ICE Detention Trends: Technical Appendix

Vera INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE

Noelle Smart

Updated July 2025

Vera's ICE Detention Trends dashboard reveals an unprecedented level of detail about U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) detention populations—nationally and across the 1,397 facilities in which ICE detained people—on each day of the 16-year period from fiscal year 2009 through mid-fiscal year 2025 (October 1, 2008, through June 10, 2025). Through interactive maps and graphs, this tool's features allow users to see changes in national and facility-level statistics, geographically and over time.

Vera chose to present the ICE detention data "as is" to the greatest extent possible, including any inconsistencies or errors that may be present in the data compiled and shared by ICE. For example, Vera retained data entries that indicated lengths of stay lasting zero minutes and those that showed people as being detained in two places at once during a transfer. Notably, some detention facilities in the older dataset were missing from the newer data in the period in which the two datasets overlap (see technical appendix). Other researchers have noted similar gaps, inconsistencies, and errors in ICE detention records.[1]

This appendix details Vera's methodology for processing and combining the ICE detention datasets, drawing on other data sources to geocode facilities and assign facility types, and calculating population statistics shared in the dashboard. The aggregated data displayed in the dashboard is available for download through Vera's GitHub repository.

About the data

This dashboard primarily draws from ICE detention datasets obtained through Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests, shared with Vera by David Hausman, assistant professor of law, University of California, Berkeley, and the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU). Each row in these datasets reflects a person's *detention stint*, associated with a single detention facility and marked by a detention stint book-in date and time, book-out date and time, and release reason. A person's *detention stay* history is comprised of one or more rows of detention stints. For example, if ICE transferred a person from one facility to another, their detention history will be constituted of two or more rows of detention stints.

The initial version of this dashboard, launched in August 2023, used data from October 1, 2008, through March 30, 2020 ("Dataset I"). Vera updated this tool in July 2025 to add more recent data from two additional datasets ("Dataset II" and "Dataset III"). The current iteration of the tool includes data from October 1, 2008, through June 10, 2025 (fiscal year 2009 through mid-fiscal year 2025). Dataset II and Dataset III, are publicly available online through the Deportation Data Project. These datasets are nearly identical in form to Dataset I, with a few notable differences which affect the calculation of detention population statistics:

Unique identifiers: Datasets II and III include anonymized unique identifiers that link together records for each person in the data. Dataset I redacted, rather than anonymized, unique identifiers for each person in the data, meaning that it does not link together separate detention stints for people whom ICE transferred to one or more facilities after their initial book-in. To overcome this limitation, Vera developed a novel algorithm to construct detention histories from a person's initial book-in to their final book-out, inclusive of any transfers. Doing so allowed Vera to combine records across spreadsheets, account for duplicated data, and compute detention populations.

Left-censoring in Dataset II: Datasets I and III include *all* detention stints of people detained during the period covered by the data. Dataset II includes *only stints with a stint book-in* occurring during the period covered by the data, which excludes stints occurring during that period with a stint book-in prior to its start date of January 1, 2012. See below for more detail on how Vera addressed this issue for calculating population statistics.

Vera used each dataset to calculate statistics for different time periods, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Primary datasets used for Vera's ICE Detention Trends dashboard

Dataset	Records included in raw data	Data range for which Vera used dataset to calculate daily statistics*	Unique identifiers
Dataset I	All detention stints between October 1, 2008 and March 30, 2020	October 1, 2008 to September 30, 2013**	Not provided by ICE; assigned by Vera's algorithm
Dataset II	Detention stints with stint book-in between January 1, 2012 and November 14, 2023	October 1, 2013 to September 30, 2023	Provided by ICE
Dataset III	All detention stints between September 1, 2023 and June 10, 2025	October 1, 2023 to June 10, 2025	Provided by ICE

*Differences in facility populations before and after the respective date boundaries (i.e., from September 30 to October 1, 2013 and from November 14 to 15, 2023) may at least partially reflect differences in how ICE compiled the different datasets, rather than a population change alone.

**As explained below, Vera appended 190 records from Dataset I into Dataset II during analysis for the period October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2023.

Developing an algorithm to assign unique identifiers for Dataset I

The original dashboard, launched in August 2023, drew only from Dataset I, which includes all detention stints between October 1, 2008, and March 30, 2020. A notable limitation of this dataset is that ICE redacted, rather than anonymized, all unique identifiers prior to releasing the data through FOIA, which are necessary to group rows of detention stints into detention stays. Vera addressed this shortcoming by developing a novel "Detention Stay ID" algorithm using machine learning to assign unique identifiers, making it possible to form continuous detention stay histories from a person's initial book-in to final book-out of ICE custody, inclusive of any transfers. Doing so allowed Vera to account for duplicated data and compute accurate detention populations.

The data for Dataset I was split into separate files for each fiscal year (FY2009 through FY2020). The hypothesis underlying the algorithm is that ICE sorted the original data *within each spreadsheet* by a person-level identifier and detention stint book-in date prior to redacting unique identifiers, allowing Vera to compare values between adjacent rows to predict whether those rows belong to the same person's detention stay. For each spreadsheet, the algorithm works in a sequential manner by proceeding down the rows in their original order, comparing values within each adjacent row pair. Vera approximated a supervised learning problem by matching the detention stay histories implied by the predicted identifiers to detention histories in supplemental ICE detention datasets that do have anonymized unique identifiers provided by ICE. (These supplemental detention datasets cover at most one fiscal year, overlapping with Dataset I for FY2014 and part of FY2015.) Vera used the resulting match rates as the measure of accuracy for the Detention Stay ID algorithm, with the final algorithm demonstrating an out-of-sample accuracy of 99.7 percent.

Each original fiscal year spreadsheet comprising Dataset I contains all detention stints that overlap with any part of the fiscal year, including stints that began prior to its start (October 1 of the previous calendar year) or endured past its end (September 30 of the respective calendar year). As such, rows of detention stints were duplicated in multiple fiscal year spreadsheets if they spanned across the fiscal year boundary (i.e., September 30 to October 1). For example, if a person's detention stint occurred between August 1, 2013 and November 1, 2013, the row for this stint would appear twice:

once in the spreadsheet for FY2013 and again in the spreadsheet for FY2014. Vera matched stints across these fiscal year spreadsheets to link unique identifiers assigned by the algorithm separately for each spreadsheet.

Working with unique identifiers in Datasets II and III

For Datasets II and III, ICE included anonymized unique identifiers associated with each person in the data. Because Vera's algorithm produces a detention stay-level identifier, not a person-level unique identifier, Vera used these person-level anonymized identifiers to create a detention stay ID, using unique combinations of anonymized identifier, detention stay book-in, and detention stay book-out.

There are 35,167 records in Dataset II and 1,331 records in Dataset III which had null anonymized identifiers. These rows also had a null redaction reason for the field alien_file_number, suggesting there was no A-number for that person in ICE's database. According to ICE, one scenario in which this may occur is when a person is recently booked into ICE custody and the officer is still working through necessary steps to populate that field in the database. For records in Dataset II and III with a null anonymized identifier, Vera assigned a new unique identifier for each row.

Comparison of Datasets I and II for overlapping period (January 1, 2012, through March 30, 2020)

Datasets I and II overlap for the period January 1, 2012, through March 30, 2020. However, the records contained in each dataset do not perfectly align for this period, and Dataset I contained more records than Dataset II. Vera iteratively matched detention stints across datasets to analyze differences between these datasets. Vera found that the differences between datasets were largely due to duplication of rows related to bond columns in Dataset II, detention facility codes not present in both datasets, and left-censoring of records in Dataset II.

Duplicated records in Dataset II: While Dataset I includes columns for latest_bond_posted_date, latest_bond_posted_amount, and latest_bond_initial_set_amount, Dataset II includes bond_posted_date, bond_posted_amount, and initial_bond_set_amount. It appears that ICE did not include solely the latest set of values for these variables, but all of them in Dataset II when merging the detention and bond data together. In other words, if a person had multiple values for any or all of these bond-related variables, their detention stints were included in the data multiple times for all of the different bond-variable values, which would result in an overcounting of detention stints if not accounted for and deduplicated during analysis. Therefore, to validate the data and calculate population statistics for the dashboard, Vera deduplicated stints that were otherwise duplicated due to these three bond columns.

Detention facility codes not present in both datasets for overlapping period: For the overlapping period covered by Datasets I and II, certain detention facility codes present in one dataset had zero stints in the other. See below for more detail on facilities in raw data not included in dashboard.

Addressing left censoring in Dataset II: Unlike Datasets I and III, which include *all detention stints* during the respective period covered by the data, Dataset II includes only *detention stints with a stint book-in* during the period covered by the data. Dataset II excluding the stints of people detained on January 1, 2012, who were booked into a given facility on December 31, 2011, or prior. This means that each person detained between December 31, 2011, and January 1, 2012, is missing that detention stint in Dataset II. (If these individuals had one or more subsequent detention stints within the same detention stay period, any subsequent stints with a stint book-in date on or after January 1, 2012, would be included in Dataset II.)

If Vera were to use Dataset II alone to calculate records on or after January 1, 2012, the calculated detention population statistics would be an undercount of the number of people detained for each day, due to the omission of people detained between December 31, 2011 and January 1, 2012 for each day they remained in detention. To address this left censoring issue, Vera used Dataset I to identify detention stints for people detained on January 1, 2012, with a stint book-out prior to this date. Vera identified 31,119 stints meeting these criteria and analyzed the distribution of stint book-outs to determine a cutoff date for appending daily statistics using different datasets. Vera selected October 1, 2013, as the cutoff date, because it is the first day of a fiscal year (FY2014) and at that point more than 99 percent of the 31,119 records had a stint book-out. As a result, Vera appended 190 records from Dataset I into Dataset II during analysis for the period October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2023.

Calculating population statistics

This section describes Vera's method of calculating the following metrics that appear on the dashboard, which Vera calculated for each day between October 1, 2008, and June 10, 2025:

- **Midnight population:** the daily number of people detained at midnight (nationally and by facility).
- **24-hour population:** the number of people detained for any part of a given day, including those who ICE transferred or booked out of custody before midnight (nationally and by facility). While ICE relies solely on midnight populations in its reporting, Vera includes both types of daily populations—midnight and 24-hour—as the two can differ drastically.
- **Book-ins:** the daily number of people ICE booked into custody (nationally).
- **Book-outs:** the daily number of people ICE booked out of custody (nationally).

National populations

Within a person's detention stay history, their first observed detention stint book-in should always equal their detention stay book-in (or datetime, where available), and their last observed detention stint book-out should always equal their detention stay book-out date (or datetime, where available) and release reason. However, this is not always the case, which has implications for how Vera calculated daily populations and identified book-in and book-out dates for each person's detention stay.

For example, for the entire period covered by Dataset I (October 1, 2008, through March 30, 2020), 99.8 percent of unique identifiers assigned by Vera's algorithm have a first row reflecting an initial detention stint, while 99.0 percent have a last row reflecting a final detention stint. The near-100-percent rate for book-ins suggests that the algorithm used for Dataset I is *not* incorrectly splitting records in the middle of people's detention stays. Thus, the lower rate of 99.0 percent for final book-outs implies an issue with the original ICE data (n=46,670 rows). The gap between the last observed detention stint book-out and the detention stay book-out suggests that, for 1.0 percent of Detention Stay IDs, one or more rows of stints at the end of a person's detention stay are missing from the data produced by ICE.

When calculating population statistics, this issue forced Vera to choose between relying on the *detention stay* book-in/book-out dates *or* the first/last observed *detention stint* book-in/book-out dates for each Detention Stay ID. As explained below, **Vera opted to use the *detention stay* book-in date as the detention start date for each detention stay per person, but the last observed *detention***

***stint* book-out date as their detention end date.** For the purpose of calculating book-ins, book-outs, and daily populations, Vera considered a person to be in ICE custody on each date between their detention stay book-in date through their last observed detention stint book-out date.

Detention start date for each detention stay

Although Vera observed instances where a person's detention stay book-in date did not match the first observed stint book-in date, this occurred very rarely (for 0.2 percent of unique identifiers in Dataset I assigned by Vera's algorithm). As such, Vera considered the *detention stay* book-in date as the detention start date for each detention stay per person. This is equivalent to using the first observed detention stint book-in date for the vast majority of detention stays.

Detention end date for each detention stay

Vera observed some instances in Dataset I where the last row of a person's detention stay was not their last detention stint (i.e., detention stay and stint book-out dates and release reasons did not match). Vera suspected this issue was associated with detention stays of unaccompanied children who were transferred from ICE to Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) custody. In the original data, ICE appears to have filtered out detention stints reflecting an unaccompanied child in ORR custody. Vera has observed ORR records in other ICE detention datasets (that is, stints with facility names indicating ORR shelters), suggesting they are present in the origin database from which the ICE detention data is extracted. Since these children would have stints reflecting *both* ICE and ORR custody in the origin database, but the detention dataset would include only their ICE stints, this would result in the gap Vera observed between their last observed (ICE) stint book-out and the detention stay book-out. Since Vera's objective was to accurately calculate ICE detention populations, Vera researchers opted to use the last observed *detention stint* book-out date as a person's detention end date. This assumes a person was not in *ICE* custody (though likely in custody of another agency, like ORR) during the gap period between the last observed stint book-out date and the detention stay date.

For instances where the last observed detention stint of a person's detention stay did reflect a final stint (e.g., the detention stay and stint book-out dates and release reasons matched), using the last observed detention stint book-out date as the detention stay end date is equivalent to using their detention stay book-out date. For the remaining records, using the last observed stint book-out date results in an earlier detention end datetime than would otherwise be reflected by the detention stay book-out date. For calculating daily populations, this approach avoids incorrectly counting additional "person-days" for every day between each person's last observed stint book-out date and detention stay book-out date.

Calculating book-ins and book-outs

For each date, Vera calculated the number of people booked in and out of ICE custody based on the detention start and end dates for each detention stay per person (the detention stay book-in and last observed detention stint book out, respectively).

Calculating midnight populations

Using detention stay book-in as the start date and the last observed detention stint book-out as the end date for each person, Vera calculated midnight populations by counting distinct people detained between two consecutive dates.

Calculating 24-hour populations

In contrast to midnight populations, Vera calculated 24-hour populations by counting distinct people detained *at any point* on a given day, including those booked-out before midnight. By counting *distinct* people using unique identifiers, the researchers avoid incorrectly duplicating 24-hour population counts of people ICE transfers between facilities within a given day.

Facility populations

For each facility, Vera researchers calculated statistics for midnight populations and 24-hour populations. In contrast to the national statistics, the **researchers used detention *stint* book-in and book-out dates as the detention start and end dates for facility-level statistics**, because detention stints are associated with the respective facility.

Otherwise, these metrics were similarly calculated. For midnight populations, Vera counted the number of distinct people detained between two consecutive dates. For 24-hour populations, Vera counted all distinct people detained at any point on a given day based, including people booked out on that date. By counting *distinct* people, Vera deduplicated records for a given day in certain instances where a single person was transferred from a facility to that very same facility one or more times on a given day.

In some instances, ICE data shows people as being detained in two places at once during a transfer (i.e., there is overlap between the previous stint book-out and the subsequent stint book-in dates and times). Since Vera calculated population statistics at a daily level (rather than more granularly by hour or minute), this issue was only relevant when Vera calculated facility midnight populations, and only for those with overlapping detention stints occurring over midnight on a given day. For such stints, people would be reflected in *each* facility's midnight population count for that day.

The ICE Detention Trends dashboard does not currently include facility book-ins and book-outs because they are meaningfully different compared with the national level. At the facility level, a book-in may reflect a person's *initial* book-in to ICE custody or may be a transfer from another ICE facility. Similarly, a book-out from a facility may reflect a transfer to another ICE facility or a final book-out of ICE custody due to one of many release reasons recorded in the data (such as "bonded out," "removal," or "order of recognizance").

Defining facilities as active or inactive

For each month, Vera computed (1) the number of active facilities in use during that month, and (2) the cumulative total number of facilities used by ICE at any point between October 2008 and the given month. The map displays, for a given month, red dots for active facilities and gray dots for inactive facilities.

Active facilities: Vera defined a facility as active for the month if ICE detained at least one person for any duration during that month (i.e., based on 24-hour population).

Inactive facilities: Vera defines inactive facilities as those that were active at some point between October 2008 and the given month, but which were not active during the given month (i.e., previously active facilities). **Note that Vera defines facilities as active or inactive for the dashboard based on population statistics, regardless of its actual contract status.** Some facilities with active contracts or agreements to hold people for ICE may appear as "inactive" on the dashboard map if ICE did not use them to detain people in a given month.

Total facilities: Vera calculated the cumulative total number of ICE facilities displayed on the dashboard as the number of facilities that were "active" (as defined above) at any point between October 2008 through the given month.

Creating a facility lookup table

Datasets I, II, and III include facility names and a facility unique identifier ("facility code") for each facility in the data. The facility names displayed on the dashboard and in the downloadable data are

the exact facility name strings from the detention dataset (not from the supplemental datasets discussed below). In cases where the detention dataset includes multiple names for a given facility code, Vera kept the name used in the most recent data extraction.

These datasets do not include additional facility information such as address, city, state, or "facility type" (as coded by ICE in other datasets). For the original dashboard launched in August 2023 using Dataset I, Vera created a lookup table drawing from additional ICE datasets and public sources to fill in this missing information. Some of these supplemental data sources included facility codes, in which event Vera researchers simply joined on that shared key to merge it with their principal facility list. For supplemental data sources without a facility code, Vera joined by facility name—and in some cases, facility name and state—based on the following rules:

- If a facility name unambiguously matched to a single facility code in all datasets with both facility code and name included, Vera joined by facility name.
- If a facility name did not unambiguously match to a single facility code:
    - Vera used the facility's state to match records that would otherwise be ambiguous if only matching by the facility's name. In many instances, the facility state can be inferred from the last two characters of the facility code, allowing the researchers to match to the state provided by the supplementary dataset. For example, an "Orange County Jail" exists in both Florida and New York; this facility name is associated with two facility codes ("ORANGFL" and "ORANGNY" respectively).
    - Vera fuzzy matched facilities by facility name that otherwise could not be matched. This involved an algorithmic component to narrow down the possible fuzzy matches, followed by manual verification. For example, Vera considered the facility name "Roger D. Wilson (Knox County, TN) Detention Facility" and "Knox County Detention Facility" to be a match based on fuzzy name matching and manual verification.
    - Vera manually reviewed facility locations for accuracy.

After acquiring Datasets II and III, Vera undertook a similar process to look up facility locations and facility types using supplemental ICE data sources and public sources. Some of the supplemental ICE data sources include latitude and longitude information, while others include addresses only. For sources with only address information, Vera used the Google Maps API to look up latitude/longitude. Because Vera's primary interest was placing facilities on a map on the dashboard that could be zoomed in to a county level, latitude and longitude should be considered approximate, as it may reference the exact facility address or the center of a zip code or city.

Given the lack of a comprehensive, up-to-date ICE source to assign facility types to all 1,397 facility codes in the dataset, Vera's categorizations should be interpreted as *best-known* facility type. Vera researchers matched facilities to facility types coded by ICE in the supplemental datasets. If types conflicted across sources, Vera prioritized information from ICE's fiscal-year-to-date statistical reports and dedicated and non-dedicated facility lists. To simplify map filtering options, Vera grouped facility types assigned by ICE, as well as ones manually entered by Vera, into the categories shown in Table 2. Vera manually classified facilities in the "hotel" category and added medical and mental health facilities to the "medical" category.

Table 2: Facility types categorized by Vera

Category (Vera)	Type detailed (ICE)	Description by ICE
Non-Dedicated	IGSA	Inter-governmental Service Agreement: a facility operated by state/local government(s) or private contractors and falls under public ownership.

Dedicated	DIGSA	Dedicated IGSA.
	CDF	Contract Detention Facility: a facility that is owned by a private company and contracted directly with the government.
	SPC	Service Processing Center: a facility that is owned by the government and staffed by a combination of federal and contract employees.
Federal	BOP	Bureau of Prisons: a facility operated by/under the management of the Bureau of Prisons.
	USMS CDF	Private facility contracted with USMS.
	USMS IGA	Intergovernment agreement in which ICE agrees to utilize an already established US Marshal Service contract.
	DOD	Department of Defense
	MOC	Migrant Operations Center
Hold/Staging	Hold	Hold: a holding facility.
	Staging	A facility used for Staging purposes.
Family/Youth	Family	Family: a facility in which families are able to remain together while awaiting their proceedings.
	Juvenile	Juvenile: an IGSA facility capable of housing juveniles (separate from adults) for a temporary period of time.
Medical	Hospital	Hospital: a medical facility.
Hotel	Hotel	*N/A: facilities coded by Vera.*
Other/Unknown	Other	Other: facilities including but not limited to transportation-related facilities, hotels and/or other facilities.
	Unknown	*N/A: facilities for which Vera could not identify a facility type.*

The descriptions in this table are taken verbatim from ICE, where available. Source for ICE facility type detailed descriptions: National Immigrant Justice Center (NIJC), "ICE Detention Facilities as of November 2017", spreadsheet obtained via FOIA request by the Immigrant Legal Resource Center (ILRC).

Facilities in raw data not included in dashboard

The dashboard includes 1,397 of the 1,417 facilities appearing in the raw detention datasets. Table 3 shows the 20 facilities found in the raw data that are not included in the dashboard, and the reasons for which they are not included– e.g., stints used for transportation only rather or reflecting U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) custody, not ICE custody. While the *detention stints* for the 20 facilities listed in Table 3 are not included in the dashboard, **Vera retained for each person any remaining detention stints** associated with one of the 1,397 facilities. This results in dropping a person's entire detention stay if their only stints in the detention dataset are among the 20 facilities not included. For example, if a person's entire detention stay was a stint indicating transportation only or "no detention," they would not be included in detention statistics.

Table 3: Facilities not included in dashboard

Facilities	Reason not included in dashboard
El Paso Holdroom	There were approximately 156,000 stints in Dataset I and zero stints in Dataset II for the period in which these datasets overlap. All stints in Dataset I for ELPHOLD fell after October 1, 2013. Because Vera primarily used Dataset II to calculate statistics for October 1, 2013 to September 30, 2023, Vera had to choose whether to add these stints from Dataset I to populations statistics primarily calculated from Dataset II. According to ICE, the purpose of this code changed and was later used for transportation purposes, so Vera chose not to add them to the statistics primarily calculated from Dataset II.
Transport Only No Detention-HLG UAC Trans Only No Detention-HLG MVM Transport, Dallas MVM Transport, El Paso MVM Transport, Phoenix MVM Transport, San Antonio Proper MVM Transport, San Diego MVN Transport, SNA	These facility names indicate transportation only, and only appear in Dataset I, despite occurring in the overlapping period with Dataset II. For the original version of *ICE Detention Trends,* Vera initially considered whether to retain these records to show the ICE detention data "as is" to the greatest extent possible. After further analysis, Vera found their inclusion would result in a substantial difference between Vera's calculated statistics and publicly available ICE-reported statistics. The majority of records associated with these eight facilities—which appear to be time out of brick and mortar facilities during transportation— have relatively short durations of less than 24 hours, and they are often a person's only record (i.e., by Detention Stay ID).
CBP San Ysidro POE CBP Chula Vista BPS Tornillo-Guadalupe POE	Detention stints for CBP San Ysidro POE, CBP Chula Vista BPS, and Tornillo-Guadalupe POE appear to reflect a person detained in CBP custody, not ICE custody.
EGP CPC Holding DRT CPC Holding	These facility codes were used for transportation only from Border Patrol locations in Eagle Pass, TX and Del Rio, TX.
ICE El Paso Hold Room Hopebridge Hospital Comprehensive Hlth Svc-Los Fresnos	There are zero stints for these facilities in Dataset II. In Dataset I, there were approximately 970 stints for ICE El Paso Hold Room, 25 stints for Hopebridge Hospital, and two stints for Comprehensive Hlth Svc-Los Fresnos. All of these stints in Dataset I fell in the period for which Vera primarily used Dataset II to calculate detention population statistics.
Greentree Inn Houston IAH Airport Huntsville Memorial Hospital Trinity Youth Services LTFC	In Dataset II, there was one stint for each of these three facilities, but zero stints in Dataset III. All of these stints in Dataset II fell in the period for which Vera primarily used Dataset III to calculate detention population statistics.

Endnotes

[1] Emily Ryo and Ian Peacock, "A National Study of Immigration Detention in the United States," Southern California Law Review, Vol 92, No 1 (2018), https://perma.cc/RV65-XPUK; Don Kerwin, Daniela Alulema, and Siqi Tu, "Piecing Together the US Immigrant Detention Puzzle One Night at a Time: An Analysis of All Persons in DHS-ICE Custody on September 22, 2012," Journal on Migration and Human Security, Vol 3 No 4 (2015), https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/233150241500300402; Human Rights Watch, "A Costly Move: Far and Frequent Transfers Impede Hearings for Immigrant Detainees in the United States," June 14, 2011, https://perma.cc/S57K-Z8CU.

The Vera Institute of Justice is powered by hundreds of advocates, researchers, and policy experts working to transform the criminal legal and immigration systems until they're fair for all. Founded in 1961 to advocate for alternatives to money bail in New York City, Vera is now a national organization that partners with impacted communities and government leaders for change. We develop just, antiracist solutions so that money doesn't determine freedom; fewer people are in jails, prisons, and immigration detention; and everyone is treated with dignity. Vera's headquarters is in Brooklyn, New York, with offices in Washington, DC, New Orleans, and Los Angeles. For more information, visit vera.org.

For more information about Vera's ICE Detention Trends dashboard, contact urep@vera.org.

Suggested citation: Noelle Smart, *ICE Detention Trends: Technical Appendix* (New York, NY: Vera Institute of Justice, 2025).