

TECHNICAL APPENDIX

LIBERTY AND JUSTICE:
PRETRIAL PRACTICES IN TEXAS

March 2017



LIBERAL ARTS
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY
PUBLIC POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE



LIBERTY AND JUSTICE: PRETRIAL PRACTICES IN TEXAS

AUTHORS

Dottie Carmichael, Ph.D.

George Naufal, Ph.D.

Steve Wood, Ph.D.

Heather Caspers, M.A.

Miner P. Marchbanks, III, Ph.D.

Public Policy Research Institute, Texas A&M University

The authors gratefully acknowledge the assistance of

Scott Griffith

Amanda Stites

Texas State Office of Court Administration

The full report can be retrieved from <https://tinyurl.com/Texas-Bond-Study>

Funding for this research was provided by the Texas Office of Court Administration and the Texas Indigent Defense Commission.

©2017 Public Policy Research Institute. All Rights Reserved.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Statistical Models	1
Table T-1. Example Table of Regression Coefficients and Standard Errors	1
Table T-2. Statistical Models Predicting the Likelihood of Pretrial Detention with and without using the ORAS-PAT Instrument.....	2
Table T-3a. Statistical Model Predicting New Criminal Activity in Financial Release System (Tarrant County).....	4
Table T-3b. Statistical Model Predicting New Criminal Activity in Risk-Informed Release System (Travis County)	6
Table T-4. Statistical Models Predicting Costs	7
Cost Sources	8
Table C-1. Travis County Program	9
○ Risk Assessment (see C-1a for detail)	
○ Personal Bond (see C-1b through C-1f for detail)	
○ Surety Bond (see C-1f for detail)	
Table C-2. Tarrant County Program	11
○ Personal Bond Supervision (see C-3a for detail)	
○ Surety Bond Supervision (see C-3b for detail)	
Table C-3. Devices & Testing Costs for Travis County	12
Table C-4. Devices & Testing Costs for Tarrant County	13
○ Monitoring Devices or Testing (see C-4a-c for detail)	
Table C-5. Travis County Counseling and Education Services	15
Table C-6. New Criminal Activity (NCA) While on Bond in Tarrant and Travis Counties	16
○ Arrest (see C-4d for detail)	
○ Prosecution (see C-4a for detail)	
○ Court Costs (see C-4b for detail)	
○ Legal Representation for Indigent Defendants (see C-4c for detail)	
Table C-7. Bail Forfeiture for Tarrant and Travis Counties	19
Table C-8. Pretrial Detention Costs for Tarrant and Travis Counties	19
Table C-9. Victim Costs for Tarrant and Travis Counties	20
Pretrial Services Survey Methodology	21

STATISTICAL MODELS

The following tables provide guidance for interpretation of the statistical material in this report. Each table shows a model used to answer one or more questions in the report. Each model depicted contains a set of *independent variables* that may be related to or influence the *dependent variable*, which is the outcome of interest. Table T-1 illustrates how the information can be read. In this example (extracted from the full model specified in Table T-4), the probability of “new criminal activity” (i.e., the dependent variable) is determined by independent variables including age at arrest and most severe charge.¹

The regression coefficients in each cell show how much each of these independent variables contributes to explaining change in the dependent variable, new criminal activity, when all other independent variables are held at a constant value.² A basic means of interpreting regression coefficients is to examine whether the relationship is positive or negative. A negative coefficient indicates that an increase in the value of the independent variable is associated with a decrease in the value of the dependent variable. For example, in the table below, the likelihood a person will commit a new crime while on bond declines with age. Conversely, a positive coefficient indicates that an increase (or decrease) in the value of the independent variable is related to the same direction of change in the dependent variable. In the table below, increasing charge severity is associated with a higher likelihood that the defendant will engage in new criminal activity.

**Table T-1. Example Table of Regression Coefficients and Standard Errors
(Extracted from Table T-4)**

Independent Variables	Dependent Variable
	New Criminal Activity
	Regression Coefficients (Standard errors in parentheses)
Age at Arrest	-0.00605*** (0.00109)
Most Severe Charge	0.0387*** (0.0116)

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

If the effect of an independent variable is large enough to be unlikely to have occurred by chance, asterisks indicating statistical significance will be shown next to the regression coefficients. One asterisk indicates a difference as great as the one observed could have occurred by luck ten times out of 100 (i.e., 10% probability it is a chance finding). Two asterisks indicate the finding could have occurred by

¹ The information presented in Table B-1 is for illustration purposes only. The fully specified model is presented in Table B-4.

² Additional calculations are needed to convert the probit regression coefficients reported here into values that have practical meaning. The magnitude of the effect of each independent variable can be interpreted relative to a reference value (typically the mean or mode).

luck five times in 100 (i.e., 5% probability it is a chance finding). Three asterisks mean the result occurred by luck just one time in 100 (i.e., 1% probability it is a chance finding).

The numbers in parentheses beneath the regression coefficients represent standard errors. Standard errors are a statistical measure of how accurately the current sample (e.g., the bookings from Travis County contained in the research dataset) represents the population (e.g., all bookings in Travis County during the study period). The smaller the standard errors (i.e., the closer to zero), the more accurate the measure is considered to be.

Question of Interest: *The models shown in Table T-2 were used to address Finding 2. They examine whether the interview-based ORAS-PAT and a “no interview” multivariate statistical model are similar in their ability to predict the court’s pretrial detention decision.*

The first column, labeled “Only ORAS-PAT,” shows the relationship between each ORAS-PAT score and the likelihood of pretrial detention, without the inclusion of any other independent variables. The second column, labeled “No ORAS-PAT,” shows the relationship between each independent variable and the likelihood of pretrial detention, without the inclusion of ORAS-PAT scores.

Table T-2. Statistical Models Predicting the Likelihood of Pretrial Detention with and without using the ORAS-PAT Instrument

	Only ORAS-PAT (n = 51,090)	No ORAS-PAT (n = 51,086)
Independent Variables	Dependent Variable	
	Pretrial Detention	
	Regression Coefficients (Standard errors in parentheses)	
Age at Arrest	-----	0.0312*** (0.00113)
US Citizenship	-----	-0.631*** (0.0516)
Indigent Status	-----	3.146*** (0.0411)
On Probation at Arrest	-----	0.00979 (0.0570)
Number of Charges Filed	-----	0.251*** (0.0201)
Most Severe Charge	-----	0.319*** (0.0118)
Current Charge Violent	-----	0.182*** (0.0362)
Prior Misdemeanor	-----	0.266*** (0.0403)

	Regression Coefficients (Standard errors in parentheses)	
Prior Felony	-----	0.407*** (0.0455)
Prior Violent Offense	-----	0.160*** (0.0522)
Prior Sentence of Incarceration	-----	1.283*** (0.0432)
Failure to Appear in Past Two Years	-----	0.297* (0.156)
Pending Charge at Arrest	-----	0.0895* (0.0531)
ORAS = 1	0.630*** (0.109)	-----
ORAS = 2	1.535*** (0.105)	-----
ORAS = 3	2.213*** (0.104)	-----
ORAS = 4	2.757*** (0.105)	-----
ORAS = 5	3.420*** (0.106)	-----
ORAS = 6	3.983*** (0.112)	-----
ORAS = 7	4.231*** (0.138)	-----
ORAS = 8	3.953*** (0.270)	-----
ORAS = 9	3.857*** (0.579)	-----
Constant	-3.387*** (0.102)	-5.424*** (0.0791)

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Question of Interest: *The models in Tables T-3a and T-3b were used to classify defendants in the financial and risk-informed release systems by risk. Results were used to discuss differences between high- and low-risk defendants in Findings 3, 4, and 5.*

The model shown in Tables T-3a and T-3b were used to compute a chance of new criminal activity for each person in the study. The upper 30% of individuals with the greatest chance of new criminal activity were said to be high-risk and subsequently “recommended for detention” while the remaining 70% were designated as low risk or “recommended for release.”

Because the chance of new criminal activity is different for people who made bond compared to those who remain in detention, a two-stage Heckman model was used. An individual’s chance of making bond computed in the first stage can be considered when assessing their chance of involvement in new crimes in the second stage. In Tables T-3a and T-3b, the second column (Heckman 1st Stage) lists the relationship between each independent variable and the likelihood of making bond. The third column (Heckman 2nd Stage) lists the relationship between each independent variable and the likelihood of new criminal activity, while also accounting for whether the defendant made bond. The second stage of the Heckman model also examined the interactive relationship between being on supervision at the time of arrest and all other independent variables

Table T-3a. Statistical Model Predicting New Criminal Activity in Financial Release System (Tarrant County)

	Heckman 1 st Stage (N = 102,193)	Heckman 2 nd Stage (N = 102,193)
Independent Variables	Dependent Variables	
	Made Bond	New Criminal Activity
	Regression Coefficients (Standard errors in parentheses)	
Age at Arrest	-0.0143*** (0.0004)	-0.00683*** (0.0011)
US Citizenship	0.0966*** (0.0162)	0.313*** (0.0254)
Indigent Status	-1.479*** (0.0116)	0.673*** (0.0634)
On Probation at Arrest	0.563*** (0.0632)	0.240*** (0.0536)
Number of Charges Filed	-0.238*** (0.0098)	0.0961*** (0.0188)
Most Severe Charge	-0.0298*** (0.0069)	0.0693*** (0.0070)
Current Charge Violent	-0.110*** (0.0153)	-0.0652*** (0.0184)
Prior Misdemeanor	-0.132*** (0.0149)	0.364*** (0.0204)

	Regression Coefficients (Standard errors in parentheses)	
Prior Felony	-0.263*** (0.0153)	0.523*** (0.0215)
Prior Violent Offense	-0.0154 (0.0184)	-0.0703*** (0.0269)
Prior Sentence of Incarceration	-0.446*** (0.0157)	-0.0531 (0.0379)
Failure to Appear in Past Two Years	-0.0694*** (0.0130)	0.0747*** (0.0193)
Pending Charge at Arrest	-0.319*** (0.0169)	0.0697** (0.0281)
Bond Amount	-0.0942*** (0.0068)	0.0672*** (0.0097)
On Supervision at Time of Arrest	-----	1.358*** (0.2410)
Constant	3.096*** (0.0506)	-2.205*** (0.0713)
Interaction On Supervision	No	Yes
Court Dummy	Yes	No

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table T-3b. Statistical Model Predicting New Criminal Activity in Risk-Informed Release System (Travis County)

	Heckman 1 st Stage (N = 61,114)	Heckman 2 nd Stage (N = 61,114)
Independent Variables	Dependent Variables	
	Made Bond	New Criminal Activity
	Regression Coefficients (Standard errors in parentheses)	
Age at Arrest	-0.0209*** (0.000577)	-0.00605*** (0.00109)
US Citizenship	0.291*** (0.0265)	0.158*** (0.0370)
Indigent Status	-1.733*** (0.0173)	0.399*** (0.0474)
On Probation at Arrest	0.0121 (0.0290)	0.368*** (0.0401)
Number of Charges Filed	-0.0715*** (0.0115)	0.0228 (0.0171)
Most Severe Charge	-0.0634*** (0.0113)	0.0387*** (0.0116)
Current Charge Violent	-0.126*** (0.0243)	-0.158*** (0.0274)
Prior Misdemeanor	-0.313*** (0.0197)	0.400*** (0.0276)
Prior Felony	-0.301*** (0.0222)	0.398*** (0.0344)
Prior Violent Offense	-0.0456* (0.0257)	-0.0865** (0.0398)
Prior Sentence of Incarceration	-0.746*** (0.0214)	0.324*** (0.0433)
Failure to Appear in Past Two Years	-0.0145 (0.0797)	-0.104 (0.116)
Pending Charge at Arrest	0.113*** (0.0262)	0.117*** (0.0336)
Bond Amount	-0.180*** (0.0103)	0.0700*** (0.0161)
On Supervision at Time of Arrest	-----	1.507*** (0.282)
Constant	4.202*** (0.0954)	-2.081*** (0.124)
Interaction On Supervision Court Dummy	No Yes	Yes No

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Question of Interest: *The models in Table T-4 were used to predict expected costs per defendant examined in Finding 4.*

Table T-4 shows the variables used to construct two-stage Heckman selection models used to predict eight different types of costs. Across all models, the first stage and independent variables were the same; only dependent variables reflecting they cost categories changed. Coefficients and standard errors for each model are available upon request from the authors.

Table T-4. Statistical Models Predicting Costs

Independent Variables Used in Eight Models	Dependent Variables Used in Eight Models		
	Heckman 1 st Stage	Heckman 2 nd Stage	
Age at Arrest US Citizenship Indigent Status On Probation at Arrest Number of Charges Filed Most Severe Charge Current Charge Violent Prior Misdemeanor Prior Felony Prior Violent Offense Prior Sentence of Incarceration Failure to Appear in Past Two Years Pending Charge at Arrest Bond Amount On Supervision at Time of Arrest	Made Bond	Program	
		New Criminal Activity	
		Failure to Appear	
		Detainment	
		Victim	
		Devices and Testing	
		Counseling and Education Services	
		Surety Bond	
Interaction On Supervision	No	Yes	
Court Dummy	Yes	No	

COST SOURCES

Tables C-1 through C-9 detail the specific cost components underlying the calculations. Costs were considered in eight categories:

1) Pretrial program operation

Table C-1: Travis County

Table C-2: Tarrant County

2) Devices and testing required by the court

Table C-3: Travis County

Table C-4: Tarrant County

3) Counseling and evaluation services to reduce bond failure in Travis County only

Table C-5: Travis County

4) Surety bond fees paid by defendants

Not shown. Estimated at 10% of surety bond amount set by the court.

5) New criminal activity committed by defendants on bail;

Table C-6: Travis and Tarrant Counties

6) Bail forfeiture resulting from failure to appear in court;

Table C-7: Travis and Tarrant Counties

7) Pretrial detention

Table C-8: Travis and Tarrant Counties

8) Victimization

Table C-9: Travis and Tarrant Counties

Table C-1

Legend for Tables Detailing Travis County Program Costs		
Cost Element	Cost	Cost Detail
Risk Assessment³		Table C-1a
Personal Bond⁴		
Personal Bond Supervision	\$2.92/day	Table C-1b
Electronic Monitoring Program Administration	\$8.70/day	Table C-1c
Alcohol Monitoring Program Administration	\$0.33/day	Table C-1d
Mental Health Program Administration	\$6.40/day	Table C-1e
Family Violence Program Administration	\$1.30/day	Table C-1f
Surety Bond		
Surety Bond Supervision	\$2.92/day	Table C-1b

³ \$31.77 one-time risk assessment cost

⁴ From FY 2013 to FY2015, a \$20 one-time defendant personal bond fee was assessed for all defendants with a bail amount of \$1,350 or less. A \$40 one-time defendant personal bond fee was assessed for all defendants with a bail amount over \$1,350. In FY 2016, Travis County Pretrial Services updated the personal bond fee to \$40 for all defendants, independent of bail amount.

Table C.1a-f

Cost Detail for Travis County Program⁵				
Cost Element	Calculations			
C-1a Risk Assessment	\$1,753,718 Travis County Pretrial Services FY 2015 Annual Cost	÷ 55,194 Defendants Assessed in FY 2015		\$31.77
C-1b Admin. Staff: Personal Bond Supervision	\$1,307,131 Travis County Pretrial Services FY 2015 Annual Cost for Minimal Monitoring	÷ 365 days/year	÷ 1,228 Defendants Supervised/Day	\$2.92 Cost of Program Administration/ Person/Day
C-1c Admin. Staff: Electronic Monitoring Program	\$524,943 Travis County Pretrial Services FY 2015 Annual Cost for Electronic Monitoring	÷ 365 days/year	÷ 165 Defendants Supervised/Day	\$8.70 Cost of Program Administration/ Person/Day
C-1d Admin. Staff: Alcohol Monitoring Program	\$207,323 Travis County Pretrial Services FY 2015 Annual Cost for Alcohol Monitoring	÷ 365 days/year	÷ 1,748 Defendants Supervised/Day	\$0.33 Cost of Program Administration/ Person/Day
C-1e Admin. Staff: Mental Health Program	\$261,799 Travis County Pretrial Services FY 2015 Annual Cost for Mental Health	÷ 365 days/year	÷ 112 Defendants Supervised/Day	\$6.40 Cost of Program Administration/ Person/Day
C-1f Admin. Staff: Family Violence Program	\$232,928 Travis County Pretrial Services FY 2015 Annual Cost for Family Violence	÷ 365 days/year	÷ 489 Defendants Supervised/Day	\$1.30 Cost of Program Administration/ Person/Day

⁵ All figures in this table (i.e., costs and number of defendants) were provided by Travis County Pretrial Services.

Table C.2

Legend for Tables Detailing Tarrant County Program Costs		
Cost Element	Cost	Cost Detail
Personal Bond Supervision		
Pretrial Services	\$2.06/day	Table C-2a
Surety Bond Supervision		
CSCD	\$2.69/day	Table C-2b

Table C.2a-b

Cost Detail for Tarrant County Program				
Cost Element	Calculations			
C-2a Personal Bond Supervision	\$1,351,925⁶ Tarrant County Pretrial Services FY 2015 Budget and Personal Bond Fees	÷ 365 days/year	÷ 1,800 ⁷ Defendants Supervised/Day	\$2.06 Cost of Supervision/Day
C-2b Surety Bond Supervision	\$448,137 Tarrant County CSCD FY 2015 Budget and Surety Bond Fees	÷ 365 days/year	÷ 457 ⁸ Defendants Supervised/Day	\$2.69 Cost of Supervision/Day

⁶ Retrieved from Tarrant County FY 2015 budget (Pretrial Services FY 2015 budget and FY 2015 pretrial release fees, one-time defendant personal bond fee of \$20 or 3% of bond amount, whichever is greater).

⁷ Provided by Tarrant County Pretrial Services.

⁸ Both budget and defendant numbers provided by Tarrant County CSCD (\$60/month defendant supervision fee).

Table C.3

Travis County Devices & Testing Costs	
Cost Element	Cost
Monitoring Devices or Testing⁹	
Drug Test	\$25/test
Ignition Interlock Fee	3% of pretrial bond amount, not to exceed \$300
Ignition Interlock	\$0.33/day
Electronic Monitoring	\$3.70/day
GPS	\$10.70/day
Continuous Alcohol Monitoring	\$10.75/day

⁹ Costs for devices and testing were provided by Travis County Pretrial Services.

Table C.4

Legend for Tables Detailing Tarrant County Devices & Testing Costs¹⁰		
Cost Element	Cost	Cost Detail
Monitoring Devices or Testing		
Drug Testing		
Pretrial Services	\$0.27/day	Table C-4a
CSCD	\$0.46/day	Table C-4c
Ignition Interlock		
Pretrial Services	\$0.48/day	Table C-4b
CSCD	\$0.18/day ¹¹	
GPS		
Pretrial Services	N/A ¹²	
CSCD	\$1.60/day ¹³	

¹⁰ Unlike Travis County, it was not clear what types of devices defendants received in Tarrant County. To assign a dollar amount for devices and testing to defendants in Tarrant County, a per day cost was applied to all individuals on the Pretrial Services (\$.75) or CSCD (\$2.24) caseload. Total devices and testing costs were calculated by multiplying the daily rate (\$.75 or \$2.24) by the number of non-jail days from initial arrest to final case disposition.

¹¹ Number provided by Tarrant County CSCD.

¹² Pretrial Services does not supervise defendants on GPS monitoring.

¹³ This number was obtained by the following calculation: approximately 16% of the average daily caseload is on GPS monitoring. With a cost of \$10 per day, the cost equals \$1.60.

Table C.4a-c

Cost Detail for Tarrant County Devices & Testing				
Cost Element	Calculations			
C-4a Drug Testing Pretrial Services	\$8,050¹⁴ Drug Testing Fees	÷ 12 months/year	÷ 82¹⁵ Defendants Tested/Month	\$0.27 Cost of Pretrial Services Drug Testing/Day
C-4b Ignition Interlock Pretrial Services	\$34,766¹⁶ DWI Interlock Fees	÷ 365 days/year	÷ 198¹⁷ Defendants/Day	\$0.48 Cost of Pretrial Services Ignition Interlock/Day
C-4c Drug Testing CSCD	\$92,569¹⁸ Drug Testing Fees	÷ 12 months/year	÷ 548 Drug Tests/Month ¹⁹	\$0.46 Cost of CSCD Drug Testing /Day

¹⁴ Pretrial Services estimated that 8% of their caseload had drug testing as a requirement. Drug testing fees in FY 2015 were \$100,619 (number provided by CSCD).

¹⁵ Number provided by Pretrial Services.

¹⁶ DWI interlock fees in FY 2015 Tarrant County budget.

¹⁷ This number is 11% of daily caseload.

¹⁸ Amount of money remaining after Pretrial Services' 8% was subtracted.

¹⁹ Average number of drug tests.

Table C.5

Counseling & Education Services Costs for Travis County²⁰	
Cost Element	Cost
AOD & Family Violence Assessment	\$55
DWI Education Class (12 hrs)	\$70
Drug Education Program (15 hrs)	\$90
DWI Intervention (30+ hrs)	\$185
12-hour AOD Education Class	\$70
Resolution Counseling 21 weeks	\$368
Minor in Possession (6 hrs)	\$45
Cognitive Change Program	\$125
8 hour Marijuana Class	\$70
Class C Misdemeanor (PI) (8hrs)	\$70

²⁰ Cost information was provided by Travis County Counseling and Education Services. However, several classes were missing costs, such as outpatient treatment/aftercare, mental health screenings, and private counseling. Missing costs were estimated by calculating a weighted average from the available class cost information.

Table C.6

New Criminal Activity while on Bond for Travis & Tarrant Counties²¹			
Cost Element per Case	Felony Cost	Misdemeanor Cost	Cost Detail
Arrest	\$2,027.27	\$2,027.27	Table C-6d
Prosecution	\$873.09	\$217.48	Table C-6a
Court Costs	\$200.29	\$135.95	Table C-6b
Legal Representation for Indigent Defendants	\$632.31	\$213.73	Table C-6c
TOTAL	\$3,732.96	\$2,594.43	

²¹ Due to large discrepancies between Travis and Tarrant Counties on costs of prosecution, court processing, and legal representation for indigent defendants, the values for these elements were standardized by taking the average between jurisdictions.

Table C.6a-d

Cost Detail for New Criminal Activity While on Bond (NCA)				
Cost Element	Calculations			
C-6a Prosecution- Felony	\$18,983,359²³ Tarrant County FY 2015 Criminal Prosecution Budget	÷ 20,846²⁴ Average Tarrant County Felony Cases Added Across FY 2012- 15	\$910.63: Prosecution Cost Per Case-Tarrant	Average: \$873.09
	\$15,279,608 Travis County FY 2015 Criminal Prosecution Budget-District Attorney	÷ 18,287 Average Travis County Felony Cases Added Across FY 2012- 15	\$835.54: Prosecution Cost Per Case-Travis	
C-6a Prosecution- Misdemeanor	\$8,569,792 Tarrant County FY 2015 Criminal Prosecution Budget	÷ 34,519 Average Tarrant County Misdemeanor Cases Added Across FY 2012-15	\$248.26: Prosecution Cost Per Case-Tarrant	Average: \$217.48
	\$9,226,138 Travis County FY 2015 Criminal Prosecution Budget-County Attorney	÷ 49,416 Average Travis County Misdemeanor Cases Added Across FY 2012-15	\$186.70: Prosecution Cost Per Case-Travis	
C-6b Court Case- Felony	\$3,735,460²⁵ Tarrant County FY 2015 Criminal District Court Budget	÷ 18,130 Tarrant County Felony Cases Disposed During FY 2015	\$206.04: Cost Per Case-Tarrant	Average: \$200.29
	\$2,268,755 Travis County FY 2015 Criminal District Court Budget	÷ 11,662 Travis County Felony Cases Disposed During FY 2015	\$194.54: Prosecution Cost Per Case-Travis	

²³ Number obtained by combining the Tarrant County FY 2015 District Attorney Criminal Budget with 96% of the Investigation budget (most investigation occurs in the criminal division, with only two investigators assigned to the civil division. Mark Kratovil, Tarrant County DA Office provided the budget and investigation allocation for criminal cases). Because the budget provided by Tarrant County did not separate misdemeanor and felony prosecution costs by offense level, findings from the Tennessee District Attorneys General Weighted Caseload Study (pg. 38-39, <http://www.comptroller.tn.gov/Repository/RE/distatt.pdf>) were used to allocate expenses in the Tarrant County DA Office budget.

²⁴ Number of cases was obtained from Texas Office of Court Administration. "Court Activity Reporting and Directory System," Retrieved from <http://card.txcourts.gov/AdHocSearchNew.aspx>.

²⁵ Court costs in Tarrant and Travis Counties were obtained from FY 2015 County Budgets. Court and administrative budgets were combined, and costs were allocated between district and county courts based on the number of felony and misdemeanor cases.

Cost Element	Calculations			
C-6b Court Case- Misdemeanor	\$5,706,315 Tarrant County FY 2015 Criminal County Court Budget	÷ 32,935 Tarrant County Misdemeanor Cases Disposed During FY 2015	\$173.26: Cost Per Case-Tarrant	Average: \$135.95
	\$3,452,498 Travis County FY 2015 Criminal County Court Budget	÷ 34,998 Travis County Misdemeanor Cases Disposed During FY 2015	\$98.65: Cost Per Case-Travis	
C-6c Legal Representation for Indigent Defendants – Felony ²⁶	\$10,034,154 Tarrant County FY 2015 Felony Court Expenditures	÷ 12,974 Tarrant County Felony Cases Paid During FY 2015	\$773.40: Cost of Representation- Tarrant	Average \$632.31
	\$4,105,648 Travis County FY 2015 Felony Court Expenditures	÷ 8,358 Travis County Felony Cases Paid During FY 2015	\$491.22: Cost of Representation- Travis	
C-6c Legal Representation for Indigent Defendants – Misdemeanor	\$3,327,299 Tarrant County FY 2015 Misdemeanor Court Expenditures	÷ 13,528 Tarrant County Misdemeanor Cases Paid During FY 2015	\$245.96: Cost of Representation- Tarrant	Average \$213.73
	\$2,893,989 Travis County FY 2015 Misdemeanor Court Expenditures	÷ 15,945 Travis County Misdemeanor Cases Paid During FY 2015	\$181.50: Cost of Representation- Travis	
C-6d Cost of Arrest	Total Amount Spent on Police Protection in Texas for 2014: ²⁷ \$7,100,000,000	÷ Total number of Arrests in Texas 2014: ²⁸ 876,601=\$8,099.47	Cost of Arrest (weighted by 25% of total cost of protection): ²⁹ \$2,024.87	Inflation from 2014 to 2015: ³⁰ \$2,027.27

²⁶ Legal representation for indigent defendants (cost and number of cases) was obtained from Travis and Tarrant Counties' Indigent Defense Expenditure Report FY 2015. Retrieved from <https://tidc.tamu.edu/Default.asp>. Capital case expenditures were weighted in proportion to their actual occurrence.

²⁷ Chantrill, Christopher "Government Spending Details." Retrieved from http://www.usgovernmentpending.com/year_spending_2014TXbn_18bs2n_5051#usgs302.

²⁸ Texas Department of Public Safety. "2014 Texas Arrest Data." Retrieved from <http://www.dps.texas.gov/crimereports/14/citCh9.pdf>.

²⁹ See Greenwood, Peter W, C. Peter Rydell, Allan F. Abrahamse, Jonathan P. Caulkins, James Chiesa, Karyn E. Model, & Stephen P. Klein (1994). *Three Strikes and You're Out: Estimated Benefits and Costs of California's New Mandatory-Sentencing Law*. RAND

³⁰ Bureau of Labor Statistics. "CPI Inflation Calculator," Retrieved from https://www.bls.gov/data/inflation_calculator.htm.

Table C.7

Bail Forfeiture for Travis & Tarrant Counties	
Cost Element	Cost
Re-Apprehension³¹	\$325.10
New Hearing³²	\$679.62
TOTAL	\$1,004.72

Table C.8

Pretrial Detention Cost for Travis & Tarrant Counties	
Cost Element	Cost
Detention in County Jail	\$60.12/day ³³

³¹ From interviews with two bail bond experts, Abrams and Rohlfs (2010) discovered that the cost of re-apprehending a fugitive defendant is roughly 5% of the bond amount. Applying a 5% cost to Travis and Tarrant Counties is problematic, however, because the average bond amounts vary widely—\$8,647.63 in Travis County versus \$4,356.19 in Tarrant County. To reconcile this discrepancy, the bond amounts from both counties were averaged together to produce a single value of \$6,501.91. The \$325.10 figure listed in the table represents 5% of \$6,501.91. Abrams and Rohlfs note that bond companies are more efficient at re-apprehending defendants; therefore, the 5% figure may underestimate the cost that a county would incur if it were to engage in the re-apprehension process.

³² Bierie (2007) found that the cost of scheduling a minor hearing is \$679.62 when inflated to 2015 dollars.

³³ Average cost per day for Texas jails – August 2015-July 2016. Information provided by the Texas Commission on Jail Standards on August 17, 2016.

Table C.9

Victim Costs for Travis & Tarrant Counties	
Cost Element	Cost ³⁴
Felony Offense³⁵	
Homicide	\$4,822,352.80
Attempted Homicide	\$15,418.41
Sexual Assault	\$142,702.28
Robbery	\$13,122.05
Assaultive Offense	\$15,418.41
Other Violent Offense	\$15,418.41
Burglary	\$2,296.36
Theft	\$606.89
Other Property Crime	\$606.89
Drug Offense	\$606.89 ³⁶
Weapons Offenses	\$606.89
Other Felony Offense	\$606.89
Misdemeanor Offenses	
Class A & B Misdemeanors	\$606.89 ³⁷

³⁴ Calculated from Miller, Ted, Mark Cohen, and Brian Wiersema (1996). *Victim Costs and Consequences: A New Look*. A Final Summary Report presented to the National Institute of Justice. Costs were inflated to 2015 dollars using <https://data.bls.gov/cgi-bin/cpicalc.pl>.

³⁵ Texas Department of Public Safety and National Crime Information Center codes were grouped into categories used by the Texas Juvenile Justice Department to indicate offense severity.

³⁶ Miller et al. (1996) did not contain victim costs for drug offenses. All drug offenses were assigned a cost of \$606.89, which represents the 10th percentile of all offenses.

³⁷ Miller et al. (1996) did not contain victim costs for misdemeanor offenses. Misdemeanor offenses were also attributed a cost of \$606.89.

PRETRIAL PRACTICE SURVEY METHODOLOGY

A two-stage methodology was used. First the research team contacted all Community Supervision and Corrections Departments (CSCD) to identify programs that support pretrial risk assessment and supervision at the county level. Community supervision departments are funded by the Texas Department of Criminal Justice's (TDCJ) Community Justice Assistance Division (CJAD) to monitor adults serving a sentence of probation. Most of the 124 CSCDs statewide serve between two and six jurisdictions, though 61 serve a single county.

CSCDs are administratively responsible to the judiciary in each county they serve, and CJAD policy allows for a small portion of state funds to assist the courts with oversight of people on pretrial bond.³⁸ In 87 counties, CSCDs receive additional local funding to operate more extensive personal or surety bond supervision programs.

Second, a telephone call was made to each of the state's CSCD directors, who were asked whether their department does pretrial risk assessment, personal bond supervision, surety bond supervision, or pretrial counseling. They were also asked to identify other programs offering these services in any of the counties they represent. The programs identified were sent a more extensive internet survey to learn more about the specific services offered. Using this two-part methodology, the status of pretrial programming was accounted for in 98 percent of the state's 254 counties.³⁹

³⁸ Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Policy Statement CJAD-PS-09. "Operation of Certain Supervisions other than Court Ordered Community Supervision or Pretrial Interventions." Carey Welebob, TDCJ-CJAD Director, to CSCD Directors. September 1, 2011. State funding may be used to support one-tenth of a full-time equivalent staff position for the supervision of individuals on pretrial bond.

³⁹ Data was unavailable to describe pretrial practices in Galveston, Johnson, Polk, and Wise Counties.