U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement

U.S. Department of Homeland Security



Institutional Removal Program National Workload Study

September 2004

Prepared by Fentress Incorporated

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	I
Chapter 1. Background	1-1
Introduction	
Program Description	1-1
Program Audit	
Summary	
Chapter 2. Scope of Services	2-1
Introduction	
Scope of Services	2-1
Project Administration, Working Group, and Reporting	
Define IRP Workload and the Timing of the IRP Process	2-1
Summary	2-2 2-3
Chapter 3. Data Collection	3-1
Introduction	3-1
Data Collection Approach	
Data Fields	
Timeframe and Admissions	
Appriss, Inc. Role	
Desuits - Data Collected	
Data Cleaning and Analysis	3-11
Summary	
Chapter 4. Data Analysis	4-1
Introduction	1_1
Analytical Plan	
Treatment of Records with Unknown Place of Birth.	
Analysis of Historical Workload Composition	
Levels of Workload Aggregation	
Forecasting Methodology	4-4
Summary	4-6
Chapter 5. Results	5-1
Historical and Projected IRP Workload	
FY 2003 Workload Composition	5-10
Appendix A. Data Collection	A-1
Appendix B. Forecasting Methodology	B-1
Appendix C. Results by Location	C-1

i

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 3-1. List of Local Jails and Organizations	
Table 3-2. Summary of Data Collected	3-5
Figure 4-1. Map of ICE Field Office Boundaries	4-3
Table 5-1. Historical and Projected IRP Workload by ICE Field Office	5-2
Table 5-2. Historical and Projected IRP Workload by State	5-6
Figure 5-1. Foreign-Born Inmates by Place of Birth	5-11
Figure 5-2. Foreign-Born Jail Inmates by Length of Stay (in days)	5-11
Figure 5-3. Foreign-Born DOC Inmates by Length of Stay	5-12
Figure 5-4. Foreign-Born Inmates by Offense.	5-12
Figure 5-5. Foreign-Born Inmates by Gender	5-13
Figure 5-6. Foreign-Born Inmates by Age	5-13
Figure 5-6. Foreign-Born Inmates by Age	5-13
Table B-1. Forecasting Methods and Selection Criteria	B-7
Figure B-1. Single Moving Average Historical Data and Forecast	В-8
Figure B-2. Double Moving Average Historical Data and Forecast	В-8
Figure B-4. Double Exponential Smoothing Historical Data and Forecast	B-10
Figure B-5. Seasonal, Additive Smoothing Historical Data and Forecast	B-11
Figure B-6. Seasonal, Multiplicative Smoothing Historical Data and Forecast	B-12
Figure B-7. Holt-Winters Additive Seasonal Historical Data and Forecast	B-13
Figure B-8. Holt-Winters Multiplicative Seasonal Historical Data and Forecast	B-14
Table B-2. Characteristics of Data for Time-Series Methods	B-14

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.

L

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:²

- A total of 382,466 foreign-born inmates were admitted in FY 2003, 346,152 to jails and 36,314 to DOCs.³
- 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.⁴
- 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.⁵

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 avoided⁸) 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 control⁹), 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).¹⁰

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 50.¹¹ 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.

	FACILITY / ORGANIZATION	State
1	Alameda County Sheriff's Office	CA
2	Bernalillo County Jail	NM
3	Bexar County Sheriff's Office	ТХ
4	Broward County Sheriff's Department	FI
5	Broward County Work Release Center - Wackenhut	FL
6	City of Philadelphia Prison System	PA
7	Clark County Detention Center	NV
8	Cobb County Sheriff's Office	GA
9	Contra Costa County Sheriff's Office	CA
10	Cook County Sheriff's Department	IL
11	Cuyahoga County Sheriff's Office	ОН
12	Dallas County Sheriff's Office	ТХ
13	Davidson County Sheriff's Department - Admin.	TN
14	De Kalb County Sheriff's Department	GA
15	Denver Sheriff's Department	СО
16	El Paso County Detention Facility	ΤХ
17	Essex County Department of Public Safety	NJ
18	Franklin County Community-Based Corrections	ОН
19	Franklin County Sheriff's Office	ОН
20	Fresno County Sheriff's Department	CA
21	Harris County Sheriff's Department	ТХ
22	Hennepin County Sheriff's Office	MN
23	Hillsborough County Sheriff's Office	FL
24	Hudson County Corrections Center	NJ
25	Jacksonville Sheriff's Office	FL
26	Jefferson County Sheriff's Office	KY
27	Kern County Sheriff's Department	CA
28	King County Dept. of Adult Detention	WA
29	Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department	CA
30	Maricopa County Sheriff's Department	AZ
31	Marion County Jail II - C.C.A.	IN
32	Marion County Sheriff's Department	IN
33	Mecklenburg County Sheriff's Office	NC
34	Miami Dade County Correct. & Rehab. Dept.	FL
35	Milwaukee County House of Corrections	WI
36	Milwaukee County Jail	WI

Table 3-1. List of Local Jails and Organizations

	FACILITY / ORGANIZATION	State
37	Monterey County Jail	CA
38	Montgomery County Jail	MD
39	Multnomah County Sheriff's Office	OR
40	Nashville-Davidson Metro Detention Facility - C.C.A.	TN
41	New York City Department of Corrections	NY
42	Oklahoma County Sheriff's Office	ОК
43	Orange County Corrections Department	FL
44	Orange County Sheriff's Department	CA
45	Palm Beach County Sheriff's Office	FL
46	Passaic County Jail	NJ
47	Pierce County Sheriff's Department	WA
48	Pima County Jail	AZ
49	Pinellas County Sheriff's Office	FL
50	Plymouth County Sheriff's Department	MA
51	Reeves County Law Enforcement Center	ТХ
52	Reeves County Sheriff's Office	ТХ
53	Riverside County Sheriff's Department	CA
54	Sacramento County Sheriff's Department	CA
55	Salt Lake County Sheriff's Office	UT
56	San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department	CA
57	San Diego County Correctional Alternatives, Inc.	CA
58	San Diego County Sheriff's Department	CA
59	San Francisco County Sheriff's Dept.	CA
60	San Mateo County Jail	CA
61	Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Department	CA
62	Santa Clara County Department of Corrections	CA
63	Suffolk County - Riverhead Facility	NY
64	Suffolk County Sheriff's Department	MA
65	Tarrant County Sheriff's Department	ТХ
66	Travis County Sheriff's Office	ТХ
67	Tulare County Sheriff's Office - County Civic Center	CA
68	Ventura County Jail	CA
69	Wayne County Sheriff's Department	MI
70	Yakima County Sheriff's Office	WA
71	Yuma County Sheriff's Office	AZ

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.¹² 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 realtime 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.¹³ 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.

			Lo	cal Jails					
FACILITY / ORGANIZATION	State	Submitted Usable Data	# Years Provided	Nationality	Age	Gender	LOS	Offense	Comments
Alameda County Sheriff's Office	CA	Yes	5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Bernalillo County Jail	NM	No							Limited or no response to requests.
Bexar County Sheriff's Office	TX	Yes	5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Appriss site
Broward County Sheriff's Department	FL	Yes	5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Broward County Work Release Center - Wackenhut	FL	No							Private facility - Limited or no response to requests.
City of Philadelphia Prison System	PA	Yes	5	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
Clark County Detention Center	NV	Yes	4	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ν	
Cobb County Sheriff's Office	GA	Yes	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Contra Costa County Sheriff's Office	CA	No		·					Did not submit usable data by cut- off date.
Cook County Sheriff's Department	IL	Yes	5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Appriss site
Cuyahoga County Sheriff's Office	OH	Yes	4	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Appriss site
Dallas County Sheriff's Office	ΤХ	No		·					Did not submit usable data by cut- off date.
Davidson County Sheriff's Department - Admin.	TN	Yes	3	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Appriss site
De Kalb County Sheriff's Department	GA	Yes	2	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Denver Sheriff's Department	со	No							Willing to participate; however, does not collect place of birth information at time of booking.
El Paso County Detention Facility	ТХ	No							Appriss site. Declined to participate.
Essex County Department of Public Safety	NJ	Yes	5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Appriss site
Franklin County Community-Based Corrections	ОН	No							Private facility - Limited or no response to requests.
Franklin County Sheriff's Office	ОН	No				_			Willing to participate; however, does not collect place of birth information at time of booking.
Fresno County Sheriff's Department	CA	Yes	2	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Harris County Sheriff's Department	ТХ	Yes	2	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Hennepin County Sheriff's Office	MN	Yes	2	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Hillsborough County Sheriff's Office	FL	Yes	5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	

Table 3-2. Summary of Data Collected

Local Jails												
FACILITY / ORGANIZATION	State	Submitted Usable Data	# Years Provided	Nationality	Age	Gender	LOS	Offense	Comments			
Hudson County Corrections Center	NJ	Yes	5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Appriss site			
Jacksonville Sheriff's Office	FL	Yes	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Jefferson County Sheriff's Office	KY	Yes	5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Appriss site			
Kern County Sheriff's Department	CA	Yes	5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
King County Dept. of Adult Detention	WA	No							Appriss site. Unwilling to participate. Concerns about confidentiality of inmate information.			
Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department	CA	Yes	5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Appriss site			
Maricopa County Sheriff's Department	AZ	Yes	5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Marion County Sheriff's Department	IN	No							Submitted data that was not usable.			
Marion County Jail II - C.C.A.	IN	No							Private facility - admission data included in Marion County Jail data.			
Mecklenburg County Sheriff's Office	NC	Yes	2	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Miami Dade County Correct. & Rehab. Dept.	FL	No							Declined to participate. Concerns on resources needed to pull the data.			
Milwaukee County House of Corrections	WI	Yes	4	Y	Y	Y	Y	N				
Milwaukee County Jail	WI	Yes	4	Y	Y	Y	Y	N				
Monterey County Jail	CA	No							Declined to participate.			
Montgomery County Jail	MD	No							Limited or no response to requests.			
Multnomah County Sheriff's Office	OR	Yes	4	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Nashville-Davidson Metro Detention Facility - C.C.A.	TN	No							Private facility - Limited or no response to requests.			
New York City Department of Corrections	NY	Yes	5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ν	Appriss site			
Oklahoma County Sheriff's Office	OK	Yes	3	Ν	Y	Y	Y	N				
Orange County Corrections Department	FL	Yes	4	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ν				
Orange County Sheriff's Department	CA	Yes	4	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Appriss site			
Palm Beach County Sheriff's Office	FL	Yes	5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Appriss site			
Passaic County Jail	NJ	Yes	5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Appriss site			
Pierce County Sheriff's Department	WA	Yes	4	Y	Y	N	Y	Y				

Local Jails												
FACILITY / ORGANIZATION	State	Submitted Usable Data	# Years Provided	Nationality	Age	Gender	LOS	Offense	Comments			
Pima County	AZ	Yes	4	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Pinellas County Sheriff's Office	FL	Yes	4	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Plymouth County Sheriff's Department	MA	Yes	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Reeves County Law Enforcement Center	тх	No							Private facility - Limited or no response to requests.			
Reeves County Sheriff's Office	тх	No							Willing to participate. Requested on- site assistance that could not be provided.			
Riverside County Sheriff's Department	CA	Yes	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Sacramento County Sheriff's Department	CA	No							Limited or no response to requests.			
Salt Lake County Sheriff's Office	UT	No							Did not submit usable data by cut-off date.			
San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department	CA	No							Appriss site. Submitted data that was not usable. Does not collect place of birth information at time of booking. Private facility - Limited or no response			
San Diego County Correctional Alternatives, Inc.	CA	No							to requests.			
San Diego County Sheriff's Department	CA	Yes	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
San Francisco County Sheriff's Dept.	CA	No							booking records. Data not available due to ongoing system conversion.			
San Mateo County	CA	No							Declined to participate.			
Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Department	CA	No							Declined to participate.			
Santa Clara County Department of Corrections	CA	Yes	5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Suffolk County - Riverhead Facility	NY	Yes	5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Appriss site			
Suffolk County Sheriff's Department	MA	No							Limited or no response to requests.			
Tarrant County Sheriff's Department	тх	No							Appriss site. Limited or no response to requests.			
Travis County Sheriff's Office	ТХ	Yes	3	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Appriss site			
Tulare County Sheriff's Office - County Civic Center	CA	Yes	5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Appriss site			
Ventura County	CA	Yes	3	Y	Y	N	Y	N				
Wayne County Sheriff's Department	MI	Yes	3	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Yakima County Sheriff's Office	WA	Yes	5	Y	Ν	N	Y	N				
Yuma County Sheriff's Office	AZ	Yes	3	Y	Y	N	Y	N				

Departments of Corrections												
FACILITY / ORGANIZATION	State	Submitted Usable Data	# Years Provided	Nationality	Age	Gender	LOS	Offense	Comments			
Alabama Department of Corrections	AL	Yes	5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ν				
Alaska Department of Corrections	AK	Yes	2	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ν				
Arizona Department of Corrections	AZ	No							Did not submit usable data by cut-off date.			
Arkansas Department of Corrections	AR	Yes	4	Y	Y	N	Y	Y				
California Department of Corrections	CA	No							Did not submit usable data by cut-off date.			
California Youth & Adult Correctional Agency	CA	No							Private facility - initial communication not well received. Facility not pursued.			
Colorado Department of Corrections	CO	Yes	5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Connecticut Department of Corrections	СТ	No							Submitted data that was not usable. Does not collect place of birth information at booking.			
Delaware Department of Corrections	DE	Yes	3	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Florida Department of Corrections	FL	Yes	4	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Georgia Department of Corrections	GA	Yes	4	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Hawaii Department of Public Safety	HI	Yes	5	Y	Y	N	Y	Y				
Idaho Department of Corrections	ID	Yes	5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Illinois Department of Corrections	IL	No							Did not submit usable data by cut-off date.			
Indiana Department of Corrections	IN	No							Submitted data that was not usable. Does not collect place of birth information at booking.			
lowa Department of Corrections	IA	Yes	4	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Kansas Department of Corrections	KS	Yes	5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Kentucky Department of Corrections	KY	Yes	5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Louisiana Dept. of Public Safety & Corrections	LA	No							Submitted data that was not usable. Does not collect place of birth information at booking.			
Maine Department of Corrections	ME	Yes	5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Maryland Department of Public Safety & Correctional Services	MD	No							Submitted data that was not usable. Does not collect place of birth information at booking.			

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

Departments of Corrections													
FACILITY / ORGANIZATION	State	Submitted Usable Data	# Years Provided	Nationality	Age	Gender	LOS	Offense	Comments				
Utah Department of Corrections	UT	No			—				Appriss site. Submitted data that was not usable. Does not collect place of birth information at booking.				
Vermont Department of Corrections	VT	Yes	1	Y	Y	Ν	Y	Ν					
Virginia Department of Corrections	VA	Yes	4	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y					
Washington Department of Corrections	WA	Yes	5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y					
West Virginia Division of Corrections	WV	No							Willing to participate; however, does not collect place of birth information at booking.				
Wisconsin Department of Corrections	WI	Yes	5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ν					
Wyoming Department of Corrections	WY	Yes	3	Y	Y	Y	N	Y					

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.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.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.

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).

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.

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.).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).¹⁷ Summary results can be found in Chapter 5. Detailed results for each facility are presented in Appendix C.

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.¹⁸ Figure 4-1 displays the Field Office boundaries.

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

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.

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.



Figure 4-1. Map of ICE Field Office Boundaries

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.¹⁹

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 nonstatistical 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).

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.

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 2003.²⁰

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 2011.²¹ The mathematical approach used to produce the workload projections is summarized in the *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.

¹⁹ 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.

²⁰ For those locations where the data did not cover all of FY 2003, FY 2002 data were used to calculate workload composition percentages.

²¹ 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.

Forecasting Approach

At the outset of the project, three forecasting techniques were considered: qualitative, regression, and timeseries. 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.²² 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.²³ 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.²⁴

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.²⁵

Because this is a non-statistical adjustment, the 5% and 95% confidence limits are not applicable to the SCAAPadjusted 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.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.

²⁵ The historical and fitted values from the SCAAP forecast were not altered.

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.²⁷ The projected workload values were produced by time-series analyses as described in Appendix B.

²⁷ 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.

Location	Historical	Workload				Forecaste	d Workload		
Atlanta Field Office	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
Mecklenburg County, NC **				3,358	3,495	3,590	3,590	3,590	3,590
Cobb County, GA **					6,539	5,962	6,530	6,530	6,530
DeKalb County, GA **				710	839	930	913	913	913
Georgia DOC	382	391	441	463	503	496	509	522	535
North Carolina DOC ***	423	490	410	544	535	528	528	528	528
South Carolina DOC	119	107	149	184	199	209	241	264	287
Jail Totals	0	0	0	4,068	10,873	10,482	11,033	11,033	11,033
DOC Totals	924	988	1,000	1,191	1,237	1,233	1,278	1,314	1,350
Baltimore Field Office	FY 99	EY 00	FY 01	EY 02	EY 03	FY 04	EY 05	EY 06	EY 07
City of Philadelphia PA	475	454	467	481	535	469	525	539	554
Delaware DOC		373	751	672	609	603	605	605	605
Maryland DOC ***		135	126	140	172	177	193	208	223
Pennsylvania DOC			153	207	205	227	248	278	309
Jail Totals	475	454	467	481	535	469	525	539	554
DOC Totals	0	508	1,030	1,019	986	1,007	1,046	1,091	1,137
	T V 00	E 14 00		EX 00	E 14.000	5 24.0.4		E 24.00	
Boston Field Office	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
Connections DOC ***	101	170	104	210	474	074	004	004	004
Maina DOC	191		104		202	202	202	202	202
Magagabugatta DOC	150	120	150	105	J 177	100	700	711	
New Hermahire DOC	150	1.00	159		- 177	190	200	211	221
Devide Jaland DOC	11/	33	35	ZZ	30	35	33	32	30
Knode Island DOC	10	993	040	537	//0	737	/3/	/ 3/	/3/
Vermont DOC	19	17	10	10	23	974	22	22	22
DOC Totals	202	1 260	1 249	1 095	4/4	0/4	1 261	1 271	1 270
DOC Totals	302	1,300	1,240	1,005	1,201	1,255	1,201	1,271	1,219
Buffalo Field Office	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
No Participating Locations									
Jail Totals	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DOC Totals	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chisago Eigld Office	EV 00	EV 00	EV 04	EV 02	EV 02	EV.04	EV 06	EV 06	EV 07
Cook County II	7 183	7 589	8.051	9.052	9 033	9 544	10.032	10 495	10.958
Jefferson County, KY	537	612	1.532	1,123	1.081	1.287	1.337	1.337	1.337
Milwaukee County, WI		915	1.137	1,160	1.235	1.255	1.307	1.335	1.362
Illinois DOC ***		728	898	904	904	904	904	904	904
Indiana DOC ***		94	83	141	135	135	135	135	135
Kansas DOC	49	56	71	95	101	72	109	120	131
Kentucky DOC	50	82	103	114	162	173	195	214	233
Missouri DOC	132	178	182	220	200	257	270	282	294
Wisconsin DOC	178	166	172	212	249	225	236	246	256
Jail Totals	7.720	9,116	10,720	11,335	11,349	12.086	12,676	13,167	13,657
DOC Totals	409	1,304	1,509	1,686	1,751	1,766	1,849	1,901	1,953
Dallas Field Office	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
Travie County, TV		6 552	9 050	200	2JO Q 199	9,640	10 222	11 010	11 Q17
Oklahoma DOC	250	2,332	171	0,073	9,100 109	5,040	10,222	11,019	11,017 רדר
	200	6 552	8.612	8 072	9 422	204	209	200	12 600
DOC Totals	256	209	171	220	3,423	3,314	250	265	12,039
DOCTORIS	230	205	1/1	220	130	234	233	205	212

Table 5-1. Historical and Projected IRP Workload by ICE Field Office

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 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.

Location	Historical	Workload				Forecaste	d Workload	1	
D.C. Field Office	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
Virginia DOC	199	222	327	3/8	427	438	455	4/1	487
Jail Totals	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DOC Lotals	199	222	327	3/8	427	438	455	4/1	487
Denver Field Office	FY 99	FY 00	EY 01	FY 02	FY 03	EY 04	FY 05	FY 06	EY 07
Colorado DOC	412	403	442	525	511	509	534	559	583
Idaho DOC	207	214	158	171	207	219	243	266	289
Montana DOC					5	6	7	8	9
Wyoming DOC		5	26	22	27	22	26	27	29
Jail Totals	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DOC Totals	619	622	626	718	750	756	810	860	910
	514.00	514.00	EX 6 4	E14.00	514.00	E 14.0.4	514.05	E14.00	
Detroit Field Office	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
Vvayne County, MI	074	540	52	36	63	37	43	43	43
Cuyahoga County, UH	3/1	519	624	481	405	4//	483	483	483
Michigan DUC	103	80	/5	113	144	126	134	142	150
Unio DUC ***	274	540	100	198	216	208	208	208	208
Jail Lotais	3/1	519	676	21/	468	214	526	526	526
DUC Lotais	10.3	80	1/5	311	360	334	342	300	308
El Paso Field Office	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
New Mexico DOC ***	3	5	14	16	32	30	32	37	42
Jail Totals	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DOC Totals	3	5	14	16	32	30	32	37	42
	C) (00	C) (00	514.04	576.00	C) (00	C) (0.4	51(.05	57.08	C) (07
	FY 99	FYUU	FYUI	10 CO1	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 00	FY U/ 10.004
	2042	2 151	2.561	10,001	4 790	4 707	4 070	5 050	10,324 5 115
	3,043	3,131	3,361	4,059	4,700	4,707	4,079	16 407	16 024
DOC Totals	3.843	3 151	3 561	4 059	4,731	4 707	4 879	5 052	5 225
Doc rotals	5,045	5,151	5,501	4,033	4,700	4,101	4,015	5,052	5,225
Los Angeles Field Office	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
Clark County, NV	5,158	7,131	7,460	7,502	7,227	7,420	7,212	7,322	7,432
Los Angeles County, CA	112,663	113,029	113,472	105,536	109,824	111,034	110,443	110,443	110,443
Orange County, CA		18,995	17,459	16,856	17,168	17,647	18,406	18,676	18,947
Riverside County, CA **				2,750	7,704	8,267	8,354	8,354	8,354
Ventura County, CA		2,500	2,662	2,061	558	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500
California DOC ***	16,313	14,794	13,635	13,556	13,370	13,557	13,557	13,557	13,557
Jail Totals	117,821	141,655	141,053	134,705	142,481	146,868	146,915	147,295	147,676
DOC Lotals	16,313	14,794	13,635	13,556	13,370	13,557	13,557	13,557	13,557
Miami Field Office	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
Broward County, FL	8,067	11,012	10,672	10,630	11,128	10,959	11,518	12,077	12,636
Hillsborough County, FL	4,299	5,221	6,044	6,837	8,351	9,236	10,200	11,171	12,142
Jacksonville, FL			·		1,523	1,547	1,572	1,580	1,588
Orange County, FL		902	2,910	3,627	1,929	1,920	2,017	2,017	2,017
Palm Beach County, FL	4,675	5,439	5,733	5,938	6,583	7 ,538	7,904	8,275	8,647
Pinellas County, FL		786	1,130	1,541	1,709	1,986	2,339	2,648	2,956
Florida DOC	909	1,750	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	35,550	37,768	39,986
DOC Totals	909	1,750	1,641	1,685	1,757	1,737	1,753	1,768	1,784

Shaded Blue Box denotes facility sent at least Q1 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.

Location	Historical	Workload		Forecasted Workload					
New Orleans Field Office	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
Davidson County, TN			1,927	2,325	2,551	3,045	3,447	3,840	4,233
Alabama DOC	62	48	43	34	38	49	52	54	57
Arkansas DOC	3	14	37	28	57	43	61	69	79
Louisiana DOC ***	65	26	38	40	40	40	40	40	40
Mississippi DOC ***	5	12	22	48	47	62	56	56	56
Tennessee DOC	46	67	100	100	117	114	130	139	148
Jail Totals	0	0	1,927	2,325	2,551	3,045	3,447	3,840	4,233
DOC Totals	181	167	240	250	299	308	339	358	380
New York City Field Office	FY 99	EY 00	EY 01	EY 02	EY 03	EY 04	EY 05	EY 06	EY 07
New York City, NY	4 832	4 389	4 541	5 884	14 422	15.524	15 524	15.524	15.524
Suffolk County, NY	1.475	1,636	1,480	1.647	1.745	1.673	1.626	1.670	1,714
New York DOC	2.291	2.207	2,151	2.082	2.167	2.039	2,192	2.328	2,463
Jail Totals	6.307	6.025	6.021	7.531	16.167	17,197	17.150	17,194	17.238
DOC Totals	2,291	2,207	2,151	2,082	2,167	2,039	2,192	2,328	2,463
Newark Field Office	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
Essex County, NJ	524	466	5/1	/13	6/2	627	648	675	/01
Hudson County, NJ	3,046	3,337	3,608	3,390	4,141	4,011	4,032	3,267	4,502
Passaic County, NJ	1,641	1,245	1,369	2,038	1,711	3,589	3,855	3,855	3,855
New Jersey DUC	946	947	6/1	656	646	/12	779	885	911
Jall Totals	5,211	5,048	5,548	6,141	6,524	8,227	8,333	1,191	9,058
DOC Totals	946	947	6/1	636	646	/1Z	119	688	911
Phoenix Field Office	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
Maricopa County, AZ	17,189	16,914	16,593	17,298	18,954	19,429	19,871	20,313	20,755
Pima County, AZ		1,136	1,751	2,187	2,203	2,252	2,252	2,252	2,252
Yuma County, AZ		158	611	668	525	758	807	855	904
Arizona DOC ***	912	1,158	1,400	1,728	1,939	2,265	2,556	2,847	3,138
Jail Totals	17,189	18,208	18,955	20,153	21,682	22,439	22,930	23,420	23,911
DOC Totals	912	1,158	1,400	1,728	1,939	2,265	2,556	2,847	3,138
St. Paul Field Office	FY 99	EY 00	FY 01	EY 02	EY 03	FY 04	EY 05	EY 06	FY 07
Hennenin County, MN				5 294	4 643	4 242	4 221	4 221	4 221
	66	132	113	126	141	138	148	156	164
Minnesota DOC	49	93	118	204	245	288	330	372	414
Nebraska DOC	83	108	94	98	106	102	107	113	119
North Dakota DOC	9	5	9	5	4	9	12	12	12
South Dakota DOC	18	15	17	28	20	21	21	23	24
Jail Totals	0	0	0	5,294	4,643	4,242	4,221	4,221	4,221
DOC Totals	225	353	351	461	516	558	618	676	733
	514.00	574.00		514.00	54.00	514.0.4	514.95	514.00	514.07
San Antonio Field Office	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
Bexar County, IX	5,497	5,9/8	6,155 6,455	6,851	7,562	7,142	7,275	7,275	7,2/5
DOC Totals	5,497	5,978	6,155	6,851	7,562	7,142	1,2/5	7,275	1,2/5
			•	5	0	J	0	0	0
San Diego Field Office	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
San Diego County, CA **					14,476	14,403	15,031	15,560	16,289
Jail Totals	0	0	0	0	14,476	14,403	15,031	15,560	16,289
DOC Totals	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Shaded Blue Box denotes facility sent at least Q1 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.

Location	Historica	l Workload	Forecasted Workload						
San Francisco Field Office	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
Alameda County, CA	4,447	4,582	4,919	4,635	4,975	5,147	5,153	5,265	5,376
Fresno County, CA				6,756	6,765	6,692	6,753	6,753	6,753
Kern County, CA	5,429	7,891	9,459	9,092	9,348	9,512	9,602	9,602	9,602
Santa Clara County, CA	13,606	18,347	17,514	17,581	18,227	18,373	18,391	18,391	18,391
Tulare County, CA	5,935	6,277	5,965	6,506	6,282	6,299	6,397	6,483	6,569
Nevada DOC	305	418	421	428	510	523	546	568	590
Hawaii DOC	1,545	1,320	1,302	1,094	1,148	1,330	1,291	1,291	1,291
Utah DOC ***	87	121	110	72	115	114	114	114	114
Jail Totals	29,417	37,097	37,857	44,570	45,597	46,023	46,296	46,494	46,691
DOC Totals	1,937	1,859	1,833	1,594	1,773	1,967	1,951	1,973	1,995
Seattle Field Office	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
Multnomah County, OR	2,872	3,662	3,552	3,548	3,095	3,708	3,708	3,708	3,708
Pierce County, WA	141	493	396	450	368	440	497	555	612
Yakima County, WA	1,689	1,864	1,836	1,663	1,930	2,353	2,290	2,290	2,290
Alaska DOC				1,299	1,382	1,484	1,554	1,637	1,720
Oregon DOC				478	359	467	464	464	464
Washington DOC	248	292	306	377	324	381	386	391	396
Jail Totals	4,702	6,019	5,784	5,661	5,393	6,501	6,495	6,553	6,610
DOC Totals	248	292	306	2,154	2,065	2,332	2,404	2,492	2,580
Total Jail Workload (participating									
locations)	211,751	260,031	270,264	300,858	346,152	358,731	366,030	371,637	379,445
Total DOC Workload (participating									
locations)	30,700	31,976	31,889	34,849	36,314	37,253	38,360	39,496	40,554

Shaded Blue Box denotes facility sent at least Q1 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.

Abbama FV 00 FV 01 FV 02 FV 03 FV 04 FV 05 FV 05 Abbama DOC 62 48 43 34 38 49 52 54 57 Abbama DOC 62 48 43 34 38 49 52 54 57 Abbama DOC 62 48 43 34 38 49 52 54 57 Abbama DOC 700 FV 00 FV 00 <th>Location</th> <th>Historical We</th> <th>orkload</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Forecasted</th> <th>Workload</th> <th></th> <th></th>	Location	Historical We	orkload				Forecasted	Workload		
Alabama FY 00 FY 01 FY 02 FY 03 FY 05 FY 06 FY 05 FY 06 FY 05 FY 06 FY 07 I 239 I 332 I 444 I .554 I .551 I .551 <thi .551<="" th=""> <thi .551<="" th=""> <thi .551<="" t<="" th=""><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></thi></thi></thi>										
Absta FY 09 FY 00 FY 01 FY 02 FY 03 FY 04 FY 05 FY 06 FY 06 FY 07 Absta DOC 1.299 FY 00 FY 01 FY 02 FY 03 FY 04 FY 05 FY 06 FY 06 FY 06 FY 06 FY 07 Attenses FY 99 FY 00 FY 01 FY 02 FY 03 FY 04 FY 05 FY 06 FY 06 FY 06 FY 06 FY 07 Attenses FY 99 FY 00 FY 01 FY 02 FY 03 FY 04 FY 05 FY 06 FY 06 FY 07 Attense DOC 3 11 5531 7.281 19.32 19.21 20.313 20.755 90.7 Maicopa County 1.136 1.751 2.167 2.033 2.2.52 2.2.52 2.2.52 2.2.52 2.2.52 2.2.52 2.2.52 2.2.52 2.2.52 2.2.52 2.2.52 2.2.52 2.2.52 2.2.52 2.2.52 2.2.52 2.2.52 2.2.55 5.6	Alabama	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
Ataska FY 00 FY 00 <t< td=""><td>Alabama DOC</td><td>62</td><td>48</td><td>43</td><td>34</td><td>38</td><td>49</td><td>52</td><td>54</td><td>57</td></t<>	Alabama DOC	62	48	43	34	38	49	52	54	57
Alaska DOC FV 00 FV 00 FV 02 FV 00 FV 04 FV 05 FV 06 FV 00 FV 01	Alaska	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
Arkaness FV 00 FV 01 FV 02 FV 03 FV 04 FV 05 FV 06 FV 05 FV 06 FV 07 FV 06 FV 06 FV 07	Alaska DOC				1.299	1,382	1.484	1.554	1.637	1,720
Arkanss FY 00 FV 00 <					.,	.,	.,	.,	.,	.,
Arkansas DOC. 3 11 37 28 57 48 61 69 19 Arkansas DOC. 3 11 37 28 19 FV 04 FV 06 FV 07 Marcoga County 17.189 16.543 17.288 18,984 19,433 19,371 20,313 20,755 Pima County 1.158 611 666 552 758 007 665 904 Jail Total 17.189 19,208 19,355 20,153 21,682 22,439 22,390 23,391 Airzona DOC *** 912 1,158 147 4,552 4,976 5,147 5,153 6,753	Arkansas	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
Arizona FY.00 FY.01 FY.02 FY.03 FY.04 FY.05 FY.06 <	Arkansas DOC	3	14	37	28	57	43	61	69	79
Maricoga County 17, 183 16, 914 16, 533 17, 230 12, 230 2, 252 2, 252 2, 252 2, 252 2, 252 2, 252 2, 252 2, 252 2, 252 2, 252 2, 252 2, 252 2, 252 2, 252 2, 252 2, 252 2, 252 2, 252 2, 252 2, 255 2, 340 3, 340 3, 340 3, 340 3, 340 3, 340 3, 340 3, 340 3, 340 3, 340 3, 340 3, 340 3, 340 3, 340 3, 340 3, 340 3, 340 3, 340 3, 350	Arizona	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
Pima County 11.36 17.51 2.187 2.203 2.252 2.252 2.252 2.252 2.252 2.252 2.252 2.252 2.252 2.252 2.252 2.252 2.252 2.252 2.253 2.2439 2.2330 2.3420 2.3411 Alizona Do C*** 912 1.158 1.400 1.728 1.939 2.265 2.556 2.556 2.556 2.556 2.556 2.556 2.556 2.556 2.556 2.556 2.556 2.556 2.556 2.556 2.556 2.556 2.556 2.556 2.566 2.556 2.566 2.556 2.566 2.566 2.566 2.566 2.566 2.566 2.566 5.765 5.147 5.143 5.266 5.536 5.735 6.753 6.753 6.753 6.753 6.753 6.753 6.753 6.753 6.753 6.753 6.753 6.755 6.962 6.962 6.962 6.963 1.9631 11.044 110.443 110.443 11	Maricopa County	17,189	16,914	16,593	17,298	18,954	19,429	19,871	20,313	20,755
Yuma County 156 611 668 525 758 907 965 904 Jail Total 17,199 18,206 19,391 20,153 22,439 22,391 23,391 23,391 23,391 23,391 23,391 23,391 23,391 23,391 23,391 23,391 23,391 23,420 23,311 23,911 23,911 23,911 23,911 23,911 24,919 4,555 2,556 2,556 2,547 5,153 5,265 5,376 Fereno County 6,429 7,891 9,459 9,929 9,349 9,512 9,602 10,613 110,433 110,433 110,43 110,43	Pima County		1,136	1,751	2,187	2,203	2,252	2,252	2,252	2,252
Jail Total 17,189 18,208 18,305 20,153 21,683 22,330 22,351 23,343 23,351 23,343 23,343 23,343 23,351 13,351 110,341 110,443 110,443 110,443 110,443 110,443 110,443	Yuma County		158	611	668	525	758	807	855	904
Arizona DOC *** 912 1,158 1,400 1,728 1,939 2,265 2,556 2,847 3,138 California FY 00 FY 00 FY 01 FY 02 FY 03 FY 04 FY 06 FY 07 FY 06 FY 07 FY 07 FY 07 FY 07	Jail Total	17,189	18,208	18,955	20,153	21,682	22,439	22,930	23,420	23,911
California FY 09 FV 00 FV 01 FV 02 FV 03 FV 04 FV 06 FV 07 FV 06 FV 06	Arizona DOC ***	912	1,158	1,400	1,728	1,939	2,265	2,556	2,847	3,138
Alameda County 1447 4.662 17.00	California	EV 00	EV 00	EV 04	EV 02	EV 02	5V 04	EV 06	5V 08	EV 07
Presince county 4,447 4,002 4,213 4,033 4,273 5,147 5,153 5,265 5,753 6,733 1,331 11,331	Alamada Countu	A AA7	A cont	1 010	A COEL	A 075	E 1 47	E 150	g nest	E 276
Institution 5,429 7,891 9,459 9,738 9,572 9,601 110,431 110,443 110,431 16,313 14,751 17,514 17,581 18,291 18,291 18,291 18,291 18,291 13,357 13,357 13,357<	Ercono County	4,447	4,502	4,919	4,030 c 750	4,975	0,147	0,100 6 750	0,200	0,370
Name Dist Dist <thdis< th=""> <thdist< th=""> Dist Di</thdist<></thdis<>	Korn County	5 400	7 991	0.450	0,750	0,705	0,032	9,000	0,755	0,755
Cos Arigetes bodiny 112,005 113,472 113,577 113,557 <td>Los Apgeles County</td> <td>112 663</td> <td>113,000</td> <td>113 472</td> <td>105 536</td> <td>109,040</td> <td>111.034</td> <td>110 443</td> <td>110 443</td> <td>110 443</td>	Los Apgeles County	112 663	113,000	113 472	105 536	109,040	111.034	110 443	110 443	110 443
Orange County*** Orange County** Orange County Orange County Orange County	Orange County	112,005	19.025	17 469	16.956	17 169	17.647	18,445	19.676	18 947
Kitersberg County** 2,700 7,704 0,204 <td>Diverside County**</td> <td></td> <td>10,335</td> <td>17,405</td> <td>2 750</td> <td>7 704</td> <td>9.047</td> <td>0,400</td> <td>10,070</td> <td>0,347</td>	Diverside County**		10,335	17,405	2 750	7 704	9.047	0,400	10,070	0,347
Sant Diego Coliny 13,606 18,347 14,470 14,470 14,473 15,011 13,001 13,001 16,001 Sant Clara County 5,935 6,277 5,965 6,500 6,282 6,299 6,397 6,483 6,689 Ventura County 2,500 2,662 2,061 558 2,500 3,531 5,53	Riverside County				2,750	14 476	14 402	15 021	15 560	16,004
Santa County 13,08 10,39 17,914 17,904 17,924 17,924 10,373 10,391 10,301 11,357 13,557 13,557 13,557 13,557 13,557 13,557 13,557 13,557 13,557 13,559 533 559 533 559 533 559 533 559 533 559 533 559 534 559<	San Diego County	12,606	10 247	17 514	17 501	14,470	14,403	10,001	10,000	10,205
Intrafe County 3,350 0,277 3,360 0,202 0,202 0,203 0,331 0,403 0,203 Jail Total 142,080 171,621 171,173 195,327 199,874 201,030 202,027 203,224 California DOC *** 16,313 14,794 13,635 13,556 13,370 13,557 13,557 13,557 13,557 Colorado FY 99 FY 00 FY 01 FY 02 FY 03 FY 04 FY 05 FY 06 FY 07 Colorado DOC 412 403 442 525 511 509 534 559 583 Connecticut FY 99 FY 00 FY 01 FY 02 FY 03 FY 04 FY 06 FY 06 FY 07 Connecticut DOC *** 191 173 184 319 252 262 262 262 262 262 262 262 262 262 262 262 262 262 262 262 262 262 262	Tuloro County	13,000	6 347	E 005	6,500	10,227 c non	6 10,373	6 207	0,391	6,551
Ventor County 2,300	Venture County	0,930	2,277	2,900	0,000	6,202	2,299	2,397	2,403	2,003
Jain Totan H2,000 H1,021 H1,73 H3,321 H3,371 201,030 202,021 203,224 California DOC *** 16,313 14,794 13,635 13,556 13,357 13,557		112.090	2,000	2,002	474 772	105 227	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
Columbrial DOC 16,313 14,734 15,337 <th< td=""><td>Galifarnia DOC ##</td><td>142,000</td><td>14 704</td><td>12 625</td><td>12 550</td><td>12,327</td><td>199,014</td><td>12 557</td><td>12 557</td><td>42 557</td></th<>	Galifarnia DOC ##	142,000	14 704	12 625	12 550	12,327	199,014	12 557	12 557	42 557
Colorado FY 99 FY 00 FY 01 FY 02 FY 03 FY 04 FY 05 FY 06 FY 07 Colorado DOC 412 403 442 525 511 509 534 559 583 Connecticut FY 99 FY 00 FY 01 FY 02 FY 03 FY 04 FY 05 FY 06 FY 07 Connecticut DOC *** 191 173 184 319 252 26		16,515	14,7 94	15,055	15,556	15,570	15,557	15,557	15,557	15,557
Colorado DOC 412 403 442 525 511 509 534 559 583 Connecticut FY 99 FY 00 FY 01 FY 02 FY 03 FY 04 FY 05 FY 06 FY 07 Connecticut DOC *** 191 173 184 319 252 26	Colorado	EV 99	EY 00	EY 01	EY 02	EY 03	EY 04	EY 05	EY 06	EY 07
Connecticut FY 99 FY 00 FY 01 FY 02 FY 03 FY 04 FY 05 FY 06 FY 07 Connecticut DOC *** 191 173 184 319 252 262	Colorado DOC	412	403	442	525	511	509	534	559	583
Connecticut FY 99 FY 00 FY 01 FY 02 FY 03 FY 04 FY 05 FY 06 FY 06 FY 07 Connecticut DOC *** 191 173 184 319 252 263 263 263 263 <td></td>										
Connecticut DOC 191 173 184 319 252 263	Connecticut	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
Delaware FY 99 FY 00 FY 01 FY 02 FY 03 FY 04 FY 05 FY 06 FY 07 Delaware DOC 373 751 672 609 603 605 605 605 Florida FY 99 FY 00 FY 01 FY 02 FY 03 FY 04 FY 05 FY 06 FY 07 Broward County 8,067 11,012 10,672 10,630 11,128 10,959 11,518 12,077 12,636 Hillsborough County 4,299 5,221 6,044 6,837 8,351 9,236 10,200 11,171 12,142 Jacksonville - 1,523 1,547 1,572 1,580 1,588 Orange County 902 2,910 3,627 1,929 1,2017 2,017<	Connecticut DOC ***	191	173	184	319	252	262	262	262	262
Delaware DOC 373 751 672 609 603 605 605 Florida FY 99 FY 00 FY 01 FY 02 FY 03 FY 04 FY 05 FY 06 FY 07 Broward County 8,067 11,012 10,672 10,630 11,128 10,959 11,518 12,077 12,636 Hillsborough County 4,299 5,221 6,044 6,837 8,351 9,236 10,200 11,171 12,636 Jacksonville 1,523 1,547 1,572 1,580 1,588 Orange County 902 2,910 3,627 1,929 1,920 2,017 2,017 Palm Beach County 4,675 5,439 5,733 5,938 6,583 7,538 7,904 8,275 8,647 Pinellas County 7,041 23,360 26,489 28,573 31,223 33,186 35,550 37,768 39,986 Florida DOC 909 1,750 1,641 1,685 1,757<	Delaware	FY 99	EY 00	EY 01	EY 02	EY 03	FY 04	EY 05	EY 06	EY 07
Florida FY 99 FY 00 FY 01 FY 02 FY 03 FY 04 FY 05 FY 06 FY 07 Broward County 8,067 11,012 10,672 10,630 11,128 10,959 11,518 12,077 12,636 Hillsborough County 4,299 5,221 6,044 6,837 8,351 9,236 10,200 11,171 12,142 Jacksonville 1,523 1,547 1,572 1,580 1,588 Orange County 902 2,910 3,627 1,929 1,920 2,017 2,017 2,017 Palm Beach County 4,675 5,439 5,733 5,938 6,583 7,538 7,904 8,275 8,647 Pinellas County 786 1,130 1,541 1,709 1,986 2,339 2,648 2,956 Jail Total 17,041 23,360 26,489 28,573 31,223 33,186 35,550 37,768 39,986 Florida DOC 909 1,750 1,641	Delaware DOC		373	751	672	609	603	605	605	605
Florida FY 99 FY 00 FY 01 FY 02 FY 03 FY 04 FY 06 FY 06 FY 07 Broward County 8,067 11,012 10,672 10,630 11,128 10,959 11,518 12,077 12,636 Hillsborough County 4,299 5,221 6,044 6,837 8,351 9,236 10,200 11,171 12,142 Jacksonville 1,523 1,547 1,572 1,580 1,588 Orange County 902 2,910 3,627 1,929 1,920 2,017 2,017 2,017 Palm Beach County 4,675 5,439 5,733 5,938 6,583 7,538 7,904 8,275 8,647 Pinellas County 786 1,130 1,541 1,709 1,986 2,339 2,648 2,956 Jail Total 17,041 23,360 26,489 28,573 31,223 33,186 35,550 37,768 39,986 Florida DOC 909 1,750 1,641										
Broward County 8,067 11,012 10,672 10,630 11,128 10,959 11,518 12,077 12,636 Hillsborough County 4,299 5,221 6,044 6,837 8,351 9,236 10,200 11,171 12,142 Jacksonville 1,523 1,547 1,572 1,580 1,588 Orange County 902 2,910 3,627 1,929 1,920 2,017 2,017 2,017 Palm Beach County 4,675 5,439 5,733 5,938 6,583 7,538 7,904 8,275 8,647 Pinellas County 4,675 5,439 5,733 5,938 6,583 7,538 7,904 8,275 8,647 Pinellas County 786 1,130 1,541 1,709 1,986 2,339 2,648 2,956 Jail Total 17,041 23,360 26,489 28,573 31,223 33,186 35,550 37,768 39,986 Florida DOC 909 1,750 1,641	Florida	EY 99	FY 00	EY 01	FY 02	EY 03	FY 04	FY 05	EY 06	EY 07
Hillsborough County 4,299 5,221 6,044 6,837 8,351 9,236 10,200 11,171 12,142 Jacksonville 1,523 1,547 1,572 1,580 1,588 Orange County 902 2,910 3,627 1,929 1,920 2,017 2,017 2,017 Palm Beach County 4,675 5,439 5,733 5,938 6,583 7,538 7,904 8,275 8,647 Pinellas County 4,675 5,439 5,733 5,938 6,583 7,538 7,904 8,275 8,647 Pinellas County 4,675 5,439 26,489 28,573 31,223 33,186 35,550 37,768 39,986 Florida DOC 909 1,750 1,641 1,685 1,757 1,737 1,753 1,768 1,784 Cobb County** 6,539 5,962 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530	Broward County	8.067	11 012	10.672	10.630	11.128	10.959	11 518	12.077	12,636
Jacksonville 1,500	Hillshorough County	4 299	5 221	6 044	6.837	8.351	9 236	10,200	11 171	12 142
Orange County 902 2,910 3,627 1,929 1,920 2,017	Jacksonville	1,400		0,011	0,001	1.523	1 547	1.572	1.580	1.588
Paim Beach County 4,675 5,439 5,733 5,938 6,583 7,538 7,904 8,275 8,647 Pinellas County 786 1,130 1,541 1,709 1,986 2,339 2,648 2,956 Jail Total 17,041 23,360 26,489 28,573 31,223 33,186 35,550 37,768 39,986 Florida DOC 909 1,750 1,641 1,685 1,757 1,737 1,753 1,768 1,784 Cobb County** 6,539 5,962 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 913<	Orange County		902	2.910	3.627	1.929	1.920	2.017	2.017	2.017
Pinellas County 786 1,130 1,541 1,709 1,986 2,339 2,648 2,956 Jail Total 17,041 23,360 26,489 28,573 31,223 33,186 35,550 37,768 39,986 Florida DOC 909 1,750 1,641 1,685 1,757 1,737 1,753 1,768 1,784 Georgia FY 99 FY 00 FY 01 FY 02 FY 03 FY 04 FY 05 FY 06 FY 07 Cobb County** 6,539 5,962 6,530 6,892 7,443	Palm Beach County	4 675	5 439	5 733	5 938	6,583	7.538	7 904	8 275	8 647
Jail Total 17,041 23,360 26,489 28,573 31,223 33,186 35,550 37,768 39,986 Florida DOC 909 1,750 1,641 1,685 1,757 1,737 1,753 1,768 1,784 Georgia FY 99 FY 00 FY 01 FY 02 FY 03 FY 04 FY 05 FY 06 FY 07 Cobb County** 0 6,539 5,962 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 913 914 <td>Pinellas County</td> <td></td> <td>786</td> <td>1 130</td> <td>1 541</td> <td>1 709</td> <td>1,986</td> <td>2,339</td> <td>2 648</td> <td>2,956</td>	Pinellas County		786	1 130	1 541	1 709	1,986	2,339	2 648	2,956
Florida DOC 909 1,750 1,641 1,685 1,757 1,737 1,753 1,768 1,784 Georgia FY 99 FY 00 FY 01 FY 02 FY 03 FY 04 FY 05 FY 06 FY 07 Cobb County** 6,539 5,962 6,530 9,13 914 463	Jail Total	17.041	23,360	26,489	28.573	31,223	33,186	35,550	37,768	39,986
Georgia FY 99 FY 00 FY 01 FY 02 FY 03 FY 04 FY 05 FY 06 FY 07 Cobb County** 6,539 5,962 6,530 913 914 916 909 522	Elorida DOC	909	1.750	1.641	1.685	1.757	1,737	1.753	1.768	1.784
Georgia FY 99 FY 00 FY 01 FY 02 FY 03 FY 04 FY 05 FY 06 FY 07 Cobb County** 6,539 5,962 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 6,530 913 914 913 913			.,	.,	.,	.,	.,	.,	.,	.,
Cobb County** 6,539 5,962 6,530 913 <	Georgia	FY 99	EY 00	EY 01	EY 02	EY 03	EY 04	EY 05	EY 06	EY 07
DeKalb County** 710 839 930 913 913 913 Jail Total - - 710 7,378 6,892 7,443 7,443 7,443 Georgia DOC 382 391 441 463 503 496 509 522 535	Cohh County**				1 1 02	6 539	5 962	6,530	6 530	6 530
Jail Total 710 7,378 6,892 7,443 7,443 Georgia DOC 382 391 441 463 503 496 509 522 535	DeKalh County**				710	839	930	913	913	913
Georgia DOC 382 391 441 463 503 496 509 522 535	Jail Total		-	-	710	7.378	6.892	7.443	7.443	7.443
	Georgia DOC	382	391	441	463	503	496	509	522	535

Table 5-2. Historical and Projected IRP Workload by State

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 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. **** Limited or no data received.

Location	Historical Wo	orkload		Forecasted Workload						
Hawaii	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	
Hawaii DOC	1,545	1,320	1,302	1,094	1,148	1,330	1,291	1,291	1,291	
Idaho	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	
Idaho DOC	207	214	158	171	207	219	243	266	289	
	514.00	514.00	514.04	514.00	514.00	514.04	514.05	514.00	514.02	
Illinois	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 00	FY 07	
	7,103	7,509	8.051	9,052	9,033	9,544	10,032	10,495	10,950	
Illinois DOC ***	7,105	728	898	904	904	904	904	904	904	
			000			004		004	004	
Indiana	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	
Indiana DOC ***		94	83	141	135	135	135	135	135	
lowa	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	
lowa DOC	66	132	113	126	141	138	148	156	164	
Kansas	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	
Kansas DOC	49	56	71	95	101	72	109	120	131	
Konstanting	514.00	514.00	514.04	514.00	574.00	574.04	E) (.05	C) (08	E) (07	
Kentucky	FY 99	FY UU 610	1 520	FY 02	FY 03	1 097	1 227	1 227	1 007	
Jail Total	537	612	1,532	1 123	1.081	1,207	1 337	1 337	1 337	
Kentucky DOC	50	82	103	114	162	173	195	214	233	
Louisiana	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	
Louisiana DOC ***	65	26	38	40	40	40	40	40	40	
Maine	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	
Maine DOC	5	6	8	6	3	7	7	7	7	
Maryland	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	
Maryland DOC		135	126	140	172	1//	193	208	223	
Massachusatte	EV 00	EV 00	EV 04	EV 02	EV 03	EV 04	EVIOS	EV 06	EV 07	
Plymouth County**	1199	7700	1101	1102	A74	874	864	864	864	
Jail Total	-	-	-	-	474	874	864	864	864	
Massachusetts DOC ***	150	138	159	185	177	190	200	211	221	
Michigan	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	
Wayne County			52	36	63	37	43	43	43	
Jail Total	-	-	52	36	63	37	43	43	43	
Michigan DOC	103	80	75	113	144	126	134	142	150	
Minnesota	EV 00	EV 00	EV 04	EV 02	EV 02	EV 04	EV 06	EV 06	EV 07	
Hennenin County	F 1 99	7700	7707	5 294	4 643	4 242	4 221	4 221	4 221	
Jail Total	-	-	-	5.294	4.643	4.242	4.221	4.221	4.221	
Minnesota DOC	49	93	118	204	245	288	330	372	414	
Mississippi	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	
Mississippi DOC***	5	12	22	48	47	62	56	56	56	
Missouri	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	
Missouri DOC	132	178	182	220	200	257	270	282	294	
	57.00	C) 4 00	C) (0(-	C) (00 -	C) (-00	C) (0.4	C) (-05	C) (-00	C) / 02	
Montana Mentene DOC	FY 99	FY 00	- FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	7 05	FYUD	- 19 07	

Shaded Blue Box denotes facility sent at least Q1 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
Location	Historical We			Forecasted	Workload				
Nebraska	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
Nebraska DOC	83	108	94	98	106	102	107	113	119
Novede	57(00	514.00	EV 04	517.00	51(02	51(.0.4	57.05	514.08	EV 07
Clork County	F Y 99 5 159	7 121	7 460	7 502	7 00	7 420	7 212	7 333	7 /22
	5 158	7 131	7,400	7,302	7 227	7,420	7 212	7 322	7 /132
Nevada DOC	305	418	421	428	510	523	546	568	590
novada boo		410	721	420	010	525	040		000
New Hampshire	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
New Hampshire DOC	17	33	35	22	30	35	33	32	30
		E) (00	E) (04	C) (00	57,00	514.04	5) (25	C) (08	C) (07
New Jersey	FY 99	FY UU AGG	FY 01 571	FY UZ	FY 03	FY 04	FY U0 649	FY U0 675	FY U/ 704
Hudson County	3.046	3 337	3 608	3 390	A 141	4 011	4 032	3.267	4 602
Passaic County	1 641	1 245	1 369	2 038	1 711	3 589	3,855	3,207	3,855
Jail Total	5 211	5 048	5 548	6 141	6 524	8 227	8 535	7 797	9.058
New Jersey DOC	946	947	671	656	646	712	779	885	911
	0.0				0.0				
New Mexico	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
New Mexico DOC ***	3	5	14	16	32	30	32	37	42
	514.00	E 14.00	E) (0 (C) (00	57,00	514.04	574.05	C) / 08	C) / 07
New York City	FY 99	FY 00 4 290	FY U1	FY UZ	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY U0 15 504	FY U/ 15 504
Suffelly County	4,032	4,369	4,541	5,004	14,422	15,524	15,524	15,524	15,524
Sulloik County	6 207	6,025	6 021	7.521	1,745	1,073	17,150	17 194	17 229
New York DOC	2 291	2 207	2 151	2 082	2 167	2 039	2 192	2 328	2 463
New TOTA DOC	2,231	2,201	2,131	2,002	2,107	2,033	2,132	2,520	2,405
North Carolina	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
Mecklenburg County**				3,358	3,495	3,590	3,590	3,590	3,590
Jail Total	-	-	-	3,358	3,495	3,590	3,590	3,590	3,590
North Carolina DOC ***	423	490	410	544	535	528	528	528	528
	514.00	E) (00	E) (04	C) (00	57,00	514.04	5) (.05	C) (.08	C) (07
North Dakota	FY 99	FY 00	- FY 07	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	12	12	FY U/ 42
North Dakota DOC	9	5	9	3	4	9	12	12	12
Ohio	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
Cuvahoga County	371	519	624	481	405	477	483	483	483
Jail Total	371	519	624	481	405	477	483	483	483
Ohio DOC ***			100	198	216	208	208	208	208
Oklahoma	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
Oklahoma County			553	299	235	334	448	665	882
Jail Total	-	-	553	299	235	334	448	665	882
Oklahoma DOC	256	209	171	220	198	254	259	265	272
0	51(00	514.00	E) (04	51(.00	51(.00	5)(04	5)(.05	C) (08	C) (07
Multhomob County	2 970	2 662	2,550	2 5 4 9	2 095	2 709	2 709	2 709	2 709
	2,072	2,002	2,552	2,540	2,095	2 709	2 709	2 709	2,700
	2,012	5,002	3,332	3,340	3,035	3,100	3,100	3,100	3,100
Uregon DUC				4/8	309	407	464	464	464
Pennsylvania	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	F <u>Y 02</u>	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
City of Philadelphia	475	454	467	481	535	469	525	539	554
Jail Total	475	454	467	481	535	469	525	539	554
Pennsylvania DOC			153	207	205	227	248	278	309
Rhode Island	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
Rhode Island DOC ***		993	846	537	776	737	737	737	737

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 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

Location	Historical We	orkload			1	Forecasted	Workload		
South Carolina	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
South Carolina DOC	119	107	149	184	199	209	241	264	287
South Dakota	EV 00	EV 00	EV 01	EV 02	EV 03	EV 04	EV 05	EV 06	EV 07
South Dakota DOC	18	15	17	28	20	21	21	23	24
	10			20	20	21	21	2.5	24
Tennessee									
Davidson County			1,927	2,325	2,551	3,045	3,447	3,840	4,233
Jail Total	-	-	1,927	2,325	2,551	3,045	3,447	3,840	4,233
Tennessee DOC	46	67	100	100	117	114	130	139	148
Texas	5 407	5.070	0.455	0.051	7,500	7.4.49	7.075	7.075	7.075
Bexar County	5,497	5,978	6,155	6,851	7,562	7,142	7,275	7,275	7,275
Harris County		0.000	0.050	13,681	14,731	15,059	15,891	16,407	16,924
I ravis County	5 497	12 530	14 214	20,073	9,100	9,640 31,841	33 399	34 701	36.016
Texas DOC	3 843	3 151	3 561	4 059	4 780	4 707	4 879	5 052	5 225
Texas boo	3,043	3,131	3,301	4,000	4,100	4,101	4,015	3,032	5,225
Utah									
Utah DOC ***	87	121	110	72	115	114	114	114	114
Vermont									
Vermont DOC ***	19	17	16	16	23	22	22	22	22
Virginia									
Virginia DOC	199	222	327	378	427	438	455	471	487
Washington Biorop County	1.41	402	206	450	269	440	497	EEE	E10
Vakima County	1 689	1 864	1.836	450	1 930	2 353	2 290	2 290	2 200
Jail Total	1.830	2.357	2,232	2,113	2,298	2,793	2,787	2,200	2,200
Washington DOC	248	292	306	377	324	381	386	391	396
West Virginia									
West Virginia DOC									
Wisconsin									
Milwaukee County		915	1,137	1,160	1,235	1,255	1,307	1,335	1,362
Jail Iotal	-	915	1,13/	1,160	1,235	1,255	1,307	1,335	1,362
Wisconsin DOC	1/8	166	1/2	212	249	225	236	246	256
Wyoming DOC									
Wyoming DOC		5	26	22	27	22	26	27	29
Nyoning Doc			20	22	21	22	20	21	25
Total Local Jail Workload									
(participating locations)	211,751	260,031	270,264	300,858	346,152	358,731	366,030	371,637	379,445
Total DOC Workload									
(participating locations)	30,700	31,976	31,889	34,849	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 Q1 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

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.²⁸ 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%.²⁹

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.³⁰ 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

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



Fentress Incorporated September 2004



Figure 5-3. Foreign-Born DOC Inmates by Length of Stay

Figure 5-4. Foreign-Born Inmates by Offense





Figure 5-5. Foreign-Born Inmates by Gender

Figure 5-6. Foreign-Born Inmates by Age



Fentress Incorporated September 2004 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 <u>released</u> 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.

ce

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.

Office of Detention and Removal Operations U.S. Department of Homeland Security 425 I Street, NW Washington, DC 20536



U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement

(b)(6), (b)(7)c

369 South High Street Columbus, Ohio 43215

Dear (b)(6), (b)(7)c

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.

March 8, 2004

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. (b)(6) 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

(b)(6), (b)(7)c El Paso County Sheriff's Office P.O. Box 125 El Paso, TX 79941

(b)(6), (b)(7)

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.

Department of Homeland Security Immigration and Customs Enforcement Sample Data Set 03/18/2004

Facility Information			Unique Identifiers						General Inmate Data			
			Inmate									
		Booking	Jacket			INS	Passport	Last	First	Middle		
Agency	Facility	Number	Number	State ID	FBI Number	Number	Visa Number	Name	Name	Name	SSN	
Name of Agency	Name of Facility	306130038	0236867	1234567	123456789	123457	123456789	Smith	Joe	В	351987712	
Name of Agency	Name of Facility	310122598	0237959	1234567	456975121	123458	123215468	Harris	Jody	A	212356987	
Name of Agency	Name of Facility	307101743	0112167	1234567	154656454	875415	651548942	Roberts	Brian	Shawn	594521111	
Name of Agency	Name of Facility	306122818	0054030	1234567	879515656	546841	983654524	Grant	Sam	К	123456789	
Name of Agency	Name of Facility	306126008	0261685	1234567	484698945	549872	956545465	Toby	Kyle	Robert	987456123	

Age Indicator Gender Citizenship/Foreign Born Indicators					Pontential Proxies for Foreign Born						
DOB	AGE	Gender	Place of Birth (POB)	Nationality	US Citizen	Foreign Born	Descent	Ethnicity	Language Spoken	Language Written	Language Read
12/1/1939	65	М	New York	American	yes	no	United States		English	English	English
6/18/1954	50	F	Mexico City	Mexican	no	yes	Mexico	Hispanic	Spanish	Spanish	Spanish
7/4/1977	27	М	Mexico City	Mexican	yes	yes	Mexico	Hispanic	Spanish	Spanish	Spanish
2/2/1968	36	М	El Paso	Mexican	yes	no	Mexico	Hispanic	English	English	English
3/5/1970	34	М	Rome	Italian	no	yes	Italy		English	English	English

Воо	king Inform (D	ation for Calc HS will calcul	ulating Length ate LOS)	of Stay	Disposition of Offense				
Booking Date	Released Indicator	Release Date	Scheduled Release Data	Expected Release Date	Offense I	Offense 2	Offense 3		
4/11/2002	N	5/12/2003	12/14/2003	12/1/2003	Aggravated assault	fraud	Drug possession		
11/4/2003	Ν	12/28/2003	1/20/2004	11/8/2004	grand theft				
10/3/2002	Ν	1/1/2003	5/12/2003	5/15/2003	possession of firearm by convicted felon				
6/23/2003	Ν	12/14/2000	2/12/2003	2/2/2003	burglary	grand theft			
11/14/2001	N	5/1/2002	5/30/2002	5/15/2002	robbery				

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).³⁴ 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:

$$y = b_0 + b_1 x_1 + b_2 x_2 + b_3 x_3 + \dots + \varepsilon$$
 (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 ε is the residual error.

The residual error, ε , 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:

$$R^{2} = \frac{\sum (\hat{y}_{i} - \bar{y})^{2}}{\sum (y_{i} - \bar{y})^{2}}$$
(a.2)

Where y_i is the actual historical value for a point in time period i; \overline{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:

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

Where *n* is the number of historical data points and ε 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:

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

Where Y_i is the actual historical value for a point in time period *i*; \overline{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 <u>caused</u> 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 <u>caused</u> 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 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 =
$$\sqrt{\frac{\sum_{t=1}^{n} (Y_t - \hat{Y}_t)^2}{n}}$$
 (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:

$$\mathsf{MAD} = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{n} |Y_t - \hat{Y}_t|}{n}$$
(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 =
$$\frac{\sum_{t=1}^{n} |\frac{(Y_t - \hat{Y}_t)}{Y_t} * 100|}{n}$$
 (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 timeseries 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 foreignborn 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.

	Fit Within Timeframe	Maximize Historical Data	Forecast the Future, not Explain the Past	Minimize Potential Error	Vary Data Point Weighting
Qualitative	•				
Regression		•			
Time Series	•	•	•	•	•

Table B-1. Forecasting Methods and Selection Criteria

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.



Figure B-1. Single Moving Average Historical Data and Forecast

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.



Figure B-2. Double Moving Average Historical Data and Forecast

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 α . Extreme values of α (i.e., zero and one) for the single exponential smoothing model are atypical.

The single exponential smoothing model can be defined as:

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

Where S_t represents the forecasted estimate; y_t represents the historical data at time t; and α 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:

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

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.

$$S_t = \beta S_t + (1 - \beta) S_{t-1}$$
(a.10)

Where S_t represents the single exponential smoothed estimate; S_t " represents the double exponential smoothed estimate; and α and β are smoothing constants valued between 0 and 1.

The double exponential smoothing method smoothing parameters (α and β) can take on the same value or different values.³⁷





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:

$$C_{t} = \alpha (Y_{t} - S_{t-s}) + (1 - \alpha)C_{t-1}$$
(a.11)

$$S_{t} = \gamma (Y_{t} - C_{t}) + (1 - \gamma)S_{t-s}$$
(a.12)

$$F_{t+m} = C_t + S_{t+m-s} \tag{a.13}$$

Where F_{t+m} represents the forecast for period m; S_t represents the seasonal component; C_t represents the cyclical component; α and γ 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:

$$C_{t} = \alpha (Y_{t} / S_{t-s}) + (1 - \alpha)C_{t-1}$$
(a.14)

$$S_{t} = \gamma(Y_{t} / C_{t}) + (1 - \gamma)S_{t-s}$$
(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; α and γ 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:

$$C_{t} = \alpha (Y_{t} - S_{t-s}) + (1 - \alpha)C_{t-1} + b_{t-1})$$
(a.17)

$$b_{t} = \beta (C_{t} - C_{t-s}) + (1 - \beta) b_{t-1}$$
(a.18)

$$S_{t} = \gamma (Y_{t} - C_{t}) + (1 - \gamma) S_{t-s}$$
(a.19)

$$F_{t+m} = C_t + m * b_t + S_{t+m-s}$$
(a.20)

APPENDIX B

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; α , β , and γ 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 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:

$$C_{t} = \alpha(Y_{t} / S_{t-s}) + (1 - \alpha)C_{t-1} + b_{t-1})$$
(a.21)

$$b_{t} = \beta(C_{t} - C_{t-s}) + (1 - \beta)b_{t-1}$$
(a.22)

$$S_{t} = \gamma (Y_{t} / C_{t}) + (1 - \gamma) S_{t-s}$$
(a.23)

$$F_{t+m} = (C_t + m * b_t) * S_{t+m-s}$$
(a.24)

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; α , β , and γ 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-8. Holt-Winters Multiplicative Seasonal Historical Data and Forecast

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 timeseries 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.

	Volatile Data	Varying Weights	Trend	Seasonality
Single Moving Average	•			
Double Moving Average	•		•	
Single Exponential Smoothing	•	•		
Double Exponential Smoothing	•	•	•	
Seasonal Additive		•		•
Seasonal Multiplicative		•	•	•
Holt-Winters Additive	•	•		•
Holt-Winters Multiplicative	•	•	•	•

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

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.⁴⁰ 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 page⁴¹:

- 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 admissions⁴²
- Goodness-of-fit measures for the forecast root mean squared error (RMSE), mean absolute deviation (MAD), and mean absolute percentage error (MAPE).⁴³
- 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 offenses⁴⁴, 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.



ALAMEDA COUNTY, CA

1,443,741 (100%)

392,656 (27%)

National Rank by Average Daily Population - 16

BACKGROUND DATA:

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

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load		Forecas	ted Wor	kload		
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
4,447	4,582	4,919	4,635	4,975	5,147	5,153	5,265	5,376

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

Data Source: Facility Data Collected April 2004

Total Foreig	n Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 41,317
(12%)	Indeterminate (88%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS): By Place of Birth: By Lengtl



By Length of Stay (in days):

County Population (2000):

County Foreign Population (2000):





http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DTGeoSearchByListServlet?ds_name=DEC_2000_SF3_U&_lang=en&_ts=111439056474



BEXAR COUNTY, TX

1,392,931 (100%)

151,340 (11%)

National Rank by Average Daily Population - 18

BACKGROUND DATA: 1

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

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load	Forecas	sted Wor	'kload			
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
5,497	5,978	6,155	6,851	7,562	7,142	7,275	7,275	7,275

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%)				

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in days):

County Population (2000):

County Foreign Population (2000):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



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



BROWARD COUNTY, FL

National Rank by Average Daily Population - 10

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location: Broward County Jail Broward County, FL County Population (2000): County Foreign Population (2000):

1,623,018 (100%) 410,387 (25%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Workic	ad	Forecasted Workload					
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
8,067	11,012	10,672	10,630	11,128	10,959	11,518	12,077	12,636

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 Foreign Born (98%)

Date

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):



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



CLARK COUNTY, NV

1,375,765 (100%)

247,751 (18%)

National Rank by Average Daily Population - 28

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location: Clark County Jail Clark County, NV

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Workl	oad	Forecasted Workload					
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
5,158*	7,131	7,460	7,502	7,227	7,420	7,212	7,322	7,432
* Partial Year								

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

Data Source: Facility Data Collected June 2004 Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 7,227 Foreign Born (100%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



By Length of Stay (in days):

County Population (2000):

County Foreign Population (2000):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



By Severity of Offense:

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



COBB COUNTY, GA

National Rank by Average Daily Population - 44

BACKGROUND DATA:

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

County Population (2000): County Foreign Population (2000):

607,751 (100%) 70,439 (12%)

FY 07

Forecasted Workload

FY 04 FY 05 FY 06

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in days):





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



COOK COUNTY, IL

National Rank by Average Daily Population - 3

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location: Cook County Jail Cook County, IL

County Population (2000): County Foreign Population (2000):

5,376,741 (100%) 1,064,703 (20%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



 Historical Workload
 Forecasted Workload

 FY 99
 FY 00
 FY 01
 FY 02
 FY 03
 FY 04
 FY 05
 FY 06
 FY 07

 7,183
 7,589
 8,051
 9,052
 9,033
 9,544
 10,032
 10,495
 10,958

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: 10.97

otal Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 10,974						
Foreign Born (82%)	(18%)					

By Place of Birth:



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Length of Stay (in days):





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



CUYAHOGA COUNTY, OH

1,397,398 (100%)

88,761(6%)

National Rank by Average Daily Population – 45

BACKGROUND DATA:

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

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load			Forecas	sted Wor	kload	
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
371*	519	624	481	405	477	483	483	483
*Partial	Year							

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:



By Length of Stay (in days):

County Population (2000):

County Foreign Population (2000):





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



DAVIDSON COUNTY, TN

569,891 (100%)

39,596 (7%)

National Rank by Average Daily Population – 27

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location: Davidson County Jail Davidson County, TN

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historical Workload						Forecasted Workload			
	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
	NA	NA	1,927	2,325	2,551	3,045	3,447	3,840	4,233

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 Foreign Born (100%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):





By Length of Stay (in days):

County Population (2000):

County Foreign Population (2000):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS): 55+ Yrs By Gender: By Severity of Offense: By Age: 0-18 Yrs 1.2% 46-55 Yrs 2.7% 4.4% emale .2% Other Offenses 36-45 Yrs Index Offenses 85.9% 15.6% 11.3% 19-25 Yrs Male 41.4% 92.8% 26-35 Yrs **Drug Offenses** 34.6% 2.8%

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



DEKALB COUNTY, GA

665,865 (100%)

101,320 (15%)

National Rank by Average Daily Population – 32

BACKGROUND DATA:

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

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historical Workload						Forecasted Workload			
	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
	NA	NA	NA	710	839	930	913	913	913

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 Foreign Born (100%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in days):

County Population (2000):

County Foreign Population (2000):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



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




ESSEX COUNTY, NJ

793,633 (100%)

168,165 (21%)

National Rank by Average Daily Population – 39

BACKGROUND DATA:

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

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	Historical Workload Forecasted Workload											
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07				
524*	466	571	713	672	627	648	675	701				
* Partial	Year											

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 Length of Stay (in days):

County Population (2000):

County Foreign Population (2000):







FRESNO COUNTY, CA

799,407 (100%)

168,717 (21%)

National Rank by Average Daily Population – 42

BACKGROUND DATA:

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

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load	Forecasted Workload					
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
NA	NA	NA	6,756	6,765	6,692	6,753	6,753	6,753

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

 Foreign Born (100%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

Mexico 84.8% 3.9% Laos 1.8% Thailand El Salvador 1.0% India 0.7% Cambodia 0.5% Germany 0.4% Vietnam Others 0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90%

By Length of Stay (in days):

County Population (2000):

County Foreign Population (2000):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS): By Severity of Offense: Index Offenses 55+ Yrs 0-18 Yrs By Gender: By Age: 0.8% 2.1% 46-55 Yrs 8.1% 7.9% emale 7.3% 19-25 Yrs Drug Offenses 36-45 Yrs 28.4% Male 20.3% 21.2% 92.7% Other Offenses 71.6% 26-35 Yrs 39.6%

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



HARRIS COUNTY, TX

3,400,578 (100%)

756,548 (22%)

National Rank by Average Daily Population - 7

BACKGROUND DATA: 1

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

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



	Historio	al Work	load		Forecasted Workload					
	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	
	NA	NA	NA	13.681	14,731	15.059	15.891	16.407	16.924	

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 Foreign Born (99%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in days):

County Population (2000):

County Foreign Population (2000):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):By Age:55+ Yrs.0-18 YrsBy Gender:By Se



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



National Rank by Average Daily Population – 95

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location:

By Place of Birth:

Hennepin County Adult Detention Center County Population (2000): Hennepin County, MN

County Foreign Population (2000):

1,116,200 (100%) 110,496 (10%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load	Forecasted Workload					
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
NA	NA	NA	5,294	4,643	4,242	4,221	4,221	4,221

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 Foreign Born (99%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



By Length of Stay (in days):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS): By Severity of Offense: 55+ Yrs 0-18 Yrs By Gender: By Age: 46-55 Yrs 1.3% 2.0% **Drug Offenses** 1.7% Female 4.6% 9.3% 8.0% 36-45 Yrs 16.6% Male 19-25 Yrs 92.0% 38.5% 26-35 Yrs Other Offenses 37.0% 89.0%

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



HILLSBOROUGH, FL

National Rank by Average Daily Population – 20

BACKGROUND DATA:

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

County Population (2000): County Foreign Population (2000):

998,948 (100%) 115,151 (12%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load		Forecasted Workload				
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
4,299	5,221	6,044	6,837	8,351	9,236	10,200	11,171	12,142

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
 Foreign Born (94%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):





By Length of Stay (in days):







608, 975 (100%)

234,597 (39%)



National Rank by Average Daily Population – 48

BACKGROUND DATA:

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

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historical Workload						Forecasted Workload				
	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	
	3.046	3.337	3.608	3.390	4.141	4.011	4.032	3.267	4.502	

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

 Foreign Born (91%)

 (9%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in days):

County Population (2000):

County Foreign Population (2000):





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





National Rank by Average Daily Population – 25

BACKGROUND DATA: 1

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

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



By Length of Stay (in days):





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



JEFFERSON COUNTY, KY

693,604 (100%)

23,895 (3%)

National Rank by Average Daily Population - 71

BACKGROUND DATA:

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

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



_									
	Historic	al Work	load		Forecasted Workload				
	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
	537	612	1,532	1,123	1,081	1,287	1,337	1,337	1,337

Projection Method - Seasonal Multiplicative Goodness of fit - RMSE: 14.4; MAD: 11.1; MAPE: 14.6

Data Source: Facility Data Collected July 2004 Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 6,789 Indeterminate (84%) (16%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



By Length of Stay (in days):

County Population (2000):

County Foreign Population (2000):





Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,



KERN COUNTY, CA

661,645 (100%)

111,944 (17%)

National Rank by Average Daily Population - 34

BACKGROUND DATA: 1

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

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load			Forecasted Workload			
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
5,429	7,891	9,459	9,092	9,348	9,512	9,602	9,602	9,602

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 Foreign Born (99%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in days):

County Population (2000):

County Foreign Population (2000):





Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,





National Rank by Average Daily Population – 1

orocae

FY 04

111,034

FY 05

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location: Los Angeles County Jail Los Angeles, CA

County Population (2000): County Foreign Population (2000):

9,591,338 (100%) 3,449,444 (36%)

FY 06

110,443 110,443 110,443

FY 07

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

Data Source: Facility Data Collected May 2004

FY 02

FY 03

Foreign Born (98%)

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in days):





Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,



MARICOPA COUNTY, AZ

3,072,141 (100%)

441,240 (14%)

National Rank by Average Daily Population – 4

BACKGROUND DATA:

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

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Histori	cal Workloa	ad		Forecasted Workload				
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
17,18	9 16,914	16,593	17,298	18,954	19,429	19,871	20,313	20,755

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

Data Source: Facility Data Collected July 2004

County Population (2000):

County Foreign Population (2000):

Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 32,161						
Foreign Born (60%)	Indeterminate (40%)					

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in days):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



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

MECKLENBURG COUNTY, NC

695,454 (100%)

68,349 (10%)



National Rank by Average Daily Population – 51

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location: Mecklenburg County Jail Mecklenburg, NC

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



					-			
Historic	al Work	load		Forecasted Workload				
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
NA	NA	NA	3,358	3,495	3,590	3,590	3,590	3,590

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

 Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 6,735

 Foreign Born (52%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in days):

County Population (2000):

County Foreign Population (2000):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



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

MILWAUKEE COUNTY, WI



National Rank by Average Daily Population – 24

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location: Milwaukee County Jail Milwaukee, WI

County Population (2000): County Foreign Population (2000):

940,164 (100%) 63,648 (7%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load	Forecasted Workload					
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
NA	915	1,137	1,160	1,235	1,255	1,307	1,335	1,362

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%)					

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in days):





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



660,486 (100%)

83,965 (13%)



National Rank by Average Daily Population – 59

BACKGROUND DATA: 1

Facility Name: Facility Location: Multnomah County Jail Multnomah, OR

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load			Forecas	sted Wor	kload	
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
2872*	3,662	3,552	3,548	3,095	3,708	3,708	3,708	3,708
*Partial	Data							

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
 Foreign Born (53%)

 Indeterminate (47%)
 Indeterminate (47%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in days):

County Population (2000):

County Foreign Population (2000):





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



NEW YORK CITY, NY

National Rank by Average Daily Population – 2

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location:

New York County Jail New York, NY

County Population (2000): County Foreign Population (2000):

1,537,195 (100%) 452,440 (29%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

Historic	al Work	load		Forecasted Workload				
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
4 832	4 389	4 541	5 884	14 422	15 524	15 524	15 524	15 524

Projection Method - Seasonal Multiplicative Goodness of fit - RMSE: 85.8; MAD: 58.7; MAPE: 9.5

Data Source: Facility Data Collected July 2004 - . . - . . . d Indotorminato Decordo EV02: 20.012

Total Foreign Born and Indeter	minate Records FY03: 29,913
Foreign Born (48%)	Indeterminate (52%)

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in days):



Data not available

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS): 0-18 Yrs 55+ Yrs By Age: By Gender: By Severity of Offense: 6.9% 2.3% 46-55 Yr 9.7% emale .0% 19-25 Yrs 36-45 Yrs 29.2% 23.0% Male 93.0% 26-35 Yrs 28.9%

Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,



660,448 (100%)

47,829 (7%)



National Rank by Average Daily Population – 43

BACKGROUND DATA: 1

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

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load	Forecasted Workload					
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
NA	NA	553	299	235	334	448	665	882

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

Data Source: Facility Data Collected July 2004

By Length of Stay (in days):

County Population (2000):

County Foreign Population (2000):

Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 235 Foreign Born (100%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:

Data not available





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





2,846,289 (100%)

849,899 (30%)



National Rank by Average Daily Population - 14

BACKGROUND DATA: 1

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

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Worklo	oad		Forecasted Workload				
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
-	18,995	17,459	16,856	17,168	17,647	18,406	18,676	18,947

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%)

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in days):

County Population (2000):

County Foreign Population (2000):







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





ORANGE COUNTY, FL

896,344 (100%)

128,904 (14%)

National Rank by Average Daily Population – 17

BACKGROUND DATA:

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

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load		Forecasted Workload				
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
NA	902	2,910	3,627	1,929	1,920	2,017	2,017	2,017

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

 Foreign Born (100%)

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in days):

County Population (2000):

County Foreign Population (2000):





By Severity of Offense:

Data not available

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



PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL

National Rank by Average Daily Population - 33

BACKGROUND DATA:

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

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

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load	Forecasted Workload					
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
4,675	5,439	5,733	5,938	6,583	7,538	7,904	8,275	8,647

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 a	nd Indeterminate Records FY03: 20,380
(32%)	Indeterminate (68%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS): By Place of Birth: By Lengtl



By Length of Stay (in days):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS): By Severity of Offense: By Gender: By Age: 55+ Yrs 0-18 Yrs 3.2% 2.8% 46-55 Yrs Data not available Female 8.5% 12.8% 19-25 Yrs 36-45 Yrs 20.1% 33.6% Male 87.2% 26-35 Yrs 317%

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



PASSAIC COUNTY, NJ

489,049 (100%)

130,291 (27%)

National Rank by Average Daily Population - 61

BACKGROUND DATA:

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

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historical Workload Forecasted Workload									
	Historie	cal Work	al Workload		Forecasted Workload				
FY99 FY00 FY01 FY02 FY03 FY04 FY05 FY06 FY0	FY 99	FY 00	FY 00 FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
1,641 1,245 1,369 2,038 1,711 3,589 3,855 3,855 3,85	1,641	1,245	1,245 1,369	2,038	1,711	3,589	3,855	3,855	3,855

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	
Foreign Born (92%)	(8%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in days):

County Population (2000):

County Foreign Population (2000):





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



1,517,550 (100%)

137,205 (9%)



National Rank by Average Daily Population – 5

BACKGROUND DATA:

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

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load	Forecasted Workload					
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
475	454	467	481	535	469	525	539	554

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:



By Length of Stay (in days):

County Population (2000):

County Foreign Population (2000):





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



PIERCE COUNTY, WA

700,820 (100%)

56,525 (8%)

National Rank by Average Daily Population - 94

BACKGROUND DATA: 1

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

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historio	al Work	load	Forecasted Workload					
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
141*	493	396	450	368	440	497	555	612
* 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

Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 368 Foreign Born (98%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



By Length of Stay (in days):

County Population (2000):

County Foreign Population (2000):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



By Gender:

Data not available

By Severity of Offense:



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



PIMA COUNTY, AZ

National Rank by Average Daily Population - 70

BACKGROUND DATA:

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

County Population (2000): County Foreign Population (2000):

843,746 (100%) 100,050 (12%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



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):



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



PINELLAS COUNTY, FL

National Rank by Average Daily Population – 26

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location: Pinellas County Jail Pinellas, FL County Population (2000): County Foreign Population (2000): 921,482 (100%) 87,685 (10%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load	Forecasted Workload					
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
NA	786	1,130	1,541	1,709	1,986	2,339	2,648	2,956

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 Foreign Born (99%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in days):





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

PLYMOUTH COUNTY, MA



National Rank by Average Daily Population – 75

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location: Plymouth County Jail Plymouth, MA

County Population (2000): County Foreign Population (2000):

472,822 (100%) 29,592 (6%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load	Forecas	sted Wor	kload			
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
NA	NA	NA	NA	474*	874	864	864	864
*Partial	Data. SC	AAP						

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

 Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 545

	•
Foreign Born (87%)	(13%)

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):



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





National Rank by Average Daily Population – 22

BACKGROUND DATA:

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

County Population (2000): County Foreign Population (2000):

1,545,387 (100%) 293,712 (19%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



By Length of Stay (in days):





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



SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CA

National Rank by Average Daily Population - 12

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location: San Diego County Jail San Diego, CA

County Population (2000): County Foreign Population (2000):

2,813,833 (100%) 606,254 (22%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



HIStorica	al Worl	kload		Forecasted Workload				
FY 99 F	TY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	14,476	14,403	15,031	15,560	16,289

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

 Foreign Born (90%)

 (10%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



By Length of Stay (in days):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS): By Age: 0-18 Yrs By Gender: By Severity of Offense: 55+ Yrs Index Offenses 3% 2.49 7.6% 46-55 Yrs Female 8.2% 10.7% 19-25 Yrs 28.5% Drug Offenses 21.3% 36-45 Yrs 22.8% Male 89.3% Other Offenses 71.1% 26-35 Yrs 36.7%

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



1,682,585 (100%)

573,130 (34%)

07

8,391



National Rank by Average Daily Population – 15

BACKGROUND DATA: 1

Facility Name: Facility Location: Santa Clara County Jail Santa Clara, CA

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historica	I Workloa	ld			Forecast	ed Worklo	bad	
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	F
13,606	18,347	17,514	17,581	18,227	18,373	18,391	18,391	1

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

Foreign Born (97%)

By Place of Birth:



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Length of Stay (in days):

County Population (2000):

County Foreign Population (2000):





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



SUFFOLK COUNTY, NY



National Rank by Average Daily Population – 76

BACKGROUND DATA:

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

County Population (2000): County Foreign Population (2000):

1,419,369 (100%) 158,525 (11%)





Historic	al Work	load	Forecasted Workload					
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
1,475	1,636	1,480	1,647	1,745	1,673	1,626	1,670	1,714

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

Data Source: Facility Data Collected July 2004

Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 1,751 Foreign Born (99%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in days):





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



TRAVIS COUNTY, TX

National Rank by Average Daily Population - 35

BACKGROUND DATA: 1

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

County Population (2000): County Foreign Population (2000):

812,280 (100%) 122,621 (15%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load	Forecas	sted Wor	kload			
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
-	6,552*	8,059	8,673	9,188	9,640	10,222	11,019	11,81
*Partial	Data							

Projection Method – Seasonal Multiplicative Goodness of fit – RMSE: 59.1; MAD: 45.1; MAPE: 6.9

 Data Source:
 Facility Data Collected June 2004

 Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 9,751
 Foreign Born (94%)

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in days):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



By Gender:

Data not available





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

368,021 (100%)

83,124 (23%)



National Rank by Average Daily Population – Not Ranked in Top 100

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location:

Tulare County Jail Tulare County, CA

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load			Forecas	sted Wor	kload	
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
5,935	6,277	5,965	6,506	6,282	6,299	6,397	6,483	6,569

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 Length of Stay (in days):

County Population (2000):

County Foreign Population (2000):





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



VENTURA COUNTY, CA

753,197 (100%)

155,913 (21%)

National Rank by Average Daily Population – 73

BACKGROUND DATA:

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

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load			Forecas	sted Wor	'kload	
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
-	2,500	2,662	2,061	558*	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500
*Partial	Data		-					

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:



By Length of Stay (in days):

County Population (2000):

County Foreign Population (2000):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



By Gender:

Data not available

By Severity of Offense:

Data not available

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



WAYNE COUNTY, MI

2,061,162 (100%)

137,769 (7%)

National Rank by Average Daily Population - 31

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location: Wayne County Jail Wayne County, MI

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load	Forecas	sted Wor	kload			
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY (
-	-	52	36	63	37	43	43	4
						-		

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%)	

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in days):

County Population (2000):

County Foreign Population (2000):





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



222,581 (100%)

37, 575(17%)



National Rank by Average Daily Population – Not Ranked in Top 100

BACKGROUND DATA:¹

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

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load		Forecasted Workload				
FY 99 *	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
1,689	1,864	1,836	1,663	1,930	2,253	2,290	2,290	2,290
*Estimate based on partial year data								

*Estimate based on partial year data

County Foreign Population (2000):

County Population (2000):

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 Foreign Born (100%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):





By Length of Stay (in days):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Age:

By Gender:

By Severity of Offense:

Data not available

Data not available

Data not available

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

160,026 (100%)

38,479 (24%)



National Rank by Average Daily Population – Not Ranked in Top 100

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location:

By Place of Birth:

Yuma County Jail Yuma, AZ

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historio	al Work	load	Forecasted Workload					
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
NA	158*	611	668	525*	758	807	855	904
*Partial Data								

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	
Foreign Born (100%)	

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2002 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



By Length of Stay (in days):

County Population (2000):

County Foreign Population (2000):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2002 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS): 0-18 Yrs 55+ Yrs By Severity of Offense: By Age: By Gender: 2.4% 3.0% 46-55 Yrs 10.8% Data not available Data not available 19-25 Yrs 22.2% 36-45 Yrs 28.4% 26-35 Yrs 33.2%

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

4,447,100 (100%)

37,170 (5.9%)



BACKGROUND DATA:

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

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historical Workload						Forecasted Workload				
FY 9	99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	
	62	48	43	34	38	49	52	54	57	
-										

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

Data Source: Facility Data Collected April 2004

Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 38 Foreign Born (100%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS): By Place of Birth: By Lengt



By Length of Stay (in months):

State Population (2000):

State Foreign Population (2000):





By Severity of Offense:

Data not available

¹ Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,
626,932 (100%)

37,170 (5.9%)



BACKGROUND DATA: 1

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

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load		Forecas	ted Wor	kload		
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
NA	NA	NA	1,299	1,382	1,484	1,554	1,637	1,720

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
 Foreign Born (92%)

 (8%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in months):

State Population (2000):

State Foreign Population (2000):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS): 0-18 Yrs By Gender: By Age: By Severity of Offense: 55+ Yrs Index Offenses 2.6% 2.2% 0.9% Drug Offenses Female 2.2% 46-55 Yrs 17.8% 12.2% 19-25 Yrs Male 27.4% 82.2% 36-45 Yrs 26.8% **Other Offenses** 97.0% 26-35 Yrs 28.8%

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

2,673,400 (100%)

73,690 (2.8%)



BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location: Arkansas Department of Corrections Based in Pine Bluff

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load			Forecas	sted Wor	'kload	
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
3*	14	37	28	57	43	61	69	79
*Partial	Data							

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

 Foreign Born (90%)

 (10%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in months):

State Population (2000):

State Foreign Population (2000):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



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

4,301,261 (100%)

369,903 (8.6%)



BACKGROUND DATA: 1

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

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load	Forecasted Workload					
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
412	403	442	525	511	509	534	559	583

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%)

By Place of Birth:



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Length of Stay (in months):

State Population (2000):

State Foreign Population (2000):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



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

783,600 (100%)

44,898 (5.7%)



BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location: Delaware Department of Corrections Based in Dover, Delaware

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



					_					
Historic	al Work:	load		Forecasted Workload						
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07		
NA	373*	751	672	609	603	605	605	605		
*Partial	Data									
Projection Method – Seasonal Multiplicative										
Goodne	ess of f	it – RMS	SE: 14.3	B; MAD:	10.2; MA	APE: 6.5	5			

 Data Source:
 Facility Data Collected May 2004

 Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 3,763

 (16%)
 Indeterminate (84%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in months):

State Population (2000):

State Foreign Population (2000):





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

15,982,378 (100%)

2,670,828 (16.7%)



BACKGROUND DATA:

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

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historio	al Work	load		Forecas	sted Wor	kload		
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
909*	1,750	1,641	1,685	1,757	1,737	1,753	1,768	1,784
*Partial	Data							

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

Data Source: Facility Data Collected July 2004

Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY02: 1,668 Foreign Born (99%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2002 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



By Length of Stay (in months):

State Population (2000):

State Foreign Population (2000):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2002 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS): 0-18 Yrs 55+ Yrs By Age: By Gender: By Severity of Offense: 1.5% 4 2% emale 6.9% 46-55 Yrs Index Offenses 12.3% 19-25 Yrs 24.0% Male Other Offenses 93.1% 45.2% 36-45 Yrs 26.4% 26-35 Yrs Drug Offenses 31.6% 28.2%

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

8,186,453 (100%)

496

577,273 (7.1%)

Forecasted Workload

FY 04 FY 05 FY 06

509

FY 07

535

522



BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location: Georgia Department of Corrections Based in Atlanta, Georgia

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in months):

State Population (2000):

Historical Workload

382*

*Partial Data

FY 99 FY 00 FY 01

391

State Foreign Population (2000):

441

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Additive

Data Source: Facility Data Collected June 2004

Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 503 Foreign Born (100%)

FY 02

463

Goodness of fit - RMSE: 14.6; MAD: 11.6; MAPE: 10.3

FY 03

503





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

GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

C-52

1,211,537 (100%)

212,229 (17.5%)



BACKGROUND DATA:

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

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load	Forecas	sted Wor	kload			
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
1,545	1,320	1,302	1,094	1,148	1,330	1,291	1,291	1,291

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

Data Source: Facility Data Collected June 2004

Fotal Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 1,30					
Foreign Born (88%)	(12%)				

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in months):

State Population (2000):

State Foreign Population (2000):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



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

HAWAII DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS ICE.000115.09-2742 C-53

1,293,953 (100%)

64,080 (5.0%)



BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location: Idaho Department of Corrections Based in Boise, Idaho

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load	Forecas	sted Wor	'kload			
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
207*	214	158	171	207	219	243	266	289

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:



By Length of Stay (in months):

State Population (2000):

State Foreign Population (2000):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



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

2,926,324 (100%)

91,085 (3.1%)



BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location: Iowa Department of Corrections Based in Des Moines, Iowa

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Date

Historic	al Work	load	Forecas	sted Wor	kload			
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
66*	132	113	126	141	138	148	156	164
*Partial	Data							

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

Data Source: Facility Data Collected May 2004

State Population (2000):

State Foreign Population (2000):

Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 141	
Foreign Born (100%)	

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS): By Place of Birth: By Lengtl



By Length of Stay (in months):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



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

2,688,418 (100%)

134,735 (5.0%)



BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location: Kansas Department of Corrections Based in Topeka, Kansas

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load			Forecas	sted Wor	kload	
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
49	56	71	95	101	72	109	120	131

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 Foreign Born (100%)

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in months):

State Population (2000):

State Foreign Population (2000):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



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

4,041,769 (100%)

80,271 (2.0%)



BACKGROUND DATA: 1

Facility Name: Facility Location: Kentucky Department of Corrections Based in Frankfort, Kentucky

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load			Forecas	sted Wor	kload	
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
50	82	103	114	162	173	195	214	233

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 Foreign Born (100%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in months):

State Population (2000):

State Foreign Population (2000):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS): 55+ Yrs By Gender: By Age: By Severity of Offense: 2.5% 46-55 Yrs emale 7.4% 8.6% Index Offenses 16.7% 19-25 Yrs 25.9% 36-45 Yrs Male 20.4% 91.4% Drug Offenses **Other Offenses** 20.3% 63.0% 26-35 Yrs 43.8%

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

1,274,923 (100%)

36,691 (2.9%)



BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location:

Maine Department of Corrections Based in Augusta, Maine

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load	Forecasted Workload						
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	
5*	6	8	5	3	7	7	7	7	
*Partial Data									

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

Data Source: Facility Data Collected April 2004

Fotal Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 6						
Foreign Born (50%)	(Indeterminate 50%)					

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



By Length of Stay (in months):

State Population (2000):

State Foreign Population (2000):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS): By Age: By Gender: By Severity of Offense: Index Offenses 33.3% 26-35 Yrs 100.0% Male 100.0% Other Offenses 66.7%

Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,

9,938,444 (100%)

523,589 (5.3%)



BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location: Michigan Department of Corrections Based in Lansing, Michigan

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load		Forecasted Workload				
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
103	80	75	113	144	126	134	142	150

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: 16	7
Foreign Born (86%)	(14%)

By Place of Birth:



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Length of Stay (in months):

State Population (2000):

State Foreign Population (2000):





By Severity of Offense:

Data not available

Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,

4,919,479 (100%)

260,463 (5.3%)



BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location: Minnesota Department of Corrections Based in St. Paul, Minnesota

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load		Forecas	sted Wor	kload		
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
49	93	118	204	245	288	330	372	414

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Multiplicative Goodness of fit – RMSE: 7.5; MAD: 5.8; MAPE: 27.9

Data Source: Facility Data Collected April 2004

State Population (2000):

State Foreign Population (2000):

Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 245 Foreign Born (100%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS): By Place of Birth: By Lengtl



By Length of Stay (in months):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS): 0-18 Yrs 55+ Yrs By Gender: By Severity of Offense: By Age: 0.8% 2.0% 46-55 Yrs 3.7% emale ndex Offenses 36-45 Yrs 6.1% 19.2% 13.5% 19-25 Yrs Male Other Offenses 42.9% 93.9% 45.7% 26-35 Yrs Drug Offenses 37.1% 35.1%

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

2,844,658 (100%)

39,908 (1.4%)



BACKGROUND DATA:

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

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



I	Historic	al Work	load	Forecasted Workload					
	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
	5*	12	22	48	47	62	56	56	56
	*Partial Data								

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 Foreign Born (100%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



By Length of Stay (in months):

State Population (2000):

State Foreign Population (2000):





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

5,595,211 (100%)

151,196 (2.7%)



BACKGROUND DATA:

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

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load		Forecasted Workload					
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	
132*	178	182	220	200	257	270	282	294	
* Partial Data									

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

 Foreign Born (96%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



By Length of Stay (in months):

State Population (2000):

State Foreign Population (2000):





Historical population numbers taken from the US Bureau of the Census,



BACKGROUND DATA: 1

Facility Name: Facility Location: Montana Department of Corrections Based in Helena, Montana

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



902,195 (100%) 16,396 (1.8%)



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in months):





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

1,711,263 (100%)

74,638 (4.4%)



BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location: Nebraska Department of Corrections Based in Lincoln, Nebraska

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load		Forecasted Workload				
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
83	108	94	98	106	102	107	113	119

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Additive Goodness of fit – RMSE: 8.0; MAD: 6.9; MAPE: 94.9

Data Source: Facility Data Collected May 2004

State Population (2000):

State Foreign Population (2000):

Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 106 Foreign Born (100%)

By Place of Birth:



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Length of Stay (in months):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



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

1,998,257 (100%)

316,593 (15.8%)



BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location:

By Place of Birth:

Nevada Department of Corrections Based in Carson City, Nevada

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load		Forecas	sted Wor	kload				
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07		
305*	418	421	428	510	523	546	568	590		
*Partial Year										

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Additive Goodness of fit – RMSE: 10.8; MAD: 8.3; MAPE: 7.4

 Data Source:
 Facility Data Collected April 2004

 Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 512

Foreign Born (99%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



By Length of Stay (in months):

State Population (2000):

State Foreign Population (2000):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS): By Severity of Offense: Index Offenses Q-18 Yrs 55+ Yrs By Age: By Gender: 1.6% 2 2% 46-55 Yrs 6.3% 6.3% emale 3.3% 19-25 Yrs 36-45 Yrs 27.8% 20.2% Male Drug Offenses Other Offenses 96.7% 34.9% 58.8% 26-35 Yrs 42.0%

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



NEW HAMPSHIRE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

1,235,786 (100%)

54,154 (4.4%)

BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location: New Hampshire Department of Corrections Based in Concord, New Hampshire

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historical	Worklo	ad	Forecasted Workload					
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
17*	33	35	22	30	35	33	32	30
*Partial Ye	ear							

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 Foreign Born (100%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in months):

State Population (2000):

State Foreign Population (2000):





8,414,350 (100%)

1,476,327(17.5%)



BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location: New Jersey Department of Corrections Based in Trenton, New Jersey

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load	Forecasted Workload					
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
946	947	671	656	646	712	779	885	911

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

 Foreign Born (100%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2002 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in months):

State Population (2000):

State Foreign Population (2000):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2002 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS): 0-18 Yrs 55+ Yrs By Gender: By Severity of Offense: By Age: 2.9% 1.1% Data not available Data not available 46-55 Yrs 9.9% 19-25 Yrs 30.0% 36-45 Yrs 23.8% 26-35 Yrs 32.3%

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

1,819,046 (100%)

149,606 (8.2%)



BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location: New Mexico Department of Corrections Based in Santa Fe, New Mexico

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load		Forecasted Workload				
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
3	5	14	16	32	30	32	37	42

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Additive Goodness of fit – RMSE: 2.3; MAD: 1.7; MAPE: 41.0

Data Source: Facility Data Collected May 2004

State Population (2000):

State Foreign Population (2000):

Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 32 Foreign Born (100%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in months):







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

18,976,457 (100%)

3,868,133 (20.4%)



BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location: New York Department of Corrections Based in Albany, New York

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



ŀ	listoric	al Work	load			Forecas	sted Wor	kload	
	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
	2,291	2,207	2,151	2,082	2,167	2,039	2,192	2,328	2,463

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 Foreign Born (100%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



By Length of Stay (in months):

State Population (2000):

State Foreign Population (2000):





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



642,200 (100%)

12,114 (1.9%)



BACKGROUND DATA: ¹

Facility Name: North Dakota Dept. of Corrections & RehabilitationFacility Location:Based in Bismarck, North Dakota

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load		Forecasted Workload				
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
9	5	9	5	4	9	12	12	12

Projection Method – Seasonal Additive Goodness of fit – RMSE: 1.2; MAD: 0.8; MAPE: 2.9

Data Source: Facility Data Collected July 2004

State Population (2000):

State Foreign Population (2000):

Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 4 Foreign Born (100%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in months):





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

3,450,654 (100%)

131,747(3.8%)



BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location: Oklahoma Department of Corrections Based in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load		Forecasted Workload				
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
256	209	171	220	198	254	259	265	272

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%)	(13%)				

By Place of Birth:



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Length of Stay (in months):

State Population (2000):

State Foreign Population (2000):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



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

3,421,399 (100%)

289,702 (8.5%)



BACKGROUND DATA: 1

Facility Name: Facility Location: Oregon Department of Corrections Based in Salem, Oregon

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load		Forecasted Workload				
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
NA	NA	NA	478	359	467	464	464	464

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

 Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY02: 493

 Foreign Born (97%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2002 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in months):

State Population (2000):

State Foreign Population (2000):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2002 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



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: Facility Location: Pennsylvania Department of Corrections Based in Camp Hill

State Population (2000): State Foreign Population (2000):

12,281,054 (100%) 508,291 (4.1%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load	Forecasted Workload					
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
14	17	153	207	205	227	248	278	309

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Multiplicative **Goodness of fit** – RMSE: 11.9; MAD: 9.5; MAPE: 12.2

Data Source: Facility Data Collected	July 2004
Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Reco	ords FY03: 310
Foreign Born (66%)	Indeterminate 34%

By Place of Birth:

27.39 Caribbear 15.6% Mexico 8.3% South America 6.8% Central America Germany 54% Cuba 4% Africa Jamaica 20.5% Others 10% 15% 25% 30% 35% 0% 20% 10%

By Length of Stay (in months):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



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



SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

4,012,012 (100%)

115,978 (2.9%)

BACKGROUND DATA: 1

Facility Name: Facility Location: South Carolina Dept of Corrections Based in Columbia, South Carolina

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load		Forecasted Workload				
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
119	107	149	184	199	209	241	264	287

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Additive Goodness of fit – RMSE 6.8; MAD: 5.5; MAPE: 28.3

Data Source: Facility Data Collected May 2004

State Population (2000):

State Foreign Population (2000):

Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 204 Foreign Born (98%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2002 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in months):

Data not available

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2002 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



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



BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location: South Dakota Department of Corrections Based in Pierre, South Dakota

State Population (2000): State Foreign Population (2000):

754,844 (100%) 13,495 (1.8%)

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load		Forecasted Workload				
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
18	15	17	28	20	21	21	23	24

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	
Foreign Born (100%)	

By Place of Birth:



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2002 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Length of Stay (in months):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2002 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



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

5,689,283 (100%)

159,004 (2.8%)



BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location: Tennessee Department of Corrections Based in Nashville, Tennessee

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load		Forecasted Workload				
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
46	67	100	100	117	114	130	139	148

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 Foreign Born (100%)

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in months):

State Population (2000):

State Foreign Population (2000):





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

608,827 (100%)

23,245 (3.8%)



BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location: Vermont Department of Corrections Based in Waterbury, Vermont

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load		Forecasted Workload				
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
19	17	16	16	23	22	22	22	22

Projection Method – Seasonal Additive Goodness of fit – RMSE: 1.9; MAD: 1.5; MAPE: 42.5

Data Source: Facility Data Collected July 2004

State Population (2000):

State Foreign Population (2000):

Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 23 Foreign Born (100%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in months):





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

7,078,515 (100%)

570,279 (8.1%)



BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location:

By Place of Birth:

Virginia Department of Corrections Based in Richmond, Virginia

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historical Workload						Forecasted Workload				
	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	
	199*	222	327	378	427	438	455	471	487	
	*Partial Data									

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Additive **Goodness of fit** – RMSE: 15.6; MAD: 12.3; MAPE: 15.2

Data Source: Facility Data Collected August 2004

Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 429 Foreign Born (99%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



By Length of Stay (in months):

State Population (2000):

State Foreign Population (2000):





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

5,894,121 (100%)

614,457 (10.4%)



BACKGROUND DATA: ¹

Facility Name: Facility Location: Washington Department of Corrections Based in Olympia, Washington

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historical Workload										
HIStorical workload					Forecas	ecasted workload				
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07		
248	292	306	377	324	381	386	391	396		

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 Foreign Born (99%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2002 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in months):

State Population (2000):

State Foreign Population (2000):





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

5,363,675 (100%)

193,751 (3.6%)



BACKGROUND DATA:

Facility Name: Facility Location: Wisconsin Department of Corrections Based in Madison, Wisconsin

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



Historic	al Work	load		Forecasted Workload				
FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
178	166	172	212	249	225	236	246	256

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 Foreign Born (100%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in months):

State Population (2000):

State Foreign Population (2000):





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

493,782 (100%)

11,205 (2.3%)



BACKGROUND DATA:¹

Facility Name: Facility Location: Wyoming Department of Corrections Based in Cheyenne, Wyoming

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED IRP WORKLOAD:



	Historic	al Work	load	Forecasted Workload					
	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
	NA	5*	26	22	27	22	26	27	29
* Partial Data									

Projection Method – Holt-Winters Multiplicative Goodness of fit – RMSE: 2.8; MAD: 2.3; MAPE: 67.9

 Data Source:
 Facility Data Collected June 2004

 Total Foreign Born and Indeterminate Records FY03: 27

 Foreign Born (100%)

BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):

By Place of Birth:



By Length of Stay (in months):

State Population (2000):

State Foreign Population (2000):



BREAKDOWN OF FY 2003 WORKLOAD (FOREIGN BORN ADMISSIONS):



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