% confidence limits are not applicable to the SCAAP-adjusted forecasts. However, the only other alternatives available were to use another non-statistical technique to generate a forecast or exclude from the analysis the seven locations that provided between one and two years of data. The working group determined that it was preferable to preserve these locations in the analysis and that the most logical way to do so was by using the SCAAP data.\textsuperscript{26}

The working group also determined that SCAAP data should be used to develop forecasts for 13 DOCs that did not provide any usable data for the study and/or declined to participate. For these DOCs, the forecasts are based exclusively on SCAAP data. The results are included in Chapter 5 with all other locations, but are identified with a footnote. Because SCAAP data do not contain any of the project details, one-page data summaries were not generated for these 13 DOCs.

Summary
This chapter details the strategic and analytical approach used to achieve the project goals by analyzing and forecasting the data collected from state DOCs and local jails. The strategies and methods presented were the result of collaborative decisions made by the working group.

The analytical process was based on the following key considerations:

- Records with missing values for place of birth were excluded from the analysis because the data sets from several locations systematically excluded place of birth for a high percentage of records. This decision was extended to also exclude records containing non-null but indeterminate values for place of birth.
- FY 2003 values were used for all locations to analyze the IRP workload composition in terms of length of stay, offense severity, age, and gender. This information can assist ICE in resource planning, requests, and allocation.
- The current and projected workload values are summarized at both the state and ICE Field Office levels.
- The forecasts for each facility extend from FY 2004 through FY 2007. Statistical forecasts could not be extended further because of data limitations.
- DOC and jail workload are analyzed separately because the inmate populations differ in important ways, particularly in terms of the number of admissions and length of stay.
- The statewide values presented represent totals of workload for facilities included in the study, as opposed to overall statewide estimates that would include workload at facilities not included in the study.
- Time series analysis was used to generate IRP workload forecasts because it is well suited to limited historical data, identifies data patterns and anomalies, and, most importantly, does not rely on collecting or forecasting additional independent variables.
- For each location, eight time-series techniques were used to develop initial forecasts and a final forecast was selected based on statistical accuracy and qualitative review.
- For seven locations that supplied less than two years of data, monthly SCAAP data were used to supplement the collected data so that time-series techniques could be properly applied.
- For 13 DOCs that did not provide usable data and/or declined to participate, forecasts were developed exclusively with SCAAP data.

\textsuperscript{25} The historical and fitted values from the SCAAP forecast were not altered.

\textsuperscript{26} The November 2004 addendum to this report will also include a detailed comparison of the collected study data and SCAAP data for several key locations.
Based on these considerations, the current and future IRP workload was estimated for each DOC and jail. Additional details about the process used to select the statistical methodology can be found in Appendix B. Forecast and workload composition results are summarized in Chapter 5 and presented in detail in Appendix C.
CHAPTER 5. RESULTS

Chapter 3 described the data collection process that yielded usable data from 81 jails and DOCs, and Chapter 4 outlined the decisions made and process used to analyze and forecast the collected data. This chapter presents the overall analysis and forecast results for all facilities. Additional details for each facility can be found in Appendix C.

Historical and Projected IRP Workload

Tables 5-1 and 5-2 display the historical and projected IRP workload values for each jail and DOC that provided usable data for the study and for the DOCs forecasted using SCAAP data. The jails and DOCs are grouped by ICE Field Office in Table 5-1 and by state in Table 5-2; the Field Offices and states are ordered alphabetically.

Some locations provided fewer than five years of historical data, illustrated by the gray boxes in the FY 1999-2003 columns. Historical data values shown in blue signify that partial data were provided for that fiscal year. Also, shaded boxes in the FY 2004 column identify locations providing more than one quarter of FY 2004 data; these data were used to develop the forecast.

As explained in Chapter 4, the forecasts for seven jails and DOCS were augmented using SCAAP data, and the forecasts for 13 DOCs were based exclusively on SCAAP data; these locations are identified with asterisks and associated footnotes at the bottom of the table. The projected workload values were produced by time-series analyses as described in Appendix B.

---

Footnote:

These techniques were used so that the analysis could include as much data from as many locations as possible. However, it is important to consider the data anomalies and limitations identified within the table and footnotes. For example, Plymouth County, MA provided 11 months of data (April 2003 - February 2004), which included 769 foreign-born admissions. However, the FY 2003 data point only reflects a portion of this total. SCAAP data were used to augment the FY 2003 data to develop a forecast. The forecasted values are in line with the collected data, though at first glance significantly larger than the FY 2003 value.
### Table 5-1. Historical and Projected IRP Workload by ICE Field Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Historical Workload</th>
<th>Forecasted Workload</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 99</td>
<td>FY 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Atlanta Field Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macclenny County, NC **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobb County, GA ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeKalb County, GA **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia DOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina DOC ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina DOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Totals</td>
<td>3350</td>
<td>3350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC Totals</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baltimore Field Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware DOC</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland DOC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Totals</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC Totals</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>1030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boston Field Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth County, MA **</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut DOC **</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main DOC</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts DOC **</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire DOC</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island DOC **</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont DOC</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Totals</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC Totals</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buffalo Field Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Participating Locations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Totals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC Totals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chicago Field Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook County, IL</td>
<td>7183</td>
<td>7588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson County, KY</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee County, WI</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois DOC</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana DOC</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas DOC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky DOC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri DOC</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin DOC</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Totals</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>9116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC Totals</td>
<td>1401</td>
<td>1304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dallas Field Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma County, OK</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis County, TX</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma DOC</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Totals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC Totals</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bold, Blue Text** denotes a partial year of data received.

Shaded Blue Box denotes facility sent at least G1 FY 2004 data.

** Limited data received. Historical SCAAP data were forecasted. The SCAAP forecast was augmented to more accurately reflect the magnitude of workload presented in actual data received.

*** Limited or no data received. Historical SCAAP data were forecasted. SCAAP forecast was not augmented because monthly SCAAP admissions were not comparable to actual monthly data received.

Fentress Incorporated
September 2004
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Historical Workload</th>
<th>Forecasted Workload</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                               | FY 00 | FY 01 | FY 02 | FY 03 | FY 04 | FY 05 | FY 06 | FY 07 
| D.C. Field Office             |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Virginia DOC                  | 199   | 220   | 327   | 378   | 427   | 438   | 456   | 471   | 487   |
| Jail Totals                   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     |
| DOC Totals                    | 199   | 220   | 327   | 378   | 427   | 438   | 456   | 471   | 487   |
| Denver Field Office           |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Colorado DOC                  | 412   | 403   | 442   | 626   | 611   | 509   | 534   | 599   | 538   |
| Idaho DOC                     | 107   | 214   | 160   | 171   | 207   | 219   | 243   | 266   | 298   |
| Montana DOC                   | 5     | 5     | 5     | 5     | 5     | 5     | 5     | 5     | 5     |
| Wyoming DOC                   | 5     | 5     | 5     | 5     | 5     | 5     | 5     | 5     | 5     |
| Jail Totals                   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     |
| DOC Totals                    | 619   | 622   | 626   | 718   | 750   | 756   | 810   | 860   | 910   |
| Detroit Field Office          |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Wayne County, MI              | 62    | 62    | 62    | 62    | 62    | 62    | 62    | 62    | 62    |
| Cuyahoga County, OH           | 371   | 619   | 624   | 461   | 405   | 477   | 482   | 433   | 463   |
| Michigan DOC                  | 103   | 60    | 76    | 113   | 144   | 128   | 134   | 142   | 150   |
| Ohio DOC                      | 100   | 158   | 216   | 233   | 263   | 283   | 303   | 323   | 343   |
| Jail Totals                   | 371   | 519   | 676   | 517   | 468   | 514   | 528   | 528   | 526   |
| DOC Totals                    | 103   | 80    | 175   | 311   | 360   | 334   | 342   | 350   | 358   |
| El Paso Field Office          |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| New Mexico DOC **             | 3     | 6     | 14    | 16    | 32    | 32    | 37    | 42    |       |
| Jail Totals                   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     |
| DOC Totals                    | 3     | 5     | 14    | 16    | 32    | 32    | 37    | 42    |       |
| Houston Field Office          |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Harris County, TX             | 3     | 3     | 3     | 3     | 3     | 3     | 3     | 3     | 3     |
| Texas DOC                     | 3,843 | 3,151 | 3,561 | 4,059 | 4,780 | 4,707 | 4,879 | 5,052 | 5,225 |
| Jail Totals                   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     |
| DOC Totals                    | 3,843 | 3,151 | 3,561 | 4,059 | 4,780 | 4,707 | 4,879 | 5,052 | 5,225 |
| Los Angeles Field Office      |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Clark County, NV              | 5,459 | 7,151 | 7,460 | 7,502 | 7,227 | 7,420 | 7,212 | 7,222 | 7,422 |
| Los Angeles County, CA **     | 112,662| 113,020| 113,472| 106,636| 109,024| 111,034| 110,443| 110,443| 110,443|
| Orange County, CA **          | 18,956| 17,469| 16,566| 16,760| 17,647| 19,406| 19,575| 19,474|       |
| Riverside County, CA **      | 2,750 | 7,704 | 8,557 | 8,354 | 8,354 | 8,354 | 8,354 | 8,354 | 8,354 |
| Ventura County, CA           | 560   | 2,061 | 2,662 | 2,061 | 550   | 550   | 550   | 550   | 550   |
| California DOC **            | 16,313| 14,794| 13,636| 13,666| 13,379| 13,557| 13,557| 13,557| 13,557|
| Jail Totals                   | 117,921| 141,665| 141,053| 134,705| 142,481| 146,368| 146,915| 147,295| 147,676|
| DOC Totals                    | 16,313| 14,794| 13,636| 13,557| 13,379| 13,557| 13,557| 13,557| 13,557|
| Miami Field Office            |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Broward County, FL            | 8,067 | 11,012| 10,872| 10,830| 11,120| 10,959| 11,519| 12,077| 12,536|
| Hillsborough County, FL       | 4,399 | 5,224 | 5,644 | 6,837 | 6,461 | 5,335 | 5,203 | 5,233 | 5,233 |
| Jacksonville, FL              | 1,523 | 1,567 | 1,567 | 1,567 | 1,567 | 1,567 | 1,567 | 1,567 | 1,567 |
| Orange County, FL             | 902   | 2,910 | 3,027 | 3,227 | 1,920 | 1,920 | 2,017 | 2,017 | 2,017 |
| Palm Beach County, FL         | 4,076 | 5,438 | 5,733 | 6,388 | 6,663 | 7,503 | 7,904 | 8,275 | 8,647 |
| Pinellas County, FL           | 706   | 1,130 | 1,641 | 1,709 | 1,869 | 2,039 | 2,099 | 2,099 | 2,099 |
| Florida DOC                   | 900   | 1,760 | 1,641 | 1,685 | 1,757 | 1,737 | 1,753 | 1,768 | 1,784 |
| Jail Totals                   | 17,041| 23,360 | 26,489| 28,573| 31,223| 33,186| 35,508| 37,768| 39,986|
| DOC Totals                    | 900   | 1,750 | 1,641 | 1,685 | 1,757 | 1,737 | 1,753 | 1,768 | 1,784|

**Bold, Blue Text** denotes a partial year of data received.

Shaded Blue Text denotes facility at least Q3 FY 2004 data.

** Limited data received. Historical SCAAP data were forecasted. The SCAAP forecast was augmented to more accurately reflect the magnitude of workload presented in actual data received.

*** Limited or no data received. Historical SCAAP data were forecasted. SCAAP forecast was not augmented because monthly SCAAP admissions were comparable to actual monthly data received.
# CHAPTER 5 – RESULTS

## U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE)
### Institutional Removal Program (IRP) – National Workload Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Historical Workload</th>
<th>Forecasted Workload</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 00</td>
<td>FY 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Orleans Field Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 00</td>
<td>FY 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New York Field Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Newark Field Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 00</td>
<td>FY 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phoenix Field Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 00</td>
<td>FY 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>St. Paul Field Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 00</td>
<td>FY 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Antonio Field Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 00</td>
<td>FY 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Diego Field Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bold, Blue Text** denotes a partial year of data received.

**Shaded Blue Box** denotes facility sent at least Q1 FY 2004 data.

**Bold, Blue Text** denotes a partial year of data received.

**Footnotes:**

- **Field Office**
  - **Historical Workload**
  - **Forecasted Workload**
  - **FY 00**
  - **FY 01**
  - **FY 02**
  - **FY 03**
  - **FY 04**
  - **FY 05**
  - **FY 06**
  - **FY 07**

**Field Office**

- **New Orleans Field Office**
- **New York Field Office**
- **Newark Field Office**
- **Phoenix Field Office**
- **St. Paul Field Office**
- **San Antonio Field Office**
- **San Diego Field Office**

**Notes:**

- **Limited data received.** Historical SCAAP data were forecasted. The SCAAP forecast was augmented to more accurately reflect the magnitude of workload presented in actual data received.

- **Limited data received.** Historical SCAAP data were forecasted. SCAAP forecast was not augmented because monthly SCAAP admissions were comparable to actual monthly data received.
# U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE)
## Institutional Removal Program (IRP) – National Workload Study

### CHAPTER 5 – RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Historical Workload</th>
<th>Forecasted Workload</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Francisco Field Office</strong></td>
<td>FY 00</td>
<td>FY 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County, CA</td>
<td>4,447</td>
<td>4,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno County, CA</td>
<td>6,764</td>
<td>6,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern County, CA</td>
<td>6,429</td>
<td>7,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County, CA</td>
<td>13,806</td>
<td>18,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulare County, CA</td>
<td>5,935</td>
<td>6,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada DOC</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii DOC</td>
<td>1,545</td>
<td>1,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah DOC</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jail Totals</strong></td>
<td>29,417</td>
<td>37,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DOC Totals</strong></td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td>1,059</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Seattle Field Office</strong></th>
<th>FY 00</th>
<th>FY 01</th>
<th>FY 02</th>
<th>FY 03</th>
<th>FY 04</th>
<th>FY 05</th>
<th>FY 06</th>
<th>FY 07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multnomah County, OR</td>
<td>2,872</td>
<td>3,662</td>
<td>3,582</td>
<td>3,548</td>
<td>3,095</td>
<td>3,758</td>
<td>3,708</td>
<td>3,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce County, WA</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakima County, WA</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,353</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska DOC</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>1,302</td>
<td>1,354</td>
<td>1,266</td>
<td>1,484</td>
<td>1,344</td>
<td>1,304</td>
<td>1,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon DOC</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington DOC</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>2,154</td>
<td>2,065</td>
<td>2,332</td>
<td>2,404</td>
<td>2,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jail Totals</strong></td>
<td>4,702</td>
<td>6,019</td>
<td>5,784</td>
<td>5,661</td>
<td>5,393</td>
<td>6,501</td>
<td>6,495</td>
<td>6,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DOC Totals</strong></td>
<td>248</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>2,154</td>
<td>2,065</td>
<td>2,332</td>
<td>2,404</td>
<td>2,580</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Total Jail Workload (participating locations)** | 211,751 | 260,031 | 270,764 | 360,858 | 346,152 | 358,731 | 366,030 | 371,637 | 379,645 |
| **Total DOC Workload (participating locations)**  | 30,700 | 31,976 | 31,889 | 34,049 | 36,314 | 37,253 | 38,360 | 39,496 | 40,554 |

**Bold, Blue Text** denotes a partial year of data received.

**Shaded Blue Box** denotes facility sent at least Q4 FY 2004 data.

**Limited data received. Historical SCAAP data were forecasted.** The SCAAP forecast was augmented to more accurately reflect the magnitude of workload presented in actual data received.

**Limited or no data received. Historical SCAAP data were forecasted.** SCAAP forecast was not augmented because monthly SCAAP admissions were comparable to actual monthly data received.
Table 5-2. Historical and Projected IRP Workload by State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Historical Workload</th>
<th>Forecasted Workload</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 99</td>
<td>FY 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alabama</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama DOC</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alaska</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska DOC</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>1,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arkansas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas DOC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arizona</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa County</td>
<td>17,189</td>
<td>16,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pima County</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>1,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuma County</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Total</td>
<td>17,189</td>
<td>18,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona DOC ***</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>1,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>California</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>4,447</td>
<td>4,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno County</td>
<td>7,175</td>
<td>7,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern County</td>
<td>6,529</td>
<td>7,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>112,863</td>
<td>113,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>18,906</td>
<td>17,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside County ***</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>7,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County **</td>
<td>14,076</td>
<td>14,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County</td>
<td>13,605</td>
<td>13,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulare County</td>
<td>5,995</td>
<td>6,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura County</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Total</td>
<td>142,080</td>
<td>171,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California DOC ***</td>
<td>16,313</td>
<td>14,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colorado</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado DOC</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connecticut</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut DOC ***</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delaware</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware DOC</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Florida</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward County</td>
<td>6,067</td>
<td>11,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough County</td>
<td>4,239</td>
<td>6,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson County</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td>1,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>4,675</td>
<td>5,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach County</td>
<td>5,131</td>
<td>6,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas County</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Total</td>
<td>17,041</td>
<td>23,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida DOC</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>1,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Georgia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobb County **</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeKalb County **</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia DOC</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bold, Blue Text** denotes a partial year of data received.
**Shaded Blue Box** denotes facility sent at least 0.1 FY 2004 data.
**Bold, Blue Text** denotes forecasted. Historical SCAAP data were forecasted. The SCAAP forecast was augmented to more accurately reflect the magnitude of workload presented in actual data received.
**Bold, Blue Text** denotes forecasted. Historical SCAAP data were forecasted. SCAAP forecast was not augmented because monthly SCAAP admissions were limited.
## CHAPTER 5 – RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Historical Workload</th>
<th>Forecasted Workload</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 99</td>
<td>FY 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii DOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho DOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois DOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa DOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa Jail Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky DOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana DOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine DOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts DOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan DOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota DOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi DOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri DOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bold, Blue Text** denotes a partial year of data received.

**Shaded Blue Box** denotes facility sent at least 01 FY 2004 data.

**Bold, Blue Text** denotes facility sent at least 01 FY 2004 data.

**Limited data received.** Historical SCAAP data were forecasted. The SCAAP forecast was augmented to more accurately reflect the magnitude of workload presented in actual data received.

**Limited data received.** Historical SCAAP data were forecasted. The SCAAP forecast was augmented to more accurately reflect the magnitude of workload presented in actual data received.

**Limited data received.** Historical SCAAP data were forecasted. The SCAAP forecast was augmented to more accurately reflect the magnitude of workload presented in actual data received.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Historical Workload</th>
<th>Forecasted Workload</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 09</td>
<td>FY 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska DOC</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark County</td>
<td>6,151</td>
<td>7,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada Total</td>
<td>5,158</td>
<td>7,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada DOC</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire DOC</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex County</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson County</td>
<td>3,045</td>
<td>3,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passaic County</td>
<td>1,841</td>
<td>1,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Total</td>
<td>5,211</td>
<td>5,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey DOC</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico DOC***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>4,882</td>
<td>4,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk County</td>
<td>1,475</td>
<td>1,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Total</td>
<td>6,357</td>
<td>6,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York DOC</td>
<td>2,291</td>
<td>2,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecklenburg County**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina DOC***</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota DOC</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga County</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Total</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio DOC***</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma DOC</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon DOC</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Philadelphia</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Total</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania DOC</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island DOC***</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>846</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bold, Blue Text** denotes a partial year of data received.

Shaded Blue Box denotes facility sent at least 01 FY 2004 data.

** Limited data received. Historical SCAPP data were forecasted. The SCAPP forecast was augmented to more accurately reflect the magnitude of workload presented in actual data received.

*** Limited or no data received. Historical SCAPP data were forecasted. SCAPP forecast was not augmented because monthly SCAPP admissions were.
# U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE)
## Institutional Removal Program (IRP) – National Workload Study
### CHAPTER 5 – RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Historical Workload</th>
<th>Forecasted Workload</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 99</td>
<td>FY 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina DOC</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota DOC</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson County</td>
<td>1,927</td>
<td>2,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Total</td>
<td>1,927</td>
<td>2,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee DOC</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bexar County</td>
<td>7,487</td>
<td>5,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris County</td>
<td>13,881</td>
<td>14,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis County</td>
<td>8,633</td>
<td>9,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Total</td>
<td>29,205</td>
<td>31,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas DOC</td>
<td>3,813</td>
<td>3,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah DOC ***</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont DOC ***</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia DOC</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce County</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakima County</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>1,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Total</td>
<td>2,357</td>
<td>2,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington DOC</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia DOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee County</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>1,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Total</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>1,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin DOC</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming DOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming DOC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Local Jail Workload (participating locations)</td>
<td>221,751</td>
<td>220,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total DOC Workload (participating locations)</td>
<td>38,709</td>
<td>31,976</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bold, Blue Text** denotes a partial year of data received.

Shaded Blue Box denotes facility sent at least Q1 FY 2004 data

** Limited data received. Historical SCAA workloads were forecasted. The SCAA forecast was augmented to more accurately reflect the magnitude of workload presented in actual data received.

*** Limited or no data received. Historical SCAA data were forecasted. SCAA forecast was not augmented because monthly SCAA admissions were...
As the tables show, in FY 2003, a total of 382,466 foreign-born inmates were admitted to the locations providing data for the study, 346,152 to jails and 36,314 to DOCs. Based on the projections for each location, foreign-born admissions in this group of jails will increase to 379,445 by FY 2007, an increase of 9.6% compared to FY 2003. A total of 40,554 foreign-born admissions are projected for the DOCs by FY 2007, an increase of 11.7%.

As mentioned in Chapter 4 (and detailed in Appendix B), the forecasts were developed using time-series analysis, the technique most suited to the data and project goals. However, it should be noted that fluctuations in the historical data could not be closely examined within the study timeframe. For example, the data provided by the New York City DOC (which houses the city’s jail population) remained relatively consistent between FY 1999 and FY 2002, then more than doubled in FY 2003 and remained at this higher level in the first quarter of FY 2004. Because further research could not be conducted, it is uncertain whether the workload spike should be considered permanent or if other adjustments to the historical data are needed. Consequently, the forecasts are based exclusively on the data provided from each location, without additional research and validation. ICE will research fluctuations and anomalies on a case-by-case basis to aid in applying the study results.

The projected growth is greater for DOCs than jails, primarily because several large jails exhibited relatively level trends in the number of foreign-born admissions. One of these locations was Los Angeles County, which represents nearly one-third of the total foreign-born jail admissions included in the study. However, this finding does not suggest that resource needs for the IRP program in such locations will remain stable. On the contrary, ICE subject matter experts indicated that the existing level of program resources is far below what is needed to manage the current workload (i.e., FY 2003 workload data). Consequently, even if there was no projected growth in any locations, additional program resources are still needed to cover the substantial program workload that agents are managing today.

Also, Table 5-2 shows that, among the locations providing data for the study, the largest concentration of foreign-born jail admissions is found in California, Texas, Florida, Arizona, New York, Illinois, and Georgia. The jails located in these seven states accounted for 90% of the FY 2003 workload and are projected to account for 89% of the FY 2007 workload. Because one of the study’s objectives was to focus attention on those areas where the IRP program can have the greatest impact, this information can assist ICE in requesting and allocating program resources.

**FY 2003 Workload Composition**

Figures 5-1 through 5-6 display details of the total FY 2003 IRP workload composition for the jails and DOCs providing data for the study. The figures present the composition of the FY 2003 foreign-born admissions in terms of nationality, length of stay, age, gender, and offense severity, respectively. Except for length of stay (Figures 5-2 and 5-3), the results reflect combined totals for jails and DOCs.

---

28 This includes the 13 DOCs for which SCAAP data were used exclusively.

29 These figures include jail inmates from six DOCs: Alaska, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Rhode Island, and Vermont. These states have integrated prison/jail systems and the DOC records therefore include the total jail and prison populations. It was not possible to separate the records; therefore they are all shown under the DOC totals. This factor and others already noted create some data anomalies. For example, the foreign-born DOC population in Rhode Island is shown as being larger than in Massachusetts. This is because 1) the Rhode Island data contains jail inmates, and 2) the Massachusetts data is exclusively from SCAAP. Although the actual foreign-born DOC population is almost certainly larger in Massachusetts than Rhode Island, the data provided for the study do not reflect this.

30 All 382,466 foreign-born admission records were used to calculate these figures. However, not all records contributed to the calculation of each figure, due to missing or invalid data. For example, some locations could not provide an offense severity field but included all other requested data. Also, some individual records contain null or indeterminate values for one field but valid values for all others.
Figure 5-1. Foreign-Born Inmates by Place of Birth

- Mexico: 59.6%
- El Salvador: 3.9%
- Guatemala: 2.3%
- Jamaica: 1.6%
- Dom. Republic: 1.5%
- Philippines: 1.5%
- Honduras: 1.4%
- Cuba: 1.3%
- Others: 26.9%

Figure 5-2. Foreign-Born Jail Inmates by Length of Stay (in days)

- 0-3 days: 58.3%
- 4-5 days: 6.3%
- 6-10 days: 7.3%
- 11-30 days: 11.4%
- 31-60 days: 6.3%
- 61-90 days: 3.2%
- 91-120 days: 2.3%
- 121-150 days: 1.3%
- >150 days: 3.6%
Figure 5-3. Foreign-Born DOC Inmates by Length of Stay

- 0-3 Months: 25.5%
- 3-6 Months: 15.7%
- 6-12 Months: 18.7%
- 1-2 Years: 23.3%
- 2-5 Years: 6.5%
- 5-10 Years: 3.3%
- 10+ Years: 0%

Figure 5-4. Foreign-Born Inmates by Offense

- Other Offenses: 79.7%
- Drug Offenses: 14.1%
- Index Offenses: 6.2%
Figure 5-5. Foreign-Born Inmates by Gender

Male 90.4%
Female 9.6%

Figure 5-6. Foreign-Born Inmates by Age

26-35 Yrs 35.7%
19-25 Yrs 29.2%
36-45 Yrs 21.0%
46-55 Yrs 8.0%
0-18 Yrs 3.8%
55+ Yrs 2.3%
The information contained in the figures highlights the following key points:

- Figure 5-1 shows that Mexican-born inmates, by far the largest concentration, represent 59.6% of the total foreign-born inmates in the jails and DOCs that provided data. Other nationalities that comprised greater than 1.6% include El Salvador, Guatemala, and Jamaica.

- Figure 5-2 shows that 58.3% of foreign-born jail inmates remain in custody for three days or less and 83% remain in custody for 30 days or less. The fact that so many foreign-born inmates spend such a short time in custody raises at least two considerations. First, agents need the ability to respond very quickly to identify potentially removable aliens at the jail level; second, the program could benefit from a method for identifying jail inmates who are likely to move to a DOC and serve a longer sentence. As mentioned previously, a study is being conducted to address this second consideration and the results will be published as an addendum to this report.

- Figure 5-3 shows that 32.5% of foreign-born DOC inmates are in custody for 6 months or less, and 51.8% serve sentences of greater than one year.31

- Figure 5-4 shows that 6.2% of foreign-born jail and DOC inmates are charged with Index crimes, 14.1% with drug crimes, and 79.7% with other violations.32 The potential relevance of offense severity in identifying jail inmates likely to be sentenced to DOCs will be addressed in the add-on study.

- Figures 5-5 and 5-6 show the demographic composition of the IRP workload in terms of age and gender. These factors can be critical in terms of the availability and cost of detention space (i.e., separate housing for females and juveniles) and can also influence IRP resource needs, particularly in specific locations.

These workload composition results provide useful information that ICE can use to apply the study findings. In addition to the potential uses noted above, the workload composition percentages can be combined with the workload forecasts to estimate future workload for specific inmate groups (e.g., Index crime offenders, inmates with certain lengths of stay, etc.).33 Detailed results for both the overall workload (historical and forecast) and workload composition are presented for each facility in Appendix C.

31 The proportion of DOC inmates in custody six months or less is likely inflated by the data from the six DOCs with integrated prison/jail systems, because the DOC records include jail inmates with relatively short lengths of stay. Also, unlike for jails, the length of stay for DOCs was calculated based on inmates released in each fiscal year, as opposed to those admitted. The reason is that, in any given year, the majority of admitted inmates will still be in custody at the end of the year, making length of stay unknown for those inmates. Although this method has limitations (i.e., it omits inmates with life sentences and may be incomplete for inmates with sentences longer than 5 years), it provides a more accurate distribution than using admissions.

32 Index crimes refer to serious crimes as defined by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) Crime Index and include murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, motor vehicle theft, and arson.

33 Any figures derived this way would assume that the percentages remain stable over time. The more the percentages vary over time, the less accurate the estimates would be. Thus, analysis of the IRP workload composition over time is a potential area of future study.
Appendix A. Data Collection

Data Collection Letter
This letter was sent March 8, 2004 to the director or Sheriff of each of the targeted facilities.

March 8, 2004
369 South High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Dear [Director, Sheriff],

The purpose of this correspondence is to request specific data pertaining to non-U.S. citizen inmates housed in your facility. This information will assist the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) in conducting an important workload analysis of the Institutional Removal Program (IRP). The IRP allows ICE personnel to identify removable criminal aliens incarcerated in the U.S., and begin removal proceedings during the incarceration period so that when a criminal alien completes the prison sentence, he/she is immediately subject to removal without further detention in ICE custody.

Fentress Incorporated (Fentress) is the prime contractor working for ICE to collect inmate data from the 50 state Departments of Correction (DOCs) and 50 of the largest local jails in the U.S. Appriss Incorporated (Appriss), which maintains a privately managed integrated criminal justice information network, is under contract to provide data for the IRP project. Fentress will use the data to estimate the non-U.S. citizen inmate population currently being held in DOCs and local jails, which will in turn help to quantify the current workload associated with the IRP. Fentress will use the data to develop a model that projects the non-U.S. citizen population and estimates the IRP workload. These projections will assist ICE in determining necessary funding and staffing requirements for the Program.

ICE hopes to obtain at least two (and ideally five) years of your most recent inmate data. Presently, record-level data (for each individual) are preferred. However, as the project moves forward, findings pertaining to data volume and file size may suggest that summary data are preferable to record-level data. This is presently a question open for consideration. Ideally, the data should include the following inmate attributes: age, gender, citizenship/place of birth, type of offense, conviction status (disposition), and length-of-stay. In particular, citizenship/place of birth and length-of-stay (or sentence length) are critical pieces of information for the IRP program.

We realize that you may already provide similar inmate data to the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS). ICE and Fentress are in contact with BJS to obtain summary-level data to support the project. However, we believe that the type of detailed information desired is more likely to reside in booking systems than in summary reports. Therefore, we respectfully request your assistance in providing data to support this important Department of Homeland Security program.

A designated project representative will contact you within the next two weeks to follow up on this correspondence. At that time, we will be happy to address any questions or concerns. We can then begin to discuss details and identify a process for obtaining the available data. If you require additional information in the meantime, please contact [Management Analyst, at (b)(6)].

Thank you for your participation in this effort and I look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

Anthony Tangeman
Director
Additional Data Collection Letter with Assurance of Confidentiality

This letter, or one containing similar information, was sent to locations that requested an assurance that the confidentiality of each inmate would be maintained. An e-mail containing portions of this text was also developed to give specifics on what data were requested.

July 19, 2004

El Paso County Sheriff’s Office
P.O. Box 125
El Paso, TX 79941

This letter is to give a bit of additional information about the study Fentress Incorporated and Appriss are conducting on behalf of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security. I hope that El Paso County will be able to help us out by providing the data we require to complete this study. For your files, I’m including a brief explanation of the study and the way the data will be used. This letter is also intended to serve as the assurance of confidentiality of record level data that you have mentioned needing in order to release the data we have requested.

The goal of this study is to project future workload for ICE’s Institutional Removal Program (IRP), which processes criminal aliens for deportation. These criminal aliens have entered the United States legally or illegally, but have become eligible for deportation by engaging in criminal activity. Under the IRP, these inmates are targeted, processed, and a deportation hearing is scheduled. If the deportation hearing finds that deportation is appropriate these aliens can be sent home immediately. Any foreign-born inmate in a local jail or state prison is a potential candidate for the IRP, and often an interview is necessary to determine candidacy.

An audit of this program by the Office of the Inspector General in September 2002 found that it was not achieving some of the desired goals. One reason for the low removal rate is inadequate staffing. The IRP process can take up to six weeks from candidate identification to deportation hearing. If the process does not begin while candidate inmates are still in local custody, they may be released from the local facility before ICE is prepared to assume custody and process the deportation. With low staffing levels, targeting and processing have not been as successful as they could be at identifying the proper individuals early enough to successfully complete the removal when appropriate.

The analysis of the volume of potential candidates for this program is the first step in improving this program. Once this study has estimated the total workload for the IRP, ICE can take steps to improve the staffing levels and the processing times so increasing numbers of criminal aliens can be processed as stipulated by the immigration laws of the United States.

The following sections describe exactly what our data analysis team is looking for, as well as how the data will be used.

TIME PERIOD TO COVER - Fentress is requesting record level data on foreign-born admissions to the El Paso County Jail over the past 2-5 years. We are working on the Federal fiscal year, which runs October 1 to September 30. Our contract asks us to collect at least 2 years of data, but our statisticians would prefer to collect five years, if possible. We would like to collect data on all admissions with foreign-born or unidentifiable place of birth from October 1 of the starting year, and then all subsequent admissions fitting the criteria up until the present time. We’d love to have data starting October 1, 1998 (five complete years, plus a few months of FY 2003). If you can only provide two years of data, please start with October 1, 2001 and give all subsequent admissions, so we can be sure to have two complete fiscal years. Please give admissions by day. We will aggregate as necessary/appropriate for the final analysis and projections.
MAIN SORT CRITERIA - Our main sort criteria is indicator of foreign born status (Place of Birth, Citizenship, etc., depending on what you store in your system). Key items to keep in mind for this criteria are:

- We want all non-US born and all undetermined place of birth, distinguished as non-US or undetermined.
- We are not interested in citizenship per se. We’d prefer place of birth. Citizenship is a second-best option.

SPECIFIC DATA ITEMS - The sample data distributed to you by e-mail shows some fields that we have found available on other systems around the country. Please bear in mind that we do not need every item listed under “unique identifier” – only one unique identifier is necessary per inmate. Likewise, we only need one item to distinguish or identify foreign-born inmates, not every item listed in that category. Necessary data items include booking date, anticipated release date/actual release date, gender, at least one unique identifier (Social Security or other number), and some indicator of origin of birth (Place of Birth, Citizenship, etc.). We would like to get the full demographic and criminal sections as well, if possible. We understand that some of this data is self-reported and may not be completely reliable, but are interested in seeing what is on your system all the same.

If you have concerns about releasing personal information relating to inmates, please note that we do not require names and Social Security numbers, but if you do not include the SSN, please include a different unique identifier for each inmate.

FORMAT - Our ideal format is Microsoft Excel or Microsoft Access, but we can accept data in any tab-delimited format.

COMPLETION DATE - We are hoping to get all data in by the end of July. Please let us know if this will not be a feasible timeframe for you, or if you can get the data in sooner.

USE OF DATA - The data Fentress is requesting for this analysis will be used internally by authorized staff on this project, all of whom have been cleared by ICE to work on this project. Some data subsets may be compiled into examples for team meetings with ICE staff to discuss modeling options, but these data sets will not be made public. El Paso County is one of 123 facilities that will be included in the study. The final report will contain aggregated data at facility, national, and regional levels. The report will also include graphical representations (maps, histograms) of data from specific locations around the country. These graphs will not include record-level data; that data will only be used to compile the diagrams.
Sample Data
This set of fictitious sample data was sent electronically to almost every participant in the study.

| Gender | DOB       | Place of Birth (POB) | Nationality | US Citizen | Foreign Born | Descent | Ethnicity | Language Spoken | Language Written | Language Read | Agency | Facility | Booking Number | Inmate Number | State ID | FBI Number | INS Number | Passport Visa Number | Last Name | First Name | Middle Name | SSN | Booking Date | Released Indicator | Released Date | Scheduled Release Date | Expected Release Date | Offense 1 | Offense 2 | Offense 3 |
|--------|-----------|----------------------|-------------|------------|-------------|---------|-----------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|--------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|-----------|------------|------------|-----|-------------|---------------------|--------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------|----------|----------|
Appendix B. Forecasting Methodology

Introduction
One objective of the IRP Workload Study is to forecast the program workload through FY 2007. The purpose of this appendix is to describe the process used to develop workload forecasts and to outline the rationale for selecting the final methodology.

Three forecasting methods were considered: qualitative, regression, and time-series. Of these, time-series was selected as the most logical approach. The section below presents the strengths and limitations of each method and describes the reasons for selecting time-series.

Qualitative Forecasting Method
Qualitative forecasts are useful when little or no historical data are available. These forecasts are based primarily on subjective methods such as informed judgment, expert opinion, or past experience. Qualitative forecasts are typically developed through a combination of answers to surveys, questionnaires, or interviews. The Delphi technique is one commonly used qualitative method. The Delphi technique is based on a structured process for collecting and distilling knowledge from a group of experts by means of a series of questionnaires interspersed with controlled opinion feedback. The philosophy behind this approach is that the group will converge toward the “best” response through this consensus process.

Strengths
One distinct advantage of qualitative forecasts is that historical data need not be available; forecasts are developed based solely on the reliability of group consensus. Qualitative forecasts are particularly useful when the future is expected to be very different than the past, thereby negating the objective and consistent value of historical data retained in a quantitative forecast.

Weaknesses
An inherent weakness of qualitative forecasts arises due to the fact that forecasts are built solely on subjective information. The use of subjective information makes the forecasts prone to error that is difficult to predict or measure. In addition, if historical data are present, the development of consensus through iterative processes may either ignore or contradict the available quantitative data. Particularly if discernible trends exist in the data, ignoring those trends is not desirable. Finally, the manpower required to collect the data for qualitative forecasts through survey and subject matter expert interviews, together with the many meetings necessary to develop consensus, can be time consuming and labor intensive.

Multivariate Regression Forecasting Method
Multivariate regression is a causal associative method that establishes a relationship between a dependent variable (quantity forecasted) and one or more independent variables (the basis for the forecast). Multivariate regression attempts to explain the variance in the dependent variable by determining a relationship between the dependent variable and independent variables.

The goal of multivariate linear regression is to find a linear equation that yields the best match to historical data. Coefficients of multivariate linear regression are found by using the equation:

$$y = b_0 + b_1x_1 + b_2x_2 + b_3x_3 + ... + \varepsilon$$  \hspace{1cm} (a.1)

Where $b_1, b_2, b_3$ are the coefficients of the independent variables; $x_1, x_2, x_3$ are the independent variables; $b_0$ is the $y$-intercept; and $\varepsilon$ is the residual error.

The residual error, $\varepsilon$, represents the random effect of the forecast after the variability of the predictive independent variables have been removed. The explanatory power of the regression equation is measured by three regression statistics: R-squared; sum of squared deviations (SSE); and F-Statistic.

34 In this study, the dependent variable is the number of foreign-born admissions to DOCs and county jails.
**R-Squared**
R-squared is the coefficient of determination. This statistic indicates the proportion of error that is accounted for in the regression. In other words, R-squared is the percentage of the variability of the dependent variable that is explained by the independent variables. R-squared is defined as:

$$R^2 = \frac{\sum (\hat{y}_i - \bar{y})^2}{\sum (y_i - \bar{y})^2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (a.2)

Where $y_i$ is the actual historical value for a point in time period $i$; $\bar{y}$ is the mean of the data and; $\hat{y}_i$ is the fitted forecast value for the time period $i$.

**SSE**
The sum of square deviations (SSE) measures the error not eliminated by the regression equation. The lower the SSE, the better the fit of the regression equation to the historical data. SSE can be defined as:

$$SSE = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \varepsilon_i^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (a.3)

Where $n$ is the number of historical data points and $\varepsilon$ is the residual error.

**F-Statistic**
The F-statistic tests the significance of the relationship between the dependent variable and a combination of one or more independent variables. The F-statistic can be compared to similar sets; the higher the F-statistic, the better the regression equation. The F-statistic can be defined by:

$$F = \frac{\sum (\hat{Y}_i - \bar{Y})^2 /(m-1)}{\sum (Y_i - \hat{Y}_i)^2 /(n-m)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (a.4)

Where $Y_i$ is the actual historical value for a point in time period $i$; $\bar{Y}$ is the mean of the data; $n$ is the total number of fitted points; $\hat{Y}_i$ is the fitted forecast value for the time period $i$; and $m$ is the number of regression coefficients.

**Strengths**
Multivariate regression is the preferred method in cases where the goal is to explain the variance in the dependent variable. The regression coefficients represent the contributions of one or more independent variables to variations in the level of the dependent variable. The ability to compare the individual contributions of independent variables to the variance of the dependent variable has numerous applications for analyzing historical data.

For example, testing the significance of individual coefficients or the collective significance of all coefficients provides insight into which factors cause changes to the dependent variable. This information can be useful both in explaining past behavior, and in forecasting future behavior.

Thus, regression analysis can provide explanatory insight, offering both a prediction of the dependent variable, and an explanation of the factors influencing the prediction. When reliable forecasts are available for all independent variables used to predict the dependent variable in the regression equation, this approach can provide sound and useful forecasts.

**Weaknesses**
The major conceptual limitation of multivariate regression is that relationships between variables can be ascertained, but causation may not be proven. Evidence of correlation between an independent variable and the dependent variable does not mean that changes in the independent variable caused changes in the
dependent variable. For causation to be inferred, the regression model must be properly specified, meaning that most or all independent variables that influence the dependent variable must be included in the model.

A poorly specified multivariate regression may identify a strong positive relationship between foreign-born admissions and the number of agents working on the IRP program, but this analytical reality would not indicate that an increase in the number of agents caused the increase in foreign-born admissions. Instead, it is more likely that other external factors (i.e., increased foreign-born population, economic conditions in other countries, etc.) caused the increase in foreign-born admissions, which in turn created the need for additional agents to handle the resulting IRP workload. Unless historical data on the relevant external factors are collected, this type of model can easily be misspecified and the model’s coefficients inaccurately represented.

Additional weaknesses in multivariate regression analysis involve the structure of the model, the amount of data, and the availability of the independent variables projected into the future. The structure of a regression model gives equal weighting to each data point (e.g., the most recent historical data are valued the same as the earliest historical data). Fluctuations in policies or other external factors not taken into account may cause the forecast to be under- or overestimated. Multivariate regression analysis also assumes that residual errors follow a normal distribution. Inspection of the distribution of individual residual values may eliminate some but not all of the concern regarding the structure of the error term.

The number of independent variables included in the model can affect the accuracy of the multivariate regression forecast. The ideal number of observations (e.g., foreign-born admissions) should be 10 to 20 times larger than the number of independent variables. With limited historical data and multiple independent variables, as in this study, forecasts produced by multivariate regression analysis are likely to be unstable.

Finally, all independent variables need to be forecasted for the entire duration of the forecast period. Even with a properly specified model, errors in the forecasts of the independent variables will lead to errors in the forecast of the dependent variable; the more independent variables, the greater the chances that forecast error across independent variables will multiply, causing the dependent variable forecast to be inaccurate.

**Time-series Forecasting Method**

Time-series is a quantitative forecasting method based on historical values measured at successive points in time. Time-series forecasting assumes past patterns can be used to predict future results.

A time-series forecast assumes that a combination of systematic pattern and random error are included in the historical data. The forecasting method attempts to isolate the pattern from the random error by identifying four components of change: cyclical movement, trend, seasonality, and residual error. A variable’s cyclical movement is the unpredictable long-term cycling behavior due to recurring patterns (e.g., business cycles) or annual fluctuations. Trend is the long-term increase or decrease in a variable being measured over time. Trends can be either linear or non-linear, depending on whether or not their rate of change remains constant. The seasonal component is the fluctuation in the data that repeats itself with the same period of recurrence (e.g., weekly, monthly, quarterly). The random or residual error of a time-series forecast is the unexplained portion of the forecast after the level, trend, and seasonal components are removed. Not every time-series forecast will exhibit all four of these components; however, at least one component will be represented in each time-series forecast.

The accuracy of time-series forecasts is measured by three “goodness of fit” measures: root mean square error (RMSE), mean absolute deviation (MAD), and mean absolute percentage error (MAPE). Each measure compares the historical fitted points of the forecast to the actual historical data. The lower the error, the closer the historical fitted values are to the actual historical values.

**Root Mean Square Error (RMSE)**

The root mean square error (RMSE) is an absolute error measure that squares the deviation of the fitted forecast to the historical data. This measure is likely to exaggerate large errors, which helps eliminate forecasting methods with large errors. The RMSE is defined as:
RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{n} (Y_t - \hat{Y}_t)^2} \tag{a.5}

Where \( Y_t \) represents the historical point for a given time period \( t \); \( n \) is the total number of historical values; and \( \hat{Y}_t \) is the fitted forecast value for the time period \( t \).

Mean Absolute Deviation (MAD)
The mean absolute deviation (MAD) is an error measure that measures the absolute difference between the historical value and forecasted value. The MAD is defined as:

\[
MAD = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{n} |Y_t - \hat{Y}_t| \tag{a.6}
\]

Where \( Y_t \) represents the historical point for a given time period \( t \); \( n \) is the total number of historical values; and \( \hat{Y}_t \) is the fitted forecast value for the time period \( t \).

Mean Absolute Percent Error (MAPE)
The mean absolute percent error (MAPE) is a relative error measure that uses absolute values. The MAPE is based on relative errors; therefore, the scale of the dependent variable does not matter, and the forecasting accuracy can be compared between differently scaled time-series data. The MAPE is defined as:

\[
MAPE = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{n} \left| \frac{Y_t - \hat{Y}_t}{Y_t} \right| \times 100 \tag{a.7}
\]

Where \( Y_t \) represents the historical point for a given time period \( t \); \( n \) is the total number of historical values; and \( \hat{Y}_t \) is the fitted forecast value for the time period \( t \).

Strengths
Time-series forecasts are not reliant on the collection or forecasting of additional independent variables, making it a more straightforward methodology than multivariate regression. Time-series analysis simply requires that a pattern of observed historical data be identified. Time-series methods cover many data contingencies (e.g., observed historical data with a seasonal component or observed historical data without trend or seasonal components). In other words, time-series forecasting has the ability to identify patterns in data sets that are not identical or do not adapt to the “one-size fits all” philosophy.

Time-series works best where stable conditions are present and are expected to remain. In addition, most time-series methods place greater weight on more recent historical data. For example, after an external factor, like a policy change, affects one or more components over the collection period, a greater emphasis would be placed on data following the external factor shift. The resulting forecast would less likely be under- or over-biased compared with a forecasting method that gives equal weighting to all historical data points.

Weaknesses
The primary limitation of time-series forecasting is that it yields better results for short to mid-term forecasts where sufficient, reliable historical data are available than for long-term forecasts. When data are not either of high quality or truly representative, time-series forecasting may give poor results; therefore, time-series methods are most appropriate for stable situations. Where underlying conditions are subject to extreme change, time-
series analysis may also produce unreliable forecasts. In addition, time-series forecasting does not assess the individual determinants (causes) of changes in the dependent variable, giving it little explanatory power.

Structural limitations are also a concern with time-series forecasting. Specifically, some methods are appropriate only for a time-series that is stationary (i.e., its mean, variance, and autocorrelation should be approximately constant through time). For these methods there should be at least 50 observations in the historical data for a successful forecast. Other methods require as few as eight observations in the historical data; however, there is a trade-off between accurate, reliable forecasts and the number of historical data observations (i.e., the fewer observations in the historical data, the less reliable the forecast.)

**Forecasting Considerations for the IRP Workload Study**

Given the strengths and weaknesses of the various forecasting methods that were considered, a total of five factors were considered in selecting the forecasting method used for estimating future IRP workload. Commentary following each consideration describes the suitability of each of the three methods and notes the method(s) that most closely satisfies the criteria.

**Consideration #1: Fit within Timeframe for Study Completion**

IRP workload needs to be forecasted for approximately eighty facilities, some of which contain limited observations and therefore require additional analysis of SCAAP data. The forecasts need to be reviewed, revised if necessary, and the results need to be compiled for presentation and publication. Given the time needed to conduct original data gathering efforts and to clean and manipulate the data, the forecasts must be produced in less than three months.

Qualitative methods are time-consuming. Given the timeframe for this study, these methods could only be used on a limited basis. The working group met regularly to review progress and address issues. This group could have participated in a Delphi process to develop projections; however, the results may have been questioned, as this team may not possess the technical familiarity with the detailed workings of the IRP to provide sufficient input. This approach would have been a useful one had fewer locations responded by providing historical data, and had time permitted field interviews with subject matter experts to take place.

A comprehensive Delphi approach, which would have included preparation and distribution of survey materials; multiple iterations of survey data gathering; and interviews with field agents and other experts from different parts of the country; was not possible within the study timeframe. Because a substantial amount of quantitative data was gathered, a purely qualitative approach would not have maximized use of all available information.

The study scope and analysis were limited to workload forecasts – they did not include provisions for collecting and analyzing data for purposes of forecasting independent variables that might serve as predictors of foreign-born admissions in the multivariate regression analysis. Selecting independent variables, developing assumptions, specifying regression models, and either purchasing or producing forecasts of independent variables would have added time and cost beyond the original project design and timeframe.

Time-series forecasting had the advantage of relative simplicity, thereby allowing forecasts for all locations that provided at least one year of historical data. This approach permitted all forecasts to be produced and reviewed within the project time frame.

**Consideration #2: Maximize Volume of Data Collected**

A considerable amount of historical data was collected for the project. Two to five years of record-level data were requested from 122 facilities. 35 In response, over eight million records were received. The single variable to be collected and forecasted was monthly foreign-born admissions. Record-level admissions data, as well as general inmate characteristics, including gender, age, offense, and nationality, were collected as part of this study and were therefore available for analysis and forecasting. Any approach selected needed to be able to accommodate the benefits and limitations of the data collected.

35 Of the 122 target locations, 81 complied with the data request and provided usable data for the study.
Qualitative forecasting techniques would not have maximized the considerable amount of historical data received. Either quantitative method (regression or time-series) would have been suitable for developing forecasts given the amount of record-level data received; however, multivariate regression would have also required historical data on all independent variables that would have been needed to develop forecast equations. Multivariate regression would have augmented the data collection to include those independent variables, thereby increasing the magnitude of data to be processed (see Consideration #3).

Historical data were aggregated on a monthly basis, providing a relatively small number of historical data points (ranging from 12 to 60 observations). The limited number of observations further constrained the forecasting methodology. As previously noted, for each independent variable included in a regression equation there should ideally be 10 to 20 times the number of observations. Most time-series methods (with the exception of ARIMA models with multiple parameters) are not similarly constrained, requiring as little as eight observations in the historical data to forecast (although the greater the amount of historical data, the more reliable the forecast).

Consideration #3: Focus on Forecasting the Future, not Explaining the Past
The project objective was to develop current estimates and future forecasts of IRP workload rather than develop an explanatory model to analyze the individual determinants of IRP workload.

Given the project objective of generating a forecast of future workload, a single set of data (record-level historical foreign-born admissions) was collected from each location for analysis and forecasting. Multivariate regression, because of its explanatory power, would have been the proper technique for a project requiring an assessment of the causes of any historical changes in the number of foreign-born admissions. Such an assessment was not an objective of the Workload Study; nor were data collected for the various independent variables that could have affected foreign-born admissions.

For multivariate regression to have been a viable alternative for examining changes in historical workload and developing forecasts, historical monthly data on potential independent variables would need to be identified and gathered, and county-level forecasts for all such independent variables would have been required. Due to geographical and seasonal variations, each location would have needed to be analyzed separately for the correct independent variables to be included in a regression equation. This approach could have amounted to analysis and forecasts for over 200 distinct independent variables before even beginning to calculate the resulting forecasts of future workload.

Given the project objective of forecasting future workload (rather than explaining the causes of that workload), time-series forecasting, which is not reliant on the collection or forecasting of additional independent variables, was the more appropriate technique, as well as more appropriate for the project timeframe and available data.

Consideration #4: Minimize Potential Error
Regardless of the data available for analysis or the project timeframe, it is important that the forecasting methodology selected minimize potential error and forecasting bias.

As was previously mentioned, a multivariate regression model that does not include all the relevant independent variables (i.e., those that most heavily influence the level of the dependent variable) can easily be statistically misspecified and the coefficients will be inaccurate. Even if historical data on all independent variables are available, accurate forecasts of each independent variable are needed to predict future levels of the dependent variable. The greater the number of forecasts that are calculated for independent variables, the more likely that error will enter the regression equation, even if the model is properly specified.

For this study, some or all of the independent variables would undoubtedly have been forecasted using time series methods. With forecasts of variables providing the basis for the workload forecast, the output would have been susceptible to as many “sub-forecasts” as there are independent variables, with all of the inherent error of each of those forecasts carrying through to the final forecast. Conversely, a time-series approach produces a single forecast of foreign-born admissions, based directly on the historical data collected. While this approach does not imply that time-series forecasts cannot contain errors, the fact that there are no “sub-forecasts” minimizes the potential error compared to a regression approach.
Consideration #5: Incorporation of Seasonal and External Fluctuation; Vary Data Point Weighting
Seasonal fluctuations were evident in the record-level data series collected for this study. Any method used for projecting future workload must take this seasonality into account and be able to vary the weights assigned to historical data points, if necessary.

As previously discussed, multivariate regression analysis gives equal weighting to each data point, whereas most time-series methods place greater weight on more recent historical data. When seasonality and external fluctuations (e.g., level shifts) are evident in the data, giving equal weighting to all data points may not be an appropriate approach. Time-series methods account for sub-components of the data series, including trend, seasonal, and cyclical variations, and also account for level shifts. Time-series forecasting has the flexibility to more heavily weight recent observations to account for level shifts and other changes to the historical data series.

Summary of Forecasting Considerations
Each of the forecasting methods considered for the project (qualitative, regression, and time-series) has strengths and weaknesses that were evaluated when selecting the method to be used to forecast foreign-born admissions. Based on the considerations discussed above, which are summarized in Table B-1, time-series forecasting was selected as the project forecasting methodology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table B-1. Forecasting Methods and Selection Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fit Within Timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Series</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Time-Series Forecasting Methods
There are a variety of specific forecasting techniques available to apply a time-series methodology. The purpose of this section is to present the eight forecasting techniques that were used to develop project forecasts. The characteristics of each method are described, including the types of historical data series to which each technique is most applicable. The section concludes with an overview of the process for identifying the proper time series technique for each IRP workload forecast.

Linear Smoothing Methods
Linear smoothing methods attempt to reduce data error by short-term volatility in data to produce a linear forecast. Smoothing techniques average adjacent observations. Underlying true values usually move slowly, so that adjacent observations are not far apart. By averaging adjacent values, the errors tend to cancel out, and the trend is well established.

Single Moving Average
The single moving average linear smoothing method seeks to smooth out historical data by averaging the last several periods and projecting that view forward.
This method is suited for volatile data with little or no trend or seasonal components. As shown in Figure B-1, the forecast converges to the series mean and results in a flat linear forecast.

**Double Moving Average**

The double moving average linear smoothing method seeks to smooth out historical data by applying the moving average technique described above twice. The moving average technique is first applied to the historical data and then to the data set created by applying the single moving average method.

The Double Moving Average time-series technique is suited for volatile data with a trend (increasing in Figure B-2), but with no seasonal component. The result, as shown in Figure B-2, is a sloped linear forecast.
**Single Exponential Smoothing**

The single exponential smoothing (SES) method largely overcomes the limitations of moving average models by weighting historical data with exponentially decreasing weights going into the past; therefore, recent data receive a greater weight than older data. When applied recursively to each successive observation in the series, each new smoothed value (fitted value) is computed as the weighted average of the current observation and the previous smoothed observation.

In effect, each smoothed fitted value is the weighted average of the previous observations, where the weights decrease exponentially depending on the value of parameter $\alpha$. Extreme values of $\alpha$ (i.e., zero and one) for the single exponential smoothing model are atypical.

The single exponential smoothing model can be defined as:

$$S_t = \alpha y_t + (1 - \alpha)S_{t-1} \quad \text{(a.8)}$$

Where $S_t$ represents the forecasted estimate; $y_t$ represents the historical data at time $t$; and $\alpha$ is the smoothing constant valued between 0 and 1.

**Figure B-3. Single Exponential Smoothing Historical Data and Forecast**

Effectively, the SES method is a weighted single moving average method. This method is most effective for volatile data that exhibit no trend. As shown in Figure B-3, the fitted values are smoother than the simple moving average because more recent data receive a greater weight. The result is a flat linear forecast that converges to a particular value, though not necessarily the series mean.\(^36\)

**Double Exponential Smoothing**

The double exponential smoothing (DES) method applies the SES method twice. The SES technique is first applied to the historical data and then to the resulting SES data. The double exponential smoothing model can be defined as:

$$S_t = \alpha y_t + (1 - \alpha)S_{t-1} \quad \text{(a.9)}$$

\(^{36}\) While the general appearance is similar to the simple moving average forecast (i.e., convergence to a single value), the SES forecast is not likely to converge to the series because of the weighting approach.
\[ S_t" = \beta S_t + (1 - \beta)S_{t-1}" \]

Where \( S_t \) represents the single exponential smoothed estimate; \( S_t" \) represents the double exponential smoothed estimate; and \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) are smoothing constants valued between 0 and 1.

The double exponential smoothing method smoothing parameters (\( \alpha \) and \( \beta \)) can take on the same value or different values.\(^{37}\)

**Figure B-4. Double Exponential Smoothing Historical Data and Forecast**

The double exponential smoothing time-series technique is better suited for volatile data with a trend (increasing in figure B-4), but no seasonal component. As shown in Figure B-4, the fitted values are smoother than the double moving average because more recent data receive a greater weight. The result is a sloped linear forecast.\(^{38}\)

**Seasonal Smoothing Methods**

When there is a recurring pattern or seasonality within each year of time-series data, a seasonal component must be added to the time-series techniques. Seasonal smoothing models extend the simple exponential smoothing methods by adding a seasonal component. To accomplish this addition, seasonal smoothing models attempt to forecast a smooth or deseasonalized version of historical data and then adjust for seasonal behavior.

First, a moving average is computed for the series using one of the four linear smoothing methods presented in the previous section, with the moving average window width equal to the length of one season (e.g., month, quarter, annual). In the linear smoothing methods, all seasonal variation will be eliminated, producing a linear forecast. The difference between the observed and smoothed series will isolate the seasonal component (plus the random error component). The seasonal component is then computed as the average for each point in the season, and the original linear smoothing method can be adjusted (added or multiplied) for the seasonal component.

---

\(^{37}\) The technique is commonly referred to as Holt’s Double Exponential Smoothing when the two smoothing parameters take on different values.

\(^{38}\) While similar in shape, the linear forecast is almost never the same absolute value between the double average method and double exponential smoothing.
Seasonal, Additive Smoothing
The seasonal, additive smoothing method calculates a seasonal component for historical data without a trend. This method determines exponentially smoothed values for the seasonal (S) and cyclical (C) components and separately projects each component forward. The seasonal and cyclical components are reassembled and added together to create the forecast. The seasonal, additive smoothing model can be defined as:

\[ C_t = \alpha(Y_t - S_{t-s}) + (1-\alpha)C_{t-1} \]  
\[ S_t = \gamma(Y_t - C_t) + (1-\gamma)S_{t-s} \]  
\[ F_{t+m} = C_t + S_{t+m-s} \]

Where \( F_{t+m} \) represents the forecast for period \( m \); \( S_t \) represents the seasonal component; \( C_t \) represents the cyclical component; \( \alpha \) and \( \gamma \) are smoothing constants valued between 0 and 1; \( m \) is the number of periods ahead to forecast; and \( s \) is the length of the seasonality.

Figure B-5. Seasonal, Additive Smoothing Historical Data and Forecast

The seasonal, additive smoothing time-series technique is best suited for data without a trend, but with a stable seasonal component. The white curve, as shown in Figure B-5, is a smoothed version of the fitted values (in blue) and the forecast (in green). The forecast is a curved forecast that duplicates the stable seasonal component.

Seasonal, Multiplicative Smoothing
The seasonal, multiplicative smoothing method also calculates a seasonal component for historical data without a trend. This method determines exponentially smoothed values for the seasonal (S) and cyclical (C) components and separately projects each component forward. The seasonal and cyclical components are reassembled and multiplied together to create the forecast. The seasonal, multiplicative smoothing model can be defined as:
\[ C_t = \alpha(Y_t / S_{t-s}) + (1 - \alpha)C_{t-1} \]  \tag{a.14}  
\[ S_t = \gamma(Y_t / C_t) + (1 - \gamma)S_{t-s} \]  \tag{a.15}  
\[ F_{t+m} = C_t + S_{t+m-s} \]  \tag{a.16}  

Where \( F_{t+m} \) represents the forecast for period \( m \); \( S_t \) represents the seasonal component; \( C_t \) represents the cyclical component; \( \alpha \) and \( \gamma \) are smoothing constants valued between 0 and 1; \( m \) is the number of periods ahead to forecast; and \( s \) is the length of the seasonality.

**Figure B-6. Seasonal, Multiplicative Smoothing Historical Data and Forecast**

The seasonal, multiplicative smoothing time-series technique is best suited for data without a trend, but with an unstable seasonal component. The white curve, as shown in Figure B-6, is a smoothed version of the fitted values (in blue) and the forecast (in green). The forecast is a curved forecast that duplicates the unstable seasonal component.

**Holt-Winters Additive Seasonal Smoothing**

Holt-Winters Additive Seasonal Smoothing is an extension of Holt’s double exponential smoothing (DES) that incorporates seasonality. This method determines exponentially smoothed values for the trend (T), seasonal adjustment (S), and cyclical (C) components and separately projects each component forward. The trend, seasonal, and cyclical components are reassembled and added together to create the forecast. The Holt-Winters additive seasonal smoothing model can be defined as:

\[ C_t = \alpha(Y_t - S_{t-s}) + (1 - \alpha)C_{t-1} + b_{t-1} \]  \tag{a.17}  
\[ b_t = \beta(C_t - C_{t-s}) + (1 - \beta)b_{t-1} \]  \tag{a.18}  
\[ S_t = \gamma(Y_t - C_t) + (1 - \gamma)S_{t-s} \]  \tag{a.19}  
\[ F_{t+m} = C_t + m \cdot b_t + S_{t+m-s} \]  \tag{a.20}
Where \( F_{t+m} \) represents the forecast for period \( m \); \( S_t \) represents the seasonal component; \( b_t \) represents the trend component; \( C_t \) represents the cyclical component; \( \alpha \), \( \beta \), and \( \gamma \) are smoothing constants valued between 0 and 1; \( m \) is the number of periods ahead to forecast; and \( s \) is the length of the seasonality.

**Figure B-7. Holt-Winters Additive Seasonal Historical Data and Forecast**

Holt-Winters Additive Seasonal time-series technique is best suited for data with both an increasing trend and a stable seasonal component. The white curve, as shown in Figure B-7, is a smoothed version of the fitted values (in blue) and the forecast (in green). The forecast is an upward curved forecast that duplicates the stable seasonal component.

**Holt-Winters Multiplicative Seasonal Smoothing**

Holt-Winters Multiplicative Seasonal Smoothing is similar to the Holt-Winter’s Additive Seasonal smoothing method. This method also determines exponentially smoothed values for the trend (T), seasonal adjustment (S), and cyclical (C) components and separately projects each component forward. The trend, seasonal, and cyclical components are reassembled, and the trend and cyclical component forecast is multiplied by the seasonal component to create the forecast. The Holt-Winters multiplicative seasonal smoothing model can be defined as:

\[
C_t = \alpha (Y_t / S_{t-s}) + (1 - \alpha) C_{t-1} + b_{t-1} \\
b_t = \beta (C_t - C_{t-s}) + (1 - \beta) b_{t-1} \\
S_t = \gamma (Y_t / C_t) + (1 - \gamma) S_{t-s} \\
F_{t+m} = (C_t + m \cdot b_t) \cdot S_{t+m-s}
\]

Where \( F_{t+m} \) represents the forecast for period \( m \); \( S_t \) represents the seasonal component; \( b_t \) represents the trend component; \( C_t \) represents the cyclical component; \( \alpha \), \( \beta \), and \( \gamma \) are smoothing constants valued between 0 and 1; \( m \) is the number of periods ahead to forecast; and \( s \) is the length of the seasonality.
Holt-Winters Multiplicative Seasonal time-series technique is best suited for data with an increasing trend and an unstable seasonal component. The white curve, as shown in Figure B-8, is a smoothed version of the fitted values (in blue) and the forecast (in green). The forecast displays an upward trend that duplicates the increasing seasonal component.

**Selection of Time-Series Method**

For the IRP Workload Study, the historical data for each location were initially forecasted using all eight time-series techniques presented above. Table B-2 summarizes the techniques and the data characteristics and historical series components that are suitable for each. For example, if a trend or seasonal component is present in the data series, the single moving average technique is not likely to provide the best forecast.

**Table B-2. Characteristics of Data for Time-Series Methods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Volatile Data</th>
<th>Varying Weights</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Seasonality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Moving Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double Moving Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Exponential Smoothing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double Exponential Smoothing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal Additive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal Multiplicative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt-Winters Additive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt-Winters Multiplicative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final forecast for each series was selected based upon the goodness-of-fit measures (i.e., RMSE, MAD, and MAPE) generated by each of the eight forecasts. Confidence intervals were calculated for each forecast at the 5% and 95% levels. All forecasts were generated through the end of FY 2007. In statistical terms, the fewer years of historical data available for a given location, the greater the likelihood the forecast variable (foreign-
born admissions) will diverge from its historical pattern. Therefore, the confidence intervals are generally wider for locations where relatively small quantities of historical data were provided.

Expert review by project staff and the working group assessed the intuitive reasonableness of each selected forecast. Where necessary, a qualitative determination to adjust a forecast was made. Specific reasons for this adjustment might include a recently level or downward sloping trend, or a data set with extreme outliers that may affect the accuracy of the forecast and must be explained qualitatively. If expert review determined that a series could not be reasonably forecasted using any of the eight methods, other time-series methods (e.g., ARIMA, random walk) were employed, as necessary.39

39 For an introduction to ARIMA methods, see Box and Jenkins (1976) or McDowall, McCleary, Meidinger, and Hay (1980). For an introduction to random walk, see Feller (1968) or Spitzer (1976).
Appendix C. Results by Location

This Appendix presents the historical and projected IRP workload and FY 2003 workload composition for each of the 45 local jail facilities and 36 DOCs that provided usable data for the study. The information for each location is presented on a one-page summary sheet. The locations are presented in alphabetical order by facility. The local jail facilities are presented first followed by the DOCs.

Each one-page summary sheet is divided into four sections, as described below.

**Background Data** provides the following background information at the top of each page:

- Name of facility(ies)
- City in which facility(ies) is located
- Population of jurisdiction served by the facility
- Foreign-born population of jurisdiction served by the facility

**Historical and Projected IRP Workload** contains the following graphics and details:

- Line graph displaying historical and projected workload values
- Table containing historical and projected workload values (to the right of line graph)
- Graphic depicting the percentage of collected FY 2003 records used to develop the forecast

This information is important because it shows the volume of potentially foreign-born records that were excluded from the analysis on the basis that place of birth was either null (i.e., missing) or indeterminate (i.e., non-null but not discernible as being a reported foreign-born inmate). The larger the yellow bar, the more records that were excluded based on indeterminate place of birth. In locations with large numbers of indeterminate records, the actual IRP workload could be significantly greater than the results indicate.

- Forecasting method used to project future foreign-born admissions
- Goodness-of-fit measures for the forecast - root mean squared error (RMSE), mean absolute deviation (MAD), and mean absolute percentage error (MAPE).
- Data source and date collected

**Breakdown of FY 2003 Workload** contains the following graphics depicting the workload composition results:

- Place of birth bar chart
- Length of stay bar chart
- Age cohort pie chart (0-18 years, 19-25 years, 26-35 years, 36-45 years, 46-55 years, 55+ years)
- Gender cohort pie chart
- Severity of offense pie chart (Index offenses, drug offenses, other offenses)

---

40 One-page summaries were not developed for the 13 DOCs for which SCAAP data were exclusively used to develop the forecasted values shown in Chapter 5. SCAAP data does not contain any of the workload composition information depicted on the summaries.

41 For local jails, each page contains the 2003 national rank in terms of average daily population, according to the Bureau of Justice Statistics.

42 See Appendix B for details on projection methods.

43 The lower the value of each error measure, the closer the historical fitted values are to the actual historical values.

44 Index crimes refer to serious crimes as defined by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) Crime Index and include murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, motor vehicle theft, and arson.
BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Alameda County Jail  
Facility Location: Alameda County, CA  
County Population (2000): 1,443,741 (100%)  
County Foreign Population (2000): 392,656 (27%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Additive  
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 29.9; MAD: 23.6; MAPE: 5.9

Data Source: Facility Data Collected April 2004

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:
- Mexico: 58.6%  
- Philippines: 7.7%  
- Vietnam: 4.0%  
- El Salvador: 2.9%  
- India: 2.7%  
- Afghanistan: 2.4%  
- Germany: 1.4%  
- Guatemala: 1.4%  
- Others: 18.9%

By Length of Stay (in days):
- 0-3: 54.6%  
- 4-5: 8.0%  
- 6-10: 10.0%  
- 11-30: 10.8%  
- 31-60: 6.6%  
- 61-90: 2.8%  
- 91-120: 2.0%  
- >150: 1.1%  
- Others: 4.1%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:
- 26-35 Yrs: 36.7%  
- 19-25 Yrs: 30.7%  
- 26-35 Yrs: 20.9%  
- 36-45 Yrs: 7.4%  
- 46-55 Yrs: 2.1%  
- 55+ Yrs: 2.3%  
- 0-18 Yrs: 2.3%  
- 20-25 Yrs: 1.4%  
- 25-30 Yrs: 0.9%  
- 30-35 Yrs: 2.4%

By Gender:
- Male: 91.8%  
- Female: 8.2%

By Severity of Offense:
- Index Offenses: 16.4%  
- Drug Offenses: 23.2%  
- Other Offenses: 60.4%

¹ Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,  
BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Bexar County Jail  
Facility Location: Bexar County, TX  
County Population (2000): 1,392,931 (100%)  
County Foreign Population (2000): 151,340 (11%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Seasonal Multiplicative  
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 33.6; MAD: 26.7; MAPE: 4.8

Data Source: Facility Data Collected July 2004

Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 8,363

Foreign Born (90%) (10%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:  
- Mexico: 78.7%  
- Germany: 5.3%  
- Honduras: 1.9%  
- El Salvador: 1.4%  
- Japan: 1.1%  
- England: 1.0%  
- Guatemala: 0.8%  
- Cuba: 0.8%  
- Others: 9.0%

By Length of Stay (in days):

- 0-3 days: 70.7%  
- 4-5 days: 2.4%  
- 6-10 days: 3.8%  
- 11-30 days: 10.3%  
- 31-60 days: 6.5%  
- 61-90 days: 2.6%  
- 91-120 days: 0.9%  
- 121-150 days: 0.8%  
- >150 days: 2.0%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Age:</th>
<th>55+ Yrs (2.5%)</th>
<th>46-55 Yrs (8.6%)</th>
<th>36-45 Yrs (24.1%)</th>
<th>26-35 Yrs (32.9%)</th>
<th>19-25 Yrs (28.0%)</th>
<th>0-18 Yrs (4.0%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Gender:</td>
<td>Male (89.7%)</td>
<td>Female (10.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Severity of Offense:</td>
<td>Index Offenses (2.9%)</td>
<td>Drug Offenses (9.1%)</td>
<td>Other Offenses (88.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,  
BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Broward County Jail
Facility Location: Broward County, FL
County Population (2000): 1,623,018 (100%)
County Foreign Population (2000): 410,387 (25%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Additive
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 57.9; MAD: 41.5; MAPE: 5.0
Data Source: Facility Data Collected July 2004
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 11,409

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

- Jamaica: 19.1%
- Haiti: 12.8%
- Cuba: 9.3%
- Mexico: 7.0%
- Colombia: 5.7%
- Bahamas: 4.5%
- Canada: 3.4%
- Peru: 3.1%
- Others: 36.1%

By Length of Stay (in days):

- 0-3: 89.6%
- 4-5: 3.8%
- 6-10: 3.2%
- 11-30: 8.1%
- 31-60: 4.9%
- 61-90: 2.1%
- 91-120: 1.1%
- >120: 1.3%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:

- 0-18 Yrs: 0.3%
- 19-25 Yrs: 14.0%
- 26-35 Yrs: 23.8%
- 36-45 Yrs: 23.8%
- 46-55 Yrs: 11.9%
- 55+ Yrs: 3.8%
- 28-35 Yrs: 31.9%
- 19-25 Yrs: 28.3%

By Gender:

- Male: 86.0%
- Female: 14.0%

By Severity of Offense:

- Drug Offenses: 22.3%
- Other Offenses: 73.5%
- Index Offenses: 4.2%

BACKGROUND DATA:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name:</th>
<th>Clark County Jail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility Location:</td>
<td>Clark County, NV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Population (2000):</td>
<td>1,375,765 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Foreign Population (2000):</td>
<td>247,751 (18%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Multiplicative
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 38.2; MAD: 29.2; MAPE: 4.9

Data Source: Facility Data Collected June 2004

Breakdown of FY 2003 Workload (Foreign Born Admissions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Place of Birth:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Length of Stay (in days):</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-18 Yrs</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-25 Yrs</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35 Yrs</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45 Yrs</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55 Yrs</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+ Yrs</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Breakdown of FY 2003 Workload (Foreign Born Admissions):

By Gender:

| Male | 86.3% |
| Female | 13.7% |

By Severity of Offense:

| Data not available |   |

Footnote:

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Cobb County Jail
Facility Location: Cobb County, GA
County Population (2000): 607,751 (100%)
County Foreign Population (2000): 70,439 (12%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Single Exponential Smoothing
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 15.4; MAD: 12.3; MAPE: 9.2
Data Source: Limited Facility Data Collected June 2004; No SCAAP data to supplement forecast

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:
- Mexico: 64.9%
- Guatemala: 3.6%
- El Salvador: 3.0%
- Germany: 2.1%
- Nigeria: 1.7%
- Jamaica: 1.6%
- Brazil: 1.4%
- Kenya: 1.1%
- Others: 20.6%

By Length of Stay (in days):
- 0-3: 76.0%
- 4-5: 2.9%
- 6-10: 3.5%
- 11-30: 7.6%
- 31-60: 2.5%
- 61-90: 1.2%
- 91-120: 0.9%
- 121-150: 0.7%
- >150: 2.7%

By Age:
- 19-25 Yrs: 90.0%
- 26-35 Yrs: 35.8%
- 36-45 Yrs: 13.4%
- 46-55 Yrs: 4.4%
- 55+ Yrs: 0.5%
- 0-18 Yrs: 4.1%

By Gender:
- Male: 90.0%
- Female: 10.0%

By Severity of Offense:
- Other Offenses: 97.3%
- Drug Offenses: 2.0%
- Index Offenses: 0.7%

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Cook County Jail
County Population (2000): 5,376,741 (100%)
Facility Location: Cook County, IL
County Foreign Population (2000): 1,064,703 (20%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Multiplicative
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 37.8; MAD: 29.8; MAPE: 4.4
Data Source: Facility Data Collected June 2004
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 10,974
Foreign Born (82%) (18%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

- Mexico: 66.3%
- Poland: 9.5%
- Russia: 1.8%
- Guatemala: 1.3%
- Cuba: 1.3%
- Honduras: 1.0%
- El Salvador: 0.9%
- Jamaica: 0.9%
- Others: 17.0%

By Length of Stay (in days):

- 0-3: 47.6%
- 4-5: 8.6%
- 6-10: 8.9%
- 11-30: 16.7%
- 31-60: 7.5%
- 61-90: 3.2%
- 91-120: 2.2%
- 121-150: 1.6%
- >150: 3.7%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:

- 0-18 Yrs: 3.1%
- 19-25 Yrs: 27.7%
- 26-35 Yrs: 37.9%
- 36-45 Yrs: 21.0%
- 46-55 Yrs: 8.3%
- 55+ Yrs: 2.0%

By Gender:

- Male: 94.9%
- Female: 5.1%

By Severity of Offense:

- Index Offenses: 8.5%
- Drug Offenses: 16.1%
- Other Offenses: 75.4%

¹ Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,
BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Cuyahoga County Jail
Facility Location: Cuyahoga County, OH

County Population (2000): 1,397,398 (100%)
County Foreign Population (2000): 68,761 (6%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Seasonal Multiplicative
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 8.5; MAD: 6.6; MAPE: 16.6

Data Source: Facility Data Collected June 2004
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 408
Foreign Born (99%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

- Jamaica: 9.1%
- Israel: 6.6%
- Germany: 7.4%
- Yugoslavia: 6.4%
- Cuba: 4.4%
- Ukraine: 4.4%
- Dominican Republic: 3.7%
- Jordan: 3.5%
- Others: 52.5%

By Length of Stay (in days):

- 0-3 days: 6.0%
- 4-5 days: 8.6%
- 6-10 days: 11.4%
- 11-30 days: 5.2%
- 31-60 days: 3.2%
- 61-90 days: 3.5%
- 91-120 days: 1.0%
- 121-150 days: 3.7%
- >150 days: 0.5%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:

- 55+ Yrs: 4.0%
- 46-55 Yrs: 10.1%
- 36-45 Yrs: 27.7%
- 26-35 Yrs: 28.6%
- 19-25 Yrs: 29.4%
- 0-18 Yrs: 0.2%

By Gender:

- Male: 89.1%
- Female: 10.9%

By Severity of Offense:

- Index Offenses: 11.1%
- Drug Offenses: 21.2%
- Other Offenses: 67.7%

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,
BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Davidson County Jail
Facility Location: Davidson County, TN
County Population (2000): 569,891 (100%)
County Foreign Population (2000): 39,596 (7%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Multiplicative
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 24.5; MAD: 17.6; MAPE: 4.9
Data Source: Facility Data Collected July 2004
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 2,551

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

- Mexico: 61.5%
- Guatemala: 16.2%
- Germany: 8.5%
- Honduras: 5.5%
- El Salvador: 2.9%
- Iraq: 1.5%
- Korea: 1.3%
- England: 1.2%
- Others: 20.5%

By Length of Stay (in days):

- 0-3: 65.9%
- 4-5: 6.7%
- 6-10: 9.5%
- 11-30: 6.3%
- 31-60: 3.9%
- 61-90: 2.3%
- >90: 0.9%
- Others: 1.2%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:

- 26-35 Yrs: 41.4%
- 25-35 Yrs: 15.6%
- 36-45 Yrs: 15.8%
- 46-55 Yrs: 4.4%
- 55+ Yrs: 1.2%
- 0-18 Yrs: 2.7%

By Gender:

- Male: 92.8%
- Female: 7.2%

By Severity of Offense:

- Other Offenses: 85.9%
- Drug Offenses: 2.8%
- Index Offenses: 11.3%

¹ Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,
BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: DeKalb County Jail
Facility Location: DeKalb County, GA

County Population (2000): 665,865 (100%)
County Foreign Population (2000): 101,320 (15%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Seasonal Multiplicative
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 4.9; MAD: 3.8; MAPE: 5.7

Data Source: Facility Data Collected March 2004

Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 839

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

- Mexico: 82.5%
- Honduras: 3.3%
- El Salvador: 2.1%
- Guatemala: 1.9%
- India: 1.0%
- Colombia: 0.7%
- Iraq: 0.7%
- Vietnam: 0.7%
- Others: 7.0%

By Length of Stay (in days):

- 0-3: 5.6%
- 4-5: 11.9%
- 6-10: 24.5%
- 11-30: 15.2%
- 31-60: 14.7%
- 61-90: 10.8%
- 91-120: 4.9%
- >150: 2.0%
- Others: 2.0%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:

- 0-18 Yrs: 5.6%
- 19-25 Yrs: 44.5%
- 26-35 Yrs: 34.8%
- 36-45 Yrs: 11.9%
- 46-55 Yrs: 2.4%

By Gender:

- Male: 93.7%
- Female: 6.3%

By Severity of Offense:

- Other Offenses: 96.5%
- Drug Offenses: 1.5%
- Index Offenses: 1.9%

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,
BACKGROUND DATA:
Facility Name: Essex County Jail
Facility Location: Essex County, NJ
County Population (2000): 793,633 (100%)
County Foreign Population (2000): 168,165 (21%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:
Projection Method – Holt-Winters Additive
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 9.9; MAD: 7.6; MAPE: 16.3
Data Source: Facility Data Collected May 2004
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 5,087
(13%) Indeterminate (87%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):
By Place of Birth:
- Jamaica: 17.0%
- Guyana: 12.8%
- Dominican Republic: 8.6%
- Portugal: 5.5%
- Cuba: 4.8%
- Brazil: 3.1%
- Nicaragua: 1.6%
- Peru: 1.6%
- Others: 45.0%

By Length of Stay (in days):
- 0-3: 24.6%
- 4-5: 12.9%
- 6-10: 17.9%
- 11-30: 16.2%
- 31-60: 9.8%
- 61-90: 6.1%
- 91-120: 4.5%
- 121+ Yrs: 1.6%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):
By Age:
- 0-18 Yrs: 1.3%
- 19-25 Yrs: 26.6%
- 26-35 Yrs: 33.6%
- 36-45 Yrs: 25.3%
- 46-55 Yrs: 9.5%

By Gender:
- Male: 93.0%
- Female: 7.0%

By Severity of Offense:
- Index Offenses: 19.0%
- Drug Offenses: 21.6%
- Other Offenses: 59.4%

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,
BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Fresno County Jail
Facility Location: Fresno County, CA

County Population (2000): 799,407 (100%)
County Foreign Population (2000): 168,717 (21%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Seasonal Multiplicative
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 19.0; MAD: 15.8; MAPE: 2.8

Data Source: Facility Data Collected March 2004
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 6,765

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:
- Mexico: 84.8%
- Laos: 6.4%
- Thailand: 5.8%
- El Salvador: 1.1%
- India: 0.7%
- Cambodia: 0.3%
- Germany: 0.2%
- Vietnam: 0.2%
- Others: 0.2%

By Length of Stay (in days):
- 0-3 days: 45.5%
- 4-5 days: 8.1%
- 6-10 days: 8.3%
- 11-30 days: 13.3%
- 31-60 days: 7.2%
- 61-90 days: 3.8%
- 91-120 days: 3.4%
- 121-150 days: 2.5%
- >150 days: 7.9%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:
- 26-35 Yrs: 39.6%
- 19-25 Yrs: 28.4%
- 36-45 Yrs: 21.2%
- 46-55 Yrs: 7.9%
- 55+ Yrs: 2.1%
- 0-18 Yrs: 0.8%

By Gender:
- Male: 92.7%
- Female: 7.3%

By Severity of Offense:
- Drug Offenses: 20.3%
- Index Offenses: 8.1%
- Other Offenses: 71.6%

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,
BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Harris County Jail  
County Population (2000): 3,400,578 (100%)  
Facility Location: Harris County, TX  
County Foreign Population (2000): 756,548 (22%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Historical Workload</th>
<th>Forecasted Workload</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 07</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>16,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 06</td>
<td>16,407</td>
<td>16,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 05</td>
<td>15,891</td>
<td>16,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 04</td>
<td>15,059</td>
<td>15,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 03</td>
<td>14,731</td>
<td>15,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 02</td>
<td>13,681</td>
<td>14,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 01</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>13,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 00</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 99</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Additive  
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 54.0; MAD: 36.8; MAPE: 3.0

Data Source: Facility Data Collected June 2004  
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 14,751

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:
- Mexico: 63.7%  
- El Salvador: 10.1%  
- Honduras: 5.6%  
- Guatemala: 2.2%  
- Colombia: 1.3%  
- Germany: 1.1%  
- Nigeria: 0.9%  
- Others: 15.1%

By Length of Stay (in days):
- 0-3: 50.8%
- 4-5: 6.4%
- 6-10: 10.0%
- 11-30: 13.6%
- 31-60: 6.9%
- 61-90: 4.3%
- 91-120: 2.4%
- 121-150: 1.6%
- >150: 4.0%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:
- 0-18 Yrs: 3.3%  
- 19-25 Yrs: 30.8%  
- 26-35 Yrs: 36.9%  
- 36-45 Yrs: 20.3%  
- 46-55 Yrs: 7.2%  
- 55+ Yrs: 1.5%

By Gender:
- Male: 90.4%  
- Female: 9.6%

By Severity of Offense:
- Drug Offenses: 10.7%  
- Other Offenses: 84.3%  
- Index Offenses: 5.0%

¹ Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,  
http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DTGeoSearchByListServlet?ds_name=DEC_2000_SF3_U&_lang=en&_ts=111439056474
BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Hennepin County Adult Detention Center  
Facility Location: Hennepin County, MN  
County Population (2000): 1,116,200 (100%)  
County Foreign Population (2000): 110,496 (10%)  

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Seasonal Additive  
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 30.9; MAD: 24.8; MAPE: 6.3  
Data Source: Facility Data Collected April 2004  
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 4,652

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:  
Mexico: 38.4%  
Somalia: 13.1%  
Ecuador: 6.5%  
Liberia: 4.1%  
Lao: 3.9%  
Canada: 2.5%  
Ethiopia: 2.4%  
Vietnam: 2.3%  
Others: 28.9%

By Length of Stay (in days):

0-3: 55.6%  
4-5: 5.3%  
6-10: 3.4%  
11-30: 2.7%  
31-60: 1.0%  
61-90: 0.9%  
91-120: 0.2%  
>120: 0.4%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:

- 55+ Yrs: 1.3%  
- 46-55 Yrs: 4.6%  
- 36-45 Yrs: 16.6%  
- 26-35 Yrs: 37.0%  
- 19-25 Yrs: 38.5%  
- 0-18 Yrs: 2.0%

By Gender:

- Male: 92.0%  
- Female: 8.0%

By Severity of Offense:

- Index Offenses: 1.7%  
- Drug Offenses: 9.3%  
- Other Offenses: 89.0%

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,  
BACKGROUND DATA:

**Facility Name:** Hillsborough County Jail  
**Facility Location:** Hillsborough, FL  
**County Population (2000):** 998,948 (100%)  
**County Foreign Population (2000):** 115,151 (12%)  

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

**Projection Method:** Holt-Winters Additive  
**Goodness of fit:** RMSE: 35.9; MAD: 29.3; MAPE: 5.6  
**Data Source:** Facility Data Collected April 2004  
**Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03:** 8,900

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

- **By Place of Birth:**
  - Mexico: 38.2%
  - Cuba: 12.5%
  - Colombia: 8.1%
  - Germany: 2.8%
  - Honduras: 2.3%
  - Dominican Republic: 2.3%
  - Jamaica: 2.0%
  - Haiti: 2.0%
  - Others: 29.1%

- **By Length of Stay (in days):**
  - 0-3: 64.2%
  - 4-5: 3.9%
  - 6-10: 8.2%
  - 11-30: 11.7%
  - 31-60: 6.3%
  - 61-90: 1.9%
  - 91-120: 1.1%
  - >121: 0.9%
  - >180: 1.8%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

- **By Age:**
  - 0-18 Yrs: 5.3%
  - 19-25 Yrs: 11.2%
  - 26-35 Yrs: 33.3%
  - 36-45 Yrs: 28.8%
  - 46-55 Yrs: 22.4%
  - 55+ Yrs: 9.6%

- **By Gender:**
  - Male: 88.8%
  - Female: 11.2%

- **By Severity of Offense:**
  - Index Offenses: 4.1%
  - Drug Offenses: 5.3%
  - Other Offenses: 90.6%

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,  
http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DTGeoSearchByListServlet?ds_name=DEC_2000_SF3_U&_lang=en&_ts=111439056474
BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Hudson County Jail  
Facility Location: Hudson County, NJ

**County Population (2000):** 608,975 (100%)
**County Foreign Population (2000):** 234,597 (39%)  

**National Rank by Average Daily Population – 48**

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

- **Projection Method:** Holt-Winters Additive
- **Goodness of fit:** RMSE: 45.9; MAD: 33.7; MAPE: 12.2

Data Source: Facility Data Collected June 2004

**Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03:** 4,532

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Historical Workload</th>
<th>Forecasted Workload</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 99</td>
<td>3,046</td>
<td>3,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 00</td>
<td>3,337</td>
<td>3,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 01</td>
<td>3,608</td>
<td>3,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 02</td>
<td>3,390</td>
<td>4,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 03</td>
<td>4,141</td>
<td>4,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 04</td>
<td>4,011</td>
<td>4,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 05</td>
<td>4,032</td>
<td>3,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 06</td>
<td>3,267</td>
<td>4,502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

**By Place of Birth:**
- Dominican Republic: 38.9%
- Mexico: 14.5%
- Cuba: 10.3%
- El Salvador: 7.4%
- Colombia: 6.8%
- Ecuador: 6.0%
- Jamaica: 3.4%
- Others: 4.5%

**By Length of Stay (in days):**
- 0-5: 39.5%
- 6-10: 14.5%
- 11-30: 9.9%
- 31-60: 13.8%
- 61-90: 9.1%
- 91-120: 4.1%
- 121-150: 2.5%
- >150: 1.8%

**By Age:**
- 0-18 Yrs: 1.5%
- 19-25 Yrs: 24.4%
- 26-35 Yrs: 26.3%
- 36-45 Yrs: 24.4%
- 46-55 Yrs: 11.2%
- 55+ Yrs: 3.4%

**By Gender:**
- Male: 95.3%
- Female: 4.7%

**By Severity of Offense:**
- Index Offenses: 6.3%
- Drug Offenses: 6.0%
- Other Offenses: 87.7%

---

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Duval County Jail  
Facility Location: Jacksonville, FL  
County Population (2000): 778,879 (100%)  
County Foreign Population (2000): 45,651 (5.9%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Historical Workload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>FY 99</th>
<th>FY 00</th>
<th>FY 01</th>
<th>FY 02</th>
<th>FY 03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1,523</td>
<td>1,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,572</td>
<td>1,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forecasted Workload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>FY 04</th>
<th>FY 05</th>
<th>FY 06</th>
<th>FY 07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,541</td>
<td>1,572</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>1,588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projection Method – Double Exponential Smoothing  
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 19.7; MAD: 16.5; MAPE: 13.0

Data Source: Limited Facility Data Collected May 2004; No SCAAP data to supplement forecast

Breakdown of FY 2003 Workload (Foreign Born Admissions):

By Place of Birth:

- Mexico: 10.9%  
- Germany: 7.7%  
- Cuba: 4.9%  
- Philippines: 4.8%  
- Jamaica: 4.5%  
- Haiti: 3.0%  
- Honduras: 2.2%  
- Korea: 2.2%  
- Others: 59.8%

By Length of Stay (in days):

- 0-3 days: 67.0%  
- 4-5 days: 2.9%  
- 6-10 days: 6.6%  
- 11-30 days: 9.6%  
- 31-60 days: 6.2%  
- 61-90 days: 2.7%  
- 91-120 days: 1.5%  
- 121-150 days: 1.3%  
- >150 days: 2.2%

Breakdown of FY 2003 Workload (Foreign Born Admissions):

By Age:

- Male: 82.3%  
- Female: 17.7%

By Gender:

- 0-18 yrs: 1.4%  
- 19-25 yrs: 29.7%  
- 26-35 yrs: 32.4%  
- 36-45 yrs: 24.0%  
- 46-55 yrs: 9.3%  
- 55+ yrs: 3.3%

By Severity of Offense:

- Other Offenses: 85.8%  
- Drug Offenses: 10.4%  
- Index Offenses: 3.7%

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,  
BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Jefferson County Jail
Facility Location: Jefferson County, KY

County Population (2000): 693,604 (100%)
County Foreign Population (2000): 23,895 (3%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projection Method</th>
<th>Goodness of fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RMSE: 14.4; MAD: 11.1; MAPE: 14.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: Facility Data Collected July 2004
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 6,789

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:
- Mexico: 52.5%
- Cuba: 6.7%
- Germany: 4.7%
- Guatemala: 3.1%
- Vietnam: 3.0%
- Sudan: 1.9%
- Yugoslavia: 1.9%
- South Korea: 1.8%
- Others: 24.2%

By Length of Stay (in days):
- 0-3: 78.0%
- 4-5: 2.3%
- 6-10: 4.6%
- 11-30: 7.8%
- 31-60: 2.5%
- 61-90: 2.5%
- 91-120: 1.6%
- >150: 0.5%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:
- 19-25 Yrs: 40.0%
- 26-35 Yrs: 32.9%
- 36-45 Yrs: 18.1%
- 46-55 Yrs: 5.5%
- 55+ Yrs: 1.4%
- 0-18 Yrs: 2.1%

By Gender:
- Female: 7.9%
- Male: 92.1%

By Severity of Offense:
- Drug Offenses: 9.3%
- Index Offenses: 4.9%
- Other Offenses: 85.8%

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Kern County Jail
Facility Location: Kern County, CA

County Population (2000): 661,645 (100%)
County Foreign Population (2000): 111,944 (17%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Seasonal Additive
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 90.1; MAD: 65.9; MAPE: 8.6
Data Source: Facility Data Collected April 2004
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 9,379

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

By Length of Stay (in days):

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:

By Gender:

By Severity of Offense:

Los Angeles County Jail

County Population (2000): 9,591,338 (100%)

County Foreign Population (2000): 3,449,444 (36%)

**Historical and Projected IRP Workload:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projection Method</th>
<th>Holt-Winters Additive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goodness of fit</td>
<td>RMSE: 270.9; MAD: 209.4; MAPE: 2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: Facility Data Collected May 2004

Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 111,731

**Breakdown of FY 2003 Workload (Foreign Born Admissions):**

By Place of Birth:

- Mexico: 63.7%
- El Salvador: 7.8%
- Guatemala: 4.5%
- South Korea: 2.0%
- Philippines: 1.8%
- Iran: 1.8%
- Honduras: 1.7%
- Armenia: 1.5%
- Others: 15.2%

By Gender:

- Male: 89.2%
- Female: 10.8%

By Severity of Offense:

- Drug Offenses: 13.4%
- Other Offenses: 81.1%
- Index Offenses: 5.5%
BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Maricopa County Jail
Facility Location: Maricopa, AZ

County Population (2000): 3,072,141 (100%)
County Foreign Population (2000): 441,240 (14%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Multiplicative
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 70.9; MAD: 57.9; MAPE: 4

Data Source: Facility Data Collected July 2004

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:
- Mexico: 87.5%
- Germany: 1.3%
- England: 0.7%
- Canada: 0.5%
- Guatemala: 0.4%
- Indonesia: 0.3%
- Philippines: 0.4%
- Cuba: 0.3%
- Others: 7.3%

By Length of Stay (in days):
- 0-3 days: 54.2%
- 4-5 days: 4.4%
- 6-10 days: 13.0%
- 11-30 days: 10.7%
- 31-60 days: 6.6%
- 61-90 days: 2.6%
- 91-120 days: 2.5%
- 121-150 days: 1.9%
- >150 days: 5.1%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:
- 0-18 yrs: 3.8%
- 19-25 yrs: 36.2%
- 26-35 yrs: 37.4%
- 36-45 yrs: 16.4%
- 46-55 yrs: 4.9%
- 55+ yrs: 1.3%

By Gender:
- Male: 94.2%
- Female: 5.8%

By Severity of Offense:
- Index Offenses: 6.5%
- Drug Offenses: 16.4%
- Other Offenses: 77.1%

BACKGROUND DATA:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name:</th>
<th>Mecklenburg County Jail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility Location:</td>
<td>Mecklenburg, NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Population (2000):</td>
<td>695,454 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Foreign Population (2000):</td>
<td>68,349 (10%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Seasonal Multiplicative
Goodness of fit – RMSE: N/A; MAD: N/A; MAPE: N/A

Data Source: Limited Facility Data Collected July 2004; SCAAP data used to supplement forecast

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

- Mexico: 66.4%
- Honduras: 8.6%
- El Salvador: 4.9%
- Guatemala: 1.7%
- Germany: 1.6%
- Vietnam: 1.4%
- Ecuador: 0.9%
- Nicaragua: 0.7%
- Others: 13.8%

By Gender: Data not available

By Severity of Offense:

- Index Offenses: 11.2%
- Drug Offenses: 7.1%
- Other Offenses: 81.7%

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Milwaukee County Jail
Facility Location: Milwaukee, WI
County Population (2000): 940,164 (100%)
County Foreign Population (2000): 63,648 (7%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Multiplicative
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 9.6; MAD: 7.3; MAPE: 7.5

Data Source: Facility Data Collected April 2004

Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 1,335
Foreign Born (93%) (7%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:
- Mexico: 40.8%
- Finland: 3.7%
- Germany: 3.4%
- Laos: 1.8%
- Cuba: 1.5%
- Jamaica: 1.0%
- Dominican Republic: 0.9%
- Others: 41.9%

By Gender:
- Male: 92.6%
- Female: 7.4%

By Severity of Offense:
- Data not available

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Multnomah County Jail
Facility Location: Multnomah, OR
County Population (2000): 660,486 (100%)
County Foreign Population (2000): 83,965 (13%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Historical Workload
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>FY 99</th>
<th>FY 00</th>
<th>FY 01</th>
<th>FY 02</th>
<th>FY 03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2872*</td>
<td>3,662</td>
<td>3,552</td>
<td>3,548</td>
<td>3,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecasted Workload</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>FY 04</td>
<td>FY 05</td>
<td>FY 06</td>
<td>FY 07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,708</td>
<td>3,708</td>
<td>3,708</td>
<td>3,708</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projection Method – Seasonal Additive
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 29.3; MAD: 22.8; MAPE: 8.1

Data Source: Facility Data Collected March 2004
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 5,873

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

- Mexico: 57.1%
- Vietnam: 4.6%
- Honduras: 3.5%
- Ukraine: 1.9%
- Guatemala: 1.9%
- Cuba: 1.8%
- Russia: 1.4%
- Canada: 1.4%
- Others: 26.4%

By Length of Stay (in days):

- 0-18 Yrs: 1.9
- 19-25 Yrs: 29.8
- 26-35 Yrs: 42.2
- 36-45 Yrs: 19.6
- 46-55 Yrs: 6.0
- 55+ Yrs: 1.3
- 0-3: 46.0%
- 4-5: 6.4%
- 6-10: 10.6%
- 11-30: 15.3%
- 31-60: 11.0%
- 61-90: 4.6%
- 91-120: 2.3%
- 121-150: 0.9%
- >150: 2.7%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:

- 0-18 Yrs: 1.1%
- 19-25 Yrs: 29.8%
- 26-35 Yrs: 42.2%
- 36-45 Yrs: 19.6%
- 46-55 Yrs: 6.0%
- 55+ Yrs: 1.3%

By Gender:

- Male: 92.7%
- Female: 7.3%

By Severity of Offense:

- Other Offenses: 82.2%
- Drug Offenses: 5.8%
- Index Offenses: 12.0%

*Partial Data

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,
BACKGROUND DATA:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name:</th>
<th>New York County Jail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility Location:</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Population (2000):</td>
<td>1,537,195 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Foreign Population (2000):</td>
<td>452,440 (29%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projection Method</th>
<th>- Seasonal Multiplicative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goodness of fit</td>
<td>RMSE: 85.8; MAD: 58.7; MAPE: 9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: Facility Data Collected July 2004

Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 29,913

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

- Dominican Republic: 18.9%
- Mexico: 12.8%
- Jamaica: 10.4%
- Norway: 4.9%
- Guyana: 4.7%
- Trinidad and Tobago: 3.8%
- Ecuador: 3.4%
- Colombia: 3.2%
- Others: 37.9%

By Length of Stay (in days):

- 0-3: 6.9%
- 4-5: 5.2%
- 6-10: 4.8%
- 11-30: 6.9%
- 31-60: 9.7%
- 61-90: 7.9%
- >90: 6.9%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:

- 55+ Yrs: 2.3%
- 46-55 Yrs: 9.7%
- 36-45 Yrs: 23.0%
- 26-35 Yrs: 28.9%
- 19-25 Yrs: 29.2%
- 0-18 Yrs: 6.9%

By Gender:

- Male: 93.0%
- Female: 7.0%

By Severity of Offense:

- Data not available

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Oklahoma County Jail
Facility Location: Oklahoma County, OK

County Population (2000): 660,448 (100%)
County Foreign Population (2000): 47,829 (7%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Additive
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 11.8; MAD: 11.8; MAPE: 49.2

Data Source: Facility Data Collected July 2004

TOTAL FOREIGN BORN AND INDETERMINATE RECORDS FY03: 235

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

Data not available

By Length of Stay (in days):

Data not available

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:

55+ Yrs: 2.6%
46-55 Yrs: 14.0%
36-45 Yrs: 15.7%
26-35 Yrs: 41.3%
0-18 Yrs: 3.0%
19-25 Yrs: 23.4%

By Gender:

Male: 92.3%
Female: 7.7%

By Severity of Offense:

Data not available

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,
BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Orange County Jail
Facility Location: Orange County, CA

County Population (2000): 2,846,289 (100%)
County Foreign Population (2000): 849,899 (30%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Multiplicative
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 55.5; MAD: 46.2; MAPE: 3.1

Data Source: Facility Data Collected August 2004
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 62,088 (28%) Indeterminate (72%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

- Mexico: 73.2%
- Vietnam: 6.8%
- El Salvador: 2.3%
- South Korea: 1.9%
- Philippines: 1.9%
- Guatemala: 1.4%
- Iran: 1.1%
- Germany: 0.8%
- Others: 10.6%

By Length of Stay (in days):

- 0-3: 35.9%
- 4-5: 8.7%
- 6-10: 6.7%
- 11-30: 12.1%
- 31-60: 16.9%
- 61-90: 10.4%
- 91-120: 5.4%
- 121-150: 3.9%
- >150: 1.8%
- Others: 4.9%

By Age:

- 0-18 Yrs: 2.6%
- 19-25 Yrs: 30.1%
- 26-35 Yrs: 38.5%
- 36-45 Yrs: 20.8%
- 46-55 Yrs: 6.5%
- 55+ Yrs: 1.6%

By Gender:

- Male: 89.8%
- Female: 10.2%

By Severity of Offense:

- Index Offenses: 8.8%
- Drug Offenses: 17.2%
- Other Offenses: 74.0%

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,
BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Orange County Jail
Facility Location: Orange County, FL

County Population (2000): 896,344 (100%)
County Foreign Population (2000): 128,904 (14%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Seasonal Multiplicative
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 39.8; MAD: 25.9; MAPE: 15.4

Data Source: Facility Data Collected March 2004

Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 1,929

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

- Mexico: 30.8%
- Haiti: 7.8%
- Jamaica: 7.2%
- Cuba: 4.3%
- Colombia: 3.0%
- Dominican Republic: 2.9%
- Germany: 2.7%
- Guatemala: 2.7%
- Others: 31.0%

By Length of Stay (in days):

- 0-5 days: 51.0%
- 6-10 days: 12.2%
- 11-30 days: 16.4%
- 31-60 days: 8.5%
- 61-90 days: 4.2%
- 91-120 days: 2.7%
- 121-150 days: 1.5%
- >150 days: 1.3%
- Data not available

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:

- 0-18 Yrs: 2.4%
- 19-25 Yrs: 28.7%
- 26-35 Yrs: 36.1%
- 36-45 Yrs: 23.1%
- 46-55 Yrs: 8.9%
- 55+ Yrs: 2.4%

By Gender:

- Male: 88.8%
- Female: 11.2%

By Severity of Offense:

Data not available

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,
BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Palm Beach County Jail
Facility Location: Palm Beach, FL

County Population (2000): 1,131,184 (100%)
County Foreign Population (2000): 196,852 (17%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Multiplicative
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 26.0; MAD: 20.6; MAPE: 4.2

Data Source: Facility Data Collected March 2004

Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 20,380

(32%) Indeterminate (68%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

- Mexico 23.2%
- Guatemala 12.8%
- Haiti 11.8%
- Cuba 7.2%
- Jamaica 6.1%
- Honduras 4.0%
- Colombia 3.3%
- Bahamas 2.0%
- Others 29.6%

By Length of Stay (in days):

- 0-3 days: 74.4%
- 4-5 days: 3.7%
- 6-10 days: 5.0%
- 11-30 days: 7.4%
- 31-60 days: 4.6%
- 61-90 days: 0.0%
- 91-120 days: 2.0%
- 121-150 days: 0.7%
- >150 days: 1.2%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:

- 0-18 Yrs: 3.2%
- 19-25 Yrs: 33.6%
- 26-35 Yrs: 31.7%
- 36-45 Yrs: 20.1%
- 46-55 Yrs: 8.5%
- 55+ Yrs: 2.8%

By Gender:

- Male: 87.2%
- Female: 12.8%

Data not available

<1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,
http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DTGeoSearchByListServlet?ds_name=DEC_2000_SF3_U&_lang=en&ts=111439056474
BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Passaic County Jail
Facility Location: Passaic, NJ

County Population (2000): 489,049 (100%)
County Foreign Population (2000): 130,291 (27%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Additive
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 48.3; MAD: 33.4; MAPE: 23.1

Data Source: Facility Data Collected May 2004
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 1,858

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:
- Dominican Republic: 23.8%
- Mexico: 14.1%
- Jamaica: 9.0%
- Peru: 8.6%
- Columbia: 3.0%
- Poland: 2.2%
- Cuba: 2.2%
- Ecuador: 2.2%
- Others: 29.0%

By Length of Stay (in days):
- 0-3: 37.6%
- 4-5: 7.3%
- 6-10: 9.1%
- 11-30: 14.1%
- 31-60: 9.1%
- 61-90: 6.0%
- 91-120: 3.1%
- 121-150: 2.6%
- >150: 10.9%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:
- 0-18 Yrs: 2.1%
- 19-25 Yrs: 26.9%
- 26-35 Yrs: 33.7%
- 36-45 Yrs: 24.5%
- 46-55 Yrs: 9.4%
- 55+ Yrs: 2.1%

By Gender:
- Male: 92.6%
- Female: 7.4%

By Severity of Offense:
- Index Offenses: 14.0%
- Drug Offenses: 12.4%
- Other Offenses: 73.6%

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,
BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Philadelphia County Jail
Facility Location: Philadelphia, PA

County Population (2000): 1,517,550 (100%)
County Foreign Population (2000): 137,205 (9%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Additive
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 7.5; MAD: 6.0; MAPE: 16.4

Data Source: Facility Data Collected July 2004
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 2,417
(22%) Indeterminate (78%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:
- Ecuador: 26.0%
- Dominican Republic: 8.2%
- Jamaica: 6.0%
- Colombia: 6.9%
- Mexico: 6.0%
- England: 4.3%
- Liberia: 3.7%
- Cuba: 3.0%
- Others: 33.9%

By Length of Stay (in days):
- 0-3: 30.5%
- 4-5: 7.3%
- 6-10: 10.5%
- 11-30: 17.9%
- 31-60: 11.8%
- 61-90: 4.1%
- 91-120: 6.7%
- 121+: 4.3%
- >150: 6.9%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:
- 0-18 Yrs: 1.7%
- 19-25 Yrs: 34.4%
- 26-35 Yrs: 31.8%
- 36-45 Yrs: 19.6%
- 46-55 Yrs: 10.7%
- 55+: 1.7%

By Gender:
- Male: 91.2%
- Female: 8.8%

By Severity of Offense:
- Data not available

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,
BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Pierce County Jail
Facility Location: Pierce County, WA

County Population (2000): 700,820 (100%)
County Foreign Population (2000): 56,525 (8%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Historical Workload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 00</th>
<th>FY 01</th>
<th>FY 02</th>
<th>FY 03</th>
<th>Forecasted Workload</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>493</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>497</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>612</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Partial Year

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Additive
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 8.8; MAD: 6.5; MAPE: 21.4

Data Source: Facility Data Collected March 2004

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

- Mexico: 48.1%
- Vietnam: 5.7%
- Korea: 5.3%
- Cuba: 5.0%
- Somalia: 3.8%
- Germany: 3.8%
- Ukraine: 3.4%
- Cambodia: 2.7%
- Others: 22.2%

By Length of Stay (in days):

- 0-2: 5.7%
- 3-9: 4.5%
- 10-30: 13.6%
- 31-60: 13.6%
- 61-90: 13.6%
- 91-120: 13.6%
- >120: 13.6%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:

- 0-18 Yrs: 1.9%
- 19-25 Yrs: 30.9%
- 26-35 Yrs: 37.0%
- 36-45 Yrs: 16.4%
- 46-55 Yrs: 10.7%
- 55+ Yrs: 3.1%

By Gender:

Data not available

By Severity of Offense:

- Drug Offenses: 14.1%
- Other Offenses: 83.6%
- Index Offenses: 2.3%

BACKGROUND DATA:

- **Facility Name:** Pima County Jail
- **County Population (2000):** 843,746 (100%)
- **County Foreign Population (2000):** 100,050 (12%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

- **Projection Method:** Seasonal Additive
- **Goodness of fit:** RMSE: 13.3; MAD: 10.8; MAPE: 6.8
- **Data Source:** Facility Data Collected March 2004

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

- **By Place of Birth:**
  - Mexico: 51.0%
  - Cuba: 8.6%
  - Guatemala: 14.7%
  - Honduras: 9.3%
  - El Salvador: 5.1%
  - Jamaica: 3.0%
  - England: 1.7%
  - Ecuador: 3.6%
  - Others: 9.3%

- **By Length of Stay (in days):**
  - 0-3 days: 8.0%
  - 4-5 days: 8.6%
  - 6-10 days: 14.7%
  - 11-30 days: 9.3%
  - 31-60 days: 3.0%
  - 61-90 days: 5.1%
  - 91-120 days: 3.0%
  - 121-150 days: 1.7%
  - >150 days: 3.6%

- **By Age:**
  - 0-18 Yrs: 2.0%
  - 19-25 Yrs: 8.7%
  - 26-35 Yrs: 91.3%
  - 36-45 Yrs: 21.9%
  - 46-55 Yrs: 28.9%
  - 55+ Yrs: 37.1%

- **By Gender:**
  - Male: 91.3%
  - Female: 8.7%

- **By Severity of Offense:**
  - Index Offenses: 14.3%
  - Drug Offenses: 15.0%
  - Other Offenses: 79.7%

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census, [link](http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DTGeoSearchByListServlet?ds_name=DEC_2000_SF3_U&_lang=en&_ts=111439056474)
**BACKGROUND DATA:**

Facility Name: Pinellas County Jail  
Facility Location: Pinellas, FL

County Population (2000): 921,482 (100%)  
County Foreign Population (2000): 87,685 (10%)

**HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:**

Projection Method = Holt-Winters Additive  
Goodness of fit = RMSE: 14.9; MAD: 12.4; MAPE: 11.2

Data Source: Facility Data Collected April 2004

Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 1,722

**BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):**

By Place of Birth:
- Mexico: 25.6%
- Canada: 5.6%
- Cuba: 5.5%
- Colombia: 4.4%
- England: 4.1%
- Jamaica: 3.7%
- Vietnam: 3.2%
- Poland: 2.7%
- Others: 45.2%

By Length of Stay (in days):
- 0-3: 73.4%
- 4-5: 4.1%
- 6-10: 9.6%
- 11-30: 4.4%
- 31-60: 2.1%
- 61-90: 1.2%
- 91-120: 0.9%
- >120: 2.4%

By Age:
- 0-18 Yrs: 1.9%
- 19-25 Yrs: 30.2%
- 26-35 Yrs: 33.5%
- 36-45 Yrs: 21.0%
- 46-55 Yrs: 10.0%
- 55+ Yrs: 3.6%
- 0-18 Yrs: 1.7%

By Gender:
- Male: 85.5%
- Female: 14.5%

By Severity of Offense:
- Index Offenses: 3.5%
- Drug Offenses: 6.4%
- Other Offenses: 90.1%

---

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,  
**BACKGROUND DATA:**

- **Facility Name:** Plymouth County Jail
- **Facility Location:** Plymouth, MA
- **County Population (2000):** 472,822 (100%)
- **County Foreign Population (2000):** 29,592 (6%)

**HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:**

*Projection Method – Seasonal Multiplicative*
*Goodness of fit – RMSE: N/A; MAD: N/A; MAPE: N/A*

*Data Source: Limited Facility Data Collected June 2004; SCAAP data used to supplement forecast*

**BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):**

*By Place of Birth:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*By Length of Stay (in days):*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-30</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-60</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-90</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-120</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121-150</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;150</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):**

*By Age:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-18 Yrs</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-25 Yrs</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35 Yrs</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45 Yrs</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55 Yrs</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+ Yrs</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*By Gender:*

- Male: 100.0%

*By Severity of Offense:*

- Other Offenses: 79.5%
- Drug Offenses: 13.9%
- Index Offenses: 6.5%
BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Riverside County Jail
Facility Location: Riverside, CA

County Population (2000): 1,545,387 (100%)
County Foreign Population (2000): 293,712 (19%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Seasonal Additive
Goodness of fit – RMSE: N/A; MAD: N/A; MAPE: N/A

Data Source: Limited Facility Data Collected June 2004; SCAAP data used to supplement forecast

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:
- Mexico: 80.3%
- Guatemala: 2.5%
- El Salvador: 2.4%
- Canada: 1.1%
- Philippines: 1.0%
- Germany: 0.8%
- England: 0.7%
- Vietnam: 0.6%
- Others: 10.0%

By Length of Stay (in days):
- 0-3: 71.9%
- 4-5: 5.0%
- 6-10: 5.1%
- 11-30: 8.1%
- 31-60: 2.7%
- 61-90: 1.8%
- 91-120: 1.7%
- 121-150: 0.8%
- >150: 2.9%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:
- 0-18 Yrs: 1.2%
- 19-25 Yrs: 29.1%
- 26-35 Yrs: 35.7%
- 36-45 Yrs: 22.7%
- 46-55 Yrs: 8.5%
- 55+ Yrs: 2.7%

By Gender:
- Male: 91.4%
- Female: 8.6%

By Severity of Offense:
- Index Offenses: 6.1%
- Drug Offenses: 8.6%
- Other Offenses: 85.3%

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,
BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: San Diego County Jail
Facility Location: San Diego, CA
County Population (2000): 2,813,833 (100%)
County Foreign Population (2000): 606,254 (22%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

![Admissions Chart]

**Forecasted Workload**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 99</th>
<th>FY 00</th>
<th>FY 01</th>
<th>FY 02</th>
<th>FY 03</th>
<th>FY 04</th>
<th>FY 05</th>
<th>FY 06</th>
<th>FY 07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>14,476</td>
<td>14,403</td>
<td>15,031</td>
<td>15,560</td>
<td>16,289</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Additive
Goodness of fit – RMSE: N/A; MAD: N/A; MAPE: N/A

Data Source: Limited Facility Data Collected April 2004;
SCAAP data used to supplement forecast

Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 16,027

Breakdown of FY 2003 Workload (Foreign Born Admissions):

**By Place of Birth:**

- Mexico: 78.0%
- Philippines: 2.6%
- Guatemala: 1.8%
- Vietnam: 1.6%
- Laos: 0.8%
- Canada: 0.8%
- El Salvador: 0.7%
- Iran: 0.6%
- Others: 15.2%

**By Length of Stay (in days):**

- 0-3: 11.2%
- 4-5: 7.4%
- 6-10: 6.9%
- 11-30: 5.7%
- 31-60: 3.1%
- 61-90: 3.2%
- 91-120: 1.0%
- >150: 2.7%

Breakdown of FY 2003 Workload (Foreign Born Admissions):

**By Age:**

- 26-35 Yrs: 36.7%
- 25-25 Yrs: 36.7%
- 0-18 Yrs: 1.3%

**By Gender:**

- Male: 89.3%
- Female: 10.7%

**By Severity of Offense:**

- Index Offenses: 7.6%
- Drug Offenses: 21.3%
- Other Offenses: 71.1%

---

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,
BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Santa Clara County Jail
Facility Location: Santa Clara, CA
County Population (2000): 1,682,585 (100%)
County Foreign Population (2000): 573,130 (34%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Seasonal Additive
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 70.9; MAD: 54.1; MAPE: 3.5
Data Source: Facility Data Collected June 2004
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 18,820

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

- Mexico: 62.4%
- Vietnam: 10.3%
- Philippines: 5.9%
- El Salvador: 1.9%
- India: 1.7%
- China: 1.4%
- Korea: 1.4%
- Iran: 1.2%
- Others: 13.8%

By Length of Stay (in days):

- 0-3: 44.7%
- 4-5: 5.3%
- 6-10: 6.8%
- 11-30: 14.5%
- 31-60: 14.5%
- 61-90: 11.9%
- 91-120: 3.4%
- 121-150: 2.6%
- >150: 5.6%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:

- 0-18 Yrs: 0.7%
- 19-25 Yrs: 27.7%
- 26-35 Yrs: 38.9%
- 36-45 Yrs: 21.8%
- 46-55 Yrs: 8.4%
- 55+ Yrs: 2.3%

By Gender:

- Male: 89.0%
- Female: 11.0%

By Severity of Offense:

- Other Offenses: 88.0%
- Drug Offenses: 9.6%
- Index Offenses: 2.4%

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,
BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Suffolk County Jail
Facility Location: Suffolk, NY

County Population (2000): 1,419,369 (100%)
County Foreign Population (2000): 158,525 (11%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Multiplicative
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 17.1; MAD: 13.1; MAPE: 10.0

Data Source: Facility Data Collected July 2004

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

- El Salvador: 31.5%
- Dominican Republic: 8.0%
- Mexico: 7.0%
- Ecuador: 4.8%
- Honduras: 3.0%
- Japan: 2.9%
- Peru: 2.1%
- Others: 40.7%

By Length of Stay (in days):

- 0-3: 43.0%
- 4-5: 11.9%
- 6-10: 6.8%
- 11-30: 50.5%
- 31-60: 11.0%
- 61-90: 7.6%
- 91-120: 3.8%
- 121-150: 3.6%
- >150: 1.6%
- 0%: 7.0%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:

- 26-35 Yrs: 35.0%
- 25-30 Yrs: 31.8%
- 19-25 Yrs: 20.9%
- 36-45 Yrs: 10.1%
- 46-55 Yrs: 6.8%
- 55+ Yrs: 4.5%

By Gender:

- Female: 8.8%
- Male: 91.2%

By Severity of Offense:

- Other Offenses: 86.7%
- Drug Offenses: 11.7%
- Index Offenses: 1.6%

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Travis County Jail
Facility Location: Travis County, TX

County Population (2000): 812,280 (100%)
County Foreign Population (2000): 122,621 (15%)
BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Tulare County Jail
Facility Location: Tulare County, CA

County Population (2000): 368,021 (100%)
County Foreign Population (2000): 83,124 (23%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Multiplicative
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 35.3; MAD: 27.4; MAPE: 5.4
Data Source: Facility Data Collected August 2004

Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 6,511
Foreign Born (96%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:
- Mexico: 94.1%
- Philippines: 0.8%
- Portugal: 0.7%
- Thailand: 0.6%
- Laos: 0.6%
- El Salvador: 0.5%
- India: 0.4%
- Guatemala: 0.3%
- Others: 2.0%

By Length of Stay (in days):
- 0-3: 58.5%
- 4-5: 3.7%
- 6-10: 6.2%
- 11-30: 12.7%
- 31-60: 6.1%
- 61-90: 3.4%
- 91-120: 2.3%
- >120: 1.7%
- Others: 5.4%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:
- 26-35 Yrs: 36.4%
- 36-45 Yrs: 21.2%
- 46-55 Yrs: 7.2%
- 55+ Yrs: 5.5%
- 0-18 Yrs: 2.6%
- 19-25 Yrs: 2.6%

By Gender:
- Male: 94.3%
- Female: 5.7%

By Severity of Offense:
- Index Offenses: 3.7%
- Drug Offenses: 15.7%
- Other Offenses: 80.6%

VENTURA COUNTY, CA

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Ventura County Jail
Facility Location: Ventura, CA
County Population (2000): 753,197 (100%)
County Foreign Population (2000): 155,913 (21%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Seasonal Multiplicative
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 36.2; MAD: 27.8; MAPE: 13.8

Data Source: Facility Data Collected March 2004
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 558

FOREIGN BORN (88%) (12%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

Mexico: 84.6%
El Salvador: 2.8%
Philippines: 2.2%
Guatemala: 1.5%
Germany: 0.8%
England: 1.0%
Cayman: 0.4%
Others: 6.0%

By Gender:

Data not available

By Severity of Offense:

Data not available

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,
**BACKGROUND DATA:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name:</th>
<th>Wayne County Jail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility Location:</td>
<td>Wayne County, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Population (2000):</td>
<td>2,061,162 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Foreign Population (2000):</td>
<td>137,769 (7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:**

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Multiplicative
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 3.7; MAD: 2.9; MAPE: 13.1

Data Source: Facility Data Collected July 2004

Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 63

Foreign Born (100%)

**BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):**

By Place of Birth:

- Mexico: 58.7%
- Costa Rica: 3.5%
- Albania: 4.8%
- Canada: 3.2%
- Colombia: 3.2%
- Jamaica: 1.6%
- Gambia: 1.6%
- Guatemala: 1.6%
- Others: 15.8%

By Length of Stay (in days):

- 0-3: 52.4%
- 4-5: 17.5%
- 6-10: 12.2%
- 11-30: 4.8%
- 31-60: 0.0%
- 61-90: 0.0%
- 91-120: 1.6%
- 121-150: 0.0%
- >150: 1.5%

**BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):**

By Age:

- 19-25 Yrs: 38.1%
- 26-35 Yrs: 38.1%
- 36-45 Yrs: 12.7%
- 46-65 Yrs: 6.3%
- 0-18 Yrs: 3.2%
- 55+ Yrs: 0.0%

By Gender:

- Male: 93.7%
- Female: 6.3%

By Severity of Offense:

- Other Offenses: 100.0%

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Yakima County Jail
Facility Location: Yakima, WA
County Population (2000): 222,581 (100%)
County Foreign Population (2000): 37,575 (17%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Seasonal Additive
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 22.7; MAD: 18.2; MAPE: 11.8
Data Source: Facility Data Collected April 2004
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 1,930

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:
- Mexico: 92.6%
- Canada: 0.8%
- Slovenia: 0.7%
- Vietnam: 0.7%
- Russia: 0.5%
- Philippines: 0.3%
- Others: 4.4%

By Length of Stay (in days):
- 0-3: 42.7%
- 4-5: 7.0%
- 6-10: 9.7%
- 11-30: 15.4%
- 31-60: 9.2%
- 61-90: 5.0%
- 91-120: 2.0%
- 121-150: 2.1%
- >150: 6.9%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS): Data not available

By Gender: Data not available

By Severity of Offense: Data not available

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,
**BACKGROUND DATA:**

Facility Name: Yuma County Jail  
Facility Location: Yuma, AZ

- **County Population (2000):** 160,026 (100%)
- **County Foreign Population (2000):** 38,479 (24%)

**HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:**

**Projection Method** – Holt-Winters Multiplicative  
**Goodness of fit** – RMSE: 8.6; MAD: 6.0; MAPE: 19.9

**Data Source:** Facility Data Collected May 2004  
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY02: 668

**BREAKDOWN OF FY 2002 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):**

- **By Place of Birth:**
  - Mexico: 96.4%
  - Germany: 0.9%
  - Canada: 0.3%
  - Italy: 0.3%

- **By Length of Stay (in days):**
  - 0-3: 6.5%
  - 4-5: 10.8%
  - 6-10: 18.4%
  - 11-30: 23.1%
  - 31-60: 16.0%
  - 61-90: 10.6%
  - 91-120: 7.2%
  - 121-150: 1.5%
  - 150+ Yrs: 3.9%

- **By Age:**
  - 0-18 Yrs: 2.4%
  - 19-25 Yrs: 22.2%
  - 26-35 Yrs: 33.2%
  - 36-45 Yrs: 28.4%
  - 46-55 Yrs: 10.8%

- **By Gender:**
  - Data not available

- **By Severity of Offense:**
  - Data not available

---

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,  
BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Alabama Department of Corrections
Facility Location: Based in Montgomery, Alabama

State Population (2000): 4,447,100 (100%)
State Foreign Population (2000): 37,170 (5.9%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Holt-Winter Multiplicative
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 0.1; MAD: 0.0; MAPE: 0.1

Data Source: Facility Data Collected April 2004

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:
- Mexico: 39.5%
- Germany: 18.4%
- Jamaica: 5.3%
- Laos: 5.3%
- Others: 31.5%

By Gender:
- Male: 81.6%
- Female: 18.4%

By Severity of Offense:
- Data not available

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,
BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Alaska Department of Corrections
Facility Location: Based in Juneau, Alaska

State Population (2000): 626,932 (100%)
State Foreign Population (2000): 37,170 (5.9%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Multiplicative
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 14.2; MAD: 11.2; MAPE: 10.5

Data Source: Facility Data Collected April 2004
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 1,495

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

- Mexico: 18.5%
- Philippines: 9.8%
- Germany: 8.0%
- Dominican Republic: 6.0%
- Korea: 4.7%
- Canada: 4.6%
- Laos: 3.4%
- Thailand: 2.7%
- Others: 42.3%

By Length of Stay (in months):

- 0-3 Months: 90.4%
- 3-6 Months: 4.8%
- 6-12 Months: 4.8%
- 1-2 Years: 4.8%
- 2-3 Years: 1.7%
- 3-5 Years: 0.2%
- 5+ Years: 0.1%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:

- 55+ Yrs: 2.6%
- 46-55 Yrs: 12.2%
- 36-45 Yrs: 28.8%
- 26-35 Yrs: 28.8%
- 19-25 Yrs: 27.4%
- 0-18 Yrs: 2.2%

By Gender:

- Male: 82.2%
- Female: 17.8%

By Severity of Offense:

- Index Offenses: 0.9%
- Drug Offenses: 2.2%
- Other Offenses: 97.0%

**ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS**

**BACKGROUND DATA:**

- **Facility Name:** Arkansas Department of Corrections
- **State Population (2000):** 2,673,400 (100%)
- **State Foreign Population (2000):** 73,690 (2.8%)
- **Facility Location:** Based in Pine Bluff

**HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:**

- **Projection Method:** Holt-Winters Additive
- **Goodness of fit:**
  - RMSE: 4.1
  - MAD: 2.8
  - MAPE: 44.0
- **Data Source:** Facility Data Collected April 2004
- **Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03:** 63

**BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):**

- **By Place of Birth:**
  - Mexico: 70.2%
  - Germany: 3.5%
  - Thailand: 3.5%
  - Guatemala: 3.5%
  - El Salvador: 1.8%
  - Philippines: 1.8%
  - Panama: 1.8%
  - Honduras: 5.1%
  - Others: 0.8%

- **By Length of Stay (in months):**
  - 0-3 Months: 83.3%
  - 3-6 Months: 8.4%
  - 6-12 Months: 0.0%
  - 1-2 Years: 8.4%
  - 2-5 Years: 0.0%
  - 5-10 Years: 0.0%
  - 10+ Years: 0.0%

- **By Age:**
  - 0-18 Yrs: 43.9%
  - 19-25 Yrs: 31.6%
  - 26-35 Yrs: 15.8%
  - 36-45 Yrs: 5.3%
  - 46-65 Yrs: 3.5%

- **By Gender:**
  - Data not available

**Notes:**

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Colorado Department of Corrections
Facility Location: Based in Colorado Springs, Colorado

State Population (2000): 4,301,261 (100%)
State Foreign Population (2000): 369,903 (8.6%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Multiplicative
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 11.3; MAD: 8.7; MAPE: 7.5

Data Source: Facility Data Collected June 2004

Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 511

FOREIGN BORN (100%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth: Mexico (34.1%), Honduras (2.3%), El Salvador (1.8%), Guatemala (1.8%), Vietnam (1.2%), Cuba (1.0%), Cambodia (0.8%), Canada (0.6%), Others (6.4%)

By Length of Stay (in months): 0-3 Months (5.6%), 3-6 Months (10.7%), 6 - 12 Months (19.7%), 1 - 2 Years (33.8%), 2 - 5 Years (26.1%), 5 - 10 Years (4.1%), 10+ Years (0.0%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age: 0-18 Yrs (1.4%), 19-25 Yrs (30.1%), 26-35 Yrs (42.1%), 36-45 Yrs (20.4%), 46-55 Yrs (4.9%), 55+ Yrs (1.2%)

By Gender: Male (97.8%), Female (2.2%)

By Severity of Offense: Drug Offenses (21.1%), Other Offenses (54.6%), Index Offenses (24.3%)
BACKGROUND DATA:

- Facility Name: Delaware Department of Corrections
- Facility Location: Based in Dover, Delaware
- State Population (2000): 783,600 (100%)
- State Foreign Population (2000): 44,898 (5.7%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

- Projection Method: Seasonal Multiplicative
- Goodness of fit: RMSE: 14.3; MAD: 10.2; MAPE: 6.5
- Data Source: Facility Data Collected May 2004

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

- By Place of Birth:
  - Mexico: 14.4%
  - Guatemala: 6.6%
  - Dominican Republic: 3.4%
  - Jamaica: 2.8%
  - Germany: 1.0%
  - Others: 41.1%

- By Length of Stay (in months):
  - 0-3 Months: 85.0%
  - 3-6 Months: 6.7%
  - 6-12 Months: 3.9%
  - 1-2 Years: 2.3%
  - 2-5 Years: 0.8%
  - 5-10 Years: 0.3%
  - 10+ Years: 0.4%

- By Age:
  - 0-18 Yrs: 2.3%
  - 26-35 Yrs: 29.1%
  - 36-45 Yrs: 17.7%
  - 46-55 Yrs: 8.2%
  - 55+ Yrs: 1.0%

- By Gender:
  - Male: 46.3%
  - Female: 53.7%

- By Severity of Offense:
  - Index Offenses: 11.8%
  - Drug Offenses: 23.0%
  - Other Offenses: 65.2%

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Florida Department of Corrections
Facility Location: Based in Tallahassee, Florida

State Population (2000): 15,982,378 (100%)
State Foreign Population (2000): 2,670,828 (16.7%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Additive
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 22.7; MAD: 16.5; MAPE: 4.0

Data Source: Facility Data Collected July 2004

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2002 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

- Cuba: 27.8%
- Mexico: 13.3%
- Jamaica: 7.4%
- Haiti: 6.6%
- Colombia: 3.9%
- Honduras: 3.3%
- Germany: 3.2%
- Bahamas: 2.4%
- Others: 29.1%

By Length of Stay (in months):

- 0-3 Month: 24.2%
- 3-6 Months: 43.1%
- 6-12 Months: 5.1%
- 1-2 Years: 0.0%
- 2-5 Years: 0.0%
- 5-10 Years: 0.0%
- 10+ Years: 0.0%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2002 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:

- 55+ Yrs: 4.2%
- 46-55 Yrs: 12.3%
- 36-45 Yrs: 26.4%
- 26-35 Yrs: 31.6%
- 19-25 Yrs: 24.0%
- 0-18 Yrs: 1.5%

By Gender:

- Male: 93.1%
- Female: 6.9%

By Severity of Offense:

- Drug Offenses: 28.2%
- Other Offenses: 45.2%
- Index Offenses: 26.6%

**BACKGROUND DATA:**

Facility Name: Georgia Department of Corrections  
Facility Location: Based in Atlanta, Georgia  
State Population (2000): 8,186,453 (100%)  
State Foreign Population (2000): 577,273 (7.1%)

**HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:**

**Projection Method** – Holt-Winters Additive  
**Goodness of fit** – RMSE: 14.6; MAD: 11.6; MAPE: 10.3  
**Data Source**: Facility Data Collected June 2004  
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 503

**BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):**

- By Place of Birth:
  - Mexico: 56.1%  
  - Germany: 9.9%  
  - El Salvador: 2.8%  
  - Guatemala: 2.6%  
  - Cuba: 2.4%  
  - Jamaica: 2.4%  
  - Honduras: 1.8%  
  - Colombia: 1.4%  
  - Others: 20.7%

- By Length of Stay (in months):
  - 0-3 Months: 20.7%  
  - 3-6 Months: 1.4%  
  - 6-12 Months: 2.4%  
  - 1-2 Years: 2.4%  
  - 2-5 Years: 2.6%  
  - 5-10 Years: 2.8%  
  - 10+ Years: 9.9%

- By Age:
  - 0-18 Yrs: 55.5%  
  - 19-25 Yrs: 37.4%  
  - 26-35 Yrs: 34.8%  
  - 36-45 Yrs: 17.3%  
  - 46-55 Yrs: 7.2%  
  - 55+ Yrs: 1.4%

- By Gender:
  - Male: 96.2%  
  - Female: 3.8%

- By Severity of Offense:
  - Drug Offenses: 32.0%  
  - Other Offenses: 44.9%  
  - Index Offenses: 23.1%

---

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census, 
BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Hawaii Department of Public Safety
Facility Location: Based in Honolulu, Hawaii

State Population (2000): 1,211,537 (100%)
State Foreign Population (2000): 212,229 (17.5%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Seasonal Additive
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 60.3; MAD: 50.1; MAPE: 18.4

Data Source: Facility Data Collected June 2004
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 1,309

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:
- Philippines: 31.3%
- Nauru: 4.1%
- Korea: 3.9%
- Mexico: 2.8%
- Togo: 2.7%
- Samoa: 2.6%
- Germany: 2.5%
- Jamaica: 2.5%
- Others: 80.0%

By Length of Stay (in months):
- 0-3 Months: 21.4%
- 3-6 Months: 23.8%
- 6-12 Months: 19.8%
- 1-2 Years: 9.0%
- 2-5 Years: 3.9%
- 5-10 Years: 4.6%
- 10+ Years: 2.0%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:
- 0-18 Yrs: 0.5%
- 19-25 Yrs: 19.8%
- 26-35 Yrs: 33.6%
- 36-45 Yrs: 31.4%
- 46-55 Yrs: 12.0%
- 55+ Yrs: 2.6%

By Gender:
- Data not available

By Severity of Offense:
- Index Offenses: 5.5%
- Other Offenses: 94.5%

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,
BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Idaho Department of Corrections
Facility Location: Based in Boise, Idaho
State Population (2000): 1,293,953 (100%)
State Foreign Population (2000): 64,080 (5.0%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Additive
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 11.8; MAD: 9.4; MAPE: 18.6
Data Source: Facility Data Collected March 2004
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 207
Foreign Born (100%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:
- Mexico: 50.2%
- Germany: 7.2%
- Iceland: 2.9%
- England: 2.4%
- Japan: 1.9%
- Bahamas: 1.4%
- Iraq: 1.4%
- Honduras: 1.0%
- Others: 31.4%

By Gender:
- Male: 92.8%
- Female: 7.2%

By Age:
- 26-35 Yrs: 43.5%
- 19-25 Yrs: 30.4%
- 36-45 Yrs: 18.8%
- 46-55 Yrs: 6.8%
- 55+ Yrs: 0.5%

By Length of Stay (in months):
- 0-3 Months: 3.3%
- 3-6 Months: 21.1%
- 6-12 Months: 25.2%
- 1-2 Years: 22.0%
- 2-5 Years: 24.4%
- 5-10 Years: 4.0%
- 10+ Years: 0.0%

By Severity of Offense:
- Drug Offenses: 26.1%
- Other Offenses: 57.0%
- Index Offenses: 16.9%

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,
BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Iowa Department of Corrections  
Facility Location: Based in Des Moines, Iowa  
State Population (2000): 2,926,324 (100%)  
State Foreign Population (2000): 91,085 (3.1%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Additive  
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 6.5; MAD: 5.4; MAPE: 17.6

Data Source: Facility Data Collected May 2004  
Historical Workload Forecasted Workload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 99</th>
<th>FY 00</th>
<th>FY 01</th>
<th>FY 02</th>
<th>FY 03</th>
<th>FY 04</th>
<th>FY 05</th>
<th>FY 06</th>
<th>FY 07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66*</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Partial Data

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

- Mexico: 53.2%
- Germany: 8.5%
- Laos: 5.7%
- El Salvador: 5.0%
- Yugoslavia: 4.3%
- Honduras: 3.5%
- Canada: 2.8%
- Vietnam: 2.8%
- Others: 14.2%

By Length of Stay (in months):

- 0-3 Months: 4.0%
- 3-6 Months: 10.1%
- 6-12 Months: 36.7%
- 1-2 Years: 24.8%
- 2-5 Years: 23.8%
- 5-10 Years: 0.0%
- 10+ Years: 0.0%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:

- 0-18 Yrs: 5.7%
- 19-25 Yrs: 29.1%
- 26-35 Yrs: 38.3%
- 36-45 Yrs: 19.1%
- 46-55 Yrs: 7.8%
- 56+ Yrs: 0.0%

By Gender:

- Male: 95.0%
- Female: 5.0%

By Severity of Offense:

- Drug Offenses: 41.8%
- Index Offenses: 22.0%
- Other Offenses: 22.0%
BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Kansas Department of Corrections
Facility Location: Based in Topeka, Kansas
State Population (2000): 2,688,418 (100%)
State Foreign Population (2000): 134,735 (5.0%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Multiplicative
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 5.3; MAD: 3.8; MAPE: 36.9

Data Source: Facility Data Collected May 2004
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 101

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:
- Mexico: 82.2%
- Vietnam: 4.0%
- Guatemala: 3.0%
- Cuba: 2.0%
- Others: 8.8%

By Length of Stay (in months):
- 0-3 Months: 0.4%
- 3-6 Months: 7.4%
- 6-12 Months: 23.5%
- 1-2 Years: 39.7%
- 2-5 Years: 22.1%
- 5-10 Years: 4.4%
- 10+ Years: 2.9%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:
- 0-18 Yrs: 1.0%
- 19-25 Yrs: 28.7%
- 26-35 Yrs: 48.5%
- 36-45 Yrs: 16.8%
- 46-55 Yrs: 3.0%
- 55+ Yrs: 2.0%

By Gender:
- Male: 98.0%
- Female: 2.0%

By Severity of Offense:
- Index Offenses: 21.8%
- Other Offenses: 54.5%
- Drug Offenses: 23.8%

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,
KENTUCKY DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Kentucky Department of Corrections  
Facility Location: Based in Frankfort, Kentucky  
State Population (2000): 4,041,769 (100%)  
State Foreign Population (2000): 80,271 (2.0%)  

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Additive  
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 7.6; MAD: 5.2; MAPE: 18.0  
Data Source: Facility Data Collected May 2004  
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 162

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

- Mexico: 44.4%  
- Canada: 1.9%  
- Guatemala: 0.6%  
- Persia: 0.6%  
- Saudi Arabia: 0.6%  
- Others: 51.9%

By Length of Stay (in months):

- 0-3 Months: 23.0%  
- 3-6 Months: 23.7%  
- 6-12 Months: 12.2%  
- 1-2 Years: 16.5%  
- 2-5 Years: 20.1%  
- 5-10 Years: 3.8%  
- 10+ Years: 0.0%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:

- 26-35 Yrs: 43.8%  
- 36-45 Yrs: 20.4%  
- 46-55 Yrs: 7.4%  
- 55+ Yrs: 2.5%  
- 19-25 Yrs: 25.9%

By Gender:

- Male: 91.4%  
- Female: 8.6%

By Severity of Offense:

- Index Offenses: 16.7%  
- Drug Offenses: 20.3%  
- Other Offenses: 63.0%

BACKGROUND DATA:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Maine Department of Corrections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility Location</td>
<td>Based in Augusta, Maine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State Population (2000): 1,274,923 (100%)
State Foreign Population (2000): 36,691 (2.9%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Seasonal Multiplicative
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 1.1; MAD: 1.0; MAPE: 44.6

Data Source: Facility Data Collected April 2004
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 6

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:
- Medeira Islands: 33.3%
- Canada: 33.3%
- Spain: 33.3%

By Length of Stay (in months):
- 0-3 Months: 0.0%
- 3-6 Months: 0.0%
- 6-12 Months: 33.3%
- 1-2 Years: 66.7%
- 2-5 Years: 0.0%
- 6-10 Years: 0.0%
- 10+ Years: 0.0%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:
- 26-35 Yrs: 100.0%

By Gender:
- Male: 100.0%

By Severity of Offense:
- Index Offenses: 33.3%
- Other Offenses: 66.7%

BACKGROUND DATA:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Michigan Department of Corrections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility Location</td>
<td>Based in Lansing, Michigan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State Population (2000): 9,938,444 (100%)
State Foreign Population (2000): 523,589 (5.3%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Multiplicative
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 6.1; MAD: 5.0; MAPE: 22.3

Data Source: Facility Data Collected April 2004
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 167
Foreign Born (86%) (14%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

- Mexico: 44.1%
- Iraq: 8.4%
- Cuba: 7.7%
- Canada: 4.2%
- Honduras: 3.5%
- Vietnam: 2.8%
- El Salvador: 2.1%
- Others: 37.2%

By Length of Stay (in months):

- 0-3 Months: 4.9%
- 3-6 Months: 4.2%
- 6-12 Months: 2.1%
- 1-2 Years: 30.8%
- 2-5 Years: 26.5%
- 5-10 Years: 22.0%
- 10+ Years: 0.0%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:

- 0-18 Yrs: 0.0%
- 19-25 Yrs: 2.1%
- 26-35 Yrs: 36.4%
- 36-45 Yrs: 21.7%
- 46-55 Yrs: 4.9%

By Gender:

- Male: 97.2%
- Female: 2.8%

By Severity of Offense:

Data not available

**BACKGROUND DATA:**

- **Facility Name:** Minnesota Department of Corrections
- **Facility Location:** Based in St. Paul, Minnesota
- **State Population (2000):** 4,919,479 (100%)
- **State Foreign Population (2000):** 260,463 (5.3%)

**HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:**

- **Projection Method:** Holt-Winters Multiplicative
- **Goodness of fit:** RMSE: 7.5; MAD: 5.8; MAPE: 27.9
- **Data Source:** Facility Data Collected April 2004

**BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-18 Yrs</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-25 Yrs</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35 Yrs</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45 Yrs</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55 Yrs</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+ Yrs</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Type</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drug Offenses</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Offenses</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index Offenses</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,
MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Mississippi Department of Corrections
Facility Location: Based in Jackson, Mississippi

State Population (2000): 2,844,658 (100%)
State Foreign Population (2000): 39,908 (1.4%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Seasonal Multiplicative
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 11.9; MAD: 9.5; MAPE: 12.2

Data Source: Limited Facility Data Collected August 2004; historical SCAAP data used for forecasting

Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 47

Historical Workload
Forecasted Workload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 99</th>
<th>FY 00</th>
<th>FY 01</th>
<th>FY 02</th>
<th>FY 03</th>
<th>FY 04</th>
<th>FY 05</th>
<th>FY 06</th>
<th>FY 07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Partial Data

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

- Mexico: 63.2%
- Vietnam: 10.5%
- Others: 26.3%

By Length of Stay (in months):

- 0-3 Months: 0.0%
- 3-6 Months: 1.8%
- 6-12 Months: 9.1%
- 1-3 Years: 10.9%
- 2-5 Years: 41.8%
- 5-10 Years: 21.8%
- 10+ Years: 14.6%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:

- 0-18 Yrs: 0.0%
- 19-25 Yrs: 26.3%
- 26-35 Yrs: 15.8%
- 36-45 Yrs: 36.8%
- 46-55 Yrs: 10.5%
- 55+ Yrs: 10.5%

By Gender:

- Male: 53.7%
- Female: 46.3%

By Severity of Offense:

- Drug Offenses: 68.4%
- Other Offenses: 10.5%
- Index Offenses: 21.1%

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census, http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DTGeoSearchByListServlet?ds_name=DEC_2000_SF3_U&_lang=en&_ts=111439056474
MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Missouri Department of Corrections
Facility Location: Based in Jefferson City, Missouri

State Population (2000): 5,595,211 (100%)
State Foreign Population (2000): 151,196 (2.7%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Multiplicative
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 15.4; MAD: 12.3; MAPE: 9.2

Data Source: Facility Data Collected May 2004
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 208

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:
- Mexico: 32.5%
- Germany: 5.5%
- Japan: 4.5%
- Cuba: 4.5%
- Netherlands: 4.0%
- Canada: 3.5%
- England: 3.0%
- Others: 23.4%

By Gender:
- Male: 93.5%
- Female: 6.5%

By Severity of Offense:
- Drug Offenses: 28.0%
- Other Offenses: 53.5%
- Index Offenses: 18.5%

**BACKGROUND DATA:**

Facility Name: Montana Department of Corrections  
State Population (2000): 902,195 (100%)  
Facility Location: Based in Helena, Montana  
State Foreign Population (2000): 16,396 (1.8%)  

**HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projection Method</th>
<th>Goodness of fit</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
<td>RMSE: NA; MAD: NA; MAPE: NA</td>
<td>Facility Data Collected April 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):**

**By Place of Birth:**
- Mexico: 20.0%
- Canada: 40.0%
- Germany: 20.0%
- England: 20.0%
- Others: 0.0%

**By Length of Stay (in months):**
- 0-3 Months: 42.9%
- 3-6 Months: 26.6%
- 6-12 Months: 7.1%
- 1-2 Years: 14.3%
- 2-5 Years: 7.1%
- 5-10 Years: 7.1%

**By Age:**
- 19-25 Yrs: 40.0%
- 26-35 Yrs: 20.0%
- 36-45 Yrs: 20.0%
- 46-55 Yrs: 20.0%

**By Gender:**
- Male: 100.0%

**By Severity of Offense:**
- Indeterminate Offenses: 40.0%
- Other Offenses: 40.0%
- Drug Offenses: 20.0%
- Index Offenses: 20.0%

**BACKGROUND DATA:**

- **Facility Name:** Nebraska Department of Corrections
- **Facility Location:** Based in Lincoln, Nebraska
- **State Population (2000):** 1,711,263 (100%)
- **State Foreign Population (2000):** 74,638 (4.4%)

**HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:**

- **Projection Method:** Holt-Winters Additive
- **Goodness of fit:**
  - RMSE: 8.0; MAD: 6.9; MAPE: 94.9
- **Data Source:** Facility Data Collected May 2004

**BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):**

- **By Place of Birth:**
  - Mexico: 76.4%
  - Guatemala: 5.7%
  - El Salvador: 4.7%
  - Laos: 2.8%
  - Sudan: 1.9%
  - Honduras: 1.9%
  - Vietnam: 0.9%
  - Guinea: 0.9%
  - Others: 4.7%

- **By Length of Stay (in months):**
  - 0-3 Months: 53.5%
  - 3-6 Months: 14.1%
  - 6-12 Months: 16.4%
  - 1-2 Years: 9.0%
  - 2-5 Years: 0.0%
  - 5-10 Years: 0.0%
  - 10+ Years: 0.0%
  - 0-18 Yrs: 2.8%
  - 19-25 Yrs: 37.7%
  - 26-35 Yrs: 37.7%
  - 36-45 Yrs: 16.0%
  - 46-55 Yrs: 3.8%
  - 55+ Yrs: 1.9%

- **By Age:** Data not available
- **By Gender:** Data not available
- **By Severity of Offense:**
  - Other Offenses: 81.1%
  - Drug Offenses: 11.3%
  - Index Offenses: 7.5%

**Historical Workload Forecasted Workload**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 99</th>
<th>FY 00</th>
<th>FY 01</th>
<th>FY 02</th>
<th>FY 03</th>
<th>FY 04</th>
<th>FY 05</th>
<th>FY 06</th>
<th>FY 07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Nevada Department of Corrections
Facility Location: Based in Carson City, Nevada
State Population (2000): 1,998,257 (100%)
State Foreign Population (2000): 316,593 (15.8%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Additive
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 10.8; MAD: 8.3; MAPE: 7.4
Data Source: Facility Data Collected April 2004

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

- Mexico: 66.2%
- Cuba: 5.9%
- Philippines: 5.3%
- El Salvador: 4.1%
- Honduras: 2.0%
- Canada: 1.6%
- Germany: 1.6%
- Guatemala: 1.2%
- Others: 10.2%

By Length of Stay (in months):

- 0-3 Months: 0.2%
- 3-6 Months: 2.1%
- 6-12 Months: 13.5%
- 1-2 Years: 44.7%
- 2-5 Years: 39.5%
- 5-10 Years: 0.0%
- 10+ Years: 0.0%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:

- 0-18 Yrs: 1.6%
- 19-25 Yrs: 27.8%
- 26-35 Yrs: 42.0%
- 36-45 Yrs: 20.2%
- 46-55 Yrs: 6.3%
- 55+ Yrs: 2.2%

By Gender:

- Male: 96.7%
- Female: 3.3%

By Severity of Offense:

- Index Offenses: 6.3%
- Other Offenses: 58.8%
- Drug Offenses: 34.9%

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,
BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: New Hampshire Department of Corrections
Facility Location: Based in Concord, New Hampshire

State Population (2000): 1,235,786 (100%)
State Foreign Population (2000): 54,154 (4.4%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Multiplicative
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 3.5; MAD: 2.8; MAPE: 45.7

Data Source: Facility Data Collected April 2004

Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 30

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Gender:

- Male: 100.0%
- Other Offenses: 13.3%
- Drug Offenses: 50.0%
- Other Offenses: 36.7%
- Index Offenses: 13.3%

By Sevéry of Offense:

- Drug Offenses: 50.0%
- Other Offenses: 36.7%
- Index Offenses: 13.3%
- Other Offenses: 13.3%

NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: New Jersey Department of Corrections
Facility Location: Based in Trenton, New Jersey
State Population (2000): 8,414,350 (100%)
State Foreign Population (2000): 1,476,327 (17.5%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Multiplicative
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 34.1; MAD: 28.8; MAPE: 15.3
Data Source: Facility Sent SCAAP Data in June 2004
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY02: 656

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2002 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

- Dominican Republic: 36.7%
- Cuba: 14.9%
- Jamaica: 12.5%
- Colombia: 9.0%
- Mexico: 8.4%
- Haiti: 8.7%
- El Salvador: 5.9%
- Ecuador: 2.7%
- Others: 3.4%
-Others: 3.4%

By Length of Stay (in months):

- 0-3 Months: 8.4%
- 3-6 Months: 28.3%
- 6-12 Months: 24.5%
- 1-2 Years: 28.7%
- 2-5 Years: 24.5%
- 5-10 Years: 5.0%
- 10+ Years: 2.7%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2002 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:

- 0-18 Yrs: 2.9%
- 19-25 Yrs: 32.3%
- 26-35 Yrs: 30.0%
- 36-45 Yrs: 23.8%
- 46-55 Yrs: 9.9%
- 55+ Yrs: 1.1%

By Gender:

- Data not available

By Severity of Offense:

- Data not available

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,
**BACKGROUND DATA:**

Facility Name: New Mexico Department of Corrections  
Facility Location: Based in Santa Fe, New Mexico  
State Population (2000): 1,819,046 (100%)  
State Foreign Population (2000): 149,606 (8.2%)

**HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:**

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Additive  
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 2.3; MAD: 1.7; MAPE: 41.0

Data Source: Facility Data Collected May 2004  
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 32

**BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):**

By Place of Birth:
- Mexico: 75.0%
- Cuba: 16.8%
- England: 3.1%
- Vietnam: 3.1%

By Length of Stay (in months):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>FY 99</th>
<th>FY 00</th>
<th>FY 01</th>
<th>FY 02</th>
<th>FY 03</th>
<th>FY 04</th>
<th>FY 05</th>
<th>FY 06</th>
<th>FY 07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3 Months</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6 Months</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-12 Months</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 Years</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 Years</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 Years</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ Years</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):**

By Age:
- 0-18 Yrs: 9.4%  
- 19-25 Yrs: 25.0%  
- 26-35 Yrs: 37.5%  
- 36-45 Yrs: 25.0%  
- 46-55 Yrs: 3.1%  
- 55+ Yrs: 9.4%

By Gender:
- Male: 96.9%  
- Female: 3.1%

By Severity of Offense:
- Drug Offenses: 34.4%  
- Other Offenses: 59.3%  
- Index Offenses: 6.3%

---

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: New York Department of Corrections
Facility Location: Based in Albany, New York

State Population (2000): 18,976,457 (100%)
State Foreign Population (2000): 3,868,133 (20.4%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Multiplicative
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 51.3; MAD: 42.0; MAPE: 9.0

Data Source: Facility Data Collected August 2004
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 2,167

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

- Dominican Republic: 36.3%
- Jamaica: 9.6%
- Mexico: 7.4%
- Colombia: 6.5%
- Guyana: 3.7%
- Trinidad and Tobago: 3.6%
- El Salvador: 3.0%
- Haiti: 2.9%
- Others: 26.9%

By Length of Stay (in months):

- 0-3 Months: 14.1%
- 3-6 Months: 11.6%
- 6-12 Months: 23.2%
- 1-2 Years: 15.6%
- 2-5 Years: 17.2%
- 5-10 Years: 10.4%
- 10+ Years: 7.4%

By Age:

- 0-18 Yrs: 3.1%
- 19-25 Yrs: 31.2%
- 26-35 Yrs: 31.8%
- 36-45 Yrs: 23.2%
- 46-55 Yrs: 8.5%
- 55+ Yrs: 2.2%

By Gender:

- Male: 95.2%
- Female: 4.8%

By Severity of Offense:

- Other Offenses: 26.0%
- Drug Offenses: 46.9%
- Index Offenses: 27.1%

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: North Dakota Dept. of Corrections & Rehabilitation
Facility Location: Based in Bismarck, North Dakota

State Population (2000): 642,200 (100%)
State Foreign Population (2000): 12,114 (1.9%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Seasonal Additive
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 1.2; MAD: 0.8; MAPE: 2.9

Data Source: Facility Data Collected July 2004

Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 4

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:
- Mexico: 50.0%
- Sudan: 50.0%

By Length of Stay (in months):
- 0-3 Months: 33.3%
- 3-6 Months: 33.3%
- 6-12 Months: 11.1%
- 1-2 Years: 22.3%
- 2-5 Years: 0.0%
- 5-10 Years: 0.0%
- 10+ Years: 0.0%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:
- 26-35 Yrs: 50.0%
- 19-25 Yrs: 50.0%

By Gender:
- Male: 100.0%

By Severity of Offense:
- Drug Offenses: 0.0%
- Other Offenses: 50.0%
- Index Offenses: 50.0%

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census, http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DTGeoSearchByListServlet?ds_name=DEC_2000_SF3_U&_lang=en&_ts=111439056474
BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Oklahoma Department of Corrections  
State Population (2000): 3,450,654 (100%)  
State Foreign Population (2000): 131,747 (3.8%)  

Facility Location: Based in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Additive
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 11.0; MAD: 9.0; MAPE: 18.1

Data Source: Facility Data Collected June 2004
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 228
Foreign Born (87%)  Indeterminate (13%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

- Mexico: 56.6%
- Germany: 6.1%
- Korea: 2.5%
- Vietnam: 2.0%
- United Kingdom: 2.0%
- Jamaica: 1.5%
- Canada: 1.5%
- Italy: 1.0%
- Others: 8.6%

By Length of Stay (in months):

- 0-3 Months: 18.7%
- 3-6 Months: 15.2%
- 6-12 Months: 12.0%
- 1-2 Years: 25.4%
- 2-5 Years: 34.4%
- 5-10 Years: 22.4%
- 10+ Years: 12.0%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:

- 0-18 Yrs: 0.5%
- 19-25 Yrs: 29.8%
- 26-35 Yrs: 36.9%
- 36-45 Yrs: 25.3%
- 46-55 Yrs: 7.6%
- 55+ Yrs: 0.0%

By Gender:

- Male: 54.4%
- Female: 45.6%

By Severity of Offense:

- Drug Offenses: 41.4%
- Other Offenses: 44.0%
- Index Offenses: 14.6%

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,  
BACKGROUND DATA:

- **Facility Name:** Oregon Department of Corrections
- **Facility Location:** Based in Salem, Oregon
- **State Population (2000):** 3,421,399 (100%)
- **State Foreign Population (2000):** 289,702 (8.5%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

- **Projection Method:** Seasonal Multiplicative
- **Goodness of fit:** RMSE: 12.5; MAD: 8.4; MAPE: 17.5
- **Data Source:** Facility Sent SCAAP Data in May 2004

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2002 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

**By Place of Birth:**
- Mexico: 70.9%
- Honduras: 3.6%
- Canada: 2.9%
- Germany: 2.5%
- Vietnam: 1.9%
- Guatemala: 1.9%
- United Kingdom: 1.5%
- Korea: 1.3%
- Others: 13.6%

**By Length of Stay (in months):**
- 0-3 Months: 7.0%
- 3-6 Months: 14.6%
- 6-12 Months: 30.1%
- 1-2 Years: 35.4%
- 2-5 Years: 15.7%
- 5-10 Years: 14.8%
- 10+ Years: 0.9%

**By Age:**
- 0-18 Yrs: 1.7%
- 19-25 Yrs: 32.2%
- 26-35 Yrs: 42.3%
- 36-45 Yrs: 17.2%
- 46-55 Yrs: 5.0%
- 55+ Yrs: 1.7%

**By Gender:**
- Data not available

**By Severity of Offense:**
- Data not available

---

BACKGROUND DATA:

- **Facility Name:** Pennsylvania Department of Corrections
- **Facility Location:** Based in Camp Hill

State Population (2000): 12,281,054 (100%)
State Foreign Population (2000): 508,291 (4.1%)  

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

- Projection Method: Holt-Winters Multiplicative
- Goodness of fit: RMSE: 11.9; MAD: 9.5; MAPE: 12.2
- Data Source: Facility Data Collected July 2004

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

- **By Place of Birth:**
  - Caribbean: 27.3%
  - Mexico: 8.3%
  - South America: 6.8%
  - Central America: 6.3%
  - Germany: 5.4%
  - Cuba: 5.4%
  - Africa: 4.4%
  - Jamaica: 20.5%
  - Others: 15.6%

- **By Length of Stay (in months):**
  - 0-3 Months: 3.1%
  - 3-6 Months: 2.3%
  - 6-12 Months: 18.6%
  - 1-2 Years: 32.6%
  - 2-5 Years: 20.9%
  - 5-10 Years: 15.5%
  - 10+ Years: 7.0%

- **By Age:**
  - 0-18 Yrs: 0.5%
  - 19-25 Yrs: 2.9%
  - 26-35 Yrs: 24.4%
  - 36-45 Yrs: 26.8%
  - 46-55 Yrs: 10.2%
  - 55+ Yrs: 2.9%

- **By Gender:**
  - Male: 95.1%
  - Female: 4.9%

- **By Severity of Offense:**
  - Drug Offenses: 41.0%
  - Other Offenses: 32.7%
  - Index Offenses: 26.3%

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: South Carolina Dept of Corrections
Facility Location: Based in Columbia, South Carolina

State Population (2000): 4,012,012 (100%)
State Foreign Population (2000): 115,978 (2.9%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Additive
Goodness of fit – RMSE 6.8; MAD: 5.5; MAPE: 28.3

Data Source: Facility Data Collected May 2004

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2002 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:
- Mexico: 30.2%
- West Germany: 5.5%
- East Germany: 4.5%
- England: 3.0%
- Philippines: 2.0%
- Japan: 2.0%
- Canada: 2.0%
- Colombia: 2.0%
- Others: 36.1%

By Length of Stay (in months):
Data not available

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2002 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:
- 0-18 Yrs: 3.0%
- 19-25 Yrs: 39.7%
- 26-35 Yrs: 16.1%
- 36-45 Yrs: 9.5%
- 46-55 Yrs: 1.5%
- 55+ Yrs: 1.0%

By Gender:
- Male: 94.0%
- Female: 6.0%

By Severity of Offense:
- Index Offenses: 13.1%
- Drug Offenses: 22.1%
- Other Offenses: 64.8%

---

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,
BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: South Dakota Department of Corrections  
Facility Location: Based in Pierre, South Dakota  
State Population (2000): 754,844 (100%)  
State Foreign Population (2000): 13,495 (1.8%)  

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Additive  
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 3.2; MAD: 2.2; MAPE: 56.9  
Data Source: Facility Data Collected June 2004  
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY02: 28

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2002 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

- Mexico: 82.1%  
- Guatemala: 7.1%  
- Ethiopia: 3.6%  
- Laos: 3.6%  
- Philippines: 3.6%

By Length of Stay (in months):

- 30.4% 0-3 Months  
- 13.0% 3-6 Months  
- 13.0% 6-12 Months  
- 8.7% 1-2 Years  
- 30.4% 2-5 Years  
- 4.5% 5-10 Years  
- 0.0% 10+ Years

By Age:

- 26-35 Yrs: 46.4%  
- 26-35 Yrs: 14.3%  
- 19-25 Yrs: 28.6%  
- 0-18 Yrs: 0.0%  
- 55+ Yrs: 7.1%  
- 46-55 Yrs: 3.6%

By Gender:

- Male: 100.0%

By Severity of Offense:

- Drug Offenses: 53.6%  
- Other Offenses: 39.3%  
- Index Offenses: 7.1%

---

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,  
BACKGROUND DATA:

- **Facility Name:** Tennessee Department of Corrections
- **Facility Location:** Based in Nashville, Tennessee
- **State Population (2000):** 5,689,283 (100%)
- **State Foreign Population (2000):** 159,004 (2.8%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

- **Projection Method:** Holt-Winters Additive
- **Goodness of fit:** RMSE: 5.1; MAD: 4.0; MAPE: 20.1

Data Source: Facility Data Collected March 2004

Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 117

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

- **By Place of Birth:**
  - Mexico: 70.1%
  - Germany: 3.4%
  - Honduras: 2.6%
  - Iraq: 1.7%
  - Sri Lanka: 1.7%
  - El Salvador: 1.7%
  - Nigeria: 1.7%
  - Kyrgyzstan: 1.7%
  - Others: 15.4%

- **By Length of Stay (in months):**

- **By Age:**
  - 0-18 Yrs: 0.9%
  - 19-25 Yrs: 35.9%
  - 26-35 Yrs: 36.8%
  - 36-45 Yrs: 18.8%
  - 46-55 Yrs: 7.7%
  - 55+ Yrs: 0.0%

- **By Gender:**
  - Male: 96.6%
  - Female: 3.4%

- **By Severity of Offense:**
  - Data not available

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Vermont Department of Corrections
Facility Location: Based in Waterbury, Vermont
State Population (2000): 608,827 (100%)
State Foreign Population (2000): 23,245 (3.8%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Seasonal Additive
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 1.9; MAD: 1.5; MAPE: 42.5

Data Source: Facility Data Collected July 2004
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 23

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Length of Stay (in months):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Stay</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3 Months</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6 Months</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-12 Months</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 Years</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 Years</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 Years</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ Years</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19-25 Yrs</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35 Yrs</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45 Yrs</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55 Yrs</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+ Yrs</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Gender: Data not available

By Severity of Offense: Data not available

---

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,
BACKGROUND DATA:

- **Facility Name:** Virginia Department of Corrections
- **Facility Location:** Based in Richmond, Virginia
- **State Population (2000):** 7,078,515 (100%)
- **State Foreign Population (2000):** 570,279 (8.1%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

- **Projection Method:** Holt-Winters Additive
- **Goodness of fit:** RMSE: 15.6; MAD: 12.3; MAPE: 15.2
- **Data Source:** Facility Data Collected August 2004

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

- **By Place of Birth:**
  - El Salvador: 22.5%
  - Mexico: 13.8%
  - Germany: 11.5%
  - Honduras: 8.1%
  - Vietnam: 4.2%
  - Guatemala: 3.7%
  - Korea: 2.3%
  - Philippines: 2.3%
  - Others: 33.8%

- **By Length of Stay (in months):**
  - 0.5 Months: 8.1%
  - 1.5 Months: 13.3%
  - 3-6 Months: 28.2%
  - 6-12 Months: 27.8%
  - 1-2 Years: 22.6%
  - 2-5 Years: 22.5%
  - 5-10 Years: 5.8%
  - 10+ Years: 0%

- **By Age:**
  - 0-18 Yrs: 1.4%
  - 19-25 Yrs: 30.7%
  - 26-35 Yrs: 40.3%
  - 36-45 Yrs: 18.3%
  - 46-55 Yrs: 7.3%
  - 55+ Yrs: 2.1%

- **By Gender:**
  - Male: 94.6%
  - Female: 5.4%

- **By Severity of Offense:**
  - Index Offenses: 30.7%
  - Other Offenses: 51.5%
  - Drug Offenses: 17.8%

---

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Washington Department of Corrections  
State Population (2000): 5,894,121 (100%)
Facility Location: Based in Olympia, Washington  
State Foreign Population (2000): 614,457 (10.4%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Multiplicative
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 11.9; MAD: 9.5; MAPE: 12.2

Data Source: Facility Sent SCAAP Data in July 2004

Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 327

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2002 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

- Mexico: 77.5%
- Vietnam: 4.5%
- Cuba: 3.7%
- Canada: 1.9%
- Cambodia: 1.6%
- Honduras: 1.3%
- Philippines: 1.3%
- Laos: 1.3%
- Others: 6.6%

By Length of Stay (in months):

- 0-3 Months: 1.3%
- 3-6 Months: 7.3%
- 6-12 Months: 15.1%
- 1-2 Years: 15.4%
- 2-5 Years: 15.4%
- 5-10 Years: 7.8%
- 10+ Years: 36.7%

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2002 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:

- 0-18 Yrs: 5.3%
- 19-25 Yrs: 36.6%
- 26-35 Yrs: 40.6%
- 36-45 Yrs: 13.8%
- 46-55 Yrs: 1.6%
- 55+ Yrs: 2.1%

By Gender:

- Male: 99.2%
- Female: 0.8%

By Severity of Offense:

- Index Offenses: 24.7%
- Drug Offenses: 15.4%
- Other Offenses: 59.9%

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,
http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DTGeoSearchByListServlet?ds_name=DEC_2000_SF3_U&_lang=en&_ts=111439056474

WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
ICE.000141.09-2742
BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Wisconsin Department of Corrections
Facility Location: Based in Madison, Wisconsin
State Population (2000): 5,363,675 (100%)
State Foreign Population (2000): 193,751 (3.6%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:

Projection Method – Seasonal Multiplicative
Goodness of fit – RMSE: 7.9; MAD: 6.1; MAPE: 12.6
Data Source: Facility Data Collected April 2004
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 249

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

- Mexico: 57.0%
- Laos: 8.0%
- Germany: 5.6%
- Thailand: 4.4%
- Cuba: 4.0%
- Dominican Republic: 3.6%
- Colombia: 2.4%
- El Salvador: 1.6%
- Others: 13.3%

By Gender:

- Male: 98.4%
- Female: 1.6%

By Severity of Offense:

- Drug Offenses: 34.1%
- Other Offenses: 52.2%
- Index Offenses: 13.7%

1 Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census, http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DTGeoSearchByListServlet?ds_name=DEC_2000_SF3_U&_lang=en&_ts=111439056474
**BACKGROUND DATA:**

- **Facility Name:** Wyoming Department of Corrections
- **Facility Location:** Based in Cheyenne, Wyoming
- **State Population (2000):** 493,782 (100%)
- **State Foreign Population (2000):** 11,205 (2.3%)

**HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:**

- **Projection Method:** Holt-Winters Multiplicative
- **Goodness of fit:** RMSE: 2.8; MAD: 2.3; MAPE: 67.9
- **Data Source:** Facility Data Collected June 2004

**BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):**

- **By Place of Birth:**
  - Mexico: 63.0%
  - Germany: 11.1%
  - Canada: 11.1%
  - Taiwan: 3.7%
  - Peru: 3.7%
  - Others: 7.4%

- **By Length of Stay (in months):**
  - 0-3 Months: 0.0%
  - 3-6 Months: 18.8%
  - 6-12 Months: 18.8%
  - 1-2 Years: 25.0%
  - 2-5 Years: 37.4%
  - 5-10 Years: 0.0%
  - 10+ Years: 0.0%

- **By Age:**
  - 0-18 Yrs: 0.0%
  - 19-25 Yrs: 0.0%
  - 26-35 Yrs: 33.3%
  - 36-45 Yrs: 22.2%
  - 46-55 Yrs: 11.1%
  - 55+ Yrs: 0.0%

- **By Gender:**
  - Male: 100.0%

- **By Severity of Offense:**
  - Drug Offenses: 25.9%
  - Index Offenses: 18.5%
  - Other Offenses: 55.6%

---