



California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation

FALL 2019 POPULATION PROJECTIONS

Division of Correctional Policy Research and Internal Oversight

OFFICE OF RESEARCH | JANUARY 2020



You can obtain reports by contacting the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation on the internet at:
<https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/research/>

The Mission of CDCR's Office of Research:

"To inform public policy by analyzing correctional trends, developing population projections, guiding research projects and publishing Department reports."

Ralph Diaz, Secretary
Jeffrey Macomber, Undersecretary
Julie Basco, Deputy Director
Chris Chambers, Associate Director
Loran Sheley, Chief



Produced by:

Huihui Xu, Research Specialist II
Juan Angel Villon, Research Data Specialist II
Jenny Belnas, Research Data Specialist I
Miguel Lizarde, Staff Services Analyst

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Changes for Fall 2019 Population Projections	1
2	Adult Population Projections	2
2.1	Adult Total Institution Population Trends and Projections	3
2.2	Adult Institution Population Trends and Projections by Gender	5
2.3	Comparison of Spring 2019 and Fall 2019 Total Institution Population Projections	8
2.3.1	Comparison of Spring 2019 and Fall 2019 Total Institution Population Projections by Gender	9
3	Court Commitments	10
3.1	Felon Court Commitment Trends and Projections by Gender	12
3.2	Felon Second Strike Court Commitment Trends and Projections	13
4	Male Inmate Placement Needs	14
5	Parole Population	15
5.1	Active Parole Population Trends and Projections	15
5.2	Comparison of Spring 2019 and Fall 2019 Active Parole Population Projections	18
6	Juvenile Population Projections	19
	Appendix A – Methodology, Technical Notes, and Limitations	20
	Methodology and Technical Notes	20
	Limitations	21
	Appendix B – Significant Chaptered Legislation, Initiatives, and Policy Changes	22
	Adults	22
	Legislation	22
	Initiatives	23
	Policy Changes	24
	Juveniles	26
	Legislation	26
	Initiatives	27
	Policy Changes	28

Appendix C – Glossary of Terms 29
 Appendix D – Population Projections Tables 9 to 20..... 31

List of Tables and Figures

Tables

Table 1. Institution and Active Parole Population, June 30, 2010 through June 30, 2024 2
 Table 2. Comparison of Spring 2019 and Fall 2019 Total Institution Population Projections 8
 Table 3. Comparison of Spring 2019 and Fall 2019 Total Institution Population Projections by
 Gender 9
 Table 4. Felon Court Commitments and Projections by Gender, Fiscal Years 2009-10 through
 2023-24 10
 Table 5. Male Institution Population Projections by Housing Level, June 30, 2019 through
 June 30, 2024 14
 Table 6. Active Parole Population Supervised in California, June 30, 2010 through June 30, 2024..... 16
 Table 7. Comparison of Spring 2019 and Fall 2019 Active Parole Population Projections..... 18
 Table 8. Juvenile Average Daily Population and Projected Average Daily Population, June 2010
 through June 2021 19
 Table 9. Actual Felon Court Commitments, Fiscal Years 2009-10 through 2018-19 31
 Table 10. Actual Male Felon Court Commitments, Fiscal Years 2009-10 through 2018-19 31
 Table 11. Actual Female Felon Court Commitments, Fiscal Years 2009-10 through 2018-19 32
 Table 12. Fall 2019 Projected Felon Prison Court Commitments, Fiscal Years 2019-20 through
 2023-24 32
 Table 13. Fall 2019 Projected Male Felon Prison Court Commitments, Fiscal Years 2019-20
 through 2023-24 33
 Table 14. Fall 2019 Projected Female Felon Prison Court Commitments, Fiscal Years 2019-20
 through 2023-24 33
 Table 15. Institution Population by Quarter and Gender, Fiscal Years 2019-20 through 2020-21 34
 Table 16. Average Daily Institution Population by Quarter and Gender, Fiscal Years 2019-20
 through 2020-21 34
 Table 17. Projected Institution Population by Quarter and Housing Level, Fiscal Years 2019-20
 through 2020-21 35

Table 18. Projected Institution Population by Housing Level, June 30, 2019 through June 30, 2024 35

Table 19. California Active Parole Population by Quarter, Fiscal Years 2019-20 through 2020-21 36

Table 20. California Average Daily Active Parole Population by Quarter, Fiscal Years 2019-20
through 2020-21 36

Figures

Figure 1. Total Institution Population Trends and Projections, June 30, 2010 through June 30, 2024..... 4

Figure 2. Male Population Trends and Projections, June 30, 2010 through June 30, 2024 5

Figure 3. Female Population Trends and Projections, June 30, 2010 through June 30, 2024..... 7

Figure 4. Felon Court Commitments and Projections, Fiscal Years 2009-10 through 2023-24 11

Figure 5. Felon Court Commitment Trends and Projections by Gender, Fiscal Years 2009-10
through 2023-24 12

Figure 6. Actual and Projected Second Strike Court Commitments, Fiscal Years 2009-10 through
2023-24 13

Figure 7. Active Parole Population Trends and Projections, June 30, 2010 through June 30, 2024 17

Executive Summary

This report presents California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's (CDCR) Fall 2019 adult institution, parole, and juvenile institution population projections. CDCR developed these projections using historical trend data and time series forecasting techniques. Institution and parole projections are provided through June 2024, and juvenile projections are provided through June 2021.

Similar to past population projections, these projections incorporate the impacts of several court-ordered population reduction measures, Proposition 47, and Proposition 57.¹ Additionally, the Fall 2019 Population Projections include several recent policy changes that were estimated separately in the Spring 2019 Population Projections.²

Adult Institution Projections

CDCR predicts the adult institution population will decrease each year throughout the projections cycle, due to the continuing impact of Proposition 57 and other recent policy changes. The institution population of 125,472 inmates on June 30, 2019 is expected to decrease to 124,147 inmates by June 30, 2020, and further decrease to 118,935 inmates by June 30, 2024, a net five-year reduction of 5.2 percent or 6,537 inmates.

The Fall 2019 projections range from 0.8 to 1.3 percent lower than the Spring 2019 projections each year, and the difference is primarily driven by lower court commitment projections in Fall 2019 compared to Spring 2019. CDCR observed a decrease in court commitments beginning in the second half of calendar year 2018. Analysis performed for the Spring 2019 Population Projections showed patterns that coincided with several major disasters in California, which were hypothesized to have reduced court commitments temporarily. Consequently, the Spring 2019 Projections did not incorporate a decrease in court commitments.

Recent analysis revealed those identified geographic patterns have stabilized. CDCR also observed that male commitments for the under 25 age group continued to decrease through the end of the last fiscal year and has incorporated this decrease into the Fall 2019 Projections, which contributed to a slight decrease in the male commitment projection over the projections cycle. Female commitments have not

¹ Many court-ordered measures were subsequently enacted with the implementation of Proposition 57. Additional information is available at: <https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/3-judge-court-update>. Proposition 47 was passed by voter initiative in November 2014 and reduced penalties for most non-serious, non-violent property and drug crimes by mandating a misdemeanor instead of a felony sentence for certain crimes. Proposition 57 was passed by voter initiative in November 2016. More information is available at: <https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/proposition57/>.

² These changes were referred to as Post-Projections Policy Changes in the Spring 2019 Projections and included: supplemental reforms to credit earning, which expanded the credits made available under Proposition 57; a parole determination process for indeterminately sentenced non-violent offenders; and changes that increased the number of offenders recommended for recall and resentencing under Penal Code section 1170(d).

experienced a similar decrease and are anticipated to increase during the projections cycle. However, the female court commitment increases will be offset by the continuing impact of Proposition 57 and other recent policy changes, resulting in an overall female population decrease throughout the projections cycle.

Adult Parole Projections

CDCR expects the active parole population will decrease 3.0 percent or 1,503 parolees from June 30, 2019 to June 30, 2020 (50,822 to 49,319 parolees). The anticipated decrease is related to a number of parolees who were released in late 2017 at the beginning of Proposition 57's implementation and are anticipated to become eligible for parole discharge in late 2019 and early 2020. The short-term decrease is anticipated to be followed by increases each year for the remainder of the projections cycle, primarily due to the continuing impact of Proposition 57 and other recent policy changes as well as growth in the population of parolees who previously served life prison terms and have long lengths of stay on parole. The parole population is projected to reach 51,882 parolees on June 30, 2024, a net five-year increase of 2.1 percent or 1,060 parolees.

The differences between the Fall 2019 and Spring 2019 Projections vary from 2.5 percent lower to 3.5 percent higher over the projections cycle. The Fall 2019 Projections are generally higher than Spring 2019 as they better account for the growing number of parolees who served life prison terms and are consequently expected to serve long lengths of stay on parole.

Juvenile Projections

CDCR predicts the total juvenile average daily population will exhibit a 15.6 percent increase to reach 829 youth by June 2020, then grow another 6.4 percent to reach 882 youth by June 2021. The projected increases are attributable to the collective impacts of three factors: 1) Proposition 57, which provided juvenile court judges authority to decide whether juveniles age 14 and older should be sentenced as adults for specified offenses 2) a Transition-Age Youth Pilot Program, and 3) a recent policy change approved in the FY 2018-19 Budget Act that raised the age of jurisdiction to 25 for certain youth committed to the Division of Juvenile Justice.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION

FALL 2019 POPULATION PROJECTIONS

1 Introduction

This report presents the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's (CDCR) Fall 2019 adult institution, parole, and juvenile institution population projections. CDCR developed these projections using historical trend data and time series forecasting techniques. The projections incorporate the effects of existing laws and regulations on the state institution and parole populations. Unless otherwise noted, the projections do not include the impact of proposed legislation, programs, propositions, or policy changes that have not been signed, affirmed, or implemented as of June 30, 2019.

1.1 Changes for Fall 2019 Population Projections

The Spring 2019 Projections included two sets of projections. Baseline projections, based on historical trend data through December 31, 2018, including the effects of Proposition 57¹; and a second set of projections that incorporated the estimated effects of policy changes that were scheduled for implementation during the Spring 2019 projections cycle, referred to collectively as Post-Projections Policy Changes. The single set of Fall 2019 Projections incorporate those recent policy changes. The Spring 2019 Projections referenced in this report are those that include the effects of the Post-Projections Policy Changes.

¹ Proposition 57 was passed by voter initiative in November 2016. More information is available at: <https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/proposition57/>

2 Adult Population Projections

CDCR observed annual decreases in the institution population each June between the years 2010 and 2016, with the exception of 2014 (see Table 1). The declines were primarily due to the impacts of 2011 Realignment legislation, several court-ordered population reduction measures, and the effects of Proposition 47.² Those decreases were outpaced by longer-term trends that caused growth in groups such as offenders convicted of violent offenses or sentenced to life prison terms, which contributed to a 2.0 percent (2,617 inmates) annual population increase from June 30, 2016 to June 30, 2017.

Table 1. Institution and Active Parole Population, June 30, 2010 through June 30, 2024

June 30	Institution				Active Parole	
	Female	Male	Total	Percent Change	Total	Percent Change
Actual						
2010	10,096	155,721	165,817	N/A	94,748	N/A
2011	9,565	152,804	162,369	-2.1%	90,813	-4.2%
2012	6,471	128,852	135,323	-16.7%	69,435	-23.5%
2013	5,995	127,019	133,014	-1.7%	51,300	-26.1%
2014	6,306	129,294	135,600	1.9%	44,499	-13.3%
2015	5,857	123,325	129,182	-4.7%	45,473	2.2%
2016	5,769	122,874	128,643	-0.4%	43,814	-3.6%
2017	5,971	125,289	131,260	2.0%	45,261	3.3%
2018	5,906	123,511	129,417	-1.4%	47,370	4.7%
2019	5,691	119,781	125,472	-3.0%	50,822	7.3%
Projected						
2020	5,530	118,617	124,147	-1.1%	49,319	-3.0%
2021	5,417	117,820	123,237	-0.7%	51,097	3.6%
2022	5,369	116,331	121,700	-1.2%	51,187	0.2%
2023	5,295	114,977	120,272	-1.2%	51,457	0.5%
2024	5,248	113,687	118,935	-1.1%	51,882	0.8%

² Population reduction measures include: prospective credit-earning changes for certain offenders; parole determination process for non-violent offenders; parole processes for medically incapacitated inmates and inmates 60 years of age or older having served at least 25 years of incarceration. Proposition 47 was passed by voter initiative in November 2014 and reduced penalties for most non-serious, non-violent property and drug crimes by mandating a misdemeanor instead of a felony sentence for certain crimes.

Proposition 57-related changes began to impact the adult institution and parole populations in 2017, which has contributed to the current population decline. Proposition 57 and other recent policy changes³ contributed to a 3.0 percent annual decrease (3,945 inmates) in the total institution population by June 30, 2019.

CDCR predicts the adult institution population will decrease steadily each year throughout the projections cycle, due to the continuing impact of Proposition 57 and other recent policy changes. The institution population of 125,472 inmates on June 30, 2019 is expected to decrease 1.1 percent to 124,147 inmates by June 30, 2020 (see Table 1). Following that, annual decreases ranging from 0.7 percent to 1.2 percent are projected, which will lead to an adult institution population of 118,935 inmates by June 30, 2024, a net five-year decrease of 5.2 percent or 6,537 inmates.

The Fall 2019 Projections predict the active parole population will decrease 3.0 percent (1,503 parolees) from June 30, 2019 to June 30, 2020 before increasing each year for the remainder of the projections cycle (see Table 1). The active parole population is projected to reach 51,882 parolees by June 30, 2024, a net five-year increase of 2.1 percent or 1,060 parolees.

2.1 Adult Total Institution Population Trends and Projections

The adult total institution population decreased each year between 2010 and 2013 (see Table 1 and Figure 1). The largest single-year percent decrease occurred after the implementation of Realignment legislation in October 2011, when the adult institution population decreased 16.7 percent or 27,046 inmates from June 30, 2011 to June 30, 2012 (162,369 to 135,323 inmates). The population continued to decrease in the following year, reaching 133,014 inmates on June 30, 2013. However, after several years of decline, the population grew by 1.9 percent (2,586 inmates) to 135,600 inmates on June 30, 2014. Following that year of growth, the institution population decreased in the two subsequent years to 128,643 inmates on June 30, 2016 (a two-year decrease of 5.1 percent or 6,957 inmates). The decrease was primarily due to the impacts of several court-ordered population reduction measures and Proposition 47.


The institution population exhibited another increase of 2.0 percent (2,617 inmates) from June 30, 2016 to June 30, 2017 (128,643 to 131,260 inmates). The previously mentioned court-ordered population reduction measures and the effects of Proposition 47 mainly impacted non-serious, non-violent, and non-sex-registrant offenders. The associated decreases were outpaced by long-term trends in groups such as offenders convicted of violent offenses or sentenced to life prison terms, who were mostly unaffected by the changes. A simultaneous increase in court commitments also contributed to the

³ These recent policy changes included supplemental reforms to credit earning, which expanded the credits made available under Proposition 57 that became effective May 1, 2019; a parole determination process for indeterminate sentenced non-violent offenders, which started in January 2019; and changes that increased the number of offenders recommended for recall and resentencing under Penal Code section 1170(d), which started in 2018.

increase in the adult institution population. Most recently, CDCR has observed a decrease in the institution population, primarily because of Proposition 57 and other recent policy changes. The adult institution population declined 1.4 percent (1,843 inmates) from 131,260 inmates on June 30, 2017 to 129,417 inmates on June 30, 2018. This was followed by a decrease of 3.0 percent (3,945 inmates) from 129,417 inmates on June 30, 2018 to 125,472 inmates on June 30, 2019.

CDCR predicts the institution population will decrease throughout the projections cycle due to the continuing impact of Proposition 57 and other recent policy changes. The institution population is expected to decrease 1.1 percent to 124,147 inmates by June 30, 2020 (see Table 1 and Figure 1). Following that, annual decreases ranging from 0.7 percent to 1.2 percent are projected, leading to an adult institution population of 118,935 inmates by June 30, 2024, a net five-year decrease of 5.2 percent or 6,537 inmates.

Figure 1. Total Institution Population Trends and Projections, June 30, 2010 through June 30, 2024




2.2 Adult Institution Population Trends and Projections by Gender

Male inmates comprise the majority of the adult institution population. As expected, male population trends were similar to the total institution population trends. Specifically, the male population decreased by 18.4 percent (28,702 inmates) from June 30, 2010 to June 30, 2013 (155,721 to 127,019 inmates; see Table 1 and Figure 2). In contrast to preceding years where decreases were observed, the male population increased by 1.8 percent in the subsequent year (127,019 to 129,294 inmates). The male population decreased in the two years immediately following the passage of Proposition 47, dropping 4.6 percent (5,969 inmates) from 129,294 inmates on June 30, 2014 to 123,325 inmates on June 30, 2015 and then 0.4 percent (451 inmates) to 122,874 inmates on June 30, 2016. CDCR observed a 2.0 percent increase (2,415 inmates) in the male population to 125,289 inmates on June 30, 2017. The male population further decreased following the implementation of Proposition 57, falling to 123,511 inmates on June 30, 2018, a 1.4 percent decrease (1,778 inmates). This was followed by a 3.0 percent decrease (3,730 inmates) to 119,781 on June 30, 2019.

The male institution population is projected to decrease every year throughout the projections cycle. The Fall 2019 Projections predict the male population will decrease to 113,687 by June 30, 2024, a net five-year decrease of 5.1 percent or 6,094 inmates (see Table 1 and Figure 2).

Figure 2. Male Population Trends and Projections, June 30, 2010 through June 30, 2024




The female institution population decreased 40.6 percent between June 30, 2010 and June 30, 2013 (10,096 to 5,995 inmates; see Table 1 and Figure 3), which was a larger percent decrease than observed in the male population during the same time period. From June 30, 2013 to June 30, 2014, the female population increased 5.2 percent (5,995 to 6,306 inmates). Similar to the male population, this was a reversal of several years of reduction, and it was a larger percent increase than observed in the male population. The female institution population decreased in the two subsequent years following the implementation of Proposition 47. CDCR observed a 7.1 percent decrease (449 inmates) in the female population to 5,857 inmates on June 30, 2015 and another 1.5 percent decrease (88 inmates) to 5,769 inmates on June 30, 2016. The female population grew by 3.5 percent (202 inmates) to 5,971 inmates on June 30, 2017. Following the introduction of Proposition 57, the female population experienced a decrease of 1.1 percent (65 inmates) to 5,906 inmates on June 30, 2018 and a 3.6 percent decrease (215 inmates) to 5,691 inmates on June 30, 2019.

Similar to the overall decreasing trends in the total and male institution populations, the female population is expected to decrease throughout the projections cycle, reaching 5,248 inmates on June 30, 2024, a net five-year decrease of 7.8 percent or 443 inmates (see Table 1 and Figure 3).

Quarterly projections of the institution population by gender for FY 2019-2020 and 2020-21 are available in Appendix D, Tables 15 and 16.

Figure 3. Female Population Trends and Projections, June 30, 2010 through June 30, 2024



2.3 Comparison of Spring 2019 and Fall 2019 Total Institution Population Projections

The Fall 2019 Projections predict a total institution population of 124,147 inmates by June 30, 2020, which is 1.0 percent or 1,217 inmates lower than the Spring 2019 Projections (see Table 2). After that, the two projections show variations of up to 1.3 percent throughout the projections cycle. The difference between the two projections is primarily due to a lower court commitment projection than Spring 2019.

Table 2. Comparison of Spring 2019 and Fall 2019 Total Institution Population Projections

June 30	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Difference	Percent Difference
2019	126,990	*125,472	-1,518	-1.2%
2020	125,364	124,147	-1,217	-1.0%
2021	124,211	123,237	-974	-0.8%
2022	123,355	121,700	-1,655	-1.3%
2023	121,443	120,272	-1,171	-1.0%
2024	N/A	118,935	N/A	N/A

*Actual Population

2.3.1 Comparison of Spring 2019 and Fall 2019 Total Institution Population Projections by Gender

As shown in Table 3, the difference in the male institution population between the Fall 2019 Projections and the Spring 2019 Projections follows the overall trend of the total institution population.

The female institution population in the Fall 2019 Projections is lower during the first two years when compared to the Spring 2019 Projections. However, the subsequent two years in the projections cycle show an increase in the female institution population compared to the Spring 2019 Projections. The female institution population is projected to reach 5,248 inmates by June 30, 2024 (see Table 3).

Table 3. Comparison of Spring 2019 and Fall 2019 Total Institution Population Projections by Gender

June 30	Male				Female			
	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Difference	Percent Difference	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Difference	Percent Difference
2019	121,157	*119,781	-1,376	-1.1%	5,833	*5,691	-142	-2.4%
2020	119,734	118,617	-1,117	-0.9%	5,630	5,530	-100	-1.8%
2021	118,710	117,820	-890	-0.7%	5,501	5,417	-84	-1.5%
2022	117,996	116,331	-1,665	-1.4%	5,359	5,369	10	0.2%
2023	116,218	114,977	-1,241	-1.1%	5,225	5,295	70	1.3%
2024	N/A	113,687	N/A	N/A	N/A	5,248	N/A	N/A

*Actual Population

3 Court Commitments

The number of felon court commitments⁴ decreased 38.9 percent from FY 2009-10 to FY 2013-14 (63,567 to 38,853 commitments; see Table 4 and Figure 4). The largest single-year percent decrease of 32.5 percent occurred in FY 2011-12 (57,747 to 39,001 commitments), following the implementation of 2011 Realignment legislation. After three consecutive years of decrease between FY 2009-10 and FY 2012-13, court commitments experienced a 7.9 percent increase (2,856 commitments) in FY 2013-14 (35,997 to 38,853 commitments). Total court commitments then decreased 8.5 percent in FY 2014-15 (38,853 to 35,547 commitments), primarily due to the passage of Proposition 47. Felon court commitments increased 0.3 percent in FY 2015-16 (35,547 to 35,637 commitments). The marginal growth was followed by a larger increase of 2.6 percent in FY 2016-17 (35,637 to 36,556 commitments). Following these two years of increase, court commitments decreased 1.0 percent in FY 2017-18 (36,556 to 36,204 commitments) and 3.5 percent in FY 2018-19 (36,204 to 34,932 commitments).

Table 4. Felon Court Commitments and Projections by Gender, Fiscal Years 2009-10 through 2023-24

Fiscal Year	Commitments						Total	Fiscal Year Percent Change
	Male	Percent of Total	Fiscal Year Percent Change	Female	Percent of Total	Fiscal Year Percent Change		
Actual								
2009-10	56,631	89.1%	N/A	6,936	10.9%	N/A	63,567	N/A
2010-11	51,306	88.8%	-9.4%	6,441	11.2%	-7.1%	57,747	-9.2%
2011-12	35,855	91.9%	-30.1%	3,146	8.1%	-51.2%	39,001	-32.5%
2012-13	33,660	93.5%	-6.1%	2,337	6.5%	-25.7%	35,997	-7.7%
2013-14	36,085	92.9%	7.2%	2,768	7.1%	18.4%	38,853	7.9%
2014-15	33,080	93.1%	-8.3%	2,467	6.9%	-10.9%	35,547	-8.5%
2015-16	33,263	93.3%	0.6%	2,374	6.7%	-3.8%	35,637	0.3%
2016-17	33,958	92.9%	2.1%	2,598	7.1%	9.4%	36,556	2.6%
2017-18	33,526	92.6%	-1.3%	2,678	7.4%	3.1%	36,204	-1.0%
2018-19	32,293	92.4%	-3.7%	2,639	7.6%	-1.5%	34,932	-3.5%
Projected								
2019-20	32,287	92.4%	0.0%	2,669	7.6%	1.1%	34,956	0.1%
2020-21	32,275	92.2%	0.0%	2,724	7.8%	2.1%	34,999	0.1%
2021-22	32,261	92.1%	0.0%	2,777	7.9%	1.9%	35,038	0.1%
2022-23	32,249	91.9%	0.0%	2,828	8.1%	1.8%	35,077	0.1%
2023-24	32,242	91.8%	0.0%	2,885	8.2%	2.0%	35,127	0.1%


⁴ Felon court commitments are a major factor in population growth or decline. Increasing court commitments generally lead to population growth, and decreasing court commitments generally lead to population decline. These general patterns may be counterbalanced by other factors, such as changes in length of stay.

CDCR observed a decrease in court commitments beginning in the second half of calendar year 2018 (approximately 800 commitments fewer than observed during the same period the previous year). Analysis performed during the last projections cycle suggested the decrease could be a temporary phenomenon not indicative of a long term trend,⁵ and the Spring 2019 Projections did not incorporate the decrease. Recent analysis showed that the previously identified patterns have stabilized, but male commitments for the under 25 age group continued to decrease through the end of the last fiscal year. This decrease has been factored into the Fall 2019 commitment projection.

CDCR predicts court commitments to state prison to increase 0.1 percent (24 commitments) in FY 2019-20, followed by slight increases each year in the projections cycle (see Table 4 and Figure 4).

Detailed tables showing actual and projected rates of court commitments are shown in Appendix D, Tables 9 through 14.

Figure 4. Felon Court Commitments and Projections, Fiscal Years 2009-10 through 2023-24




⁵ Analysis showed patterns that coincided with several major disasters in California, which were hypothesized to have impacted commitments indirectly.

3.1 Felon Court Commitment Trends and Projections by Gender

CDCR observed a 3.7 percent decrease (1,233 commitments) during FY 2018-19 in male felon court commitments compared to the preceding fiscal year (see Table 4 and Figure 5). Male felon court commitments are projected to slightly decrease each year throughout the projections cycle. This decrease is in contrast to projected total felon court commitments, which are expected to increase throughout the projections cycle as a result of a projected increase in female felon court commitments.

The Fall 2019 Projections predict female felon court commitments will increase each year throughout the projections cycle and outpace the projected decrease in male felon court commitments, resulting in an increase in total felon court commitments.

Figure 5. Felon Court Commitment Trends and Projections by Gender, Fiscal Years 2009-10 through 2023-24




3.2 Felon Second Strike Court Commitment Trends and Projections

The number of felon Second Strike court commitments decreased 4.8 percent from FY 2009-10 to FY 2011-12 (7,941 to 7,558 Second Strike commitments; see Figure 6). During the two years after the implementation of 2011 Realignment legislation, Second Strike court commitments increased to an all-time high, reaching 10,376 in FY 2013-14. However, following the passage of Proposition 47, Second Strike commitments decreased 13.6 percent down to 8,959 commitments in FY 2015-16. Following these two years of decrease, Second Strike commitments increased 8.7 percent (8,959 to 9,738 commitments) from FY 2015-16 to FY 2016-17, which was a larger percent increase than observed in total court commitments. Similar to total felon court commitments, Second Strike court commitments decreased 3.5 percent (342 commitments) from FY 2016-17 to FY 2017-18 and 6.2 percent (580 commitments) from FY 2017-18 to FY 2018-19.

Following the overall trend in total felon court commitments, the Fall 2019 Projections predict slight increases in Second Strike commitments throughout the projections cycle.

Figure 6. Actual and Projected Second Strike Court Commitments, Fiscal Years 2009-10 through 2023-24



4 Male Inmate Placement Needs

Table 5 presents the Fall 2019 male institution population by housing level, based on historical trend. CDCR’s Reception Center population was 10,073 on June 30, 2019. CDCR predicts Reception Center needs will initially decrease and then remain relatively stable in subsequent years, falling to 9,945 inmates by June 30, 2024.

Of inmates requiring housing in Security Levels I through IV, CDCR projects Level II inmates to encompass the largest proportion of the male population, while Level I inmates are expected to represent the smallest proportion throughout the projections cycle.

Quarterly housing level projections through June 30, 2021 and annual housing level projections through June 30, 2024 are available in Appendix D, Tables 17 and 18.

Table 5. Male Institution Population Projections by Housing Level, June 30, 2019 through June 30, 2024

June 30	Security Level							Total Male
	Reception Center	Level I	Level II	Level III	Level IV	PHU	SHU	
2019 (Actual)	10,073	13,950	46,837	20,557	27,314	5	1,045	119,781
2020	9,969	13,907	46,156	20,373	27,162	5	1,045	118,617
2021	9,950	13,857	45,757	20,163	27,043	5	1,045	117,820
2022	9,946	13,694	45,102	19,898	26,641	5	1,045	116,331
2023	9,945	13,553	44,518	19,657	26,254	5	1,045	114,977
2024	9,945	13,414	43,968	19,421	25,889	5	1,045	113,687

5 Parole Population

5.1 Active Parole Population Trends and Projections

The population of active parolees supervised in California decreased 53.0 percent between 2010 and 2014 (94,748 to 44,499 parolees; see Table 6 and Figure 7). The largest single-year percent decrease of 26.1 percent occurred between June 30, 2012 and June 30, 2013 (69,435 to 51,300 parolees) and coincided with the implementation of 2011 Realignment legislation. Following four years of decline, the parole population increased 2.2 percent from June 30, 2014 to June 30, 2015 (44,499 to 45,473 parolees). This change was driven by the effects of Proposition 47, which resulted in approximately 4,700 offenders being resentenced and released from prison. Most resentenced offenders subsequently served a one-year parole period.⁶ A short-term 3.6 percent decrease (1,659 parolees) was observed between June 30, 2015 and June 30, 2016 (45,473 to 43,814 parolees) as Proposition 47 parolees were discharged from parole.

Following this decrease, the parole population has started increasing due to a growing number of parolees who served life prison terms and are consequently expected to serve long lengths of stay on parole, and continued credit earning and releases from prison due to Proposition 57 and other recent policy changes. The active parole population grew by 3.3 percent from June 30, 2016 to June 30, 2017 (43,814 to 45,261 parolees). This was followed by a 4.7 percent increase from June 30, 2017 to June 30, 2018 (45,261 parolees to 47,370 parolees), and a 7.3 percent increase from June 30, 2018 to June 30, 2019 (47,370 parolees to 50,822 parolees).

CDCR projects the active parole population will experience a decrease of 3.0 percent (1,503 parolees) from June 30, 2019 to June 30, 2020 (50,822 parolees to 49,319 parolees). The anticipated decrease is related to a number of parolees who were released in late 2017 at the beginning of Proposition 57's implementation and are anticipated to become eligible for parole discharge in late 2019 and early 2020. The short-term decrease is anticipated to be followed by increases each year for the remainder of the projections cycle, due to the continuing impact of Proposition 57 and other recent policy changes as well as continued growth in the population of parolees who previously served life prison terms. The parole population is expected to reach 51,882 parolees by June 30, 2024 for a net five-year increase of 2.1 percent.


Quarterly projections of the active parole population through June 2021 are available in Appendix D, Tables 19 and 20.

⁶ In addition to the impact of resentencing while in CDCR prison, offenders may also be resentenced while serving time in county jail or under other county-level supervision and subsequently placed on state parole supervision under Proposition 47 (court walkovers).

Table 6. Active Parole Population Supervised in California, June 30, 2010 through June 30, 2024

June 30	Active Parole	Percent Change
Actual		
2010	94,748	N/A
2011	90,813	-4.2%
2012	69,435	-23.5%
2013	51,300	-26.1%
2014	44,499	-13.3%
2015	45,473	2.2%
2016	43,814	-3.6%
2017	45,261	3.3%
2018	47,370	4.7%
2019	50,822	7.3%
Projected		
2020	49,319	-3.0%
2021	51,097	3.6%
2022	51,187	0.2%
2023	51,457	0.5%
2024	51,882	0.8%

Figure 7. Active Parole Population Trends and Projections, June 30, 2010 through June 30, 2024



5.2 Comparison of Spring 2019 and Fall 2019 Active Parole Population Projections

The Fall 2019 parole projections vary between 2.5 lower and 3.5 percent higher than the Spring 2019 projections (see Table 7). The Fall 2019 Projections are generally higher than Spring 2019 as they better account for the growing number of parolees who served life prison terms and are required to serve longer lengths of time on parole before becoming eligible for discharge than determinately sentenced parolees.

Table 7. Comparison of Spring 2019 and Fall 2019 Active Parole Population Projections

June 30	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Difference	Percent Difference
2019	49,403	*50,822	1,419	2.9%
2020	50,569	49,319	-1,250	-2.5%
2021	50,336	51,097	761	1.5%
2022	49,447	51,187	1,740	3.5%
2023	50,489	51,457	968	1.9%
2024	N/A	51,882	N/A	N/A

*Actual Population

6 Juvenile Population Projections

Between June 2010 and June 2018, the total juvenile population decreased 55.9 percent, from a June average daily population (ADP) of 1,436 to 633 youth (see Table 8). The total juvenile population increased from June 2018 to June 2019 by 13.3 percent (84 youth). Male youth consistently make up the majority of the juvenile population. Specifically, the male juvenile June ADP decreased 55.7 percent from 1,371 to 608 youth from 2010 to 2018 then increased by 13.3 percent (81 youth) from 2018 to 2019. The female juvenile June ADP decreased 61.5 percent from 65 to 25 youth from 2010 to 2018 then increased by 12 percent (3 youth) from 2018 to 2019.

CDCR predicts the total juvenile June ADP will exhibit a 15.6 percent (112 youth) increase to reach 829 youth by June 2020, and grow another 6.4 percent to reach 882 youth by June 2021. The projected increases are attributable to the collective impacts of three factors: 1) Proposition 57, 2) a Transition-Age Youth Pilot Program, and 3) a recent policy change approved in the FY 2018-19 Budget Act that raised the age of jurisdiction to 25 for certain youth committed to the Division of Juvenile Justice. More information about these changes is included in Appendix B.

Table 8. Juvenile Average Daily Population and Projected Average Daily Population, June 2010 through June 2021

June	Male	Female	Total
Actual			
2010	1,371	65	1,436
2011	1,196	42	1,238
2012	934	26	960
2013	709	26	735
2014	665	23	688
2015	665	25	690
2016	678	26	705
2017	613	21	634
2018	608	25	633
2019	689	28	717
Projected			
2020	799	30	829
2021	850	32	882

Appendix A – Methodology, Technical Notes, and Limitations

Methodology and Technical Notes

Most corrections population experts agree that projections beyond two- to three-year time horizons are difficult to model with precision.⁷ Due to the need to prepare longer-term projections for planning purposes, this report presents up to five years of projections for some populations. CDCR's Office of Research uses the most current data available to produce its population projections. Routine database updates may cause some reported values to differ from previously reported values. The adult and juvenile population projections were developed using historical trend data and time series forecasting techniques. Juvenile forecasts were constructed based on weekly average daily populations of all juvenile facilities and juvenile offenders who are the responsibility of DJJ but not physically housed in a DJJ facility. The juvenile population, however, does not include juveniles housed in adult institutions or juveniles under county supervision in accordance with Assembly Bill 1628.⁸

An updated model for adult institution and parole projections is under development that will project offender movements based on major factors that affect prison population, such as court commitments, length of stay in prison, and length of stay on parole. The model will forecast anticipated offender actions (e.g., release from the institution to parole, discharge from parole) for each stage of the CDCR process, one offender at a time. Movements and lengths of stay will be based on historical trend data that are entered into the model.

Beginning with the Spring 2014 Population Projections, the active parole population excludes parolees on non-revocable parole. Parole population values reported in earlier reports included parolees on non-revocable parole.

Beginning with the Fall 2015 Projections, CDCR adopted a new court commitment forecasting procedure that relies solely on data observed after the implementation of 2011 Realignment legislation (October 2011) for determinately sentenced offenders. This approach was employed because sufficient data became available at that point to conduct robust analyses of the predictive power of pre-Realignment compared to post-Realignment data. These analyses have revealed predictions using only data collected after the implementation period are more accurate than predictions using both pre-and post-Realignment commitment data.

⁷ See *Limitations* below.

⁸ More information on Assembly Bill 1628 is available in Appendix B.

Additionally, beginning with the Fall 2015 Projections, CDCR utilized inmate classification data collected in the Strategic Offender Management System (SOMS). This change resulted in shifts of projected housing placement needs compared to past projections, primarily in housing Levels II and III. The deployment of SOMS in 2013 coincided with a revised classification scoring structure that changed the cut points for determining housing placements.⁹ As inmates were rescored under the new classification structure, there was a data entry lag for some inmate information into the legacy Inmate Classification Scoring System. The SOMS data provide a more complete and accurate account of current inmate placement needs.

Beginning with the Spring 2016 Projections, the adult institution population includes inmates in alternative custody and community re-entry programs, as well as inmates on medical parole. CDCR made this change to create a more comprehensive view of the adult offender population serving a prison term. The authors of this report recommend exercising caution when comparing projections published in past reports.

The California population data used to calculate the commitment rates to prison are based on demographic data obtained from the California Department of Finance.¹⁰ These population data are provided for calendar year midpoints (July 1). For the purposes of this report, data for two points in time were averaged to afford a closer fit to the state fiscal year.

Limitations

Although CDCR's population projections are designed to be as accurate as possible, it is difficult to model projections beyond a two- to three-year time horizon with precision. Nevertheless, this report provides up to five years of projections for some populations. The authors of this report suggest using caution when interpreting projection results beyond two years, as the full impact of recent correctional policy changes on CDCR's populations is still developing.

⁹ A summary of the findings by the related study is available at: <https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/news/2012/03/09/new-study-makes-recommendations-for-cdcrs-inmate-classification-score-system>

¹⁰ State of California, Department of Finance, Race/Hispanics Population with Age and Gender Detail, 2000-2010, September 2012; and State of California, Department of Finance, Report P-3: State and County Population Projections by Race/Ethnicity, Detailed Age, and Gender, 2010-2060, Sacramento, California, May 2019.

Appendix B – Significant Chaptered Legislation, Initiatives, and Policy Changes

Adults

Legislation

Chapter 471, Statutes of 2015

[Senate Bill (SB) 261, Hancock]

Required the Board of Parole Hearings (BPH) to conduct youth offender parole hearings to consider release of offenders who committed specified crimes when they were under 23 years of age and who were sentenced to state prison. *The impact of this legislation is factored into the Population Projections to the extent the impact is in trend.*

Chapter 312, Statutes of 2013

(SB 260, Hancock)

Required BPH to conduct youth offender parole hearings to consider release of offenders who committed specified crimes prior to being 18 years of age and who were sentenced to state prison. *The impact of this legislation is factored into the Population Projections to the extent the impact is in trend.*

The following Realignment legislation was chaptered in 2011 and is expected to continue to have a significant impact on the state prison system.

- Chapter 15, Statutes of 2011
[Assembly Bill (AB) 109, (Committee on Budget; Blumenfield, Chair)]
- Chapter 39, Statutes of 2011
[AB 117, (Committee on Budget; Blumenfield, Chair)]

Initiatives

Proposition 57 – Public Safety and Rehabilitation Act of 2016.

The proposition 1) increased the number of non-violent offenders eligible for parole consideration and allowed parole consideration after serving the full term of the sentence for their primary offense; 2) authorized CDCR to award sentence credits for rehabilitation, good behavior, or educational achievements; and 3) provided juvenile court judges authority to decide whether juveniles age 14 and older should be sentenced as adults for specified offenses. *This proposition was passed into law on November 8, 2016, and is factored into the Population Projections.*

Proposition 47 – Criminal Sentences, Misdemeanor Penalties, Initiative Statute.

Required misdemeanor instead of felony sentence for certain drug possession offenses. Required misdemeanor instead of felony sentence for the following crimes when amount involved is \$950 or less: petty theft, receiving stolen property, and forging/writing bad checks. Allowed felony sentence for these offenses if a person has had previous conviction for crimes such as rape, murder, or child molestation or is a registered sex offender. Required resentencing for persons serving felony sentences for these offenses unless court finds unreasonable public safety risk.

The proposition resulted in fewer commitments to state prison from court. The Proposition 47-related decreases in the institution population includes the effect of resentencing avoided court commitments. The impact of avoided court commitments is assumed to continue indefinitely. *This proposition was passed into law on November 4, 2014, and is factored into the Population Projections.*

Proposition 36 – Three Strikes Law.

Revised three strikes law to impose life sentence only when a new felony conviction is serious or violent. Authorized resentencing for offenders currently serving life sentences if the third strike conviction is not serious or violent and the judge determines the sentence not pose unreasonable risk to public safety. *This proposition was passed into law on November 6, 2012, and is factored into the Population Projections.*

Policy Changes

Supplemental Reforms to Credit Earning

Implemented to enhance the credits made available under Proposition 57. These policy changes became operationally effective in May 2019.

- Rehabilitative Achievement Credit: Prospectively increased credit earning from 7 days to 10 days per 52 hours of participation, up to maximum of 40 days of credit per year.
- Educational Merit Credit: Increased credit earning from 90 days to 180 days for General Equivalency Diplomas (GED), High School Diploma, or equivalent.
- Changes to 60-day release restriction for certain inmates unless otherwise required by statute.

Parole Determination Process for Indeterminately-sentenced Non-violent Offenders

Created a process for certain indeterminately-sentenced non-violent offenders to be reviewed for parole consideration by BPH after serving the full term of their primary offense effective January 2019.

Penal Code Section 1170(d) Recall and Resentencing Changes

Changed Penal Code section 1170(d) authorizing the resentencing of an inmate to a lesser sentence under certain circumstances. *These changes were made as part of the FY 2018-19 Budget.*

Court-ordered Measures Subsequently Enacted with the Implementation of Proposition 57

CDCR implemented the following policies and programs subsequently enacted with the implementation of Proposition 57. *The impact is assumed to continue indefinitely and is factored into the Population Projections.*

- Credit-earning change for specific offenders: Prospectively increased credit earning for non-violent, non-sex-registrant Second Strike offenders from 20 percent to 33.3 percent, and allowed these offenders to earn milestone credits for rehabilitative programs. *This policy became operationally effective in February 2014.* Prospectively increased credit earning for all inmates designated Minimum Custody who were eligible to earn day-for-day (50 percent) credits to two days of credit for each day served (2-for-1). *This policy became effective by court order on January 1, 2015.*
- Parole determination process for certain Second Strike offenders: Created a process for certain non-violent, non-sex-registrant Second Strike offenders to be reviewed for parole consideration by BPH once 50 percent of their sentence has been served. *This policy became effective by court order on January 1, 2015.*

Utilization of Administrative Determinants and Increased Access to Rehabilitative Programs

The California Code of Regulations, Title 15, sections 3375 and 3375.2, allowed for the placement of inmates in facilities with higher or lower security levels than indicated by inmate placement scores. In order to expand access to rehabilitative programs for inmates who have demonstrated positive programming, CDCR clarified its application of these regulations in July 2016. *This policy change is factored into the Population Projections and is expected to result in an overall decreased need for male Level IV housing and a corresponding net increased need for male Level II and III housing.*

Segregated Housing

Effective in June 2015, the regulations provided for shorter segregated housing unit stays based on inmate behavior and reduced the number of offenses that may result in Security Housing Unit (SHU) terms. *The projections incorporate the effects of the Ashker settlement, which outlined a process for ending indeterminate SHU terms.*

Automatic Restoration of Forfeited Credits

Effective on April 3, 2019, California Code of Regulations, Title 15, section 3329.5 allows for Good Conduct Credits forfeited by Rules Violation Reports (RVR) to be automatically restored. Previously, offenders were required to apply for a restoration once eligible. *This change is expected to result in an increase in restored credits, and a consequent decrease in length of stay for impacted inmates. However, the impact of the change was not able to be quantified and is not included in the population projections.*

Juveniles

Legislation

Chapter 41, Statutes of 2012

[SB 1021, (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review)]

Lowered the jurisdiction age for youth from 25 to 23 and ensured counties be charged an annual rate of \$24,000 per youth committed to DJJ via juvenile court. It also eliminated juvenile parole, disciplinary time additions, and new parole violator admissions after December 31, 2012. The legislation also restructured the methodology for Discharge Consideration Hearing. It required that all youth, on or before their initial projected board date, must be reviewed by the Juvenile Parole Board for release consideration regardless of behavior or program completion.

Chapter 729, Statutes of 2010

(AB 1628, Blumenfield)

Transferred supervisory responsibility to the jurisdiction county's probation department for community supervision of youth released on or after implementation. This had no effect on DJJ youth who were released as parolees to the supervision of the Division of Juvenile Parole Operations prior to implementation.

Chapter 175, Statutes of 2007

[SB 81, (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review)]; and

Chapter 257, Statutes of 2007

[AB 191, (Committee on Budget)]

Restricted juvenile court commitments to cases committed for specified (serious/violent) offenses listed in subdivision (b) of section 707 of the Welfare and Institution Code (WIC) or for specified non-WIC 707(b) sex offender registrants (Penal Code section 290.008). Non-WIC 707(b) (excluding sex offenders) cases who were on parole on September 1, 2007 will be discharged once they have completed their parole time.

Chapter 6, Statutes of 1996

(SB 681, Hurtt)

Required counties to pay the State for each juvenile court commitment pursuant to a "sliding scale fee system" based on commitment offense as an incentive to the county when they do not commit a juvenile because of the associated costs. Commitment offenses were categorized according to Title 15 of the California Code of Regulations seriousness of the primary offense: Category I (most serious) to Category VII (least serious). Counties were required to 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.

Chapter 195, Statutes of 1996

(AB 3369, Bordonaro)

Reduced the age limit for authorizing a transfer of a person to the California Youth Authority (CYA), now known as DJJ, by the Director of CDCR to under 18 years and required the transfer to terminate in specified situations. This was only applicable to minors convicted as an adult but housed at DJJ under WIC 1731.5(c).

Initiatives

Proposition 57 – Public Safety and Rehabilitation Act of 2016.

Provided juvenile court judges authority to decide whether juveniles age 14 and older should be sentenced as adults for specified offenses. *This proposition was passed into law on November 8, 2016, and is factored into the Population Projections.*

Proposition 21 – Gang Violence and Juvenile Crime Preventive Act (March 7, 2000).

Made changes to the prosecution, sentencing, and incarceration of juvenile offenders:

- Increased punishment for gang-related felonies; death penalty for gang-related murder; indeterminate life sentences for home-invasion robbery, carjacking, witness intimidation, and drive-by shootings; created crime of recruiting for gang activities; and authorized wiretapping for gang activities.
- Allowed for the direct filing of a felony complaint to the adult criminal court for juveniles age 14 years or older under a variety of circumstances. Eliminated informal probation for juveniles committing felonies.
- Required registration for gang related offenses.

Designated additional crimes as violent and serious felonies, thereby making offenders subject to adult prosecution.

Policy Changes

Raising the Age of Juvenile Court Jurisdiction

Raised the age of jurisdiction for juvenile court commitments to 25 for youth offenders facing a term of seven years or more. Raised the age of confinement for superior court commitments so youth able to complete sentence by age 25 can serve entire term at a juvenile facility rather than being transferred to adult prison. *This policy was implemented with the passage of the Fiscal Year 2018-19 Budget and is factored into the Population Projections.*

Transition-Age Youth Pilot Program

Diverted a limited number of young adults who have committed specified crimes from adult prison to a juvenile facility and initially targeting offenders committed to adult prisons between the ages of 18 and 21. *This program was implemented with the passage of the Fiscal Year 2018-19 Budget and is factored into the Population Projections.*

Appendix C – Glossary of Terms¹¹

ADP (Average Daily Population): The average population per day for a stated population for a specified time period, usually one year.

DJJ 290: Juvenile sex registrants.

DJJ 707(b): Serious and violent juvenile offenders.

DJJ AB 1628: Youth who leave DJJ but are not put on parole, rather they are released back to communities for probation supervision.

DJJ Contract Cases (P): Youth held under a contract agreement for alternative county placement court-ordered by the Juvenile Court to DJJ. They have been previously housed by DJJ and have been released to the county for probation supervision under AB 1628, and are now returning to custody.

DJJ “E” Cases: Youth sentenced to adult prison but sent to DJJ if under 18 years of age regardless of educational status. They will transfer to adult facilities at age 18 unless they can serve their time and be eligible to be out on parole prior to reaching age 21.

DJJ “M” Cases: Youth committed to adult prison and court-ordered to DJJ for housing. They are housed at DJJ until they reach age 21 at which time they are transferred to adult facilities.

DOF: Department of Finance.

DISCHARGE: When an offender is no longer under the jurisdiction of CDCR.

DSL: Cases that fall under the Determinate Sentencing Law.

FELON: A person convicted of a felony offense and sentenced to state prison by the court.

IN FACILITY: A juvenile offender who is physically located and housed in a DJJ facility.

LEVEL I, II, III, IV: The security level, and therefore the facility level, assigned to inmates based on their classification score ranges. The higher the score, the higher the security level.

OFF FACILITY: Any juvenile offender who is the responsibility of DJJ but is not physically in a DJJ facility. This could include juvenile offenders who are in a medical facility, out to court, or being housed in an adult facility.

PAL (Parolee-At-Large): A felon parolee who absconds (hides) from parole supervision.

¹¹ Some terms may not be used in this report.

PAROLE: After the prison term is served, offenders are supervised in the community by CDCR for an established period up to the statutory maximum.

PAROLEE: A felon released from confinement in state prison to supervision in the community by CDCR, as defined in Penal Code section 3000.08.

PENDING REVOCATION: A parolee who has been charged with violating a condition of parole and placed in CDCR custody pending investigation to determine if revocation time will be assessed.

PHU: Protective Housing Unit.

POST RELEASE COMMUNITY SUPERVISION (PRCS): Felons released from confinement in state prison who do not meet the criteria for state parole supervision are released to PRCS for community supervision at the local level.

PV-RTC (Parole Violator-Returned to Custody): A parolee who has violated the conditions of parole and has been returned to prison.

PV-WNT (Parole Violator-Returned with a New Term): A parolee who has received a court sentence for a new crime and been returned to prison.

RECEPTION CENTER: An institution designated as a center for the reception of prisoners newly committed to CDCR.

SERIOUS/VIOLENT: Serious, as defined in Penal Code (PC) sections 1192.7(c) and 1192.8, and Violent as defined in PC section 667.5(c).

SHU: Security Housing Unit.

SOMS: Strategic Offender Management System.

SUSPENSION: The interruption of a parole period, usually by absconding. Time on suspension is not credited to the period of parole.

TOTAL RESPONSIBLE POPULATION: All individuals in the juvenile population regardless of status or place of residence, for whom the DJJ is responsible. This includes all off facility, AB 1628, parole detainees, and youth responsible to DJJ but housed in adult institutions.

Appendix D – Population Projections Tables 9 to 20

Tables 9 through 14 display actual and projected court commitments as rates relative to the California state population ages 18 to 49, for the total population and by gender. Actual rates are displayed for FY 2009-10 through 2018-19 and projected rates are displayed for 2019-20 through 2023-24.

Table 9. Actual Felon Court Commitments, Fiscal Years 2009-10 through 2018-19

Fiscal Year	Felon Court Commitments	State Population Ages 18-49 (in Thousands)*	Commitment Rate
2009-10	63,567	17,116	371.4
2010-11	57,747	17,134	337.0
2011-12	39,001	17,167	227.2
2012-13	35,997	17,206	209.2
2013-14	38,853	17,239	225.4
2014-15	35,547	17,257	206.0
2015-16	35,637	17,260	206.5
2016-17	36,556	17,271	211.7
2017-18	36,204	17,284	209.5
2018-19	34,932	17,307	201.8

Table 10. Actual Male Felon Court Commitments, Fiscal Years 2009-10 through 2018-19

Fiscal Year	Felon Court Commitments	State Population Ages 18-49 (in Thousands)*	Commitment Rate
2009-10	56,631	8,716	649.7
2010-11	51,306	8,716	588.6
2011-12	35,855	8,740	410.3
2012-13	33,660	8,765	384.0
2013-14	36,085	8,790	410.5
2014-15	33,080	8,805	375.7
2015-16	33,263	8,811	377.5
2016-17	33,958	8,822	384.9
2017-18	33,526	8,836	379.4
2018-19	32,293	8,855	364.7

**Source of state population data is the California Department of Finance.
See Appendix A, Methodology and Technical Notes.*

Table 11. Actual Female Felon Court Commitments, Fiscal Years 2009-10 through 2018-19

Fiscal Year	Felon Court Commitments	State Population Ages 18-49 (in Thousands)*	Commitment Rate
2009-10	6,936	8,400	82.6
2010-11	6,441	8,418	76.5
2011-12	3,146	8,428	37.3
2012-13	2,337	8,441	27.7
2013-14	2,768	8,450	32.8
2014-15	2,467	8,452	29.2
2015-16	2,374	8,449	28.1
2016-17	2,598	8,449	30.8
2017-18	2,678	8,448	31.7
2018-19	2,639	8,453	31.2

Table 12. Fall 2019 Projected Felon Prison Court Commitments, Fiscal Years 2019-20 through 2023-24

Fiscal Year	Felon Court Commitments	State Population Ages 18-49 (in Thousands)*	Commitment Rate
2019-20	34,956	17,332	201.7
2020-21	34,999	17,357	201.6
2021-22	35,038	17,413	201.2
2022-23	35,077	17,494	200.5
2023-24	35,127	17,589	199.7

* Source of state population data is the California Department of Finance.
See Appendix A, Methodology and Technical Notes.

Table 13. Fall 2019 Projected Male Felon Prison Court Commitments, Fiscal Years 2019-20 through 2023-24

Fiscal Year	Felon Court Commitments	State Population Ages 18-49 (in Thousands)*	Commitment Rate
2019-20	32,287	8,874	363.9
2020-21	32,275	8,893	362.9
2021-22	32,261	8,929	361.3
2022-23	32,249	8,978	359.2
2023-24	32,242	9,034	356.9

Table 14. Fall 2019 Projected Female Felon Prison Court Commitments, Fiscal Years 2019-20 through 2023-24

Fiscal Year	Felon Court Commitments	State Population Ages 18-49 (in Thousands)*	Commitment Rate
2019-20	2,669	8,459	31.6
2020-21	2,724	8,464	32.2
2021-22	2,777	8,484	32.7
2022-23	2,828	8,516	33.2
2023-24	2,885	8,555	33.7

* Source of state population data is the California Department of Finance.
See Appendix A, Methodology and Technical Notes.

Table 15. Institution Population by Quarter and Gender, Fiscal Years 2019-20 through 2020-21

	Actual June 30, 2019	Fiscal Year 2019				Fiscal Year 2020				Fiscal Year 2021			
		2019		2020		2020		2021		2021			
		Sep 30	Dec 31	Mar 31	Jun 30	Sep 30	Dec 31	Mar 31	Jun 30	Sep 30	Dec 31	Mar 31	Jun 30
Total Male Population	119,781	119,427	118,911	118,750	118,617	118,518	118,198	118,041	117,820				
Total Female Population	5,691	5,642	5,612	5,595	5,530	5,530	5,471	5,444	5,417				
Total Population	125,472	125,069	124,523	124,345	124,147	124,048	123,669	123,485	123,237				

Table 16. Average Daily Institution Population by Quarter and Gender, Fiscal Years 2019-20 through 2020-21

	Fiscal Year 2019-20					Fiscal Year 2020-21				
	First Quarter	Second Quarter	Third Quarter	Fourth Quarter	Fiscal Year Average	First Quarter	Second Quarter	Third Quarter	Fourth Quarter	Fiscal Year Average
Total Male Population	119,625	119,129	118,853	118,584	119,048	118,607	118,346	118,099	117,920	118,243
Total Female Population	5,652	5,625	5,591	5,563	5,608	5,538	5,485	5,447	5,422	5,473
Total Population	125,277	124,754	124,444	124,147	124,655	124,146	123,831	123,546	123,342	123,716

Table 17. Projected Institution Population by Quarter and Housing Level, Fiscal Years 2019-20 through 2020-21

Fiscal Year	Quarter Ending	Security Level							Male	Female	Total Population
		Reception Center	Level I	Level II	Level III	Level IV	PHU	SHU			
2019-20	Sep 30	9,851	14,008	46,548	20,552	27,420	5	1,043	119,427	5,642	125,069
	Dec 31	9,850	13,951	46,291	20,459	27,313	5	1,042	118,911	5,612	124,523
	Mar 31	9,999	13,914	46,183	20,402	27,209	5	1,038	118,750	5,595	124,345
	Jun 30	9,969	13,907	46,156	20,373	27,162	5	1,045	118,617	5,530	124,147
2020-21	Sep 30	9,914	13,903	46,140	20,370	27,141	5	1,045	118,518	5,530	124,048
	Dec 31	9,877	13,873	46,012	20,314	27,072	5	1,045	118,198	5,471	123,669
	Mar 31	9,997	13,862	45,861	20,224	27,048	5	1,044	118,041	5,444	123,485
	Jun 30	9,950	13,857	45,757	20,163	27,043	5	1,045	117,820	5,417	123,237

Table 18. Projected Institution Population by Housing Level, June 30, 2019 through June 30, 2024

June 30	Security Level							Male	Female	Total Population
	Reception Center	Level I	Level II	Level III	Level IV	PHU	SHU			
2019 (Actual)	10,073	13,950	46,837	20,557	27,314	5	1,045	119,781	5,691	125,472
2020	9,969	13,907	46,156	20,373	27,162	5	1,045	118,617	5,530	124,147
2021	9,950	13,857	45,757	20,163	27,043	5	1,045	117,820	5,417	123,237
2022	9,946	13,694	45,102	19,898	26,641	5	1,045	116,331	5,369	121,700
2023	9,945	13,553	44,518	19,657	26,254	5	1,045	114,977	5,295	120,272
2024	9,945	13,414	43,968	19,421	25,889	5	1,045	113,687	5,248	118,935

Table 19. California Active Parole Population by Quarter, Fiscal Years 2019-20 through 2020-21

	Actual June 30, 2019	Fiscal Year 2019				Fiscal Year 2020				Fiscal Year 2021	
		2019		2020		2020		2021			
		Sep 30	Dec 31	Mar 31	Jun 30	Sep 30	Dec 31	Mar 31	Jun 30		
Total Population	50,822	50,978	51,174	50,208	49,319	49,912	50,308	50,875	51,097		

Table 20. California Average Daily Active Parole Population by Quarter, Fiscal Years 2019-20 through 2020-21

	Fiscal Year 2019-20					Fiscal Year 2020-21				
	First Quarter	Second Quarter	Third Quarter	Fourth Quarter	Fiscal Year Average	First Quarter	Second Quarter	Third Quarter	Fourth Quarter	Fiscal Year Average
Total Population	50,882	51,073	50,490	49,375	50,455	50,045	50,118	50,562	50,987	50,428



**California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation
Division of Correctional Policy Research and Internal Oversight
Office of Research**

Note: this report was updated on January 11, 2020 to include contextual information about court commitments.