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Why Be Data Driven?

• Diagnoses Needs
• Enhances efficiency
• Promotes optimal resource allocation
• Guides improvements
• Evaluates changes
• Gets you money
University Partnerships

- **Expertise**
  - Knowledge of data and statistics

- **Efficiency**
  - Often cheaper than hiring staff

- **Effectiveness**
  - Easier to sustain with local partners
Example 1: System Mapping

- Collect data on key decision points in Jefferson and Rapides Parish juvenile justice system in 2007 and 2011

- Purpose:
  - Guide reform efforts
  - Make the decision-making procedures at each point transparent to foster communication among stakeholders
  - Evaluate effectiveness of reform
  - Maintain data for funding opportunities
Specific Goals of Mapping

• Describe youth at key decision points
• Describe the most common and important decisions that are made for youth at each point
• Describe how these decisions are made
• Assess satisfaction with decision-making process
• Describe what data are obtained, stored, and shared related to these decisions.
The Mapping Process

• Meet with key stakeholders:
  – To obtain buy-in
  – Define key decision points
  – Define “useful” information
  – Identify local partners

• Develop and disseminate survey

• Conduct follow-up interviews to collect additional information

• Prepare report summarizing results

• Review results with local partners

• Determine methods for widespread dissemination

• Discuss uses of data

• Repeat process in 2010
## Jefferson Parish: Initial Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Point</th>
<th>Source of Entry</th>
<th>Number of Youth (2006)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Delinquency petitions by DA</td>
<td>1,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal FINS</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal FINS</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>1,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caretaker</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Key Decision Points and Methods: Jefferson Parish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Point</th>
<th>Important Decisions</th>
<th>Standardized Tools</th>
<th>Other Tools</th>
<th>Persons Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff’s Office</td>
<td>Detain/release</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Arrest reports/offending history</td>
<td>On duty intake supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intake interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Accept/reject charge</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Available physical and testimonial evidence</td>
<td>Assistant DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FINS petitions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arrest reports/offending history</td>
<td>DA investigator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic history</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Guilt/innocence</td>
<td>MAJOR</td>
<td>Arrest reports/offending history</td>
<td>Judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detain/release</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mental health history</td>
<td>Court probation officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal Adjustment Agreement (IAA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic history</td>
<td>Case manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post – disposition services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with youth and parent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FINS history</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OCS investigations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINS</td>
<td>Accept/reject complaint</td>
<td>MAJOR</td>
<td>Arrest reports</td>
<td>Hearing officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needed services for child/family</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with youth and parent</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refer for formal FINS</td>
<td></td>
<td>School reports</td>
<td>Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention</td>
<td>Dangerousness to self/others</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Arrest reports</td>
<td>Probation officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suicide interview</td>
<td>OYD officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Previous psychological evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jefferson Parish: Looking Deeper and Reforming

- Detention decisions made by law enforcement without set criteria and a large number of youth were detained for minor offenses
  - Implemented standard detention screening instrument

- Many first-time FINS cases were formally processed
  - First-time FINS referrals to DA are diverted to Informal FINS office

- Disproportionate number of Informal FINS referrals came from a minority of schools and it was unclear if schools were considering other options prior to FINS referral
  - Implemented training of school resource officers
## Jefferson Parish: Follow-up Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Delinquency petitions by DA</td>
<td>1,393</td>
<td>1,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal FINS</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,534</td>
<td>1,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal FINS</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>1,625</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caretaker</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,794</td>
<td>897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td>1,278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 2: SAVRY Implementation

• Jefferson Parish Department of Juvenile Services (DJS) implemented the SAVRY in 2009

• Goals:
  – Objectively measure risk for future violent and nonviolent behavior
  – Assist dispositional decision-making
  – Tool for treatment planning

• Has the implementation of the SAVRY effectively met these goals?
Study Development

• Collaborative effort:
  – UNO and LSUHSC
  – DJS

• Several sources of information
  – Outcome monitoring sheet (Green Sheet)
  – Treatment tracking file
  – Automated Records Management and Mapping System (ARMMS)
  – Probation paper files

• Data collection occurred over a three-month period
Results of the Study: Goal 1

Goal 1: Test whether the implementation of the SAVRY resulted in an increase in treatment referral and positive youth outcomes.

Results:

- Significant increase in referrals to EBPs following SAVRY implementation
- Youth with one or more SAVRY administrations were on probation an average of 7 months shorter than the originally ordered probation
Implementation of SAVRY & Treatment Referral

Pre-SAVRY (n=57)  No SAVRY (n=205)  One SAVRY (n=138)  Both SAVRYs (n=104)

% Referred to Tx  % Referred to Brand EBP

LSU Health New Orleans Institute for Public Health and Justice
Results of the Study: Goal 2

Goal 2: Both within and across types of treatments, compare SAVRY scores pre and post-treatment.

Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Cases</th>
<th>% Stable Low</th>
<th>% Decrease</th>
<th>% Increase/Stable High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delinquency Risk</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to Brand EBP</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not referred to Brand EBP</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Violence Risk</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to Brand EBP</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not referred to Brand EBP</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal 3: Compare probation outcomes and recidivism across changes in SAVRY risk scores.

Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reason for Probation Release</th>
<th>Recidivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>% Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable Low</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable High/Increase</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable Low</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable High/Increase</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 3: Evaluation of the Detention Screening Instrument (DSI)

• DSI was created in 2008
  – In response to Mapping Survey Results

• Goals:
  – Public safety
  – Identify need for secure placement
  – Reduce DMC in Rapides Parish

• Collaborative effort between UNO, CCLP, and Rapides Parish stakeholders
Rapides Parish Detention Screening Instrument

• Assigns numerical values:
  – Most serious current offense
  – Additional offenses
  – Prior criminal history
  – History of failing to appear
  – History of escape or runaway
  – Aggravating factors
  – Mitigating factors

• List of mandatory and administrative overrides

• Decision guidelines:
  – 13+ or an override = secure detention
  – 8 -12 = detention alternative
  – < 8 = release
Development of the Study

- Data collection occurred over a 3-month period
- Three law enforcement agencies
- Information obtained from:
  - DSI
  - Contact sheet
  - Impression questionnaire
- Juvenile detectives, renaissance detention center, and juvenile probation officers submitted data to UNO monthly
Results of the Study: Question 2

Question 2: Does the use of the DSI reduce secure placements?

Results:
Results of the Study: Question 3

Question 3: Does the use of the DSI reduce DMC?

Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony Crime</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Only cases with a DSI are included. In total, there were 24 detention admission from 8/15/08 – 10/31/2008.
Example 4: Developing a Database to Track DA Decisions

- Occurred in Rapides Parish District Attorney’s Office in 2009-2010

- Process:
  - What do you want to know?
  - Where can we find this information?
  - What type of system is best suited for the agency’s needs and available resources?
  - How should this information reported?
What do you want to know?

Demographics
Arrest data
Case processing information
Offense data
Charge amendments
Pre-adjudication status
DA decisions
Referrals to outside agencies
Court orders
Disposition
Victim information
Prior charges
Next Steps

• Where can we find this information?
  – AS400
  – Paper files
  – Treatment agencies

• What type of system is best suited for the agency’s needs and resources?
  – Electronic data base
    • Excel
    • IJJIS
Standard DA Reports

**Standard Reports**
- Offender residence by police zone
- Days from arrest to referral
- DA Referrals to Court
- New Referrals
- New Referrals by Offense
- Transfers to adult court

**Selection Criteria**
- Age
- Race
- Ethnicity
- Offense
- Referred by agency
- DA decision
- Complaint start/end date
- Received start/end date
- Screened start/end date
Benefits of University/Agency Partnerships

• Role of the university
  – Helped identify the “questions” that stakeholders wanted to answer
    *Conceptualization
  – Data collection, analysis, and reporting results
  – Worked as the liaison between different agencies
  – Local, state, and national dissemination

• Benefit to stakeholders:
  – Empirical evidence of effectiveness
  – Increased objectivity in decision-making
  – Provides a baseline for future evaluations
  – Identified areas in need of revision
University Partnerships as a Strategy for Promoting Data-Driven Decision Making in Juvenile Justice


Indicators of Success: Developing System and Youth Outcome Measures for Juvenile Justice Agencies

- [http://sph.lsuhsc.edu/Websites/lsupublichealth/images/pdf/iphj/LaMfC_Innovations_Brief_Indicators_Youth_Outcome_Measures_for_JJ_FINAL.pdf](http://sph.lsuhsc.edu/Websites/lsupublichealth/images/pdf/iphj/LaMfC_Innovations_Brief_Indicators_Youth_Outcome_Measures_for_JJ_FINAL.pdf)
Contact Information

• Stephen Phillippi, PhD sphill2@lsuhsc.edu

• Institute for Public Health & Justice http://sph.lsuhsc.edu/iphj
Pretrial Population Management in Humboldt County, CA

Using Data to Support System Change
Humboldt County Facts

- Rural, coastal county
- Land area 3,572 sq miles
- Population of 135,000, 37.8 per sq mile
- One jail with a capacity of 391
- 10,090 bookings in 2011 – 37% felonies
- Pre-Realignment, 68% pretrial inmates
- No court-imposed cap
Supervised Release Program

- Assumptions:
  - Jail impacts – Realignment
  - Need alternatives for lower risk offenders to leave room for highest risk offenders
  - Supervised Release Program (SRP) put in place, but underutilized
  - Sheriff implemented booking matrix for population management
Baseline Profile (5/1-12/31/12)

- Who is in the jail?
- Who is potentially eligible for pretrial release?
- What decision points influence the use of SRP, and what are the outcomes of each decision?
  - Screening
  - Reporting
  - Risk Assessment
- What are the outcomes for defendants?

Collaborative Conversation, Shared Data
Who is in Jail Pretrial?

- 6,856 bookings April 30 – December 31, 2012
- 4,345 individuals booked

- Charge type for any count (N=6,856)
  - 2,879 (42%) charged with any felony
  - 297 (4%) charged with any serious felony
  - 70 (1%) charged with any violent felony
  - 522 (8%) charged with any violation of PRCS/Parole
  - 1,477 (22%) charged with violation of Probation
Who is in Jail Pretrial?

Proxy Score Distribution for All Bookings
February 7 to March 7, 2013

Number of Defendants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proxy Score</th>
<th>Number of Defendants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is the System Doing?

- 488 defendants were screened by SRP
- 212 identified as qualified
- 273 defendants deemed unqualified
  - 167 of these should have been eligible per SRP guidelines
- 45 defendants not eligible per guidelines were deemed qualified by SRP
Of 169 reports filed, 105 were initially screened out by SRP
SRP Screening

60 percent are screened within one day of booking.

78 percent are screened within two days.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Days from Booking to Screening</th>
<th>Number of Defendants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>same day</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 days</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ days</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are Defendant Outcomes?

- **SRP releases**
  - 28 defendants released to SRP
  - 26 had at least one scheduled court appearance after release
  - 1 (4%) defendant failed to appear

- **Release Matrix releases**
  - 277 felony defendants released via Matrix
  - 229 had at least one post-release appearance
  - 56 (25%) failed to appear

- **Court Own Recognizance (OR) releases**
  - 302 felony defendants released on OR
  - 278 had at least one post-release appearance
  - 42 (15%) failed to appear
Observations

- Risk profile for overall population is normal
- Large potential pool for pretrial release
- Mismatch between eligibility criteria and SRP screening decisions
- Many cases are lost between screening and report
- Court referrals drive reporting
- Appearance rates for SRP are good
Data Dashboards

- Cross-agency contributions
- As close to real time as possible
- Inform policy and management decisions
  - What are we doing?
  - Are we doing it well?
  - Are we achieving desired results?
- Go beyond the numbers
  - Analysis and interpretation
- Discussion and action steps
Monthly Reporting, Assessing, and Recommendations
9/1/13 - 2/28/14

- Report Filed
- Assessed
- Rec SRP
- Rec OR Release

Graph shows monthly reporting trends from September 2013 to February 2014.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact type</th>
<th>Average Contacts/Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low-Risk (n=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total attempted contacts</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful contacts</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful contacts</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted home</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA office</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face w/ other PO</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Defendant Outcomes

Success Rate on SRP Supervision

![Graph showing the relationship between ORAS Risk Score and Success Rate on SRP Supervision]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRP Outcome &amp; Recommendation</th>
<th>Low Risk</th>
<th>Medium Risk</th>
<th>High Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommended SRP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abscond</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful – New Crime</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful – Revocation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful – FTA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommended Detain</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abscond</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful – New Crime</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful – Revocation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful – FTA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jail Population Policy Impact Tool

Created by:
Michael Wilson
(mike.wilson.inc@gmail.com)

2 Steps to Policy Impacts

Step 1: Enter Policy Areas and Growth Rates

Policy Areas and Growth Rates
Adjust Detailed Data

Data entered here defines how large an impact policy changes have on Jail Population projections, as well as factors that drive jail population growth. Double click on the cells below to enter new values. Enter the names for the policy changes in the green boxes, along with the number of releases in the last 12 months and the average length of stay. On the right enter the underlying growth rates for changes in length of stay, the number of bookings, and the population "at risk". Use the slider to choose the annualized growth rate.

Annualized Growth Rates

Annual Length of Stay Change
- 2.0%

Annual Booking Rate Change
- 0.2%

Annual Change in at Risk General Population
- 1.4%

10-Year Projection
- 1.4%

Policy Impact Tool

Top 3 Policy Impacts at Full Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Jail Bed Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Felony</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Misdemeanor</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Violators</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enter Current Jail Population
800

Ten-Year Jail Population Projection

With Policy Changes
Baseline

Enter the Policy Areas of Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enter Policy Areas</th>
<th>Jail Releases</th>
<th>LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probation Violators</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Misdemeanor</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Felony</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV Misdemeanor</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV Felony</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI Misdemeanor</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI Felony</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Misdemeanor</td>
<td>5793</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Felony</td>
<td>1683</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Felony</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non-Criminal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jail Population Policy Impact Tool

Created by:
Michael Wilson
(mike.wilson.inc@gmail.com)

2 Steps to Policy Impacts

1. Set a start date.
2. Insert new policy assumptions.

Adjust Start Date and Policy Impact

Ten-Year Jail Population Projection

Enter Current Jail Population
800

Adjus

Top 3 Policy Impacts at Full Implementation

Policy | Jail Bed Impact
-------|-----------------|
Other Felony | -114
Other Misdemeanor | -34
Probation Violators | -26
Other | -22

Policy Choice Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Adjust Expected Change in</th>
<th>Adjust Expected Change in LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probation Violators</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Misdemeanor</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Felony</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV Misdemeanor</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV Felony</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI Misdemeanor</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI Felony</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Misdemeanor</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Felony</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non-Criminal</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjust Timing Detail
For More Information

- Meghan Guevara
  Meghan.Guevara@gmail.com

- Lisa Brooks, lead technical assistance provider
  lbrooks@crj.org

- Bill Damiano, Chief of Probation
  BDamiano@co.humboldt.ca.us
USING DATA TO ENHANCE DECISION-MAKING

V. Glenn Fueston Jr.
Director Investigative Support Center
Washington / Baltimore HIDTA
301-982-7522
gfueston@wb.hidta.org
HIDTA Overview: Locations

High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program Counties
with Intelligence and Information Sharing Initiative Locations
HIDTA Overview: Goals

1. Disrupt the market for illegal drugs by dismantling or disrupting drug trafficking and/or money laundering organizations.

2. Improve efficiency and effectiveness of HIDTA initiatives
HIDTA Overview: Purpose

- Facilitate cooperation
- Enhance intelligence
- Share information and intelligence
- Maximize resources through coordinated strategies
W/B HIDTA: Projects/Capabilities

- Case Support for Criminal Organizations
- Gang Intelligence
- Telephone Toll Analysis
- Geo-Spatial Analysis
- Event Deconfliction
- Case/Subject/Target Deconfliction
- Open Source Data Project
Big Data Approach
The Problem:

• Decision makers want to know “everything” about a threat or problem the moment it is identified.

• They need “actionable” intelligence to assist in making a decision.

• They need to be alerted to an issue *before* it has a significant impact on their area of responsibility.
Traditional Reactive Intelligence Cycle

Establish Requirements ➔ Set Direction/Plan ➔ Collect Data ➔ Analyze ➔ Dissemination ➔ Get Feedback

Data isn’t collected until *after* the problem arises and the direction is set.
Proactive Intelligence Cycle

1. **Collect Data**
   - Continuous Data collection provides for timely, accurate and actionable analysis

2. **Establish Requirements**
3. **Set Direction / Plan**
4. **Get Feedback**
5. **Dissemination**
6. **Analysis**
We needed to:

• Quickly collect data from many different sources
• Optimize analyst resources
• Blend internal data with external data sources, including open source data
• Implement an agile system that can quickly adapt to changing requirements, data and business processes

Solutions:

• Tried several offerings
• Selected the TETRA platform
New & Innovative Approach

- Typical focus is solely on tools for “analysis” of data
- W/B HIDTA focused on new tools for the collection and collation of data in addition to analysis – while leveraging existing IT systems
- We needed ALL data relevant to our area of responsibility for a given threat
- For W/B HIDTA, individuals and, more specifically, criminal organizations are our Problem
Big Data Case Studies

Heroin Overdose
Repeat Violent Offenders
Movement of Crime
Case Study: Heroin Overdose

Relevant Sources of Data:

• Fatal Overdose Data
• Non-Fatal Overdoes Data
• Communication Data
• Communication Analysis Portal
• Field Debriefs
• Drug Samples
• Case Data
• Parole and Probation
• Arrest Information
• Gang Information
• Treatment Data
Case Study: Heroin Overdose

Data Connections:
Leveraging Communications Data:

• **Strategic Value:** Assessing overall threat

• **Operational Value:**
  • Law Enforcement – Identifying criminal networks
  • Public Health – Identifying target areas & people for optimal deployment of resources

• **Tactical Value:** Assisting criminal investigations
Case Study: Heroin Overdose

Uncovering the Network of Victims through Data:

Legend
- Overdose Victim
- Connections
Case Study: Repeat Violent Offender

When data isn’t shared among agencies, you end up with two separate clusters of minimal value:

Agency A’s Offender Data

Agency B’s Offender Data
Case Study: Repeat Violent Offender

Sharing of data leads to actionable intelligence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>DPP Violent</th>
<th>Homicide</th>
<th>Shooting</th>
<th>Gang Member</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A pattern in overdose victims was identified via data collated from many disparate sources.

Color coded dots represent the home location and death location of victims. All deaths are in Maryland.

We were able to utilize this data to identify the overdose victims were specifically coming to Maryland for their drugs.
Questions?