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Appendix A: County Data

This study draws on data from the BSCC-PPIC Multi-County Study (MCS), an ongoing effort to collect and merge California state and county criminal justice data for the purpose of evaluating the effects of key criminal justice reforms and identifying effective recidivism-reduction policies and practices. The MCS is a collaborative effort between the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC), the California Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC), and our partner counties throughout the state. The data collection effort has also benefited from data- and information-sharing by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) and the California Department of Justice (DOJ). The MCS dataset is built at the individual level and will capture a wide scope of offender characteristics, including demographics, criminal histories, risk assessments, custody and probation terms, programmatic interventions and recidivism outcomes.

In this study of the effects of Proposition 47 on jail populations, we leverage a subset of the MCS dataset collected from county jail systems. These data allow us to observe individuals as they move through jail systems over time, capturing bookings, releases, and offense information. Here, we focus on individuals moving through county jail systems during the time period ranging from one year prior to Prop 47 implementation through one year following implementation (November 2013 through October 2015).

This study was designed to utilize individual-level data from a subset of county jail systems to represent the overall effect of Prop 47 on county jail populations. We use this technical appendix to provide county-level analysis for each county participating in the study. In some cases, county data was not included in the main analysis due to current data limitations. We explain those limitations in the notes of the figures that follow for each county. We also show differences between our estimate of the jail ADP based on MCS data and the jail ADP reported to the BSCC through the Jail Profile Survey (JPS). In general, we estimate jail ADP by constructing custody spells. This approach captures all individuals moving through the jail system, even if they spend less than one day in jail. We also capture a broad population in our analysis, including all individuals housed within a particular jail system regardless of their status or jurisdiction. This method is distinct from the “daily count” method, which is used by sheriffs to produce the ADP reported through the JPS. The daily count method is straightforward – specified inmate populations are counted once per day and the monthly reported ADP is simply the average of those daily counts for a particular month. Our estimates of ADP using custody spells will be somewhat different from the daily count estimates, but we expect to see similar trends over time in these different estimates of jail ADP.
FIGURE A1
MCS estimate of total jail ADP and Proposition 47 ADP over the implementation period

SOURCE: Author’s calculations based on the BSCC-PPIC Multi-County Study data (2013-2015).
NOTE: Alameda County jail data were not included in the main analysis.

FIGURE A2
Comparison of MCS estimate of ADP and JPS reported ADP

NOTE: As shown in this figure, the MCS estimate of total ADP diverges over time from the ADP reported through the JPS. At the time of publication, we were missing data for a particular group of individuals. Given the nature of the missing data, the effect increases over time and, therefore, would have biased our estimates in the main analysis.
Contra Costa County

FIGURE A3
MCS estimate of total jail ADP and Proposition 47 ADP over the implementation period

SOURCE: Author’s calculations based on the BSCC-PPIC Multi-County Study data (2013-2015).
NOTE: Contra Costa County jail data were not included in the main analysis.

FIGURE A4
Comparison of MCS estimate of ADP and JPS reported ADP

NOTE: As shown in this figure, the MCS estimate of total ADP diverges over time from the ADP reported through the JPS. At the time of publication, we were missing data for a particular group of individuals. Given the nature of the missing data, the effect increases over time and, therefore, would have biased our estimates in the main analysis.
**Fresno County**

**FIGURE A5**
MCS estimate of total jail ADP and Proposition 47 ADP over the implementation period

![Chart](chart.png)

**SOURCE:** Author's calculations based on the BSCC-PPIC Multi-County Study data (2013-2015).

**NOTE:** Fresno County data were included in the main analysis.

**FIGURE A6**
Comparison of MCS estimate of ADP and JPS reported ADP
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**NOTE:** Small differences between the MCS estimate of total ADP and the ADP reported to the JPS are likely the result of differences in the estimation method—particularly, the counting of jail inmates who are in custody for less than one day. However, these measures follow a similar trend line throughout the period.
Humboldt County

**FIGURE A7**
MCS estimate of total jail ADP and Proposition 47 ADP over the implementation period

![Graph showing MCS estimate of total jail ADP and Proposition 47 ADP over the implementation period](image)

**SOURCE:** Author’s calculations based on the BSCC-PPIC Multi-County Study data (2013-2015).  
**NOTE:** Humboldt County data were included in the main analysis.

**FIGURE A8**
Comparison of MCS estimate of ADP and JPS reported ADP

![Graph comparing MCS estimate of ADP and JPS reported ADP](image)

**NOTE:** Small differences between the MCS estimate of total ADP and the ADP reported to the JPS are likely the result of differences in the estimation method—particularly, the counting of jail inmates who are in custody for less than one day. However, these measures follow a similar trend line throughout the period.
Kern County

FIGURE A9
MCS estimate of total jail ADP and Proposition 47 ADP over the implementation period

SOURCE: Author’s calculations based on the BSCC-PPIC Multi-County Study data (2013-2015).
NOTE: Kern County data were included in the main analysis.

FIGURE A10
Comparison of MCS estimate of ADP and JPS reported ADP

NOTE: The MCS estimate of total ADP and the ADP reported to the JPS are substantially different throughout the period. Part of this difference is likely the result of differences in the estimation method—particularly, the counting of jail inmates who are in custody for less than one day. We have identified additional sources of this difference and are working with Kern County to revise the MCS estimates. However, these measures follow a similar trend line through the period.
Los Angeles County

**FIGURE A11**
MCS estimate of total jail ADP and Proposition 47 ADP over the implementation period

![Graph showing the comparison of MCS estimate of total jail ADP and Proposition 47 ADP over the implementation period.](image)

**SOURCE:** Author’s calculations based on the BSCC-PPIC Multi-County Study data (2013-2015).

**NOTE:** Los Angeles County data were included in the main analysis.

**FIGURE A12**
Comparison of MCS estimate of ADP and JPS reported ADP

![Graph comparing the MCS estimate of ADP and the JPS reported ADP.](image)


**NOTE:** Small differences between the MCS estimate of total ADP and the ADP reported to the JPS are likely the result of differences in the estimation method—particularly, the counting of jail inmates who are in custody for less than one day. However, these measures follow a similar trend line throughout the period.
Monterey County

**FIGURE A13**
MCS estimate of total jail ADP and Proposition 47 ADP over the implementation period
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**SOURCE**: Author’s calculations based on the BSCC-PPIC Multi-County Study data (2013-2015).

**NOTE**: Monterey County data were included in the main analysis.

**FIGURE A14**
Comparison of MCS estimate of ADP and JPS reported ADP
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**NOTE**: Small differences in the MCS estimate of total ADP and the ADP reported to the JPS are likely the result of differences in the estimation method—particularly, the counting of jail inmates who are in custody for less than one day. However, these measures follow a similar trend line throughout the period.
Orange County

**FIGURE A15**
MCS estimate of total jail ADP and Proposition 47 ADP over the implementation period


NOTE: Orange County data were included in the main analysis.

**FIGURE A16**
Comparison of MCS estimate of ADP and JPS reported ADP


NOTE: Small differences in the MCS estimate of total ADP and the ADP reported to the JPS are likely the result of differences in the estimation method—particularly, the counting of jail inmates who are in custody for less than one day. However, these measures follow a similar trend line throughout the period.
Sacramento County

FIGURE A17
MCS estimate of total jail ADP and Proposition 47 ADP over the implementation period

SOURCE: Author’s calculations based on the BSCC-PPIC Multi-County Study data (2013-2015).
NOTE: Sacramento County data were included in the main analysis.

FIGURE A18
Comparison of MCS estimate of ADP and JPS reported ADP

NOTE: The MCS estimate of total ADP and the ADP reported to the JPS are substantially different throughout the period. Part of this difference is likely the result of differences in the estimation method—particularly, the counting of jail inmates who are in custody for less than one day. We have identified additional sources of this divergence and are working with Sacramento County to revise the MCS estimates. However, these measures follow a similar trend line through the period.
San Bernardino County

FIGURE A19
MCS estimate of total jail ADP and Proposition 47 ADP over the implementation period

SOURCE: Author’s calculations based on the BSCC-PPIC Multi-County Study data (2013-2015).
NOTE: San Bernardino County data were included in the main analysis.

FIGURE A20
Comparison of MCS estimate of ADP and JPS reported ADP

NOTE: The MCS estimate of total ADP and the ADP reported to the JPS are substantially different throughout the period. Part of this difference is likely the result of differences in the estimation method—particularly, the counting of jail inmates who are in custody for less than one day. We are working with San Bernardino County to identify the source of the remaining, systematic difference in the estimated and reported ADP measures. However, these measures follow a similar trend line through the period.
San Francisco County

FIGURE A21
MCS estimate of total jail ADP and Proposition 47 ADP over the implementation period

SOURCE: Author’s calculations based on the BSCC-PPIC Multi-County Study data (2013-2015).
NOTE: San Francisco County data were included in the main analysis.

FIGURE A22
Comparison of MCS estimate of ADP and JPS reported ADP

NOTE: Small differences between the MCS estimate of total ADP and the ADP reported to the JPS are likely the result of differences in the estimation method—particularly, the counting of jail inmates who are in custody for less than one day. However, these measures follow a similar trend line throughout the period.
Shasta County

FIGURE A23
MCS estimate of total jail ADP and Proposition 47 ADP over the implementation period

SOURCE: Author’s calculations based on the BSCC-PPIC Multi-County Study data (2013-2015).
NOTE: Shasta County jail data were not included in the main analysis.

FIGURE A24
Comparison of MCS estimate of ADP and JPS reported ADP

NOTE: As shown in this figure, the MCS estimate of total ADP diverges over time from the ADP reported through the JPS. At the time of publication, we were missing data for a particular group of individuals. Given the nature of the missing data, the effect increases over time and would bias our estimates in the main analysis.
FIGURE A25
MCS estimate of total jail ADP and Proposition 47 ADP over the implementation period

SOURCE: Author’s calculations based on the BSCC-PPIC Multi-County Study data (2013-2015).
NOTE: Stanislaus County data were included in the main analysis.

FIGURE A26
Comparison of MCS estimate of ADP and JPS reported ADP

NOTE: Small differences between the MCS estimate of total ADP and the ADP reported to the JPS are likely the result of differences in the estimation method—particularly, the counting of jail inmates who are in custody for less than one day. However, these measures follow a similar trend line throughout the period.
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