

National Prisoner Statistics program jurisdiction notes

These notes are provided to the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) by state departments of corrections (DOCs) and the Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP) as part of the National Prisoner Statistics (NPS) data collection. The notes are presented mostly verbatim and were generally edited only for misspellings and to order the respondents' comments according to the questions they answer. Not all jurisdictions comment on every question. BJS encouraged respondents to describe other types of admissions and releases specific to their system, which are summarized in these jurisdiction notes and included in the totals in table 8 in the report *Prisoners in 2018* (NCJ 253516, BJS, April 2020).

Alabama—Other admissions included reopened cases. Prisons were not recently rated for official capacity. The majority of Alabama prisons were overcrowded. As of 2018, a total of 22,176 beds were in operation, which represented the physical capacity for prisoners but was not based on staffing, programs, and services. The operating capacity differed from BJS's definition.

Alaska—Other conditional releases included offenders released due to suspended sentences. The Alaska DOC did not have data on capacity levels by gender. The design capacity was 4,664. The rated capacity was 4,838. The rated population capacity did not include non-traditional confinement such as halfway houses or electronic monitoring.

Arizona—Jurisdiction counts were based on custody data and prisoners in contracted beds. These counts excluded prisoners held in other jurisdictions because Arizona receives an equal number of prisoners to house from other jurisdictions. Arizona abolished parole in 1994, so only prisoners released prior to 1994 were on parole. Because community supervision prisoners were supervised as parolees, both parolees and community supervision violators were included in admission counts as parole violators. Other admissions included persons returned from deportation and persons released in error. Other unconditional releases included prisoners released by the court. Other conditional releases included those released to other community supervision programs. Prison capacities included the capacity of private prisons in Arizona.

Arkansas—No notes.

California—Custody counts included out-of-state correctional facility contracted beds, community correctional facility private contract beds, and private work-furlough prisoners. Other conditional releases included boarders from county correctional facilities. Other releases included prisoners released under California's Public Safety Realignment law (A.B. 109). Citizenship data were extracted from a report published by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's Office of Research (https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/research/wp-content/uploads/sites/174/2019/08/DataPoints_122017.pdf) and represented the country of birth as reported by prisoners. Per California, this does not reflect documentation of current citizenship status.

Colorado—Jurisdiction and custody counts included a small, undetermined number of prisoners with a maximum sentence of one year or less, and 203 males and 11 females who were part of the Youthful Offender System. Prisoners reported as housed in privately operated correctional facilities were under Federal Transfer and Interstate Compact programs and were not reported in the department's population and capacity counts. Jurisdiction population counts included a small number of prisoners from other states admitted under the interstate compact agreement. Release counts excluded prisoners who were absent without leave (AWOL) or had escaped. Other releases included discharges from youthful offender systems. Prison design capacity is based on data from the Colorado DOC's annual statistical report. Previous years' design capacity figures were set equal to operational capacity.

Connecticut—Prisons and jails formed one integrated system. All NPS data included jail and prison populations. New court-commitment admissions included prisoners who were admitted on accused status but received a sentence later in the year. Other admissions included persons returned to prison without prejudice. Counts of other types of admissions and releases included persons with legitimate types of prison entries and exits that did not match BJS categories. Legislation in July 1995 abolished the capacity law, making a facility's capacity a fluid number based on the needs of the department. The needs were dictated by security issues, populations, court decrees, legal mandates, staffing, and physical plant areas of facilities that served other purposes or had been decommissioned. The actual capacity of a facility was subject to change.

Delaware—Prisons and jails formed one integrated system. All NPS data included jail and prison populations. Capacity counts included the halfway houses under the Delaware DOC. Releases included offenders who received a combined sentence (prison and parole) of more than one year.

Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP)—Data in *Prisoners in 2018* reflect prisoners under BOP jurisdiction on December 29, 2018, except for tables 14 and 15 in the report, which are for September 30, 2018. BOP jurisdiction counts included prisoners housed in secure private facilities where the BOP had a direct contract with a private operator and prisoners housed in secure facilities where there was a subcontract with a private provider at a local governmental facility. Jurisdiction counts also included prisoners housed in jail or short-term detention and prisoners held in state-operated or other non-federal secure facilities. BOP prisoners housed in state facilities are counted as held in local or county-operated facilities. BOP counts included 9,597 prisoners (8,364 males and 1,233 females) held in non-secure, privately operated community corrections centers or halfway houses and 1,832 offenders on home confinement (1,589 males and 243 females). A total of 36 juveniles (33 males and 3 females) were held in contract facilities. These juvenile prisoners were included in the jurisdiction and custody totals but were excluded from the counts of privately or locally operated facilities. Some of these juveniles were under the jurisdiction of U.S. probation but housed in the custody of the BOP in contract facilities. Due to BOP's information-system configuration, Asians, Native Hawaiians, and Other Pacific Islanders were combined into one racial category, and Hispanic prisoners were included in all the racial categories. On December 29, 2018, the BOP held 53,746 male and 4,168 female Hispanic prisoners. Parole violation counts included prisoners with and without a new sentence. Parole violation admissions include commitments of special parolees and returns to prison of persons who violated probation or parole for either federal or District of Columbia sentences. Expirations of sentence included good-conduct releases that usually had a separate and distinct term of supervision and releases from the residential drug-abuse treatment program. Other releases included clemencies, compassionate releases, hospitalizations and treatments completed, and releases based on the amount of time served. On December 31, 2018, the BOP custody population was 151,865 prisoners (excluding those in contracted and private facilities) and the rated capacity was 135,424. Citizenship data are provided as recorded in the BOP data system and are subject to verification by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE).

Florida—Data on race or ethnicity from 2018 are not comparable to data reported prior to 2016 due to a change in reporting methods. Florida reported only admissions for prisoners with new sentences and did not report prisoners admitted on technical violations. Other admissions included program supervision violations. Other unconditional releases included vacated sentences. Other conditional releases included those to provisional release supervision, conditional medical releases, releases to program supervision, mandatory conditional releases, releases under conditional pardons, and parole reinstatements. Other releases included those under full pardons in 2018. The number of deaths included two executed males. Reported operational capacity included the capacity of contracted institutions (8,696 males and 1,250 females) and contracted work-release facilities (1,858 males and 354 females), although BJS removed these facilities from the calculations of percentage capacity in table 16 of *Prisoners in 2018*. Contracted capacities are current as of December 31, 2018. Florida's DOC revised the variables used to determine the citizenship of prisoners in 2015. Therefore, estimates of non-U.S. citizens from after 2014 are not comparable to previous years.

Georgia—Data reflected the prison population during the last week of December 2018. Custody populations included both state prisons and county correctional institutions. Subtotals of gender, race, and sentence length, as well as custody counts, were adjusted using interpolation to match the overall totals. Counts of admissions and releases were adjusted using interpolation to balance the jurisdictional populations on January 1, 2018, and December 31, 2018. Georgia did not house females in privately operated correctional facilities. Capacity counts included state, county, and private prisons. The overall population was slightly lower again in 2018 because Georgia's criminal justice reform initiatives impacted counts of both commitments and admissions of offenders into the prison system.

Hawaii—Prisons and jails formed one integrated system. All NPS data included jail and prison populations. Other releases included prisoners released due to status change.

Idaho—Counts were estimates based on live data, with some changing variability over time due to the movement and processing of offenders.

Illinois—Jurisdiction, custody population, and admission and release counts for prisoners with maximum sentences of more than one year included an undetermined number of prisoners with a one-year sentence. All Illinois DOC prisoners have a minimum

sentence of one year. However, some prisoners were in custody for less than one year due to pre-trial time spent in the custody of local jails. The Illinois DOC contracted with an outside vendor for two adult transition facilities (i.e., work release). The department considered these offenders in its custody and included them in the daily population counts. Prisoners in other state or federal custody were tracked separately. Counts of admissions and releases included escapes from adult transition centers, where prisoners leave and return for work assignments. All escapees counted were from adult transition centers, and all returning escapees had escaped from those centers. The Illinois DOC applied the term AWOL returns only to parolees who committed a subsequent technical violation or new offense while on parole. These returns were included in parole violation admissions. Electronic-detention prisoners were not included in the population total. Other unconditional releases included court-ordered remands and reversals. The Illinois DOC method for determining rated capacity was under revision in 2018. The department provided the operational capacity, defined as the total number of beds in a facility. The count of non-U.S. citizen offenders represented persons who self-reported that they were not born in the U.S. The Illinois DOC did not have information on offender's country of current citizenship.

Indiana—Custody, jurisdiction, admissions, release, and capacity counts included prisoners in two facilities owned by the state of Indiana but staffed by employees of a private correctional company.

Iowa—In 2009, the Iowa DOC began including offenders on work release in the operating-while-intoxicated population. Iowa prisoners housed in out-of-state prisons were also included in the department's jurisdiction counts. Iowa data included in BJS reports prior to 2009 were custody counts only. The count of transfer admissions included offenders transferring from other jurisdictions with an Iowa sentence. Counts of AWOL admissions and releases were of the work-release (753 offenders) and operating-while-intoxicated (129 offenders) populations. Other conditional releases included persons released to special sentence supervision.

Kansas—Kansas updated its 2017 data for offenders for which jurisdiction data were missing. Kansas did not house prisoners in privately operated facilities. Other admissions included sanctions from probation. Other unconditional releases included court-appearance releases, releases on appeal bond, and other court-ordered releases. Other conditional releases included reparole and release in lieu of

revocation. Information on foreign nationals held in state correctional facilities was based on self-reported data by prisoners, but an ICE agent was present when a facility's reception and diagnostic unit interviewed a prisoner, and the agent informed the Kansas DOC if the prisoner was a confirmed non-U.S. citizen.

Kentucky—Inmates housed in other states' facilities were not included in the jurisdiction population because the Kentucky DOC did not have custody over these offenders and did not pay other states to house them. Other types of admissions included special admissions, returns from active release, and returns from shock probation with an additional sentence. Other types of conditional prison releases included exits to home incarceration. Other releases included releases from jail and active releases.

Louisiana—Jurisdiction and capacity counts were correct as of December 26, 2018. Other types of unconditional releases included court orders and releases for good time with no supervision. Other types of conditional release included reinstatements to probation. Other types of release included compassionate releases.

Maine—The Maine DOC discovered database errors in some admission and release records that depended on how an inmate was transferred. These errors could not be fixed in time for the 2018 NPS submission, so admission and release data should be viewed as preliminary.

Maryland—For the jurisdiction and custody measures, the number of prisoners with a maximum sentence of more than one year was estimated by taking the percentage of prisoners with a maximum sentence of more than one year from the automated data and applying the percentage to the manual headcounts for the measure of interest (December 31 jurisdiction population or December 31 custody population). Any sentenced prisoners housed at the Baltimore City Detention Center or the Baltimore Central Booking and Intake Center were included in the jurisdiction and custody counts. Pre-trial prisoners at these facilities were excluded. The unsentenced prisoners in Maryland's custody on December 31, 2018, were all federal prisoners housed contractually at the Chesapeake Detention Facility. The reported prisoners under Maryland's jurisdiction who were housed in facilities operated by a county or local authority were sentenced to state prison by local jurisdictions and waiting to be transferred to Maryland DOC custody. Hispanic origin may have been underreported because records for existing prisoners were still being updated in the new information system. Due to implementation issues with the new information system, admissions and releases for 2018 were estimates.

The total number of new court commitments may have included a small, undetermined number of returns from appeal or bond. Mandatory release violators were included with parole violators. Maryland did not distinguish between AWOLs and escapees. Other unconditional releases included court-ordered releases and a small number of persons released to appeal or bond. Operational capacities included beds used for some Maryland pre-trial prisoners who were not counted in year-end counts (29 males). BJS removed these 29 individuals from the reported capacity figures.

Massachusetts—By law, offenders in Massachusetts may be sentenced to terms of up to 2.5 years in locally operated jails and correctional institutions. This population was excluded from the state count but was included in published population counts and rates for local jails and correctional institutions. Jurisdiction counts excluded approximately 2,133 prisoners (2,057 males and 76 females) in the county system (local jails and houses of correction) who were serving a sentence of more than one year, but these prisoners were included in imprisonment rate calculations at the request of the Massachusetts DOC. Jurisdiction and custody counts may have included a small but undetermined number of prisoners who were remanded to court or transferred to the custody of another state, federal, or locally operated system and subsequently released. Other admissions included returns from court-ordered release, and other unconditional releases included those ordered by courts.

Michigan—Data recorded for Hispanics were treated as representing ethnicity rather than race, and reporting was optional. Therefore, the numbers for Hispanics were significantly underreported. Rather than reporting an incorrect number, the Michigan DOC included the relatively small number of cases recorded as Hispanic in the “white” racial category. Other admissions included returns from court.

Minnesota—Minnesota measured only operational capacity.

Mississippi—Jurisdiction counts of local facilities included both local county jails and county regional facilities. Other types of release from state prisons included data corrections because of a lag in processing. Other conditional releases included earned release supervision, house arrests, and medical releases. Total operational capacity did not include county jails, county regional facilities, private prisons, or technical violation centers.

Missouri—Other types of unconditional releases included those after resentencing, reversals, discharges from remand, and court-ordered discharges. Other types of conditional releases included parole-board holdover returns. Other releases included revocations or remands of convictions and releases after erroneous returns from release. The Missouri DOC did not have design capacity data for its older prisons or update design capacity for prison extensions or improvements. Missouri did not use a rated capacity. The state defined operational capacity as the number of beds available, including those temporarily offline. Non-U.S. citizen data were based on the number of offenders with ICE detainees.

Montana—The Montana DOC converted all offender location data to a new computer system in November 2018, so data from 2018 are not comparable to data from 2017 and prior years. The decline in the number of prisoners held in local jails was mandated by the Montana legislature and corresponded to an increase in the number of inmates held in private prisons. Other releases included court-ordered releases.

Nebraska—Nebraska defined operational capacity as its stress capacity, which was 125% of design capacity for designated facilities. The total design and operational capacities for institutions housing females included one female multi-custody facility. The Nebraska DOC operated two co-ed facilities, which represented a design capacity of 290 and was included in the male design and operational capacities.

Nevada—Data for 2017 were updated on the 2018 NPS form to reflect inmates in residential confinement, who were under the jurisdiction of the Nevada DOC but were supervised for the final portion of their sentences at home by the Nevada Department of Public Safety. Other admissions included persons committed to the Nevada DOC through the Intermediate Sanction Probation; Safe Keeper-Boot Camp; Safe Keeper-pre-trial detainees, including local jail inmates admitted to the Nevada DOC due to medical, behavioral, protective, or local-staffing issues; persons ordered by judges to serve 6 months or less in prison prior to actual sentencing for felonies; and prisoners serving consecutive sentences in Nevada and another state but not physically in the custody of Nevada.

New Hampshire—The state did not submit 2018 NPS data. BJS imputed 2018 responses for New Hampshire's custody, jurisdiction, admission, and release figures from three state reports.¹ See *Methodology in Prisoners in 2018* for the imputation strategy for non-reporting states.

New Jersey—Population counts for prisoners with a maximum sentence of more than one year included prisoners with sentences of one year. The New Jersey DOC had no jurisdiction over prisoners with sentences of less than one year or unsentenced prisoners. Other types of unconditional releases included vacated and amended sentences and court-ordered releases. Reporting of other conditional releases included offenders in intensive supervision programs. New Jersey data for escapes did not differentiate between prisoners who disappeared from confined walls or disappeared while out of institutions. Other releases included prisoners transferred early from county jails into the state prison system before being released back to county jails, other transfers, and persons who were brought into the prison system from the jail system too early and were released back to the county jails.

New Mexico—The state did not submit 2017 NPS data and did not update the BJS-imputed 2017 data on the submitted 2018 NPS form. In 2018, female prisoners were relocated from private facilities to state-operated prisons. Admission and release data included prisoners regardless of sentence length. Other types of admissions and releases included those for diagnostic purposes. Two individuals were released unconditionally when their cases were dismissed by the court.

New York—Other admissions included persons who returned to prison after they were erroneously discharged. Other releases included the discharge of prisoners who were erroneously admitted.

North Carolina—As of December 1, 2011, North Carolina prisons no longer housed misdemeanor offenders with sentences of less than 180 days. Captured escapees were not considered a prison admission type in North Carolina, and escape was not considered a type of prison release. Other admission types included direct receipt of offenders through an interstate compact. Other types of unconditional releases included court orders and interstate compact releases. Supervised mandatory releases were post-release offenders. Post-release supervision was defined as a reintegration program for

serious offenders who served extensive prison terms. This form of supervision was created by the state's Structured Sentencing Act of 1993. Rated capacity was not available. Reported operational capacity included the capacity at a private facility that housed the 30 female offenders included in the private state facilities, and BJS removed these from the calculations of percentage capacity.

North Dakota—The state did not submit 2017 NPS data and did not update the 2017 BJS imputations on the 2018 NPS form. The North Dakota DOC was unable to provide a detailed breakdown of admissions and releases by type.

Ohio—Population counts for prisoners with a maximum sentence of more than one year included an undetermined number of prisoners with a sentence of one year or less. Admissions and releases reported by the Ohio DOC included all offenders regardless of sentence length. Returns and conditional releases involving transitional control prisoners were reported after movement from confinement to a terminal-release status. Admissions of parole violators without a new sentence included only formally revoked violators. Other admission types included judicial-release technical returns, previously included as conditional release violators without a new sentence. Escapes included non-confinement escapes. Other unconditional releases included sentences reversed by appellate courts and other court discharges. Other releases included administrative releases. Counts of non-U.S. citizens and prisoners age 17 or younger excluded prisoners housed in privately operated halfway houses.

Oklahoma—Most prisoners with sentences of one year or less were part of the Oklahoma Delayed Sentencing Program for Young Adults. On December 31, 2018, the number of prisoners under the Oklahoma DOC's jurisdiction with a maximum sentence of more than one year included 693 males and 60 females who were waiting in county jails to be moved to state prisons. The Oklahoma DOC did not include these in its reported jurisdiction counts, but per NPS definitions, BJS added these individuals into the sentenced-jurisdiction and total-jurisdiction counts. Prisoners held by Oklahoma for other states were excluded from all jurisdiction counts. Jurisdiction counts included offenders in the Oklahoma DOC's county jail program. The numbers reported in "escapes from confinement" represented escapes from state-run prisons and walkaways from halfway houses and community corrections or work centers. Only Oklahoma DOC facilities were included in the capacity counts. Non-U.S. citizen status was based on ICE detainers. Previously, non-U.S. citizen status was based on inmate self-report.

¹See New Hampshire Department of Corrections. (n.d.). *NH DOC Monthly Facility Population Summary Report—All—*, *NH DOC Monthly Facility Crime Summary Report—All—*, and *NH DOC Monthly Facility Demographics Summary Report—All—*. Retrieved July 2019 from <https://www.nh.gov/nhdoc/government.html>

Oregon—The state did not submit 2018 NPS data. BJS imputed 2018 responses for Oregon’s custody, jurisdiction, admission, and release figures from the Oregon DOC’s Prison Population Trends Report.² See *Methodology* in *Prisoners in 2018* for the imputation strategy for non-reporting states.

Pennsylvania—Other admissions included parole detainees. Other types of unconditional releases included vacated sentences and vacated convictions. Other releases included transfers to other states and unknown other releases. Capacity counts included state correctional institutions, community corrections centers, community contract facilities, and contracted county jails. Community contract facilities were contracted out by the Pennsylvania DOC to private service providers, and it maintained contracted housing services with certain Pennsylvania county jails. In 2018, the Pennsylvania DOC provided the capacities of these contracted facilities (826), so BJS removed them from capacity calculations in this report. The number of non-U.S. citizens included persons with an unknown place of birth.

Rhode Island—Prisons and jails formed one integrated system. All NPS data included jail and prison populations. The number of offenders serving sentences outside of Rhode Island was highly variable throughout 2018, which was not reflected in a single day’s count. The Rhode Island data system recorded Hispanic origin as a race rather than an ethnicity and did not capture Native Hawaiians, Other Pacific Islanders, or persons of two or more races, including persons who may have identified themselves as Hispanic in addition to another race. Prison admissions classified as escape returns included offenders serving out of state. The Rhode Island DOC’s data system could not differentiate between parole violation admissions with and without new sentences, which were all counted as new sentences. Other types of unconditional releases consisted of discharges at court, court-ordered discharges, and discharges out of state. Conditional releases included persons paroled to immigration or paroled out of state. Transfer releases to another jurisdiction included only persons serving a sentence out of state. Other types of conditional releases included discharges to the state’s Institute for Mental Health. Figures for prison system capacity were valid as of December 31, 2018. The Rhode Island DOC no longer asks questions relating to citizenship at prison admission, but in previous years, the data were self-reported.

²See <https://www.oregon.gov/doc/Documents/prison-population-trends.pdf>

South Carolina—The December 31, 2018, custody count of unsentenced prisoners included three unsentenced males, all of whom were designated as “safekeepers.” As of July 1, 2003, the South Carolina DOC began releasing prisoners due for release and housed in the department’s institutions on the first day of every month. Since January 1, 2019, was a holiday, prisoners eligible for release on January 1 were released on December 31, 2018, causing the prisoner count to be at its lowest point for the month on December 31, 2018. Of the 73 inmates reported in the jurisdictional count housed in privately operated correctional facilities, 26 were housed in privately operated medical facilities and the remaining 47 inmates were located in a private facility in another state. The 314 prisoners reported as housed in local facilities for the South Carolina DOC were housed in designated facilities or considered absent with leave to local or county facilities. South Carolina did not have a specific race code to designate persons identifying as two or more races. These individuals were included in other specific race groups or labeled as “other race.” Other types of admissions included prisoners who were resentenced. Other types of unconditional releases consisted of remands. Other release types included persons who were resentenced. There were two paroling authorities within the adult correctional system in South Carolina: the Intensive Supervision Administrative Release Authority paroled 702 offenders under the Youthful Offender Act (YOA) in 2018, while the South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole, and Pardon Services paroled 1,350 non-YOA offenders. The state utilized the operational capacity concept in its management reports and in other requested surveys.

South Dakota—Custody and jurisdiction counts of prisoners serving a maximum sentence of one year or less included those under a probation sentence who, as a condition of probation, had to serve up to 180 days in state prison. The reporting system for the South Dakota DOC did not have a category for prisoners of two or more races. These prisoners were labeled as “other race.” Other admissions included parole or supervised release detainees. South Dakota did not separate discretionary and presumptive parole releases. Parole detainees were included in counts of other release types. The operational capacity reported was planned capacity and included some offenders housed in contractual beds at halfway houses.

Tennessee—Other conditional releases included offenders who were released to community corrections. In a change from previous years, the Tennessee DOC reported capacity statistics that did not include four private facilities.

Texas—Offenders in custody were all those serving time in a facility owned and operated by the Texas Department of Criminal Justice at the time of data collection. Jurisdiction counts included offenders in custody and those held in privately operated prisons, intermediate-sanction facilities, punishment facilities for substance-abuse felonies, and halfway houses; temporarily released to a county for less than 30 days; and awaiting paperwork for transfer to state-funded custody. Capacities excluded county jail beds because those correctional facilities did not have a minimum or maximum number of beds available for paper-ready and bench-warrant prisoners. Admissions and releases included offenders received into an intermediate sanction facility, which was a sanction in lieu of revocation. These offenders were counted in the parole violator category, although these were not revocations. Other conditional releases included discretionary mandatory releases. Executions were included in releases due to death. Other admissions and other release types included transfers between divisions. The methodology for foreign offenders was changed in 2017 to include private facilities, as instructed by BJS. Prior to 2017, this number was calculated using the custody population, which excluded private facilities.

Utah—The Utah DOC updated its submitted 2017 population counts. However, the 2018 population counts included an undetermined number of offenders not previously included in NPS data due to a shift in legal status requirements for a parole violator program instituted during 2018. For this reason, 2018 data should not be compared to previous years' data. Other types of unconditional release included court-ordered releases and discharges of cases or prisoner holds.

Vermont—Prisons and jails formed one integrated system. All NPS data included jail and prison populations. BJS derived the total number of 2018 admissions and releases from the Vermont DOC's submission to BJS's National Corrections Reporting Program (NCRP). Distributions of types of admission and release were assumed to be the same as they were when last submitted, in 2014, because Vermont's NCRP submission did not include the type of admission or release.

Virginia—Jurisdiction counts were for December 31, 2018. As of September 1, 1998, the state was responsible for prisoners with a sentence of more than one year or a sentence of 12 months plus one day. Prior to September 1, 1998, the state was responsible for a sentence of more than one year, while local authorities were responsible for a sentence of 12 months or less. Jurisdiction, custody, and race or ethnicity counts for 2018 were preliminary and will change. Native Hawaiians and Other Pacific Islanders were included in the Asian racial category. The Virginia DOC revised its method of reporting prison capacity in 2014 to match BJS definitions. As a result, comparisons should not be made to estimates for 2013 and before. The counts excluded beds assigned to institutional hospitals that may not have been designated as male or female only and beds assigned to detention and diversion centers. Prison capacity statistics included a private facility to hold males in 2018.

Washington—Admission and release counts for conditional releases included offenders who did not receive a sentence of more than one year. Admission and release counts of conditional release violators included offenders who received probation sentences and were sent to county jails for a term of less than 30 days for violating probation conditions. Other unconditional releases included vacated sentences.

West Virginia—Other types of admissions and releases included those to and from the Anthony Center for Young Adults and Diagnostics. Other types of unconditional releases included court-ordered releases.

Wisconsin—Consistent with the method used to generate population estimates in 2017, the Wisconsin DOC used the time between a prisoner's admission date and maximum discharge date to determine sentence length for year-end counts. If a maximum discharge date was not recorded, the mandatory release date was used. If the mandatory release date was not recorded, the prisoner's release date was used. Therefore, the data may not accurately reflect whether the prisoner was initially sentenced to one year or less or to more than one year. Custody measures included prisoners without Wisconsin sentences who were physically housed in a Wisconsin prison. Jurisdiction measures included prisoners with Wisconsin sentences, regardless of where the prisoners were physically located. Unsentenced prisoners included those who had not yet had data entered reflecting their mandatory release date and maximum discharge date and some offenders temporarily held in the Milwaukee facility. An offender on a temporary hold who was on probation did not have a mandatory release date

or maximum discharge date. The same time intervals used to determine sentence length for year-end counts were used to determine sentence length for admissions totals, while the time between a prisoner's admission date and release date was used to determine sentence length for the releases total. Therefore, admissions

and releases totals may not accurately reflect whether a prisoner was initially sentenced to one year or less or to more than one year. Other types of releases included those released after temporary holds.

Wyoming—No notes.