

Division of Criminal Justice FALL 1998

ADULT PRISON AND PAROLE POPULATION PROJECTIONS

JUVENILE DETENTION AND COMMITMENT POPULATION PROJECTIONS

February 1999

This report was prepared by

Office of Research and Statistics
Division of Criminal Justice
Colorado Department of Public Safety

Diane Patrick, Lead Analyst
Ed Wensuc, Project Coordinator

Kim English, Research Director, Division of Criminal Justice
Carol Poole, Acting Director, Division of Criminal Justice
Ari Zavaras, Executive Director, Colorado Department of Public Safety

700 Kipling Street, Suite 1000
Denver, Colorado 80215
Ph 303-239-4442
Fx 303-239-4491
www.state.co.us/gov_dir/cdps/dcj.htm

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ADULT PROJECTIONS

- 05 Why Is the Crime Rate Falling and the Incarceration Rate Rising?
- 11 Adult Projection Model
- 17 Scenarios
- 19 Assumptions
- 21 Important Legislation Influencing Projections
- 25 Findings: Fall 1998 Prison and Parole Population Projections
- 29 The Numbers: Fall 1998 Prison and Parole Population Projections
- 33 The Numbers: Length of Stay
- 41 Historical Accuracy

JUVENILE PROJECTIONS


- 43 Juvenile Projection Model
 - 45 Assumptions
 - 47 Factors Influencing Projections
 - 49 Findings: Fall 1998 Juvenile Detention and Commitment Population Projections
 - 53 The Numbers: Fall 1998 Juvenile Detention Projections
 - 55 The Numbers: Fall 1998 Juvenile Commitment Projections
 - 57 The Numbers: Fall 1998 Juvenile Overall Projections
 - 59 Historical Accuracy
-
- 61 Appendix
 - A) Colorado Total Population, 1980-1997
 - B) Colorado Adult Population, 1980-1997
 - C) Colorado Juvenile Population, 1980-1997
 - D) Colorado Adult Arrest Rate, Violent and Non-Violent Index Crimes, 1980-1997
 - E) Colorado Juvenile Arrest Rate, Violent and Non-Violent Index Crimes, 1980-1997

WHY IS THE CRIME RATE FALLING AND THE INCARCERATION RATE RISING?

For the past several years, crime rates in Colorado have been significantly declining. In 1991, there were 7,401 violent arrests in Colorado. In 1997, there were 5,569 violent arrests -- a nearly one-fourth decrease.¹ However, in the same time period between 1991 and 1997, Colorado's overall prison population increased by over 50 percent from 7,794 to 12,205.²

At each stage of the criminal justice system there are opportunities for individuals to be “processed-out” of the system (i.e., for their cases to be terminated). Each of these stages represents a major point in which decision-makers determine whether the case warrants further processing (see Figure 1).

Figure 1. Flowchart of the Criminal Justice System




1 When adjusting for the increasing state population, the rate of violent crime decrease was 54.8 percent during this period.
 2 Reported as Average Daily Population; Source: Colorado Department of Corrections.

If the process of incarceration is viewed as a series of decision-points, streamlining these decisions might make it possible to incarcerate greater numbers of people.³ Furthermore, under a *streamlined process*, it is possible to conceive of a situation where fewer crimes may be committed, yet more offenders are sentenced to the Department of Corrections (DOC). This discussion poses two important questions:

- ***In recent years, does the process leading to incarceration appear to have been streamlined?***
- ***If so, in which ways has it been streamlined?***

It does appear that a greater percentage of arrestees are being sentenced to the Department of Corrections. Between 1992 and 1996, there were marked increases (or statistical constancy) in prison incarceration for all six major crime categories.⁴ Figure 2 below depicts how the crime funnel has changed over a four-year period for all crime categories combined.

Figure 2. Crime Funnel, 1992 vs. 1996 (all categories are shown as a percentage of total arrests)



³ The term of "streamlining" is meant in this context to describe the process where a larger percentage of offenders who enter into the criminal justice system result in a sentence to the Department of Corrections. By no means does this term denote that constitutional or other civil rights are being waived for the purpose of incarcerating greater numbers of people.

⁴ Violent (1992= 1.3, 1996= 2.7), Sex (1992= 1.4, 1996= 2.1), Property (1992= 0.2, 1996= 0.3), Forgery/Fraud (1992= 0.8, 1996= 0.8), Drugs (1992= 0.6, 1996= 1.0), (1992= 0.6, 1996= 0.6).

Specifically, according to Figure 2, the likelihood that an arrest would result in a prison placement has nearly increased by nearly one-fourth between 1992 and 1996 (0.22 percent in 1992 to 0.27 percent in 1996). This change has a direct impact on prison growth. During this period, prison admissions increased by nearly one-third (4,061 in 1992 to 4,746 in 1996).⁵ The increase of 685 additional prisoners into the system is roughly the operational capacity of the *Colorado Territorial Correctional Facility*.⁶

The data clearly indicate that more offenders are being sentenced to prison. However, it is unclear from this data exactly how the criminal justice system has streamlined the process. Uncovering why the criminal justice system is sentencing more offenders to prison is an enormous research project in itself. Several theories are explored below, but each should be investigated further before any definitive conclusions are drawn.

First, as depicted in Figure 2, there has been a significant increase in the proportion of arrests that later become filings. In 1992, 1.22 percent of arrests later resulted in a criminal filing. By 1996, this *arrest-to-filing proportion* rose to 1.5 percent. The impact of this *proportional* increase is that criminal filings have increased by 45 percent (3,064 in 1992 to 4,428 in 1996). There are a number of possible reasons why the arrest-to-filing proportion increased dramatically during this period: 1) the District Attorneys may have been more inclined to pursue certain high-profile crime categories (e.g., sex offenses, domestic violence, etc.); 2) better cooperation between the District Attorney's Office and Police Departments may have resulted in better cases (evidence) to prosecute (e.g., the Denver Drug Court); 3) the Federal Crime Act of 1996 placed an additional 100,000 law-enforcement officers on the street. The presence of these officers may have provided law-enforcement with the needed resources to target certain crimes and to make *better* arrests.


Second, there has been an increase in the number of *plea-bargains* granted to offenders (see Figure 3 on following page). In 1992, 29 percent of offenders sentenced to prison were convicted of a lessor charge. In 1996, this percentage rose to 36 percent (an increase of nearly 25 percent in five years). (This statistic for Colorado is lower than national estimates that suggest that between 75 to 90 percent of convicted persons have pleaded guilty to a lessor charge in a plea-bargaining session.)⁷ The practice of plea-bargaining is a widely debated issue within the criminal justice system. Opponents suggest that offenders are "getting-off easy," while proponents maintain that since there are inadequate resources to try every case, plea-bargaining guarantees that some form of legal sanction is imposed. Also, insufficient evidence makes certain charges untenable. Whatever the causes, the overall impact of plea-bargaining is that more offenders are convicted of *some* offense. These offenders, while convicted of a lessor charge, still remain within the criminal justice system.

5 Colorado Department of Corrections 1997 Annual Report.

6 The operational capacity of the Colorado Territorial Correctional Facility is 686. Source: Colorado Department of Corrections 1997 Annual Report.

7 Fox, Vernon, Introduction to Criminology, p. 380.

Figure 3. Percentage of Offenders Sentenced to Prison on a Plea-Bargain



Third, there has been a significant increase in the number of convictions that result in some type of criminal justice placement (i.e., probation, intensive supervision probation, community corrections and prison). In 1992, 76 percent of felony convictions received some type of criminal justice placement. By 1996, the proportion of convicted offenders receiving some type of criminal justice placement rose to over 91 percent. As one would assume, the majority of convicted felony offenders are sentenced to some form of criminal justice supervision. However, there are a small percentage of felony offenders who are offered alternative sentences such as suspended sentence (SS), fines, restitution or useful public service (UPS). Offenders who are offered these types of sentences are traditionally first-time offenders who commit relatively low-level crimes. The trend towards sentencing low-risk offenders to some type of criminal justice placement may be indicative of the court's desire to control and more closely observe the case.⁸

In addition, legislation and local policies may have minimized discretion by mandating certain policies and practices. This lessening of discretion within the criminal justice system appears to be having the effect of sentencing more offenders to prison. Discretion allows cases to be diverted out of the criminal justice system. Examples of this discretion exist throughout the criminal justice system:

- A police officer may utilize discretion to make an arrest or issue a verbal warning.
- A district attorney may choose to file a case or drop the charge as evidence permits.
- A judge may sentence an offender to prison or probation.
- A probation or parole officer may choose to file a revocation or sanction without revocation.
- The parole board may deny or grant an offender's request for parole.

Minimizing discretion reduces the possibility of variable treatment and increases the possibility that certain behaviors will result in certain outcomes. The net result of these mandatory policies and practices is that there are fewer opportunities for individuals to "fall out" of the criminal justice system. For example, with mandatory minimums for certain crimes, a judge loses his or her discretion to sentence an offender to anything less than what is statutorily required.⁹

⁸ This trend may also be indicative of greater proportions of offenders who have criminal histories. Evidence to this theory is presented later in this report.

⁹ However, it is uncertain whether these mandatory policies and higher rates of incarceration always result in enhancing public safety. Source: Clear, Todd, "When Incarceration Increases Crime", *The Journal of the Oklahoma Criminal Justice Research Consortium*, August 1996.

Finally, the criminal justice system is experiencing a significant increase in the number of offenders who have prior criminal histories. Prison sentences are generally reserved for offenders who have lengthy criminal histories or who have committed a serious crime. With a few notable exceptions (e.g., murder, kidnapping, etc.), criminal history is generally the determining factor for whether an offender will go to prison. The percentage of offenders with criminal histories has significantly increased throughout the 1990s. The percentage of offenders sentenced to DOC with a previous non-violent adult arrest increased from 69.3% to 75.9% between 1990 to 1995. Likewise, offenders sentenced to DOC with a previous non-violent adult conviction increased from 60.1% to 72.1% within this same time period (see Table 1).¹⁰


Table 1. Changes in the Criminal History of DOC Placements

PREVIOUS CRIMINAL HISTORY (ADULT)	DOC PLACEMENT (1990)	DOC PLACEMENT (1995) ¹¹
Non-Violent Arrest	69.3%	75.9%
Violent Arrest	36.2%	40.0%
Non-Violent Convictions	60.1%	72.1%
Violent Convictions	26.5%	28.1%

Conclusion

In conclusion, it is possible to simultaneously experience lower crime rates and higher incarceration rates. As Figure 4 depicts, in recent years, growth has been unequal at various points within the criminal justice system. Violent crime, for example, has been experiencing lower rates of arrests, but higher rates of filings, convictions, and DOC placements.

Figure 4. Growth Rates for Violent Crime, 1992 to 1996



¹⁰ It is important to note that previous juvenile criminal history provided less consistent results in sentencing.

¹¹ All criminal history variables were not available in the 1996 Criminal Justice Database.

Streamlining of case processing, increases in plea-bargaining, and changes in the proportion of offenders with a prior official record are among the factors that have contributed to the growing incarceration rate.

ADULT PROJECTION MODEL


The Division of Criminal Justice Prison Population Projection (PPP) Model is highly dependent upon data for the formulation of its projections. The essential data elements in the model come from the Department of Corrections (DOC), the Department of Local Affairs (DLA) and the Criminal Justice Database (collected, compiled and analyzed by the Division of Criminal Justice's [DCJ] Office of Research and Statistics [ORS]).

The Division of Criminal Justice's projection model utilizes the general premise that state population and aged-based prison incarceration rates are the primary determinants of new prison commitments. Further, when new commitments are combined with estimates of average length of stay in prison (ALOS), this calculation produces a very reliable and accurate forecast of the future prison population. The fundamental components of the PPP Model are described in greater detail in the narrative below. The interactions of these components are depicted in graphical form immediately following the narrative description (Figure 6).

(A) State Population Projections

The Division of Criminal Justice uses the Department of Local Affairs's population projections as the starting point for determining prison population. Each year the Department of Local Affairs, through the Division of Local Government (Demographic Section), prepares population projections for the state. The graph below describes the projected state population growth for years from 1995 to 2020.

Figure 5. Colorado's Population Projections (Department Of Local Affairs)



The Demographic Section produces these projections by utilizing an **economic-demographic system** that *models the intra- and interrelations of demographic and economic change at the county, region and state level.*¹² The Demographic Section describes the statewide population projections as a *3 Step Process*.

¹² Source Internet: www.dlg.oem2.state.co.us/demog/projprog.htm (December 1998).

- STEP 1: An economic forecast is developed using the Center for Business and Economic Development (CBED) Model.¹³ The underlying assumption is that the level of economic activity creates a labor force demand. If the labor force demand exceeds the existing population, then there will be a “positive” net migration. Likewise, if the labor force demand is lower than the existing population, then there will be a “negative” net migration. The theory is that the population will expand or shrink to accommodate the labor need.
- STEP 2: The levels of net migrations (as calculated in Step 1) are used in the demographic model to create a *population forecast*. The demographic model is built upon the simple premise that **Population = Current Population + Births – Deaths + Net Migration**. These population forecasts are then broken-down by sex and age and compared to labor force participation rates to produce an initial forecast of the labor force (supply).
- STEP 3: This demographically produced labor force supply (Step 2) is compared with the labor force (demand) generated by the economic model (Step 1). It is assumed that the demographic model accurately forecasts labor supply. In the event that there are discrepancies between the two models, the economic model is adjusted to bring the labor force demand closer to labor force supply.

By including these population projections, DCJ’s prison projections also include the numerous assumptions (economic and demographic) that were incorporated into the Department of Local Affairs’ population model. Therefore, any weakness that is associated with the Population Model is also reflected in DCJ’s Prison Projection Model.

It is important to note that the Division of Criminal Justice does not use economic factors (employment rates, Gross Domestic Product growth, etc.) as part of its PPP Model. Colorado’s incarceration rates appear to be more a product of “governmental decision-making” than the vitality of its economy. This contention is supported by the fact that while Colorado has been experiencing an “economic boom” for the past five years its prison population has increased by nearly 50 percent. Furthermore, the literature of criminal justice research concludes that the linkage between crime and economics is very weak.¹⁴

(B) Age and Offense Profile of Prison Commitments

The Department of Corrections collects a number of demographic variables on inmates who are sentenced and committed to one of their institutions. *Age* and *Offense* are the two demographic variables of particular interest to prison population projections. When combined with that year’s state population data, these two variables determine the *incarceration rate* for each *offense type* by age.¹⁵ For example, in FY1998 the State of Colorado committed 0.0642 percent of the entire male

¹³ CBED is affiliated with Regis University.

¹⁴ Andrews, D. & Bonta, J. (1994). *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct*. Cincinnati, OH, Anderson Publishing Company, p. 154.

¹⁵ Incarceration rates are not to be confused with offense rates. Incarceration rates refer to the percentage of the population that is committed to a DOC facility. Offense rates refer to the percentage of the population that commits a particular offense. It is possible to experience a situation where offense rates are declining yet incarceration rates are increasing. Such a situation currently exists within Colorado (as well as throughout the United States).

population on the offense type of drugs.¹⁶ The table below describes the overall incarceration rates for men and women by offense type, across all age groups.

Table 2. 1998 Incarceration Rates by Most Serious Offense (Rate per 100,000)

OFFENSE TYPE	MEN	WOMEN
Homicides	8.5	1.1
Assaults	30.6	2.4
Sex Offenses	20.8	0.4
Robbery	9.2	0.7
Burglary	21.0	0.5
Theft/Forgery	43.8	7.3
Technical Returns	78.5	6.3
Other (Non-Violent)	36.6	2.1
Drug	64.2	11.2
Escape	11.9	2.1
Parole Violation	23.6	1.7

(C) Projected Prison Commitments by Offense Type

This aspect of the model is a calculation using the previous two components of the prison projection model (i.e., *State Population Projections* and *Age and Offense Profile of Commitments*). Based on current incarceration rates and projected state population, the model predicts the number of new commitments by crime type and age for the forecasted period.

This is an important component of the model because it incorporates demographic shifts that can have a significant impact on prison population. For example, incarceration rates for adults between 18 and 26 have been historically high. If the population of this age group is anticipated to increase, it stands to reason that the numbers committed will also increase.¹⁷ The ability of DCJ's PPP Model to incorporate this information is particularly important when it is expected that the number of Americans aged 14 to 24 will grow one percent a year from 1995 to 2010 (from 40.1 to 47 million). This represents an overall increase of 16 percent in this age group.¹⁸

(D) Average Length of Stay (ALOS) by Offense

The Colorado Department of Corrections (DOC) also collects information about prisoners who were released from DOC institutions during the previous year. Based on this information, it is possible to calculate the average time an inmate is likely to serve in prison, based on their convicted offense type. Also, this component of the model incorporates historical changes or trends in the decision-making

¹⁶ This category is a "catch-all" category that includes a multitude of crimes related to drugs (e.g., possession, distribution, manufacture, etc.).

¹⁷ However, there has been some recent debate that this theory is flawed. For example, during the past five years homicide rates for teenage offenders have been falling; whereas the population of adolescents has already begun to rise.

¹⁸ New York Times, January 03, 1999.

processes that impact how long an inmate will serve in prison. Decisions by criminal justice professionals can either increase or decrease the time an offender spends in prison. For example, if the Parole Board decides not to grant early releases to offenders convicted of a certain crime type, or if judges increase sentence lengths, the ALOS would reflect these decisions as evidenced by their longer period of incarceration.

It is important to note the difficulty in predicting how long inmates will remain “locked-up” in an institution. Numerous variables influence the amount of time an individual will remain in prison: sentence length, behavior in prison, Parole Board decisions, sentencing legislation, probation and parole revocation policies, etc. Despite these limitations, disaggregating estimates of ALOS by offense type has historically been a valuable and accurate component of the DCJ’s PPP Model.¹⁹

(E) Projected Commitments by Time To Serve

Projected Commitments by Time to Serve is computed by multiplying *Projected Commitments by Offense Type* by *Average Length of Stay by Offense*. This protocol attaches a projected ALOS to the projected new commitment categories so that the model can calculate how long these new commitments will remain in prison. As the ALOS tables presented later in this report evidence, some new commitments will remain in prison for longer periods (e.g., Homicides), while others will cycle through DOC relatively quickly (e.g., Technical Returns).

(F) Prisoners Remaining from Previous Year

The Department of Corrections also provides DCJ information regarding the number of prisoners remaining from the previous year. This information includes the number of prisoners incarcerated, the offense type under which these prisoners were committed, and the amount of time served and remaining to serve on their sentence. From this information, the model is able to determine when the current inmate population (a.k.a. stock population) is expected to terminate their sentence and cycle-out of prison.

Once the expected termination dates for the existing population are determined, the new commitments are added in the model. This final calculation results in what the expected prison population will be at a given time. If new commitments increase at a rate higher than releases, then the prison population will grow. Likewise, if releases exceed new commitments, then prison populations will decrease.

¹⁹ Averages by offense types are more predictive than aggregating categories (i.e., one large category) because errors in multiple categories tend to counter-balance one another (assuming a normalized bell-shaped curve).

Figure 6. Prison Population Projection Model (graphic representation)

SCENARIOS

Scenario Building is an important component of the PPP Model. Scenario Building enables the model to respond to the changing environment of the criminal justice system. The following is a list of some of the potential impacts on the PPP Model:

- New legislation
- Court decisions
- Changed prison-bed capacity
- Bureaucratic mandates
- Department policy directives/and or mandates
- Community initiatives

The PPP Model has been constructed to incorporate these types of potential impacts. The Division of Criminal Justice (DCJ) relies on its Criminal Justice Database to make data-based decisions on how these potential impacts may affect the criminal justice system. Each year, DCJ dispatches a crew of researchers to collect data on adult criminal filings. The on-site collection consists of a 20 percent sample of felony cases filed in nine of the state's 22 Judicial Districts.²⁰ The Criminal Justice Database is a valuable tool for developing quantitatively oriented, research-based decision-making. This database promotes objectivity and corrects inaccurate assumptions about decision points within the criminal justice system and offender profiles.

The following information was revealed from the Criminal Justice Database regarding the characteristics and composition of the adult inmate population in Colorado. First, less than 25 percent of all felony convictions were sentenced to the Department of Corrections (23.9%). Nearly two-thirds of all convictions were placed in either probation or ISP (65.9%).²¹ Predictably, the more serious convictions (i.e., homicide and sex offense) had the greatest probability of a DOC placement.²² The less serious convictions (i.e., theft, forgery & fraud, and drugs) had the greatest probability of a probation placement (see Table 3).

Crime of conviction generally correlates with placement, but as evidenced earlier in this report, the most predictive measure of DOC placement is criminal history. Offenders who have prior contact with the criminal justice system are more likely to receive a prison sentence.

²⁰ The nine Judicial Districts are 1st (Jefferson and Gilpin Counties), 2nd (Denver County), 4th (El Paso and Teller Counties), 8th (Larimer and Jackson Counties), 10th (Pueblo County), 17th (Adams County), 18th (Arapahoe, Douglas, Elbert and Lincoln Counties), 19th (Weld County), and 21st (Mesa County). These jurisdictions represent approximately 80 percent of the state's population.

²¹ Probation and ISP were combined because both are supervised by the Judicial Branch.

²² Although, the most common placement for an assault is probation.

Table 3. Offender Placement by Most Serious Conviction

	HOMICIDE	ASSAULT	SEX	BURGLARY	ROBBERY	THEFT	FORGERY & FRAUD	DRUGS	TOTAL
PROBATION (n)	(5)	(197)	(39)	(64)	(11)	(366)	(202)	(530)	(1,414)
Row %	0.3%	13.9%	2.8%	4.5%	0.8%	25.9%	14.3%	37.5%	100%
Column %	14.7%	56.1%	41.5%	52.5%	17.7%	66.7%	70.6%	64.4%	60.9%
ISP (n)	(0)	(20)	(7)	(4)	(3)	(26)	(8)	(49)	(117)
Row %	0%	17.1%	6.0%	3.4%	2.6%	22.2%	6.8%	41.9%	100%
Column %	0%	5.7%	7.4%	3.3%	4.8%	4.7%	2.8%	6.0%	5.0%
COMCOR (n)	(1)	(14)	(3)	(12)	(6)	(35)	(23)	(52)	(146)
Row %	0.7%	9.6%	2.1%	8.2%	4.1%	24.0%	15.8%	35.6%	100%
Column %	2.9%	4.0%	3.2%	9.8%	9.7%	6.4%	8.0%	6.3%	6.3%
JAIL (n)	(0)	(27)	(0)	(3)	(0)	(29)	(9)	(22)	(90)
Row %	0%	30.0%	0%	3.3%	0.0%	32.2%	10.0%	24.4%	100%
Column %	0%	7.7%	0%	2.5%	0.0%	5.3%	3.1%	2.7%	3.9%
PRISON (n)	(28)	(93)	(45)	(39)	(42)	(93)	(44)	(170)	(554)
Row %	5.1%	16.8%	8.1%	7.0%	7.6%	16.8%	7.9%	30.7%	100%
Column %	82.4%	26.5%	47.9%	32.0%	67.7%	16.9%	15.4%	20.7%	23.9
TOTAL (n)	(34)	(351)	(94)	(122)	(62)	(549)	(286)	(823)	(2,321)
Row %	1.5%	15.1%	4.0%	5.3%	2.7%	23.7%	12.3%	35.5%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Source: DCJ Criminal Justice Database, 1996.

ASSUMPTIONS

The prison population projection figures are based on several assumptions. The more significant assumptions are outlined below.

- The data provided by the Department of Corrections accurately describes the number, characteristics, and trends of offenders committed to DOC facilities for fiscal years 1997-98.
- Incarceration rates will continue to experience predictable and stable growth.
- The data provided by the Colorado Department of Local Affairs Demographic Section accurately describe the current and projected trends for age and gender of Colorado's citizens between years 1998 and 2005.
- Decision-makers in the adult criminal justice system will not change the way they use their discretion, except in explicitly stated ways that can be incorporated into future iterations of the model.
- The Colorado General Assembly will not pass any legislation during the projection period that impacts the way adults are processed or defined for commitment into DOC facilities.
- Average Length of Stay in a DOC facility will remain constant throughout the projection period.
- The mandatory parole provisions (as outlined in HB-93-1302) will increase the commitment population by increasing the pool of parole violators.
- Increased capacity of DOC beds will increase the number of new commitments by reducing the number of offenders placed in community supervision programs.
- The General Assembly will not allocate additional resources to community supervision corrections programs. Increased funding to these programs will likely reduce commitments.
- No catastrophic event such as war or disease will occur during the projection period.

IMPORTANT LEGISLATION INFLUENCING PROJECTIONS

Historical Overview²³

- In 1979, H.B. 1589 changed sentences from indeterminate to determinate terms and made parole mandatory at one-half (the mid-point) the sentence served.
- In 1981, H.B. 1156 required that the courts sentence offenders above the maximum of the presumptive range for “crimes of violence” as well as those crimes committed with aggravating circumstances.
- In 1985, H.B. 1320 doubled the maximum penalties of the presumptive ranges for all felony classes and mandated that parole be granted at the discretion of the Parole Board. (As a result of this legislation, the average length of stay projected for new commitments nearly tripled from 20 months in 1980 to 57 months in 1989.)
- In 1988, S.B. 148 changed the previous requirement of the courts to sentence above the maximum of the presumptive range to sentencing at least the mid-point of the presumptive range for “crimes of violence” and crime associated with aggravating circumstances. (An analysis of DCJ’s Criminal Justice Database indicated that judges continue to sentence well above the mid-point of the range for these crimes.)
- In 1990, H.B. 1327 doubled the maximum amount of earned time that an offender is allowed to earn while in prison from five to ten days per month. In addition, parolees were allowed “earned time” awards that reduced time spent on parole. This legislation also applied earned time to sentence discharge date as well as parole eligibility date. (The effect of this law was that it shortened the length of stay for those offenders who did not parole but rather discharged their sentences.)
- In 1990 S.B. 117 modified life sentences for felony-one convictions to “life without parole” from the previous parole eligibility after 40 calendar years served.
- In 1993, H.B. 1302 reduced the presumptive ranges for certain class three through class six non-violent crimes. This legislation also added a split sentence, *mandating a period of parole for all crimes following a prison sentence*. This legislation also eliminated the earned time awards while on parole.
- In 1993, S.B. 9 established the Youthful Offender System (Y.O.S.) with 96 beds within the Department of Corrections. The legislation created a new adult sentencing provision for offenders between the ages of 14 and 18 years (except for those convicted of a class one or class two or sexual assault felony).

²³ Rosten, Kristi. Statistical Report, Fiscal Year 1997, Department of Corrections, pages 3-7.

- In 1993, the Legislature appropriated a new 300-bed facility in Pueblo (subsequently, an additional 180 beds have been approved).
- In 1994, S.B. 196 created a new provision for offenders who have a current conviction of any class one or two felony (or any class three felony that is defined as a crime of violence) and have been convicted of these same offenses twice earlier. This “three strikes” legislation requires these offenders be sentenced to a term of life imprisonment with parole eligibility in forty years.
- In 1994, the Legislature appropriated the construction of nearly 1,200 adult prison beds and 300 YOS beds.
- In 1995, H.B. 1087 allowed “earned time” for certain non-violent offenders. (This legislation was enacted in part as a response to the projected parole population growth as part of H.B. 93-1302.)
- In 1996, H.B. 1005 broadened the criminal charges eligible for direct filings of juveniles as adults and possible sentencing to the Youthful Offender System.
- In 1996, the Legislature appropriated funding for 480 beds at the Trinidad Correctional Facility and reconstruction and expansion of two existing facilities.

Recent Legislation

Two major pieces of legislation were enacted in 1998 that will impact the number of prison commitments during the projection period: House Bill 98-1160 and House Bill 98-1156. Both pieces of legislation refer to the length of time spent by an offender under parole supervision.

HOUSE BILL 98-1160. This legislation applies to offenses occurring on or after July 1, 1998, and mandates that every offender must complete a period of parole supervision after incarceration. A summary of the major provisions that apply to mandatory parole follows:

- Offenders committing class 2, 3, 4 or 5 felonies or second or subsequent felonies which are class 6, and who are revoked during the period of their mandatory parole, may serve a period up to the end of the mandatory parole period in incarceration. In such a case, one year of parole supervision must follow.
- If revoked during the last six months of mandatory parole, intermediate sanctions including community corrections, home detention, community service or restitution programs are permitted, as is a re-incarceration period of up to twelve months.
- If revoked during the one year of parole supervision, the offender may be re-incarcerated for a period not to exceed one year.

HOUSE BILL 98-1156. This legislation concerns the lifetime supervision of certain sex offenders. A number of provisions in the bill address sentencing, parole terms, and conditions. Some of these provisions are summarized below:

- For certain crimes (except those in the following two bullets), a sex offender shall receive an indeterminate term of at least the minimum of the presumptive range specified in 18-1-105 for the level of offense committed and a maximum of the sex offender's natural life.
- For crimes of violence (defined in 16-11-309), a sex offender shall receive an indeterminate term of at least the midpoint in the presumptive range for the level of offense committed and a maximum of the sex offender's natural life.
- For sex offenders eligible for sentencing as a habitual sex offender against children (pursuant to 18-3-412), the sex offender shall receive an indeterminate term of at least the upper limit of the presumptive range for the level of offense committed and a maximum of the sex offender's natural life.
- The period of parole for any sex offender convicted of a class 4 felony shall be an indeterminate term of at least 10 years and a maximum of the remainder of the sex offender's natural life.
- The period of parole for any sex offender convicted of a class 2 or 3 felony shall be an indeterminate term of at least 20 years and a maximum of the sex offender's natural life.

FINDINGS: FALL 1998 PRISON AND PAROLE POPULATION PROJECTIONS

The Colorado Division of Criminal Justice (DCJ) is mandated, pursuant to 24-33.5-503 C.R.S. to prepare Department of Corrections population projections for the General Assembly. This section presents significant findings from this year's quarterly projections.

Historical Summary²⁴

Colorado has been experiencing significant growth in its adult prison populations. Between 1991 and 1997, Colorado's average adult inmate population has increased by over 50 percent (56.6%). In this same period, prison admissions have increased by nearly two-thirds (64.8%) and releases have increased by over one-half (51.3%). (© See the Prison and Parole Projections section of this report for more detailed projection data.)

Table 4. Adult Admissions, Releases and Average Daily Population (1991-1997)

YEAR	ADMISSIONS	RELEASES	ADP POPULATION
1991	3,498	3,115	7,794
1992	4,061	3,309	8,474
1993	4,040	3,563	9,068
1994	4,373	3,593	9,622
1995	4,746	4,001	10,564
1996	5,371	4,445	11,019
1997	5,765	4,713	12,205

Table 5. Annual Growth of Admission, Releases and Average Daily Population (1991-1997)

YEAR	ADMISSIONS	RELEASES	ADP POPULATION
1991-1992	16.09%	6.23%	8.72%
1992-1993	-0.52%	7.68%	7.01%
1993-1994	8.24%	0.84%	6.11%
1994-1995	8.53%	11.36%	9.79%
1995-1996	13.17%	11.10%	4.31%
1996-1997	7.34%	6.03%	10.76%

From these data, it is easy to uncover the fundamental reason why the adult population rate is increasing in Colorado: *The growth in admissions is outpacing the growth in releases.* Understanding

²⁴ Last available published information from the Department of Corrections. Rosten, Kristi. *Statistical Report, Fiscal Year 1997*, Department of Corrections, pages 3-7.


the reason why admissions have increased and why releases have not been able to keep pace is significantly more complicated.

The short answer to why admissions have increased is that there has been: 1) greater efficiency in the crime funnel (as referenced in the first section of this report); 2) more *technical returns* and *new crimes* as the result of mandatory parole; and 3) recent legislation that mandates prison sentences (e.g., HB-81-1156, HB-85-1320, HB-93-1303, SB-94-196, etc.).

It would be incorrect to conclude that releases are slowing. Rather, releases have not kept up with admissions. As the previous tables evidence, releases have increased by over one-half (51.3%) in the period of 1991-1997. Further, DOC is releasing approximately the same percentage of offenders when compared to total population in 1997 as it had in 1991 (39-40%).

Increases in releases can be attributed to three major factors:²⁵ 1) more offenders are being committed to prison on offenses that carry shorter prison sentences (e.g., technical violations); 2) mandatory parole legislation; and 3) ability to accumulate “earned time” while in prison. The net impact of these three factors is that Average Length of Stay (ALOS) for those released from prison has stabilized in recent years. In 1981, the ALOS was 22.2 months, by 1990 ALOS had increased to 42.0 months (52.9%). Since 1991, there has been relatively little movement in ALOS. In fact the ALOS in 1998 was almost exactly the same as it was in 1991 (within 0.1 month or 3 days) (see Figure 7 below). (© See the Length of Stay section of this report for more detailed ALOS data.)

Figure 7. Average Length of Stay, 1980-1998 (months)




25 Many of the three factors are interrelated.

General Comments Regarding the Fall 1998 Adult Projections

This year's projection model forecasts that the prison population will be 21,786 by January 01, 2005. Male and female populations are predicted to be 19,952 and 1,835, respectively. The growth rate of the prison population is expected to "level-off" in accordance to the projected slowing in the state population growth. When growth curves are baselined at 100 percent for 1999, the projected prison population and state population growth are predictably consistent by the year 2005²⁶ (see Figure 8). The relatively higher growth curve for prison populations in the first three years accommodates the significant increases currently being observed in many offense categories (i.e., sex offenses, parole returns [technical and new crime], drugs, etc.).

Figure 8. Comparison of Projected State and Prison Population Growth Rates, 1999-2005 (% growth)



Note: Baseline for this graphic is 100%. For example, between 1999 and 2001 the prison population is projected to increase its growth rate, whereas for the same time period, the state population is projected to decrease its growth rate (while still exhibiting positive population growth).

This year's projections are similar to last year's in a number of respects. First, projections for *regular commitments* have remained relatively stable. Last year's model predicted that by January 01, 2004 there would be 16,583 regular commitments. This year's model predicts that regular commitments will be 16,433, a decline of less than one percent for the corresponding time. Likewise, in the crime category *technical violations*, the results from this year's model are nearly identical to last year's model (2,329 and 2,320 respectively).

However, there have been significantly larger differences between the models in the area of *parole new crime violations*. Last year's model predicted that there would be 1,563 parole new crime violations, this year the model forecasts the number to be 1,880 (an increase of over 20 percent).

²⁶ The reason why they are predictably consistent is that the PPP Model uses state population as the starting point for its analysis. If state population growth rates decline, prison populations will decline at similar rates (For additional information, please refer the section of this report that describes the PPP Model).

Male Projections

Significant increases in specific offense categories of the prison population have occurred in the last year. The projection calculations have been altered to accommodate these increases. Table 6 below describes these increases over approximately a 16-month period.

Table 6. Male Inmate Population by Offense Category

	MURDER	ASSAULT/ KIDNAPPING	SEX ASSAULT	ROBBERY	BURGLARY	THEFT/ FORG/FRAUD	OTHER NON-VIOLENT	DRUGS	ESCAPE	PAROLE TECH VIOL	PAROLE NEW CRIME	TOTAL
1997	1035	1506	1489	724	879	989	922	1492	498	1062	1155	11751
1998	1130	1540	1635	804	966	1067	661	1771	471	1165	1319	12529

The 1999 Prison Population Projection Model predicts significant increases for the following crime types: *sex offenses, technical returns, drugs and parole violations (new crime)*. Increases in these areas are justified not only by actual increases in stock population, but also by legislation (e.g., HB-93-1302, HB-98-1156 and HB-98-1160).

Female Projections

Similar to the male projections, there have been significant increases in specific offense categories of the prison population for females. The model has been altered to accommodate these increases. Table 7 below describes the rates of these increases over approximately a 16-month period.

Table 7. Female Inmate Population by Offense Category

	MURDER	ASSAULT/ KIDNAPPING	SEX ASSAULT	ROBBERY	BURGLARY	THEFT/ FORG/FRAUD	OTHER NON-VIOLENT	DRUGS	ESCAPE	PAROLE TECH VIOL	PAROLE NEW CRIME	TOTAL
1997	93	83	20	27	24	168	39	217	65	52	93	881
1998	102	99	19	35	25	198	30	281	76	60	116	1041

DCJ's 1999 Prison Population Projection Model predicts significant increases for the following crime types: *assaults, theft/forgery, drugs and parole violations (new crime)*. Again, increases in these areas are justified not only by actual increases in population, but also by legislation (e.g., HB-93-1302, HB-98-1156 and HB-98-1160) and other factors included in the crime funnel.

THE NUMBERS: FALL 1998 PRISON AND PAROLE POPULATION PROJECTIONS

Table 8. Division of Criminal Justice Fall 1998 Adult Prison Population Projections

YEAR	MONTH	MEN	WOMEN	TOTAL
1999	JAN	13,038	1,116	14,154
	APR	13,297	1,143	14,440
	JULY	13,574	1,172	14,746
	OCT	13,833	1,199	15,032
2000	JAN	14,167	1,234	15,402
	APR	14,468	1,268	15,736
	JULY	14,792	1,303	16,095
	OCT	15,093	1,336	16,429
2001	JAN	15,483	1,380	16,863
	APR	15,777	1,410	17,187
	JULY	16,092	1,443	17,535
	OCT	16,385	1,474	17,859
2002	JAN	16,766	1,513	18,279
	APR	17,013	1,540	18,553
	JULY	17,279	1,570	18,848
	OCT	17,526	1,597	19,123
2003	JAN	17,846	1,632	19,478
	APR	18,090	1,655	19,744
	JULY	18,352	1,679	20,030
	OCT	18,595	1,702	20,297
2004	JAN	18,911	1,731	20,642
	APR	19,149	1,755	20,904
	JULY	19,405	1,780	21,185
	OCT	19,643	1,804	21,447
2005	JAN	19,952	1,835	21,786

**Table 9. Division of Criminal Justice Fall 1998 Prison Population Projections:
Adult Prison Commitments by Commitment Type and Gender***

DATE		REG COMMITS		PV NEW CRIME		TECH VIOLATORS		COMBINED		TOTAL
YEAR	MONTH	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
1999	JAN	10,597	928	1,236	65	1,206	123	13,038	1,116	14,154
	APR	10,795	949	1,258	66	1,244	128	13,297	1,143	14,440
	JULY	11,007	971	1,282	67	1,285	133	13,574	1,172	14,746
	OCT	11,205	992	1,305	68	1,323	139	13,833	1,199	15,032
2000	JAN	11,462	1,019	1,333	70	1,372	145	14,167	1,234	15,402
	APR	11,689	1,046	1,351	71	1,428	150	14,468	1,268	15,736
	JULY	11,933	1,076	1,371	72	1,488	156	14,792	1,303	16,095
	OCT	12,161	1,103	1,389	73	1,544	161	15,093	1,336	16,429
2001	JAN	12,455	1,138	1,412	74	1,616	167	15,483	1,380	16,863
	APR	12,681	1,165	1,434	76	1,662	169	15,777	1,410	17,187
	JULY	12,924	1,193	1,457	78	1,711	172	16,092	1,443	17,535
	OCT	13,149	1,219	1,478	80	1,758	174	16,385	1,474	17,859
2002	JAN	13,442	1,253	1,506	83	1,817	177	16,766	1,513	18,279
	APR	13,619	1,274	1,537	88	1,856	179	17,013	1,540	18,553
	JULY	13,810	1,296	1,570	93	1,898	180	17,279	1,570	18,848
	OCT	13,987	1,317	1,601	98	1,937	181	17,526	1,597	19,123
2003	JAN	14,217	1,344	1,641	104	1,988	183	17,846	1,632	19,478
	APR	14,401	1,360	1,666	110	2,023	184	18,090	1,655	19,744
	JULY	14,598	1,377	1,692	117	2,061	185	18,352	1,679	20,030
	OCT	14,782	1,392	1,717	123	2,096	186	18,595	1,702	20,297
2004	JAN	15,020	1,413	1,749	131	2,142	187	18,911	1,731	20,642
	APR	15,188	1,428	1,783	139	2,178	188	19,149	1,755	20,904
	JULY	15,369	1,444	1,819	147	2,216	189	19,405	1,780	21,185
	OCT	15,537	1,459	1,853	155	2,253	189	19,643	1,804	21,447
2005	JAN	15,755	1,479	1,897	165	2,299	190	19,952	1,835	21,786

* Please Note: All projections are rounded to the next whole number. Calculations may appear slightly off.

Table 10. Division of Criminal Justice Adult Prison Population Projections, 1994-1998

YEAR	MONTH	FALL 1994 PROJECTION	FALL 1995 PROJECTION	FALL 1996 PROJECTION	FALL 1997 PROJECTION	FALL 1998 PROJECTION
1995	OCT	11,186	(actual) 10,802	(actual) 10,802	(actual) 10,802	(actual) 10,802
1996	JAN	11,403	10,926	(actual) 10,933	(actual) 10,933	(actual) 10,933
	APR	11,625	11,010	(actual) 11,101	(actual) 11,101	(actual) 11,101
	JULY	11,844	11,071	(actual) 11,577	(actual) 11,577	(actual) 11,577
	OCT	12,065	11,217	(actual) 11,873	(actual) 11,873	(actual) 11,873
1997	JAN	12,261	11,387	12,180	(actual) 12,205	(actual) 12,205
	APR	12,508	11,491	12,393	(actual) 12,353	(actual) 12,353
	JULY	12,761	11,568	12,610	(actual) 12,590	(actual) 12,590
	OCT	13,003	11,749	12,887	(actual) 12,953	(actual) 12,953
1998	JAN	13,232	11,960	13,184	13,264	(actual) 13,195
	APR	13,505	12,094	13,419	13,530	(actual) 13,388
	JULY	13,788	12,195	13,660	13,803	(actual) 13,663
	OCT	14,059	12,432	13,968	14,152	(actual) 13,842
1999	JAN	14,326	12,704	14,299	14,527	14,154
	APR	14,615	12,843	14,506	14,810	14,440
	JULY	14,891	12,947	14,718	15,101	14,746
	OCT	15,172	13,193	14,989	15,473	15,032
2000	JAN	15,455	13,475	15,279	15,875	15,402
	APR	NA	13,626	15,522	16,112	15,736
	JULY	NA	13,738	15,771	16,354	16,095
	OCT	NA	14,003	16,089	16,664	16,429
2001	JAN	NA	14,308	16,431	16,997	16,863
	APR	NA	NA	16,655	17,228	17,187
	JULY	NA	NA	16,883	17,465	17,535
	OCT	NA	NA	17,176	17,768	17,859
2002	JAN	NA	NA	17,490	18,094	18,279
	APR	NA	NA	17,721	18,333	18,553
	JULY	NA	NA	17,957	18,577	18,848
	OCT	NA	NA	18,258	18,891	19,123
2003	JAN	NA	NA	18,582	19,228	19,478
	APR	NA	NA	NA	19,485	19,744
	JULY	NA	NA	NA	19,748	20,030
	OCT	NA	NA	NA	20,085	20,297
2004	JAN	NA	NA	NA	20,446	20,642
	APR	NA	NA	NA	NA	20,904
	JULY	NA	NA	NA	NA	21,185
	OCT	NA	NA	NA	NA	21,447
2005	JAN	NA	NA	NA	NA	21,786

**Table 11. Division of Criminal Justice Fall 1998 Prison Population Projections:
Adult Parole Populations by Supervision Type***

DATE		PAROLE RELEASES	DOMESTIC PAROLE POPULATION				ADDITIONAL PAROLE			TOTAL
YEAR	MONTH		Regular	ISP	Interstate In	Total	Interstate Out	Abscond	Total	
1998	JAN	3,513	2,034	504	313	2,851	1,080	208	1,288	4,139
	APR	3,764	2,177	535	331	3,043	1,146	237	1,383	4,426
	JULY	4,020	2,411	492	316	3,219	1,200	233	1,433	4,652
	OCT	4,291	2,540	573	316	3,429	1,229	265	1,494	4,923
1999	JAN	4,891	2,761	565	318	3,644	1,293	272	1,565	5,209
	APR	5,211	2,979	565	321	3,865	1,389	278	1,668	5,532
	JULY	5,563	3,218	565	323	4,106	1,495	285	1,780	5,886
	OCT	5,905	3,450	565	326	4,341	1,597	293	1,890	6,230
2000	JAN	6,246	3,682	565	328	4,575	1,699	300	1,999	6,574
	APR	6,617	3,935	565	330	4,830	1,810	307	2,118	6,948
	JULY	7,025	4,212	565	333	5,110	1,933	315	2,248	7,358
	OCT	7,420	4,481	565	335	5,381	2,052	323	2,375	7,756
2001	JAN	7,816	4,750	565	338	5,653	2,170	331	2,501	8,154
	APR	8,011	4,882	565	341	5,788	2,224	339	2,563	8,351
	JULY	8,225	5,028	565	343	5,936	2,284	348	2,632	8,568
	OCT	8,432	5,169	565	346	6,080	2,342	356	2,698	8,778
2002	JAN	8,640	5,310	565	348	6,223	2,399	365	2,765	8,988
	APR	8,829	5,439	565	351	6,355	2,451	374	2,825	9,180
	JULY	9,037	5,580	565	353	6,499	2,508	384	2,892	9,390
	OCT	9,239	5,717	565	356	6,639	2,563	393	2,956	9,595
2003	JAN	9,441	5,855	565	359	6,778	2,618	403	3,021	9,799
	APR	9,620	5,976	565	361	6,903	2,665	413	3,078	9,981
	JULY	9,816	6,110	565	364	7,039	2,718	424	3,141	10,180
	OCT	10,007	6,240	565	367	7,172	2,768	434	3,202	10,374
2004	JAN	10,198	6,369	565	370	7,304	2,818	445	3,263	10,567
	APR	10,386	6,498	565	372	7,435	2,867	456	3,324	10,759
	JULY	10,593	6,638	565	375	7,578	2,922	468	3,390	10,968
	OCT	10,793	6,775	565	378	7,718	2,975	479	3,454	11,171
2005	JAN	10,994	6,911	565	381	7,857	3,027	491	3,518	11,375

* Please Note: All projections are rounded to the next whole number. Calculations may appear slightly off.

THE NUMBERS: LENGTH OF STAY

Table 12. Length of Stay for New Admissions to Prison: FY1980-FY1998

BASED ON SENTENCE DATA FROM:	AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY ESTIMATE*
FY 1980-81	22.2 Months
FY 1981-82	23.4 Months
FY 1982-83	23.4 Months
FY 1983-84	25.4 Months
FY 1984-85	31.7 Months
FY 1985-86	34.7 Months
FY 1986-87	43.2 Months
FY 1987-88	53.3 Months
FY 1988-89	57.0 Months
FY 1989-90	42.0 Months
FY 1990-91	39.5 Months
FY 1991-92	40.7 Months
FY 1992-93	37.6 Months
FY 1993-94	40.7 Months
FY 1994-95	43.1 Months
FY 1995-96	40.2 Months
FY 1996-97	41.5 Months
FY 1997-98	39.6 Months
FY 1998-99	39.6 Months

* Average length of stay reflects the amount of time offenders who were admitted during the representative year are expected to serve.

Table 13. Length of Stay Components (months) by Felony Class, FY1998-99: Men

OFFENSE CATEGORY	COURT SENTENCE	JAIL CREDIT	TIME TO PED	EARNED TIME	SENTENCE TO SERVE TO PED	PDE	AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY
F1	480	0.00	0	0	0	0	480
F2 EXT*	558.04	9.28	265.07	66.26	217.43	97.9	315.35
F2 SEX	745.66	10.38	354.19	82.66	298.43	171.4	469.83
F2 DRUG	159.25	6.26	75.64	20.93	56.42	14.8	71.27
F2 OTHER	279.51	8.33	132.77	33.09	105.32	5.5	110.81
F3 EXT	188.47	6.35	89.52	23.86	68.74	35.4	104.16
F3 SEX	182.66	6.69	86.76	23.99	65.22	55.4	120.62
F3 DRUG	76.59	4.83	36.38	10.07	25.31	5.7	30.99
F3 OTHER	105.38	6.27	50.05	13.85	35.21	18.5	53.75
F4 EXT	78.05	5.85	37.07	10.25	24.88	22.5	47.39
F4 SEX	83.69	6.11	39.75	11.00	26.83	35.0	61.81
F4 DRUG	51.41	4.51	24.42	6.76	15.72	7.3	23.04
F4 OTHER	61.22	5.46	29.08	8.05	18.63	15.7	34.33
F5 EXT	42.16	1.33	20.23	5.59	15.01	8.0	23
F5 SEX	35.22	4.86	16.73	4.64	8.99	16.6	25.63
F5 DRUG	34.98	4.73	16.62	4.61	9.02	8.2	17.21
F5 OTHER	35.03	4.76	16.64	4.61	9.02	11.6	20.65
F6 EXT	22.49	1.93	10.68	2.95	6.93	8.2	15.15
F6 DRUG	27.44	3.66	13.03	3.61	7.14	1.6	8.7
F6 OTHER	21.65	2.83	10.29	2.85	5.68	5.9	11.59
HAB LITTLE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0
HAB BIG	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0

* The offense categories are broken down according to statute enacted in July 1993, which created a category of mostly violent offenses as "extraordinary risk of harm offenses." In this table "EXT" refers to offenses included in that category. Also, convicted sexual offenders typically serve more time, and drug offenders, some of whom are considered extraordinary risk crimes, serve less time than other offenders in this category -- they are identified by the projection model as their own offense group.

Table 14. Length of Stay Components (months) by Felony Class, FY1998-99: Women

OFFENSE CATEGORY	COURT SENTENCE	JAIL CREDIT	TIME TO PED	EARNED TIME	SENTENCE TO SERVE TO PED	PDE	AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY
F1	480	0.0	0	0	0	0	0
F2 EXT*	387.62	10.2	184.12	54.48	138.78	0.00	128.88
F2 SEX	0.00	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
F2 DRUG	236.72	9.3	112.44	33.27	81.75	16.75	98.5
F2 OTHER	284.06	9.2	134.93	39.93	99.98	12.52	112.5
F3 EXT	179.84	8.2	85.42	25.28	60.92	14.97	75.89
F3 SEX	165.70	10.0	78.71	23.29	53.72	75.78	129.5
F3 DRUG	72.08	4.7	34.24	10.13	23.01	0.11	23.12
F3 OTHER	121.18	7.0	57.56	17.03	39.59	23.73	63.32
F4 EXT	56.04	3.5	26.62	7.88	18.09	13.66	31.75
F4 SEX	44.98	4.0	21.36	6.32	13.32	18.68	32
F4 DRUG	47.11	5.5	22.38	6.62	12.63	9.95	22.58
F4 OTHER	51.41	4.1	24.42	7.23	15.67	13.60	29.27
F5 EXT	37.64	1.7	17.88	5.29	12.77	6.59	19.36
F5 SEX	0.00	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.44	12.44
F5 DRUG	26.11	4.1	12.40	3.67	5.98	11.18	17.16
F5 OTHER	31.41	4.9	14.92	4.41	7.20	2.80	10
F6 EXT	17.75	5.7	8.43	2.49	1.14	1.86	3
F6 DRUG	16.27	0.6	7.73	2.29	5.63	5.97	11.6
F6 OTHER	19.37	3.1	9.20	2.72	4.38	17.32	21.7
HAB LITTLE	0.00	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
HAB BIG	0.00	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0

* The offense categories are broken down according to statute enacted in July 1993, which created a category of mostly violent offenses as "extraordinary risk of harm offenses." In this table "EXT" refers to offenses included in that category. Also, convicted sexual offenders typically serve more time, and drug offenders, some of whom are considered extraordinary risk crimes, serve less time than other offenders in this category -- they are identified by the projection model as their own offense group.

Table 15. 1998 PROJECTION MODEL / Men: New Commitments (average projected length of stay for all men: 40.85)
 Projected Average Length of Stay Comparison: Fall 1997 DCJ Projections vs. Fall 1998 DCJ Projections
 OVERALL PROJECTED AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY: 39.58 MONTHS

OFFENSE CATEGORY	NUMBER OF MEN COMMITTED TO PRISON		% OF ALL COMMITMENTS TO PRISON: MEN		AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY (MONTHS)		AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY EFFECT (MONTHS)*	
	Fall 1997** (7/1/96-6/30/97)	Fall 1998 (7/1/97-6/30/98)	Fall 1997	Fall 1998	Fall 1997**	Fall 1998	Fall 1997	Fall 1998
F1	24	24	0.50%	0.50%	480.0	480.0	2.41	2.40
F2 EXT***	69	53	4.15%	1.10%	286.2	312.2	4.99	3.45
F2 SEX	9	6	0.19%	0.13%	383.2	469.8	.87	0.59
F2 DRUG	14	11	0.29%	0.23%	107.7	71.3	.32	0.16
F2 OTHER	5	26	0.10%	0.54%	111.0	110.8	.11	0.60
F3 EXT	140	125	2.93%	2.60%	115.9	108.8	3.40	2.83
F3 SEX	111	123	2.32%	2.56%	104.6	116.5	2.43	2.99
F3 DRUG	273	335	5.72%	6.98%	30.3	30.8	1.73	2.15
F3 OTHER	225	186	4.71%	3.88%	47.5	51.7	2.24	2.00
F4 EXT	146	146	3.06%	3.04%	43.4	45.4	1.33	1.38
F4 SEX	154	164	3.23%	3.42%	51.1	61.7	1.65	2.11
F4 DRUG	278	492	5.82%	10.25%	19.8	21.8	1.15	2.23
F4 OTHER	538	785	11.27%	16.35%	28.9	33.0	3.26	5.40
F5 EXT	204	108	4.27%	2.25%	30.9	21.5	1.32	0.48
F5 SEX	20	50	0.42%	1.04%	24.6	25.5	.10	0.27
F5 DRUG	15	163	0.31%	3.40%	12.4	14.9	.04	0.51
F5 OTHER	613	710	12.84%	14.79%	20.8	19.4	2.67	2.87
F6 EXT	141	17	2.95%	0.35%	12.0	14.5	.35	0.05
F6 DRUG	63	29	0.00%	0.00%	11.4	8.1	0	0
F6 OTHER	900	384	18.85%	8.00%	20.4	10.0	3.85	0.80
HAB-LITTLE	19	0	0.40%	0.00%	196.0	0.0	.78	0
HAB-BIG	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.0	0.0	0	0
MEN TOTAL	3961	3937	84.33%	81.41%	NA	NA	NA	NA

* Average length of stay effect is the amount of time each commitment group contributes to the overall average length of stay of 39.58 months.

** Note that crime code data provided by DOC for the 1997 projections changed to become more precise, for example, identifying the crime family of attempted offenses. This allowed us to more clearly categorize data. For that reason, average length of stay and the number of offenders in similar categories may not be comparable.

*** The offense categories are broken down according to statute enacted in July 1993, which created a category of mostly violent offenses as "extraordinary risk of harm offenses." In this table "EXT" refers to offenses included in that category. Also, convicted sexual offenders typically serve more time, and drug offenders, some of whom are considered "extraordinary risk" crimes, serve less time than other offenders in this category -- they are identified by the projection model as their own offense group.

Table 16. 1998 PROJECTION MODEL / Women: New Commitments (average projected length of stay for all women: 28.39)
 Projected Average Length of Stay Comparison: Fall 1997 DCJ Projections vs. Fall 1998 DCJ Projections
 OVERALL PROJECTED AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY: 39.58 MONTHS

OFFENSE CATEGORY	NUMBER OF WOMEN COMMITTED TO PRISON		% OF ALL COMMITMENTS TO PRISON: WOMEN		AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY (MONTHS)		AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY EFFECT (MONTHS)*	
	Fall 1997** (7/1/96-6/30/97)	Fall 1998 (7/1/97-6/30/98)	Fall 1997	Fall 1998	Fall 1997**	Fall 1998	Fall 1997	Fall 1998
F1	3	1	0.06%	0.02%	480.0	480.0	.30	.10
F2 EXT***	8	8	0.17%	0.17%	245.3	128.9	.41	.21
F2 SEX	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.0	0.0	0	.00
F2 DRUG	0	2	0.00%	0.04%	0.0	98.5	0	.04
F2 OTHER	1	2	0.02%	0.04%	210.0	112.5	.44	.05
F3 EXT	12	9	0.25%	0.19%	77.8	75.9	.20	.14
F3 SEX	2	2	0.04%	0.04%	79.1	129.5	.03	.05
F3 DRUG	39	50	0.82%	1.04%	23.3	23.1	.19	.24
F3 OTHER	22	21	0.46%	0.44%	39.1	64.8	.18	.28
F4 EXT	10	16	0.21%	0.33%	41.1	31.8	.09	.11
F4 SEX	3	5	0.06%	0.10%	65.7	32.0	.04	.03
F4 DRUG	45	96	0.91%	2.00%	19.9	22.0	.19	.44
F4 OTHER	63	87	1.32%	1.81%	26.0	29.1	.34	.53
F5 EXT	22	20	0.46%	0.42%	28.3	20.0	.13	.08
F5 SEX	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.0	0.0	0	.00
F5 DRUG	3	34	0.06%	0.71%	15.8	12.0	.01	.08
F5 OTHER	66	79	1.38%	1.65%	18.8	16.6	.26	.27
F6 EXT	7	2	0.15%	0.04%	12.0	10.0	.02	.00
F6 DRUG	14	3	0.29%	0.06%	10.9	7.0	.03	.00
F6 OTHER	110	21	2.30%	0.44%	21.2	10.0	.19	.04
HAB-LITTLE	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.0	0.0	0	.00
HAB-BIG	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.0	0.0	0	.00
WOMEN TOT	430	458	8.96%	9.54%	NA	NA	NA	NA

* Average length of stay effect is the amount of time each commitment group contributes to the overall average length of stay of 39.58 months.

** Note that crime code data provided by DOC for the 1997 projections changed to become more precise, for example, identifying the crime family of attempted offenses. This allowed us to more clearly categorize data. For that reason, average length of stay and the number of offenders in similar categories may not be comparable.

*** The offense categories are broken down according to statute enacted in July 1993, which created a category of mostly violent offenses as "extraordinary risk of harm offenses." In this table "EXT" refers to offenses included in that category. Also, convicted sexual offenders typically serve more time, and drug offenders, some of whom are considered "extraordinary risk" crimes, serve less time than other offenders in this category -- they are identified by the projection model as their own offense group.

Table 17. 1998 PROJECTION MODEL / Men: Parole Violators with New Crime
 Projected Average Length of Stay Comparison: Fall 1997 DCJ Projections vs. Fall 1998 DCJ Projections
 OVERALL PROJECTED AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY: 39.58 MONTHS

OFFENSE CATEGORY	NUMBER OF MALE PAROLEES COMMITTED TO PRISON FOR A NEW CRIME		% OF ALL COMMITMENTS TO PRISON: MALE PAROLEES WITH NEW CRIME		AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY (MONTHS)		AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY EFFECT (MONTHS)*	
	Fall 1997** (7/1/96-6/30/97)	Fall 1998 (7/1/97-6/30/98)	Fall 1997	Fall 1998	Fall 1997**	Fall 1998	Fall 1997	Fall 1998
F1	1	1	0.02%	0.02%	480.0	480.0	0.10	0.10
F2 EXT***	1	1	0.02%	0.02%	214.0	482.0	0.04	0.10
F2 SEX	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.00
F2 DRUG	1	0	0.02%	0.00%	110.0	0.0	0.02	0.00
F2 OTHER	1	0	0.02%	0.00%	112.0	0.0	0.02	0.00
F3 EXT	11	16	0.23%	0.33%	177.2	68.1	0.41	0.23
F3 SEX	4	5	0.08%	0.10%	144.5	221.4	0.12	0.23
F3 DRUG	11	14	0.23%	0.29%	47.8	34.6	0.11	0.10
F3 OTHER	16	16	0.34%	0.33%	61.0	77.1	0.20	0.26
F4 EXT	10	18	0.21%	0.38%	64.0	63.8	0.13	0.24
F4 SEX	2	1	0.04%	0.02%	54.6	78.0	0.02	0.02
F4 DRUG	28	35	0.59%	0.73%	37.4	40.8	0.22	0.30
F4 OTHER	30	70	0.63%	1.46%	39.4	49.1	0.25	0.72
F5 EXT	36	45	0.75%	0.94%	19.7	26.6	0.15	0.25
F5 SEX	2	1	0.04%	0.02%	55.5	33.0	0.02	0.01
F5 DRUG	2	28	0.04%	0.58%	14.7	30.7	0.01	0.18
F5 OTHER	34	52	0.71%	1.08%	24.5	37.3	0.17	0.40
F6 EXT	8	3	0.17%	0.06%	26.7	18.7	0.04	0.01
F6 DRUG	8	4	0.17%	0.08%	21.0	12.8	0.04	0.01
F6 OTHER	151	67	3.16%	1.40%	10.1	20.9	0.31	0.29
HAB-LITTLE	4	0	0.08%	0.00%	156.2	0.0	0.13	0.00
HAB-BIG	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.00
PV MEN TOTAL	361	377	7.56	7.85	NA	NA	NA	NA

* Average length of stay effect is the amount of time each commitment group contributes to the overall average length of stay of 39.58 months.

** Note that crime code data provided by DOC for the 1997 projections changed to become more precise, for example, identifying the crime family of attempted offenses. This allowed us to more clearly categorize data. For that reason, average length of stay and the number of offenders in similar categories may not be comparable.

*** The offense categories are broken down according to statute enacted in July 1993, which created a category of mostly violent offenses as "extraordinary risk of harm offenses." In this table "EXT" refers to offenses included in that category. Also, convicted sexual offenders typically serve more time, and drug offenders, some of whom are considered extraordinary risk crimes, serve less time than other offenders in this category -- they are identified by the projection model as their own offense group.

Table 18. 1998 PROJECTION MODEL / Women: Parole Violators with New Crime
 Projected Average Length of Stay Comparison: Fall 1997 DCJ Projections vs. Fall 1998 DCJ Projections
 OVERALL PROJECTED AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY: 39.58 MONTHS

OFFENSE CATEGORY	NUMBER OF FEMALE PAROLEES COMMITTED TO PRISON FOR A NEW CRIME		% OF ALL COMMITMENTS TO PRISON: FEMALE PAROLEES WITH NEW CRIME		AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY (MONTHS)		AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY EFFECT (MONTHS)*	
	Fall 1997** (7/1/96-6/30/95)	Fall 1998 (7/1/97-6/30/98)	Fall 1997	Fall 1998	Fall 1997**	Fall 1998	Fall 1997	Fall 1998
F1	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.0	0.0	0	0
F2 EXT***	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.0	0.0	0	0
F2 SEX	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.0	0.0	0	0
F2 DRUG	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.0	0.0	0	0
F2 OTHER	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.0	0.0	0	0
F3 EXT	1	0	0.02%	0.00%	71.5	0.0	.015	0
F3 SEX	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.0	0.0	0	0
F3 DRUG	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.0	0.0	0	0
F3 OTHER	0	1	0.00%	0.02%	0.0	33.0	0	0.01
F4 EXT	3	0	0.06%	0.00%	14.0	0.0	.009	0.0
F4 SEX	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.0	0.0	0	0.0
F4 DRUG	0	7	0.00%	0.15%	0.0	31.0	0	0.05
F4 OTHER	2	8	0.04%	0.17%	31.3	30.3	.013	0.05
F5 EXT	3	5	0.06%	0.10%	9.4	17.0	.006	0.02
F5 SEX	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.0	0.0	0	0.0
F5 DRUG	0	2	0.00%	0.04%	0.0	20.5	0	0.01
F5 OTHER	3	3	0.06%	0.06%	19.3	32.0	.012	0.02
F6 EXT	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.0	0.0	0	0.0
F6 DRUG	1	1	0.02%	0.02%	21.0	3.0	.004	0.0
F6 OTHER	9	1	0.19%	0.02%	26.9	5.0	.051	0.0
HAB-LITTLE	1	0	0.02%	0.00%	42.0	0.0	.009	0.0
HAB-BIG	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.0	0.0	0	0.0
PV WOMEN TOTAL	23	28	0.48%	0.58%	NA	NA	NA	NA
4-TABLE TOTAL	4775	4800	100%	100%	NA	NA	39.61	39.58

* Average length of stay effect is the amount of time each commitment group contributes to the overall average length of stay of 39.58 months.

** Note that crime code data provided by DOC for the 1997 projections changed to become more precise, for example, identifying the crime family of attempted offenses. This allowed us to more clearly categorize data. For that reason, average length of stay and the number of offenders in similar categories may not be comparable.

*** The offense categories are broken down according to statute enacted in July 1993, which created a category of mostly violent offenses as "extraordinary risk of harm offenses." In this table "EXT" refers to offenses included in that category. Also, convicted sexual offenders typically serve more time, and drug offenders, some of whom are considered extraordinary risk crimes, serve less time than other offenders in this category -- they are identified by the projection model as their own offense group.

HISTORICAL ACCURACY


The Division of Criminal Justice submits these projections with a high degree of confidence. Numerous advances have been made to the model since its origin in 1981. In this time period, DCJ has consistently been within a five-percent range in error (see Table 19 and Figure 9 below).

Table 19. Colorado Adult Prison Populations Projected by the Division of Criminal Justice and Actual Populations, 1981-1998

DATE	POPULATION PROJECTIONS	ACTUAL POPULATION	*DIFFERENCE
6/30/81	3,080	2,911	+ 5.8%
6/30/82	3,259	3,343	- 2.5%
6/30/83	3,397	3,570	- 4.8%
6/30/84	3,445	3,587	- 4.0%
6/30/85	3,488	3,410	+ 2.3%
6/30/86	3,446	3,517	- 2.1%
6/30/87	4,603	4,702	- 2.0%
6/30/88	5,830	5,766	+ 1.1%
6/30/89	6,471	6,763	- 4.3%
6/30/90	7,789	7,663	+ 1.6%
6/30/91	8,572	8,043	+ 6.6%
6/30/92	8,745	8,774	- 0.3%
6/30/93	9,382	9,242	+ 1.5%
6/30/94	9,930	10,005	- 0.7%
6/30/95	11,003	10,669	+ 3.1%
6/30/96	11,171	11,577	- 3.5%
6/30/97	12,610	12,590	+ 0.2%
6/30/98	13,803	13,663	+ 1.0%

* Difference reflects projections published eight months prior to date of comparison.

Figure 9. DCJ Adult Prison Population Projection Model Accuracy Rate, 1981-1998 (% error rate)



JUVENILE PROJECTION MODEL

The method used to project youth populations is similar to that used in the adult prison population projections discussed earlier. In short, state population and incarceration rates for Colorado youth are the primary determinants of new commitments. Further, new commitments can be combined with length of stay ratios to produce reliable estimates of the stock population.

Youth models are developed for each of five Division of Youth Corrections (DYC) management regions: Denver, Central, Southern, Northeast and Western. A total of 10 separate detention and commitment projections are developed. Projections are then adjusted to include or exclude backlog. Regional projections are summed for statewide totals.

DYC uses Average Daily Population (ADP)²⁷ to measure and describe their populations. Viewing these populations in other ways, such as counting the number of detention admissions during a particular year, may be misleading. Confusion occurs because clients, particularly those in detention, may be held in a facility for a short period of time—a few hours or even minutes. DYC thus prefers to manage and plan facilities based on current and projected ADP.

Current population projections include the most current demographic forecasts available from the Colorado Department of Local Affairs. Forecasted populations are obtained for individuals aged 10 to 20. This information, along with length of stay in the facility, is a key component in projecting the size of future DYC populations.

Detention and commitment data sets are obtained from the DYC Research and Evaluation Unit. The detention data set contains a number of variables including age, gender,²⁸ length of stay, and detention group. Detention group refers to the youth's legal status (pre-adjudicated, sentenced, return commitment, new commitment or backlog). The DYC detention data set is used to calculate detention admissions by age as well as length of stay by legal status for each DYC region.

The DYC commitment data is used to calculate residential commitments by age as well as residential length of stay by region and targeted placement level. Targeted placement level (intensive, medium or community) is a measure of each youth's risk level. DYC and DCJ researchers have evaluated a number of variables and found targeted placement is the most predictive determinant of length of stay. Targeted placement has recently been added as a component of the youth projection model for commitment²⁹ to better project variation in average length of stay of committed youth.

Two types of predictions are provided—with backlog and without backlog. Backlog refers to the number of sentenced youth in detention facilities who are awaiting placement in commitment facilities. Detention projections with backlog include clients with an indicated backlog status. Detention projections without backlog remove those clients with a backlog status from the projections. For commitments, projections without backlog exclude those in detention with backlog status. Commitment projections with backlog add those in detention with backlog status into the commitment model.

27 ADP is computed as follows: $ADP = (\text{Average Length of Stay} \times \text{Admissions}) / 365$.

28 Although both DYC and demographic data are available by gender, males and females are combined when input into the model. Small sample sizes for females in both commitment and detention prohibit model development by gender. Sample sizes are further reduced as models are developed by DYC region.

29 Targeted placement was first included in DCJ projections developed in 1996.

ASSUMPTIONS

The Division of Criminal Justice used the following assumptions to guide the development of Division of Youth Corrections detention and commitment population projections.

- The data provided by the Division of Youth Corrections (DYC) accurately describe the number, characteristics, and trends of youth admitted or committed to DYC facilities FY97-98.
- The data provided by the Colorado Department of Local Affairs Demographic Section accurately describe current and projected trends of Colorado's citizens between the years 1998 and 2004.
- Decision-makers at crucial points in the juvenile justice and criminal justice systems will not change their use of discretion, except in explicitly stated ways.
- The Colorado General Assembly will not pass any new legislation during the projection period that impacts the way juveniles are processed or defined for detention, admission or commitment to DYC facilities.
- Average length of stay for youth in DYC detention and commitment facilities will remain relatively stable throughout the projection period.
- The mandatory parole provisions, effective for youth whose crimes were committed on or after January 1997, will impact commitment populations by increasing the pool of parole violators.
- The proportion of youth with parole revocations will remain at 23%. Youth with parole revocations will experience an additional 2.1 months of residential confinement in a commitment facility.³⁰
- No catastrophic event such as war or disease will occur during the projection period.

³⁰ Information on parole revocations and additional months of confinement was provided by DYC communication.

FACTORS INFLUENCING PROJECTIONS

A number of developments have occurred in the last several years that impact juvenile detention and commitment populations. While these forces have implications for both commitment and detention populations, their exact impact is not known.

- A. *Capping the Gilliam Population* – As a result of a American Civil Liberties Union and San Francisco Youth Law Center lawsuit filed against the Gilliam Youth Services Center, the population of the Gilliam Youth Services Center was capped at 78 beds. The lawsuit was settled in October 1995, and efforts to stabilize the population at 78 were put into place. These projections assume that the juvenile justice system has adjusted to this change, and that the impact of this cap is included in the current DYC FY97-98 data sets.
- B. *SB94* – The SB94 initiative was funded to reduce average daily population (ADP) in DYC facilities. The evaluation method for determining the success of this initiative has undergone recent and extensive changes as previous impacts of this initiative upon detention and commitment populations were found to be unclear.³¹ These projections assume that recent FY97-98 DYC data sets include the current impacts of this program.
- C. *Recodification of the Children's Code* – After a two-year study of the juvenile justice system, the Legislature undertook a comprehensive revision of the Children's Code. House Bill 96-1005 was signed by the Governor on June 3, 1996, and outlined numerous and notable changes to delinquency laws. The following is a summary³² of some of the changes that apply to crimes committed after January 1, 1997:
 - The right to a jury trial will be limited to certain offenses (aggravated juvenile offenders or juveniles charged with crimes of violence per C.R.S.16-11-309).
 - All juveniles (except those requesting jury trial) are required to have an adjudicatory hearing within 60 days of entry of pleas. If adjudicated, the court must sentence within 45 days of completion of the adjudicatory trial.
 - Parental accountability is expanded in the bill.
 - Allows juveniles ages 12 and 13 charged with crimes of violence to be transferred to district court and tried as adults.
 - Directs the Department of Corrections to place children sentenced as adults in the Department of Human Services (DHS) until they reach age 14.
 - Lowers the age of commitment at Lookout Mountain and Mount View to 10.

³¹ The SB94 FY87-98 Evaluation Report, ONMI Institute, October 28, 1998.

³² Summarized from *The Forum*, Third and Fourth Quarter Edition, FY96, Colorado Judicial Branch, State Court Administrator's Office, Office of Probation Services.

- Directs the court to commit juveniles adjudicated for class 1 felonies to a seven-year determinate commitment.
- Allows the court to commit class 3,4,5 and 6 felonies to a determinate sentence of two years with one-year mandatory parole.
- Does not allow DHS to transfer legal or physical custody of a youth committed on a determinate sentence.
- Allows DHS to petition the court for an additional two-year commitment.
- Allows DYC to control overcrowding through detention releases only.
- Requires a bootcamp sentence to be a sentence to probation.
- Allows children as young as 10 years old to be sentenced to probation.

FINDINGS: FALL 1998 JUVENILE DETENTION AND COMMITMENT POPULATION PROJECTIONS

Summary

Detention and commitment populations are expected to increase at rates of 26% over the six-year projection period. When the backlog³³ numbers are removed from detention populations, the most current estimates of detention capacity meet projected detention Average Daily Population (ADP). When backlog is placed in commitment projections, shortfalls of commitment beds occur in four of the six projections years. Shortfalls range from 9.53 to 56.68 ADP beds. Capacity comparisons are based on figures from the Division of Youth Corrections Long Range Bed Plan that include *both authorized and proposed projects*.

DCJ projects an increase of 26% in the Division of Youth Correction overall³⁴ average daily population over the six-year projection period. ADP will increase from 1732.36 in FY98-99 to 2,182.83 in FY03-04. The most current estimates of overall total capacity meet projected overall ADP.

Background

The Colorado Division of Criminal Justice is mandated, pursuant to 24-33.5-503 C.R.S., to prepare Division of Youth Corrections population projections for the General Assembly. The report presents average daily population (ADP) projections for two DYC population groups—detention and commitment—as well as an overall projection that combines both population groups for the six-year period between FY98-99 and FY03-04.

General Comments Regarding the Fall 1998 Juvenile Projections

This year's projections have some similarities to those submitted to the General Assembly last year. Year-to-year detention ADP growth rates over the six-year projection period are comparable and range from 3.9% to 5.1% this year compared to a range of 3.8% to 4.6% in last year's projections. Last year's detention projections reflect a statewide growth in detention ADP of 22.5% over the projection period, compared to 26% for this year's models with and without backlog

Year-to-year growth rates in commitment ADP are somewhat lower in the projections submitted this year. Year-to-year commitment ADP growth rates range between 4.4% and 5.1% this year compared

³³ Backlog describes youth in detention who are sentenced and awaiting commitment.

³⁴ Overall combines commitment and detention figures and includes backlog.

to a range of 6.2% and 6.9% in last year's projections. Last year's commitment projections reflect statewide growth in commitment ADP of 37.4% over the projection period, compared to 26% in this year's model.

The most recent DYC data available that may reflect possible trends resulting from legislative and other policy changes are included in the projections presented here. The model also includes up-to-date forecasts of Colorado's population trends, as noted in the methodology sections of this report. The most recent demographic data for the state indicate a modest average year-to-year growth rate of 1.65% over the projection period (1999 to 2004). This growth rate declines from 2.16% between 1999 and 2000 to a mere 1.07% between 2003 and 2004. Population growth rates do not vary widely among the five DYC management regions.

Table 20. Colorado Population Projections Males and Females Age 10-20, 1999-2004 (in hundreds)

REGION	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Central	1876	1913	1950	1984	2016	2032
Denver	760	779	796	808	817	825
Northeast	1927	1970	2005	2039	2070	2096
Southern	1504	1537	1567	1593	1614	1632
Western	619	630	640	652	662	671
TOTAL	6684	6829	6958	7076	7179	7256
		1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004
YEAR-TO-YEAR GROWTH		2.17%	1.89%	1.70%	1.46%	1.07%

Source: State of Colorado, Department of Local Affairs.

Models in this report have been updated to reflect the most recent capacity projections for detention and commitments provided by DYC.³⁵ This year's projections are presented by region. Regional projections have been summed to provided statewide totals. Separate projections to include and exclude backlog are also provided.

Detention Projections

- Statewide detention average daily population (ADP) increases approximately 26% over the six-year projection period (between FY98-99 and FY03-04). This percentage increase is the same for detention projections with and without backlog.
- FY97-98 statewide detention ADP is 13.2% greater than the previous year. This is the first increase in detention ADP in the last three years.
- Actual statewide detention ADP is greater than DCJ projected last year. The actual ADP for FY97-98 is 591.5 compared to DCJ's projected ADP of 578.2 (w/o cap) and 566.1 (w/cap).³⁶

³⁵ Division of Youth Corrections Long Range Bed Plan, Revised November 20, 1998, including authorized and proposed projects.

³⁶ 1998 Division of Youth Correction Detention and Commitment Projections for the Period FY 1997-98 through FY 2002-03, Colorado Department of Public Safety, Division of Criminal Justice. Cap refers to cap imposed on Gilliam Youth Services Center.

- The largest increases in detention ADP occur in the Western, Central and Northeast regions. Western region detention ADP increases 38.5% in the projected time frame. For the Central region there is a similar increase of 38.4%. The increase for the Northeast region is 32.1%.
- The most current estimates of detention capacity generally meet projected detention ADP. This is true regardless of whether models include or exclude backlog, with the exception of a bed shortfall of 3.41 occurring in FY03-04 for projected ADP with backlog.³⁷

Commitment Projections

- Statewide commitment ADP increases approximately 26% over the six-year projection period (between FY98-99 and FY03-04). This increase is the same for commitment projections with and without backlog.
- FY97-98 statewide commitment ADP is 4.8% greater than the previous year.
- Actual statewide commitment ADP is less than DCJ projected last year. The actual ADP for FY97-98 is 973.05 compared to the projected ADP of 1060.5.³⁸
- Growth in commitment ADP is expected to occur evenly across regions.
- Current estimates of commitment capacity do not meet commitment projections when detention backlog is included in the commitment projection. Projected capacity bed shortfalls range from 9.53 in FY01-02 to 56.68 in FY03-04.

Overall Projections

- Overall ADP increases 26% over the six-year projection period—from 1732.36 in FY98-99 to 2,182.83 in FY03-04.
- Overall ADP increases 7.85% between FY97-98 and FY96-97.
- The most current estimates of overall total capacity meet projected overall ADP.

³⁷ Projections with backlog include individuals in detention facilities awaiting placement in a DYC commitment facility. Projections without backlog remove the number of youth, by region, in detention facilities awaiting placement in a DYC commitment facility.

³⁸ 1998 Division of Youth Correction Detention and Commitment Projections for the Period FY 1997-98 through FY 2002-03, Colorado Department of Public Safety, Division of Criminal Justice.

THE NUMBERS: FALL 1998 JUVENILE DETENTION PROJECTIONS

Table 21. Actual and Projected Statewide Detention ADP, FY1992-93 to FY2003-04

ACTUAL*	ADP (includes backlog)	% CHANGE	
FY92-93	403.2		
FY93-94	467.8	16.0%	
FY94-95	589.0	25.9%	
FY95-96	541.5	- 8.8%	
FY96-97	522.5	- 3.6%	
FY97-98	591.5	13.2%	

PROJECTED	ADP With Backlog	% CHANGE **With Backlog	ADP Without Backlog
FY98-99	620.99	5.0%	568.86
FY99-00	644.97	3.9%	591.06
FY00-01	678.18	5.1%	621.59
FY01-02	711.06	4.8%	651.74
FY02-03	745.06	4.8%	683.69
FY03-04	780.59	4.8%	715.75

* Actual figures are from DYC Management Reference Manuals FY92-93 to FY96-97.

FY97-98 figures are from data supplied by DYC Office of Research and Evaluation.

** % Change with Backlog is provided for comparisons with actual figures that include backlog.

**Table 22. The Division of Criminal Justice 1998 Juvenile Detention Projections
Average Daily Population (WITH backlog)**

REGIONS	FY98-99	FY99-00	FY00-01	FY01-02	FY02-03	FY03-04
Southern	151.94	155.13	159.99	163.82	167.94	172.21
Western	54.68	58.79	62.85	66.84	71.01	75.72
Denver	137.40	140.14	143.96	148.40	152.77	156.70
Central	159.48	170.99	183.08	195.18	208.07	220.74
Northeast	117.48	119.93	128.31	136.82	145.97	155.22
TOTAL	620.99	644.97	678.18	711.06	745.76	780.59
DYC Revised Statewide Capacity*	683.80	687.90	694.80	735.30	758.80	784.00
Estimated Bed Surplus (Shortfall)	62.81	42.93	16.62	24.24	13.04	(3.41)

* Capacity figures are from the Division of Youth Corrections, Long Range Bed Plan, total Revised Capacity, November 20, 1998, including authorized and proposed projects.

**Table 23. The Division of Criminal Justice 1998 Juvenile Detention Projections
Average Daily Population (WITHOUT backlog)**

REGIONS	FY98-99	FY99-00	FY00-01	FY01-02	FY02-03	FY03-04
Southern	137.58	140.46	144.86	148.31	152.05	155.93
Western	54.28	58.35	62.38	66.35	70.48	75.16
Denver	124.93	127.39	130.87	134.90	138.93	142.49
Central	146.45	157.05	168.13	179.21	191.04	202.66
Northeast	105.62	107.82	115.35	122.97	131.19	139.52
TOTAL	568.86	591.06	621.59	651.74	683.69	715.75
DYC Revised Statewide Capacity*	683.80	687.90	694.80	735.30	758.80	784.00
Estimated Bed Surplus (Shortfall)	114.94	96.84	73.21	83.56	75.11	68.25

* Capacity figures are from the Division of Youth Corrections, Long Range Bed Plan, total Revised Capacity, November 20, 1998, including authorized and proposed projects.

THE NUMBERS: FALL 1998 JUVENILE COMMITMENT PROJECTIONS

Table 24. Actual and Projected Statewide Commitment ADP, FY1992-93 to FY2003-04

ACTUAL*	ADP (without backlog)	% CHANGE	
FY92-93	609.3		
FY93-34	613.7	0.7%	
FY94-95	633.0	3.1%	
FY95-96	763.1	20.6%	
FY96-97	928.5	21.6%	
FY97-98	973.05	4.8%	
PROJECTED	ADP Without Backlog	% CHANGE **Without Backlog	ADP With Backlog
FY98-99	1,111.37	14.2%	1,163.50
FY99-00	1,168.52	5.1%	1,222.43
FY00-01	1,226.60	5.0%	1,283.20
FY01-02	1,284.22	4.7%	1,343.53
FY02-03	1,343.69	4.6%	1,405.76
FY03-04	1,402.24	4.4%	1,467.08

* Actual figures are from DYC Management Reference Manuals FY92-93 to FY96-97.

FY97-98 figures are from data supplied by DYC Office of Research and Evaluation.

** Percent change without backlog is presented. Figures without backlog are comparable to the actual DYC data presented.

**Table 25. The Division of Criminal Justice 1998 Juvenile Commitment Projections
Average Daily Population (WITH backlog)**

REGIONS	FY98-99	FY99-00	FY00-01	FY01-02	FY02-03	FY03-04
Southern	255.04	267.79	281.27	293.65	306.43	319.99
Western	142.75	150.27	157.61	164.62	171.88	179.87
Denver	240.58	252.31	263.91	277.35	291.15	303.92
Central	256.02	269.51	283.46	296.87	310.70	325.50
Northeast	269.10	282.55	296.94	311.04	325.59	339.80
TOTAL	1,163.50	1,222.43	1,283.20	1,343.53	1,405.76	1,467.08
DYC Revised Statewide Capacity*	1,143.50	1,235.20	1,291.40	1,334.00	1,377.00	1,410.40
Estimated Bed Surplus (Shortfall)	(20)	12.77	8.20	(9.53)	(28.76)	(56.68)

* Capacity figures are from the Division of Youth Corrections, Long Range Bed Plan, total Revised Capacity, November 20, 1998, including authorized and proposed projects.

**Table 26. The Division of Criminal Justice 1998 Juvenile Commitment Projections
Average Daily Population (WITHOUT backlog)**

REGIONS	FY98-99	FY99-00	FY00-01	FY01-02	FY02-03	FY03-04
Southern	240.68	253.12	266.15	278.14	290.54	303.70
Western	142.34	149.84	157.14	164.12	171.36	179.30
Denver	228.11	239.56	250.82	263.86	277.31	289.71
Central	242.99	255.57	268.51	280.90	293.67	305.42
Northeast	257.24	270.44	283.98	297.19	310.82	324.10
TOTAL	1,111.37	1,168.52	1,226.60	1,284.22	1,343.69	1,402.24
DYC Revised Statewide Capacity(*)	1,143.50	1,235.20	1,291.40	1,334.00	1,377.00	1,410.40
Estimated Bed Surplus (Shortfall)	32.13	66.68	64.80	49.78	33.31	8.16

* Capacity figures are from the Division of Youth Corrections, Long Range Bed Plan, total Revised Capacity, November 20, 1998, including authorized and proposed projects.

THE NUMBERS: FALL 1998 JUVENILE OVERALL PROJECTIONS

Table 27. Actual and Projected Overall Statewide ADP (includes detention backlog), FY1992-93 to FY2003-04

ACTUAL*	ADP	% INCREASE
FY92-93	1,012.5	
FY93-34	1,081.5	6.8%
FY94-95	1,222.0	13.0%
FY95-96	1,304.6	6.8%
FY96-97	1,451.0	11.2%
FY97-98	1,564.6	7.8%
PROJECTED		
FY98-99	1,732.36	10.7%
FY99-00	1,813.49	4.7%
FY00-01	1,904.78	5.0%
FY01-02	1,995.28	4.8%
FY02-03	2,089.45	4.7%
FY03-04	2,182.83	4.5%

* Actual figures are from DYC Management Reference Manuals FY92-93 to FY96-97. FY97-98 figures are from data supplied by DYC Office of Research and Evaluation.

Table 28. The Division of Criminal Justice 1998 Juvenile Overall Projections Average Daily Population (WITH detention backlog included)

REGIONS	FY98-99	FY99-00	FY00-01	FY01-02	FY02-03	FY-03-04
Southern	392.62	408.25	426.14	441.96	458.96	475.91
Western	197.02	208.63	219.99	230.96	242.37	255.02
Denver	365.51	379.70	394.78	412.26	430.08	446.41
Central	402.47	426.56	451.59	476.08	501.74	526.16
Northeast	374.72	390.37	412.29	434.01	456.79	479.32
TOTAL	1,732.34	1,813.51	1,904.79	1,995.27	2,089.46	2,182.82
DYC Revised Statewide Capacity*	1,827.30	1,923.10	1,986.30	2,069.30	2,135.80	2,194.40
Estimated Bed Surplus (Shortfall)	94.96	109.59	81.51	74.03	46.34	11.58

* Capacity figures are from the Division of Youth Corrections Long Range Bed Plan, total Revised Capacity, November 20, 1998.

HISTORICAL ACCURACY


The following table indicates that the largest disparities between actual and predicted numbers occur for individual projections of detention ADP and commitment ADP. Overall projections combining detention and commitment ADP have been accurate within five percent (5%) of actual ADP for each of the last five fiscal years.

Table 29. Five-Year Comparison of Predicted and Actual ADP*

FISCAL YEAR	DETENTION ADP			COMMITMENT ADP			OVERALL ADP		
	Predicted	Actual	% Diff.	Predicted	Actual	% Diff.	Predicted	Actual	% Diff.
93-94	429.0	467.8	- 9.0%	632.0	613.7	3.0%	1061.0	1081.5	- 1.9%
94-95	564.0	589.0	- 4.4%	632.0	633.9	- 0.2%	1196.0	1222.9	- 2.2%
95-96	617.0	541.5	13.9%	658.0	763.1	- 15.9%	1275.0	1304.6	- 2.3%
96-97	571.0	522.5	9.2%	836.0	928.4	- 9.9%	1407.0	1450.9	- 3.0%
97-98	578.2	591.5	- 2.3%	1060.5	973.05	8.9%	1638.7	1564.6	4.7%

* Actual ADP is from DYC Reference Manuals for FY93-94, FY94-945, FY95-96 and FY96-97. FY97-98 actual ADP is from data sets supplied by DYC Office of Research and Evaluation. Predicted numbers for these years are from Colorado Department of Public Safety, Division of Criminal Justice Projections. Actual Projections and actual numbers include backlog in detention figures. FY-97-98 projection is without cap.

Figure 10. DCJ Juvenile Projection Model Overall ADP Accuracy Rate, FY1993-94 to FY1997-98 (% error rate)



APPENDIX

- 1) Colorado Total Population, 1980-1997
- 2) Colorado Adult Population, 1980-1997
- 3) Colorado Juvenile Population, 1980-1997
- 4) Colorado Adult Arrest Rate, Violent and Non-Violent Index Crimes, 1980-1997
- 5) Colorado Juvenile Arrest Rate, Violent and Non-Violent Index Crimes, 1980-1997

