

**California Department of Corrections
and Rehabilitation**

Division of Juvenile Justice



**Fall 2013
Juvenile Population Projections**

**Juvenile Facility
Fiscal Years 2013-14 through 2017-18**

Prepared by the Office of Research

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION

JEFFREY A. BEARD, Ph.D.

Secretary

MARTIN HOSHINO

Undersecretary, Operations

DIANA TOCHE, D.D.S.

Undersecretary (A), Administration and Offender Services

BRYAN BEYER

Director

Division of Internal Oversight and Research

WAYNE BABBY

Deputy Director (A)

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 Fall 2013 Population Projections for the Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) is a summary of the juvenile facility population assumptions and projections for fiscal years (FY) 2013-14 through 2017-18. The Projections are based on current data, existing laws and regulations, and include only legislation, programs, propositions, and policy changes signed, passed and/or implemented prior to June 30, 2013 (the start date for the projection process).

The total facility population was 733¹ on June 30, 2013. This is 23 percent (215) lower than the actual population of 948 on June 30, 2012. This decline in population compares to a decline of 21 percent (245) seen from June 30, 2011 to June 30, 2012 (1,193 and 948 respectively).

Current facility population projections are lower than the Spring 2013 Juvenile Population Projections (Spring Projections) due to fewer overall admissions, fewer "M" cases², and elimination of parole violator admissions. This is slightly offset by higher "E" cases². This trend is expected to continue through June 30, 2018. The juvenile facility population is projected to be 610 (577 males and 33 females) on June 30, 2014, which is 69 lower than projected in the Spring Projections. The facility population is projected to decrease to 603 (569 males and 34 females) during the following year and is expected to reach 560 (531 males and 29 females) by June 30, 2018.

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

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

Juvenile Facility Population Projections for Fiscal Years 2013-14 through 2017-18

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 the juvenile facility population 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 Fall 2013 Population Projections (Fall 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&IC) § 707(b) offenses or non-707(b) sex offenses (Penal Code [PC] § 290). The Fall 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 Table 1 and Table 2 on pages 10 and 11. 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 706 on June 30, 2013. Like the male population, the female facility population has decreased, from a high of 235 on June 30, 2003 to 27 on June 30, 2013, 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
2013	706	27	733

Institution Population Projections

The male facility population is projected to gradually decrease during FY 2013-14, down to 577 by June 30, 2014. The population will continue to decrease thereafter reaching 531 by June 30, 2018. Similarly, the female population is projected to be 33 by June 30, 2014, and 29 by June 30, 2018. 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 10.

Table II: Fall 2013 Institution Population Projections

June 30	Males	Females	Total
2014	577	33	610
2015	569	34	603
2016	548	31	579
2017	527	29	556
2018	531	29	560

Comparison of Fall 2013 Projections to Spring 2013 Projections

The Fall 2013 projections are lower than the Spring 2013 projections on June 2014 and June 2015 but higher in the outer years. They are lower during the first two years primarily due to fewer overall admissions while an increase in female admissions affects the out years. The projections' comparisons are shown below on Table III.

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

June 30	Spring 2013	Fall 2013	Difference
2014	679	610	- 69
2015	632	603	- 29
2016	574	579	5
2017	545	556	11
2018	545	560	15

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 on the next page.

The W&IC § 707(b) offenses and non-707(b) sex offenses (PC § 290) juvenile court first admission cases are projected to stabilize at the FY 2012-13 rate of 5.0, which is 11.1 percent higher than the 4.5 projected during the Spring 2013 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
2012-13	148	7	0	11	0	0	166	5.0

As shown below in Table V, annual juvenile court first admissions are projected to be 1 less than the 166 actual juvenile court first admissions that occurred in FY 2012-13. This is due to an expected 0.2 percent decline in the State's at-risk youth population until FY 2013-14. The State's at-risk youth population is then projected to increase steadily beginning in FY 2014-15 and is expected to impact juvenile court first admissions reaching 170 by FY 2017-18.

Table V: Projected Juvenile Court First Admissions

Fiscal Year	Spring 2013	Fall 2013
2013-14	145	165
2014-15	145	165
2015-16	145	165
2016-17	150	165
2017-18	150	170

As shown in Table VI, 92.8 percent of the admissions during FY 2012-13 had a violent and/or sex primary commitment offense. This is 5.2 percent lower compared to FY 2011-12. The Fall projections assume that future admissions will have the same percentage of violent and/or sex offenses. Incidentally, property offenses increased 4.7 percent over the same time period.

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
2012-13	92.8	6.7	0.0	0.5

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 we had projected in the Spring projections, the future criminal court first admissions in the Fall projections are also projected to stabilize at five admissions annually, beginning in FY 2013-14, as shown in Table VII.

Table VII: Projected Criminal Court First Admissions

Fiscal Year	Spring 2013	Fall 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. The “E” case admissions are juveniles admitted to DJJ under an agreement that began on July 1, 2004 between the juvenile and adult divisions within the CDCR. The “M” case admissions are juveniles who are court-ordered to DJJ. This provision has been in effect since 1984. The enactment of AB 3369 (1996) limited “M” case admissions to youth under 18 years of age as shown below in Table VIII.

Table VIII: “M” and “E” Case Admissions

Fiscal Year	“M” cases	“E” cases	Total
2003-04	65	90	155
2004-05	60	96	156
2005-06	87	96	183
2006-07	76	158	234
2007-08	105	181	286
2008-09	146	146	292
2009-10	158	111	269
2010-11	128	79	207
2011-12	102	68	170
2012-13	72	45	117

As shown on Table IX, future “M” case admissions are projected to average 72 annually during the projections period, 19 lower than the 91 admissions assumed in the Spring Projections. The number of “E” cases in juvenile facilities is projected to stabilize at 45, 10 lower than the 55 admissions assumed in the Spring Projections.

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

Fiscal Year	Spring 2013		Fall 2013	
	“M” Case	“E” Case	“M” Case	“E” Case
2013-14	91	55	72	45
2014-15	91	55	72	45
2015-16	91	55	72	45
2016-17	91	55	72	45
2017-18	91	55	72	45

Parole Violator Admissions

Table X displays changes in parole violator admissions [including W&IC § 707(b) offenses and non-707(b) sex offenses (PC § 290 cases)] compared to the parole average daily population (ADP). In FY 2009-10 there were 361 parole violator admissions (including recommitments) compared to 61 in FY 2012-13, 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
2012-13	61	173	35.3

As of January 1, 2013, there were no new parole violator admissions, per SB 1021(2012). As of January 31, 2013, there were 6 admissions and by March 31, 2013 the last admission was discharged.

Facility LOS for Juvenile Cases

Facility length of stay (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 XI, 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 XI: 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
2012-13	31.5	8.4	-3.7	36.7

*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 Spring Projections due to higher PBDs. By FY 2017-18 facility LOS for first releases to probation is estimated to average 29.0 months for males (see Table 1 on page 10), 28.2 months for females (see Table 2 on page 11), and 28.8 months weighted for both.

PBDs and net time add/cut decisions were assumed to stabilize at the CY 2012 level based on information provided by DJJ. It was determined that the most 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 27.2 months, which is lower than the 28.3 assumed in the Spring Projections. Another factor that impacts the facility length of stay is the issuance of time adds/cuts. During FY 2012-13 there were a total of 1,427 months of time adds (180 disciplinary and 1,247 non-disciplinary) and 2,068 months of time cuts. From the total time adds and

time cuts given there were 1,193 months of time adds (180 disciplinary and 1,013 non-disciplinary) and 1,830 months of time cuts given at DJJ facilities. The juvenile commitments to DJJ while housed in adult facilities (dual commitment cases) received 176 time adds and 238 time cuts while 58 time adds were given at DMH.

Facility LOS for "M" Cases

Both "E" and "M" cases transfer from the custody of DJJ to the Division of Adult Institutions (DAI) upon their 18th birthday. However, DJJ may continue to house the youth if their period of incarceration is completed on or prior to their 21st birthday. Once they attain their Earliest Possible Release Date (EPRD), the youth would then be released to either the Division of Adult Parole Operations (DAPO), or to Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS), as appropriate.

Facility LOS for "M" case releases has fluctuated from 12.4 and 16.4 months between July 1, 2003 and December 31, 2012, with the trend mostly decreasing since FY 2006/07 but rising in FY 2012-13, as shown in Table XII.

Table XII: 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
2012-13	13.4

Facility LOS for future "M" case releases is projected to decrease, approaching an average of 10.7 months by FY 2016-17, as shown on Table XIII.

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

Fiscal Year	Spring 2013	Fall 2013
2013-14	10.9	12.2
2014-15	9.3	10.5
2015-16	10.1	10.2
2016-17	9.9	10.7

Table 1
 Projected Facility Population
 Fiscal Years 2013-14 Through 2017-18

Males

	Actual					Projected				
	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18
Institution Population at Beginning of Fiscal Year										
Juvenile Cases.....	1,508	1,256	1,060	970	731	556	444	435	411	390
"M" Cases.....	108	153	161	125	87	78	61	77	80	80
Total.....	1,616	1,409	1,221	1,095	821	637	508	515	494	473
Admissions										
First Admissions										
Juvenile Court.....	353	328	312	192	155	155	155	155	155	155
Criminal Court.....	1	2	4	1	0	5	5	5	5	5
Parole Violators.....	331	340	284	161	59	0	0	0	0	0
"M" Cases.....	137	155	127	98	69	70	70	70	70	70
Probation returns.....	0	0	0	3	8	1	3	5	4	5
Total.....	822	825	727	455	291	231	233	235	234	235
Departures										
Releases to Parole.....	748	774	556	206	71	0	0	0	0	0
Probation Releases.....	0	0	100	304	267	261	168	183	178	156
Probation Re-releases....	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0
DJJ Discharges.....	189	92	34	80	57	12	4	6	7	7
"M" Cases.....	92	147	163	136	78	87	54	67	70	68
Total.....	1,029	1,013	853	729	475	360	226	256	255	231
Institution Population at End of Fiscal Year										
Juvenile Cases.....	1,256	1,060	970	731	556	444	435	411	390	392
"M" Cases*.....	153	161	125	87	78	61	77	80	80	82
Total.....	1,409	1,221	1,095	821	637	508	515	494	473	477
"E" Cases*.....	144	116	62	57	54	54	54	54	54	54
Total with "E" Cases.....	1,553	1,337	1,157	878	691	562	569	548	527	531
Contract/Other Cases**....	30	0	0	44	15	15				
Total Population	1,583	1,337	1,157	922	706	577	569	548	527	531
Length of Stay at Release										
Juvenile Cases										
All Releases	25.8	22.3	20.3	21.0	23.1	37.2	34.8	32.3	30.9	28.4
First Releases	37.2	36.2	36.4	33.6	36.3	37.2	35.1	32.8	31.5	29.0
"M" Cases										
All Releases	13.2	12.9	12.5	12.5	13.4	12.4	10.9	10.5	11.1	10.9

*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 2
 Projected Facility Population
 Fiscal Years 2013-14 Through 2017-18

Females

	Actual					Projected				
	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18
Institution Population at										
Beginning of Fiscal Year										
Juvenile Cases.....	84	64	54	33	17	18	23	25	22	20
"M" Cases.....	3	10	6	0	3	5	7	7	7	7
Total.....	87	74	60	33	20	23	30	32	29	27
Admissions										
First Admissions										
Juvenile Court.....	18	13	9	7	11	10	10	10	10	10
Criminal Court.....	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Parole Violators.....	13	21	15	5	2	0	0	0	0	0
Probation returns.....	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
"M" Cases.....	9	3	1	4	3	2	2	2	2	2
Total.....	40	38	25	17	17	12	12	12	12	12
Departures										
Releases to Parole.....	42	43	33	7	1	0	0	0	0	0
Probation Releases.....	0	0	9	19	6	5	5	5	8	5
Probation Re-releases....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DJJ Discharges.....	9	2	3	3	6	0	3	8	4	5
"M" Cases.....	2	7	7	1	1	0	2	2	2	2
Total.....	53	52	52	30	14	5	10	15	14	12
Institution Population at										
End of Fiscal Year										
Juvenile Cases.....	64	54	33	17	18	23	25	22	20	20
"M" Cases*.....	10	6	0	3	5	7	7	7	7	7
Total.....	74	60	33	20	23	30	32	29	27	27
"E" Cases*.....	2	2	3	4	2	2	2	2	2	2
Total with "E" Cases.....	76	62	36	24	25	32	34	31	29	29
Contract/Other Cases**....					2	1				
Total Population	76	62	36	26	27	33	34	31	29	29
Length of Stay at Release										
Juvenile Cases										
All Releases	29.5	23.6	20.6	24.2	25.5	30.6	33.3	32.2	34.2	28.2
First Releases	39.4	38.2	36.4	32.2	37.1	30.6	33.3	32.2	34.2	28.2
"M" Cases										
All Releases	9.7	17.7	13.2	5.5	7.8	3.0	8.0	7.4	7.6	7.5

*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.

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 \$24,000¹ 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).

¹ 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 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 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 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, and offense category.

The juvenile projection model has two major components. One component simulates the release from a facility 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 system progress from there.

Historical data are used for determining assumptions necessary to project future juvenile facility populations. For example, for the Fall Projections, Fiscal Year (FY) 2012-13 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.