

California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation

Division of Juvenile Justice



Spring 2013 Juvenile Population Projections

Juvenile Facility and Parole Fiscal Years 2012-13 through 2016-17

Prepared by the Office of Research

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION

JEFFREY A. BEARD, Ph.D.

Secretary

MARTIN HOSHINO

Undersecretary (A), Operations

DIANA TOCHE, D.D.S.

Undersecretary (A), Administration and Offender Services

BRYAN BEYER

Director (A)

Division of Internal Oversight and Research

BRENDA GREALISH

Deputy Director

Office of Research

JAY ATKINSON

Chief

Offender Information Services Branch

JACQUI CODER

Chief

Estimates and Statistical Analysis Section

Population Projections

Roberto Garcia

Research Program Specialist II

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's Spring 2013 Population Projections for the Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) is a summary of juvenile facility and parole population assumptions and projections for fiscal years (FY) 2012-13 through 2016-17. The Projections are based on current data, existing laws and regulations, and include only legislation, programs, propositions, and policy changes signed prior to December 31, 2012 (the start date for the projection process).

The total facility population was 811¹ on December 31, 2012. This is 24 percent (259) lower than the actual population on December 31, 2011. This population total compares to a decline of 17 percent (219) seen from December 31, 2010 to December 31, 2011.

The total parole population (both California and out-of-state supervision) was 398 on December 31, 2012. This is 44 percent (308) lower than the actual population on December 31, 2011. This population total compares to a decline of 54 percent (828) seen from December 31, 2010 to December 31, 2011.

Current facility population projections are lower than the Fall 2012 Juvenile Population Projections (Fall Projections) due to fewer admissions, fewer "M" cases², fewer "E" cases² and elimination of parole violator admissions. This trend is expected to continue through June 30, 2017. The juvenile facility population is projected to be 704 (680 males and 24 females) on June 30, 2013, which is 40 lower than projected in the Fall Projections. The facility population is projected to decrease to 679 (652 males and 27 females) during the following year and is expected to reach 545 (525 males and 20 females) by June 30, 2017.

The current parole projections are the same as the Fall Projections, which eliminates the parole population by January 1, 2013 due to the impact of SB 1021 (June 2012). On June 30, 2013, the parole population is projected to be zero.

¹ Includes parolee detainees in DJJ facility, out to court/jail and other releases.

² "M" and "E" cases are juveniles sentenced as adults but housed in juvenile facilities. "M" cases are court-ordered to DJJ; "E" cases are admitted to DJJ under an agreement between the juvenile and adult divisions.

Table of Contents

Table of contents.....	PAGE
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	i
Introduction.....	1
Institution Population.....	2
Institution Population Trends.....	2
Institution Population Projections.....	2
Comparison of Spring 2013 Projections to Fall 2012 Population Projections.....	3
Juvenile Court First Admissions.....	3
Criminal Court First Admissions.....	5
“M” and “E” Case Admissions.....	6
Parole Violator Admissions.....	7
Facility Length of Stay for Juvenile Cases.....	8
Facility Length of Stay for “M” Cases.....	9
Parole Length of Stay.....	10
Table 1 - Male Facility Population.....	11
Table 2 - Male Parole Population.....	12
Table 3 - Female Facility Population.....	13
Table 4 - Female Parole Population.....	14
APPENDICES A and B	
A - Projection Assumptions, Significant Legislation and policy changes.....	15
B - Methodology and technical notes.....	17

Juvenile Facility and Parole Population Projections for Fiscal Years 2012-13 through 2016-17

INTRODUCTION

The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) is required to submit a budget semi-annually to the Department of Finance (DOF). The initial budget is developed in the fall and presented by the Governor in January for the next fiscal year. This budget is based on projections of juvenile facility and parole populations developed within the CDCR Office of Research. This is followed by a revised budget created in the spring and presented as an adjustment to the original budget.

Population projections, critical for these budgeting processes, are also used for strategic planning, program planning, the development of annual operating budgets, and the capital outlay program. Projections of CDCR's juvenile facility and parole populations are developed twice a year, in the spring and the fall. Input from major stakeholders inside and outside the Department is required in order to discuss and recommend population projection assumptions and their impact on the final projections.

The Spring 2013 Population Projections (Spring Projections) are based on the most current data available and follow only existing law and regulations. Included is the impact on the projections resulting from the enactment of Senate Bill (SB) 81 (September 1, 2007) and Assembly Bill (AB) 191 (September 1, 2007), which restrict juvenile court admissions to cases committed for Welfare & Institutions Code (W&I) Section 707(b) offenses or non-707(b) sex offenses (Penal Code [PC] Section 290). The Spring Projections also include the effect of AB 1628 (January 19, 2011), which sends juveniles to county probation instead of parole and SB 1021 (July 1, 2012), which lowers the jurisdiction age for Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) youths from 25 to 23. It also eliminates juvenile parole, time adds and new parole violator admissions.

More detailed tables of the projections are found in Tables 1 through 4 on pages 11 through 14. Appendix A contains specific legislation that has been included in the projections. The projections methodology is described in Appendix B.

Institution Population

Institution Population Trends

Historically the male and female facility populations have been impacted by the enactment of legislation, and increases/decreases in juvenile court admissions. The facilities' male population drops continue from 4,919 on June 30, 2003 to 922 on June 30, 2012. Like the male population, the female facility population has decreased, from a high of 235 on June 30, 2003 to 26 on June 30, 2012, as shown on Table I below.

Table I: Actual Institution Population

June 30	Males	Females	Total
2003	4,919	235	5,154
2004	3,932	197	4,129
2005	3,232	147	3,379
2006	2,887	129	3,016
2007	2,378	138	2,516
2008	1,808	89	1,897
2009	1,583	76	1,659
2010	1,337	62	1,399
2011	1,157	36	1,193
2012	922	26	948

Institution Population Projections

The male facility population is projected to gradually decrease during FY 2012-13, down to 680 by June 30, 2013. The population will continue to decrease thereafter reaching 525 by June 30, 2017. Similarly, the female population is projected to be 24 by June 30, 2013, and 20 by June 30, 2017. Decreasing admissions continue to have a major impact on the projections. Table II shows the projection by gender. Additional information may be found in Table 1 on page 11.

Table II: Spring 2013 Institution Population Projections

June 30	Males	Females	Total
2013	680	24	704
2014	652	27	679
2015	608	24	632
2016	552	22	574
2017	525	20	545

Comparison of Spring 2013 Projections to Fall 2012 Projections

For each year, the Spring 2013 projections are lower than the Fall 2012 projections. The current projections are expected to be 40 (5%) lower by June 30, 2013 compared to the Fall Projections. The population decline continues, leaving a difference of 122 (18%) lower by June 30, 2017. The current projections are lower compared to the Fall Projections primarily due to fewer admissions and more departures than admissions. The projections' comparisons are shown on Table III.

Table III: Spring 2013 Projections vs. Fall 2012 Projections
Institution Population

June 30	Fall 2012	Spring 2013	Difference
2013	744	704	40
2014	740	679	61
2015	713	632	81
2016	684	574	110
2017	667	545	122

Juvenile Court First Admissions

For the projection of juvenile court first admissions, a historical base of juvenile court first admissions since FY 2003-04 was examined along with rates based upon DOF's State population estimates for youth aged 12 to 17 years. These juvenile court first admissions and admission rates are shown in Table IV.

The W&IC Section 707(b)/sex offender (PC Section 290) juvenile court first admission cases are projected to stabilize at the CY 2012 rate of 4.5, which is 24.0 percent lower than was projected in the Fall Projections.

Table IV: Juvenile Court First Admissions

Fiscal Year	Male			Female			Total	Rate
	W&IC 707(b)	Non-707(b) Sex Off.	Other	W&IC 707(b)	Non-707(b) Sex Off.	Other		
2003-04	455	84	468	33	1	34	1,075	17.3
2004-05	362	47	329	15	0	16	769	12.5
2005-06	326	45	303	21	0	16	711	11.5
2006-07	296	39	215	10	0	19	579	10.0
2007-08	303	26	37	14	1	5	386	9.7
2008-09	334	19	0	18	0	0	371	10.5
2009-10	307	21	0	13	0	0	341	9.8
2010-11	286	26	0	9	0	0	321	9.4
2011-12	179	13	0	7	0	0	199	5.9
2012	142	6	0	6	0	0	154	4.5

As shown in Table V, annual juvenile court first admissions are projected to drop below the 154 actual juvenile court first admissions that occurred in CY 2012 based on an expected 0.7 percent decline in the State's at-risk youth population. It is anticipated that the State's at-risk youth population will increase beginning in FY 2014-15, but is not expected to impact juvenile court first admissions until after FY 2015-16. Accordingly, admissions will stabilize at 145 during most of the projected period.

Table V: Projected Juvenile Court First Admissions

Fiscal Year	Fall 2012	Spring 2013
2012-13	195	145
2013-14	195	145
2014-15	195	145
2015-16	195	145
2016-17	195	150

As shown in Table VI, 95.0 percent of the admissions during CY 2012 had a violent and/or sex primary commitment offense. The Spring projections assume that future admissions will have the same percentage of violent and/or sex offenses.

Table VI: Percent of Admissions by Primary Commitment Offense

Fiscal Year	Violent & Sex	Property	Drug	Other
2003-04	61.8	25.1	4.4	8.7
2004-05	64.7	21.8	3.1	10.4
2005-06	64.8	21.7	4.4	9.1
2006-07	71.2	17.8	3.1	7.9
2007-08	88.9	7.2	1.3	2.6
W&IC 707(b)/Sex Offenders				
2007-08	95.0	3.8	0.3	0.9
2008-09	96.5	3.2	0.0	0.3
2009-10	97.1	2.6	0.3	0.0
2010-11	96.3	2.5	0.0	1.2
2011-12	98.0	2.0	0.0	0.0
2012	95.0	3.0	0.0	2.0

Criminal Court First Admissions

Criminal court first admissions are juveniles committed to DJJ from an adult criminal court. A variety of legislation enacted during 1994 prohibiting juvenile commitments from criminal court for certain types of cases have led to sharp decreases in juvenile criminal court admissions. As was reported in the Fall Projections, future criminal court first admissions are projected to stabilize at five admissions annually, beginning in FY 2012-13, as shown in Table VII.

Table VII: Projected Criminal Court First Admissions

Fiscal Year	Fall 2012	Spring 2013
2012-13	5	5
2013-14	5	5
2014-15	5	5
2015-16	5	5
2016-17	5	5

“M” and “E” Case Admissions

“M” and “E” case admissions are juveniles sentenced to an adult institution, but housed in juvenile facilities. “E” case admissions are juveniles admitted to DJJ under an agreement between the juvenile and adult divisions that became effective on July 1, 2004. “M” case admissions are juveniles who are court-ordered to DJJ. This provision has been in effect since 1984, but the enactment of AB 3369 (1996) limited “M” case admissions to youth under 18 years of age.

“M” case and “E” case admissions over age 17.5 years are restricted to those with earliest possible release dates prior to age 21 and are no longer the responsibility of the DJJ once they are eligible for parole, or reach age 18 and are not eligible for camp. All “M”/“E” case admissions are transferred to the Division of Adult Institutions after completion of their confinement time. Table VIII contains “M” case admissions by age.

Table VIII: “M” Case Admissions by Age at Admission

Fiscal Year	Under Age 18	18 and Over	Total
2003-04	65	0	65
2004-05	60	0	60
2005-06	87	0	87
2006-07	76	0	76
2007-08	105	0	105
2008-09	146	0	146
2009-10	158	0	158
2010-11	128	0	128
2011-12	102	0	102
2012	91	0	91

As shown on Table IX, future “M” case admissions are projected to average 91 annually during the projections period, 3 higher than the 88 admissions assumed in the Fall Projections. The number of “E” cases in juvenile facilities is projected to stabilize at 55, 2 lower than the 57 admissions assumed in the Fall Projections.

Table IX: Projected “M” and “E” Case Admissions

Fiscal Year	Fall 2012		Spring 2013	
	“M” Case	“E” Case	“M” Case	“E” Case
2012-13	88	57	91	55
2013-14	88	57	91	55
2014-15	88	57	91	55
2015-16	88	57	91	55
2016-17	88	57	91	55

Parole Violator Admissions

Table X displays changes in parole violator admissions [including W&IC Section 707(b)/sex offender (PC Section 290 cases)] compared to the parole average daily population (ADP). In FY 2009-10 there were 361 parole violator admissions (including recommitments) compared to 131 in CY 2012, primarily due to low admissions and a low parole ADP because youth are now supervised by county probation instead of parole.

Table X: Parole Violator Admissions Compared to Parole ADP

Fiscal Year	Admissions	Parole ADP	Parole Violator Admissions/ADP
2003-04	795	3,884	20.5
2004-05	906	3,739	24.2
2005-06	775	3,246	23.9
2006-07	579	2,841	20.4
2007-08	349	2,348	14.9
W&IC 707(b)/Sex Offenders (PC 290)			
2006-07	398	2,141	18.6
2007-08	310	1,951	15.9
2008-09	344	1,842	18.7
2009-10	361	1,676	21.5
2010-11	305	1,469	20.8
2011-12	167	721	23.2
2012	131	526	24.9

As of January 1, 2013, there were no more new parole violator admissions, per SB 1021 (2012). As of January 31, 2013, there were 6 admissions that were in the violation process who will be discharged no later than June 30, 2013. The Spring Projections assume a drop in parole violators, from 6 to 0 by FY 2013-14, which remains unchanged compared to the Fall Projections.

Table XI: Projected Parole Violator Admissions

Fiscal Year	Fall 2012	Spring 2013
2012-13	6	6
2013-14	0	0
2014-15	0	0
2015-16	0	0
2016-17	0	0

Facility LOS for Juvenile Cases

Facility LOS for juvenile cases is based on the anticipated LOS as reflected in initial Parole Board Date (PBD), the net effect of time cuts, re-establishment of PBDs, and the impact of any law or policy changes. The DJJ has been assigning initial Parole Board Dates (PBDs) since November 2002 and making time add and time cut decisions since January 2004. The Juvenile Parole Board will continue to make decisions regarding discharge.

As shown in Table XII, changes in facility LOS for first releases depend on time adds/cuts and PBDs. The major portion of LOS is composed of PBDs followed by time add/cuts. The facility LOS increases, beginning in FY 2008-09, were due primarily to SB 81, which restricted juvenile court admissions to cases committed for violent and/or specified sex offenses.

Table XII: Average Facility LOS for Juvenile First Releases to Parole/Probation

Fiscal Year of Release	PBD	Time Adds	Time Cuts	Length of Stay
2003-04	24.5	10.5	-1.0	34.0
2004-05	24.0	10.3	-1.3	33.0
2005-06	23.9	12.5	-1.5	34.9
2006-07	22.6	11.9	-1.5	33.0
2007-08	22.2	12.7	-1.4	33.3
2008-09	24.2	15.0	-1.6	37.6
2009-10	27.1	12.6	-3.1	36.6
2010-11*	29.8	11.2	-3.6	37.6
2011-12*	29.9	8.7	-3.2	35.5
2012*	30.7	8.8	-3.1	36.4

*Results include first releases to parole before January 19, 2011 (the AB 1628 implementation effective date) and afterwards include first releases going to probation.

Facility LOS for juvenile cases is estimated to be higher than the Fall Projections due to more time adds and higher PBDs. By FY 2016-17 facility LOS for first releases to probation is estimated to average 33.5 months for males (see Table 1 on page 11), 38.1 months for females (see Table 3 on page 13), and 33.2 months for both.

PBDs and net time add/cut decisions were assumed to stabilize at the CY 2012 level based on information provided by DJJ during the assumptions meeting, at which it was determined that current trends be utilized since it would reflect as close as possible the average LOS due to the elimination of time adds. Accordingly, PBDs for future first admissions will average 28.3 months, which is lower than the 30.4 assumed in the Fall Projections. PBDs for existing parole violator admissions are estimated to average 6.8 months, as compared to the 7.4 months assumed during the Fall Projections.

Another factor that impacts the facility length of stay is the issuance of time adds/cuts. During CY 2012 there were 2,039 months of time adds (1,001 disciplinary and 1,038 non-disciplinary) and 2,735 months of time cuts. At DJJ facilities, there were 1,821 months of time adds (993 disciplinary and 828 non-disciplinary) and 2,434 months of time cuts.

Facility LOS for "M" Cases

If "M" cases do not transfer early to the Division of Adult Institutions (DAI) for program or disciplinary reasons, they will transfer at their Earliest Possible Release Date (EPRD) if it is prior to age 21. They will transfer at age 18 if their EPRD is not prior to age 21 or if they are not eligible for camp.

Facility LOS for "M" case releases has fluctuated between 12.4 and 16.4 months between July 1, 2003 and December 31, 2012, with the trend mostly decreasing since FY 2006/07, as shown in Table XIII.

Table XIII: Average Facility LOS for "M" Case Releases

Fiscal Year of Release	Length of Stay
2003-04	15.2
2004-05	16.4
2005-06	13.9
2006-07	15.5
2007-08	13.8
2008-09	13.1
2009-10	13.1
2010-11	12.5
2011-12	12.4
2012	12.5

Facility LOS for future "M" case releases is projected to continue to drop, approaching an average of 10.1 months by FY 2015-16, as shown on Table XIV.

Table XIV: Projected Facility LOS for "M" Case Releases

Fiscal Year	Fall 2012	Spring 2013
2012-13	12.0	12.1
2013-14	11.0	10.9
2014-15	10.9	9.3
2015-16	11.2	10.1

Parole LOS

The average LOS on parole for juveniles has increased gradually from 19.8 months in FY 2003-04 to 24.5 months in FY 2011-12 for all parole departures, as shown in Table XV. For FY 2007-08 and FY 2008-09, the average LOS dropped to around 22 months due to non-707(b) cases being released to parole for only 15 days.

The increases in parole LOS were due, in part, to early parole intervention efforts for parolees committing less serious parole violations. These efforts include electronic monitoring and relapse prevention programs in lieu of revocation. Another factor impacting the parole LOS is a continuing increase in the percentage of violent cases being released to parole with more jurisdiction time available (i.e., more cases with jurisdiction to age 25 instead of 21).

Table XV: Average Parole LOS

Fiscal Year	Departures	LOS
2003-04	2,493	19.8
2004-05	2,482	20.4
2005-06	2,040	21.1
2006-07	1,793	23.8
2007-08	1,624	22.0
2008-09	1,359	22.5
2009-10	1,220	24.0
2010-11	1,203	25.3
2011-12	864	24.5
2012	491	22.7

Since new facility admissions are being released to county probation instead of parole due to AB 1628 (January 19, 2011), and SB 1021 (June 2012) eliminates the parole population effective January 1, 2013, the expected average parole time excluding SB 1021 (June 2012) would have been 22.0 months for males (see Table 2 on page 15), 30.8 months for females (see Table 4 on page 15), and 24.0 for both in FY 2012-13. The parole LOS will be 0 months beginning FY 2013-14 when there will not be a parole population.

Table 1
 Projected Facility Population
 Fiscal Years 2012-13 Through 2016-17

Males

	Actual					Projected				
	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17
Institution Population at Beginning of Fiscal Year										
Juvenile Cases.....	2,131	1,508	1,256	1,060	970	734	493	490	443	384
"M" Cases.....	90	108	153	161	125	87	116	111	114	117
Total.....	2,221	1,616	1,409	1,221	1,095	821	609	601	557	501
Admissions										
First Admissions										
Juvenile Court.....	366	353	328	312	192	140	140	140	140	140
Criminal Court.....	5	1	2	4	1	5	5	5	5	5
Parole Violators.....	336	331	340	284	161	6	0	0	0	0
"M" Cases.....	104	137	155	127	98	88	88	88	88	88
Probation returns.....	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	4	5	6
Total.....	811	822	825	727	455	244	236	237	238	239
Departures										
Releases to Parole.....	1,016	748	774	556	206	22	0	0	0	0
Probation Releases.....	0	0	0	100	304	332	131	179	180	161
Probation Re-releases....	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
DJJ Discharges.....	314	189	92	34	80	43	20	17	29	16
"M" Cases.....	86	92	147	163	136	59	93	85	85	89
Total.....	1,416	1,029	1,013	853	729	456	244	281	294	266
Institution Population at End of Fiscal Year										
Juvenile Cases.....	1,508	1,256	1,060	970	734	493	490	443	384	358
"M" Cases*.....	108	153	161	125	87	116	111	114	117	116
Total.....	1,616	1,409	1,221	1,095	821	609	601	557	501	474
"E" Cases*.....	171	144	116	62	57	51	51	51	51	51
Total with "E" Cases.....	1,787	1,553	1,337	1,157	878	660	652	608	552	525
Contract/Other Cases**....	21	30	0	0	44	20				
Total Population	1,808	1,583	1,337	1,157	922	680	652	608	552	525
Length of Stay at Release										
Juvenile Cases										
All Releases	22.9	25.8	22.3	20.3	21.0	32.7	34.6	35.9	33.0	32.5
First Releases	33.1	37.2	36.2	36.4	33.6	37.2	35.0	36.5	33.6	33.5
"M" Cases										
All Releases	13.8	13.2	12.9	12.5	12.5	12.3	11.0	9.3	9.4	10.2

*Criminal court commitments housed in juvenile facilities.

**Housing contract with Los Angeles County ended December 2009; Other includes parolee detainees in DJJ facility, out to court/jail, DMH, other releases.

Table 2
 Projected Parole Population
 Fiscal Years 2012-13 Through 2016-17

Males

	Actual					Projected				
	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13***	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17
Total Parole Population at Beginning of Fiscal Year...	2,602	2,173	1,724	1,540	1,117	495	0	0	0	0
Received on Parole.....	1,108	834	949	617	296	22	0	0	0	0
Departures from Parole.....	1,537	1,283	1,133	1,040	918	537	0	0	0	0
Parole Revocations.....	369	452	492	398	251	6	0	0	0	0
Discharges.....	1,168	831	641	642	667	531	0	0	0	0
In-State Parole Population End of Fiscal Year.....	2,124	1,678	1,500	1,101	494	0	0	0	0	0
Out-of-State Parole Population End of Fiscal Year.....	49	46	40	16	1	0	0	0	0	0
Total Parole Population at End of Fiscal Year.....	2,173	1,724	1,540	1,117	495	0	0	0	0	0
Length of Stay All Departures.....	21.7	22.5	23.6	24.9	23.6	22.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

*** Effective January 1, 2013 the SB 1021 (July 2012) legislation terminated parole jurisdiction and supervision of juvenile offenders

Table 3
 Projected Facility Population
 Fiscal Years 2012-13 Through 2016-17

Females

	Actual					Projected				
	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17
Institution Population at Beginning of Fiscal Year										
Juvenile Cases.....	133	84	64	54	33	17	18	19	16	14
"M" Cases.....	3	3	10	6	0	3	1	4	4	4
Total.....	136	87	74	60	33	20	19	23	20	18
Admissions										
First Admissions										
Juvenile Court.....	20	18	13	9	7	5	5	5	5	5
Criminal Court.....	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	0
Parole Violators.....	13	13	21	15	5	0	0	0	0	0
Probation returns.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
"M" Cases.....	1	9	3	1	4	3	3	3	3	3
Total.....	34	40	38	25	17	11	8	8	8	8
Departures										
Releases to Parole.....	64	42	43	33	7	0	0	0	0	0
Probation Releases.....	0	0	0	9	19	5	0	5	2	3
Probation Re-releases....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DJJ Discharges.....	18	9	2	3	3	2	4	3	5	4
"M" Cases.....	1	2	7	7	1	5	0	3	3	3
Total.....	83	53	52	52	30	12	4	11	10	10
Institution Population at End of Fiscal Year										
Juvenile Cases.....	84	64	54	33	17	18	19	16	14	12
"M" Cases*.....	3	10	6	0	3	1	4	4	4	4
Total.....	87	74	60	33	20	19	23	20	18	16
"E" Cases*.....	2	2	2	3	4	4	4	4	4	4
Total with "E" Cases.....	89	76	62	36	24	23	27	24	22	20
Contract/Other Cases**....					2	1				
Total Population	89	76	62	36	26	24	27	24	22	20
Length of Stay at Release										
Juvenile Cases										
All Releases	28.8	29.5	23.6	20.6	24.2	21.4	28.8	35.1	32.7	38.1
First Releases	35.9	39.4	38.2	36.4	32.2	39.0	28.8	35.1	32.7	38.1
"M" Cases										
All Releases	10.6	9.7	17.7	13.2	5.5	8.8	7.7	9.1	8.6	8.9

*Criminal court commitments housed in juvenile facilities.

**Housing contract with Los Angeles County ended December 2009; Other includes parolee detainees in DJJ facility, out to court/jail, DMH, other releases.

Table 4
 Projected Parole Population
 Fiscal Years 2012-13 Through 2016-17

Females

	Actual					Projected				
	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13***	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17
Total Parole Population at Beginning of Fiscal Year...	180	158	127	100	78	38	0	0	0	0
Received on Parole.....	65	45	48	32	14	0	0	0	0	0
Departures from Parole.....	87	76	75	54	54	38	0	0	0	0
Parole Revocations.....	12	14	24	19	5	0	0	0	0	0
Discharges.....	75	62	51	35	49	38	0	0	0	0
In-State Parole Population End of Fiscal Year.....	156	127	99	77	38	0	0	0	0	0
Out-of-State Parole Population End of Fiscal Year.....	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Parole Population at End of Fiscal Year.....	158	127	100	78	38	0	0	0	0	0
Length of Stay All Departures.....	27.6	29.2	30.2	32.6	33.9	30.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

*** Effective January 1, 2013 the SB 1021 (July 2012) legislation terminated parole jurisdiction and supervision of juvenile offenders

Appendix A

PROJECTION ASSUMPTIONS

Specific assumptions regarding Chaptered Legislation, Initiatives, Propositions and Policy Changes regarding the major factors affecting the juvenile populations, first admissions, “M” and “E” case admissions, parole violator admissions, facility LOS, and parole LOS are discussed below.

Enacted Laws with Population Impact

Chapter 41, Statutes of 2012 (SB 1021, Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review). Effective July 1, 2012, SB 1021 lowers the jurisdiction age for DJJ youths from 25 to 23 and ensures counties be charged an annual rate of \$24,000² per youth committed to DJJ via juvenile court. It also eliminates juvenile parole, time adds and new parole violator admissions after December 31, 2012.

Chapter 729, Statutes of 2010 (AB 1628, Blumenfield). Effective January 19, 2011, AB 1628 transfers parole supervisory responsibility to county probation for new admissions and any wards remaining on parole will be discharged by July 1, 2014.

Chapter 175, Statutes of 2007 (SB 81, Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review) and Chapter 257, Statutes of 2007 (AB 191, Committee on Budget). Effective September 1, 2007 juvenile court commitments are restricted to cases committed for specified (violent) offenses listed in subdivision (b) of Section 707 of the W&IC or for specified non-707(b) sex offenses (PC Section 290). The impact is estimated to be 240 fewer juvenile court first admissions per year. It is assumed that any remaining non-707(b) youth (excluding sex offenders) who were in a juvenile facility on September 1, 2007 will complete their facility time, be released to parole for 15 days, and then discharge (returned to their county of commitment). Non-707(b) cases who were on parole on September 1, 2007 (excluding sex offenders) will discharge once they have completed their parole time.

Proposition 21, Gang Violence and Juvenile Crime Preventive Act (March 7, 2000), made changes to the prosecution, sentencing and incarceration of juvenile offenders. Its impact on the juvenile facility population is unknown. Since these projections reflect facility population and movement trends through December 31, 2012, the impact of this initiative is now included. As of December 31, 2012, of those we can identify, there were 170 first admission cases in the facility population which were Proposition 21 cases (i.e., cases committed for gang-related offenses for which counties are not billed).

² This is not incorporated in the projections because there is no trend on which to base it.

Chapter 6, Statutes of 1996 (*SB 681, Hurtt*). Effective January 1, 1997, counties are required to pay the State for each juvenile court commitment pursuant to a scale based on commitment offense. It's an incentive to the county when they don't commit a juvenile and a disincentive when they commit a person to DJJ because of the associated costs. Commitment offenses are categorized according to seriousness: Category I, most serious to Category VII, least serious. Counties pay 50 percent of the per capita facility cost for offense Category V juvenile court commitments, 75 percent for Category VI commitments, and 100 percent for Category VII commitments. As of December 31, 2011 for all other commitments, counties were paying the State \$212 per month for the time spent in a facility until SB 1021 took effect, which allows the state to charge counties \$24,000 per youth committed to DJJ via juvenile court. The rate prior to the sliding scale for all commitment types was \$25 per month.

Chapter 195, Statutes of 1996 (*AB 3369, Bordonaro*). Effective July 22, 1996, the statute reduces the age limit for authorizing a transfer of a person to the California Youth Authority (CYA), currently known as the Division of Juvenile Justice, by the Director of the California Department of Corrections (CDC) to under 18 years and requires the transfer to terminate in specified situations.

Appendix B

Methodology and Technical Notes

CDCR's juvenile facility and parole population projections are developed using a computer simulation model. In the model (sometimes referred to as a stochastic entity simulation model), juveniles progress through the facility and parole system individually using a collection of probabilistic assumptions. Because random numbers are a critical part of computer simulation, this type of model has also been referred to as a Monte Carlo simulation model.

The juvenile Monte Carlo simulation model requires more than 100 different input variables for each gender and is designed to describe activity central to the critical components of the juvenile facility and parole system. Some of those variables include age, admission type, commitment type, commitment offense, court-imposed sentence, parole consideration date, facility length of stay (LOS), time adds and cuts, jail credits, offense category, parole LOS, and parole violation rates.

The juvenile projection model has two major components. One component simulates the release from a facility (and from parole) for the populations at the start of the projection period. For example, determining the release time of a juvenile case from a facility, current Parole Board Date (PBD), probability of future time adds and cuts, and their time until jurisdiction termination are all taken into consideration.

The second component of the projection model simulates the intake and release of future juvenile facility admissions. The number of first admissions is projected independently from the model. For example, future juvenile court first admissions are projected using DOF population forecasts for the State youth population, ages 12 to 17 years. These projections are then entered into the model as an input variable and subsequent juvenile movements through the facility and parole system progress from there.

Historical data are used for determining assumptions necessary to project future juvenile facility and parole populations. For example, for the Spring Projections, Calendar Year (CY) 2012 decisions regarding PBDs and time cuts were assumed to remain the same for future juveniles. The projection model can take into consideration future changes in law and policy any time during the projection period. However, as with any projection model, these changes and their estimated impact must be known at the start of the projection process.