# AB 74 Jan 2021 Output Tables

Noah Lehman and Sal Lempert

# Total Assessments by Tool

Tool Name	County	Assessments
ORAS	Modoc, Napa, Nevada, Ventura, Yuba	2,652
PSA	Calaveras, Los Angeles, Sacramento, Tulare, Tuolumne	38,619
SPRAT	Sonoma	2,856
VPRAI	San Joaquin, Santa Barbara	5,443
VPRAIO	Kings	79
VPRAIR	Alameda, San Mateo, Santa Barbara	3,255

16.

- (a) The number of assessed individuals by age, gender, and race or ethnicity.
- (b) The number of assessed individuals by risk level, booking charge levels, and release decision
- (c) The number and percentage of assessed individuals who receive pretrial supervision by level of supervision.
- (d) The number and percentage of assessed individuals by supervision level who fail to appear in court as required, are arrested for a new offense during the pretrial period, or have pretrial release revoked.

16. (a) The number of assessed individuals by age, gender, and race or ethnicity.

The Number of Assessed Individuals by Age

County Size	18-25	26-35	36-45	46-55	56+	Unknown	Total
Small	69	179	124	82	37	2	493
Small/Medium	99	187	107	63	33	139	628
Medium	2,758	4,316	2,872	1,363	791	1,735	13,835
Large	8,305	14,263	8,285	3,953	2,171	971	37,948
Total	11,231	18,945	11,388	$5,\!461$	3,032	$2,\!847$	$52,\!904$

The Number of Assessed Individuals by Gender

County Size	Male	Female	Other/Unknown	Total
Small	375	115	3	493
Small/Medium	465	110	53	628
Medium	10,972	2,736	127	13,835
Large	30,204	6,780	964	37,948
$\operatorname{Total}$	$42,\!016$	9,741	1,147	$52,\!904$

The Number of Assessed Individuals by Race

County Size	Black	White	Hispanic	Other/Unknown	Total
Small	3	387	59	44	493
Small/Medium	51	294	190	93	628
Medium	1,837	4,479	6,652	867	13,835
Large	10,579	8,409	16,001	2,959	37,948
Total	$12,\!470$	$13,\!569$	$22,\!902$	$3,\!963$	$52,\!904$

16. (b) The number of assessed individuals by risk level, booking charge levels, and release decision

The Number of Assessed Individuals by Risk Score (ORAS)

ORAS Risk Score	Count
0	80
1	188
2	292
3	362
4	378
5	342
6	403
7	302
8	183
9	122
Total	$2,\!652$

Notes: This table includes data from five counties (Modoc, Napa, Nevada, Ventura, Yuba).

The Number of Assessed Individuals by Risk Score (VPRAI)

VPRAI Risk Score	Count
0	95
1	501
2	872
3	1,027
4	892
5	799
6	563
7	439
8	210
9	45
Total	5,443

Notes: This table includes data from two counties (San Joaquin, Santa Barbara).

The Number of Assessed Individuals by Risk Score (VPRAI-R)

VPRAI-R Risk Score	Count
0	309
1	233
2	235
3	349
4	225
5	326
6	339
7	246
8	322
9	220
10	164
11	161
12	65
13	51
14	10
Total	3,255

Notes: This table includes data from two counties (Alameda, San Mateo, Santa Barbara).

The Number of Assessed Individuals by Risk Score (VPRAI-O)  $\,$ 

VPRAI-O Risk Score	Count
1	3
2	11
3	9
4	21
5	15
6	11
7	6
8	3
Total	<b>7</b> 9

Notes: This table includes data from one county (Kings).

The Number of Assessed Individuals by Risk Score (PSA FTA)

PSA FTA Risk Score	Count
1	8,318
2	7,841
3	8,009
4	6,765
5	4,806
6	2,880
Total	38,619

Notes: This table includes data from five counties (Calaveras, Los Angeles, Sacramento, Tulare, Tuolumne).

The Number of Assessed Individuals by Risk Score (PSA New Criminal Activity)

PSA NCA Risk Score	Count
1	6,017
2	$5,\!539$
3	$7,\!161$
4	8,630
5	$6,\!350$
6	4,920
Total	38,619

Notes: This table includes data from five counties (Calaveras, Los Angeles, Sacramento, Tulare, Tuolumne).

The Number of Assessed Individuals by Risk Score (PSA New Violent Criminal Activity)

PSA NVCA Risk Score	Count
0	30,831
1	7,788
Total	38,619

Notes: This table includes data from five counties (Calaveras, Los Angeles, Sacramento, Tulare, Tuolumne).

The Number of Assessed Individuals by Risk Score (SPRAT)

SPRAT Risk Score	Count
-10	1
-9	3
-8	70
-7	70
-6	163
-5	138
-4	174
-3	207
-2	197
-1	179
0	210
1	205
2	249
3	179
4	358
5	119
6	216
7	73
8	22
9	16
10	7
Total	2,856

Notes: This table includes data from one county (Sonoma).

#### The Number of Assessed Individuals by Booking Charge Level

Notes: Booking charge level is reported in a seperate data source from assessment data. Data on this measure is currently unavailable but will be provided in future reports.

The Number of Assessed Individuals by Pretrial Program Release Decision

County Size	Granted Program Release	Denied Program Release
Small	175	104
Small/Medium	61	178
Medium	3,032	3,862
Large	1,668	1,578
Total	$4,\!936$	$5{,}722$

Notes: 'Release Denied' indicates individuals who judicial officers did not choose to release through the pretrial program. These individuals may still have gotten out on bail. 'Release Approved' includes individuals released on OR or monitoring. 'Bail/Zero Bail/Ineligible/Other' includes individuals who bailed out, who were released on zero bail, whose charges were dropped or dismissed, who were held for other reasons, and who are missing release decision data. Total Other = 17,858. Total = 28,516

# The Number of Assessed Individuals by Pre-Arraignment Program Release Decision

County	Granted Prearraignment	Denied Prearraignment
	Program Release	Program Release
Los Angeles	686	8,544

Notes: 'Release Denied' indicates individuals who judicial officers did not choose to release through the pretrial program. These individuals may still have gotten out on bail. 'Release Approved' includes individuals released on OR or monitoring. 'Bail/Zero Bail/Ineligible/Other' includes individuals who bailed out, who were released on zero bail, whose charges were dropped or dismissed, who were held for other reasons, and who are missing release decision data. Total Other = 15,158. Total = 24,388

#### # AB 74: Tables

16. (c) The number and percentage of assessed individuals who receive pretrial supervision by level of supervision

The Number and Percentage of Assessed and Supervised Individuals by Supervision Level

County Size	Total	Basic		Moderate		Enhanced		Unspecified Supervision	
		Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count
Small	88	56%	49	30%	26	11%	10	3%	3
Small/Med	lium 46	7%	3	13%	6	4%	2	76%	35
Medium	2,639	17%	438	28%	728	45%	1181	11%	292
Large	1,214	13%	155	57%	686	27%	329	4%	44
Total	3,987	16%	645	36%	1446	38%	$\boldsymbol{1522}$	9%	374

Notes: 'Unspecified Supervision' includes individuals in counties which do not categorize supervision conditions into discrete levels. For counties which use discrete supervision levels, supervision levels were collapsed into 'Basic', 'Moderate', and 'Enhanced' supervision, though what each of these supervision levels mean varies widely across counties.

16. (d) The number and percentage of assessed individuals by supervision level who fail to appear in court as required, are arrested for a new offense during the pretrial period, or have pretrial release revoked.

#### Pretrial Revocations by Termination Reason and Monitor Level

			FTA		New Crime		Technical Violation/ Unknown		Total Revoked	
Monitor Level	Total	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	
Basic	645	8%	52	2%	12	4%	26	14%	90	
Moderate	1,446	13%	187	3%	42	3%	42	19%	271	
Enhanced	1,522	13%	197	7%	100	6%	96	26%	393	
Unspecified All_Levels	374 <b>3,987</b>	4% 11%	15 <b>451</b>	2% $4%$	8 <b>162</b>	5%	20 <b>184</b>	$11\%$ $\mathbf{20\%}$	43 <b>797</b>	

Notes: 'Unspecified Supervision' includes individuals in counties which do not categorize supervision conditions into discrete levels. For counties which use discrete supervision levels, supervision levels were collapsed into 'Basic', 'Moderate', and 'Enhanced' supervision, though what each of these supervision levels mean varies widely across counties.

Data quality is low for failures to appear, new offenses during the pretrial period, and revocations of pretrial release. For future reports, FTA and new offense data will come from different data sources which are not currently available; probation departments keep limited records of FTA and new offenses. The data in this table includes individuals whose pretrial period is not yet complete, and may accrue adverse outcomes before completion of the pretrial period. The short time frame for this first reporting period means that that many programs have not been operational long enough to accurately measure outcomes.