

1633

VERA INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE
377 BROADWAY
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10013
TELEPHONE (212) 334-1300 • FAX (212) 941-9407

Date: January 25, 1992

TO: Jail Population Management Project Advisory Committee, and
Staff of the Planning Unit, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Public Safety
FROM: Laura Winterfield, Project Director
SUBJECT: Eligible Pool Analysis

INTRODUCTION

This memorandum addresses two questions: How many inmates in the daily population of the Department of Correction (DOC) are eligible for the various city-funded alternative programs?¹ And, given the sizes of these "eligible pools," how much room is there for program expansion?

For this analysis, each program's eligibility criteria were applied to a cohort of defendants and offenders admitted to DOC custody in March, 1987. Some programs, in addition to using eligibility criteria to screen potential candidates for intake, can state a range of ultimate sentences that they are trying to displace by their intervention. When it is possible to state a program's objectives this way, the "eligible pools" are presented in this memorandum both as the programs' screening staff initially see them when they screen cases before the disposition is known (the "Maximum Eligible Pool"), and as the research data ultimately reveal them (the "Perfectly Targeted Eligible Pool", which includes only those eligible detainees who actually received a sentence in the program's targeted range).

This is the second in a series of analytic memoranda prepared for the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Public Safety under the Jail Population Management Project. The first memorandum reveals the pattern of demand for the city's jail capacity, by various categories of inmates found in DOC custody. The third memorandum describes the construction and content of models that help predict both pretrial detention and incarcerative sentences in felony cases. The fourth memorandum presents information about those admitted to DOC who are *not* eligible for any existing alternative program, and discusses some implications for the city's alternative program investment strategy.

¹ For this series of memoranda, alternative programs have been categorized as follows:

- ATD: Programs designed principally as alternatives to pretrial detention only.
- ATI: Programs designed principally to serve as alternative penal measure in cases that would otherwise draw jail or prison time at disposition.
- ATD/I: Programs that intervene when an individual is in pretrial detention, offering an alternative to continued detention *and* an alternative penal measure at disposition.

These definitions have also been used to categorize DOC inmates, by the type of jail days they use. "ATD-only" users of jail capacity are those admitted to DOC at or after arraignment, but who are released before disposition and sentence. "ATI-only" inmates are those who are at liberty when sentenced, but are admitted to begin serving a local or state term. "ATD/I" inmates are those in DOC custody pretrial, who remain in custody through disposition, and stay in custody to begin serving an incarcerative sentence.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The Office of the Deputy Mayor is charged with deciding how many program slots should be funded in specific alternative programs. Because the primary purpose of the city's investment in alternative programs is to relieve jail overcrowding, it is useful to have some idea of how many of those in DOC custody meet the eligibility criteria of these programs.² This memorandum presents information about the number of DOC inmates eligible for the various alternative programs, to give city policy-makers a quantitative framework within which to judge the adequacy of their current inventory of program slots, and within which to make informed decisions about expansion.

As the other analytic memoranda produced in this research project demonstrate, defendants who are not in DOC custody at the time of program intake use comparatively little of DOC's capacity — either before or after conviction. Therefore, this memorandum explores only the number **in detention** who meet the formal eligibility criteria of the existing alternative programs. On the one hand, focusing on the eligibility of detainees (without regard to the number at liberty who might also be eligible for alternative programs) helps establish an upper limit for the number any given program might ultimately be able to displace from DOC beds. On the other hand, it would be wrong to assume that, as currently operated, all of the existing alternative programs are filling their slots (or would fill additional slots) only from the pool of individuals analyzed here — those in detention.

To the extent that the existing or prospective slots in alternative programs are actually filled by individuals who are not in detention at time of intake, city investment in those slots is unlikely to displace much of the demand for jail cells. Thus, this memorandum's assessment of the relationship between "eligible pools" and funded program capacity should be considered in light of the other memoranda in this series, particularly the presentation of models for predicting detention and custodial sentences.³

Nevertheless, displacement of demand for jail capacity is only one of the objectives of the city's investments in alternative programs. There are justice interests to be served (*e.g.*, punishment through non-custodial means) and there are community safety interests to be served (*e.g.*, through supervision, treatment and rehabilitation). As the overall capacity of alternative programs is increased, it is to be expected (and, presumably, desired) that the city's overall achievement of these objectives is also increased. Some of that benefit should be expected from the application of appropriate non-custodial measures to individuals who otherwise would have been subjected to less effective non-custodial measures (*e.g.*, unconditional discharge or unenforced conditional discharge, simple probation), just as some of that benefit should come from the application of alternative measures to those who would otherwise have consumed jail capacity.

² Although alternative programs are often appropriately concerned not only with displacing defendants and offenders from local jail beds but also with displacing state prison sentences, the primary concern of the city is with local jail overcrowding. Thus, this memorandum focuses on the population occupying city jail cells.

³ Some programs are designed in a way that limits intake to persons who are in detention (see Appendix B), but others are not. For programs whose intake is not restricted to pretrial detainees, the data available for this research project do not reveal the extent to which the programs' slots are being filled by persons who are not represented in a detention cohort. Nor was this project designed to determine the extent to which any individual program achieves actual displacement (although the Felony Prediction models presented in the third memorandum from this project provide a framework for the city to assess the jail displacement efficacy of programs' current eligibility criteria and screening processes).

Achieving the right balance between these objectives seems an important additional purpose of the city's orderly development of alternative programs. Thus, when this memorandum identifies the number **in detention** who are eligible for existing alternative programs, it is not meant to suggest either that existing programs are targeting intake exclusively on this population (desirable for achieving maximum displacement of individuals from jail) or that the city might not want alternative program capacity great enough both to maximize jail displacement effects *and* to subject to appropriate penal measures others who are currently subjected to little or no punishment or control at all.

For the analysis discussed below, the eligibility criteria of nine alternative programs were applied to the DOC detention cohort: the Center for Alternative Sentences and Employment Services' Court Employment Project (CEP) and its Community Service Sentencing Project (CSSP); the Criminal Justice Agency's Bail Expediting Project (BEX); the Federated Employment and Guidance Service's Consultants for Criminal Justice Alternatives (CCJA); Intensive Supervision Probation (ISP); the Osborne Association's Assigned Counsel Alternatives Advocacy Project (ACAAP) and its Alternative to Reincarceration Project (ATR); Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC); and the Vera Institute's Bronx Bailbond Supervision Project (BBAILBOND). Detailed descriptions of the eligibility criteria of each program can be found in Appendix B.⁴

SUMMARY OF HOW THE PROGRAMS' "ELIGIBLE POOLS" WERE CONSTRUCTED AND HOW THE RESULTING ESTIMATES CAN BE USED

Eligibility was determined from the criteria actually used by the screening staffs of the various alternative programs, as reported on questionnaires distributed for that purpose and in follow-up interviews. For each program, the eligibility criteria were applied to all March, 1987 DOC admits from the borough(s) and court(s) where the program operates, for whom all of the necessary data could be obtained⁵; those who met the criteria are termed **absolute eligibles** in this memorandum. Admits from the borough(s) and court(s) where the program operates for whom any data necessary for determining eligibility were missing were assumed to exhibit the same pattern of eligibility as was found among the one-third of admits for whom full eligibility data could be obtained — permitting creation of a more realistic pool of **estimated eligibles**.

Then, for some programs, two views were taken to stating the size of the "absolute" and "estimated" eligible pools. Because the ultimate disposition and the sentence cannot be known with certainty at the time program screeners assess the eligibility of defendants, **maximum eligible pools** were created; these pools include all admits who meet formal program eligibility criteria, no matter what the disposition or sentence ultimately was. For some programs, this is the only eligible pool discussed. But other ATI and ATD/I programs specify the type of sentence they aim to displace (*e.g.*, a jail sentence of six months or more). For these programs, **perfectly targeted eligible pools** were also created, in addition to the "maximum eligible pools." A program's "perfectly

⁴ Since the Fortune Society's programs were not in existence at the time this work was begun, that program was not considered here.

⁵ Detailed prior criminal histories from the DCJS TRENDS data set were unavailable for two-thirds of the cohort. See discussion below, at pages 6 and 19.

targeted eligible" pool includes only those admits meeting formal eligibility criteria who were ultimately subjected to a sentence in the range the program aims to displace.⁶

An additional adjustment was made, both to the annualized eligible pools and to the annualized number of jail days used by the eligibles in each pool, to discount those numbers by each program's "screening ratio." (The "screening ratio" was calculated by dividing the number of individuals taken into a given program by the number that program's screening staff initially found eligible.) This discounting attempts to produce results similar to those that occur in an intake decision-making process that is bound both by program capacity limits and by information about individual candidates which is invisible to the research but is known to program screeners and the judges, defense attorneys and prosecutors who have roles to play in admitting candidates to alternative programs. The screening ratios used in this memorandum should by no means be regarded as fixed features of these programs, but some discounting of this sort is necessary to reflect reality. Paper-eligibility for an alternative program does not mean that the program can achieve intake, even under ideal circumstances — prosecutorial, judicial and even defense objections will often prevent intake by programs that depend upon the agreement of one or more of these actors, and defendant characteristics (*e.g.*, extent of drug abuse) that are invisible to a research inquiry can block further consideration of a defendant's eligibility. The issues surrounding construction of screening ratios, and their use to discount the estimates of eligible pools, are discussed at greater length in the section of this memorandum headed "Analytic Approach."

Thus, a discounted eligible pool is the annualized number of individuals in DOC custody who are formally eligible for a program and who, if program capacity and screening practices were held constant, would be likely to be taken into the program if they were targeted for intake by program screening staff. Similarly, the discounted number of jail days used by a program's eligibles reflects a program's potential for jail displacement, if the program's capacity and practices remain constant and its screening were limited to those actually in DOC custody.

⁶ The "maximum eligible pool" helps give a sense of what the universe of DOC admits looks like from a program screener's point of view, but it includes admits whose cases will ultimately be disposed by discharge, probation, or even dismissal. By contrast, the "perfectly targeted eligible pool" helps give a sense of the number of admits whose intake would actually accomplish what the program aims to achieve by way of jail displacement. In reality, however, some programs' screeners are privy to a substantial amount of information that could never be incorporated into a research design of this type — information about the strength of parties' positions in plea negotiations, for example — and may make distinctions between paper-eligible cases that would blur the distinction drawn here between "maximum eligible pool" and "perfectly targeted eligible pool."

Five of the programs separately specify the range of custodial sentences they aim to displace — ACAAP, CCJA, CEP, ISP, and TASC. The programs that do not do so, and for which "perfectly targeted eligible pools" are not distinguished from "maximum eligible pools" in this memorandum, are the ATR, BEX, BBAILBOND, and CSSP programs. For BEX, an ATD program, the aim is to displace pretrial detention, not some range of custodial sentences. For ATR, the aim is simply to avoid incarceration upon parole revocation. BBAILBOND and CSSP, on the other hand, do not separately specify the custodial sentences they aim to displace because their eligibility criteria are derived from research designed to predict the targeted outcomes: for BBAILBOND, the target is long-term pretrial detention (and, because such detention is correlated with custodial sentences, the program expects to displace some custodial sentences as well); for CSSP, the eligibility criteria were constructed to predict jail terms.

Finally, this memorandum presents an analysis of the extent of overlap among the various programs' pools of "perfectly targeted estimated eligibles." Overlapping eligibility, by itself, is no bad thing. But if program intake efforts were focused exclusively on those in DOC custody, and if the city were to increase each program's capacity to accommodate the discounted number of perfectly targeted estimated eligibles, there could be an excess of capacity corresponding to the extent of overlap in the eligible pools. For reasons discussed in the "Overlapping Eligibility" section of this memorandum, this is not a problem the city faces now, or is likely to face in the near future. Even when the most conservative pools are used — the "*discounted* perfectly targeted absolute eligibles", which include only the one-third of admits for whom all necessary prior record data were provided — funded capacity typically falls far short of exhausting the pool. For each of the programs where the discounted number of absolute eligibles appears close to the funded capacity (BBAILBOND, CEP, and CSSP), there are special difficulties in generating and applying an appropriate screening ratio, creating doubt that the pools should be as deeply discounted as they have been in this analysis.⁷

ANALYTIC APPROACH — FOR TECHNICALLY-ORIENTED READERS⁸

Databases Used. The primary database used for these analyses was a cohort of all individuals admitted to DOC custody during March, 1987, which was prepared for Vera by the Criminal Justice Agency. These data were annualized, to provide yearly estimates of the numbers eligible for existing alternative programs, and the jail days they use. The unit of analysis was each admit (admission to DOC custody), rather than each court case and all its related admissions, or each individual and all his or her associated court cases. This was seen as appropriate theoretically, because each admit represents a unique opportunity for an alternative program intervention.

The database prepared by CJA contained all relevant DOC information (the admit and release dates, the sentence date if the defendant was still in DOC custody at time of sentence, the sentence if it was a custodial sentence, and the docket and indictment numbers for all other court cases pending against the defendant at the time of the sampled admit). The database was then supplemented by information about all court cases pending, at the time of the admit, against the individual admitted. The supplementary data included, for each pending case: (1) charge, bail amount and detention status immediately after arraignment, in both Criminal and Supreme Court; (2) the type of disposition and, if a conviction, the charge; and, (3) the sentence, if the case went to conviction.

This database, as supplemented, is referred to in this memorandum as the "CJA/DOC" database.

⁷ For BBAILBOND, while all potential eligibles are screened, program intake is stopped when all slots are filled, leading to a very low (3%) screening ratio. For both CEP and CSSP, some proportion of the caseload is not in DOC detention at time of program intake. For CEP, these are cases expected to receive custodial sentences, while for CSSP, these are cases screened at Criminal Court arraignment. While these cases are not represented in the eligible pool analyses, they are included in the screening ratios reported by the programs. Thus, the screening ratios generated in this memo for these three programs may very well be different from what would have been found if the only cases used to develop the ratios had been cases in DOC detention at the time of screening. For BBAILBOND and CEP, then, the "*undiscounted* absolute pools" are more appropriate for this analysis; their magnitudes suggest there is room to expand the number of slots funded. For CSSP the "*undiscounted* estimated pool" is the one to use; it suggests some expansion potential, although not as great as for the other programs.

⁸ Other readers might want to skip ahead to the next heading, at page 9.

Also used in these analyses was a summary data set, called the "TRENDS database", created by the Division of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) for use in a DCJS population projection project. Vera was allowed access to that data set, which contained the prior record for all individuals admitted to DOC from January 1, 1987 through November 30, 1989. There were two problems with this otherwise efficient method for securing the prior criminal records of those admits who had them. First, as it turned out, the TRENDS database did not include *any* prior record information for admits whose prior records contained one or more sealed cases. Second, there were an unknown number of randomly distributed errors in the NYSID identifiers contained in the CJA/DOC database itself. Thus, when the individuals in the CJA/DOC data set were matched against the TRENDS data set, only one-third of the detainee cohort were reported either to have a criminal record or to have none. Because it would be foolhardy to estimate the number of admits eligible for programs after discarding the two-thirds of admits for whom prior record information was lacking, an estimation procedure was adopted: admits not found in the TRENDS data set were assumed to exhibit the same pattern of eligibility as was found among the one-third of admits for whom full prior record data was available through TRENDS.

Variables Created to Describe the Admit. There were two types of variables created from the CJA/DOC database: (1) "general variables", which included information about the current case, about predicate status, and about other pending cases; and (2) detailed "prior record variables" which drew upon the data from the TRENDS data set. Appendix A contains a detailed discussion of the specific variables created.

Creation of the Eligibility Factors. The first step in determining which individuals were eligible for any of the various alternative programs was to specify the eligibility criteria actually used by each program. This was done through a questionnaire, which asked each program's staff to specify any fact that would exclude an individual from being taken into the program. The items were grouped as follows: the present offense, the prior record, the personal characteristics of the individual, and the individual's legal status (*i.e.*, open cases, warrants, and probation or parole status). The questionnaire responses were then verified through meetings with each program's supervisory staff. For each alternative program, the result was a set of factors that excluded potential candidates. A program's eligibility criteria can be expressed as the absence of such factors, and that is what is meant in this memorandum by the term: "formal eligibility criteria." The formal eligibility criteria used to estimate the number of admits eligible for each program are listed in Appendix B; for each program, these criteria are presented under three headings — General criteria, Pending Case criteria, and Additional Prior Record criteria.

Specification of "Appropriate Court and Borough". The second step in determining admits' eligibility for any given alternative program is to identify those admitted from a borough in which the program operates, during a prosecution in a court (Criminal or Supreme) from which the program takes participants. For example, to be eligible for CSSP Manhattan, the case must be one which will reach disposition in the Manhattan Criminal Court; CEP, on the other hand, takes Supreme Court cases from all boroughs but Richmond, but does not operate in the Criminal Courts. For most admits in

the CJA/DOC database, court and borough identifiers were available: The number of admits for whom both court and borough data were missing was 326 (4% of the cohort); the number missing only the information about court of final disposition was 398 (5% of the cohort); and the number for whom only the borough identifier was missing was 588 (7% of the cohort). For each program, the number of admits in the DOC cohort whose cases were in the appropriate court and borough is displayed in Appendix C, Table C-1. (That table also specifies, for each program, the numbers for whom the TRENDS data was available, and the numbers for whom prior record data was lacking.)

Once the cohort members admitted from a court and borough where a program operates were identified, the proportion of eligibles to ineligibles was calculated for those whose eligibility data were complete. That proportion was then applied to the remainder — those in the right court and borough for whom not all eligibility data were known — to generate a pool of "estimated eligibles." These "estimated eligibles" were then added to the "absolute eligibles" to determine the size of the "Estimated Eligible" pool. To get a sense of the number of jail days used by an "Estimated Eligible" pool, the mean number of jail days used by a program's "absolute eligibles" was multiplied by the number of DOC inmates in the "Estimated Eligible" pool.⁹

Developing the Screening Ratio. All of the alternative programs except ISP and BEX perform an initial paper screening, to determine the eligibility of candidates before launching formal intake efforts. Staff of the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Public Safety contacted representatives of the programs that do an initial paper screening and received, for calendar year 1989, the number of individuals screened by project staff who were initially found to "formally eligible," and the number actually taken into the project.¹⁰ The "screening ratio" was computed by dividing the number taken in by the number screened who were found eligible. For each of these programs, this discounting percentage was then applied to the number in the CJA/DOC database who were determined to be formally eligible, in order to generate the program's annualized "discounted maximum eligible" pool and "discounted perfectly targeted eligible" pool.

Caveats About The Screening Ratios Used In This Analysis. The data available for this research exercise permit estimation of the number of persons in DOC custody who are formally eligible for any given alternative program, but the data do not reveal those individual defendant characteristics that often render a candidate inappropriate for program participation in the eyes of a program's intake staff, or from the point of view of others involved in the decision-making process (*i.e.*, judges and attorneys) or the defendant himself. Thus, the number found "formally eligible" artificially inflates the

⁹ For reasons discussed below, there were too few CSSP "absolute eligibles" to apply their mean jail day usage this way. The jail days shown as used by CSSP "estimated eligibles" is the actual jail use of those assigned by the estimation procedure to the CSSP "Estimated Eligible" pool.

¹⁰ The exception among the projects that do an initial eligibility screening was the Court Employment Project, which did not have all this information available in the desired form. A special analysis was done, by manually reviewing CEP case files for fiscal year 1991 (July 1990 through June 1991), in an attempt to determine the number that screening staff had initially found formally eligible.

number that a program could reasonably be expected to draw from DOC custody into its caseload. In particular, there are factors only known at the point of defendant interview, such as seriousness of drug addiction, homelessness, or mental illness, which would in practice exclude a "formally eligible" defendant from program participation.¹¹

The screening ratios actually used in this memorandum, to discount the size of the eligible pools to more realistic levels, divide the number actually taken into a program by the number of individuals screened by program staff who were found "paper eligible" during the same period. Thus, the denominator is the number initially found to meet a program's formal eligibility criteria (no matter how the particular program staffed or performed that part of its screening function, and no matter when in the process it did that initial screening), while the numerator is simply the number added to the program's caseload during that period. However, it should be apparent that the data available in this research exercise do not permit analysis of the extent to which any program's "screening ratio" is determined by factors such as: the timing or method of its initial screening, the importance assigned by its intake staff to debilitating defendant characteristics, the credibility of the program in the eyes of other criminal justice system personnel, or imbalances between the funded capacity and the number who would, if screened, be found eligible.

The bottom line is that the screening ratios used in this analysis are probably artificially inflated in some cases and artificially depressed in others.¹²

¹¹ Ideally, when estimates of eligible pools size are based on the number in DOC custody who meet a program's formal eligibility criteria, the estimate ought to be discounted by a percentage which expresses the ratio at which formally eligible DOC inmates, screened for program intake during periods when program slots are open, are actually taken into that program. (Even then the ratio ought to be seen, from a policy perspective, as one that might be increased by changes in program capacity, services, or screening practices, or by advocacy among judges and lawyers.) But, because many alternative programs currently screen defendants who are at liberty as well defendants in DOC custody, and because funding constraints on the number of program slots leads programs not to pursue the intake of some candidates who screening staff find formally eligible, the screening ratios used in this memorandum fall far short of that ideal.

¹² A problem with the screening ratios developed for this analysis is that, for some programs, both the numerator and the denominator of the screening ratio include individuals who are at liberty, rather than in DOC custody, at the time of screening and program intake. It is likely that, when a large percentage of those found paper eligible by a program's screening staff are not in detention, they do not exhibit debilitating individual characteristics to the same extent as do those in the DOC cohort. Where, as here, the purpose is to generate a discounting ratio for estimating the number of formally eligible DOC detainees who would actually be taken into a particular program, a screening ratio produced from such a program's screening experience is likely to be artificially inflated.

It is also important to note that both the numerator and the denominator of the screening ratio used in this analysis can be affected by current funding levels. As the numerator is simply the number actually taken into a program's caseload, constraints on funded capacity will reduce the number actually accepted, and would tend to depress a screening ratio if initial screening activity proceeds even when available program slots are few or entirely filled. On the other hand, funding constraints can also affect the screening ratio's denominator (the number found formally eligible at initial screening), in two ways, both of which would tend to inflate screening ratios: (1) shortages of staff could depress the number of candidates a program initially screens, independently of the number of candidates the program could take in; or (2) scarcity of funded slots could depress the number that staff actually bother to screen to determine initial eligibility.

Thus, while application of screening ratios is a necessary step in the estimation of eligible pool size, and in the estimation of a program's potential for reducing jail use, and although consistently constructed and monitored screening ratios would be of great help to the city in its attempt to identify inefficient screening operations, or to identify opportunities for greater displacement effects,¹³ the screening ratios used here lack the consistency and precision desired.¹⁴

RELATIONSHIPS OF PROGRAMS' FUNDED CAPACITY TO THEIR ELIGIBLE POOLS – SURPLUS OR DEFICIENCY OF ALTERNATIVES?

Tables 1 - 4 summarize the eligible pool analysis. For each program, the annualized number of DOC admits found "formally eligible" and the total jail days they use are presented, and these numbers are also shown after discounting by application of the programs' screening ratios.

Table 1 displays each program's **Maximum Eligible Pool** (showing data about both the discounted and the undiscounted numbers of absolute eligibles and estimated eligibles). Each program's Fiscal Year 1991 funded capacity is shown for comparison to the size of its maximum eligible pool.

Table 2 is a summary of the dispositions actually reached in the cases for which admits in the "maximum absolute eligible pools" were admitted to DOC custody.¹⁵

Table 3 displays each program's the **Perfectly Targeted Eligible Pool** (showing data about both the discounted and the undiscounted numbers of absolute eligibles and estimated eligibles). Each program's Fiscal Year 1991 funded capacity is shown for comparison to the size of its perfectly targeted eligible pool.¹⁶

Table 4 is a summary of the types of jail days used (ATD-only, ATI-only, or ATD/I) by the admits in each program's "perfectly targeted absolute eligible" pool.

¹³ For example, a low screening ratio might suggest to an oversight agency that a program could usefully be re-designed, when it appears that the program's existing content is not viewed by sentencers as adequate to accomplish their sentencing purposes in a substantial portion of the program's targeted cases. Or it might suggest the need for a new program, constructed similarly in some respects but supplemented with features designed to reach deeper into an existing target pool.

¹⁴ For example, CEP accepts some proportion of its caseload from among defendants who, although not in detention at time of screening or program intake, are believed by program staff to be facing custodial sentences. Individuals of this type, while not represented in the DOC cohort available to this research, are represented in both the numerator and the denominator of CEP's screening ratio. It is more than possible that this results in a higher screening ratio, as the ratio was calculated for this analysis (.66), than would be found if the numerator and denominator were limited to cases screened from DOC only. To the extent that this is true, the CEP screening ratio reported in this memorandum is overstated. The same point could be made about the relatively high screening ratio reported for ACAAP (.86).

Perhaps more important is that BEX and ISP do not operate in a way that produces information about candidates' initial eligibility, which is necessary for the calculation of any screening ratio. In Tables 1 and 3, the lack of any discounting of ISP's and BEX's eligible pools should not be taken to mean that these programs enjoy a 100% screening ratio.

¹⁵ The dispositional categories used in Table 2 are: Mandatory Prison, Non-mandatory Prison, Jail, Probation/Fine/Discharge, and Dismissal/Acquittal.

¹⁶ For reasons discussed earlier in this memorandum, the eligible pools are smaller in Table 3 ("perfectly targeted") than in Table 1 ("maximum") only for ACAAP, CCJA, CEP, ISP and TASC.

From Table 1, which follows, it appears that the "maximum eligible pools" greatly exceed most programs' 1991 funded capacity, even when funded capacity is compared to the smallest estimate of eligibles in the maximum pool — the "discounted absolute eligibles." For ACAAP, CCJA, CEP and ISP, funded capacity is only a fraction of the eligible pool of DOC admits, and for TASC the funded capacity is still only about half the size of the discounted maximum eligible pool.

Table 1
Program Slots Funded Compared to Size of Programs*
"Maximum" Eligible Pool

PROGRAM Fiscal Year '91	Absolute Eligibles (All Eligibility Data Is Known)						Estimated Eligibles (Pattern for "Absolutes" Extrapolated)					
	Admits			Jail Days*			Admits			Jail Days*		
	Funded Capacity:	Annual N	Discounted N*	Annual N	Discounted N*	Mean Days per Admit	Annual N	Discounted N*	Annual N	Discounted N*	Discounting Factor ("Screening Ratio")**	
ACAP	265	5,532	4,758	588,052	505,724	106.3	12,525	10,772	1,331,408	1,145,064	86.0%	
ATR	125	372	272	30,504	22,268	82.0	524	383	42,968	31,406	73.0%	
BBAILBOND	40	2,208	66	222,125	6,664	100.6	3,290	99	330,974	9,959	3.0%	
BEX	15,743	22,092	22,092	846,124	846,124	38.3	25,825	25,825	988,087	988,087	N/A	
CCJA	90	3,300	1,221	159,720	59,096	48.4	11,421	4,226	552,776	204,538	37.0%	
CEP	883	4,848	3,200	180,346	119,028	37.2	15,381	10,151	572,173	377,617	66.0%	
CSSP	1,600	96	***	4,416	***	30.7*	1,851	772	56,879	21,954	***	
ISP	1,150	19,548	19,548	1,149,422	1,149,422	58.8	27,073	27,073	1,591,892	1,591,892	N/A	
TASC	487	1,392	819	80,875	47,584	58.1	2,918	1,714	167,022	92,808	*****	
TOTAL	20,383	59,388	51,975	3,261,584	2,755,910		100,808	81,015	5,634,179	4,463,326		

*For all programs except CSSP, the "Mean Days per Admit" shown in this Table is the mean of jail days used by those in a program's Absolutely Eligible pool for whom jail use data was available. The number of jail days used by Absolutely Eligibles, as reported in this Table, is that mean of jail days used, times the total number found absolutely eligible (including the relatively few Absolutely Eligibles for whom data on actual jail use was missing). For all programs except BEX, CSSP and TASC, the number of jail days used by Estimated Eligibles, as reported in the Table, is the number of Estimated Eligibles times the mean of jail days used by the program's Absolutely Eligibles. The approach had to be different for BEX, CSSP and TASC, because those programs have borough-specific operations in more than one borough. For the multi-borough programs, the number of jail days used by Estimated Eligibles was first generated borough-by-borough. In this Table, the number of jail days reported as used by the BEX, CSSP and TASC Estimated Eligibles is simply the sum of those borough estimates - it is not the same as the mean of jail days used by all Absolutely Eligibles times the total of Estimated Eligibles. The difference is insignificant except for CSSP, because the number of admits found Absolutely Eligible for that alternative was too small for their mean jail use to be relied upon. Thus, the mean jail use for CSSP-eligible admits, reported in this Table, is the mean of jail days used by those in the program's combined Estimated Eligible pool. For BEX and TASC, by contrast, the borough-by-borough estimates were done in the normal way - by multiplying the mean jail day use of each borough's Absolutely Eligibles times the number of Estimated Eligibles in the borough; those borough estimates were then summed and reported in this Table, but the mean jail use shown here, for each of these programs, is the mean number of jail days used by those in the combined Absolutely Eligible pool.

** Each program's screening ratio was used to discount the annualized pools to account for slippage between being found "formally eligible" and actually being taken into the program. The screening ratios were calculated by dividing the number of participants actually taken into a program, during a test period, by the number found formally eligible for the program by its screening or intake staff. Because neither BEX's nor ISP's intake procedures generate a pool of "formally eligible" candidates from which program participants are ultimately drawn, no screening ratios could be generated for those programs. The absence of a BEX or ISP discounting factor (which would reflect the difficulties of actually achieving program intake) should not be taken to mean that these programs could actually displace from jail all the DOC inmates who meet the formal eligibility criteria.

*** For CSSP, which has very tight and detailed eligibility criteria, the number of Admits who were clearly "Absolutely Eligibles" was so small in the individual boroughs that it was not possible to discount the "Absolutes" by the borough "Screening Ratios," but the "Estimated Eligibles" were sufficiently numerous to be subjected to the discounting factor.

***** TASC also had borough-specific Screening Ratios, as follows: Brooklyn = 43%; Bronx = 51%; Manhattan = 28%; Queens = 38%.

Although it appears from Table 1 that many more detainees are eligible than could be accommodated by the alternative programs as currently funded, Table 2 shows that the prosecutions against a significant proportion of the admits in the maximum eligible pools ended with dismissals and non-custodial sentences — not the kinds of dispositions the city is aiming to displace:

Table 2

Distribution of Actual Sentences and Dispositions For Eligibles
(Maximum Eligible Pools — "Absolute Eligibles" Only)

	Mandatory Prison	Non-Mandatory Prison	Jail	Probation, Fines Discharges	Dismissal & Acquittal
ACAAP	47%	13%	31%	7%	3%
BEX	13%	4%	34%	21%	28%
BBAILBOND	9%	6%	65%	6%	15%
CCJA	18%	15%	42%	18%	7%
CEP	1%	20%	48%	29%	3%
CSSP *	--	--	38%	28%	34%
ISP	--	22%	45%	16%	16%
TASC	17%	16%	35%	10%	22%

* Because the number of "Absolute Eligibles" for CSSP is so low, the CSSP distributions here are for "Estimated Eligibles".

Because program screeners are experienced in assessing the "worth" of cases in the plea-bargaining process, and because they are often privy to plea and sentence negotiations, they would be expected to anticipate the dispositions in some of these cases and to drop further consideration of candidates they believed were headed toward non-custodial dispositions. Thus the maximum eligible pools shown in Table 1 should be viewed as overstatements of pool size. For this reason, Table 1 is not referenced in the discussion below; instead, the discussion turns to Table 3, which compares funded program capacity with the "perfectly targeted eligible pools." Perfectly targeted eligible pools, which are smaller than maximum eligible pools, could be created for ACAAP, BBAILBOND, CCJA, CEP, ISP, and TASC.

From Table 3, which follows, it still seems that most of the city's alternative programs are not currently funded at anywhere close to a level that would exhaust the supply of eligibles,¹⁷ even when the most conservative estimate of eligible pool size is used — the "discounted perfectly targeted absolute eligible pool." This comforting conclusion cannot be reached so easily for BBAILBOND, CEP, or CSSP, each of which carries, in this analysis, a relatively low screening ratio and tightly-drawn eligibility criteria that exclude very large numbers of admits from their eligibility pools.

¹⁷ The difference between a program's current funded capacity and its eligible pools is still understated in both Table 1 and Table 3, to the extent that a program is intentionally designed to reach beyond DOC detainees for the potential candidates it screens for intake.

Table 3
Program Slots Funded Compared to Size of Programs'
"Perfectly Targeted" Eligible Pool

PROGRAM	Funded Capacity: Fiscal Year '91	Absolute Eligibles (All Eligibility Data Is Known)				Estimated Eligibles (Pattern for "Absolutes" Extrapolated) *				Discourting Factor ("Screening Ratio") **	
		Admits		Jail Days		Admits		Jail Days			
		Annual N	Discourting N*	Annual N	Discourting N*	Annual N	Discourting N*	Annual N	Discourting N*		
ACAAP	265	3,792	3,261	390,576	335,895	103.0	9,119	7,842	939,257	807,726	86.0%
ATR	125	372	272	30,504	22,268	82.0	524	383	42,968	31,406	73.0%
BBALLBOND	40	2,208	66	222,125	6,664	100.6	3,290	99	330,974	9,959	3.0%
BEX	15,743	22,092	22,092	846,124	846,124	38.3	25,825	25,825	988,087	988,087	N/A
CCJA	90	948	351	75,935	28,096	80.1	3,761	1,392	301,256	111,499	37.0%
CEP	883	1,212	800	52,964	34,957	43.7	4,395	2,901	192,062	126,774	66.0%
CSSP	1,600	96	***	4,416	***	30.7 *	1,851	772	56,879	21,954	***
ISP	1,150	7,500	7,500	374,250	374,250	49.9	9,338	9,338	465,966	465,966	N/A
TASC	487	564	345	27,918	17,078	49.5	1,331	788	65,815	39,849	*****
TOTAL	20,383	38,784	34,687	2,024,812	1,665,331		59,434	49,340	3,383,264	2,603,220	

* For all programs except CSSP, the "Mean Days per Admit" shown in this Table is the mean of jail days used by those in a program's Absolutely Eligible pool for whom jail use data was available. The number of jail days used by Absolutely Eligibles, as reported in this Table, is that mean of jail days used, times the total number found absolutely eligible (including the relatively few Absolutely Eligibles for whom data on actual jail use was missing). For all programs except BEX, CSSP and TASC, the number of jail days used by Estimated Eligibles, as reported in the Table, is the number of Estimated Eligibles times the mean of jail days used by the program's Absolute Eligibles. The approach had to be different for BEX, CSSP and TASC, because those programs have borough-specific operations in more than one borough. For the multi-borough programs, the number of jail days used by Estimated Eligibles was first generated borough-by-borough. In this Table, the number of jail days reported as used by the BEX, CSSP and TASC Estimated Eligibles is simply the sum of those borough estimates - it is not the same as the mean of jail days used by all Absolutely Eligibles times the total of Estimated Eligibles. The difference is insignificant except for CSSP, because the number of admits found Absolutely Eligible for that alternative was too small for their mean jail use to be relied upon. Thus, the mean jail use for CSSP-eligible admits, reported in this Table, is the mean of jail days used by those in the program's combined Estimated Eligible pool. For BEX and TASC, by contrast, the borough-by-borough estimates were done in the normal way - by multiplying the mean jail day use of each borough's Absolute Eligibles times the number of Estimated Eligibles in the borough; those borough estimates were then summed and reported in this Table; but the mean jail use shown here, for each of these programs, is the mean number of jail days used by those in the combined Absolutely Eligible pool.

** Each program's screening ratio was used to discount the annualized pools to account for slippage between being found "formally eligible" and actually being taken into the program. The screening ratios were calculated by dividing the number of participants actually taken into a program, during a last period, by the number found formally eligible for the program by its screening or intake staff. Because neither BEX's nor ISP's intake procedures generate a pool of "formally eligible" candidates from which program participants are ultimately drawn, no screening ratios could be generated for those programs. The absence of a BEX or ISP discounting factor (which would reflect the difficulties of actually achieving program intake) should not be taken to mean that these programs could actually displace from jail all the DOC inmates who meet the formal eligibility criteria.

*** For CSSP, which has very tight and detailed eligibility criteria, the number of Admits who were clearly "Absolutely Eligibles" was so small in the individual boroughs that it was not possible to discount the "Absolutes" by the borough "Screening Ratios," but the "Estimated Eligibles" were sufficiently numerous to be subjected to the discounting factor.

**** The CSSP borough-specific Screening Ratios were: Brooklyn = 43%; Bronx = 51%; Manhattan = 28%; Queens = 38%.

***** TASC also had borough-specific Screening Ratios, as follows: Brooklyn = 68%; Queens = 41%; Staten Island = 89%.

Discussions with BBAILBOND project staff indicated that the program's low screening ratio (3%, which produces very low "discounted" eligible pools) is primarily due to current project funding levels: Project staff do not post bailbonds for any more defendants, once the intake goal is met in a given period, even though the Bronx Bailbond Supervision Program's screeners have identified more who are formally eligible. This practice is undoubtedly responsible for the low BBAILBOND screening ratio. Therefore, for this program, the **undiscounted** number of eligibles more accurately reflects the real size of BBAILBOND's eligible pool — indicating that this program could also be substantially expanded without exhausting its eligible pool.

For CEP, the discounted number of "absolute eligibles" (drawn only from the one-third of DOC admits for whom full prior record information was available in the TRENDS data set) appears rather close to current funded capacity. To gauge the potential for expansion of CEP, therefore, it is more appropriate to compare its funded capacity with the discounted number of "**estimated** eligibles" (rather than "absolute eligibles") — a comparison that suggests expansion potential for CEP as well.

CSSP presents a somewhat different situation. Here, the eligibility criteria are very detailed and specific (*see* Appendix A), and are completely dependent on prior record information. For this program, then, the "**estimated** eligible pool" is the only one that should be considered. Even so, when the low screening ratios (which range from .28 in Manhattan to .51 in the Bronx) are applied to the "estimated perfectly targeted" pool, only 772 DOC detainees appear eligible on an annualized basis; they would consume slightly less than 50 percent of CSSP's currently funded capacity. Two additional analytic points must be made about why CSSP's discounted pool of "estimated eligibles" appears so low.

First, CSSP was fully operational in 1987, when the DOC cohort was drawn. Because CSSP takes a substantial proportion (roughly 20%) of its participants at Criminal Court arraignment, there were a substantial number of formally eligible defendants who never reached DOC custody, and therefore are not represented at all in the eligibility pools created for this analysis. That is, program operations deflated the number of eligible candidates who showed up in the CJA/DOC database.¹⁸

Second, it is likely that CSSP's low screening ratio is in part a bookkeeping artifact. For the research, it was possible to use the computer to apply quite rigorously all of CSSP's screening criteria very precisely, to define those "formally eligible" in the CJA/DOC database. But actual screening practice in CSSP is probably not this precise, at least at the point in the court processing where individuals are excluded from eligibility and the remainder are reported as "formally eligible." Such a lack of precision in the application of CSSP's eligibility criteria would tend to inflate the denominator of the

¹⁸ In addition, because CSSP's eligibility criteria were designed to *exclude* large numbers of Criminal Court defendants for whom jail sentences would not be likely, few candidates remain when the criteria are applied to any sample. As a result, the one-month DOC admit sample from March, 1987, produced too few "absolute eligibles" for much confidence to be placed in the pool size estimates subsequently produced for this analysis. (*See* Tables C-2. Only one admit from the Bronx was found absolutely eligible, one from Brooklyn, three from Manhattan, and three Queens). If only one more March 1987 admit had been found formally eligible in each borough, CSSP's annualized "discounted estimated eligibles" would have numbered 1,378 rather than 772. A more realistic and reliable estimate of the eligible pool for CSSP really should be based on a larger sample of admits than was available for this research.

screening ratio developed in this research — because the number initially recorded by project staff as "formally eligible" would include individuals who would not actually meet the eligibility criteria if all the data known to the research computer were known to the program's screening staff when the initial screening outcome is recorded.

Both these factors tend to depress the apparent size of the eligible pools, when the screening ratios developed for this analysis are applied to CSSP: Thus, there appears to be expansion potential for CSSP — although not great as for most of the other programs.

Table 4 uses the eligible pool analysis to address a different policy concern. The table displays the percentage of each program's "perfectly targeted absolute eligible" pool whose use of jail capacity is categorized as ATD-only, ATI-only, or ATD/I, and it shows the percentage of the jail days used by the programs' eligibles that are used by each of those categories of eligible admits.

Table 4
Summary Distributions of Admits and the Types of Jail Days They Used, by Program
(*"Perfectly Targeted" Eligible Pools — "Absolute Eligibles" Only*)

<u>Admits Eligible for</u>	<u>Types of Jail Days Used</u>							
	<u>ATD-only</u>		<u>ATI-only</u>		<u>ATD/I</u>		<u>Type Unknown</u>	
	<u>% of Program's Admits</u>	<u>% of Jail Days Used by Them</u>	<u>% of Program's Admits</u>	<u>% of Jail Days Used by Them</u>	<u>% of Program's Admits</u>	<u>% of Jail Days Used by Them</u>	<u>% of Program's Admits</u>	<u>% of Jail Days Used by Them</u>
ACAAP	34%		--		66%		--	
		14%		--		86%		--
BEX	64%		5%		22%		9%	
		19%		9%		63%		10%
BBAILBOND	40%		--		60%		--	
		16%		--		84%		--
CCJA	58%		--		41%		1%	
		20%		--		80%		<1%
CEP	70%		8%		22%		--	
		32%		7%		61%		--
CSSP *	66%		6%		27%		1%	
		13%		13%		73%		1%
ISP	63%		12%		25%		--	
		28%		13%		58%		--
TASC	63%		11%		26%		--	
		35%		4%		61%		--

* Because the number of "Absolute Eligibles" for CSSP is so low, the CSSP distributions here are for "Estimated Eligibles".

Other memoranda produced over the course of this research demonstrate that the heaviest demand for jail capacity comes from the ATD/I category of admits — those admitted to DOC before disposition who remain in custody through and after sentencing. At times when the city is considering expansion of existing alternative programs, some guidance can be found by examining the different patterns of jail day use exhibited by the programs' eligible pools. The pattern of jail use by program-eligible inmates does differ, by program. There is, of course, a relationship between the individual programs' eligibility criteria and the type of jail days used by those who are found eligible.¹⁹ To increase these programs' displacement of demand for jail capacity, the city could either emphasize expansion of programs whose "eligibles" are heavy ATD/I jail day users, or it could work with programs to amend screening criteria to emphasize the eligibility of inmates in the ATD/I category. (See "Models for Predicting Incarceration" — the third in the series of memorandum reports from the JPMC research.) Detailed breakdowns of absolute eligibles' jail use, by program, can be found in Appendix C, Tables C-2.²⁰

When the distribution of jail day use is examined for "perfectly targeted eligibles" (Table 4) it is immediately apparent that many programs' eligibility criteria do not specifically target ATD/I admits; this is because few programs formally restrict intake to those in detention at the time of screening. Nevertheless, in each programs' eligible pool, the one-quarter to one-third who are ATD/I admits use a large proportion of all the jail days used by the program's eligibles — the jail days used by ATD/I eligibles account for anywhere from over one-half to more than three-quarters of the total jail days used by program eligibles. Because the relatively small proportion of most program's eligibles who are ATD/I admits use such a disproportionate amount of jail capacity, there is ample reason to explore ways to amend programs eligibility criteria so that they are more likely to exclude candidates who would be predicted to receive non-custodial dispositions, and to replace them with ATD/I DOC admits.

In conclusion, it appears that substantial increases in the funded capacity of all the existing alternative programs would not run much risk of creating more capacity than there are DOC inmates eligible for the programs. It also appears that screening criteria could in many cases usefully be amended, to focus program intake more tightly on ATD/I users of the city's jail capacity, and that attention could be given to the efficiency of programs' efforts to achieve intake of those who are "formally eligible." Meanwhile, the "mean jail days used," presented in Table 3, can be used by the city to estimate the jail day savings that could be achieved for every additional slot funded in each of the programs, if programs restrict their intake to individuals who are actually in DOC custody at the time of screening.

¹⁹ The expected relationship can be seen, between program type (ATD, ATI and ATD/I) and the types of jail days used by "absolute eligibles."

²⁰ In Appendix C, each page of Table C-2 presents detailed data about one program's "maximum" and (where appropriate) "perfectly targeted" eligible pools. There, and in Table 4, the jail days used by eligibles are categorized as "ATD-only," "ATI-only," and "ATD/I" jail days. "ATD-only" jail days are the jail days used by eligibles who were admitted to *and* discharged from DOC prior to the disposition of their cases; "ATI-only" jail days are the jail days used by eligibles admitted to DOC at or after disposition, to serve a local sentence or to be transferred to state custody; and "ATD/I" jail days are jail days used by eligibles admitted to DOC prior to the disposition of their case, who remain in custody through disposition and after sentencing (either to serve a local sentence or be transferred to state custody).

OVERLAPPING PROGRAM ELIGIBILITY – A PROBLEM OR AN OPPORTUNITY?

Table 5, attached to this memorandum, summarizes the extent of overlap among the DOC admits found formally eligible for one or more alternative programs.²¹ It is clear from this table that there is some overlapping eligibility; of the 3,272 admits eligible for one or more programs, 736 (22.5 percent) were eligible for more than one program within a program type (*i.e.*, ATD or ATI).²² While this degree of overlapping eligibility might at first be viewed with some alarm, further examination of the data should mitigate the concern.

Although the city's strategy for investment in alternative programs ought to be informed by knowledge of the size of the pools of candidates who meet programs' eligibility criteria, and although there is much to recommend a funding strategy that maintains a desired relationship between program capacity and eligibility pool size, there are at least two reasons to *want* some overlap in program eligibility.

First, where the pool of eligible candidates exceeds the **combined** capacities of two or more programs, it is desirable for the programs to display a similar mix of program elements. Under these circumstances there are likely to be differences in screening ratios and program outcomes which, if analyzed by the city, can accelerate the process of refining and strengthening program design.

Second, the sentencing purposes served by different programs (and, therefore, the mix of punitive, incapacitative and rehabilitative program elements that can make a program plausible to judges and lawyers as an alternative to a custodial measure) can be quite different even when formal eligibility criteria overlap. This can be a distinct advantage when, within a pool of candidates, different sentencing purposes animate the dispositional decision-making process — more of the pool can be reached when the array of programs responds more fully to the array of distinct purposes sentencers have in mind in the individual cases.

An examination of Table 5 shows that 14.6 percent of those eligible for an ATD program are eligible for two or more. The only overlaps that occur often are the overlaps between BEX and ACAAP (6.2 percent of those eligible for an ATD program) or BEX and BBAILBOND (5.8 percent of those eligible for an ATD program). The overlap between BEX and ACAAP occurs because some defendants held on bail of less than \$2,500 (BEX) are assigned 18B attorneys (ACAAP). The overlap between BEX and BBAILBOND occurs because some defendants held on bail of less than \$2,500 (BEX) are by definition held on bail of less than \$7,500 (BBAILBOND). But ACAAP and BBAILBOND offer strikingly different program elements from those offered by BEX: BEX's efforts to arrange bail-making before transfer to DOC starts immediately after Criminal Court arraignment and ceases at the moment bail is made or a targeted defendant is taken from the court to DOC

²¹ In Table 5, in order to make the presentation reasonably accessible, programs categorized elsewhere as ATD/I are grouped with those categorized as ATI. For programs where it was possible to construct "perfectly targeted eligible pools," these were used in Table 5. For the others, the "maximum eligible pools" were used. In either case, the numbers used are not annualized in this Table.

²² Those eligible for two or more ATD programs numbered 312 (9.6 percent of those eligible for at least one alternative); those eligible for two or more ATI programs numbered 95 (2.9 percent); those eligible for one ATD and two or more ATI programs numbered 89 (2.7 percent); those eligible for two or more ATD and 1 ATI program numbered 157 (4.8 percent); and those eligible for two or more ATD programs and two or more ATI programs numbered 110 (3.4 percent).

custody. ACAAP, by contrast, provides alternative sentence advocacy throughout the life of the case, whether or not the ATD client remains in custody. BBAILBOND actually posts bonds to secure the supervised liberty of defendants who, from statistical profile, are likely to remain in pretrial detention for long periods.

Overlapping eligibility also occurs in 20.3 percent of the cases in which admits are eligible for an ATI (or ATD/I) program. The most frequent combination is ISP and CEP. While both these programs offer similar services (a supervised community-based sentence as an alternative to a custodial sentence), and although both programs screen out those headed for mandatory prison sentences, the program elements are sufficiently different so that sentencers are likely to use these programs in different subsets of eligible cases. For example, defendants placed by CEP into its Working Solutions program are provided on-site vocational and educational training (which affords unusual opportunities for intensive supervision and training by program staff), while ISP refers clients who need such services elsewhere. For others eligible for both ISP and CEP (but who would not be eligible for CEP's Working Solutions), overlap is still not problematic — the total combined eligible pools far exceed current funded capacity.²³

Some admits who are eligible for both ACAAP and CCJA are also eligible for various ATI combinations. This may be the only group of eligibles who are targeted for essentially similar program interventions, in the same boroughs (CCJA's service area is citywide, while ACAAP's was funded for Bronx, Queens, and Manhattan). However, these admits are quite a small portion of those eligible for alternative programs, and the programs for which they are eligible are not funded to a capacity that comes even close to the size of the collective "perfectly targeted absolute" pool.

These findings suggest that overlapping program eligibility is not a problem today. This is not surprising, given the quite distinct missions and program elements advanced by programs that have otherwise similar eligibility criteria. BEX provides a limited service to large numbers, but at a different point in the process than any other ATD. BBAILBOND bonds long-term detainees out of jail and provides intensive pretrial supervision and services. ACAAP and CCJA provide advocacy memoranda to 18B attorneys (of which there is a rather large pool). TASC provides drug treatment linkages. CEP focuses on in-house provision of employment training and remedial education, around which it organizes its intensive supervision. ISP provides a more intensive form of probation supervision than ordinary probation. CSSP is the only program offering a punitive alternative to jail terms for repeat property offenders in the Criminal Court. And ATR is the only program seeking non-custodial dispositions in proceedings on technical parole violations. For the places where potential overlap does exist (CCJA and ACAAP in certain boroughs; and ISP and CEP for certain defendants), the eligible pools far exceed combined funded capacity.

²³ Admits who are eligible for more than one of each type of program (e.g., eligible for two or more ATD programs and at least one ATI program, or eligible for two or more ATI programs and at least one ATD program), are most frequently either eligible for BEX and ACAAP in the ATD category while also eligible for one ATI, or are eligible for one ATD while also eligible for CEP and ISP. For the reasons stated above, these overlaps do not appear to present any problems, and may be advantageous.

It is unlikely that overlapping program eligibility diminishes the potential jail displacement effects of the city's existing array of investments in alternative programs. However, the analysis offered here, and the data on which it is based, are drawn from a DOC detention cohort. Jail displacement effects *are* diminished to the extent these programs draw intake from pools of non-detained defendants whose use of jail resources is lower. From the city's perspective the problem with programs' definitions of eligibility is not overlap, but aim.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

To the extent that the composition of today's DOC population resembles the DOC population of 1987 cohort, the eligibility pool analysis yields good news for city policy-makers. There appears to be room for substantial expansion of most alternative programs, without risk of any program exhausting the supply of formally eligible individuals who consume jail resources. The programs' criteria, if applied to individuals detained by DOC (and, perhaps, if tightened to avoid intake of the less heavy users of jail resources who are at liberty before disposition), would target heavy users of jail resources and would not overlap in ways that would diminish the programs' capacity to serve the city's interests.

The city could expand most of the alternative programs, **without exhausting the eligible pools**. The most conservative estimates of eligible pool size — the discounted number of "absolute" eligibles — are well in excess of the funded capacity of most programs. This is not true for BBAILBOND, CEP, and CSSP. But, for reasons detailed in the text above, estimates of the expansion potential for these programs ought to be based either on the *undiscounted absolute* pool (BBAILBOND), or on the *undiscounted estimated* eligible pool (CEP and CSSP). Given those figures, there are expansion possibilities for each of these programs as well. The cohort from which this finding was drawn is, of course, several years old, and the criminal justice system changes over time. But, the gap found between funded capacity and the size of eligible pools is, in most cases, so great that there is little chance of time's passage wholly eliminating it through changes in the composition of the detention population.

The city could structure a procedure for replicating this analysis annually or bi-annually, now that the eligibility factors have been quantified. For an immediate update, the most recent DOC exit cohort (June, 1991) could be used, supplemented by CJA court information and DCJS prior record information.²⁴ In such an up-dating

²⁴ A request to DCJS for specified offenders' prior record information would be likely to produce a substantially better return rate than the one-third rate found when the cohort used in this research exercise was matched with the TRENDS data set that DCJS had generated for a different analysis. When individual-specific prior record data requests were made for the other data sets used in this JPMC research, DCJS managed to return prior record information on close to 75% of the sample. The estimation procedures described in this memo, while producing eligible pool estimates that serve the present purpose, present complications that would be better avoided in future exercises of this kind. The decision to rely on the TRENDS data set for this research was made early on — because of the apparent time-savings that were expected from use of a pre-existing data set covering precisely the period during which the DOC cohort was admitted. (The demands on DCJS programmers are great enough that requests of this kind are generally backlogged and considerable time can pass before the requested prior record data are produced.) When the DOC cohort was fully assembled and available for matching against the TRENDS data set, not enough time remained to assemble DCJS prior record data on the cohort by other means.

exercise, the exact same procedures as were used here could be replicated to categorize admits whose cases have reached disposition.²⁵ The approach taken to estimating the eligibility of DOC inmates whose cases are still open at the time of data collection would have to be different — perhaps the predictors of jailboundness developed for the JPMC Models for Predicting Incarceration could be used for this purpose.

For ongoing efforts, DOC can periodically supply exit cohort data sets; the procedures developed for this research could then be routinely applied to the data set by the Deputy Mayor's Office itself. As the city continues its efforts to reduce jail overcrowding, and as investments in alternative programs continue to be viewed as an important means of accomplishing that objective, it would help the city enormously to move beyond one-shot research projects, toward the creation and maintenance of data sets that allow estimation annually, in conjunction with the budgetary cycles.

²⁵ The structure of programs' eligibility criteria requires some eligibility determinations to be based on the sentences finally imposed in the sampled case; this requires that the court case giving rise to the sampled admit to have been fully disposed by the time the data is collected. But, because the cohort available to the city from DOC for this purpose is an exit cohort, most of the admits who have exited DOC by the time of data collection will have had their cases disposed. For those who exit because of a change in pretrial detention status on open cases, nine months should be long enough to allow for dispositions on all but the most severe charges.

**Table 5
DETAIL ON THE OVERLAP AMONG PROGRAMS' ELIGIBILITY POOLS**

	<u>Number of Eligible Admits</u>	<u>Percent of Total Detainee Cohort (N = 7558)</u>	<u>Percent of Detainees Eligible for Alternative Programs (N = 3251)</u>	<u>Percent of Admits in This General Eligibility Group</u>	<u>Percent of Admits Eligible for This Combination</u>
ELIGIBLE FOR ATD PROGRAMS ONLY					
Eligible for only 1 ATD Program:					
BEX	1515	20.0%	46.6%	70.7%	82.7%
ACAAP	265	3.5%	8.2%	12.4%	14.5%
CCJA	29	0.4%	0.9%	1.4%	1.6%
BBAILBOND	22	0.3%	0.7%	1.0%	1.2%
Total Eligible for only 1 ATD Program	1831	24.2%	56.3%	85.4%	100.0%
Eligible for 2 or more ATD Programs:					
BEX & ACAAP	132	1.7%	4.1%	6.2%	42.3%
BEX & BBAILBOND	125	1.7%	3.8%	5.8%	40.1%
Other Combinations	47	0.6%	1.4%	2.2%	15.1%
CCJA & ACAAP	8	0.1%	0.2%	0.4%	2.6%
Total Eligible for 2 or more ATD Programs	312	4.1%	9.6%	14.6%	100.0%
TOTAL ADMITS ELIGIBLE FOR ATD PROGRAMS ONLY	2143	28.4%	65.9%	100.0%	
ELIGIBLE FOR ATI PROGRAMS ONLY *					
Eligible for only 1 ATI Program:					
ISP	289	3.8%	8.9%	61.6%	77.3%
TASC	32	0.4%	1.0%	6.8%	8.6%
CSSP	48	0.6%	1.5%	10.2%	12.8%
CEP	5	<.1%	0.2%	1.1%	1.3%
Total Eligible for only 1 ATI Program	374	4.9%	11.5%	79.7%	100.0%
Eligible for 2 or More ATI Programs:					
CEP & ISP	56	0.7%	1.7%	11.9%	58.9%
ISP & TASC	14	0.2%	0.4%	3.0%	14.7%
CSSP & TASC	24	0.3%	0.7%	5.1%	25.3%
Other Combinations	1	<.1%	<.1%	0.2%	1.1%
Total Eligible for 2 or More ATI Programs	95	1.3%	2.9%	20.3%	100.0%
TOTAL ADMITS ELIGIBLE FOR ATI PROGRAMS ONLY	469	6.2%	14.4%	100.0%	
ELIGIBLE FOR ATD & ATI PROGRAMS SIMULTANEOUSLY					
Eligible for 1 ATD and 1 ATI:					
CEP & CCJA	50	0.7%	1.5%	7.8%	17.7%
ACAAP & ISP	76	1.0%	2.3%	11.9%	26.9%
BEX & ISP	82	1.1%	2.5%	12.8%	29.0%
BEX & CSSP	50	0.7%	1.5%	7.8%	17.7%
Other Combinations	25	0.3%	0.8%	3.9%	8.8%
Total Eligible for 1 ATD and 1 ATI Program	283	3.7%	8.7%	44.3%	100.0%
Eligible for 1 ATD & 2 or more ATIs:					
CCJA & OTHERS	12	0.2%	0.4%	1.9%	13.5%
CCJA & CEP & ISP	29	0.4%	0.9%	4.5%	32.6%
ACAAP & CEP & ISP	10	0.1%	0.3%	1.6%	11.2%
BEX & CSSP & TASC	17	0.2%	0.5%	2.7%	19.1%
BEX & CEP & ISP	17	0.2%	0.5%	2.7%	19.1%
BEX & ISP & TASC	2	<.1%	<.1%	0.3%	2.2%
ACAAP & ISP & TASC	1	<.1%	<.1%	0.2%	1.1%
Other Combinations	1	<.1%	<.1%	0.2%	1.1%
Total Eligible for 1 ATD & 2 or more ATI Programs	89	1.2%	2.7%	13.9%	100.0%
Eligible for 2 or more ATDs & 1 ATI:					
Eligible for 2 ATDs & 1 ATI:					
BEX & ACAAP & ISP	34	0.4%	1.0%	5.3%	21.7%
CCJA & ACAAP & ISP	31	0.4%	1.0%	4.9%	19.7%
BEX & BBAILBOND & CSSP	17	0.2%	0.5%	2.7%	10.8%
BEX & ACAAP & TASC	1	<.1%	<.1%	0.2%	0.6%
BEX & Other Combinations	19	0.3%	0.6%	3.0%	12.1%
CCJA & ACAAP & ISP	5	<.1%	0.2%	0.8%	3.2%
Other Combinations	6	<.1%	0.2%	0.9%	3.8%
Subtotal Eligible for 2 ATDs & 1 ATI Program	113	1.5%	3.5%	17.7%	72.0%
Eligible for 3 ATDs & 1 ATI:					
BEX & ACAAP & CCJA & CEP	10	0.1%	0.3%	1.6%	6.4%
Three Other ATDs & 1 ATI	34	0.4%	1.0%	5.3%	21.7%
Subtotal Eligible for 3 ATDs & 1 ATI Program	44	0.6%	1.4%	6.9%	28.0%
Total Eligible for 2 or more ATDs & 1 ATI Program	157	2.1%	4.8%	24.8%	100.0%
Eligible for 2 or 3 ATDs & 2 or more ATIs:					
CCJA & ACAAP & CEP & ISP	48	0.6%	1.5%	7.5%	43.6%
BEX & CCJA & ACAAP & CEP & ISP	11	0.1%	0.3%	1.7%	10.0%
Other Combinations	25	0.3%	0.8%	3.9%	22.7%
Subtotal Eligible for 2 or 3 ATDs & 2 or more ATI Programs	84	1.1%	2.6%	13.1%	76.4%
Subtotal Eligible for 4 ATDs & 1 or more ATIs	26	0.3%	0.8%	4.1%	23.6%
Total Eligible for 2 or more ATDs & 2 or more ATI Programs	110	1.5%	3.4%	17.2%	100.0%
TOTAL ADMITS ELIGIBLE FOR ATDs AND ATIs SIMULTANEOUSLY	639	8.5%	19.7%	100.0%	

* Programs categorized elsewhere as "ATD/I" Programs, are collapsed with "ATI" Programs here, for ease of presentation.

ELIGIBLE POOL ANALYSIS

Appendix A

APPENDIX A

VARIABLE DEVELOPMENT

Responses to the program eligibility questionnaires, developed early in the JPMC research effort and distributed to the various alternative programs, provided information about individual and case characteristics that determine program eligibility. These characteristics were then transformed into a core set of variables corresponding to data available in the CJA/DOC data set. In addition, the CJA/DOC data were used to create composite variables (describing each admit in terms of all the cases currently pending against that admit).

The following defendant descriptors from the CJA interview data correspond to eligibility criteria used by various programs:

- borough of arraignment;
- current age;
- current employment status;
- total prior misdemeanor convictions;
- total prior felony convictions;
- whether this is the first arrest;
- zip code of the current address (used to indicate whether defendant is a New York City resident)

Additional descriptors from the CJA court information were also used to define the "sample case".¹ These were specific to the Criminal Court or the Supreme Court:

- top charge at arraignment (and its severity and type);
- arraignment release status (whether detained immediately after arraignment);
- arraignment bail and bond amounts;
- disposition type;
- disposition date;
- final disposition charge (and its severity and type);
- length of sentence, if custodial sentence imposed.
- type of lawyer (18B or not), for the Supreme Court cases.

DOC admit and discharge dates were used to determine detention status at various points in the court process.

Additional variables were constructed to reflect other cases pending against an admit. In combination with the sample case information, these descriptors allowed the target case and accompanying cases to be represented as a whole. The "other pending case" variables, which focused on the ultimate disposition of those cases, were:

- whether the disposition charge was an A-I, A-II, B violent, or a C violent felony;
- whether the disposition charge led to a violent felony, non-violent felony, or misdemeanor custodial sentence or to a non-custodial sentence;
- whether the defendant was YO- or probation-eligible at disposition of that case.

¹ For admits who had more than one case pending at the time of admission to DOC, it was necessary to specify one case as the "sample case" — the one for which the admit's eligibility would be assessed. This was done through the following decision rule: If there was a court case with an arrest date within seven days of the admission date, select it as the sample case; if there were more than one within seven days, use the one with the arrest date closest to the admission date; if there were no cases with arrest dates within seven days of the admission date, select the most serious case, based on arraignment charge.

Finally, because the routinely available data elements in the CJA/DOC data set were not sufficient to cover all program eligibility criteria, more detailed information was required to mimic some criteria. Data were sought for each admit from the DCJS TRENDS data set.² The additional information focused on charge and sentencing in prior arrests and convictions. From these data, the following descriptors were developed:

- total prior arrests, and date of last prior arrest;
- total prior "DWI" convictions.
- whether last conviction resulted in a jail or prison sentence and the date of that conviction;
- totals of prior A, B, or C drug felony convictions, and the date of the last conviction in each category;
- total of prior violent felony offense convictions, and the date of the last such conviction;
- totals of prior probation sentences, jail sentences, and prison sentences.

² Almost a third of the admits were found to have more detailed prior record information on this data set.

ELIGIBLE POOL ANALYSIS

Appendix B

APPENDIX B
DESCRIPTORS USED IN DETERMINING EACH PROGRAM'S ELIGIBLE POOLS

Each program is described briefly below, and its eligibility criteria are presented under three headings: (1) general criteria (matching the data elements available in the DOC/CJA data set), (2) pending case descriptors, and (3) additional prior history criteria. The specific variables used to determine admits' eligibility for each program are given in narrative form, rather than in the form used in the computer program.

ACAAP: The Osborne Association's Assigned Counsel Alternatives Advocacy Program (ACAAP) develops bail memoranda, sentencing plans, and other written products for 18B lawyers, to assist their advocacy of bail reduction and alternative sentences. Defendants can be either in pretrial detention or at liberty, at time of program intake. ACAAP aims to displace custodial sentences of 90 days or more.

GENERAL CRITERIA: The case is assigned to an 18B lawyer in Queens, Manhattan, or the Bronx; the defendant is aged 14 or older; and the defendant has either been in pretrial detention for 14 days or longer (ATD clients) or has made bail or was ROR'd (ATI clients). Cases disposed as B misdemeanors are not eligible.

PENDING CASE CRITERIA: N/A

ADDITIONAL PRIOR RECORD CRITERIA: N/A

For the Osborne Association's ACAAP, the "Maximum Eligible Pool" is determined by the general criteria above, while the criteria for determining the "Perfectly Targeted Eligible Pool" adds: case resulted in a custodial sentence of 90 days or longer.

ATR: The Osborne Association's Alternatives to Reincarceration (ATR) program provides various services to persons who are in DOC custody because of technical parole violation charges, to prevent the necessity of their return to state custody.

GENERAL CRITERIA: The only current case is a parole violation, and the case is assigned to an 18B lawyer.

PENDING CASE CRITERIA: N/A

ADDITIONAL PRIOR RECORD CRITERIA: N/A

For Osborne's ATR program, the "Maximum Eligible Pool" and the "Perfectly Targeted Eligible Pool" are determined by the same criteria.

BAILBOND BRONX: The Vera Institute's Bronx Bailbond Supervision Program posts bailbonds for defendants in DOC custody who are likely to be staying in pretrial detention for long periods of time, and supervises them in the community using short-term residential facilities, in-house counseling, referral services, intensive field supervision, and enforcement staff to return to custody those who violate individualized conditions of their bonds.

GENERAL CRITERIA: Arraignment borough is the Bronx; more than 9 days already spent in pretrial detention; the defendant (if indicted) is not a predicate felon; the bond amount at criminal court arraignment is less than \$7,500.00; and the current DOC admission is not for a parole violation or violation of probation. In addition the arraignment charge on the current case must have been one of the following:

For cases proceeding in the Supreme Court:

- assault — second degree
- burglary — first, second and third degree, or attempted third
- grand larceny — third and fourth degree
- robbery — second and third degree, or attempted second
- possession of controlled substance — third degree, or attempted fourth
- sale of controlled substance — third degree
- possession of a weapon — second or third degree

For cases proceeding in the Criminal Court:

- vehicular assault — first degree
- sodomy — attempted first degree
- kidnapping — second degree
- arson — second degree
- grand larceny — attempted second degree
- promoting prison contraband — first degree

For cases proceeding in either court:

- reckless endangerment — first degree
- burglary — attempted second degree
- robbery — attempted first degree
- possession of stolen property — third degree
- possession of controlled substance — fourth degree

PENDING CASE CRITERIA: N/A

ADDITIONAL PRIOR RECORD CRITERIA: N/A

For Bronx Bailbond, the "Maximum Eligible Pool" and the "Perfectly Targeted Eligible Pool" are determined by the same criteria.

BEX: The Criminal Justice Agency's Bail Expediting Program (BEX) program helps defendants post bail before leaving the court after arraignment. The bail expediting effort takes place only between arraignment and transfer to DOC (if BEX cannot effect release).

GENERAL CRITERIA: Bronx or Queens Criminal Court arraignment bail or bond is set, and is less than \$2,500; the defendant has not made bail; and the arraignment charge is not for prostitution.

PENDING CASE CRITERIA: N/A

ADDITIONAL PRIOR RECORD CRITERIA: N/A

For the BEX program, the "Maximum Eligible Pool" and the "Perfectly Targeted Eligible Pool" are determined by the same criteria.

CCJA: Consultants for Criminal Justice Advocacy (CCJA) develops bail memoranda, sentencing plans, and other written products for 18B lawyers, to assist their advocacy of bail reduction and alternative sentences. Defendants can be either in pretrial detention or at liberty, at time of program intake. CCJA aims to displace custodial sentences of more than a year.

GENERAL CRITERIA: Case has been assigned to an 18B lawyer in any borough except Staten Island; defendant is not a predicate felon; defendant is 16 years of age or older; current DOC admission is not for a parole violation or violation of probation; and defendant has less than two prior convictions (misdemeanors and felonies combined).

PENDING CASE CRITERIA: The defendant has no current pending charge for a Violent Felony Offense, on which the prosecution is demanding a custodial sentence.

ADDITIONAL PRIOR RECORD CRITERIA: The defendant has no more than 4 prior custodial or probation sentences, and no more than 2 prior convictions for Violent Felony Offenses.

For CCJA, the "Maximum Eligible Pool" is determined by the general criteria above, while the criteria for determining the "Perfectly Targeted Eligible Pool" adds: case resulted in a custodial sentence of more than 365 days.

COMMUNITY SERVICE SENTENCING: The Community Service Sentencing Project (CSSP), now administered by CASES, provides a short (70 hour) sentence of supervised, unpaid labor on community sites as an alternative to misdemeanor jail sentences. CSSP aims to displace jail sentences of up to 90 days. Eligibility criteria are specific to each borough in which CSSP operates, as they were drawn from research to predict jail sentences; that research revealed borough-specific differences in sentencing patterns.

CSSP - QUEENS

GENERAL CRITERIA: Arrest was in Queens; charge is for misdemeanor; not a first arrest; more than one prior conviction (misdemeanors and felonies combined); defendant in detention at Criminal Court disposition; and the disposition must not be conviction for 730 CPL.

PENDING CASE CRITERIA: The defendant has no current pending charges for Violent Felony Offenses.

ADDITIONAL PRIOR RECORD CRITERIA: Fewer than 50 prior arrests; no more than 2 prior A, B or C Drug felonies in the last 10 years; no prior Violent Felony Offense convictions within the last year.

CSSP - BRONX

GENERAL CRITERIA: Arrest was in the Bronx; charge is for misdemeanor; not a first arrest; more than four prior convictions (misdemeanor and felonies combined); defendant in detention at Criminal Court disposition; and the disposition must not be conviction for 730 CPL.

PENDING CASE CRITERIA: The defendant has no current pending charges for Violent Felony Offenses.

ADDITIONAL PRIOR RECORD CRITERIA: Fewer than 50 prior arrests; no more than 2 prior A, B or C Drug felony convictions in the last 10 years; no prior Violent Felony Offense convictions within the last year; no more than 13 arrests in the past 5 years; and defendant's last arrest was not within the 60 days preceding this arrest. In addition, two of the following three conditions must be met:

- 1 Last conviction led to jail or prison sentence.
- 2 At least four prior convictions (misdemeanors and felonies combined).
- 3 At least eight prior arrests.

CSSP - BROOKLYN

GENERAL CRITERIA: Arrest was in Brooklyn; charge is for misdemeanor; not a first arrest; more than four prior convictions (misdemeanor and felonies combined); defendant in detention at Criminal Court disposition; and the disposition must not be conviction for 730 CPL.

PENDING CASE CRITERIA: The defendant has no current pending charges of Violent Felony Offenses, and no pending felony charges for which the prosecution is demanding a custodial sentence.

ADDITIONAL PRIOR RECORD CRITERIA: Fewer than 50 prior arrests; no more than 2 prior A, B or C Drug felony convictions in the last 10 years; no prior Violent Felony Offense convictions within the last year; no more than 13 arrests in the past 5 years; and defendant's last arrest was not within the 60 days preceding this arrest. In addition, two of the following three conditions must be met:

- 1 Last conviction led to jail or prison sentence.
- 2 Last conviction was within the past eighteen months.
- 3 At least six prior arrests.

CSSP - MANHATTAN

GENERAL CRITERIA: Arrest was in Manhattan; charge is for misdemeanor; not a first arrest; more than four prior convictions (misdemeanor and felonies combined); defendant in detention at Criminal Court disposition; and the disposition must not be conviction for 730 CPL.

PENDING CASE CRITERIA: The defendant has no current pending charges for Violent Felony Offenses, and no pending felony charges for which the prosecution is demanding a custodial sentence.

ADDITIONAL PRIOR RECORD CRITERIA: Fewer than 50 prior arrests; no more than 2 prior A, B or C Drug felonies in the last 10 years; no prior Violent Felony Offense convictions within the last year; no more than 13 arrests in the past 5 years; and defendant's last arrest was not within the 60 days preceding this arrest. In addition, two of the following three conditions must be met:

- 1 Last conviction led to jail or prison sentence;
- 2 Last conviction date within the past thirteen months;
- 3 At least thirteen prior arrests.

For all CSSP programs the "Maximum Eligible Pool" and the "Perfectly Targeted Eligible Pool" are determined by the same criteria.

COURT EMPLOYMENT PROJECT: The Court Employment Project (CEP), administered by CASES, provides on-site supervision, counselling, and educational and vocational training to defendants and offenders, primarily those sixteen to twenty-one years old, believed to be facing at least six months of actual jail sentenced time to be served (minus good time and time spent in pretrial detention).

CEP - DAILY SUPERVISION (This program aims to displace custodial sentences of six months or more.)

GENERAL CRITERIA: Defendant is not a predicate felon; defendant is more than 14 years old; residence is in New York City; charge is a felony (other than a DWI charge) proceeding in Supreme Court; defendant has no more than 4 prior misdemeanor convictions; defendant is either probation-eligible or, if facing any A-I felony charge, A felony arson charge, or A felony sex offense charge, defendant is YO-eligible. In addition, one of the following criteria must be met:

- 1 Defendant is between 16 and 21 and is currently employed or in school;
- 2 Defendant is between 16 and 21 and faces a custodial sentence of less than one year;
- 3 Defendant is younger than 16 or older than 21.

PENDING CASE CRITERIA: Defendant has no current pending felony charges for which the prosecution is demanding a custodial sentence.

ADDITIONAL PRIOR RECORD CRITERIA: The defendant has no more than 4 prior custodial sentences, and no more than 2 prior prison or probation sentences.

For CEP's Daily Supervision program, the "Maximum Eligible Pool" is determined by the general criteria above, while the criteria for determining the "Perfectly Targeted Eligible Pool" adds: case resulted in a custodial sentence with at least 180 days remaining to be served.

CEP - WORKING SOLUTIONS (This program aims to displace custodial sentences of a year or more.)

GENERAL CRITERIA: Defendant is not a predicate felon; defendant is in pretrial detention after Supreme Court arraignment; defendant is between 16 and 21 years old; residence is in New York City; charge is a felony (other than DWI) proceeding in Supreme Court; defendant has no more than 4 prior misdemeanor convictions; defendant is currently neither in school nor employed; defendant is either probation-eligible or, if facing any A-I felony charge, A felony arson charge, or A felony sex offense charge, defendant is YO-eligible. In addition, one of the following criteria must be met:

- 1 Defendant is less than 19, YO-eligible, and facing sentence on an A felony conviction;
- 2 Defendant is between 19 and 21 years old, and is in pretrial detention;
- 3 Defendant is younger than 19, is not YO-eligible, and has been ROR'd or made bail.

PENDING CASE CRITERIA: Defendant has no current pending felony charges for which the prosecution is demanding a custodial sentence.

ADDITIONAL PRIOR RECORD CRITERIA: Defendant has no more than 4 prior custodial sentences and no more than 2 prior prison or probation sentences.

For CEP's Working Solutions program, the "Maximum Eligible Pool" is determined by the general criteria above, while the criteria for determining the "Perfectly Targeted Eligible Pool" adds: the case resulted in a custodial sentence for which the offender has at least 365 days remaining to be served.

ISP: Intensive Supervision Probation (ISP) is a sentence that begins with bi-weekly face-to-face contacts and two additional collateral contacts, for defendants believed to be facing a custodial sentence. ISP aims to displace custodial sentences of any duration.

GENERAL CRITERIA: Disposition in Supreme Court; offender is probation eligible (not a predicate felon).

PENDING CASE CRITERIA: N/A

ADDITIONAL PRIOR RECORD CRITERIA: N/A

For ISP, the "Maximum Eligible Pool" is determined by the GENERAL CRITERIA criteria above, while the criteria for determining the "Perfectly Targeted Eligible Pool" adds: case resulted in a custodial sentence of 1 day or more.

TASC: TASC (Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime) provides drug treatment referral and a monitoring service for drug-abusing defendants believed to be facing a custodial sentence. TASC aims to displace custodial sentences of 60 days or longer.

GENERAL CRITERIA: Defendant arrested in Queens or Staten Island; aged 16 or older; current charge is not an A-I, A-II, B or C violent felony; defendant has no more than 3 prior convictions (misdemeanors and felonies combined).

PENDING CASE CRITERIA: The defendant has no current pending charges for Violent Felony Offenses.

ADDITIONAL PRIOR RECORD CRITERIA: If the current charge is a DWI offense, it is not the first DWI offense .

For TASC, the "Maximum Eligible Pool" is determined by the general criteria above, while the criteria for determining the "Perfectly Targeted Eligible Pool" adds: case resulted in a custodial sentence of 60 days or longer.

ELIGIBLE POOL ANALYSIS

Appendix C

Table C-1
Summary Distribution of Eligibility Data, by Program
 (Actual Numbers from the Cohort, not Annualized)

	ACAAP		ATR		Bronx		Queens		BBALLBOND		CCJA		CEP	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Admits for Whom Court and Borough Eligibility Data is Known:														
Admits from Court or Borough Where Program does not Operate	4,931	65.3	7,379	98.8	5,763	79.0	5,972	81.9	5,763	79.0	3,860	51.6	3,860	51.6
• Court and Borough are Appropriate for Program Eligibility	<u>2,624</u>	<u>34.7</u>	<u>93</u>	<u>1.2</u>	<u>1,530</u>	<u>21.0</u>	<u>1,321</u>	<u>18.1</u>	<u>1,530</u>	<u>21.0</u>	<u>3,623</u>	<u>48.4</u>	<u>3,623</u>	<u>48.4</u>
Total	7,555	100.0	7,472	100.0	7,293	100.0	7,293	100.0	7,293	100.0	7,483	100.0	7,483	100.0
For Admits Known to be from Court and Borough Where Program Operates:														
All Other Eligibility Data Are Known	906	34.5	66	71.0	1,319	86.2	1,119	84.7	1,027	67.1	741	20.5	813	22.4
** Some Eligibility Data Are Missing	<u>1,718</u>	<u>65.5</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>29.0</u>	<u>211</u>	<u>13.8</u>	<u>202</u>	<u>15.3</u>	<u>503</u>	<u>32.9</u>	<u>2,882</u>	<u>79.5</u>	<u>2,810</u>	<u>77.6</u>
Total	2,624	100.0	93	100.0	1,530	100.0	1,321	100.0	1,530	100.0	3,623	100.0	3,623	100.0
Admits for Whom Court and Borough Eligibility Data is Known														
Admits from Court or Borough where Program does not Operate	6,720	88.9	6,787	89.8	6,151	81.4	6,911	91.5	3,860	51.6	5,434	74.5	5,972	81.9
• Court and Borough are Appropriate for Program Eligibility	<u>835</u>	<u>11.1</u>	<u>768</u>	<u>10.2</u>	<u>1,404</u>	<u>18.6</u>	<u>644</u>	<u>8.5</u>	<u>3,623</u>	<u>48.4</u>	<u>1,859</u>	<u>25.5</u>	<u>1,321</u>	<u>18.1</u>
Total	7,555	100.0	7,555	100.0	7,555	100.0	7,555	100.0	7,483	100.0	7,293	100.0	7,293	100.0
For Admits Known to be from Court and Borough Where Program Operates:														
All Other Eligibility Data Are Known	45	5.4	11	1.4	100	7.1	81	12.6	1,597	44.1	577	31.0	432	32.7
** Some Eligibility Data Are Missing	<u>790</u>	<u>94.6</u>	<u>757</u>	<u>98.6</u>	<u>1,304</u>	<u>92.9</u>	<u>563</u>	<u>87.4</u>	<u>2,026</u>	<u>55.9</u>	<u>1,282</u>	<u>69.0</u>	<u>889</u>	<u>67.3</u>
Total	835	100.0	768	100.0	1,404	100.0	644	100.0	3,623	100.0	1,859	100.0	1,321	100.0

* The total number of admits in the detainee cohort is 7,881. The first step in estimating the size of the pool of individuals in DOC custody who are eligible for a given program is to determine which admits came to DOC from a borough where the program operates, and are available for intake from a court (Criminal or Supreme) where the program operates. Some programs are court-specific (e.g., Osborne's ACAAP, which limits intake to cases in the Supreme Court), some are borough-specific (e.g., BEX, which operates in the Bronx), and some defined by borough and by court (e.g., Manhattan CSSP, which operates only in the Criminal Court in Manhattan). The court of disposition was unknown in 398 (5%) of the 7,881 admits in our cohort; for 588 (7.5%) of the admits, the database was missing the borough in which the admit was being prosecuted, and the number of admits for whom both court and borough data were missing was 326 (4% of the cohort).

** The second step in estimating the size is to determine, from among those who are in an appropriate court and borough, the number who are ineligible by reason of other formal criteria. For the most part, these criteria reference prior record data — data available to this research only from the DCJS TRENDS database. For reasons described in the text, that database provides no prior record information for two-thirds of the cohort.

Table C-2
Distribution of Eligibility in the Detained Cohort, and Distribution of Eligibles' Jail Use, By Program

	ACAAP		Maximum Pools - Admits Meeting Screening Criteria, Whether or Not Disposition Fits Program Objective												
	Admits		Jail Days		Pattern of Dispositions, for Admits Whose Dispositions are Known								Dismissal		
	Annual N	Discounted* Annual N	Annual N	Discounted* Annual N	Total Known** Dispositions	Mandatory Prison N	%	Non-Mandatory Prison N	%	Jail Sentence N	%	Prob'n/ Discharge/ Fine N	%	Dismissal N	%
Admits from Appropriate Court & Borough	31,488	100.0													
"ABSOLUTE" POOL (All Other Data Known)	8,376	60.2													
"Absolute" ineligible	5,532	39.8													
"Absolute" Eligibles	13,908	100.0													
Total in the "Absolute" Pool	6,993														
"ABSOLUTE" ELIGIBLES, by Type of Jail Days Used															
ATD-only	2,052	37.2	1,765		1,980	612	30.9	216	10.9	732	37.0	336	17.0	84	4.2
ATD/	3,468	62.8	2,982		3,372	1,920	56.9	468	13.9	812	27.0	24	0.7	48	1.4
Type of Jail Days Used Unknown	5,520	100.0	4,747		5,352	2,532	47.3	684	12.8	1,644	30.7	360	6.7	132	2.5
TOTAL for "ABSOLUTE" ELIGIBLES	12		10												
Missing Data on Type AND Number of Jail Days	5,532		4,758												
Total in "Absolute" Pool															

* "Discounted" Numbers are the number Eligible (whether "Absolute" or "Estimated"), discounted by the program's "Screening Ratio" -- a rough measure of the rate at which screened "eligibles" are actually taken into the program. (86.00%)

** "Total Known Dispositions" may be less than "Total Admits" in a category, because some admits lack dispositional data. The pattern of dispositions is displayed for known dispositions only.

DERIVATION OF THE ESTIMATED POOL:

Of the 31,488 admits from the appropriate court and borough, all the data required to determine program eligibility were available for 13,908. Of these, 39.78% (or 5,532) were found eligible. To estimate the number likely to be found eligible if all the necessary data were available (as it would be to program screeners), it was assumed that the missing eligibility data (primarily prior criminal history records) would make 39.78% of the remainder eligible as well. An "estimated eligible pool" is created by adding these 6,993 "estimated eligibles" to the "absolute eligibles."

ESTIMATED ELIGIBLE POOL: 12,525
 DISCOUNTED ELIGIBLES: 10,772
 *** ESTIMATED ELIGIBLES' JAIL USE: 1,331,408 Jail Days (3,648 calls per year)
 DISCOUNTED: 1,145,064 Jail Days (3,137 calls per year)

*** (Mean Jail Days Used per Absolute Eligible x Number of Estimated Eligibles)

Table C-2
Distribution of Eligibility in the Detained Cohort, and Distribution of Eligibles' Jail Use, By Program

Admits From Appropriate Court & Borough	ACAAP Perfect Target Pools - Admits Meeting Screening Criteria, Whose Dispositions Fit the Program's Displacement Objective																
	Admits			Jail Days			Pattern of Dispositions, for Admits Whose Dispositions are Known										
	Annual N	%	Discounted* Annual N	Annual N	%	Discounted* Annual N	Total Known** Dispositions	Mandatory Prison N	%	Non-Mandatory Prison N	%	Jail Sentence N	%	Prob'n/ Discharge/ Fine N	%	Dismissed N	%
*ABSOLUTE POOL (All Other Data Known)	31,488	100.0															
*Absolute Ineligibles	9,300	71.0	3,261														
*Absolute Eligibles	3,792	29.0															
Total in the "Absolute" Pool	13,092	100.0															
ABSOLUTE ELIGIBLES, by Type of Jail Days Used																	
ATD-only	1,296	34.3	1,115	52,886	13.6	45,401	1,296	612	47.2	216	16.7	468	36.1				
ATD/I	2,484	65.7	2,136	336,420	86.4	289,321	2,472	1,920	77.7	468	18.9	84	3.4				
Type of Jail Days Used Unknown	3,780	100.0	3,251	389,316	100.0	334,812	3,768	2,532	67.2	684	18.2	552	14.6				
TOTAL for *ABSOLUTE* ELIGIBLES	12		10														
Missing Data on Type AND Number of Jail Days	3,792		3,261														
Total in "Absolute" Pool																	

* "Discounted" Numbers are the number Eligible (whether "Absolute" or "Estimated"), discounted by the program's "Screening Ratio" -- a rough measure of the rate at which screened "eligibles" are actually taken into the program. (85.00%)

** "Total Known Dispositions" may be less than "Total Admits", in a category, because some admits lack dispositional data. The pattern of dispositions is displayed for known dispositions only.

DERIVATION OF THE ESTIMATED POOL:

Of the 31,488 admits from the appropriate court and borough, all the data required to determine program eligibility were available for 13,092. Of these, 28.96% (or 3,792) were found eligible. To estimate the number likely to be found eligible if all the necessary data were available (as it would be to program screeners), it was assumed that the missing eligibility data (primarily prior criminal history records) would make 28.96% of the remainder eligible as well. An "estimated eligible pool" is created by adding these 5,327 "estimated eligibles" to the "absolute eligibles."

ESTIMATED ELIGIBLE POOL: 9,119 *** ESTIMATED ELIGIBLES' JAIL USE: 839,257 Jail Days (2,573 cells per year)
 DISCOUNTED ELIGIBLES: 7,842 DISCOUNTED: 807,726 Jail Days (2,213 cells per year)

*** (Mean Jail Days Used per Absolute Eligible x Number of Estimated Eligibles)

Table C-2
Distribution of Eligibility in the Detained Cohort, and Distribution of Eligibles' Jail Use, By Program

Admits From Appropriate Court & Borough	Admits		Jail Days		Pattern of Dispositions, for Admits Whose Dispositions are Known							
	Annual N	Discouraged* % Annual N	Annual N	Discouraged* % Annual N	Total Known** Dispositions	Mandatory Prison N	Non-Mandatory Prison %	Jail Sentence N	Prob'n/Discharge/Fine %	Dismissal N	%	
"ABSOLUTE" POOL (All Other Data Known)	1,116	100.0										
"Absolute" Ineligibles	420	53.0										
"Absolute" Eligibles	372	47.0										
Total In the "Absolute" Pool	792	100.0										
"ABSOLUTE" ELIGIBLES, by Type of Jail Days Used												
ATD-only	360	100.0	29,520	100.0	348	204	58.6	48	13.8	96	27.6	
ATD/I												
Type of Jail Days Used Unknown	360	100.0	29,520	100.0	348	204	58.6	48	13.8	96	27.6	
TOTAL for "ABSOLUTE" ELIGIBLES	12											
Missing Data on Type AND Number of Jail Days	372											
Total In "Absolute" Pool	272											

Discouraged Numbers are the number Eligible (whether "Absolute" or "Estimated"), discounted by the program's "Screening Ratio" -- a rough measure of the rate at which screened "eligibles" are actually taken into the program. (73.00%)

**Total Known Dispositions* may be less than "Total Admits". In a category, because some admits lack dispositional data. The pattern of dispositions is displayed for known dispositions only.

DERIVATION OF THE ESTIMATED POOL:

Of the 1,116 admits from the appropriate court and borough, all the data required to determine program eligibility were available for 792. Of these, 46.97% (or 372) were found eligible. To estimate the number likely to be found eligible if all the necessary data were available (as it would be to program screeners), it was assumed that the missing eligibility data (primarily prior criminal history records) would make 46.97% of the remainder eligible as well. An "estimated eligible pool" is created by adding these 152 "estimated eligibles" to the "absolute eligibles."

ESTIMATED ELIGIBLE POOL: 524
 DISCOUNTED ELIGIBLES: 383
 *** ESTIMATED ELIGIBLES' JAIL USE: 42,968 Jail Days (118 calls per year)
 DISCOUNTED: 31,406 Jail Days (86 calls per year)

*** (Mean Jail Days Used per Absolute Eligible x Number of Estimated Eligibles)

Table C-2
Distribution of Eligibility in the Detained Cohort, and Distribution of Eligibles' Jail Use, By Program

Admits From Appropriate Court & Borough	BBAILBOND Both Pools - All Admits Meeting Screening Criteria (Program Has No Stated Objective of Disposition to Displace)																
	Admits			Jail Days			Pattern of Dispositions, for Admits Whose Dispositions are Known										
	Annual N	% Annual N	Discouraged* Annual N	Annual N	% Annual N	Discouraged* Annual N	Total Known** Dispositions	Mandatory Prison N	%	Non-Mandatory Prison N	%	Jail Sentence N	%	Prob'n/Direct/Or Fine N	%	Diamond N	%
ABSOLUTE POOL (All Other Data Known)	10,116	82.1	66														
Absolute Ineligibles	2,208	17.9															
Absolute Eligibles	12,324	100.0															
Total In the "Absolute" Pool			66														
ABSOLUTE ELIGIBLES, by Type of Jail Days Used																	
ATD-only	876	39.7	26	34,856	15.7	1,049	768	60	7.8			372	48.4	108	14.1	228	29.7
ATI-only	1,332	60.3	40	187,212	84.3	5,616	1,224	120	9.8	120	9.8	912	74.5	12		60	4.9
ATI/II																	
Type of Jail Days Used Unknown	2,208	100.0	66	222,168	100.0	6,665	1,992	180	9.0	120	6.0	1,284	64.5	120	6.0	288	14.5
Missing Data on Type AND Number of Jail Days																	
Total In "Absolute" Pool	2,208		66														

Discouraged Numbers are the number Eligible (whether "Absolute" or "Estimated"), discounted by the program's "Screening Ratio" - a rough measure of the rate at which screened "eligibles" are actually taken into this program. (3.00%)

**Total Known Dispositions* may be less than "Total Admits", in a category, because some admits lack dispositional data. The pattern of dispositions is displayed for known dispositions only.

DERIVATION OF THE ESTIMATED POOL:

Of the 18,360 admits from the appropriate court and borough, all the data required to determine program eligibility were available for 12,324. Of these, 17.92% (or 2,208) were found eligible. To estimate the number likely to be found eligible if all the necessary data were available (as it would be to program screeners), it was assumed that the missing eligibility data (primarily prior criminal history records) would make 17.92% of the remainder eligible as well. An "estimated eligible pool" is created by adding these 1,082 "estimated eligibles" to the "absolute eligibles."

ESTIMATED ELIGIBLE POOL: 3,290 ** ESTIMATED ELIGIBLES' JAIL USE: 330,974 Jail Days (907 cells per year)
 DISCOUNTED ELIGIBLES: 99 DISCOUNTED: 9,959 Jail Days (27 cells per year)

*** (Mean Jail Days Used per Absolute Eligible x Number of Estimated Eligibles)

Table C-2
**Distribution of Eligibility in the Detained Cohort, and Distribution of Eligibles' Jail Use,
 By Program**

BEX : BRONX Both Pools - All Admits Meeting Screening Criteria (Program Has No Stated Objective of Disposition to Displace)

	Admits		Jail Days		Total Known** Dispositions	Pattern of Dispositions, for Admits Whose Dispositions are Known									
	Annual N	% Annual N	Annual N	% Annual N		Mandatory Prison N	%	Non-Mandatory Prison N	%	Jail Sentence N	%	Prob'n / Discharge / Fine N	%	Dismissal N	%
Admits from Appropriate Court & Borough	18,360	100.0													
ABSOLUTE POOL (All Other Data Known)	3,408	21.5													
Absolute Ineligibles	12,420	78.5													
Absolute Eligibles	15,828	100.0													
Total in the *Absolute* Pool															
ABSOLUTE ELIGIBLES, by Type of Jail Days Used															
ATD-only	7,152	68.7	7,152	15.8	6,276	372	5.9	120	1.9	1,832	28.9	1,680	26.8	2,292	36.5
AT-Only	564	4.7	564	7.9	480	252	52.5	48	10.0	144	30.0	24	5.0	12	2.5
AT/DI	3,024	25.3	3,024	64.8	2,820	564	20.0	96	3.4	1,836	65.1	48	1.7	276	9.8
Type of Jail Days Used Unknown	1,236	10.3	1,236	11.5	516					24	4.7			492	95.3
TOTAL for *ABSOLUTE* ELIGIBLES	11,976	100.0	11,976	100.0	10,092	1,188	11.8	264	2.6	3,816	37.8	1,752	17.4	3,072	30.4
Missing Data on Type AND Number of Jail Days	444		444												
Total in *Absolute* Pool	12,420		12,420												

** "Discounted" Numbers are the number Eligible (whether "Absolute" or "Estimated"), discounted by the program's "Screening Ratio" - a rough measure of the rate at which screened "eligibles" are actually taken into a program. For BEX : BRONX it was not possible to generate a screening ratio, because the program does not routinely generate a pool of "formally eligible" defendants, the number of whom would be the denominator of the screening ratio.

** "Total Known Dispositions" may be less than "Total Admits", in a category, because some admits lack dispositional data. The pattern of dispositions is displayed for known dispositions only.

DERIVATION OF THE ESTIMATED POOL:

Of the 18,360 admits from the appropriate court and borough, all the data required to determine program eligibility were available for 15,828. Of these, 78.47% (or 12,420) were found eligible. To estimate the number likely to be found eligible if all the necessary data were available (as it would be to program screeners), it was assumed that the missing eligibility data (primarily prior criminal history records) would make 78.47% of the remainder eligible as well. An "estimated eligible pool" is created by adding these 1,987 "estimated eligibles" to the "absolute eligibles."

ESTIMATED ELIGIBLE POOL: 14,407 * ESTIMATED ELIGIBLES' JAIL USE: 598,450 Jail Days (1,634 cells per year)**

*** (Moon Jail Days Used per Absolute Eligible x Number of Estimated Eligibles)

Distribution of Eligibility in the Detained Cohort, and Distribution of Eligibles' Jail Use, By Program

BEX : QUEENS Both Pools - All Admits Meeting Screening Criteria (Program Has No Stated Objective of Disposition to Displace)

	Admits			Jail Days			Pattern of Dispositions, for Admits Whose Dispositions are Known										
	Annual N	% Annual N	Discouraged* Annual N	Annual N	% Annual N	Discouraged* Annual N	Total Known* Dispositions	Mandatory Prison N	%	Non-Mandatory Prison N	%	Jail Sentence N	%	Prob'n / Discharge / Fines N	%	Discharge N	%
Admits From Appropriate Court & Borough	15,852	100.0															
ABSOLUTE POOL (All Other Data Known)	3,756	28.0	9,672	76,512	23.6	76,512	6,060	468	7.7	336	5.5	1,596	26.3	2,010	33.3	1,644	27.1
Absolute Ineligibles	9,672	72.0		30,466	9.4	30,466	336	168	50.0	72	21.4	72	21.4	12	3.8	12	3.8
Absolute Eligibles	13,428	100.0		195,884	60.4	195,884	1,548	576	37.2	108	7.0	756	48.8	24	1.8	84	5.4
Total in the *Absolute* Pool				21,684	6.7	21,684	372									372	100.0
ABSOLUTE ELIGIBLES, by Type of Jail Days Used																	
ATD-only	6,612	69.9	6,612	76,512	23.6	76,512	6,060	468	7.7	336	5.5	1,596	26.3	2,010	33.3	1,644	27.1
ATI-only	480	5.1	480	30,466	9.4	30,466	336	168	50.0	72	21.4	72	21.4	12	3.8	12	3.8
ATDI	1,820	17.1	1,820	195,884	60.4	195,884	1,548	576	37.2	108	7.0	756	48.8	24	1.8	84	5.4
Type of Jail Days Used Unknown	744	7.9	744	21,684	6.7	21,684	372									372	100.0
TOTAL for *ABSOLUTE* ELIGIBLES	9,456	100.0	9,456	324,528	100.0	324,528	8,316	1,212	14.6	516	6.2	2,424	29.1	2,052	24.7	2,112	25.4
Missing Data on Type AND Number of Jail Days	216		216														
Total in *Absolute* Pool	9,672		9,672														

*"Discouraged" Numbers are the number Eligible (whether "Absolute" or "Estimated"), discounted by the program's "Screening Ratio" - a rough measure of the rate at which screened "eligible" are actually taken into a program. For BEX : QUEENS it was not possible to generate a screening ratio, because the program does not routinely generate a pool of "formally eligible" defendants, the number of whom would be the denominator of the screening ratio.

** "Total Known Dispositions" may be less than "Total Admits", in a category, because some admits lack dispositional data. The pattern of dispositions is displayed for known dispositions only.

DERIVATION OF THE ESTIMATED POOL:

Of the 15,852 admits from the appropriate court and borough, all the data required to determine program eligibility were available for 13,428. Of these, 72.03% (or 9,672) were found eligible. To estimate the number likely to be found eligible if all the necessary data were available (as it would be to program screeners), it was assumed that the missing eligibility data (primarily prior criminal history records) would make 72.03% of the remainder eligible as well. An "estimated eligible pool" is created by adding these 1,746 "estimated eligibles" to the "absolute eligibles."

ESTIMATED ELIGIBLE POOL: 11,418 * ESTIMATED ELIGIBLES' JAIL USE: 391,637 Jail Days (1,073 cells per year)**

*** (Mean Jail Days Used per Absolute Eligible x Number of Estimated Eligibles)

Distribution of Eligibility in the Detained Cohort, and Distribution of Eligibles' Jail Use, By Program

Table C-2

BEX : TOTAL -- Both Pools

BEX : TOTAL Both Pools -- All Admits Meeting Screening Criteria (Program Has No Stated Objective of Disposition to Displace)

Admits	Admits		Jail Days		Pattern of Dispositions, for Admits Whose Dispositions are Known													
	Annual N	% Annual N	Annual N	% Annual N	Total Known* Dispositions	Mandatory Prison N	%	Non-Mandatory Prison N	%	Jail Sentence N	%	Prob'n/ Discharge/ Fine N	%	Dismissal N	%			
<p>ABSOLUTE POOL (All Other Data Known)</p> <p>*Absolute* Ineligibles *Absolute* Eligibles Total in the *Absolute* Pool</p>																		
	7,164																	
	22,092																	
	29,256																	
<p>ABSOLUTE ELIGIBLES, by Type of Jail Days Used</p> <p>ATD-only ATI-only ATD/I Type of Jail Days Used Unknown TOTAL for *ABSOLUTE ELIGIBLES Missing Data on Type AND Number of Jail Days Total in *Absolute* Pool</p>																		
	13,764	64.2	13,764	155,016	18.9	155,016	12,336	8.16	840	6.8	456	3.7	3,408	27.6	3,696	30.0	3,036	31.9
	1,044	4.9	1,044	69,444	8.5	69,444	816	4.368	420	5.15	120	1.47	216	26.5	36	4.4	24	2.9
	4,644	21.7	4,644	517,008	63.0	517,008	4,368	1,140	26.1	204	4.7	2,592	59.3	72	1.6	360	8.2	
	1,980	9.2	1,980	78,936	9.6	78,936	888					24	2.7			864	97.3	
	21,432	100.0	21,432	820,404	100.0	820,404	18,408		2,400	13.0	780	4.2	6,240	33.9	3,804	20.7	5,184	28.2
	660		660															
	22,092		22,092															

To create this Table, the *Absolute Eligibles* from all boroughs were summed, as was their jail day use and the pattern of their dispositions.

Discouraged Numbers are the number Eligible (whether *Absolute* or *Estimated*), discounted by the program's "Screening Ratio" -- a rough measure of the rate at which screened "eligibles" are actually taken into a program. For BEX : TOTAL, it was not possible to generate a screening ratio, because the program does not routinely generate a pool of "formally eligible" defendants, the number of whom would be the denominator of the screening ratio.

**Total Known Dispositions* may be less than Total Admits*, in a category, because some admitte lack dispositional data. The pattern of dispositions is displayed for known dispositions only.

DERIVATION OF THE ESTIMATED POOL:

Of the 34,212 admits from the appropriate court and borough, all the data required to determine program eligibility were available for 29,256. Of these, 75.51% (or 22,092) were found eligible. But, for a program with multiple borough operations, the estimated pools from the individual boroughs were summed, to show the number likely to be found eligible if all the necessary data were available (as it would be to program screeners).

ESTIMATED ELIGIBLE POOL: 25,825

***** ESTIMATED ELIGIBLES' JAIL USE: 988,087 Jail Days (2,707 calls per year)**

Table C-2
Distribution of Eligibility in the Detained Cohort, and Distribution of Eligibles' Jail Use, By Program

Admits is From Appropriate Court & Borough	Admits		Jail Days		Pattern of Dispositions, for Admits Whose Dispositions are Known										
	Annual N	% Annual N	Annual N	% Annual N	Total Known* Dispositions	Mandatory Prison N	%	Non-Mandatory Prison N	%	Jail Sentence N	%	Prob'n/ Disch'ge/ Fine N	%	Dismissed N	%
ABSOLUTE POOL (All Other Data Known)	43,476	100.0													
Absolute Ineligibles	8,264	73.7													
Absolute Eligibles	3,300	26.3													
Total In the *Absolute* Pool	12,564	100.0													
ABSOLUTE ELIGIBLES, by Type of Jail Days Used															
ATD-only	2,098	68.5	773	36.6	19,949	216	10.8	264	13.3	936	47.0	444	22.3	132	6.6
ATD-only	36	1.2	13	1.4	764	36	3.6	12	33.3	12	33.3	12	33.3	12	33.3
ATD/I	540	17.7	200	57.3	31,266	228	46.3	108	22.0	120	24.4	12	2.4	24	4.8
Type of Jail Days Used Unknown	384	12.6	142	4.7	2,566	12	50.0							12	50.0
TOTAL for *ABSOLUTE* ELIGIBLES	3,048	100.0	1,128	100.0	54,545	456	17.9	372	14.6	1,056	42.0	488	18.4	180	7.1
Missing Data on Type AND Number of Jail Days	252		93												
Total In *Absolute* Pool	3,300		1,221												

**Discouraged* Numbers are the number Eligible (whether *Absolute* or *Estimated*), discounted by the program's "Screening Ratio" -- a rough measure of the rate at which screened "eligible" are actually taken into the program. (37.00%)

**Total Known Dispositions* may be less than "Total Admits", in a category, because some admits lack dispositional data. The pattern of dispositions is displayed for known dispositions only.

DERIVATION OF THE ESTIMATED POOL:

Of the 43,476 admits from the appropriate court and borough, all the data required to determine program eligibility were available for 12,564. Of these, 26.27% (or 3,300) were found eligible. To estimate the number likely to be found eligible if all the necessary data were available (as it would be to program screeners), it was assumed that the missing eligibility data (primarily prior criminal history records) would make 26.27% of the remainder eligible as well. An "estimated eligible pool" is created by adding these 8,121 "estimated eligibles" to the "absolute eligibles."

ESTIMATED ELIGIBLE POOL: 11,421 *** ESTIMATED ELIGIBLES' JAIL USE: 552,776 Jail Days (1,514 calls per year)
 DISCOUNTED ELIGIBLES: 4,228 DISCOUNTED: 204,538 Jail Days (560 calls per year)

*** (Mean Jail Days Used per Absolute Eligible x Number of Estimated Eligibles)

Table C-2
Distribution of Eligibility in the Detained Cohort, and Distribution of Eligibles' Jail Use, By Program

Admits From Appropriate Court & Borough	Admits		Jail Days		Pattern of Dispositions, for Admits Whose Dispositions are Known										
	Annual N	Discouraged * Annual %	Annual N	Discouraged * Annual %	Total Known** Dispositions	Mandatory Prison N	%	Non-Mandatory Prison N	%	Jail Sentence N	%	Probn./Discharge/Fine N	%	Dismissed N	%
*ABSOLUTE POOL (All Other Data Known)	10,008	91.3													
Absolute Ineligibles	948	8.7													
Absolute Eligibles	10,956	100.0													
Total in the *Absolute* Pool															
ABSOLUTE ELIGIBLES, by Type of Jail Days Used															
ATD-only	480	58.0	13,428	20.3	4,968	216	45.0	264	55.0						
ATD+only	336	40.6	52,764	79.6	19,523	228	67.9	108	32.1						
ATD#	12	1.4	96		36	12	100.0								
Type of Jail Days Used Unknown	828	100.0	66,288	99.9	24,527	456	55.1	372	44.9						
TOTAL for *ABSOLUTE* ELIGIBLES	1,220														
Missing Data on Type AND Number of Jail Days	44														
Total in *Absolute* Pool	948														

Discouraged Numbers are the number Eligible (whether *Absolute* or *Estimated*), discounted by the program's "Screening Ratio" - a rough measure of the rate at which screened *eligibles* are actually taken into the program. (37.00%)

**Total Known Dispositions* may be less than "Total Admits", in a category, because some admits lack dispositional data. The pattern of dispositions is displayed for known dispositions only.

DERIVATION OF THE ESTIMATED POOL:

Of the 43,476 admits from the appropriate court and borough, all the data required to determine program eligibility were available for 10,956. Of these, 8.65% (or 948) were found eligible. To estimate the number likely to be found eligible if all the necessary data were available (as it would be to program screeners), it was assumed that the missing eligibility data (primarily prior criminal history records) would make 8.65% of the remainder eligible as well. An "estimated eligible pool" is created by adding these 2,813 "estimated eligibles" to the "absolute eligibles."

ESTIMATED ELIGIBLE POOL: 3,761 *** ESTIMATED ELIGIBLES' JAIL USE: 301,256 Jail Days (825 calls per year)
 DISCOUNTED ELIGIBLES: 1,392 DISCOUNTED: 111,489 Jail Days (305 calls per year)

*** (Mean Jail Days Used per Absolute Eligible x Number of Estimated Eligibles)

Table C-2
Distribution of Eligibility in the Detained Cohort, and Distribution of Eligibles' Jail Use, By Program

Admits From Appropriate Court & Borough	CEP Maximum Pools - Admits Meeting Screening Criteria, Whether or Not Disposition Fits Program Objective				Pattern of Dispositions, for Admits Whose Dispositions are Known													
	Admits		Jail Days		Total Known* Dispositions	Mandatory Prison		Non-Mandatory Prison		Jail Sentence	Prob'n/ Discharge / Fine		Dismissal					
	Annual N	% Annual N	Annual N	% Annual N		N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%	N	%		
ABSOLUTE POOL (All Other Data Known)	8,956	64.6																
Absolute Ineligibles	4,848	35.4																
Total in the "Absolute" Pool	13,704	100.0																
ABSOLUTE ELIGIBLES, by Type of Jail Days Used																		
ATD-only	3,192	68.0	2,107	65,652	3,024	444	14.7	96	40.0	84	35.0	1,044	34.5	96	3.2			
ATI-only	1,276	5.9	182	11,292	240	96	40.0	216	38.3	300	53.2	48	20.0	12	5.0			
ATI/	600	12.8	396	82,668	564	24	4.3	216	38.3	300	53.2	24	4.3	12	2.1			
Type of Jail Days Used Unknown	624	13.3	412	14,964	12													
TOTAL for *ABSOLUTE* ELIGIBLES	4,692	100.0	3,097	174,576	3,640	24	0.6	756	19.7	1,824	47.5	1,116	29.1	120	3.1			
Missing Data on Type AND Number of Jail Days	156		103															
Total in "Absolute" Pool	4,848		3,200															

Discouraged Numbers are the number Eligible (whether "Absolute" or "Estimated"),
discouraged by the program's "Screening Ratio" - a rough measure of
the rate at which screened "eligibles" are actually taken into the program. (66.00%)

**Total Known Dispositions* may be less than "Total Admits", in a category, because some admits lack dispositional data.
The pattern of dispositions is displayed for known dispositions only.

DERIVATION OF THE ESTIMATED POOL:

Of the 43,476 admits from the appropriate court and borough, all the data required to determine program eligibility were available for 13,704.
Of these, 35.38% (or 4,848) were found eligible. To estimate the number likely to be found eligible if all the necessary data were available
(as it would be to program screeners), it was assumed that the missing eligibility data (primarily prior criminal history records) would make
35.38% of the remainder eligible as well. An "estimated eligible pool" is created by adding these 10,533 "estimated eligibles" to the "absolute eligibles."

ESTIMATED ELIGIBLE POOL: 15,381 *** ESTIMATED ELIGIBLES' JAIL USE: 572,173 Jail Days (1,588 calls per year)
DISCOUNTED ELIGIBLES: 10,151 DISCOUNTED: 377,617 Jail Days (1,035 calls per year)

*** (Mean Jail Days Used per Absolute Eligible x Number of Estimated Eligibles)

Table C-2
Distribution of Eligibility in the Detained Cohort, and Distribution of Eligibles' Jail Use, By Program

CEP Perfect Target Pools - Admits Meeting Screening Criteria, Whose Dispositions Fit the Program's Displacement Objective

	Admits			Jail Days			Pattern of Dispositions, for Admits Whose Dispositions are Known										
	Annual N	% Discounted*	Annual N	Annual N	% Discounted*	Annual N	Total Known** Dispositions	Mandatory Prison N	%	Non-Mandatory Prison N	%	Jail Sentence N	%	Prob'n/ Discharge/ Fine N	%	Dismissal N	%
Admits from Appropriate Court & Borough	43,476	100.0															
"ABSOLUTE" POOL (All Other Data Known)																	
Absolute Ineligibles	10,776	89.9															
Absolute Eligibles	1,212	10.1	800														
Total in the "Absolute" Pool	11,988	100.0															
"ABSOLUTE" ELIGIBLES, by Type of Jail Days Used																	
ATD-only	792	69.5	523	15,616	31.8	10,439	792			444	56.1	348	43.9				
AT-Only	96	8.4	63	3,408	6.8	2,249	96			96	100.0						
ATDI/	252	22.1	166	30,576	61.4	20,180	252	24	0.5	216	85.7	12	4.8				
Type of Jail Days Used Unknown																	
TOTAL for "ABSOLUTE" ELIGIBLES	1,140	100.0	752	49,800	100.0	32,868	1,140	24	2.1	756	66.3	360	31.6				
Missing Data on Type AND Number of Jail Days	72		48														
Total in "Absolute" Pool	1,212		800														

* "Discounted" Numbers are the number Eligible (whether "Absolute" or "Estimated"), discounted by the program's "Screening Ratio" - a rough measure of the rate at which screened "eligibles" are actually taken into the program. (66.00%)

** "Total Known Dispositions" may be less than "Total Admits" in a category, because some admits lack dispositional data. The pattern of dispositions is displayed for known dispositions only.

DERIVATION OF THE ESTIMATED POOL:

Of the 43,476 admits from the appropriate court and borough, all the data required to determine program eligibility were available for 11,988. Of these, 10,11% (or 1,212) were found eligible. To estimate the number likely to be found eligible if all the necessary data were available (as it would be to program screeners), it was assumed that the missing eligibility data (primarily prior criminal history records) would make 10.11% of the remainder eligible as well. An "estimated eligible pool" is created by adding these 3,183 "estimated eligibles" to the "absolute eligibles."

ESTIMATED ELIGIBLE POOL: 4,395 ** ESTIMATED ELIGIBLES' JAIL USE: 192,062 Jail Days (526 calls per year)
DISCOUNTED ELIGIBLES: 2,901 DISCOUNTED: 126,774 Jail Days (347 calls per year)

*** (Mean Jail Days Used per Absolute Eligible x Number of Estimated Eligibles)

Table C-2
Distribution of Eligibility in the Detained Cohort, and Distribution of Eligibles' Jail Use, By Program

	CSSP : BRONX Both Pools -- All Admits Meeting Screening Criteria (Program Has No Stated Objective of Disposition to Displace)				Pattern of Dispositions, for Admits Whose Dispositions are Known										
	Admits		Jail Days		Total Known** Dispositions	Mandatory Prison		Non-Mandatory Prison		Jail Sentence		Prob'n / Discharge / Fine		Dismissed	
	Annual N	% Annual N	Annual N	% Annual N		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Admits From Appropriate Court & Borough	9,216	100.0													
*ABSOLUTE POOL (All Other Data Known)															
*Absolute Ineligibles	120	60.9													
*Absolute Eligibles	12	9.1													
Total In the "Absolute" Pool	132	100.0													
*ABSOLUTE ELIGIBLES, by Type of Jail Days Used															
ATD-only											
ATI-only											
ATD/I	12	100.0													
Type of Jail Days Used Unknown											
TOTAL for *ABSOLUTE ELIGIBLES	12	100.0													
Missing Data on Type AND Number of Jail Days											
Total In "Absolute" Pool	12														

CSSP's screening criteria, when applied to a one month DOC admission cohort, eliminate so many admits that too few "Absolute Eligibles" are left (sample month N=1, in Bronx) to distribute them by the type of jail days used. (See NOTE)

* "Discounted" Numbers are the number Eligible (whether "Absolute" or "Estimated"), discounted by the program's "Screening Ratio" -- a rough measure of the rate at which screened "eligibles" are actually taken into the program. (51.00%)

** "Total Known Dispositions" may be less than "Total Admits", in a category, because some admits lack dispositional data. The pattern of dispositions is displayed for known dispositions only.

NOTE: CSSP has very tightly drawn eligibility criteria. Of the 758 admits from the Bronx Criminal Court in March, 1987, all data necessary to evaluate CSSP eligibility were available for only 11 of these only 1 met all criteria. That number is too small to lend much confidence to the low estimate of pool size generated from the one month sampling method. If, for example, only one more admit had been found formally eligible, the "percentage eligible" would have more than doubled. Under these circumstances, the estimated number of eligibles would have been 24; instead of an estimated pool size of 838 and a discounted estimated pool of 427, the estimated pool would have been 1,677, using 42,093 jail days. The discounted number of would have been 855, using 21,467 jail days.

DERIVATION OF THE ESTIMATED POOL:

Of the 9,216 admits from the appropriate court and borough, all the data required to determine program eligibility were available for 132. Of these, 9.09% (or 12) were found eligible. To estimate the number likely to be found eligible if all the necessary data were available (as it would be to program screeners), it was assumed that the missing eligibility data (primarily prior criminal history records) would make 9.09% of the remainder eligible as well. An "estimated eligible pool" is created by adding these 826 "estimated eligibles" to the "absolute eligibles."

ESTIMATED ELIGIBLE POOL: 838 *** ESTIMATED ELIGIBLES' JAIL USE: 21,034 Jail Days (58 cells per year)
 DISCOUNTED ELIGIBLES: 427 DISCOUNTED: 10,718 Jail Days (29 cells per year)

** (Mean Jail Days Used per Estimated Eligible x Number of Estimated Eligibles)
 The number of absolute eligibles was too low to apply their mean of jail days used.

Table C-2
Distribution of Eligibility in the Detained Cohort, and Distribution of Eligibles' Jail Use, By Program

Admits From Appropriate Court & Borough	Admits		Jail Days		Pattern of Dispositions, for Admits Whose Dispositions are Known							
	Annual N	Discounted * Annual N	Annual N	Discounted * Annual N	Total Known** Dispositions	Mandatory Prison N	Non-Mandatory Prison N	Jail Sentence N	Prob'n / Discharge / Fine N	Dismissal N		
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%		
ABSOLUTE POOL (All Other Data Known)	10,020	100.0										
Absolute Ineligibles	528	97.8										
Absolute Eligibles	12	2.2										
Total in the *Absolute* Pool	540	100.0	5		<p>CSSP's screening criteria, when applied to a one month DOC admission cohort, eliminate so many admits that too few "Absolute Eligibles" are left (sample month N=1 in Brooklyn) to distribute them by the type of jail days used. (See NOTE)</p>							
ABSOLUTE ELIGIBLES, by Type of Jail Days Used												
ATD-only								
ATI-only	12	100.0	5									
Type of Jail Days Used Unknown	12	100.0	5									
TOTAL for *ABSOLUTE* ELIGIBLES	12	100.0	5									
Missing Data on Type AND Number of Jail Days												
Total in "Absolute" Pool	12		5									

Discounted Numbers are the number Eligible (whether "Absolute" or "Estimated"), discounted by the program's "Screening Ratio" - a rough measure of the rate at which screened "eligibles" are actually taken into this program. (43.00%)

** "Total Known Dispositions" may be less than "Total Admits", in a category, because some admits lack dispositional data. The pattern of dispositions is displayed for known dispositions only.

NOTE: CSSP has very tightly drawn eligibility criteria. Of the 635 admits from the Brooklyn Criminal Court in March, 1987, all data necessary to evaluate CSSP eligibility were available for only 45 of these only 1 met all criteria. That number is too small to lend much confidence to the low estimate of pool size generated from the one month sampling method. If, for example, only one more admit had been found formally eligible, the "percentage eligible" would have more than doubled. Under those circumstances, the annualized number of eligibles would have been 24; instead of an estimated pool size of 222 and a discounted estimated pool of 95, the estimated pool would have been 441, using 11,113 jail days. The discounted number of would have been 190, using 4,779 jail days.

DERIVATION OF THE ESTIMATED POOL:

Of the 10,020 admits from the appropriate court and borough, all the data required to determine program eligibility were available for 540. Of these, 2.22% (or 12) were found eligible. To estimate the number likely to be found eligible if all the necessary data were available (as it would be to program screeners), it was assumed that the missing eligibility data (primarily prior criminal history records) would make 2.22% of the remainder eligible as well. An "estimated eligible pool" is created by adding these 210 "estimated eligibles" to the "absolute eligibles."

ESTIMATED ELIGIBLE POOL: 222 **** ESTIMATED ELIGIBLES' JAIL USE: 5,594 Jail Days (15 calls per year)**

DISCOUNTED ELIGIBLES: 95 **DISCOUNTED: 2,394 Jail Days (7 calls per year)**

*** (Mean Jail Days Used per Estimated Eligible x Number of Estimated Eligibles)
 The number of absolute eligibles was too low to apply their mean of jail days used.

Table C-2
Distribution of Eligibility in the Detained Cohort, and Distribution of Eligibles' Jail Use, By Program

CSSP : MANHATTAN Both Pools - All Admits Meeting Screening Criteria (Program Has No Stated Objective of Disposition to Displace)

	Admits		Jail Days		Pattern of Dispositions for Admits Whose Dispositions are Known										
	Annual N	Discouraged* % Annual N	Annual N	Discouraged* % Annual N	Total Known** Dispositions	Mandatory Prison N	%	Non-Mandatory Prison N	%	Jail Sentence N	%	Prob'n / Discharge / Fine N	%	Dismissal N	%
Admits from Appropriate Court & Borough	16,948	100.0													
ABSOLUTE POOL (All Other Data Known)															
Absolute Ineligibles	1,164	97.0													
Absolute Eligibles	36	3.0													
Total in the *Absolute* Pool	1,200	100.0													
ABSOLUTE* ELIGIBLES, by Type of Jail Days Used															
ATD-only	.	.													
ATD-only	36	100.0													
ATD/I															
Type of Jail Days Used Unknown	36	100.0													
TOTAL for *ABSOLUTE* ELIGIBLES															
Missing Data on Type AND Number of Jail Days															
Total in *Absolute* Pool	36		10												

CSSP's screening criteria, when applied to a one month DOC admission cohort, eliminate so many admits that too few "Absolute Eligibles" are left (example month N=3, in Manhattan) to distribute by the type of jail days used. (See NOTE)

Discouraged Numbers are the number Eligible (whether "Absolute" or "Estimated"), discounted by the program's "Screening Ratio" - a rough measure of the rate at which screened "eligibles" are actually taken into this program. (28.00%)

** Total Known Dispositions may be less than "Total Admits", in a category, because some admits lack dispositional data. The pattern of dispositions is displayed for known dispositions only.

NOTE: CSSP has very tightly drawn eligibility criteria. Of the 1404 admits from the Manhattan Criminal Court in March, 1987, all data necessary to evaluate CSSP eligibility were available for only 100. of these only 3 met all criteria. That number is too small to lend much confidence to the low estimate of pool size generated from the one month sampling method. If, for example, only one more admit had been found formally eligible, the percentage eligible would have more than doubled. Under those circumstances, the annualized number of eligibles would have been 72; instead of an estimated pool size of 505 and a discounted estimated pool of 141, the estimated pool would have been 674, using 35,183 jail days. The discounted number of would have been 189, using 9,851 jail days.

DERIVATION OF THE ESTIMATED POOL:

Of the 16,948 admits from the appropriate court and borough, all the data required to determine program eligibility were available for 1,200. Of these, 3.00% (or 36) were found eligible. To estimate the number likely to be found eligible if all the necessary data were available (as it would be to program screeners), it was assumed that the missing eligibility data (primarily prior criminal history records) would make 3.00% of the remainder eligible as well. An "estimated eligible pool" is created by adding these 469 "estimated eligibles" to the "absolute eligibles."

ESTIMATED ELIGIBLE POOL: 505 ***** ESTIMATED ELIGIBLES' JAIL USE: 26,361 Jail Days (72 calls per year)**
DISCOUNTED ELIGIBLES: 141 **DISCOUNTED: 7,360 Jail Days (20 calls per year)**

*** (Mean Jail Days Used per Estimated Eligible x Number of Estimated Eligibles)
 The number of absolute eligibles was too low to apply their mean of jail days used.

Table C-2
**Distribution of Eligibility in the Detained Cohort, and Distribution of Eligibles' Jail Use,
 By Program**

	CSSP : QUEENS Both Pools - All Admits Meeting Screening Criteria (Program Has No Stated Objective of Disposition to Displace)				Pattern of Dispositions, for Admits Whose Dispositions are Known										
	Admits		Jail Days		Total Known* Dispositions	Mandatory Prison		Non-Mandatory Prison		Jail Sentence		Prob'n/ Disch'ge / Fine		Dismissed	
	Annual N	Discourted* % Annual N	Annual N	Discourted* % Annual N		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Admits From Appropriate Court & Borough	7,728	100.0													
ABSOLUTE POOL (All Other Data Known)															
Absolute Ineligibles	836	96.3													
Absolute Eligibles	36	3.7													
Total In the *Absolute* Pool	972	100.0													
ABSOLUTE ELIGIBLES, by Type of Jail Days Used															
ATD-only	36	100.0													
ATI-only	.	.													
ATD/I	.	.													
Type of Jail Days Used Unknown	.	.													
TOTAL for *ABSOLUTE* ELIGIBLES	36	100.0													
Missing Data on Type AND Number of Jail Days	.	.													
Total In *Absolute* Pool	36		14												

CSSP's screening criteria, when applied to a one month DOC admission cohort, eliminate so many admits that too few "Absolute Eligibles" are left (sample month N=3; in Queens) to distribute them by the type of jail days used.

Discourted Numbers are the number Eligible (whether "Absolute" or "Estimated"), discounted by the program's "Screening Ratio" - a rough measure of the rate at which screened "eligibles" are actually taken into the program. (38.00%)

** Total Known Dispositions* may be less than "Total Admits", in a category, because some admits lack dispositional data. The pattern of dispositions is displayed for known dispositions only.

NOTE: CSSP has very tightly drawn eligibility criteria. Of the 644 admits from the Queens Criminal Court in March, 1987, all data necessary to evaluate CSSP eligibility were available for only 81 of these only 3 met all criteria. That number is too small to lend much confidence to the low estimate of pool size generated from the one month sampling method. If, for example, only one more admit had been found formally eligible, the "percentage eligible" would have more than doubled. Under those circumstances, the actualized number of eligibles would have been 72, instead of an estimated pool size of 285 and a discounted estimated pool of 109, the estimated pool would have been 379, using 5,154 jail days. The discounted number of would have been 144, using 1,959 jail days.

DERIVATION OF THE ESTIMATED POOL:

Of the 7,728 admits from the appropriate court and borough, all the data required to determine program eligibility were available for 972. Of these, 3.70% (or 36) were found eligible. To estimate the number likely to be found eligible if all the necessary data were available (as it would be to program screeners), it was assumed that the missing eligibility data (primarily prior criminal history records) would make 3.70% of the remainder eligible as well. An "estimated eligible pool" is created by adding these 250 "estimated eligibles" to the "absolute eligibles."

ESTIMATED ELIGIBLE POOL: 286 *** ESTIMATED ELIGIBLES' JAIL USE: 3,890 Jail Days (11 cells per year)
 DISCOUNTED ELIGIBLES: 109 DISCOUNTED: 1,482 Jail Days (4 cells per year)

*** (Mean Jail Days Used per Estimated Eligible x Number of Estimated Eligibles)
 The number of absolute eligibles was too low to apply their mean of jail days used.

Table C-2
Distribution of Eligibility in the Detained Cohort, and Distribution of Eligibles' Jail Use, By Program

CSSP : TOTAL Both Pools - All Admits Meeting Screening Criteria (Program Has No Stated Objective of Disposition to Displace)

Admits From Appropriate Court & Borough	Admits		Jail Days		Pattern of Dispositions, for Admits Whose Dispositions are Known							
	Annual N	Discounted * Annual N	Annual N	Discounted * Annual N	Total Known** Dispositions	Mandatory Prison N	Non-Mandatory Prison N	Jail Sentence N	Prob'n/Discharge/Fine N	Dismissal N	%	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
ABSOLUTE POOL (All Other Data Known)	43,812											
Absolute Ineligibles	2,748											
Absolute Eligibles	96											
Total in the *Absolute* Pool	2,844											
To create this Table, the *Absolute Eligibles* from all boroughs were summed, as was their jail day use and the pattern of their dispositions.												
ABSOLUTE ELIGIBLES, by Type of Jail Days Used												
ATD-only	36	37.5	14	420	9.5	160	36	12	33.3	24	66.7	
ATI-only	60	62.5	21	3,996	90.5	1,257	60	60	100.0			
Type of Jail Days Used Unknown	96	100.0	35	4,416	100.0	1,417	96	72	75.0	24	25.0	
TOTAL for *ABSOLUTE* ELIGIBLES												
Missing Data on Type AND Number of Jail Days												
Total in *Absolute* Pool	96		35									

Discounted Numbers are the number Eligible (whether "Absolute" or "Estimated"), discounted by the program's "Screening Ratio" - a rough measure of the rate at which screened "eligibles" are actually taken into the program. **Total Known Dispositions* may be less than "Total Admits" in a category, because some admits lack dispositional data. The pattern of dispositions is displayed for known dispositions only.

NOTE: CSSP has very tightly drawn eligibility criteria. Of the 3,651 admits from the All boroughs Criminal Court in March, 1987, all data necessary to evaluate CSSP eligibility were available for only 237 of these only 8 met all criteria. That number is too small to lend much confidence to the low estimate of pool size generated from the one month sampling method. If, for example, only one more admit had been found formally eligible in each borough, the "percentage eligible" would have more than doubled. Under those circumstances, the annualized number of eligibles would have been 192, instead of an estimated pool size of 1,851 and a discounted estimated pool of 772, the estimated pool would have been 3,174, using 93,543 jail days. The discounted number of would have been 1,378, using 38,056 jail days.

DERIVATION OF THE ESTIMATED POOL:

Of the 43,812 admits from the appropriate court and borough, all the data required to determine program eligibility were available for 2,844. Of these, 3.38% (or 96) were found eligible. But, for a program with multiple borough operations, the estimated pools from the individual boroughs were summed, to show the number likely to be found eligible if all the necessary data were available (as it would be to program screeners).

ESTIMATED ELIGIBLE POOL: 1,851 *** ESTIMATED ELIGIBLES' JAIL USE: 58,879 Jail Days (158 calls per year)
 DISCOUNTED ELIGIBLES: 772 DISCOUNTED: 21,954 Jail Days (60 calls per year)

Table C-2
Distribution of Eligibility in the Detained Cohort, and Distribution of Eligibles' Jail Use, By Program

Admits From Appropriate Court & Borough	Admits		Jail Days		Pattern of Dispositions, for Admits Whose Dispositions are Known										
	Annual N	Discounted* % Annual N	Annual N	Discounted* % Annual N	Total Known** Dispositions	Mandatory Prison N	%	Non-Mandatory Prison N	%	Jail Sentence N	%	Prob/ Discharge / Fine N	%	Dismissed N	%
"ABSOLUTE" POOL (All Other Data Known)	43,476	100.0													
"Absolute" Ineligibles	11,944	37.7													
"Absolute" Eligibles	19,548	62.3													
Total in the "Absolute" Pool	31,392	100.0													
"ABSOLUTE" ELIGIBLES, by Type of Jail Days Used															
ATD-only	8,340	43.9	8,340	100.0	199,164	17.8		199,164	100.0						
ATI-only	1,820	8.5	1,820	100.0	119,160	10.7		119,160	100.0						
ATDI	4,572	24.1	4,572	100.0	681,864	61.1		681,864	100.0						
Type of Jail Days Used Unknown	4,452	23.5	4,452	100.0	116,864	10.4		116,864	100.0						
Missing Data on Type AND Number of Jail Days	18,984	100.0	18,984	100.0	1,118,852	100.0		1,118,852	100.0						
Total in "Absolute" Pool	584	100.0	584	100.0	15,984	100.0		15,984	100.0						
	19,548		19,548												

* "Discounted" Numbers are the number Eligible (whether "Absolute" or "Estimated"), discounted by the program's "Screening Ratio" -- a rough measure of the rate at which screened "eligibles" are actually taken into a program. For ISP it was not possible to generate a screening ratio, because the program does not routinely generate a pool of "formally eligible" defendants, the number of whom would be the denominator of the screening ratio.

** "Total Known Dispositions" may be less than "Total Admits", in a category, because some admits lack dispositional data. The pattern of dispositions is displayed for known dispositions only.

DERIVATION OF THE ESTIMATED POOL:

Of the 43,476 admits from the appropriate court and borough, all the data required to determine program eligibility were available for 31,392. Of these, 62.27% (or 19,548) were found eligible. To estimate the number likely to be found eligible if all the necessary data were available (as it would be to program screeners), it was assumed that the missing eligibility data (primarily prior criminal history records) would make 62.27% of the remainder eligible as well. An "estimated eligible pool" is created by adding these 7,525 "estimated eligibles" to the "absolute eligibles."

ESTIMATED ELIGIBLE POOL: 27,073 * ESTIMATED ELIGIBLES' JAIL USE: 1,581,892 Jail Days (4,361 cells per year)**

*** (Mean Jail Days Used per Absolute Eligible x Number of Estimated Eligibles)

Table C-2
Distribution of Eligibility in the Detained Cohort, and Distribution of Eligibles' Jail Use, By Program

Admits From Appropriate Court & Borough	ISP Perfect Target Pools - Admits Meeting Screening Criteria, Whose Dispositions Fit the Program's Displacement Objective																
	Admits			Jail Days			Pattern of Dispositions, for Admits Whose Dispositions are Known										
	Annual N	% Annual N	Discounted* Annual N	Annual N	% Annual N	Discounted* Annual N	Total Known** Dispositions	Mandatory Prison N	%	Non-Mandatory Prison N	%	Jail Sentence N	%	Prob'n / Discharge / Fine N	%	Dismissal N	%
"ABSOLUTE" POOL (All Other Data Known)	43,476	100.0															
"Absolute" Ineligible	27,420	78.5	7,500														
"Absolute" Eligible	7,500	21.5															
Total in the "Absolute" Pool	34,920	100.0															
"ABSOLUTE" ELIGIBLES, by Type of Jail Days Used																	
ATD-only	4,572	63.2	4,572	102,072	28.3	102,072	4,572		1,299	28.3	3,276	71.7					
ATD-only	876	12.1	876	48,284	13.4	48,284	876		744	84.9	132	15.1					
ATD/M	1,788	24.7	1,788	210,828	58.4	210,828	1,788		1,478	82.6	312	17.4					
Type of Jail Days Used Unknown	7,236	100.0	7,236	361,164	100.0	361,164	7,236		3,516	48.6	3,720	51.4					
Missing Data on Type AND Number of Jail Days	284		284														
Total in "Absolute" Pool	7,500		7,500														

*"Discounted" Numbers are the number Eligible (whether "Absolute" or "Estimated"), discounted by the program's "Screening Ratio" - a rough measure of the rate at which screened "eligible" are actually taken into a program. For ISP it was not possible to generate a screening ratio, because the program does not routinely generate a pool of "formally eligible" defendants, the number of whom would be the denominator of the screening ratio.

**"Total Known Dispositions" may be less than "Total Admits" in a category, because some admits lack dispositional data. The pattern of dispositions is displayed for known dispositions only.

DERIVATION OF THE ESTIMATED POOL:

Of the 43,476 admits from the appropriate court and borough, all the data required to determine program eligibility were available for 34,920. Of these, 21.48% (or 7,500) were found eligible. To estimate the number likely to be found eligible if all the necessary data were available (as it would be to program screeners), it was assumed that the missing eligibility data (primarily prior criminal history records) would make 21.48% of the remainder eligible as well. An "estimated eligible pool" is created by adding these 1,838 "estimated eligibles" to the "absolute eligibles."

ESTIMATED ELIGIBLE POOL: 9,338 * ESTIMATED ELIGIBLES' JAIL USE: 485,966 Jail Days (1,277 cells per year)**

*** (Mean Jail Days Used per Absolute Eligible x Number of Estimated Eligibles)

Table C-2
Distribution of Eligibility in the Detained Cohort, and Distribution of Eligibles' Jail Use, By Program

Admits From Appropriate Court & Borough	TASC: BROOKLYN Maximum Pools - Admits Meeting Screening Criteria, Whether or Not Disposition Fits Program Objective			Pattern of Dispositions, for Admits Whose Dispositions are Known												
	Admits			Jail Days			Total Known**									
	Annual N	% Annual N	Discourted* Annual N	Annual N	% Annual N	Discourted* Annual N	Mandatory Prison N	%	Non-Mandatory Prison N	%	Jail Sentence N	%	Prob'n/ Discharge/ Fine N	%	Dismissed N	%
ABSOLUTE POOL (All Other Data Known)	22,308	100.0														
Absolute Ineligible	9,096	91.9	596													
Absolute Eligible	976	8.1														
Total in the *Absolute* Pool	10,872	100.0														
ABSOLUTE ELIGIBLES, by Type of Jail Days Used																
ATD-only	348	42.0	237	10,848	26.1	7,377	96	29.6	36	11.1	144	44.4	36	11.1	12	3.7
ATF-only	72	8.7	49	1,644	4.0	1,116	12	20.0	36	60.0			12	20.0		
ATDI	168	20.3	114	22,608	54.5	15,373	36	21.4	48	28.6	72	42.9	12	7.1		
Type of Jail Days Used Unknown	240	29.0	163	6,408	15.4	4,357									168	100.0
TOTAL for *ABSOLUTE* ELIGIBLES	828	100.0	563	41,508	100.0	28,225	144	20.0	120	16.7	216	30.0	60	8.3	180	25.0
Missing Data on Type AND Number of Jail Days	48		33													
Total in *Absolute* Pool	876		596													

Discourted Numbers are the number Eligible (whether *Absolute* or *Estimated*), discounted by the program's "Screening Ratio" - a rough measure of the rate at which screened "eligibles" are actually taken into this program. (69.00%)

**Total Known Dispositions* may be less than "Total Admits" in a category, because some admits lack dispositional data. The pattern of dispositions is displayed for known dispositions only.

DERIVATION OF THE ESTIMATED POOL:

Of the 22,308 admits from the appropriate court and borough, all the data required to determine program eligibility were available for 10,872. Of these, 8.06% (or 876) were found eligible. To estimate the number likely to be found eligible if all the necessary data were available (as it would be to program screeners), it was assumed that the missing eligibility data (primarily prior criminal history records) would make 8.06% of the remainder eligible as well. An "estimated eligible pool" is created by adding these 922 "estimated eligibles" to the "absolute eligibles."

ESTIMATED ELIGIBLE POOL: 1,798
 ESTIMATED ELIGIBLES' JAIL USE: 90,080 Jail Days (247 calls per year)
 DISCOUNTED ELIGIBLES: 1,223
 DISCOUNTED ELIGIBLES' JAIL USE: 61,272 Jail Days (168 calls per year)

*** (Mean Jail Days Used per Absolute Eligible x Number of Estimated Eligibles)

Table C-2
Distribution of Eligibility in the Detained Cohort, and Distribution of Eligibles' Jail Use, By Program

TASC : BROOKLYN Perfect Target Pools -- Admits Meeting Screening Criteria, Whose Dispositions Fit the Program's Displacement Objective															
Admits	Annual		Jail Days		Total Known* Dispositions	Pattern of Dispositions, for Admits Whose Dispositions are Known									
	N	% Annual N	N	% Annual N		Mandatory Prison N	%	Non-Mandatory Prison N	%	Jail Sentence N	%	Prob'n/ Discharge / Fine N	%	Dismissed N	%
Admits From Appropriate Court & Borough	22,308	100.0													
ABSOLUTE POOL (All Other Data Known)															
Absolute Ineligible	9,168	96.0													
Absolute Eligible	384	4.0													
Total In the *Absolute* Pool	9,552	100.0													
ABSOLUTE ELIGIBLES, by Type of Jail Days Used															
ATD-only	228	61.3	7,344	37.2	228	96	42.1	36	15.8	96	42.1				
ATD-only	48	12.9	816	4.1	48	12	25.0	36	75.0						
ATD/I	96	25.8	11,604	58.7	96	36	37.5	48	50.0	12	12.5				
Type of Jail Days Used Unknown															
TOTAL for *ABSOLUTE* ELIGIBLES	372	100.0	19,764	100.0	372	144	38.7	120	32.3	108	29.0				
Missing Data on Type AND Number of Jail Days	12														
Total In *Absolute* Pool	384														

* "Discounted" Numbers are the number Eligible (whether "Absolute" or "Estimated"), discounted by the program's "Screening Ratio" - a rough measure of the rate at which screened "eligibles" are actually taken into the program. (68.00%)

** "Total Known Dispositions" may be less than "Total Admits" in a category, because some admits lack dispositional data. The pattern of dispositions is displayed for known dispositions only.

DERIVATION OF THE ESTIMATED POOL:

Of the 22,308 admits from the appropriate court and borough, all the data required to determine program eligibility were available for 9,552. Of these, 4.02% (or 384) were found eligible. To estimate the number likely to be found eligible if all the necessary data were available (as it would be to program screeners), it was assumed that the missing eligibility data (primarily prior criminal history records) would make 4.02% of the remainder eligible as well. An "estimated eligible pool" is created by adding these 513 "estimated eligibles" to the "absolute eligibles."

ESTIMATED ELIGIBLE POOL: 897 *** ESTIMATED ELIGIBLES' JAIL USE: 47,631 Jail Days (130 calls per year)
 DISCOUNTED ELIGIBLES: 610 DISCOUNTED: 32,391 Jail Days (89 calls per year)

*** (Mean Jail Days Used per Absolute Eligible x Number of Estimated Eligibles)

Table C-2
TASC : QUEENS - Maximum Pools
Distribution of Eligibility in the Detained Cohort, and Distribution of Eligibles' Jail Use,
By Program

Admits From Appropriate Court & Borough	TASC : QUEENS - Maximum Pools - Admits Meeting Screening Criteria, Whether or Not Disposition Fits Program Objective																
	Admits					Jail Days					Pattern of Dispositions, for Admits Whose Dispositions are Known						
	Annual N	%	Discouraged* Annual N	Annual N	%	Discouraged* Annual N	Total Known** Dispositions	Mandatory Prison N	%	Non-Mandatory Prison N	%	Jail Sentence N	%	Prob'n / Discharge / Fine N	%	Dismissal N	%
"ABSOLUTE" POOL (All Other Data Known)	6,912	83.4	202	4,704	13.4	1,929	216	12	5.6	36	16.7	120	55.6	48	22.2		
"Absolute" Ineligibles	492	6.6		228	0.7	93	12	100.0									
"Absolute" Eligibles	7,404	100.0	202	25,164	71.9	10,317	108	24	22.2	24	22.2	60	55.6				
Total in the "Absolute" Pool				4,920	14.1	2,017	72										
"ABSOLUTE" ELIGIBLES, by Type of Jail Days Used																	
ATI-only	228	47.5	93	1,929	1.929	93	12	5.6	36	16.7	120	55.6	48	22.2			
ATI-only	12	2.5	5	25,164	71.9	10,317	108	24	22.2	24	22.2	60	55.6				
ATI/DI	120	25.0	49	4,920	14.1	2,017	72										
Type of Jail Days Used Unknown	480	100.0	197	35,016	100.0	14,357	408	48	11.8	60	14.7	180	44.1	48	11.8	72	17.6
TOTAL for "ABSOLUTE" ELIGIBLES	12		5														
Missing Data on Type AND Number of Jail Days	492		202														
Total in "Absolute" Pool																	

* "Discouraged" Numbers are the number Eligible (whether "Absolute" or "Estimated"), discouraged by the program's Screening Ratio -- a rough measure of the rate at which screened "eligibles" are actually taken into this program. (41.00%)

** "Total Known Dispositions" may be less than "Total Admits" in a category, because some admits lack dispositional data. The pattern of dispositions is displayed for known dispositions only.

DERIVATION OF THE ESTIMATED POOL:

Of the 15,852 admits from the appropriate court and borough, all the data required to determine program eligibility were available for 7,404. Of these, 6.65% (or 492) were found eligible. To estimate the number likely to be found eligible if all the necessary data were available (as it would be to program screeners), it was assumed that the missing eligibility data (primarily prior criminal history records) would make 6.65% of the remainder eligible as well. An "estimated eligible pool" is created by adding these 562 "estimated eligibles" to the "absolute eligibles."

ESTIMATED ELIGIBLE POOL: 1,054 **** ESTIMATED ELIGIBLES' JAIL USE: 76,942 Jail Days (211 calls per year)**
DISCOUNTED ELIGIBLES: 432 **DISCOUNTED: 31,536 Jail Days (86 calls per year)**

*** (Mean Jail Days Used per Absolute Eligible x Number of Estimated Eligibles)

Table C-2
Distribution of Eligibility in the Detained Cohort, and Distribution of Eligibles' Jail Use, By Program

Admits From Appropriate Court & Borough	TASC : QUEENS Perfect Target Pools -- Admits Meeting Screening Criteria, Whose Dispositions Fit the Program's Displacement Objective															
	Admits			Jail Days			Pattern of Dispositions, for Admits Whose Dispositions are Known									
	Annual N	%	Discounted * Annual N	Annual N	%	Discounted * Annual N	Total Known** Dispositions	Mandatory Prison N	%	Non-Mandatory Prison N	%	Jail Sentence N	%	Prob'n / Discharge / Fine N	%	Dismissal N
ABSOLUTE POOL (All Other Data Known)																
Absolute Ineligibles																
Absolute Eligibles																
Total in the *Absolute* Pool																
ABSOLUTE ELIGIBLES, by Type of Jail Days Used																
ATD-only																
ATD-only																
ATD/I																
Type of Jail Days Used Unknown																
TOTAL for *ABSOLUTE* ELIGIBLES																
Missing Data on Type AND Number of Jail Days																
Total in *Absolute* Pool																

Discounted Numbers are the number Eligible (whether *Absolute* or *Estimated*), discounted by the program's "Screening Ratio" -- a rough measure of the rate at which screened "eligibles" are actually taken into this program. (41.00%)

**Total Known Dispositions* may be less than "Total Admits", in a category, because some admits lack dispositional data. The pattern of dispositions is displayed for known dispositions only.

DERIVATION OF THE ESTIMATED POOL:

Of the 15,852 admits from the appropriate court and borough, all the data required to determine program eligibility were available for 6,576. Of these, 2.74% (or 180) were found eligible. To estimate the number likely to be found eligible if all the necessary data were available (as it would be to program screeners), it was assumed that the missing eligibility data (primarily prior criminal history records) would make 2.74% of the remainder eligible as well. An "estimated eligible pool" is created by adding these 254 "estimated eligibles" to the "absolute eligibles."

ESTIMATED ELIGIBLE POOL: 434 **** ESTIMATED ELIGIBLES' JAIL USE: 18,185 Jail Days (50 calls per year)**
DISCOUNTED ELIGIBLES: 178 **DISCOUNTED: 7,458 Jail Days (20 calls per year)**

*** (Mean Jail Days Used per Absolute Eligible x Number of Estimated Eligibles)

Table C-2
Distribution of Eligibility in the Detained Cohort, and Distribution of Eligibles' Jail Use, By Program

TASC : RICHMOND Maximum Pools - Admits Meeting Screening Criteria, Whether or Not Disposition Fits Program Objective

	Admits		Jail Days		Total Known* Dispositions	Pattern of Dispositions, for Admits Whose Dispositions are Known					
	Annual N	Discounted* Annual N	Annual N	Discounted* Annual N		Mandatory Prison N	Non-Mandatory Prison N	Jail Sentence N	Prob'n/Discharge/Fine N	Dismissal N	
Admits From Appropriate Court & Borough	1,284	100.0									
ABSOLUTE POOL (All Other Data Known)											
Absolute Ineligible	444	94.9									
Absolute Eligibles	24	5.1									
Total in the "Absolute" Pool	468	100.0									
ABSOLUTE ELIGIBLES, by Type of Jail Days Used											
ATD-only
ATD/I
Type of Jail Days Used Unknown	24	100.0	804	100.0							
TOTAL for *ABSOLUTE* ELIGIBLES	24	100.0	804	100.0							
Missing Data on Type AND Number of Jail Days	.	.									
Total in "Absolute" Pool	24		21								

* "Discounted" Numbers are the number Eligible (whether "Absolute" or "Estimated"), discounted by the program's "Screening Ratio" - a rough measure of the rate at which screened "eligibles" are actually taken into this program. (89.00%)

** "Total Known Dispositions" may be less than "Total Admits" in a category, because some admits lack dispositional data. The pattern of dispositions is displayed for known dispositions only.

DERIVATION OF THE ESTIMATED POOL:

Of the 1,284 admits from the appropriate court and borough, all the data required to determine program eligibility were available for 468. Of these, 5.13% (or 24) were found eligible. To estimate the number likely to be found eligible if all the necessary data were available (as it would be to program screeners), it was assumed that the missing eligibility data (primarily prior criminal history records) would make 5.13% of the remainder eligible as well. An "estimated eligible pool" is created by adding these 42 "estimated eligibles" to the "absolute eligibles."

ESTIMATED ELIGIBLE POOL: 66 * ESTIMATED ELIGIBLES' JAIL USE: 2,211 Jail Days (6 calls per year)**
DISCOUNTED ELIGIBLES: 59 DISCOUNTED: 1,877 Jail Days (5 calls per year)

*** (Mean Jail Days Used per Absolute Eligible x Number of Estimated Eligibles)

Table C-2
Distribution of Eligibility in the Detained Cohort, and Distribution of Eligibles' Jail Use, By Program

TASC : RICHMOND Perfect Target Pools -- Admits Meeting Screening Criteria, Whose Dispositions Fit the Program's Displacement Objective

	Admits		Jail Days		Pattern of Dispositions, for Admits Whose Dispositions are Known						
	Annual N	Discourted* % Annual N	Annual N	Discourted* % Annual N	Total Known** Dispositions	Mandatory Prison N	Non-Mandatory Prison %	Jail Sentence N	Prob'n/Discharge/Fine %	Dismissed N	%
Admits From Appropriate Court & Borough	1,284	100.0									
ABSOLUTE POOL (All Other Data Known)	456	100.0									
Absolute Ineligibles											
Absolute Eligibles	456	100.0									
Total In the "Absolute" Pool	456	100.0									
ABSOLUTE ELIGIBLES, by Type of Jail Days Used											
ATD-only	.										
ATD/I	.										
Type of Jail Days Used Unknown	.										
TOTAL for *ABSOLUTE* ELIGIBLES	.										
Missing Data on Type AND Number of Jail Days	.										
Total In "Absolute" Pool	.										

1,284 admits with the appropriate Court and Borough for TASC's Richmond County Project were apparently eligible, before their prior record data were examined for eligibility. Prior record data were available for 456. Because none of those 456 received a custodial sentence and because the target for TASC's displacement objective is a jail or prison sentence of two months or more, none of the "Absolutes" were eligible for inclusion in the "Perfect Target" pool. As no one was "Absolutely Eligible" for inclusion in the Perfect Target pool, it was not possible to distribute them by type of jail days used, nor was it possible to apply their prior record pattern to the "Estimated Eligible" pool.

* "Discourted" Numbers are the number Eligible (whether "Absolute" or "Estimated"), discounted by the program's "Screening Ratio" -- a rough measure of the rate at which screened "eligibles" are actually taken into a program.

** "Total Known Dispositions" may be less than "Total Admits" in a category, because some admits lack dispositional data. The pattern of dispositions is displayed for known dispositions only.

Distribution of Eligibility in the Detained Cohort, and Distribution of Eligibles' Jail Use, By Program

Table C-2

TASC : TOTAL - Maximum Pools

TASC : TOTAL Maximum Pools - Admits Meeting Screening Criteria, Whether or Not Disposition Fits Program Objective

	Admits		Jail Days		Pattern of Dispositions, for Admits Whose Dispositions are Known										
	Annual N	% Annual N	Annual N	% Annual N	Total Known** Dispositions	Mandatory Prison N	%	Non-Mandatory Prison N	%	Jail Sentence N	%	Prob'n/Discharge/Fine N	%	Dismissal N	%
ABSOLUTE POOL (All Other Data Known)	17,352														
Absolute Ineligibles	1,392														
Absolute Eligibles	18,744														
Total In the "Absolute" Pool															
<p>ABSOLUTE ELIGIBLES, by Type of Jail Days Used</p>															
ATD-only	576	43.2	330	15,552	20.1	9,305	54.0	108	20.0	72	13.3	264	48.9	84	15.6
ATI-only	84	6.3	54	1,872	2.4	1,211	7.2	24	33.3	36	50.0	12	16.7	12	2.2
ATDI/	288	21.6	163	47,772	61.8	25,691	27.6	60	21.7	72	26.1	132	47.8	12	4.3
Type of Jail Days Used Unknown	384	28.8	234	12,132	15.7	7,080	24.0								
TOTAL for ABSOLUTE ELIGIBLES	1,332	100.0	781	77,328	100.0	43,298	1,128	192	17.0	180	16.0	396	35.1	108	9.6
Missing Data on Type AND Number of Jail Days	60		38												
Total In "Absolute" Pool	1,392		819												

To create this Table, the "Absolute Eligibles" from all boroughs were summed, as was their jail day use and the pattern of their dispositions.

** "Discounted" Numbers are the number Eligible (whether "Absolute" or "Estimated"), discounted by the program's "Screening Ratio" - a rough measure of the rate at which screened "eligibles" are actually taken into a program.

** "Total Known Dispositions" may be less than "Total Admits" (in a category, because some admits lack dispositional data. The pattern of dispositions is displayed for known dispositions only.

DERIVATION OF THE ESTIMATED POOL:

Of the 39,444 admits from the appropriate court and borough, all the data required to determine program eligibility were available for 18,744. Of these, 7.43% (or 1,392) were found eligible. But, for a program with multiple borough operations, the estimated pools from the individual boroughs were summed, to show the number likely to be found eligible if all the necessary data were available (as it would be to program screeners).

ESTIMATED ELIGIBLE POOL: 2,918 * ESTIMATED ELIGIBLES' JAIL USE: 187,022 Jail Days (458 calls per year)**
DISCOUNTED ELIGIBLES: 1,714 DISCOUNTED: 92,808 Jail Days (254 calls per year)

Table C-2
Distribution of Eligibility in the Detained Cohort, and Distribution of Eligibles' Jail Use, By Program

TASC : TOTAL Perfect Target Pools -- Admits Meeting Screening Criteria, Whose Dispositions Fit the Program's Displacement Objective

	Admits		Jail Days		Pattern of Dispositions, for Admits Whose Dispositions are Known										
	Annual N	% Annual N	Annual N	% Annual N	Total Known* Dispositions	Mandatory Prison N	%	Non-Mandatory Prison N	%	Jail Sentence N	%	Prob'n / Discharge / Fine N	%	Dismissed N	%
ABSOLUTE* POOL (All Other Data Known)	16,020														
Absolute Ineligibles	564														
Absolute Eligibles	16,584														
Total in the "Absolute" Pool															
ABSOLUTE* ELIGIBLES, by Type of Jail Days Used															
ATD-only	348	63.0	204	35.1	9,576	108	31.0	72	20.7	168	48.3				
ATD-only	60	10.9	38	3.8	1,044	24	40.0	36	60.0						
ATD/I	144	26.1	85	61.1	16,680	60	41.7	72	50.0	12	8.3				
Type of Jail Days Used Unknown	552	100.0	327	100.0	27,300	192	34.8	180	32.6	180	32.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL for "ABSOLUTE* ELIGIBLES	12		8												
Missing Data on Type AND Number of Jail Days	564		335												
Total in "Absolute" Pool															

To create this Table, the "Absolute Eligibles" from all boroughs were summed, as was their jail day use and the pattern of their dispositions.

* "Discounted" Numbers are the number Eligible (whether "Absolute" or "Estimated"), discounted by the program's "Screening Ratio" -- a rough measure of the rate at which screened "eligibles" are actually taken into a program.

** "Total Known Dispositions" may be less than "Total Admits" in a category, because some admits lack dispositional data. The pattern of dispositions is displayed for known dispositions only.

DERIVATION OF THE ESTIMATED POOL:

Of the 39,444 admits from the appropriate court and borough, all the data required to determine program eligibility were available for 16,584. Of these, 3,40% (or 564) were found eligible. But, for a program with multiple borough operations, the estimated pools from the individual boroughs were summed, to show the number likely to be found eligible if all the necessary data were available (as it would be to program screeners).

ESTIMATED ELIGIBLE POOL: 1,331
 DISCOUNTED ELIGIBLES: 788
 ESTIMATED ELIGIBLES' JAIL USE: 65,816 Jail Days (180 cells per year)
 DISCOUNTED: 39,849 Jail Days (109 cells per year)