

FEBRUARY 2024

An Overview of Intermittent Confinement and Weekend Incarceration in the U.S.

DRUG ENFORCEMENT AND POLICY CENTER

An Overview of Intermittent Confinement and Weekend Incarceration in the U.S.

Pete Leasure, Douglas A. Berman, and Jana Hrdinová
Drug Enforcement and Policy Center, Moritz College of Law, The Ohio State University

This report was produced with generous support from the Aleph Institute.

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
I. Overview of Federal Law on Intermittent Confinement	1
II. Overview of Defendants Who Received Intermittent Confinement	3
III. Review of Literature on Intermittent Confinement	20
IV. Weekend-Only Inmates in U.S. Jails	22
V. Survey of Federal Probation Officers	26
VI. Discussion of Survey Results	32
VII. Conclusion	32
Technical Appendix	34

INTRODUCTION

This study provides an overview of available data and research about the use of intermittent confinement in federal and state criminal justice systems. In the sections below, we (1) provide an overview of federal law on intermittent confinement,¹ (2) present data on the use of intermittent confinement in the federal system and weekend incarceration in the state system, (3) discuss existing research on intermittent confinement and weekend incarceration, and (4) present results of a survey of federal probation officers on their opinions of intermittent confinement.

I. OVERVIEW OF FEDERAL LAW ON INTERMITTENT CONFINEMENT

Congress has set out express authority for federal district judges to impose intermittent confinement when ascribing sentences to achieve the purposes Congress set forth for criminal sentencing. Specifically, 18

¹ A review of current state legislation on intermittent confinement is beyond the scope of this project.

U.S.C. § 3563(b)(10) provides that a court may order that a defendant “remain in the custody of the Bureau of Prisons during nights, weekends, or other intervals of time, totaling no more than the lesser of one year or the term of imprisonment authorized for the offense, during the first year of the term of probation or supervised release.”

The legislative history of the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984 indicates that Congress was eager, through this provision, to give sentencing judges “flexibility” to consider factors that could advance a “rehabilitative program” and “educational or employment purposes.”² The Senate Report stressed the value of an express intermittent confinement provision to enable judges to sentence appropriate offenders in ways that could, for example, “permit the defendant to continue employment and his contacts with his family and community.”³

The United States Sentencing Commission has issued only the most minimal guidance to federal judges concerning intermittent confinement in the U.S. Sentencing Guidelines. Specifically, U.S.S.G. § 5F1.8 simply restates the basic statutory rules for intermittent confinement. Here is the full text of the only guideline discussing intermittent confinement:

Intermittent confinement may be imposed as a condition of probation during the first year of probation. See 18 U.S.C. § 3563(b)(10). It may also be imposed as a condition of supervised release during the first year of supervised release, but only for a violation of a condition of supervised release in accordance with 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(2) and only when facilities are available. See 18 U.S.C. § 3583(d).⁴

Somewhat more beneficial, in November 2016, the Probation and Pretrial Services Office of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts published an "Overview of Probation and Supervised Release Conditions" that provided a bit more guidance on the use of intermittent confinement. Specifically, in a short section, this document states:

In some circumstances this condition may prevent a defendant from losing employment, or allow a defendant to avoid the complete removal from role of provider or caretaker for dependents and other family members that would result from a traditional term of incarceration. Similarly, this condition may benefit a defendant with a medical or psychiatric diagnosis requiring regular, consistent care by a physician.⁵

This document further explains: “Once the court imposes a condition requiring intermittent confinement, the probation officer submits a referral packet (including the court’s order of intermittent confinement, judgment form, and presentence report) to the Bureau of Prisons (BOP) so that it can designate the defendant to the appropriate facility.”⁶

This document also sets forth these additional administrative particulars: “Probation officers communicate clearly to the defendant the designated schedule of confinement. The defendant is required to abide by the rules and regulations of the facility during the periods of confinement, and the facility staff may impose additional restrictions or sanctions on defendants who violate the rules and regulations. The probation officer maintains regular communication with the BOP and/or facility staff to monitor the defendant’s

² Senate Rep. No. 98-225, at 98 (1984), as reprinted at 1984 U.S.C.C.A.N. 3182, 3281.

³ Senate Rep. No. 98-225, at 89 (1984), as reprinted at 1984 U.S.C.C.A.N. 3182, 3272.

⁴ See United States Sentencing Guidelines § 5F1.8 - INTERMITTENT CONFINEMENT. Note that under 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(2), the court may modify the conditions of supervised release “at any time prior to the expiration or termination of the term of supervised release” (see: Chapter 1, Section II(A)(3). <https://www.uscourts.gov/services-forms/intermittent-confinement-probation-supervised-release-conditions>).

⁵ Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Probation and Pretrial Services Office, *Overview of Probation and Supervised Release Conditions* 77 (Nov. 2016).

⁶ *Id.* at 78.

compliance with both the schedule of confinement and facility rules and regulations and intervenes as necessary.”⁷

II. OVERVIEW OF DEFENDANTS WHO RECEIVED INTERMITTENT CONFINEMENT

To our knowledge, the U.S. Sentencing Commission has never published any systematic research or detailed analyses on the use of intermittent confinement in the federal sentencing system. In addition, we are unaware of any other federal agency or department, or any private research or advocacy group, that has collected data or conducted any assessments of when and how intermittent confinement has been utilized as a possible alternative to traditional periods of incarceration in the federal system. Given that the U.S. Sentencing Commission and many advocacy groups have expressed interest in alternatives to incarceration (in the federal system and elsewhere), it is somewhat curious that the use of intermittent confinement in the federal sentencing system has largely gone unstudied and unanalyzed.

Helpfully, though it has not regularly made any public report or assessments of the use of intermittent confinement, the U.S. Sentencing Commission does collect and maintain data on the use of this sentencing opinion. For this report, United States Sentencing Commission data was extracted from official USSC data files to provide an overview of defendants who received intermittent confinement (IC).⁸ Where practical, results across 10 years are presented in tables.⁹ Where not practical, results for 2020-2021 are presented in tables, and patterns across 10 years are discussed in the text. Detailed information on the years before 2020-2021 is also available in the technical appendix.

Intermittent Confinement Sentences

Table 1 displays counts and percentages of defendants who received a term of intermittent confinement over the last 11 fiscal years according to USSC data. Note that some defendants may have received IC (or may have been relieved of IC) after sentencing through a modification, which would not be captured in the data. As shown, the number of individuals receiving IC sentences is extremely small as compared to the overall sentenced population, with the total number of defendants sentenced yearly ranging from 81 to 163 (and from 0.13% to 0.24% of all cases).

Table 1. Defendant received intermittent confinement.

Year	Yes	No
2021-2022	81 (0.13%)	64,061 (99.87%)
2020-2021	106 (0.19%)	57,181 (99.81%)
2019-2020	95 (0.15%)	64,470 (99.85%)
2018-2019	133 (0.17%)	76,404 (99.83%)
2017-2018	153 (0.22%)	69,272 (99.78%)
2016-2017	162 (0.24%)	66,711 (99.76%)
2015-2016	163 (0.24%)	67,579 (99.76%)

⁷ Id.

⁸ United States Sentencing Commission. Monitoring of Federal Criminal Sentences, [United States], 2020-2021. Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2023-03-28. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR38552.v1>.

⁹ The lack of data in older datasets or the number of categories within a variable made some 10-year tables not practical.

Year	Yes	No
2014-2015	129 (0.18%)	70,874 (99.82%)
2013-2014	128 (0.17%)	75,708 (99.83%)
2012-2013	116 (0.14%)	79,919 (99.86%)
2011-2012	109 (0.13%)	84,058 (99.87%)

Tables 2 and 3 display the term of IC ordered in months for 2020-2021 and 2021-2022. As shown, one-month sentences were the most common. However, note that many cases did not have a term of IC specified. In previous years, one-month and two-month IC terms were the most common.

Table 2. Term of IC ordered in months for 2020-2021.¹⁰

Term of IC Ordered (Months)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percentage
1	17	16.04	16.04
2	3	2.83	18.87
3	7	6.60	25.47
4	3	2.83	28.30
5	5	4.72	33.02
6	14	13.21	46.23
10	1	0.94	47.17
12	5	4.72	51.89
IC ordered, but term not specified	51	48.11	100.00
Total	106	100.00	<i>Not applicable</i>

Table 3. Term of IC ordered in months for 2021-2022.

Term of IC Ordered (Months)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percentage
1	15	18.52	18.52
2	7	8.64	27.16
3	4	4.94	32.1
4	2	2.47	34.57
5	2	2.47	37.04
6	1	1.23	38.27

¹⁰ Variables used for Tables 1-2: INTDUM (Indicates whether a defendant received intermittent confinement) and MOINTCON (total term of intermittent confinement ordered, in months).

Term of IC Ordered (Months)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percentage
12	1	1.23	39.51
IC ordered, but term not specified	49	60.49	100
Total	81	100.00	<i>Not applicable</i>

Demographics

Tables 4 and 5 display the defendants' age at sentencing for the 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 periods. As shown, most individuals were in the 26-30 and 41-50 age categories. However, distributions varied in other years. For example, some years showed that most individuals were in the 41-50 age category. The technical appendix displays the age at sentencing for all other years.

Table 4. Age at Sentencing for 2020-2021.¹¹

Defendant's Age at Time of Sentencing Categorized	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percentage
< 20	12	11.32	11.32
21 thru 25	16	15.09	26.42
26 thru 30	23	21.70	48.11
31 thru 35	12	11.32	59.43
36 thru 40	15	14.15	73.58
41 thru 50	14	13.21	86.79
51 thru 60	7	6.60	93.40
> 61	7	6.60	100.00
Total	106	100.00	<i>Not applicable</i>

Table 5. Age at Sentencing for 2021-2022.

Defendant's Age at Time of Sentencing Categorized	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percentage
< 20	6	7.41	7.41
21 thru 25	8	9.88	17.28
26 thru 30	12	14.81	32.1
31 thru 35	9	11.11	43.21
36 thru 40	14	17.28	60.49
41 thru 50	21	25.93	86.42

¹¹ Variable AGECAT: Categories of age ranges (Recode of AGE for USSC Sourcebook Fiscal Year 2018 on). See YEARS for categories used in Sourcebook prior to Fiscal Year 2018. Field available FY2019-present.

Defendant's Age at Time of Sentencing Categorized	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percentage
51 thru 60	8	9.88	96.3
> 61	3	3.7	100
Total	81	100.00	<i>Not applicable</i>

Table 6 displays the education level of defendants who received an IC sentence. Results are presented for all 11 years. As shown, high school and some college were generally the two most common levels of education.

Table 6. Defendant's Education.¹²

Year	Less than High School	High School	Some College	College
2021-2022	21 (26.58%)	24 (30.38%)	28 (35.44%)	6 (7.59%)
2020-2021	32 (32%)	37 (37%)	27 (27%)	6 (6%)
2019-2020	24 (28.92%)	26 (31.33%)	26 (31.33%)	7 (8.43%)
2018-2019	26 (23.01%)	39 (34.51%)	35 (30.97%)	13 (11.50%)
2017-2018	25 (19.23%)	39 (30.00%)	48 (36.92%)	18 (13.85%)
2016-2017	35 (25.55%)	46 (33.58%)	35 (25.55%)	21 (15.33%)
2015-2016	28 (21.21%)	41 (31.06%)	43 (32.58%)	20 (15.15%)
2014-2015	16 (15.24%)	30 (28.57%)	37 (35.24%)	22 (20.95%)
2013-2014	27 (25.47%)	27 (25.47%)	31 (29.25%)	21 (19.81%)
2012-2013	10 (9.80%)	37 (36.27%)	30 (29.41%)	25 (24.51%)
2011-2012	9 (10.84%)	32 (38.55%)	34 (40.96%)	8 (9.64%)

Table 7 displays the defendant's race/ethnicity for all 11 years. As shown, Hispanic and White individuals were the majority categories in all 10 years.

Table 7. Defendant's Race.¹³

Year	White	Black	Hispanic	Other
2021-2022	19 (23.46%)	11 (13.58%)	50 (61.73%)	1 (1.23%)
2020-2021	24 (22.64%)	16 (15.09%)	65 (61.32%)	1 (0.94%)
2019-2020	34 (36.96%)	12 (13.04%)	45 (48.91%)	1 (1.09%)

¹² Variable NEWEDUC: Highest level of education for offender (Recode of EDUCATN for annual report).

¹³ Variable NEWRACE: Race of defendant (Recode of MONRACE and HISPORIG for the annual report).

Year	White	Black	Hispanic	Other
2018-2019	34 (26.77%)	31 (24.41%)	56 (44.09%)	6 (4.72%)
2017-2018	57 (39.31%)	41 (28.28%)	40 (27.59%)	7 (4.83%)
2016-2017	48 (30.38%)	48 (30.38%)	57 (36.08%)	5 (3.16%)
2015-2016	67 (42.68%)	37 (23.57%)	50 (31.85%)	3 (1.91%)
2014-2015	56 (45.16%)	35 (28.23%)	24 (19.35%)	9 (7.26%)
2013-2014	49 (41.53%)	25 (21.19%)	37 (31.36%)	7 (5.93%)
2012-2013	52 (50.49%)	24 (23.30%)	17 (16.50%)	10 (9.71%)
2011-2012	48 (57.14%)	16 (19.05%)	11 (13.10%)	9 (10.71%)

Table 8 displays counts and percentages of individuals who had no dependents. All 11 years are displayed in the table. As shown in Table 8, most individuals in all years had one or more dependents.

Table 8. Defendants with no dependents.¹⁴

Year	Count (%)
2021-2022	30 (37.97%)
2020-2021	34 (34.00%)
2019-2020	36 (43.90%)
2018-2019	49 (43.75%)
2017-2018	49 (38.28%)
2016-2017	52 (37.68%)
2015-2016	44 (33.08%)
2014-2015	40 (38.10%)
2013-2014	33 (31.73%)
2012-2013	33 (33.00%)
2011-2012	25 (30.49%)

Tables 8 and 9 display the citizenship of the defendant in 2020-2021 and 2021-2022. As shown, a large majority of defendants (over 95%) were United States citizens. This pattern was consistent across all 11 years.

¹⁴ Variable NUMDEPEN: Number of dependents whom the offender supports (excluding self).

Table 8. Defendant's citizenship for 2020-2021.¹⁵

Nature of Defendant's Citizenship	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percentage
United States citizen	100	95.24	95.24
Resident/legal alien	3	2.86	98.10
Illegal alien	2	1.90	100.00
Total	105	100.00	<i>Not applicable</i>

Table 9. Defendant's citizenship for 2021-2022.

Nature of Defendant's Citizenship	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percentage
United States citizen	74	91.36	91.36
Resident/legal alien	6	7.41	98.77
Illegal alien	1	1.23	100
Total	81	100.00	<i>Not applicable</i>

Table 10 displays the defendant's gender for all 11 years. As shown, the majority of defendants were male for all 11 years. However, the distribution of gender varied across those 11 years (e.g., 2014-2015). It is important to note that the pool of sentenced federal defendants is typically around 85% male, so female defendants are potentially overrepresented in the pool of those sentenced to IC.¹⁶

Table 10. Defendant's Gender.¹⁷

Year	Male	Female
2021-2022	55 (67.90%)	26 (32.10%)
2020-2021	65 (61.32%)	41 (38.68%)
2019-2020	72 (75.79%)	23 (24.21%)
2018-2019	83 (62.88%)	49 (37.12%)
2017-2018	107 (69.93%)	46 (30.07%)
2016-2017	106 (65.84%)	55 (34.16%)
2015-2016	111 (68.10%)	52 (31.90%)
2014-2015	106 (82.17%)	23 (17.83%)
2013-2014	90 (70.87%)	37 (29.13%)
2012-2013	77 (70.00%)	33 (30.00%)
2011-2012	65 (65.00%)	35 (35.00%)

¹⁵ Variable CITIZEN: Identifies the nature of defendant's citizenship with respect to the United States. Value 5 (Extradited Alien) added in September of 2007.

¹⁶ For example, males comprised 86.72% of the total pool of sentenced federal defendants in 2020-2021.

¹⁷ Variable MONSEX: Indicates the offender's gender.

Sentencing Court Information

Table 11 displays the district in which the defendant was sentenced for the 2020-2021 period.¹⁸ As shown, Texas West, Texas South, and Virginia East most often utilized IC sentences. Texas West and Virginia East also had consistently higher numbers of IC sentences over the 11 years.¹⁹ Other districts (e.g., North Carolina East, Oklahoma West, and New York North) also had higher numbers of IC sentences in particular years. The technical appendix displays sentencing court information for all other years. Table 12 also displays IC sentences across circuits for the 2020-2021 period.

Table 11. District in which defendant was sentenced for 2020-2021.²⁰

District in which defendant was sentenced	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percentage
New York South	1	0.94	0.94
Pennsylvania Middle	1	0.94	1.89
Maryland	2	1.89	3.77
North Carolina East	1	0.94	4.72
North Carolina Middle	2	1.89	6.60
North Carolina West	1	0.94	7.55
Virginia East	9	8.49	16.04
Alabama North	1	0.94	16.98
Florida Middle	2	1.89	18.87
Florida South	1	0.94	19.81
Georgia South	1	0.94	20.75
Texas North	1	0.94	21.70
Texas South	15	14.15	35.85
Texas West	53	50.00	85.85
Kentucky East	1	0.94	86.79
Kentucky West	1	0.94	87.74
Illinois Central	1	0.94	88.68
Illinois South	1	0.94	89.62
Indiana South	1	0.94	90.57
Minnesota	1	0.94	91.51

¹⁸ 2021-2022 results also indicated that Texas West continued to be the court with the most IC sentences. Note that the probation office variable POOFFICE indicated that El Paso comprises approximately 84% of the Texas West IC cases for the 2021-2022 period.

¹⁹ The technical appendix includes a section that presents several descriptive statistics for the Texas West district.

²⁰ Variable DISTRICT: The district in which the defendant was sentenced. Use CIRCDIST for the districts in the same order in which they appear in the Sourcebook.

District in which defendant was sentenced	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percentage
Nebraska	2	1.89	93.40
California South	2	1.89	95.28
Nevada	2	1.89	97.17
Oklahoma West	2	1.89	99.06
District of Columbia	1	0.94	100.00
Total	106	100.00	<i>Not applicable</i>

Table 12. Circuit in which the defendant was sentenced for 2020-2021.²¹

Circuit in which the defendant was sentenced	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percentage
1	1	0.94	0.94
2	1	0.94	1.89
3	1	0.94	2.83
4	15	14.15	16.98
5	69	65.09	82.08
6	2	1.89	83.96
7	3	2.83	86.79
8	3	2.83	89.62
9	4	3.77	93.40
10	2	1.89	95.28
11	5	4.72	100.00
Total	106	100.00	<i>Not applicable</i>

Additional Sentencing Factors

Tables 13 and 14 display the dollar amount of the fine ordered for those with IC sentences in 2020-2021 and 2021-2022. As shown, a large majority of defendants received no fine. This pattern was consistent across all 11 years.

²¹ Variable MONCIRC: Indicates the judicial circuit in which the defendant was sentenced. This variable is generated from the entry for judicial district.

Table 13. Dollar amount of fine ordered for 2020-2021.²²

Dollar amount of fine ordered	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percentage
No fine	96	90.57	90.57
\$200	1	0.94	91.51
\$250	2	1.89	93.40
\$300	1	0.94	94.34
\$500	2	1.89	96.23
\$1,000	1	0.94	97.17
\$2,000	1	0.94	98.11
\$3,600	1	0.94	99.06
\$10,000	1	0.94	100.00
Total	106	100.00	<i>Not applicable</i>

Table 14. Dollar amount of fine ordered for 2021-2022.

Dollar amount of fine ordered	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percentage
No Fine	72	88.89	88.89
\$465	1	1.23	90.12
\$600	1	1.23	91.36
\$1,000	2	2.47	93.83
\$1,250	1	1.23	95.06
\$2,000	1	1.23	96.3
\$2,500	1	1.23	97.53
\$5,500	1	1.23	98.77
\$20,000	1	1.23	100
Total	81	100.00	<i>Not applicable</i>

Tables 15 and 16 display the dollar amount of restitution ordered for those with IC sentences in 2020-2021 and 2021-2022. As shown, a large majority of defendants received no fine. This pattern was consistent across all 11 years.

²² Variable FINE: The dollar amount of fine ordered (including cost of supervision when fine and cost of supervision are not reported separately).

Table 15. Dollar amount of restitution for 2020-2021.²³

Dollar amount of restitution	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percentage
No restitution ordered	87	82.08	82.08
\$100	1	0.94	83.02
\$3,000	1	0.94	83.96
\$11,750	1	0.94	84.91
\$16,125	1	0.94	85.85
\$20,385	2	1.89	87.74
\$21,370	2	1.89	89.62
\$23,258	1	0.94	90.57
\$27,525	1	0.94	91.51
\$58,114	1	0.94	92.45
\$76,974	1	0.94	93.40
\$94,416	1	0.94	94.34
\$131,912	1	0.94	95.28
\$194,148	1	0.94	96.23
\$297,155	1	0.94	97.17
\$416,389	1	0.94	98.11
\$649,974	1	0.94	99.06
\$1,641,868	1	0.94	100.00
Total	106	100.00	<i>Not applicable</i>

Table 16. Dollar amount of restitution for 2021-2022.

Dollar amount of restitution	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percentage
No Restitution Ordered	65	82.28	82.28
\$500	2	2.53	84.81
\$6,627	1	1.27	86.08
\$7,344	1	1.27	87.34
\$18,037	1	1.27	88.61
\$117,806	1	1.27	89.87

²³ Variable AMTREST: Dollar amount of restitution. Similar to the variable TOTREST.

Dollar amount of restitution	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percentage
\$120,733	1	1.27	91.14
\$181,137	1	1.27	92.41
\$212,848	1	1.27	93.67
\$254,085	1	1.27	94.94
\$271,000	1	1.27	96.2
\$272,202	1	1.27	97.47
\$569,333	1	1.27	98.73
\$2,884,193	1	1.27	100
Total	81	100.00	<i>Not applicable</i>

Table 17 displays whether financial sanctions were ordered. The displayed results are for the full 11-year period. As shown, the majority of defendants received no fine or restitution over the 11-year period (although note 2011-2012 where the counts and percentages are equal for those with no fine/restitution and only restitution).

Table 17. Whether financial sanctions were ordered.²⁴

Year	None	Only Restitution	Only Fine	Both
2021-2022	54 (66.67%)	11 (13.58%)	11 (13.58%)	5 (6.17%)
2020-2021	68 (64.15%)	16 (15.09%)	19 (17.92%)	3 (2.83%)
2019-2020	52 (45.74%)	12 (12.63%)	26 (27.37%)	5 (5.26%)
2018-2019	71 (53.38%)	21 (15.79%)	35 (26.32%)	6 (4.51%)
2017-2018	72 (47.06%)	30 (19.61%)	43 (28.10%)	8 (5.23%)
2016-2017	75 (46.30%)	35 (21.60%)	44 (27.16%)	8 (4.94%)
2015-2016	68 (41.72%)	40 (24.54%)	46 (28.22%)	9 (5.52%)
2014-2015	38 (29.56%)	38 (29.46%)	35 (27.13%)	18 (13.95%)
2013-2014	61 (47.66%)	40 (31.25%)	21 (16.41%)	6 (4.69%)
2012-2013	48 (41.38%)	32 (27.59%)	28 (24.14%)	8 (6.90%)
2011-2012	37 (33.94%)	37 (33.94%)	30 (27.52%)	5 (4.59%)

²⁴ Variable TYPEMONY: Indicates whether a fine/cost of supervision or restitution was ordered. Compare to RESTDUM, ECONDUM, and FINECDUM.

Tables 18 and 19 display whether the case was a felony or misdemeanor in 2020-2021 and 2021-2022. As shown, a large majority of IC sentences were for felony cases. However, the percentage of misdemeanor cases is larger in previous years where this variable is available (i.e., 2018-present). The technical appendix displays the type of case for all other available years.

Table 18. Type of case (felony or misdemeanor) in 2020-2021.²⁵

Type of case	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percentage
Felony	100	94.34	94.34
Misdemeanor A	6	5.66	100.00
Total	106	100.00	<i>Not applicable</i>

Table 19. Type of case (felony or misdemeanor) in 2021-2022.

Type of case	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percentage
Felony	74	91.36	91.36
Misdemeanor A	7	8.64	100.00
Total	81	100.00	<i>Not applicable</i>

Table 20 displays whether the defendant has any criminal history for all years. As shown, most defendants in all years had some form of criminal history.

Table 20. Any criminal history.²⁶

Year	No	Yes
2021-2022	24 (30.38%)	55 (69.62%)
2020-2021	28 (27.72%)	73 (72.28%)
2019-2020	27 (32.53%)	56 (67.47%)
2018-2019	32 (27.12%)	86 (72.88%)
2017-2018	38 (27.94%)	98 (72.06%)
2016-2017	43 (30.28%)	99 (69.72%)
2015-2016	49 (35.25%)	90 (64.75%)
2014-2015	30 (26.55%)	83 (73.45%)
2013-2014	36 (31.03%)	80 (68.97%)
2012-2013	31 (29.25%)	75 (70.75%)
2011-2012	30 (31.58%)	65 (68.42%)

²⁵ Variable CASETYPE: Identifies the type of case. This field is available FY2018-present.

²⁶ Variable CRIMHIST: Indication as to whether the defendant has any criminal history, including behavior that is not eligible for the application of criminal history points (ex. arrests).

Tables 21 and 22 display the crime-type category of the current offense for the 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 years. As shown, drug trafficking was the most common offense category, with fraud and immigration being larger categories. Larger numbers of firearms offenses, larceny offenses, and other/traffic offenses were also present in previous years. The technical appendix displays crime-types for all other years.

Table 21. Crime-type category for 2020-2021.²⁷

Primary Type of Crime for the Case	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percentage
Bribery/Corruption	1	0.94	0.94
Child Pornography	1	0.94	1.89
Drug Trafficking	48	45.28	47.17
Extortion/Racketeering	1	0.94	48.11
Firearms	5	4.72	52.83
Fraud/Theft/Embezzlement	10	9.43	62.26
Immigration	22	20.75	83.02
Individual Rights	1	0.94	83.96
Money Launder	5	4.72	88.68
National Defense	2	1.89	90.57
Tax	3	2.83	93.40
Other	7	6.60	100.00
Total	106	100.00	<i>Not applicable</i>

Table 22. Crime-type category for 2021-2022.

Primary Type of Crime for the Case	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percentage
Administration of Justice	1	1.23	1.23
Bribery/Corruption	1	1.23	2.47
Burglary/Trespass	2	2.47	4.94
Drug Trafficking	34	41.98	46.91
Environmental	1	1.23	48.15
Firearms	8	9.88	58.02
Fraud/Theft/Embezzlement	12	14.81	72.84
Immigration	14	17.28	90.12

²⁷ Variable OFFGUIDE: Primary type of crime for the case generated mainly from the primary guideline and then the count of conviction with the highest statutory maximum. See OFFTYPE2 for offense types used in USSC Sourcebook FY1999-FY2009 and OFFTYP2 for offense types used in USSC Sourcebook FY2010-FY2017. This field available FY2018-present. Commission publications use OFFGUIDE starting in FY2018.

Primary Type of Crime for the Case	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percentage
Money Laundering	1	1.23	91.36
Prison Offenses	1	1.23	92.59
Sex Abuse	1	1.23	93.83
Stalking/Harassing	1	1.23	95.06
Tax	2	2.47	97.53
Other	2	2.47	100
Total	81	100.00	<i>Not applicable</i>

Tables 23 and 24 display the final criminal history category for individuals who received an IC sentence in 2020-2021 and 2021-2022. This category is calculated based on the number and nature of defendants' prior criminal history, with higher categories representing more prior criminal contacts. As shown, category 1 was the most common criminal history category for individuals who received an IC sentence. This pattern was consistent across all 11 years.

Table 23. Final criminal history category for 2020-2021.²⁸

Defendants Final Criminal History Category	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percentage
1	80	76.19	76.19
2	8	7.62	83.81
3	12	11.43	95.24
4	4	3.81	99.05
5	1	0.95	100.00
Total	106	100.00	<i>Not applicable</i>

Table 24. Final criminal history category for 2021-2022.

Defendants Final Criminal History Category	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percentage
1	52	65.82	65.82
2	13	16.46	82.28
3	6	7.59	89.87
4	4	5.06	94.94
5	2	2.53	97.47

²⁸ Variable XCRHISSR: Defendant's final criminal history category (I-VI), as determined by the court. If info is missing from the SOR, then PSR values are used- use SOURCES to choose only SOR values.

Defendants Final Criminal History Category	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percentage
6	2	2.53	100
Total	79	100.00	<i>Not applicable</i>

Tables 25 and 26 display the final offense level for individuals who received an IC sentence in 2020-2021 and 2021-2022. The levels (which range from level 1 to level 43) are calculated based on the nature of the crime of conviction and other related offense-factors such as the amount of drugs or money involved in certain offenses, the use of weapons, role in the offense and even some pre- and post-offense behaviors. Higher final offense levels represent more serious offenses and offense-related behaviors. As shown, levels 10, 13, and 27 were the most common in 2020-2021. However, there was variability in other years. For example, level 4 was common in earlier years. The technical appendix displays the final offense level for all other years.

Table 25. Final offense level for 2020-2021.²⁹

Final Offense Level	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percentage
4	5	4.76	4.76
6	2	1.90	6.67
8	5	4.76	11.43
9	1	0.95	12.38
10	12	11.43	23.81
11	4	3.81	27.62
12	7	6.67	34.29
13	11	10.48	44.76
14	1	0.95	45.71
15	8	7.62	53.33
16	1	0.95	54.29
17	1	0.95	55.24
18	1	0.95	56.19
19	3	2.86	59.05
20	2	1.90	60.95
21	1	0.95	61.90
23	8	7.62	69.52
24	4	3.81	73.33

²⁹ Variable XFOLSOR: The final offense level, as determined by the court. If info is missing from the SOR, then PSR values are used - use SOURCES to choose only SOR values.

Final Offense Level	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percentage
25	3	2.86	76.19
26	4	3.81	80.00
27	14	13.33	93.33
28	2	1.90	95.24
29	4	3.81	99.05
33	1	0.95	100.00
Total	105	100.00	<i>Not applicable</i>

Table 26. Final offense level for 2021-2022.

Final Offense Level	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percentage
4	4	5.13	5.13
6	4	5.13	10.26
7	1	1.28	11.54
8	1	1.28	12.82
10	4	5.13	17.95
11	6	7.69	25.64
12	6	7.69	33.33
13	2	2.56	35.9
15	4	5.13	41.03
16	1	1.28	42.31
17	3	3.85	46.15
18	1	1.28	47.44
19	3	3.85	51.28
20	1	1.28	52.56
21	6	7.69	60.26
23	10	12.82	73.08
24	1	1.28	74.36
25	9	11.54	85.9
26	2	2.56	88.46
27	4	5.13	93.59
29	3	3.85	97.44

Final Offense Level	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percentage
32	1	1.28	98.72
37	1	1.28	100
Total	78	100.00	<i>Not applicable</i>

Table 27 displays the sentence table zone group for all 11 years. These groups are defined placements on the sentencing table that recommends sentencing terms for individuals based on their offense levels and criminal history categories. When offense levels and criminal histories score lower on the table, the defendant is in a grouping that recommends more prison alternatives.³⁰ In other words, zone group A would receive the least severe sanctions, while zone group D would receive the most severe. As shown, most defendants were in zone group D for all years.

Table 27. Sentence table zone group.³¹

Year	A	B	C	D
2021-2022	7 (8.97%)	11 (14.10%)	6 (7.69%)	54 (69.23%)
2020-2021	12 (11.43%)	13 (12.38%)	19 (18.10%)	61 (58.10%)
2019-2020	12 (13.33%)	20 (22.22%)	11 (12.22%)	47 (52.22%)
2018-2019	23 (18.25%)	18 (14.29%)	27 (21.43%)	58 (46.03%)
2017-2018	24 (16.11%)	30 (20.13%)	29 (19.46%)	66 (44.30%)
2016-2017	25 (16.45%)	16 (10.53%)	39 (25.66%)	72 (47.37%)
2015-2016	38 (24.05%)	35 (22.15%)	29 (18.35%)	56 (35.44%)
2014-2015	24 (18.90%)	18 (14.17%)	31 (24.41%)	54 (42.52%)
2013-2014	23 (18.40%)	22 (17.60%)	24 (19.20%)	56 (44.80%)
2012-2013	26 (23.01%)	22 (19.47%)	23 (20.35%)	42 (37.17%)
2011-2012	23 (21.50%)	21 (19.63%)	18 (16.82%)	45 (42.06%)

Table 28 displays the type of sentence (probation, prison, or fine only) for all years. As shown, most IC conditions involved probation for the earlier years. However, IC was given more often as a prison condition in more recent years.

³⁰ See <https://www.ussc.gov/z>.

³¹ Variable ZONE: Sentence table group which determines eligibility for probation and alternative prison sentences (See §5B1.1 and §5C1.1).

Table 28. Probation, parole, or fine only.³²

Year	Probation	Prison	Fine Only
2021-2022	31 (38.27%)	50 (61.73%)	0 (0%)
2020-2021	51 (48.11%)	55 (51.89%)	0 (0%)
2019-2020	53 (55.79%)	42 (44.21%)	0 (0%)
2018-2019	94 (70.68%)	39 (29.32%)	0 (0%)
2017-2018	105 (68.63%)	48 (31.37%)	0 (0%)
2016-2017	103 (63.58%)	59 (36.42%)	0 (0%)
2015-2016	132 (80.98%)	30 (18.40%)	1 (0.61%)
2014-2015	107 (82.95%)	22 (17.05%)	0 (0%)
2013-2014	109 (85.16%)	18 (14.06%)	1 (0.78%)
2012-2013	90 (77.59%)	26 (22.41%)	0 (0%)
2011-2012	86 (78.90%)	21 (19.27%)	2 (1.83%)

III. REVIEW OF LITERATURE ON INTERMITTENT CONFINEMENT

U.S. Studies

Very few studies have examined intermittent confinement in the U.S. Early studies presented legal overviews of IC across multiple states.³³ One study published in 1989 found low numbers of re-arrests, high levels of employment, and low levels of absenteeism (not showing up for their weekend incarceration) in a sample of individuals ordered to serve weekend sentences in New York State.³⁴ However, this study had a very low sample size (62) and utilized self-reporting rather than official records. Wood and May (2003) found that African American individuals were less willing to serve alternative sentences (e.g., intermittent confinement) compared to White individuals.³⁵ Regarding longer IC sentences, one article indicated that some defendants would prefer serving their sentence consecutively, rather than only on weekends.³⁶

Another recent study examined perceptions of correctional professionals about a new law that expanded the use of IC in Virginia.³⁷ The study found that correctional professionals were concerned about staffing issues, logistical issues, and safety issues as a result of the newly expanded IC law. For example, some respondents noted as follows:

Fridays are an absolute nightmare in my jail. Not only are Friday nights busy at the jail to begin with, we also have weekends. We don't always know exactly how many weekends are going to show up—and it's different every weekend—so not only is it difficult to plan housing space and

³² Variable SENTIMP: Indicates what type of sentence was given.

³³ See Parisi, N. (1979). Part-Time Imprisonment: The Legal and Practical Issues of Periodic Confinement. *Judicature*, 63, 385.

³⁴ See Cohen, P. M. (1989). The weekend sentence: a descriptive/evaluative study. Adelphi University, School of Social Work.

³⁵ See Wood, P. B., & May, D. C. (2003). Racial differences in perceptions of the severity of sanctions: A comparison of prison with alternatives. *Justice Quarterly*, 20(3), 605-631.

³⁶ See <https://www.themarshallproject.org/2015/08/28/weekends-in-jail-for-rape>.

³⁷ See Bowman Balestrieri, B. A. (2020). Part-Time Jail Time: Jailors' Perspectives on the Practice of Nonconsecutive Day Sentencing in Virginia. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 31(3), 452-474.

weekend staffing, but there's no consistency, so one weekend we're fine and then the next weekend the booking area is overflowing for hours while we process and drug test people, we're putting boats (jail mattresses) in the gym for extra housing because the pods are full, and my officers are stressed out working overtime . . . my officers don't need the extra stress, and I don't need the extra liability.

I barely have enough staff as it is, so when I get weekenders I'm not able to plan in advance for it, [it] drives my officers crazy especially on the night shift. Sometimes we have dozens of weekenders reporting on a Friday afternoon and they're [the officers] processing until three, four in the morning. I've got two officers back there booking, and it's a lot, and you run across a lot of errors in the booking process because they have to do everything and they're constantly being interrupted . . . that's a big security concern. People come in, they don't have the papers or fees they're supposed to have, the officer has to stop what they're doing to explain it to them personally, then they go back to their job and fifteen minutes later the person comes back with papers and fees, maybe they're right this time and maybe they're wrong, either way the officer has to start the process all over again

Weekenders creat[e] a dangerous and possibly deadly situation for officers and other inmates Despite thorough strip searches, drugs, guns, needles, cigarettes, lighters, knives, and cell phones have all been detected after the fact.³⁸

International Studies

One evaluation from 1992 in New South Wales, Australia studied several areas of the jurisdiction's IC law.³⁹ The following are excerpts from this study's executive summary:

One of the main concerns of periodic detention is the problem of "net-widening" - that is, the sanction is used in cases where periodic detention is imposed as an alternative to a less severe sanction, such as a community service order or a recognizance with supervision. While the extent of net-widening is difficult to measure and there is some evidence of its continued existence, recent data suggest that in the main, periodic detention is being used as an alternative to imprisonment.

Without including the value of community work performed by periodic detainees and the saving to the community in social welfare benefits paid to the offenders' dependants, periodic detention costs about one-third of that of full-time imprisonment. Any saving, however, is contingent upon the absence of net-widening, i.e. a term of periodic detention is imposed instead of an equivalent term of full-time imprisonment. The cost of corrections could be further reduced by expanding the use of periodic detention to a post-imprisonment or half-way-out option (periodic detention as a reestablishment programme). It is suggested that this could be offered to offenders who: have served at least one half their full-time sentences, have demonstrated acceptable behaviour in gaol, and are considered to be of minimal risk to the community.

A study was undertaken in order to determine what proportion of offenders successfully complete their term of periodic detention. . . A failure rate of 16.4% was calculated by dividing the number of failures (ie 321) by the sum of the number of failures and successes (ie 1956). . . It is suggested that the failure rate for women might be decreased significantly if child care facilities were available.

³⁸ Id at 458-460.

³⁹ See Potas, I. L., Cumines, S., & Takach, R. (1992). A critical review of periodic detention in New South Wales. Judicial Commission of New South Wales.

Another evaluation from 2018 in Québec City, Canada found the following:⁴⁰

The problems of people serving intermittent sentences are numerous. Given the shortage of staff during peak periods (Saturdays and Sundays), often there are no information sessions or documents for these detainees. As a result, their management is often inadequate. Furthermore, detention areas are limited or poorly adapted because of the large number of people there at the same time. As a result, they must sleep on mattresses on the floor, crammed into gymnasiums or visiting rooms. Sometimes these areas do not have washrooms. Overcrowding can also lead to inter-facility transfers when the number of detainees exceeds the maximum occupancy rate. This means that there are more strip searches, a procedure that detainees must undergo when they enter and leave a facility. Women serving intermittent sentences in outlying regions are usually detained at the male correctional facility closest to where they live. Since, most of the time, the gymnasiums and other detention areas are set aside for male inmates, the women are housed under poor conditions, in holding cells or visiting rooms, for example.

IV. WEEKEND-ONLY INMATES IN U.S. JAILS

Table 29 displays counts, percentages, and measures of statistical significance for individuals serving weekend-only sentences from 2005 to 2019. The data in table 29 represents national data of individuals held in U.S. jails.⁴¹ As shown, the number of persons serving weekend-only sentences significantly decreased in several years (when compared to 2019). Updated numbers of weekend inmates have been made available, and that data shows that the number of weekend sentences continues to decline.⁴²

Table 29. Persons serving weekend-only sentences on the weekend before midyear, 2005-2019.⁴³

Year	Total Jail Population	Weekend-Only	Percent Weekend-Only
2005	805,300	14,100	1.8
2006	814,600	11,400	1.4
2007	838,000	10,500	1.3
2008	846,000	12,300	1.5
2009	826,400	11,200	1.4
2010	799,500	9,900	1.2
2011	787,000	11,400	1.4
2012	798,200	10,400	1.3
2013	779,700	11,000	1.4
2014	798,400	9,700	1.2

⁴⁰ See https://protecteurducitoyen.gc.ca/sites/default/files/pdf/rapports_speciaux/consequences-increase-intermittent-sentences.pdf.

⁴¹ See <https://bjs.ojp.gov/content/pub/pdf/ji19.pdf> for detailed methodology.

⁴² Year 2020 = 2,200 weekend inmates, year, 2021 = 2,100 weekend inmates, and year 2022 = 1,300 weekend inmates. Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Annual Survey of Jails, 2012–2018 and 2020–2022; and Census of Jails, 2019.

⁴³ Data are based on the number of inmates supervised on the last weekday in June, unless specified. Data are rounded to the nearest 100. Details may not sum to totals due to rounding. See appendix table 7 for standard errors. Includes persons who served their sentences of confinement on weekends only (i.e., Friday to Sunday) on the weekend before the last weekday in June. In 2015 and 2016, the number of weekenders was collected for the weekend before December 31. 2019 is the comparison year. Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Annual Survey of Jails, 2006-2018; and Census of Jails, 2005 and 2019. <https://bjs.ojp.gov/library/publications/jail-inmates-2019>.

Year	Total Jail Population	Weekend-Only	Percent Weekend-Only
2015	774,500	7,800	1.0
2016	789,400	5,500	0.7
2017	794,300	6,800	0.9
2018	790,400	5,900	0.7
2019	773,200	4,500 ⁴⁴	0.8

Table 30 displays whether states had jails that possessed weekend programs on the weekend prior to June 30, 2021. As shown, all states had at facilities with at least one weekend program. However, most states had more facilities without a weekend program. Data was also available displaying the number of inmates in each facility for the weekend prior to June 30, 2021. The number of weekend-only inmates ranged from 0 to 87. The average number of weekend-only inmates was 3.42.

Table 30. On the weekend prior to June 30, 2021, did your jail facility have a weekend program?

Organization State	Missing	No	Yes	Total
Alabama	1 (4%)	14 (56%)	10 (40%)	25 (100%)
Arizona	0 (0%)	2 (33.33%)	4 (66.67%)	6 (100%)
Arkansas	0 (0%)	10 (76.92%)	3 (23.08%)	13 (100%)
California	0 (0%)	27 (75%)	9 (25%)	36 (100%)
Colorado	0 (0%)	11 (78.57%)	3 (21.43%)	14 (100%)
District of Columbia	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Florida	2 (4.65%)	25 (58.14%)	16 (37.21%)	43 (100%)
Georgia	5 (8.06%)	37 (59.68%)	20 (32.26%)	62 (100%)
Idaho	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9 (100%)	9 (100%)
Illinois	0 (0%)	9 (47.37%)	10 (52.63%)	19 (100%)
Indiana	0 (0%)	13 (38.24%)	21 (61.76%)	34 (100%)
Iowa	0 (0%)	9 (75%)	3 (25%)	12 (100%)
Kansas	1 (7.69%)	7 (53.85%)	5 (38.46%)	13 (100%)
Kentucky	0 (0%)	16 (43.24%)	21 (56.76%)	37 (100%)
Louisiana	0 (0%)	35 (89.74%)	4 (10.26%)	39 (100%)
Maine	0 (0%)	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	4 (100%)
Maryland	0 (0%)	9 (60%)	6 (40%)	15 (100%)

⁴⁴ The 2019 report showed this number as 6,500; however, updated reports show this number as 4,500. Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Annual Survey of Jails, 2012–2018 and 2020–2022; and Census of Jails, 2019.

Organization State	Missing	No	Yes	Total
Massachusetts	0 (0%)	9 (90%)	1 (10%)	10 (100%)
Michigan	0 (0%)	11 (57.89%)	8 (42.11%)	19 (100%)
Minnesota	0 (0%)	10 (71.43%)	4 (28.57%)	14 (100%)
Mississippi	0 (0%)	19 (76.00%)	6 (24.00%)	25 (100%)
Missouri	0 (0%)	10 (52.63%)	9 (47.37%)	19 (100%)
Montana	0 (0%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	4 (100%)
Nebraska	0 (0%)	7 (87.50%)	1 (12.50%)	8 (100%)
Nevada	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	4 (80%)	5 (100%)
New Hampshire	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (100%)	4 (100%)
New Jersey	0 (0%)	5 (45.45%)	6 (54.55%)	11 (100%)
New Mexico	0 (0%)	6 (75%)	2 (25%)	8 (100%)
New York	1 (5.56%)	5 (27.78%)	12 (66.67%)	18 (100%)
North Carolina	0 (0%)	9 (39.13%)	14 (60.87%)	23 (100%)
North Dakota	0 (0%)	5 (55.56%)	4 (44.44%)	9 (100%)
Ohio	0 (0%)	31 (73.81%)	11 (26.19%)	42 (100%)
Oklahoma	0 (0%)	9 (75%)	3 (25%)	12 (100%)
Oregon	0 (0%)	7 (63.64%)	4 (36.36%)	11 (100%)
Pennsylvania	0 (0%)	20 (60.61%)	13 (39.39%)	33 (100%)
South Carolina	0 (0%)	8 (42.11%)	11 (57.89%)	19 (100%)
South Dakota	0 (0%)	3 (60%)	2 (40%)	5 (100%)
Tennessee	0 (0%)	18 (41.86%)	25 (58.14%)	43 (100%)
Texas	0 (0%)	34 (56.67%)	26 (43.33%)	60 (100%)
Utah	0 (0%)	5 (62.50%)	3 (37.50%)	8 (100%)
Virginia	0 (0%)	11 (29.73%)	26 (70.27%)	37 (100%)
Washington	0 (0%)	11 (78.57%)	3 (21.43%)	14 (100%)
West Virginia	0 (0%)	1 (9.09%)	10 (90.91%)	11 (100%)
Wisconsin	1 (6.25 %)	14 (87.50%)	1 (6.25%)	16 (100%)
Wyoming	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	4 (100%)
Total	11 (1.26%)	499 (57.09%)	364 (41.65%)	874 (100%)

Table 31 displays the number of jails within a state that have 10 or more weekend-only inmates for the weekend prior to June 30, 2021. As shown, Virginia had the most jails with 10 or more weekend-only inmates for the weekend prior to June 30, 2021.

Table 31. The number of jails within a state that have 10 or more weekend-only inmates for the weekend prior to June 30, 2021.

Facility	State
Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department	California
San Diego County Sheriff's Department	California
Arapahoe County Sheriff's Office	Colorado
Broward Sheriff's Office	Florida
Henry County Sheriff's Department	Georgia
St. Joseph County Police Department	Indiana
Shawnee County Department of Corrections	Kansas
Marion County Detention Center	Kentucky
Hopkins County Jail	Kentucky
Anne Arundel County Department of Detention Facilities	Maryland
Macomb County Sheriff's Office	Michigan
Issaquena County Correctional Facility	Mississippi
Daviess-Dekalb Regional Jail	Missouri
Jackson County Department of Corrections	Missouri
Burlington County Department of Corrections	New Jersey
Multnomah County Sheriff's Office	Oregon
Franklin County Jail	Pennsylvania
Washington County Sheriff's Office	Tennessee
Sumner County Sheriff's Office	Tennessee
Sullivan County Sheriff's Office	Tennessee
Davidson County Sheriff's Office	Tennessee
Marshall County Sheriff's Office	Tennessee
Kaufman County Sheriff's Office	Texas
Brazos County Sheriff's Office	Texas
Tarrant County Sheriff's Department	Texas
Galveston County Sheriff's Office	Texas
Johnson County Sheriff's Office	Texas

Facility	State
Virginia Beach Sheriff's Office	Virginia
Newport News Sheriff's Office	Virginia
Southwest Virginia Regional Jail Authority	Virginia
Chesterfield County Sheriff's Office	Virginia
Piedmont Regional Jail Authority	Virginia
Norfolk Sheriff's Office	Virginia
Henrico County Sheriff's Office	Virginia
Northwestern Regional Adult Detention Center	Virginia
Rappahannock Regional Jail Authority	Virginia
Meherrin River Regional Jail	Virginia
Riverside Regional Jail Authority	Virginia

V. SURVEY OF FEDERAL PROBATION OFFICERS

Methods

A list of federal probation officers was secured from [safetysource.com](https://www.safetysource.com), a company who compiled lists of criminal justice personnel. From the [safetysource.com](https://www.safetysource.com) list, we identified 374 federal probation officers who had an associated email address. We utilized Qualtrics to develop and distribute the survey. The survey was piloted with a federal criminal justice professional before distribution. The survey was distributed in November 2023 and data collection concluded in December 2023 after three reminder emails. Our final sample included 16 respondents.

Results

Table 32. Jurisdiction of employment.

Response
Northern District of Florida
Mississippi Southern
Central Illinois
Colorado
Southern Ohio
Kansas
Western Arkansas
Southern Ohio - Probation

Response
Montana
New Mexico
north carolina middle
Utah
SD/IN
SM/MS
Florida Southern

Table 33. Are you aware that intermittent confinement is a sentencing option under federal law?

Answer	%	Count
Yes	100.00%	15
No	0.00%	0
Total	100%	15

Table 34. Have you ever recommended intermittent confinement as a sentencing option to a judge?

Answer	%	Count
Yes	46.67%	7
No	53.33%	8
Unsure	0.00%	0
Total	100%	15

Table 35. How likely is it that you would recommend intermittent confinement as a sentencing option to a judge?

Answer	%	Count
Very unlikely	26.67%	4
Somewhat unlikely	6.67%	1
Somewhat likely	13.33%	2
Very likely	20.00%	3
Neither likely or unlikely	33.33%	5
Total	100%	15

Table 36. Approximately how many defendants do you generally have under your supervision?

Response
35
0
45
none at this time; in leadership position
None
I am the Chief Probation Officer so I do not directly supervise individuals on supervision.
None at this time--I am the Deputy Chief
1,500 throughout the state
52
45
40
55
0

Table 37. Have you ever had anyone under your supervision sentenced to intermittent confinement?

Answer	%	Count
Yes	60.00%	9
No	40.00%	6
Unsure	0.00%	0
Total	100%	15

Table 38. How many defendants do you currently have under supervision that were sentenced to intermittent confinement? If unsure, please write unsure.

Response
unsure
0
none, in leadership position currently/ no caseload
0
None
Unsure, but if any it's very very few

Response
Unsure
0
none

Table 39. Have other probation officers in your jurisdiction had defendants under their supervision sentenced to intermittent confinement?

Answer	%	Count
Yes	78.57%	11
No	7.14%	1
Unsure	14.29%	2
Total	100%	14

Table 40. Do you feel that judges in your jurisdiction use intermittent confinement with roughly similar frequency?

Answer	%	Count
Yes	27.27%	3
No	45.45%	5
Unsure	27.27%	3
Total	100%	11

Table 41. Please indicate below to what extent to you agree or disagree with the following statements:

Question	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Total
Intermittent confinement can serve as just punishment for a defendant.	6 (46.15%)	6 (46.15%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	0 (0.00%)	13
Intermittent confinement can be an adequate deterrent for the defendant.	4 (30.77%)	6 (46.15%)	1 (7.69%)	1 (7.69%)	1 (7.69%)	13
Intermittent confinement can adequately protect public safety.	2 (15.38%)	6 (46.15%)	4 (30.77%)	1 (7.69%)	0 (0.00%)	13
Intermittent confinement allows for effective rehabilitation of the defendant.	1 (7.69%)	5 (38.46%)	1 (7.69%)	2 (15.38%)	4 (30.77%)	13

Question	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Total
Intermittent confinement creates an unnecessary security risk at incarceration facilities.	1 (7.69%)	4 (30.77%)	3 (23.08%)	3 (23.08%)	2 (15.38%)	13
Intermittent confinement overburdens staff at incarceration facilities.	2 (15.38%)	3 (23.08%)	2 (15.38%)	2 (15.38%)	4 (30.77%)	13

Table 42. Please indicate below to what extent to you agree or disagree with the following statements:

Question	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Total
Intermittent confinement helps convicted individuals keep their jobs.	6 (46.15%)	4 (30.77%)	1 (7.69%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (15.38%)	13
Intermittent confinement helps convicted individuals with serious or chronic medical conditions get proper medical care.	1 (7.69%)	4 (30.77%)	2 (15.38%)	1 (7.69%)	5 (38.46%)	13
Intermittent confinement helps convicted individuals maintain their familial relationships.	1 (7.69%)	6 (46.15%)	2 (15.38%)	0 (0.00%)	4 (30.77%)	13

Table 43. In your opinion, how important should the following factors be when judges are deciding whether a defendant should be sentenced to intermittent confinement?

Question	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Total
Seriousness of current offense.	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (18.18%)	9 (81.82%)	11
Type of current offense (e.g., violent, drug, fraud, theft, etc.).	0 (0.00%)	1 (8.33%)	1 (8.33%)	2 (16.67%)	8 (66.67%)	12
Criminal history of the defendant.	0 (0.00%)	1 (8.33%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (8.33%)	10 (83.33%)	12
Defendant has children or other dependents.	3 (25.00%)	2 (16.67%)	0 (0.00%)	5 (41.67%)	2 (16.67%)	12
Defendant is employed.	2 (16.67%)	2 (16.67%)	0 (0.00%)	4 (33.33%)	4 (33.33%)	12

Question	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Total
Defendant has serious and chronic medical conditions.	1 (8.33%)	2 (16.67%)	3 (25.00%)	3 (25.00%)	3 (25.00%)	12

Table 44. Please indicate below to what extent do you agree that your jurisdiction’s incarceration facilities are able to receive individuals who have been sentenced to intermittent confinement.

Answer	%	Count
Strongly agree	0.00%	0
Somewhat agree	46.15%	6
I do not know	7.69%	1
Somewhat disagree	15.38%	2
Strongly disagree	30.77%	4
Total	100%	13

Table 45. Please indicate below to what extent do you agree with the following statement: I would be concerned about defendants failing to report to the incarceration facility for their terms of intermittent confinement.

Answer	%	Count
Strongly agree	0.00%	0
Somewhat agree	30.00%	3
Neither agree nor disagree	40.00%	4
Somewhat disagree	30.00%	3
Strongly disagree	0.00%	0
Total	100%	10

Table 46. Please indicate below to what extent do you agree with the following statement: In my opinion, intermittent confinement should be used with greater frequency in my jurisdiction.

Answer	%	Count
Strongly agree	10.00%	1
Somewhat agree	50.00%	5
Neither agree nor disagree	10.00%	1
Somewhat disagree	20.00%	2
Strongly disagree	10.00%	1
Total	100%	10

Table 47. Please share any other thoughts or concerns that you have regarding intermittent confinement.

Response
Has only been used as part of a revocation sentence, to my knowledge.
There are no federal facilities in the Southern District of OH and no local jails can house intermittent confinement inmates
I believe it is a useful tool that should be used
Intermittent confinement is not available in my district because none of the contracted jails offer it.
One challenge is that USM has only one contracted jail facility for the central and northern part of the state, and it's overcrowded. Plus not a lot of confidence in their medical facilities for inmates
It's really based on the situation as mentioned in the survey. I especially think it is useful for reentry and specialty courts.
Intermittent confinement in the federal system is too difficult to coordinate with BOP and the USMS. On the supervision side it is nearly impossible to use intermittent confinement as a sanction. It is because of coordinating with BOP and USMS won't take them into their contracted facilities.
Intermittent confinement cause too many issues and does not have deterrent affect on the case that have received this sentence. Not worth all the issues it causes.

VI. DISCUSSION OF SURVEY RESULTS

One hundred percent of respondents (15) noted that they were aware of intermittent confinement as a sentencing option, while only 47% noted that they had recommended intermittent confinement. Approximately 45% of respondents (5) felt that judges do not use intermittent confinement with roughly the same frequency. Most respondents agreed (strongly agree or somewhat agree) that intermittent confinement can serve as a just punishment, can be an adequate deterrent, can adequately protect public safety, can allow for effective rehabilitation of the defendant, and can overburden incarceration facilities. Additionally, most respondents disagreed (strongly disagree or somewhat disagree) that intermittent confinement causes a security risk for incarceration facilities. Most respondents also agreed that intermittent confinement helps people keep their jobs, maintain familial relationships, and maintain medical care for serious medical issues. Seriousness of the current offense, criminal history of the defendant, and type of crime were deemed very important factors (majority or more of respondents noted very important) for who should receive intermittent confinement. Finally, while most respondents noted that intermittent confinement should be used more often in their jurisdiction, some respondents noted that they currently do not have incarceration facilities that are able to receive individuals serving intermittent confinement sentences, that their facilities are already overcrowded, and that the logistical difficulties with intermittent confinement outweigh the effort it takes to effectuate that sentence.

VII. CONCLUSION

In the current study, we provided an overview of federal law on intermittent confinement, presented data on the use of intermittent confinement in the federal system and weekend incarceration in the state system, discussed existing research on intermittent confinement and weekend incarceration, and presented results of a survey of federal probation officers on their opinions of intermittent confinement. Overall, the results of the study indicated that intermittent confinement and weekend sentences are rarely used in federal and state systems (relative to traditional incarceration sentences). Additionally, the results indicated that a single federal district (Texas West) accounted for the majority of federal intermittent

confinement cases across several years of data.

Results of the survey of federal probation officers indicated that logistical issues with intermittent confinement and incarceration facility availability may be a cause for low numbers of intermittent confinement sentences. The majority of survey respondents agreed that intermittent confinement can serve as a just punishment, can be an adequate deterrent, can adequately protect public safety, can allow for effective rehabilitation of the defendant, and can overburden incarceration facilities. The majority of respondents also agreed that intermittent confinement helps people keep their jobs, maintain familial relationships, and maintain medical care for serious medical issues. Seriousness of the current offense, criminal history of the defendant, and type of crime were deemed important factors for who should receive intermittent confinement. Finally, a majority of respondents noted that intermittent confinement should be used more often in their jurisdiction and disagreed that intermittent confinement causes a security risk for incarceration facilities.

The above results inform several areas of future research. First, researchers should seek to identify the number of federal incarceration facilities that are capable of handling intermittent confinement sentences. Second, researchers should further explore potential logistical or security issues with intermittent confinement or weekend sentences. Third, and perhaps most important, researchers should explore whether there are meaningful differences in various outcomes (e.g., recidivism, employment, health, and housing stability) between those who receive intermittent confinement sentences and similarly situated individuals who receive traditional incarceration sentences.

TECHNICAL APPENDIX

To request a fully accessible version of the technical appendix, please email depc@osu.edu.

2019-2020

IC Sentences

```
. tab MOINTCON if INTDUM==1
```

TERM OF INTERMITTENT CONFINEMENT			
ORDERED	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----			
1	30	31.58	31.58
2	15	15.79	47.37
3	7	7.37	54.74
4	2	2.11	56.84
6	2	2.11	58.95
12	2	2.11	61.05
20	1	1.05	62.11
Intermittent confinement ordered, but n	36	37.89	100.00
-----+-----			
Total	95	100.00	

```
. tab MOINTCON
```

TERM OF INTERMITTENT CONFINEMENT			
ORDERED	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----			
No intermittent confinement ordered	64,470	99.85	99.85

1	30	0.05	99.90
2	15	0.02	99.92
3	7	0.01	99.93
4	2	0.00	99.94
6	2	0.00	99.94
12	2	0.00	99.94
20	1	0.00	99.94
-----+-----			
Intermittent confinement ordered, but n	36	0.06	100.00
-----+-----			
Total	64,565	100.00	

. tab INTDUM

RECEIPT OF			
INTERMITTEN			
T			
CONFINEMENT	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----			
No	64,470	99.85	99.85
Yes	95	0.15	100.00
-----+-----			
Total	64,565	100.00	

Demographics

```
. tab AGECAT if INTDUM ==1
```

```
DEFENDANT'S |
```

```
AGE AT TIME |
```

```
OF |
```

```
SENTENCING |
```

```
CATEGORIZED | Freq. Percent Cum.
```

```
-----+-----
```

< 20	10	10.53	10.53
21 thru 25	15	15.79	26.32
26 thru 30	9	9.47	35.79
31 thru 35	10	10.53	46.32
36 thru 40	18	18.95	65.26
41 thru 50	19	20.00	85.26
51 thru 60	9	9.47	94.74
> 61	5	5.26	100.00

```
-----+-----
```

```
Total | 95 100.00
```

```
. tab NEWEDUC if INTDUM ==1
```

```
EDUCATION OF DEFENDANT | Freq. Percent Cum.
```

```
-----+-----
```

Less than H.S. graduate	24	28.92	28.92
H.S. graduate	26	31.33	60.24
Some college	26	31.33	91.57
College graduate	7	8.43	100.00

```
-----+-----
Total |      83  100.00
```

```
. tab NEWRACE if INTDUM ==1
```

```
RACE OF |
DEFENDANT |  Freq.  Percent  Cum.
-----+-----
White |    34   36.96   36.96
Black |    12   13.04   50.00
Hispanic |   45   48.91   98.91
Other |     1    1.09  100.00
```

```
-----+-----
Total |    92  100.00
```

```
. tab NUMDEPEN if INTDUM ==1
```

```
NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS WHOM DEFENDANT |
SUPPORTS |  Freq.  Percent  Cum.
-----+-----
No dependents |    36   43.90   43.90
1 |    11   13.41   57.32
2 |    14   17.07   74.39
3 |     5    6.10   80.49
4 |    10   12.20   92.68
5 |     2    2.44   95.12
6 |     3    3.66   98.78
```

11 | 1 1.22 100.00

-----+-----
Total | 82 100.00

. . tab CITIZEN if INTDUM ==1

NATURE OF DEFENDANT'S CITIZENSHIP | Freq. Percent Cum.

-----+-----
United States citizen | 88 94.62 94.62
Resident/legal alien | 1 1.08 95.70
Illegal alien | 3 3.23 98.92
Not a US citizen/alien status unknown | 1 1.08 100.00

-----+-----
Total | 93 100.00

. tab MONSEX if INTDUM ==1

DEFENDANT'S |

GENDER | Freq. Percent Cum.

-----+-----
Male | 72 75.79 75.79
Female | 23 24.21 100.00

-----+-----
Total | 95 100.00

Sentencing Court Information

```
. tab DISTRICT if INTDUM ==1
```

```
DISTRICT IN WHICH |
DEFENDANT WAS SENTENCED |  Freq.  Percent  Cum.
-----+-----
```

Rhode Island	1	1.05	1.05
New York South	1	1.05	2.11
Maryland	1	1.05	3.16
North Carolina East	6	6.32	9.47
South Carolina	3	3.16	12.63
Virginia East	7	7.37	20.00
West Virginia South	2	2.11	22.11
Alabama Middle	1	1.05	23.16
Florida North	1	1.05	24.21
Florida Middle	2	2.11	26.32
Florida South	1	1.05	27.37
Georgia Middle	2	2.11	29.47
Georgia South	2	2.11	31.58
Texas East	1	1.05	32.63
Texas West	37	38.95	71.58
Kentucky West	1	1.05	72.63
Ohio North	2	2.11	74.74
Tennessee East	3	3.16	77.89
Tennessee Middle	1	1.05	78.95
Illinois Central	3	3.16	82.11
Wisconsin East	2	2.11	84.21

Arkansas East	1	1.05	85.26
Minnesota	2	2.11	87.37
Nebraska	1	1.05	88.42
California Central	1	1.05	89.47
California South	3	3.16	92.63
Nevada	2	2.11	94.74
Oklahoma West	1	1.05	95.79
Utah	1	1.05	96.84
District of Columbia	3	3.16	100.00

-----+-----

Total	95	100.00
-------	----	--------

. tab MONCIRC if INTDUM ==1

CIRCUIT IN |

WHICH |

DEFENDANT |

WAS |

SENTENCED	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----------	-------	---------	------

-----+-----

0	3	3.16	3.16
1	1	1.05	4.21
2	1	1.05	5.26
4	19	20.00	25.26
5	38	40.00	65.26
6	7	7.37	72.63
7	5	5.26	77.89

8	4	4.21	82.11
9	6	6.32	88.42
10	2	2.11	90.53
11	9	9.47	100.00

-----+-----

Total	95	100.00	
-------	----	--------	--

Additional Sentencing Factors

```
. tab FINE if INTDUM==1
```

DOLLAR |

AMOUNT OF |

FINE |

ORDERED	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
---------	-------	---------	------

-----+-----

No fine	72	75.79	75.79
---------	----	-------	-------

245	1	1.05	76.84
-----	---	------	-------

300	1	1.05	77.89
-----	---	------	-------

390	1	1.05	78.95
-----	---	------	-------

400	2	2.11	81.05
-----	---	------	-------

500	2	2.11	83.16
-----	---	------	-------

600	1	1.05	84.21
-----	---	------	-------

805	1	1.05	85.26
-----	---	------	-------

1000	2	2.11	87.37
------	---	------	-------

1200	1	1.05	88.42
------	---	------	-------

1500		1	1.05	89.47
2000		1	1.05	90.53
2500		1	1.05	91.58
3000		1	1.05	92.63
3100		1	1.05	93.68
4000		1	1.05	94.74
5500		2	2.11	96.84
20000		2	2.11	98.95
50000		1	1.05	100.00

-----+-----

Total		95	100.00	
-------	--	----	--------	--

. tab AMTREST if INTDUM==1

DOLLAR AMOUNT OF |

RESTITUTION		Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-------------	--	-------	---------	------

-----+-----

No restitution ordered		78	84.78	84.78
------------------------	--	----	-------	-------

178		1	1.09	85.87
2500		1	1.09	86.96
2951		1	1.09	88.04
5242		1	1.09	89.13
11669		1	1.09	90.22
13373		1	1.09	91.30
21520		1	1.09	92.39
41333		1	1.09	93.48
91615		1	1.09	94.57

102000	1	1.09	95.65
159927	1	1.09	96.74
395402	1	1.09	97.83
403720	1	1.09	98.91
534848	1	1.09	100.00

-----+-----
Total | 92 100.00

. tab TYPEMONY if INTDUM==1

FINE/COST OF SUPERVISION OR RESTITUTION	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
---	-------	---------	------

-----+-----
No fine / cost of supervision, nor rest | 52 54.74 54.74
Restitution ordered, no fine / cost of | 12 12.63 67.37
Fine / cost of supervision, no restitut | 26 27.37 94.74
Both fine / cost of supervision and res | 5 5.26 100.00

-----+-----
Total | 95 100.00

. tab CASETYPE if INTDUM==1

TYPE OF CASE	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
--------------	-------	---------	------

-----+-----
Felony | 81 85.26 85.26
Misdemeanor A | 14 14.74 100.00

Total | 95 100.00

. tab CASETYPE if INTDUM==1

TYPE OF CASE	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----			
Felony	81	85.26	85.26
Misdemeanor A	14	14.74	100.00
-----+-----			
Total	95	100.00	

. tab CRIMHIST if INTDUM==1

DOES DEFENDANT HAVE ANY CRIMINAL |

HISTORY	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----			
No criminal history	27	32.53	32.53
Yes, there is a criminal history	56	67.47	100.00
-----+-----			
Total	83	100.00	

. tab OFFGUIDE if INTDUM==1

PRIMARY TYPE OF CRIME FOR |

THE CASE	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----			
Administration of Justice	5	5.26	5.26

Assault	1	1.05	6.32
Bribery/Corruption	4	4.21	10.53
Drug Possession	2	2.11	12.63
Drug Trafficking	20	21.05	33.68
Environmental	1	1.05	34.74
Firearms	7	7.37	42.11
Forgery/Counter/Copyright	1	1.05	43.16
Fraud/Theft/Embezzlement	11	11.58	54.74
Immigration	21	22.11	76.84
Money Launder	6	6.32	83.16
Obscenity/Other Sex Offenses	1	1.05	84.21
Prison Offenses	2	2.11	86.32
Robbery	1	1.05	87.37
Tax	2	2.11	89.47
Other	10	10.53	100.00
-----+			
Total	95	100.00	

```
. tab OFFTYPE2 if INTDUM==1
```

```
variable OFFTYPE2 not found
```

```
r(111);
```

```
. tab XCRHISSR if INTDUM==1
```

```
DEFENDANTS |
```

```
FINAL |
```

```
CRIMINAL |
```

HISTORY |

CATEGORY | Freq. Percent Cum.

1	64	71.11	71.11
2	10	11.11	82.22
3	9	10.00	92.22
4	2	2.22	94.44
5	4	4.44	98.89
6	1	1.11	100.00

Total | 90 100.00

. tab XFOLSOR if INTDUM==1

FINAL |

OFFENSE |

LEVEL | Freq. Percent Cum.

2	1	1.11	1.11
4	6	6.67	7.78
7	1	1.11	8.89
8	9	10.00	18.89
9	4	4.44	23.33
10	10	11.11	34.44
11	5	5.56	40.00
12	6	6.67	46.67
13	6	6.67	53.33

14		3	3.33	56.67
15		2	2.22	58.89
16		1	1.11	60.00
17		5	5.56	65.56
18		2	2.22	67.78
19		7	7.78	75.56
21		3	3.33	78.89
23		6	6.67	85.56
24		2	2.22	87.78
25		5	5.56	93.33
26		1	1.11	94.44
27		2	2.22	96.67
29		1	1.11	97.78
31		1	1.11	98.89
34		1	1.11	100.00

-----+-----

Total | 90 100.00

```
. tab OFFTYPSE if INTDUM ==1
```

```
variable OFFTYPSE not found
```

```
r(111);
```

```
. tab ZONE if INTDUM ==1
```

```
SENTENCE |
```


TABLE GROUP | Freq. Percent Cum.

	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
A	12	13.33	13.33
B	20	22.22	35.56
C	11	12.22	47.78
D	47	52.22	100.00
Total	90	100.00	

2018-2019

IC Sentences

tab MOINTCON if INTDUM==1

TERM OF INTERMITTENT CONFINEMENT |

ORDERED	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	59	44.36	44.36
2	16	12.03	56.39
3	6	4.51	60.90
4	6	4.51	65.41
5	1	0.75	66.17
6	3	2.26	68.42
8	1	0.75	69.17
10	1	0.75	69.92
12	1	0.75	70.68
Intermittent confinement ordered, but n	39	29.32	100.00

-----+-----
Total | 133 100.00

. tab MOINTCON

TERM OF INTERMITTENT CONFINEMENT |

ORDERED | Freq. Percent Cum.

-----+-----
No intermittent confinement ordered | 76,404 99.83 99.83

1 | 59 0.08 99.90

2 | 16 0.02 99.92

3 | 6 0.01 99.93

4 | 6 0.01 99.94

5 | 1 0.00 99.94

6 | 3 0.00 99.95

8 | 1 0.00 99.95

10 | 1 0.00 99.95

12 | 1 0.00 99.95

Intermittent confinement ordered, but n | 39 0.05 100.00

-----+-----
Total | 76,537 100.00

. tab INTDUM

RECEIPT OF |

INTERMITTEN |

T |

CONFINEMENT | Freq. Percent Cum.

```
-----+-----
```

No	76,404	99.83	99.83
Yes	133	0.17	100.00

```
-----+-----
```

Total	76,537	100.00	
-------	--------	--------	--

Demographics

```
. tab AGECAT if INTDUM ==1
```

```
DEFENDANT'S |
```

```
AGE AT TIME |
```

```
OF |
```

```
SENTENCING |
```

```
CATEGORIZED | Freq. Percent Cum.
```

```
-----+-----
```

< 20	5	3.76	3.76
21 thru 25	19	14.29	18.05
26 thru 30	31	23.31	41.35
31 thru 35	23	17.29	58.65
36 thru 40	12	9.02	67.67
41 thru 50	23	17.29	84.96
51 thru 60	14	10.53	95.49
> 61	6	4.51	100.00

```
-----+-----
```

Total	133	100.00	
-------	-----	--------	--

```
.  
. . tab NEWEDUC if INTDUM ==1
```

EDUCATION OF DEFENDANT	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----			
Less than H.S. graduate	26	23.01	23.01
H.S. graduate	39	34.51	57.52
Some college	35	30.97	88.50
College graduate	13	11.50	100.00
-----+-----			
Total	113	100.00	

```
. tab NEWRACE if INTDUM ==1
```

RACE OF			
DEFENDANT	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----			
White	34	26.77	26.77
Black	31	24.41	51.18
Hispanic	56	44.09	95.28
Other	6	4.72	100.00
-----+-----			
Total	127	100.00	

```
. tab NUMDEPEN if INTDUM ==1
```

NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS WHOM DEFENDANT |

SUPPORTS | Freq. Percent Cum.

No dependents	49	43.75	43.75
1	15	13.39	57.14
2	17	15.18	72.32
3	15	13.39	85.71
4	7	6.25	91.96
5	4	3.57	95.54
6	3	2.68	98.21
8	1	0.89	99.11
11	1	0.89	100.00

Total	112	100.00	
-------	-----	--------	--

. tab CITIZEN if INTDUM ==1

NATURE OF DEFENDANT'S CITIZENSHIP | Freq. Percent Cum.

United States citizen	127	96.21	96.21
Resident/legal alien	4	3.03	99.24
Not a US citizen/alien status unknown	1	0.76	100.00

Total	132	100.00	
-------	-----	--------	--

. tab MONSEX if INTDUM ==1

DEFENDANT'S |

GENDER | Freq. Percent Cum.

-----+-----

Male | 83 62.88 62.88

Female | 49 37.12 100.00

-----+-----

Total | 132 100.00

Sentencing Court Information

. tab DISTRICT if INTDUM ==1

DISTRICT IN WHICH |

DEFENDANT WAS SENTENCED | Freq. Percent Cum.

-----+-----

Rhode Island | 1 0.75 0.75

New York South | 4 3.01 3.76

Maryland | 7 5.26 9.02

North Carolina East | 6 4.51 13.53

North Carolina Middle | 2 1.50 15.04

Virginia East | 15 11.28 26.32

Alabama North | 1 0.75 27.07

Alabama Middle | 3 2.26 29.32

Florida Middle | 5 3.76 33.08

Georgia Middle | 3 2.26 35.34

Georgia South | 4 3.01 38.35

Mississippi North	1	0.75	39.10
Mississippi South	1	0.75	39.85
Texas West	40	30.08	69.92
Kentucky East	4	3.01	72.93
Kentucky West	2	1.50	74.44
Michigan West	2	1.50	75.94
Tennessee East	1	0.75	76.69
Tennessee Middle	1	0.75	77.44
Illinois Central	1	0.75	78.20
Illinois South	3	2.26	80.45
Wisconsin East	1	0.75	81.20
Iowa South	1	0.75	81.95
Nebraska	2	1.50	83.46
California North	1	0.75	84.21
California South	5	3.76	87.97
Idaho	2	1.50	89.47
Nevada	7	5.26	94.74
Washington East	1	0.75	95.49
Oklahoma West	3	2.26	97.74
District of Columbia	3	2.26	100.00

-----+-----

Total | 133 100.00

. tab MONCIRC if INTDUM ==1

CIRCUIT IN |

WHICH |

DEFENDANT |
 WAS |
 SENTENCED | Freq. Percent Cum.

	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
0	3	2.26	2.26
1	1	0.75	3.01
2	4	3.01	6.02
4	30	22.56	28.57
5	42	31.58	60.15
6	10	7.52	67.67
7	5	3.76	71.43
8	3	2.26	73.68
9	16	12.03	85.71
10	3	2.26	87.97
11	16	12.03	100.00
Total	133	100.00	

Additional Sentencing Factors

. tab FINE if INTDUM==1

DOLLAR |
 AMOUNT OF |
 FINE |
 ORDERED | Freq. Percent Cum.

-----+-----

No fine	104	78.20	78.20
25	1	0.75	78.95
150	1	0.75	79.70
200	1	0.75	80.45
250	3	2.26	82.71
300	1	0.75	83.46
350	1	0.75	84.21
500	7	5.26	89.47
600	1	0.75	90.23
1000	3	2.26	92.48
1500	2	1.50	93.98
2000	2	1.50	95.49
4000	1	0.75	96.24
4369	1	0.75	96.99
5000	1	0.75	97.74
6533	1	0.75	98.50
10000	2	1.50	100.00

-----+-----

Total | 133 100.00

. tab AMTREST if INTDUM==1

DOLLAR AMOUNT OF |

RESTITUTION | Freq. Percent Cum.

-----+-----

No restitution ordered | 106 81.54 81.54

75 | 1 0.77 82.31

1753		1	0.77	83.08
8092		1	0.77	83.85
10000		1	0.77	84.62
19542		1	0.77	85.38
21384		1	0.77	86.15
24158		1	0.77	86.92
60000		1	0.77	87.69
66646		1	0.77	88.46
75312		1	0.77	89.23
82565		1	0.77	90.00
98000		1	0.77	90.77
122648		1	0.77	91.54
123176		1	0.77	92.31
133924		1	0.77	93.08
184003		1	0.77	93.85
198354		1	0.77	94.62
230480		1	0.77	95.38
236000		1	0.77	96.15
268797		1	0.77	96.92
358454		1	0.77	97.69
405000		2	1.54	99.23
406726		1	0.77	100.00

-----+-----

Total		130	100.00
-------	--	-----	--------

. tab TYPEMONY if INTDUM==1

FINE/COST OF SUPERVISION OR RESTITUTION | Freq. Percent Cum.

```
-----+-----  
No fine / cost of supervision, nor rest | 71 53.38 53.38  
Restitution ordered, no fine / cost of | 21 15.79 69.17  
Fine / cost of supervision, no restitut | 35 26.32 95.49  
Both fine / cost of supervision and res | 6 4.51 100.00  
-----+-----
```

Total | 133 100.00

. tab CASETYPE if INTDUM==1

TYPE OF CASE | Freq. Percent Cum.

```
-----+-----  
Felony | 104 78.20 78.20  
Misdemeanor A | 29 21.80 100.00  
-----+-----
```

Total | 133 100.00

. tab CASETYPE if INTDUM==1

TYPE OF CASE | Freq. Percent Cum.

```
-----+-----  
Felony | 104 78.20 78.20  
Misdemeanor A | 29 21.80 100.00  
-----+-----
```

Total | 133 100.00

. tab CRIMHIST if INTDUM==1

DOES DEFENDANT HAVE ANY CRIMINAL |

HISTORY	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----			
No criminal history	32	27.12	27.12
Yes, there is a criminal history	86	72.88	100.00
-----+-----			
Total	118	100.00	

. tab OFFGUIDE if INTDUM==1

PRIMARY TYPE OF CRIME FOR |

THE CASE	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----			
Administration of Justice	2	1.50	1.50
Bribery/Corruption	2	1.50	3.01
Child Pornography	2	1.50	4.51
Drug Trafficking	36	27.07	31.58
Environmental	3	2.26	33.83
Extortion/Racketeering	1	0.75	34.59
Firearms	13	9.77	44.36
Forgery/Counter/Copyright	1	0.75	45.11
Fraud/Theft/Embezzlement	24	18.05	63.16
Immigration	18	13.53	76.69

Kidnapping	1	0.75	77.44
Money Launder	4	3.01	80.45
Prison Offenses	1	0.75	81.20
Robbery	1	0.75	81.95
Sex Abuse	1	0.75	82.71
Tax	5	3.76	86.47
Other	18	13.53	100.00

-----+-----

Total	133	100.00	
-------	-----	--------	--

. tab OFFTYPE2 if INTDUM==1

variable OFFTYPE2 not found

r(111);

. tab XCRHISSR if INTDUM==1

DEFENDANTS |

FINAL |

CRIMINAL |

HISTORY |

CATEGORY	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
----------	-------	---------	------

-----+-----

1	98	77.78	77.78
2	13	10.32	88.10
3	11	8.73	96.83
4	2	1.59	98.41
5	1	0.79	99.21

```
6 | 1 0.79 100.00
```

-----+-----

```
Total | 126 100.00
```

```
. tab XFOLSOR if INTDUM==1
```

```
FINAL |
```

```
OFFENSE |
```

```
LEVEL | Freq. Percent Cum.
```

-----+-----

```
2 | 1 0.79 0.79
```

```
4 | 12 9.52 10.32
```

```
6 | 2 1.59 11.90
```

```
7 | 1 0.79 12.70
```

```
8 | 11 8.73 21.43
```

```
10 | 14 11.11 32.54
```

```
11 | 4 3.17 35.71
```

```
12 | 16 12.70 48.41
```

```
13 | 9 7.14 55.56
```

```
14 | 1 0.79 56.35
```

```
15 | 8 6.35 62.70
```

```
16 | 4 3.17 65.87
```

```
17 | 10 7.94 73.81
```

```
18 | 1 0.79 74.60
```

```
19 | 6 4.76 79.37
```

```
21 | 10 7.94 87.30
```

```
22 | 2 1.59 88.89
```

23	5	3.97	92.86
24	1	0.79	93.65
25	3	2.38	96.03
27	2	1.59	97.62
28	2	1.59	99.21
34	1	0.79	100.00

-----+-----
Total | 126 100.00

```
. tab OFFTYPSEB if INTDUM ==1
variable OFFTYPSEB not found
r(111);
```

```
. . tab ZONE if INTDUM ==1
```

```
SENTENCE |
TABLE GROUP | Freq. Percent Cum.
```

A	23	18.25	18.25
B	18	14.29	32.54
C	27	21.43	53.97
D	58	46.03	100.00

-----+-----
Total | 126 100.00

2017-2018

IC Sentences

```
tab MOINTCON if INTDUM==1
```

```
TERM OF INTERMITTENT CONFINEMENT |
```

```
ORDERED | Freq. Percent Cum.
```

```
-----+-----
```

1	74	48.37	48.37
2	14	9.15	57.52
3	11	7.19	64.71
4	5	3.27	67.97
5	2	1.31	69.28
6	4	2.61	71.90
7	3	1.96	73.86
8	1	0.65	74.51

```
Intermittent confinement ordered, but n | 39 25.49 100.00
```

```
-----+-----
```

Total	153	100.00	
-------	-----	--------	--

```
. tab MOINTCON
```

```
TERM OF INTERMITTENT CONFINEMENT |
```

```
ORDERED | Freq. Percent Cum.
```

```
-----+-----
```

No intermittent confinement ordered	69,272	99.78	99.78
1	74	0.11	99.89

2	14	0.02	99.91
3	11	0.02	99.92
4	5	0.01	99.93
5	2	0.00	99.93
6	4	0.01	99.94
7	3	0.00	99.94
8	1	0.00	99.94
-----+-----			
Intermittent confinement ordered, but n	39	0.06	100.00
-----+-----			
Total	69,425	100.00	

. tab INTDUM

RECEIPT OF			
INTERMITTEN			
T			
CONFINEMENT	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----			
No	69,272	99.78	99.78
Yes	153	0.22	100.00
-----+-----			
Total	69,425	100.00	

Demographics

. tab AGECAT if INTDUM ==1
variable AGECAT not found

```
r(111);
```

```
. tab YEARS if INTDUM ==1
```

```
CATEGORIES OF |
```

```
AGE RANGES | Freq. Percent Cum.
```

```
-----+-----
```

<21	8	5.23	5.23
21 through 25	26	16.99	22.22
26 through 30	23	15.03	37.25
31 through 35	24	15.69	52.94
36 through 40	29	18.95	71.90
41 through 50	29	18.95	90.85
>50	14	9.15	100.00

```
-----+-----
```

Total	153	100.00	
-------	-----	--------	--

```
. tab NEWEDUC if INTDUM ==1
```

```
EDUCATION OF DEFENDANT | Freq. Percent Cum.
```

```
-----+-----
```

Less than H.S. graduate	25	19.23	19.23
H.S. graduate	39	30.00	49.23
Some college	48	36.92	86.15
College graduate	18	13.85	100.00

```
-----+-----
```

Total	130	100.00	
-------	-----	--------	--

```
. tab NEWRACE if INTDUM ==1
```

```
RACE OF |
DEFENDANT |  Freq.  Percent  Cum.
-----+-----
White |    57   39.31   39.31
Black |    41   28.28   67.59
Hispanic |   40   27.59   95.17
Other |     7    4.83  100.00
-----+-----
Total |   145  100.00
```

```
. tab NUMDEPEN if INTDUM ==1
```

```
NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS WHOM DEFENDANT |
SUPPORTS |  Freq.  Percent  Cum.
-----+-----
No dependents |    49   38.28   38.28
1 |    21   16.41   54.69
2 |    25   19.53   74.22
3 |    19   14.84   89.06
4 |     5    3.91   92.97
5 |     7    5.47   98.44
6 |     2    1.56  100.00
-----+-----
Total |   128  100.00
```

```
. tab CITIZEN if INTDUM ==1
```

NATURE OF DEFENDANT'S CITIZENSHIP	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----			
United States citizen	145	96.03	96.03
Resident/legal alien	5	3.31	99.34
Illegal alien	1	0.66	100.00
-----+-----			
Total	151	100.00	

```
. tab MONSEX if INTDUM ==1
```

DEFENDANT'S |

GENDER	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----			
Male	107	69.93	69.93
Female	46	30.07	100.00
-----+-----			
Total	153	100.00	

Sentencing Court Information

```
. tab DISTRICT if INTDUM ==1
```

DISTRICT IN WHICH |

DEFENDANT WAS SENTENCED	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----			

Rhode Island	2	1.31	1.31
New York North	8	5.23	6.54
New York South	3	1.96	8.50
Pennsylvania West	2	1.31	9.80
Maryland	9	5.88	15.69
North Carolina East	3	1.96	17.65
North Carolina Middle	1	0.65	18.30
Virginia East	21	13.73	32.03
Virginia West	4	2.61	34.64
West Virginia South	1	0.65	35.29
Alabama North	2	1.31	36.60
Alabama Middle	5	3.27	39.87
Alabama South	1	0.65	40.52
Florida North	1	0.65	41.18
Florida Middle	6	3.92	45.10
Florida South	3	1.96	47.06
Georgia Middle	1	0.65	47.71
Georgia South	3	1.96	49.67
Louisiana West	1	0.65	50.33
Mississippi North	1	0.65	50.98
Texas South	1	0.65	51.63
Texas West	34	22.22	73.86
Kentucky East	3	1.96	75.82
Kentucky West	1	0.65	76.47
Michigan West	1	0.65	77.12
Tennessee East	3	1.96	79.08
Tennessee Middle	3	1.96	81.05

Illinois Central	1	0.65	81.70
Illinois South	1	0.65	82.35
Arkansas East	2	1.31	83.66
Missouri East	1	0.65	84.31
Nebraska	1	0.65	84.97
South Dakota	1	0.65	85.62
California Central	2	1.31	86.93
California South	4	2.61	89.54
Idaho	1	0.65	90.20
Oregon	1	0.65	90.85
Colorado	1	0.65	91.50
Oklahoma West	8	5.23	96.73
District of Columbia	5	3.27	100.00

-----+-----

Total | 153 100.00

. tab MONCIRC if INTDUM ==1

CIRCUIT IN |
 WHICH |
 DEFENDANT |
 WAS |

SENTENCED | Freq. Percent Cum.

-----+-----

0	5	3.27	3.27
1	2	1.31	4.58
2	11	7.19	11.76

3	2	1.31	13.07
4	39	25.49	38.56
5	37	24.18	62.75
6	11	7.19	69.93
7	2	1.31	71.24
8	5	3.27	74.51
9	8	5.23	79.74
10	9	5.88	85.62
11	22	14.38	100.00

-----+-----
Total | 153 100.00

Additional Sentencing Factors

. tab FINE if INTDUM==1

DOLLAR |

AMOUNT OF |

FINE |

ORDERED | Freq. Percent Cum.

-----+-----

No fine	125	81.70	81.70
100	1	0.65	82.35
250	3	1.96	84.31
300	1	0.65	84.97
350	1	0.65	85.62

400		1	0.65	86.27
500		7	4.58	90.85
600		1	0.65	91.50
750		1	0.65	92.16
1200		2	1.31	93.46
1500		1	0.65	94.12
2000		1	0.65	94.77
2500		1	0.65	95.42
3000		1	0.65	96.08
3500		1	0.65	96.73
4000		1	0.65	97.39
5000		1	0.65	98.04
10000		2	1.31	99.35
20000		1	0.65	100.00

-----+-----

Total		153	100.00	
-------	--	-----	--------	--

. tab AMTREST if INTDUM==1

DOLLAR AMOUNT OF |

RESTITUTION		Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-------------	--	-------	---------	------

-----+-----

No restitution ordered		115	76.16	76.16
------------------------	--	-----	-------	-------

132		1	0.66	76.82
-----	--	---	------	-------

4679		1	0.66	77.48
------	--	---	------	-------

6525		1	0.66	78.15
------	--	---	------	-------

8665		1	0.66	78.81
------	--	---	------	-------

9000		1	0.66	79.47
13772		1	0.66	80.13
16965		1	0.66	80.79
20285		1	0.66	81.46
26829		1	0.66	82.12
28532		1	0.66	82.78
30650		1	0.66	83.44
31210		1	0.66	84.11
35000		1	0.66	84.77
39019		1	0.66	85.43
53553		1	0.66	86.09
65014		1	0.66	86.75
69428		1	0.66	87.42
70000		1	0.66	88.08
70599		1	0.66	88.74
70870		1	0.66	89.40
75357		1	0.66	90.07
75398		1	0.66	90.73
86153		1	0.66	91.39
91185		1	0.66	92.05
92579		1	0.66	92.72
93882		1	0.66	93.38
112613		1	0.66	94.04
124479		1	0.66	94.70
136732		1	0.66	95.36
193708		1	0.66	96.03
217366		1	0.66	96.69

217367		1	0.66	97.35
306524		1	0.66	98.01
344172		1	0.66	98.68
949102		1	0.66	99.34
987500		1	0.66	100.00

-----+-----

Total		151	100.00
-------	--	-----	--------

. tab TYPEMONY if INTDUM==1

FINE/COST OF SUPERVISION OR RESTITUTION		Freq.	Percent	Cum.
---	--	-------	---------	------

-----+-----

No fine / cost of supervision, nor rest		72	47.06	47.06
Restitution ordered, no fine / cost of		30	19.61	66.67
Fine / cost of supervision, no restitut		43	28.10	94.77
Both fine / cost of supervision and res		8	5.23	100.00

-----+-----

Total		153	100.00
-------	--	-----	--------

. tab CASETYPE if INTDUM==1

TYPE OF CASE		Freq.	Percent	Cum.
--------------	--	-------	---------	------

-----+-----

Felony		123	80.39	80.39
Misdemeanor A		30	19.61	100.00

-----+-----

Total		153	100.00
-------	--	-----	--------

. tab CRIMHIST if INTDUM==1

DOES DEFENDANT HAVE ANY CRIMINAL |

HISTORY	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----			
No criminal history	38	27.94	27.94
Yes, there is a criminal history	98	72.06	100.00
-----+-----			
Total	136	100.00	

. tab OFFGUIDE if INTDUM==1

PRIMARY TYPE OF CRIME FOR |

THE CASE	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----			
Administration of Justice	3	1.96	1.96
Assault	1	0.65	2.61
Child Pornography	1	0.65	3.27
Drug Possession	4	2.61	5.88
Drug Trafficking	39	25.49	31.37
Extortion/Racketeering	1	0.65	32.03
Firearms	10	6.54	38.56
Forgery/Counter/Copyright	3	1.96	40.52
Fraud/Theft/Embezzlement	34	22.22	62.75
Immigration	21	13.73	76.47

Individual Rights	2	1.31	77.78
Money Launder	2	1.31	79.08
Obscenity/Other Sex Offenses	2	1.31	80.39
Robbery	1	0.65	81.05
Tax	4	2.61	83.66
Other	25	16.34	100.00
-----+			
Total	153	100.00	

```
. tab OFFTYPE2 if INTDUM==1
variable OFFTYPE2 not found
r(111);
```

```
. tab XCRHISSR if INTDUM==1
```

DEFENDANTS			
FINAL			
CRIMINAL			
HISTORY			
CATEGORY	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+			
1	101	67.79	67.79
2	20	13.42	81.21
3	13	8.72	89.93
4	9	6.04	95.97
5	3	2.01	97.99
6	3	2.01	100.00

-----+-----
Total | 149 100.00

. tab XFOLSOR if INTDUM==1

FINAL |

OFFENSE |

LEVEL | Freq. Percent Cum.

-----+-----
2 | 3 2.01 2.01
4 | 22 14.77 16.78
5 | 2 1.34 18.12
6 | 2 1.34 19.46
7 | 2 1.34 20.81
8 | 5 3.36 24.16
9 | 3 2.01 26.17
10 | 18 12.08 38.26
11 | 3 2.01 40.27
12 | 21 14.09 54.36
13 | 10 6.71 61.07
14 | 5 3.36 64.43
15 | 10 6.71 71.14
16 | 3 2.01 73.15
17 | 7 4.70 77.85
18 | 3 2.01 79.87
19 | 13 8.72 88.59
20 | 1 0.67 89.26

21		1	0.67	89.93
23		6	4.03	93.96
24		1	0.67	94.63
25		1	0.67	95.30
27		1	0.67	95.97
29		2	1.34	97.32
31		1	0.67	97.99
34		1	0.67	98.66
35		1	0.67	99.33
36		1	0.67	100.00

-----+-----

Total		149	100.00
-------	--	-----	--------

```
. tab OFFTYPSB if INTDUM ==1
variable OFFTYPSB not found
r(111);
```

```
. tab ZONE if INTDUM ==1
```

SENTENCE				
TABLE GROUP		Freq.	Percent	Cum.

-----+-----

A		24	16.11	16.11
B		30	20.13	36.24
C		29	19.46	55.70
D		66	44.30	100.00

-----+-----
Total | 149 100.00

2016-2017

IC Sentences

tab MOINTCON if INTDUM==1

TERM OF INTERMITTENT CONFINEMENT |

ORDERED | Freq. Percent Cum.

-----+-----
1 | 80 49.38 49.38
2 | 22 13.58 62.96
3 | 5 3.09 66.05
4 | 5 3.09 69.14
5 | 1 0.62 69.75
6 | 3 1.85 71.60
12 | 2 1.23 72.84
25 | 1 0.62 73.46

Intermittent confinement ordered, but n | 43 26.54 100.00

-----+-----
Total | 162 100.00

. tab MOINTCON

TERM OF INTERMITTENT CONFINEMENT |

ORDERED	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
No intermittent confinement ordered	66,711	99.76	99.76
1	80	0.12	99.88
2	22	0.03	99.91
3	5	0.01	99.92
4	5	0.01	99.93
5	1	0.00	99.93
6	3	0.00	99.93
12	2	0.00	99.93
25	1	0.00	99.94
Intermittent confinement ordered, but n	43	0.06	100.00
Total	66,873	100.00	

. tab INTDUM

RECEIPT OF			
INTERMITTEN			
T			
CONFINEMENT	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
No	66,711	99.76	99.76
Yes	162	0.24	100.00
Total	66,873	100.00	

Demographics

```
. tab YEARS if INTDUM ==1
```

```
CATEGORIES OF |
```

```
AGE RANGES | Freq. Percent Cum.
```

```
-----+-----
```

<21	12	7.41	7.41
21 through 25	31	19.14	26.54
26 through 30	24	14.81	41.36
31 through 35	19	11.73	53.09
36 through 40	22	13.58	66.67
41 through 50	34	20.99	87.65
>50	20	12.35	100.00

```
-----+-----
```

Total	162	100.00	
-------	-----	--------	--

```
. tab AGECAT if INTDUM ==1
```

```
variable AGECAT not found
```

```
r(111);
```

```
. tab NEWEDUC if INTDUM ==1
```

```
EDUCATION OF DEFENDANT | Freq. Percent Cum.
```

```
-----+-----
```

Less than H.S. graduate	35	25.55	25.55
H.S. graduate	46	33.58	59.12
Some college	35	25.55	84.67

College graduate | 21 15.33 100.00

-----+-----

Total | 137 100.00

. tab NEWRACE if INTDUM ==1

RACE OF |

DEFENDANT | Freq. Percent Cum.

-----+-----

White | 48 30.38 30.38

Black | 48 30.38 60.76

Hispanic | 57 36.08 96.84

Other | 5 3.16 100.00

-----+-----

Total | 158 100.00

. tab NUMDEPEN if INTDUM ==1

NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS WHOM DEFENDANT |

SUPPORTS | Freq. Percent Cum.

-----+-----

No dependents | 52 37.68 37.68

1 | 29 21.01 58.70

2 | 22 15.94 74.64

3 | 18 13.04 87.68

4 | 9 6.52 94.20

5 | 5 3.62 97.83

6	1	0.72	98.55
7	2	1.45	100.00

-----+-----

Total	138	100.00
-------	-----	--------

. tab CITIZEN if INTDUM ==1

NATURE OF DEFENDANT'S CITIZENSHIP	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----------------------------------	-------	---------	------

-----+-----

United States citizen	152	95.00	95.00
-----------------------	-----	-------	-------

Resident/legal alien	6	3.75	98.75
----------------------	---	------	-------

Illegal alien	1	0.63	99.38
---------------	---	------	-------

Not a US citizen/alien status unknown	1	0.63	100.00
---------------------------------------	---	------	--------

-----+-----

Total	160	100.00
-------	-----	--------

. tab MONSEX if INTDUM ==1

DEFENDANT'S |

GENDER	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
--------	-------	---------	------

-----+-----

Male	106	65.84	65.84
------	-----	-------	-------

Female	55	34.16	100.00
--------	----	-------	--------

-----+-----

Total	161	100.00
-------	-----	--------

Sentencing Court Information

```
. tab DISTRICT if INTDUM ==1
```

```
DISTRICT IN WHICH |
DEFENDANT WAS SENTENCED |  Freq.  Percent  Cum.
-----+-----
```

Massachusetts	1	0.62	0.62
Rhode Island	1	0.62	1.23
New York North	6	3.70	4.94
New York South	2	1.23	6.17
New York West	1	0.62	6.79
Pennsylvania East	1	0.62	7.41
Pennsylvania West	1	0.62	8.02
Maryland	6	3.70	11.73
North Carolina East	7	4.32	16.05
Virginia East	11	6.79	22.84
Alabama North	3	1.85	24.69
Alabama Middle	4	2.47	27.16
Florida Middle	2	1.23	28.40
Florida South	6	3.70	32.10
Georgia North	1	0.62	32.72
Georgia Middle	1	0.62	33.33
Georgia South	5	3.09	36.42
Mississippi North	3	1.85	38.27
Texas North	1	0.62	38.89
Texas East	3	1.85	40.74
Texas West	46	28.40	69.14

Michigan West	9	5.56	74.69
Tennessee East	9	5.56	80.25
Illinois North	2	1.23	81.48
Arkansas East	3	1.85	83.33
Minnesota	1	0.62	83.95
Missouri West	1	0.62	84.57
Nebraska	1	0.62	85.19
South Dakota	1	0.62	85.80
Arizona	1	0.62	86.42
California South	5	3.09	89.51
Hawaii	1	0.62	90.12
Idaho	1	0.62	90.74
Nevada	2	1.23	91.98
Washington West	1	0.62	92.59
Colorado	2	1.23	93.83
Oklahoma West	3	1.85	95.68
Utah	1	0.62	96.30
District of Columbia	6	3.70	100.00

-----+-----

Total | 162 100.00

. tab MONCIRC if INTDUM ==1

CIRCUIT IN |

WHICH |

DEFENDANT |

WAS |

SENTENCED	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
0	6	3.70	3.70
1	2	1.23	4.94
2	9	5.56	10.49
3	2	1.23	11.73
4	24	14.81	26.54
5	53	32.72	59.26
6	18	11.11	70.37
7	2	1.23	71.60
8	7	4.32	75.93
9	11	6.79	82.72
10	6	3.70	86.42
11	22	13.58	100.00
Total	162	100.00	

Additional Sentencing Factors

```
. tab FINE if INTDUM==1
```

DOLLAR	AMOUNT OF	FINE	ORDERED	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
No fine				123	75.93	75.93

200	1	0.62	76.54
250	5	3.09	79.63
300	3	1.85	81.48
500	7	4.32	85.80
600	1	0.62	86.42
800	1	0.62	87.04
1000	6	3.70	90.74
1500	1	0.62	91.36
2000	5	3.09	94.44
3000	1	0.62	95.06
4000	3	1.85	96.91
5000	1	0.62	97.53
8800	1	0.62	98.15
22291	1	0.62	98.77
25000	1	0.62	99.38
30000	1	0.62	100.00

-----+-----

Total | 162 100.00

. tab AMTREST if INTDUM==1

DOLLAR AMOUNT OF |

RESTITUTION | Freq. Percent Cum.

-----+-----

No restitution ordered | 119 75.32 75.32

225 | 1 0.63 75.95

1200 | 2 1.27 77.22

3798		1	0.63	77.85
5811		1	0.63	78.48
6696		1	0.63	79.11
18474		1	0.63	79.75
30712		1	0.63	80.38
31213		1	0.63	81.01
32002		1	0.63	81.65
40219		1	0.63	82.28
41075		1	0.63	82.91
42743		1	0.63	83.54
43705		1	0.63	84.18
44287		1	0.63	84.81
52135		1	0.63	85.44
69156		1	0.63	86.08
70097		1	0.63	86.71
72971		1	0.63	87.34
76476		1	0.63	87.97
79563		1	0.63	88.61
89882		1	0.63	89.24
120544		1	0.63	89.87
132893		1	0.63	90.51
137897		1	0.63	91.14
140298		1	0.63	91.77
149962		1	0.63	92.41
150000		1	0.63	93.04
181000		1	0.63	93.67
184871		1	0.63	94.30

209566		1	0.63	94.94
245181		1	0.63	95.57
460707		1	0.63	96.20
503028		1	0.63	96.84
538948		1	0.63	97.47
602730		1	0.63	98.10
616289		1	0.63	98.73
636278		1	0.63	99.37
1188729		1	0.63	100.00

-----+-----

Total		158	100.00
-------	--	-----	--------

. tab TYPEMONY if INTDUM==1

FINE/COST OF SUPERVISION OR RESTITUTION		Freq.	Percent	Cum.
---	--	-------	---------	------

-----+-----

No fine / cost of supervision, nor rest		75	46.30	46.30
Restitution ordered, no fine / cost of		35	21.60	67.90
Fine / cost of supervision, no restitut		44	27.16	95.06
Both fine / cost of supervision and res		8	4.94	100.00

-----+-----

Total		162	100.00
-------	--	-----	--------

. tab CASETYPE if INTDUM==1

variable CASETYPE not found

r(111);

```
. tab CRIMHIST if INTDUM==1
```

```
DOES DEFENDANT HAVE ANY CRIMINAL |
```

HISTORY	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----			
No criminal history	43	30.28	30.28
Yes, there is a criminal history	99	69.72	100.00
-----+-----			
Total	142	100.00	

```
. tab OFFGUIDE if INTDUM==1
```

```
variable OFFGUIDE not found
```

```
r(111);
```

```
. tab OFFTYPE2 if INTDUM==1
```

```
PRIMARY OFFENSE TYPE GENERATED FROM |
```

```
CONVICTION WITH HIGHEST STATUTORY MAX | Freq. Percent Cum.
```

	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----			
Sexual abuse	2	1.23	1.23
Assault	1	0.62	1.85
Drugs: trafficking	43	26.54	28.40
Drugs: communication facilities	2	1.23	29.63
Drugs: simple possession	3	1.85	31.48
Firearms: use (incl'd offtype=14, firear	10	6.17	37.65
Larceny	4	2.47	40.12
Fraud	25	15.43	55.56

Embezzlement	2	1.23	56.79	
Forgery/counterfeiting	1	0.62	57.41	
Bribery	4	2.47	59.88	
Tax offenses	9	5.56	65.43	
Money laundering	6	3.70	69.14	
Racketeering (includes offtype=8, extor	1	0.62	69.75	
Civil rights offenses	2	1.23	70.99	
Immigration	13	8.02	79.01	
Admin just (inc access after fact, misp	7	4.32	83.33	
Environmental, game, fish, and wildlife	1	0.62	83.95	
National defense offenses	1	0.62	84.57	
Antitrust violations	1	0.62	85.19	
Traf viols other offns (incl offtype=3	23	14.20	99.38	
Child Pornography	1	0.62	100.00	
-----+				
Total	162	100.00		

. tab XCRHISSR if INTDUM==1

DEFENDANTS |

FINAL |

CRIMINAL |

HISTORY |

CATEGORY | Freq. Percent Cum.

-----+			
1	117	76.97	76.97
2	23	15.13	92.11

3	8	5.26	97.37
4	1	0.66	98.03
5	2	1.32	99.34
6	1	0.66	100.00

-----+-----

Total	152	100.00	
-------	-----	--------	--

. tab XFOLSOR if INTDUM==1

FINAL |

OFFENSE |

LEVEL	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-------	-------	---------	------

-----+-----

2	2	1.32	1.32
4	16	10.53	11.84
5	1	0.66	12.50
6	2	1.32	13.82
7	1	0.66	14.47
8	4	2.63	17.11
10	15	9.87	26.97
11	2	1.32	28.29
12	25	16.45	44.74
13	19	12.50	57.24
14	1	0.66	57.89
15	10	6.58	64.47
16	3	1.97	66.45
17	9	5.92	72.37

18	1	0.66	73.03
19	6	3.95	76.97
20	2	1.32	78.29
21	10	6.58	84.87
22	1	0.66	85.53
23	6	3.95	89.47
24	1	0.66	90.13
25	2	1.32	91.45
26	4	2.63	94.08
28	2	1.32	95.39
29	1	0.66	96.05
30	1	0.66	96.71
31	2	1.32	98.03
36	1	0.66	98.68
37	1	0.66	99.34
38	1	0.66	100.00

-----+-----
Total | 152 100.00

. tab ZONE if INTDUM ==1

SENTENCE |

TABLE GROUP	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-------------	-------	---------	------

A	25	16.45	16.45
B	16	10.53	26.97

C	39	25.66	52.63
D	72	47.37	100.00

-----+-----

Total	152	100.00	
-------	-----	--------	--

2015-2016

IC Sentences

. tab INTDUM

RECEIPT OF			
INTERMITTEN			
T			
CONFINEMENT	Freq.	Percent	Cum.

-----+-----

No	67,579	99.76	99.76
Yes	163	0.24	100.00

-----+-----

Total	67,742	100.00	
-------	--------	--------	--

tab MOINTCON if INTDUM==1

TERM OF INTERMITTENT CONFINEMENT			
ORDERED	Freq.	Percent	Cum.

-----+-----

1	97	59.51	59.51
---	----	-------	-------

2	19	11.66	71.17
3	2	1.23	72.39
4	7	4.29	76.69
5	1	0.61	77.30
6	2	1.23	78.53
7	2	1.23	79.75
8	1	0.61	80.37

Intermittent confinement ordered but no | 32 19.63 100.00

-----+-----
Total | 163 100.00

. tab MOINTCON

TERM OF INTERMITTENT CONFINEMENT |

ORDERED | Freq. Percent Cum.

No intermittent confinement ordered	67,579	99.76	99.76
1	97	0.14	99.90
2	19	0.03	99.93
3	2	0.00	99.93
4	7	0.01	99.94
5	1	0.00	99.95
6	2	0.00	99.95
7	2	0.00	99.95
8	1	0.00	99.95

Intermittent confinement ordered but no | 32 0.05 100.00

Total | 67,742 100.00

Demographics

```
. tab YEARS if INTDUM ==1
```

CATEGORIES OF |

AGE RANGES	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
<21	7	4.29	4.29
21 through 25	27	16.56	20.86
26 through 30	18	11.04	31.90
31 through 35	29	17.79	49.69
36 through 40	22	13.50	63.19
41 through 50	34	20.86	84.05
>50	26	15.95	100.00
Total	163	100.00	

```
. tab NEWEDUC if INTDUM ==1
```

EDUCATION OF DEFENDANT	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Less than H.S. graduate	28	21.21	21.21
H.S. graduate	41	31.06	52.27
Some college	43	32.58	84.85
College graduate	20	15.15	100.00

Total | 132 100.00

. tab NEWRACE if INTDUM ==1

RACE OF |

DEFENDANT | Freq. Percent Cum.

-----+-----

White | 67 42.68 42.68

Black | 37 23.57 66.24

Hispanic | 50 31.85 98.09

Other | 3 1.91 100.00

-----+-----

Total | 157 100.00

. tab NUMDEPEN if INTDUM ==1

NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS WHOM DEFENDANT |

SUPPORTS | Freq. Percent Cum.

-----+-----

No dependents | 44 33.08 33.08

1 | 30 22.56 55.64

2 | 29 21.80 77.44

3 | 17 12.78 90.23

4 | 6 4.51 94.74

5 | 5 3.76 98.50

6 | 1 0.75 99.25

8 | 1 0.75 100.00

```
-----+-----
Total |    133    100.00
```

```
. tab CITIZEN if INTDUM ==1
```

```
NATURE OF DEFENDANT'S CITIZENSHIP |   Freq.   Percent   Cum.
-----+-----
United States citizen |    154    98.09    98.09
Resident/legal alien |     3     1.91   100.00
-----+-----
Total |    157   100.00
```

```
. tab MONSEX if INTDUM ==1
```

```
DEFENDANT'S |
GENDER |   Freq.   Percent   Cum.
-----+-----
Male |    111    68.10    68.10
Female |     52    31.90   100.00
-----+-----
Total |    163   100.00
```

Sentencing Court Information

```
. tab DISTRICT if INTDUM ==1
```

DISTRICT IN WHICH	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
New York North	6	3.68	3.68
New York East	1	0.61	4.29
New York South	1	0.61	4.91
New jersey	1	0.61	5.52
Pennsylvania East	1	0.61	6.13
Maryland	5	3.07	9.20
North Carolina East	4	2.45	11.66
North Carolina Middle	2	1.23	12.88
Virginia East	27	16.56	29.45
Virginia West	1	0.61	30.06
West Virginia North	1	0.61	30.67
Alabama Middle	3	1.84	32.52
Florida North	2	1.23	33.74
Florida Middle	9	5.52	39.26
Georgia South	6	3.68	42.94
Texas West	32	19.63	62.58
Kentucky East	1	0.61	63.19
Ohio South	1	0.61	63.80
Tennessee East	1	0.61	64.42
Tennessee West	1	0.61	65.03
Illinois North	1	0.61	65.64
Illinois Central	2	1.23	66.87
Illinois South	1	0.61	67.48
Indiana South	2	1.23	68.71

Wisconsin East	1	0.61	69.33
Arkansas East	1	0.61	69.94
Arkansas West	1	0.61	70.55
Iowa North	2	1.23	71.78
Minnesota	4	2.45	74.23
Missouri East	2	1.23	75.46
Missouri West	3	1.84	77.30
Nebraska	12	7.36	84.66
Arizona	2	1.23	85.89
California East	1	0.61	86.50
California Central	1	0.61	87.12
California South	1	0.61	87.73
Idaho	3	1.84	89.57
Oklahoma West	6	3.68	93.25
Utah	2	1.23	94.48
District of Columbia	8	4.91	99.39
Virgin Islands	1	0.61	100.00

-----+-----
 Total | 163 100.00

. tab MONCIRC if INTDUM ==1

CIRCUIT IN |

WHICH |

DEFENDANT |

WAS |

SENTENCED | Freq. Percent Cum.

0		8	4.91	4.91
2		8	4.91	9.82
3		3	1.84	11.66
4		40	24.54	36.20
5		32	19.63	55.83
6		4	2.45	58.28
7		7	4.29	62.58
8		25	15.34	77.91
9		8	4.91	82.82
10		8	4.91	87.73
11		20	12.27	100.00
-----+-----				
Total		163	100.00	

Additional Sentencing Factors

```
. tab FINE if INTDUM==1
```

DOLLAR				
AMOUNT OF				
FINE				
ORDERED		Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----				
No fine		121	74.23	74.23
100		1	0.61	74.85
200		3	1.84	76.69

250	5	3.07	79.75
300	3	1.84	81.60
350	1	0.61	82.21
390	1	0.61	82.82
400	1	0.61	83.44
450	1	0.61	84.05
500	4	2.45	86.50
600	2	1.23	87.73
1000	12	7.36	95.09
1500	1	0.61	95.71
1800	1	0.61	96.32
2000	2	1.23	97.55
2300	1	0.61	98.16
3000	1	0.61	98.77
5000	1	0.61	99.39
10000	1	0.61	100.00

-----+-----
Total | 163 100.00

. tab AMTREST if INTDUM==1

DOLLAR AMOUNT OF |

RESTITUTION | Freq. Percent Cum.

-----+-----

No restitution ordered	114	70.81	70.81
20	1	0.62	71.43
1142	1	0.62	72.05

3673		1	0.62	72.67
4195		1	0.62	73.29
4259		1	0.62	73.91
8590		1	0.62	74.53
12971		1	0.62	75.16
15001		1	0.62	75.78
18991		1	0.62	76.40
20545		1	0.62	77.02
27200		1	0.62	77.64
32732		1	0.62	78.26
51362		1	0.62	78.88
51500		1	0.62	79.50
54032		1	0.62	80.12
54600		1	0.62	80.75
55179		1	0.62	81.37
57564		1	0.62	81.99
60750		1	0.62	82.61
61046		1	0.62	83.23
61342		1	0.62	83.85
80000		1	0.62	84.47
89461		1	0.62	85.09
92064		1	0.62	85.71
100000		1	0.62	86.34
105958		1	0.62	86.96
108905		1	0.62	87.58
109139		1	0.62	88.20
111903		1	0.62	88.82

127489		1	0.62	89.44
138658		1	0.62	90.06
153435		1	0.62	90.68
153754		1	0.62	91.30
168481		1	0.62	91.93
171914		1	0.62	92.55
192762		1	0.62	93.17
225000		1	0.62	93.79
247269		1	0.62	94.41
265483		1	0.62	95.03
368889		1	0.62	95.65
482568		1	0.62	96.27
496667		1	0.62	96.89
531844		1	0.62	97.52
756694		1	0.62	98.14
1451410		1	0.62	98.76
1865231		1	0.62	99.38
14092205		1	0.62	100.00

-----+-----

Total		161	100.00
-------	--	-----	--------

. tab TYPEMONY if INTDUM==1

FINE/COST OF SUPERVISION OR RESTITUTION		Freq.	Percent	Cum.
---	--	-------	---------	------

-----+-----

No fine / cost of supervision, nor rest		68	41.72	41.72
---	--	----	-------	-------

Restitution ordered, no fine / cost of	40	24.54	66.26
Fine / cost of supervision, no restitut	46	28.22	94.48
Both fine / cost of supervison and rest	9	5.52	100.00

-----+-----

Total	163	100.00	
-------	-----	--------	--

. tab CRIMHIST if INTDUM==1

DOES DEFENDANT HAVE ANY CRIMINAL |

HISTORY	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
No criminal history	49	35.25	35.25
Yes, there is a criminal history	90	64.75	100.00

-----+-----

Total	139	100.00	
-------	-----	--------	--

. tab OFFTYPE2 if INTDUM==1

PRIMARY OFFENSE TYPE GENERATED FROM |

CONVICTION WITH HIGHEST STATUTORY MAX	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
---------------------------------------	-------	---------	------

-----+-----

Assault	1	0.61	0.61	
Drugs: trafficking	36	22.09	22.70	
Drugs: communication facilities	2	1.23	23.93	
Drugs: simple possession	6	3.68	27.61	
Firearms: use (incl'd offtype=14, firear	8	4.91	32.52	
Larceny	11	6.75	39.26	
Fraud	37	22.70	61.96	
Embezzlement	2	1.23	63.19	
Forgery/counterfeiting	2	1.23	64.42	
Bribery	2	1.23	65.64	
Tax offenses	5	3.07	68.71	
Money laundering	6	3.68	72.39	
Immigration	8	4.91	77.30	
Admin just (inc access after fact, misp	7	4.29	81.60	
Environmental, game, fish, and wildlife	1	0.61	82.21	
National defense offenses	1	0.61	82.82	
Traf viols other offns (incl'd offtype=3	28	17.18	100.00	
-----+-----				
Total	163	100.00		

. tab XCRHISSR if INTDUM==1

DEFENDANTS |

FINAL |

CRIMINAL |

HISTORY |

CATEGORY | Freq. Percent Cum.

```
-----+-----
```

1	123	77.85	77.85
2	14	8.86	86.71
3	15	9.49	96.20
4	1	0.63	96.84
5	3	1.90	98.73
6	2	1.27	100.00

```
-----+-----
```

Total	158	100.00	
-------	-----	--------	--

```
. tab XFOLSOR if INTDUM==1
```

```
FINAL |
```

```
OFFENSE |
```

LEVEL	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
2	3	1.90	1.90
4	27	17.09	18.99
6	2	1.27	20.25
7	3	1.90	22.15
8	9	5.70	27.85
9	2	1.27	29.11
10	24	15.19	44.30
11	6	3.80	48.10
12	16	10.13	58.23
13	17	10.76	68.99
14	5	3.16	72.15

15	12	7.59	79.75
16	2	1.27	81.01
17	9	5.70	86.71
18	3	1.90	88.61
19	5	3.16	91.77
20	1	0.63	92.41
21	6	3.80	96.20
22	1	0.63	96.84
23	2	1.27	98.10
26	1	0.63	98.73
27	1	0.63	99.37
43	1	0.63	100.00

-----+-----
Total | 158 100.00

. tab ZONE if INTDUM ==1

SENTENCE |

TABLE GROUP | Freq. Percent Cum.

A	38	24.05	24.05
B	35	22.15	46.20
C	29	18.35	64.56
D	56	35.44	100.00

-----+-----
Total | 158 100.00

2014-2015

IC Sentences

```
. tab INTDUM
```

```
RECEIPT OF |  
INTERMITTEN |  
T |  
CONFINEMENT | Freq. Percent Cum.  
-----+-----  
No | 70,874 99.82 99.82  
Yes | 129 0.18 100.00  
-----+-----  
Total | 71,003 100.00
```

```
. tab MOINTCON if INTDUM==1
```

```
TERM OF INTERMITTENT CONFINEMENT |  
ORDERED | Freq. Percent Cum.  
-----+-----  
1 | 83 64.34 64.34  
2 | 19 14.73 79.07  
3 | 6 4.65 83.72  
4 | 6 4.65 88.37  
5 | 1 0.78 89.15  
6 | 1 0.78 89.92  
9 | 1 0.78 90.70
```

12	1	0.78	91.47	
14	1	0.78	92.25	
Intermittent confinement ordered but no	10	7.75	100.00	

Total	129	100.00		
-------	-----	--------	--	--

. tab MOINTCON

TERM OF INTERMITTENT CONFINEMENT |

ORDERED	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	
No intermittent confinement ordered	70,874	99.82	99.82	
1	83	0.12	99.94	
2	19	0.03	99.96	
3	6	0.01	99.97	
4	6	0.01	99.98	
5	1	0.00	99.98	
6	1	0.00	99.98	
9	1	0.00	99.98	
12	1	0.00	99.98	
14	1	0.00	99.99	
Intermittent confinement ordered but no	10	0.01	100.00	

Total	71,003	100.00		
-------	--------	--------	--	--

Demographics

```
. tab YEARS if INTDUM ==1
```

```
CATEGORIES OF |
```

```
AGE RANGES | Freq. Percent Cum.
```

```
-----+-----
```

<21	3	2.34	2.34
21 through 25	10	7.81	10.16
26 through 30	33	25.78	35.94
31 through 35	13	10.16	46.09
36 through 40	18	14.06	60.16
41 through 50	28	21.88	82.03
>50	23	17.97	100.00

```
-----+-----
```

Total	128	100.00	
-------	-----	--------	--

```
. tab NEWEDUC if INTDUM ==1
```

```
EDUCATION OF DEFENDANT | Freq. Percent Cum.
```

```
-----+-----
```

Less than H.S. graduate	16	15.24	15.24
H.S. graduate	30	28.57	43.81
Some college	37	35.24	79.05
College graduate	22	20.95	100.00

```
-----+-----
```

Total	105	100.00	
-------	-----	--------	--

```
. tab NEWRACE if INTDUM ==1
```

```
RACE OF |
DEFENDANT |  Freq.  Percent  Cum.
-----+-----
White |    56   45.16   45.16
Black |    35   28.23   73.39
Hispanic |   24   19.35   92.74
Other |     9    7.26  100.00
-----+-----
Total |   124  100.00
```

```
. tab NUMDEPEN if INTDUM ==1
```

```
NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS WHOM DEFENDANT |
SUPPORTS |  Freq.  Percent  Cum.
-----+-----
No dependents |    40   38.10   38.10
1 |    17   16.19   54.29
2 |    21   20.00   74.29
3 |    16   15.24   89.52
4 |     8    7.62   97.14
5 |     2    1.90   99.05
6 |     1    0.95  100.00
-----+-----
Total |   105  100.00
```



```
. tab CITIZEN if INTDUM ==1
```

NATURE OF DEFENDANT'S CITIZENSHIP	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----			
United States citizen	120	96.77	96.77
Resident/legal alien	2	1.61	98.39
Not a US citizen/alien status unknown	2	1.61	100.00
-----+-----			
Total	124	100.00	

```
. tab MONSEX if INTDUM ==1
```

DEFENDANT'S			
GENDER	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----			
Male	106	82.17	82.17
Female	23	17.83	100.00
-----+-----			
Total	129	100.00	

Sentencing Court Information

```
. tab DISTRICT if INTDUM ==1
```

DISTRICT IN WHICH				
DEFENDANT WAS SENTENCED	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	
Rhode Island	2	1.55	1.55	
New York North	1	0.78	2.33	
New jersey	1	0.78	3.10	
Pennsylvania Middle	1	0.78	3.88	
Maryland	5	3.88	7.75	
North Carolina East	1	0.78	8.53	
North Carolina Middle	1	0.78	9.30	
Virginia East	34	26.36	35.66	
Virginia West	1	0.78	36.43	
West Virginia North	3	2.33	38.76	
Alabama Middle	5	3.88	42.64	
Florida Middle	2	1.55	44.19	
Florida South	5	3.88	48.06	
Georgia North	1	0.78	48.84	
Georgia Middle	1	0.78	49.61	
Georgia South	3	2.33	51.94	
Louisiana East	1	0.78	52.71	
Mississippi North	2	1.55	54.26	
Texas East	1	0.78	55.04	
Texas South	1	0.78	55.81	
Texas West	10	7.75	63.57	
Kentucky East	3	2.33	65.89	
Kentucky West	1	0.78	66.67	
Michigan West	1	0.78	67.44	

Ohio North	1	0.78	68.22
Illinois North	3	2.33	70.54
Illinois Central	2	1.55	72.09
Illinois South	1	0.78	72.87
Arkansas West	1	0.78	73.64
Iowa North	1	0.78	74.42
Missouri East	1	0.78	75.19
Missouri West	1	0.78	75.97
Nebraska	3	2.33	78.29
South Dakota	2	1.55	79.84
California North	1	0.78	80.62
California East	1	0.78	81.40
California Central	6	4.65	86.05
California South	1	0.78	86.82
Hawaii	1	0.78	87.60
Idaho	2	1.55	89.15
Colorado	2	1.55	90.70
Oklahoma West	1	0.78	91.47
Utah	1	0.78	92.25
District of Columbia	10	7.75	100.00

-----+-----

Total	129	100.00
-------	-----	--------

. tab MONCIRC if INTDUM ==1

CIRCUIT IN |

WHICH |

DEFENDANT				
WAS				
SENTENCED	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	
0	10	7.75	7.75	
1	2	1.55	9.30	
2	1	0.78	10.08	
3	2	1.55	11.63	
4	45	34.88	46.51	
5	15	11.63	58.14	
6	6	4.65	62.79	
7	6	4.65	67.44	
8	9	6.98	74.42	
9	12	9.30	83.72	
10	4	3.10	86.82	
11	17	13.18	100.00	
Total	129	100.00		

Additional Sentencing Factors

. tab FINE if INTDUM==1

DOLLAR |

AMOUNT OF |

FINE |

ORDERED | Freq. Percent Cum.

-----+-----
No fine | 92 71.32 71.32
50 | 1 0.78 72.09
100 | 1 0.78 72.87
125 | 1 0.78 73.64
150 | 1 0.78 74.42
200 | 1 0.78 75.19
250 | 2 1.55 76.74
300 | 3 2.33 79.07
350 | 1 0.78 79.84
390 | 1 0.78 80.62
400 | 1 0.78 81.40
500 | 4 3.10 84.50
800 | 1 0.78 85.27
1000 | 4 3.10 88.37
1250 | 1 0.78 89.15
2793 | 1 0.78 89.92
3000 | 1 0.78 90.70
4000 | 1 0.78 91.47
5000 | 3 2.33 93.80
6000 | 1 0.78 94.57
10000 | 1 0.78 95.35
15000 | 2 1.55 96.90
20000 | 1 0.78 97.67
100000 | 2 1.55 99.22
175000 | 1 0.78 100.00

-----+-----
Total | 129 100.00

. tab AMTREST if INTDUM==1

DOLLAR AMOUNT OF |

RESTITUTION | Freq. Percent Cum.

-----+-----
No restitution ordered | 73 58.87 58.87

350 | 1 0.81 59.68
530 | 1 0.81 60.48
765 | 1 0.81 61.29
2396 | 1 0.81 62.10
2564 | 1 0.81 62.90
3765 | 1 0.81 63.71
3979 | 1 0.81 64.52
5001 | 1 0.81 65.32
5354 | 1 0.81 66.13
5435 | 1 0.81 66.94
5447 | 1 0.81 67.74
8900 | 2 1.61 69.35
14890 | 1 0.81 70.16
19350 | 1 0.81 70.97
20000 | 1 0.81 71.77
25200 | 1 0.81 72.58
30401 | 1 0.81 73.39
51439 | 1 0.81 74.19

51480		1	0.81	75.00
56508		2	1.61	76.61
62020		1	0.81	77.42
78282		1	0.81	78.23
85879		1	0.81	79.03
99286		1	0.81	79.84
104820		1	0.81	80.65
108478		1	0.81	81.45
110066		1	0.81	82.26
110705		1	0.81	83.06
118085		1	0.81	83.87
127957		1	0.81	84.68
134377		1	0.81	85.48
145351		1	0.81	86.29
146941		1	0.81	87.10
158033		1	0.81	87.90
238600		1	0.81	88.71
300600		1	0.81	89.52
328238		1	0.81	90.32
353506		1	0.81	91.13
466562		1	0.81	91.94
487370		1	0.81	92.74
924529		1	0.81	93.55
1000000		1	0.81	94.35
1015756		1	0.81	95.16
1667900		1	0.81	95.97
1972486		1	0.81	96.77

2206931	1	0.81	97.58
3122162	1	0.81	98.39
4523777	1	0.81	99.19
7359791	1	0.81	100.00

-----+-----

Total	124	100.00	
-------	-----	--------	--

. tab TYPEMONY if INTDUM==1

FINE/COST OF SUPERVISION OR RESTITUTION	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
---	-------	---------	------

-----+-----

No fine / cost of supervision, nor rest	38	29.46	29.46
Restitution ordered, no fine / cost of	38	29.46	58.91
Fine / cost of supervision, no restitut	35	27.13	86.05
Both fine / cost of supervison and rest	18	13.95	100.00

-----+-----

Total	129	100.00	
-------	-----	--------	--

. tab CRIMHIST if INTDUM==1

DOES DEFENDANT HAVE ANY CRIMINAL |

HISTORY	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
---------	-------	---------	------

-----+-----

No criminal history	30	26.55	26.55
Yes, there is a criminal history	83	73.45	100.00


```
-----+-----
Total |    113    100.00
```

```
. tab OFFTYPE2 if INTDUM==1
```

```
PRIMARY OFFENSE TYPE GENERATED FROM |
CONVICTION WITH HIGHEST STATUTORY MAX |  Freq.  Percent  Cum.
```

```
-----+-----
Assault |      2    1.55    1.55
Drugs: trafficking |     14   10.85   12.40
Drugs: simple possession |      3    2.33   14.73
Firearms: use (incl'd offtype=14, firear |      7    5.43   20.16
Larceny |     10    7.75   27.91
Fraud |     37   28.68   56.59
Embezzlement |      2    1.55   58.14
Tax offenses |      6    4.65   62.79
Money laundering |      6    4.65   67.44
Racketeering (includes offtype=8, extor |      1    0.78   68.22
Gambling/lottery |      1    0.78   68.99
Civil rights offenses |      1    0.78   69.77
Immigration |      2    1.55   71.32
Admin just (inc access after fact, misp |      3    2.33   73.64
National defense offenses |      1    0.78   74.42
Traf viols other offns (incl'd offtype=3 |     32   24.81   99.22
Child Pornography |      1    0.78  100.00
-----+-----
Total |     129   100.00
```

```
. tab XCRHISSR if INTDUM==1
```

```
DEFENDANTS |
```

```
FINAL |
```

```
CRIMINAL |
```

```
HISTORY |
```

```
CATEGORY | Freq. Percent Cum.
```

```
-----+-----
```

1	98	77.17	77.17
2	9	7.09	84.25
3	9	7.09	91.34
4	7	5.51	96.85
5	1	0.79	97.64
6	3	2.36	100.00

```
-----+-----
```

Total	127	100.00	
-------	-----	--------	--

```
. tab XFOLSOR if INTDUM==1
```

```
FINAL |
```

```
OFFENSE |
```

```
LEVEL | Freq. Percent Cum.
```

```
-----+-----
```

2	1	0.79	0.79
4	23	18.11	18.90
5	1	0.79	19.69

6	3	2.36	22.05
8	3	2.36	24.41
9	1	0.79	25.20
10	8	6.30	31.50
11	5	3.94	35.43
12	15	11.81	47.24
13	17	13.39	60.63
14	2	1.57	62.20
15	7	5.51	67.72
16	2	1.57	69.29
17	9	7.09	76.38
18	2	1.57	77.95
19	4	3.15	81.10
20	4	3.15	84.25
21	2	1.57	85.83
23	2	1.57	87.40
24	1	0.79	88.19
25	4	3.15	91.34
27	7	5.51	96.85
28	2	1.57	98.43
30	1	0.79	99.21
35	1	0.79	100.00

-----+-----

Total | 127 100.00

. tab ZONE if INTDUM ==1

SENTENCE			
TABLE GROUP	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
A	24	18.90	18.90
B	18	14.17	33.07
C	31	24.41	57.48
D	54	42.52	100.00
-----+			
Total	127	100.00	

2013-2014

IC Sentences

. tab INTDUM

RECEIPT OF			
INTERMITTEN			
T			
CONFINEMENT	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
No	75,708	99.83	99.83
Yes	128	0.17	100.00
-----+			
Total	75,836	100.00	

tab MOINTCON if INTDUM==1

TERM OF INTERMITTENT CONFINEMENT |

ORDERED	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	63	49.22	49.22
2	26	20.31	69.53
3	8	6.25	75.78
4	1	0.78	76.56
5	1	0.78	77.34
6	4	3.13	80.47
9	2	1.56	82.03
30	1	0.78	82.81
Intermittent confinement ordered but no	22	17.19	100.00
Total	128	100.00	

. tab MOINTCON

TERM OF INTERMITTENT CONFINEMENT |

ORDERED	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
No intermittent confinement ordered	75,708	99.83	99.83
1	63	0.08	99.91
2	26	0.03	99.95
3	8	0.01	99.96

4	1	0.00	99.96
5	1	0.00	99.96
6	4	0.01	99.97
9	2	0.00	99.97
30	1	0.00	99.97

Intermittent confinement ordered but no | 22 0.03 100.00

-----+-----
 Total | 75,836 100.00

Demographics

. tab YEARS if INTDUM ==1

CATEGORIES OF |

AGE RANGES	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
------------	-------	---------	------

-----+-----
 <21 | 3 2.36 2.36
 21 through 25 | 19 14.96 17.32
 26 through 30 | 23 18.11 35.43
 31 through 35 | 19 14.96 50.39
 36 through 40 | 14 11.02 61.42
 41 through 50 | 32 25.20 86.61
 >50 | 17 13.39 100.00

-----+-----
 Total | 127 100.00

. tab NEWEDUC if INTDUM ==1

EDUCATION OF DEFENDANT	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Less than H.S. graduate	27	25.47	25.47
H.S. graduate	27	25.47	50.94
Some college	31	29.25	80.19
College graduate	21	19.81	100.00
Total	106	100.00	

. tab NEWRACE if INTDUM ==1

RACE OF DEFENDANT	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
White	49	41.53	41.53
Black	25	21.19	62.71
Hispanic	37	31.36	94.07
Other	7	5.93	100.00
Total	118	100.00	

. tab NUMDEPEN if INTDUM ==1

NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS WHOM DEFENDANT	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
SUPPORTS			

No dependents	33	31.73	31.73
1	19	18.27	50.00
2	21	20.19	70.19
3	19	18.27	88.46
4	6	5.77	94.23
5	1	0.96	95.19
7	1	0.96	96.15
8	2	1.92	98.08
11	2	1.92	100.00

-----+-----
Total | 104 100.00

. tab CITIZEN if INTDUM ==1

NATURE OF DEFENDANT'S CITIZENSHIP	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
United States citizen	98	81.67	81.67
Resident/legal alien	8	6.67	88.33
Illegal alien	14	11.67	100.00

-----+-----
Total | 120 100.00

. tab MONSEX if INTDUM ==1

DEFENDANT'S |

GENDER	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
--------	-------	---------	------

-----+-----

Male	90	70.87	70.87
Female	37	29.13	100.00

-----+-----

Total	127	100.00	
-------	-----	--------	--

Sentencing Court Information

. tab DISTRICT if INTDUM ==1

DISTRICT IN WHICH			
DEFENDANT WAS SENTENCED	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----			
Massachusetts	2	1.56	1.56
Rhode Island	1	0.78	2.34
New York North	6	4.69	7.03
New York East	2	1.56	8.59
New York South	5	3.91	12.50
New jersey	1	0.78	13.28
Pennsylvania East	1	0.78	14.06
Pennsylvania Middle	1	0.78	14.84
Maryland	2	1.56	16.41
North Carolina East	2	1.56	17.97
North Carolina Middle	1	0.78	18.75
Virginia East	21	16.41	35.16
West Virginia South	1	0.78	35.94
Alabama Middle	2	1.56	37.50
Florida North	1	0.78	38.28

Georgia South	4	3.13	41.41
Mississippi North	1	0.78	42.19
Mississippi South	1	0.78	42.97
Texas North	1	0.78	43.75
Texas West	24	18.75	62.50
Kentucky East	1	0.78	63.28
Ohio North	2	1.56	64.84
Tennessee East	1	0.78	65.63
Tennessee Middle	2	1.56	67.19
Illinois North	1	0.78	67.97
Illinois South	2	1.56	69.53
Indiana South	1	0.78	70.31
Missouri East	1	0.78	71.09
Arizona	1	0.78	71.88
California North	2	1.56	73.44
California East	2	1.56	75.00
California Central	2	1.56	76.56
California South	3	2.34	78.91
Hawaii	5	3.91	82.81
Nevada	2	1.56	84.38
Oklahoma West	16	12.50	96.88
Utah	1	0.78	97.66
District of Columbia	3	2.34	100.00

-----+-----

Total | 128 100.00

. tab MONCIRC if INTDUM ==1

CIRCUIT IN |
 WHICH |
 DEFENDANT |
 WAS |
 SENTENCED | Freq. Percent Cum.

-----+-----

0	3	2.34	2.34
1	3	2.34	4.69
2	13	10.16	14.84
3	3	2.34	17.19
4	27	21.09	38.28
5	27	21.09	59.38
6	6	4.69	64.06
7	4	3.13	67.19
8	1	0.78	67.97
9	17	13.28	81.25
10	17	13.28	94.53
11	7	5.47	100.00

-----+-----

Total | 128 100.00

Additional Sentencing Factors

. tab FINE if INTDUM==1

DOLLAR |

AMOUNT OF			
FINE			
ORDERED	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----			
No fine	103	80.47	80.47
100	1	0.78	81.25
250	1	0.78	82.03
300	2	1.56	83.59
350	1	0.78	84.38
375	1	0.78	85.16
390	1	0.78	85.94
500	4	3.13	89.06
600	1	0.78	89.84
775	1	0.78	90.63
800	1	0.78	91.41
1000	2	1.56	92.97
1665	1	0.78	93.75
2700	1	0.78	94.53
4000	1	0.78	95.31
5000	3	2.34	97.66
10000	2	1.56	99.22
25000	1	0.78	100.00
-----+-----			
Total	128	100.00	

. tab AMTREST if INTDUM==1

DOLLAR AMOUNT OF |

RESTITUTION | Freq. Percent Cum.

No restitution ordered	82	64.57	64.57
1005	1	0.79	65.35
7515	1	0.79	66.14
8000	1	0.79	66.93
9372	1	0.79	67.72
9424	1	0.79	68.50
10420	1	0.79	69.29
13095	1	0.79	70.08
15600	1	0.79	70.87
16245	1	0.79	71.65
18993	1	0.79	72.44
21000	1	0.79	73.23
21164	1	0.79	74.02
34903	1	0.79	74.80
38753	1	0.79	75.59
39282	1	0.79	76.38
39375	1	0.79	77.17
42401	1	0.79	77.95
43865	1	0.79	78.74
48902	1	0.79	79.53
56626	1	0.79	80.31
61543	1	0.79	81.10
61993	1	0.79	81.89
72859	1	0.79	82.68

73570		1	0.79	83.46
75000		1	0.79	84.25
88451		1	0.79	85.04
104220		1	0.79	85.83
114166		1	0.79	86.61
137016		1	0.79	87.40
152925		1	0.79	88.19
159884		1	0.79	88.98
161554		1	0.79	89.76
187916		1	0.79	90.55
196245		1	0.79	91.34
200254		1	0.79	92.13
209673		1	0.79	92.91
222068		1	0.79	93.70
242685		1	0.79	94.49
290635		1	0.79	95.28
298784		1	0.79	96.06
301736		1	0.79	96.85
352598		1	0.79	97.64
611320		1	0.79	98.43
1172000		1	0.79	99.21
13531112		1	0.79	100.00

-----+-----

Total		127	100.00
-------	--	-----	--------

. tab TYPEDUM if INTDUM==1

FINE/COST OF SUPERVISION OR RESTITUTION	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
---	-------	---------	------

No fine / cost of supervision, nor rest	61	47.66	47.66
Restitution ordered, no fine / cost of	40	31.25	78.91
Fine / cost of supervision, no restitut	21	16.41	95.31
Both fine / cost of supervison and rest	6	4.69	100.00

Total	128	100.00	
-------	-----	--------	--

. tab CRIMHIST if INTDUM==1

DOES DEFENDANT HAVE ANY CRIMINAL |

HISTORY	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
---------	-------	---------	------

No criminal history	36	31.03	31.03
Yes, there is a criminal history	80	68.97	100.00

Total	116	100.00	
-------	-----	--------	--

. tab OFFTYPE2 if INTDUM==1

PRIMARY OFFENSE TYPE GENERATED FROM |

CONVICTION WITH HIGHEST STATUTORY MAX	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
---------------------------------------	-------	---------	------

Bank robbery (includes offtype=7, other	1	0.78	0.78
Drugs: trafficking	28	21.88	22.66
Drugs: communication facilities	1	0.78	23.44

Drugs: simple possession	3	2.34	25.78
Firearms: use (incl'd offtype=14, firear	3	2.34	28.13
Auto theft	2	1.56	29.69
Larceny	6	4.69	34.38
Fraud	26	20.31	54.69
Embezzlement	3	2.34	57.03
Forgery/counterfeiting	3	2.34	59.38
Bribery	2	1.56	60.94
Tax offenses	9	7.03	67.97
Money laundering	3	2.34	70.31
Gambling/lottery	1	0.78	71.09
Civil rights offenses	1	0.78	71.88
Immigration	12	9.38	81.25
Admin just (inc access after fact, misp	3	2.34	83.59
Food and drug offenses	1	0.78	84.38
Traf viols other offns (incl'd offtype=3	20	15.63	100.00
-----+-----			
Total	128	100.00	

. tab XCRHISSR if INTDUM==1

DEFENDANTS |

FINAL |

CRIMINAL |

HISTORY |

CATEGORY | Freq. Percent Cum.

-----+-----

1	99	79.20	79.20
2	14	11.20	90.40
3	8	6.40	96.80
4	3	2.40	99.20
5	1	0.80	100.00

-----+-----
Total | 125 100.00

. tab XFOLSOR if INTDUM==1

FINAL |

OFFENSE |

LEVEL | Freq. Percent Cum.

-----+-----

2	2	1.60	1.60
4	21	16.80	18.40
6	2	1.60	20.00
8	4	3.20	23.20
9	1	0.80	24.00
10	12	9.60	33.60
11	4	3.20	36.80
12	14	11.20	48.00
13	12	9.60	57.60
14	5	4.00	61.60
15	22	17.60	79.20
16	2	1.60	80.80
17	6	4.80	85.60

18	3	2.40	88.00
19	2	1.60	89.60
20	1	0.80	90.40
21	3	2.40	92.80
22	1	0.80	93.60
23	4	3.20	96.80
25	1	0.80	97.60
27	1	0.80	98.40
31	1	0.80	99.20
33	1	0.80	100.00

-----+-----
Total | 125 100.00

. tab ZONE if INTDUM ==1

SENTENCE |

TABLE GROUP | Freq. Percent Cum.

A	23	18.40	18.40
B	22	17.60	36.00
C	24	19.20	55.20
D	56	44.80	100.00

-----+-----
Total | 125 100.00

2012-2013

IC Sentences

```
. tab INTDUM
```

```
RECEIPT OF |  
INTERMITTEN |  
T |  
CONFINEMENT | Freq. Percent Cum.  
-----+-----  
No | 79,919 99.86 99.86  
Yes | 116 0.14 100.00  
-----+-----  
Total | 80,035 100.00
```

```
tab MOINTCON if INTDUM==1
```

```
TERM OF INTERMITTENT CONFINEMENT |  
ORDERED | Freq. Percent Cum.  
-----+-----  
1 | 65 56.03 56.03  
2 | 19 16.38 72.41  
3 | 9 7.76 80.17  
4 | 10 8.62 88.79  
5 | 2 1.72 90.52  
6 | 1 0.86 91.38
```

12	1	0.86	92.24
Intermittent confinement ordered but no	9	7.76	100.00
-----+-----			
Total	116	100.00	

. tab MOINTCON

TERM OF INTERMITTENT CONFINEMENT |

ORDERED	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----			
No intermittent confinement ordered	79,919	99.86	99.86
1	65	0.08	99.94
2	19	0.02	99.96
3	9	0.01	99.97
4	10	0.01	99.98
5	2	0.00	99.99
6	1	0.00	99.99
12	1	0.00	99.99
Intermittent confinement ordered but no	9	0.01	100.00
-----+-----			
Total	80,035	100.00	

Demographics

. tab YEARS if INTDUM ==1

CATEGORIES OF |

AGE RANGES	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
------------	-------	---------	------

```
-----+-----
```

<21	2	1.72	1.72
21 through 25	9	7.76	9.48
26 through 30	22	18.97	28.45
31 through 35	18	15.52	43.97
36 through 40	17	14.66	58.62
41 through 50	30	25.86	84.48
>50	18	15.52	100.00

```
-----+-----
```

Total	116	100.00	
-------	-----	--------	--

```
. tab NEWEDUC if INTDUM ==1
```

EDUCATION OF DEFENDANT	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Less than H.S. graduate	10	9.80	9.80
H.S. graduate	37	36.27	46.08
Some college	30	29.41	75.49
College graduate	25	24.51	100.00

```
-----+-----
```

Total	102	100.00	
-------	-----	--------	--

```
. tab NEWRACE if INTDUM ==1
```

RACE OF	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
DEFENDANT			

```
-----+-----
```

White	52	50.49	50.49
Black	24	23.30	73.79
Hispanic	17	16.50	90.29
Other	10	9.71	100.00

```
-----+-----
```

Total	103	100.00	
-------	-----	--------	--

```
. tab NUMDEPEN if INTDUM ==1
```

```
NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS WHOM DEFENDANT |
```

SUPPORTS	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
No dependents	33	33.00	33.00
1	27	27.00	60.00
2	16	16.00	76.00
3	10	10.00	86.00
4	8	8.00	94.00
5	4	4.00	98.00
6	2	2.00	100.00

```
-----+-----
```

Total	100	100.00	
-------	-----	--------	--

```
. tab CITIZEN if INTDUM ==1
```

NATURE OF DEFENDANT'S CITIZENSHIP	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----------------------------------	-------	---------	------

```
-----+-----
```

United States citizen	100	95.24	95.24
Resident/legal alien	3	2.86	98.10
Illegal alien	1	0.95	99.05
Not a US citizen/alien status unknown	1	0.95	100.00
-----+-----			
Total	105	100.00	

. tab MONSEX if INTDUM ==1

DEFENDANT'S |

GENDER	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----			
Male	77	70.00	70.00
Female	33	30.00	100.00
-----+-----			
Total	110	100.00	

Sentencing Court Information

. tab DISTRICT if INTDUM ==1

DISTRICT IN WHICH	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----			
Massachusetts	2	1.72	1.72
New York North	14	12.07	13.79

New York East	1	0.86	14.66
New York South	1	0.86	15.52
New jersey	1	0.86	16.38
Maryland	2	1.72	18.10
North Carolina East	2	1.72	19.83
North Carolina Middle	1	0.86	20.69
Virginia East	17	14.66	35.34
West Virginia South	1	0.86	36.21
Alabama Middle	4	3.45	39.66
Georgia Middle	3	2.59	42.24
Georgia South	2	1.72	43.97
Mississippi South	1	0.86	44.83
Texas East	1	0.86	45.69
Texas West	10	8.62	54.31
Kentucky East	7	6.03	60.34
Kentucky West	1	0.86	61.21
Michigan West	1	0.86	62.07
Ohio North	2	1.72	63.79
Tennessee East	3	2.59	66.38
Tennessee Middle	2	1.72	68.10
Illinois North	1	0.86	68.97
Illinois South	2	1.72	70.69
Indiana South	2	1.72	72.41
Arkansas East	1	0.86	73.28
Iowa North	1	0.86	74.14
Minnesota	1	0.86	75.00
Missouri East	1	0.86	75.86

Arizona	2	1.72	77.59
California East	1	0.86	78.45
California South	7	6.03	84.48
Hawaii	6	5.17	89.66
Idaho	5	4.31	93.97
Oklahoma West	3	2.59	96.55
Utah	1	0.86	97.41
District of Columbia	3	2.59	100.00

-----+-----

Total	116	100.00
-------	-----	--------

. tab MONCIRC if INTDUM ==1

CIRCUIT IN |

WHICH |

DEFENDANT |

WAS |

SENTENCED	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----------	-------	---------	------

-----+-----

0	3	2.59	2.59
1	2	1.72	4.31
2	16	13.79	18.10
3	1	0.86	18.97
4	23	19.83	38.79
5	12	10.34	49.14
6	16	13.79	62.93
7	5	4.31	67.24

8	4	3.45	70.69
9	21	18.10	88.79
10	4	3.45	92.24
11	9	7.76	100.00

-----+-----

Total	116	100.00	
-------	-----	--------	--

Additional Sentencing Factors

. tab FINE if INTDUM==1

DOLLAR |

AMOUNT OF |

FINE |

ORDERED	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
---------	-------	---------	------

-----+-----

No fine	83	71.55	71.55
100	1	0.86	72.41
150	1	0.86	73.28
250	4	3.45	76.72
400	1	0.86	77.59
500	4	3.45	81.03
550	1	0.86	81.90
1000	6	5.17	87.07
1500	2	1.72	88.79
2000	1	0.86	89.66
2500	2	1.72	91.38

3000	4	3.45	94.83
5000	2	1.72	96.55
10000	3	2.59	99.14
15000	1	0.86	100.00

-----+-----

Total	116	100.00	
-------	-----	--------	--

. tab AMTREST if INTDUM==1

DOLLAR AMOUNT OF |

RESTITUTION	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-------------	-------	---------	------

-----+-----

No restitution ordered	76	65.52	65.52
------------------------	----	-------	-------

218	1	0.86	66.38
-----	---	------	-------

500	1	0.86	67.24
-----	---	------	-------

1625	1	0.86	68.10
------	---	------	-------

2600	1	0.86	68.97
------	---	------	-------

4045	1	0.86	69.83
------	---	------	-------

5000	2	1.72	71.55
------	---	------	-------

6212	1	0.86	72.41
------	---	------	-------

6945	1	0.86	73.28
------	---	------	-------

9751	1	0.86	74.14
------	---	------	-------

9923	1	0.86	75.00
------	---	------	-------

17877	1	0.86	75.86
-------	---	------	-------

19615	1	0.86	76.72
-------	---	------	-------

20678	1	0.86	77.59
-------	---	------	-------

23917	1	0.86	78.45
-------	---	------	-------

28276		1	0.86	79.31
28505		1	0.86	80.17
34945		1	0.86	81.03
35707		1	0.86	81.90
35708		1	0.86	82.76
47373		1	0.86	83.62
58633		1	0.86	84.48
64336		1	0.86	85.34
66400		1	0.86	86.21
68000		1	0.86	87.07
87596		1	0.86	87.93
110581		1	0.86	88.79
125756		1	0.86	89.66
137016		2	1.72	91.38
147440		1	0.86	92.24
225000		1	0.86	93.10
277262		1	0.86	93.97
311210		1	0.86	94.83
321366		1	0.86	95.69
449570		1	0.86	96.55
535435		1	0.86	97.41
594073		1	0.86	98.28
1131645		1	0.86	99.14
1736251		1	0.86	100.00

-----+-----
Total | 116 100.00

. tab TYPEMONY if INTDUM==1

FINE/COST OF SUPERVISION OR RESTITUTION	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----			
No fine / cost of supervision, nor rest	48	41.38	41.38
Restitution ordered, no fine / cost of	32	27.59	68.97
Fine / cost of supervision, no restitut	28	24.14	93.10
Both fine / cost of supervison and rest	8	6.90	100.00
-----+-----			
Total	116	100.00	

. tab CRIMHIST if INTDUM==1

DOES DEFENDANT HAVE ANY CRIMINAL	HISTORY	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----				
No criminal history		31	29.25	29.25
Yes, there is a criminal history		75	70.75	100.00
-----+-----				
Total		106	100.00	

. tab OFFTYPE2 if INTDUM==1

PRIMARY OFFENSE TYPE GENERATED FROM	CONVICTION WITH HIGHEST STATUTORY MAX	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----				

Sexual abuse	1	0.86	0.86
Assault	1	0.86	1.72
Drugs: trafficking	24	20.69	22.41
Drugs: communication facilities	2	1.72	24.14
Drugs: simple possession	4	3.45	27.59
Firearms: use (incl'd offtype=14, firear	6	5.17	32.76
Larceny	9	7.76	40.52
Fraud	34	29.31	69.83
Embezzlement	1	0.86	70.69
Forgery/counterfeiting	1	0.86	71.55
Bribery	1	0.86	72.41
Tax offenses	3	2.59	75.00
Money laundering	3	2.59	77.59
Gambling/lottery	2	1.72	79.31
Immigration	2	1.72	81.03
Admin just (inc access after fact, misp	5	4.31	85.34
Traf viols other offns (incl'd offtype=3	16	13.79	99.14
Prostitution	1	0.86	100.00
-----+-----			
Total	116	100.00	

. tab XCRHISSR if INTDUM==1

DEFENDANTS |

FINAL |

CRIMINAL |

HISTORY |

CATEGORY	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	91	80.53	80.53
2	8	7.08	87.61
3	5	4.42	92.04
4	6	5.31	97.35
5	1	0.88	98.23
6	2	1.77	100.00
Total	113	100.00	

. tab XFOLSOR if INTDUM==1

FINAL	OFFENSE	LEVEL	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
		2	3	2.65	2.65
		4	13	11.50	14.16
		5	2	1.77	15.93
		6	8	7.08	23.01
		7	1	0.88	23.89
		8	5	4.42	28.32
		9	3	2.65	30.97
		10	10	8.85	39.82
		11	4	3.54	43.36
		12	11	9.73	53.10

13		12	10.62	63.72
14		1	0.88	64.60
15		10	8.85	73.45
16		2	1.77	75.22
17		4	3.54	78.76
18		1	0.88	79.65
19		5	4.42	84.07
20		1	0.88	84.96
21		3	2.65	87.61
22		1	0.88	88.50
23		5	4.42	92.92
24		1	0.88	93.81
25		3	2.65	96.46
27		2	1.77	98.23
29		1	0.88	99.12
33		1	0.88	100.00

-----+-----

Total | 113 100.00

. tab ZONE if INTDUM ==1

SENTENCE |

TABLE GROUP | Freq. Percent Cum.

-----+-----

A | 26 23.01 23.01

B	22	19.47	42.48
C	23	20.35	62.83
D	42	37.17	100.00

-----+-----

Total	113	100.00	
-------	-----	--------	--

2011-2012

IC Sentences

. tab INTDUM

RECEIPT OF			
INTERMITTEN			
T			
CONFINEMENT	Freq.	Percent	Cum.

-----+-----

No	84,058	99.87	99.87
Yes	109	0.13	100.00

-----+-----

Total	84,167	100.00	
-------	--------	--------	--

tab MOINTCON if INTDUM==1

TERM OF INTERMITTENT CONFINEMENT			
ORDERED	Freq.	Percent	Cum.

-----+-----

1	65	59.63	59.63
---	----	-------	-------

2	13	11.93	71.56
3	9	8.26	79.82
4	6	5.50	85.32
5	2	1.83	87.16
6	9	8.26	95.41
7	1	0.92	96.33
12	1	0.92	97.25
18	1	0.92	98.17

Intermittent confinement ordered but no | 2 1.83 100.00

-----+-----
Total | 109 100.00

. tab MOINTCON

TERM OF INTERMITTENT CONFINEMENT |

ORDERED | Freq. Percent Cum.

-----+-----
No intermittent confinement ordered | 84,058 99.87 99.87

1	65	0.08	99.95
2	13	0.02	99.96
3	9	0.01	99.97
4	6	0.01	99.98
5	2	0.00	99.98
6	9	0.01	99.99
7	1	0.00	100.00
12	1	0.00	100.00
18	1	0.00	100.00

```
Intermittent confinement ordered but no |      2      0.00   100.00
```

-----+-----

```
Total |  84,167  100.00
```

Demographics

```
. tab YEARS if INTDUM ==1
```

```
CATEGORIES OF |
```

```
AGE RANGES |  Freq.  Percent  Cum.
```

-----+-----

```
<21 |      2    1.85    1.85
```

```
21 through 25 |     17   15.74   17.59
```

```
26 through 30 |     15   13.89   31.48
```

```
31 through 35 |     21   19.44   50.93
```

```
36 through 40 |     23   21.30   72.22
```

```
41 through 50 |     12   11.11   83.33
```

```
>50 |     18   16.67  100.00
```

-----+-----

```
Total |   108  100.00
```

```
. tab NEWEDUC if INTDUM ==1
```

```
EDUCATION OF DEFENDANT |  Freq.  Percent  Cum.
```

-----+-----

```
Less than H.S. graduate |      9   10.84   10.84
```

```
H.S. graduate |     32   38.55   49.40
```

```
Some college |     34   40.96   90.36
```

```
College graduate |      8      9.64  100.00
```

-----+-----

```
Total |      83  100.00
```

```
. tab NEWRACE if INTDUM ==1
```

```
RACE OF |
```

```
DEFENDANT |  Freq.  Percent  Cum.
```

-----+-----

```
White |      48   57.14   57.14
```

```
Black |      16   19.05   76.19
```

```
Hispanic |     11   13.10   89.29
```

```
Other |       9   10.71  100.00
```

-----+-----

```
Total |      84  100.00
```

```
. tab NUMDEPEN if INTDUM ==1
```

```
NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS WHOM DEFENDANT |
```

```
SUPPORTS |  Freq.  Percent  Cum.
```

-----+-----

```
No dependents |      25   30.49   30.49
```

```
1 |      23   28.05   58.54
```

```
2 |      13   15.85   74.39
```

```
3 |      14   17.07   91.46
```

```
4 |       5    6.10   97.56
```

```
5 |       1    1.22   98.78
```

7 | 1 1.22 100.00

-----+-----

Total | 82 100.00

. tab CITIZEN if INTDUM ==1

NATURE OF DEFENDANT'S CITIZENSHIP | Freq. Percent Cum.

-----+-----

United States citizen | 76 90.48 90.48

Resident/legal alien | 4 4.76 95.24

Illegal alien | 2 2.38 97.62

Not a US citizen/alien status unknown | 2 2.38 100.00

-----+-----

Total | 84 100.00

. tab MONSEX if INTDUM ==1

DEFENDANT'S |

GENDER | Freq. Percent Cum.

-----+-----

Male | 65 65.00 65.00

Female | 35 35.00 100.00

-----+-----

Total | 100 100.00

Sentencing Court Information

. tab DISTRICT if INTDUM ==1

DISTRICT IN WHICH DEFENDANT WAS SENTENCED	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
New York North	13	11.93	11.93
New York East	3	2.75	14.68
New York South	4	3.67	18.35
Maryland	1	0.92	19.27
North Carolina East	2	1.83	21.10
North Carolina Middle	1	0.92	22.02
North Carolina West	1	0.92	22.94
Virginia East	23	21.10	44.04
Virginia West	3	2.75	46.79
Alabama Middle	3	2.75	49.54
Florida North	1	0.92	50.46
Georgia Middle	3	2.75	53.21
Georgia South	3	2.75	55.96
Louisiana West	1	0.92	56.88
Mississippi South	1	0.92	57.80
Texas East	3	2.75	60.55
Texas South	2	1.83	62.39
Texas West	1	0.92	63.30
Kentucky East	5	4.59	67.89
Kentucky West	2	1.83	69.72
Ohio North	1	0.92	70.64

Tennessee East	7	6.42	77.06
Wisconsin East	2	1.83	78.90
Arkansas East	3	2.75	81.65
Iowa North	3	2.75	84.40
Missouri West	1	0.92	85.32
South Dakota	1	0.92	86.24
California South	2	1.83	88.07
Hawaii	2	1.83	89.91
Idaho	1	0.92	90.83
Colorado	1	0.92	91.74
New Mexico	1	0.92	92.66
Oklahoma West	5	4.59	97.25
District of Columbia	1	0.92	98.17
Guam	2	1.83	100.00

-----+-----

Total | 109 100.00

. tab MONCIRC if INTDUM ==1

CIRCUIT IN |

WHICH |

DEFENDANT |

WAS |

SENTENCED | Freq. Percent Cum.

-----+-----

0 | 1 0.92 0.92

2 | 20 18.35 19.27

4	31	28.44	47.71
5	8	7.34	55.05
6	15	13.76	68.81
7	2	1.83	70.64
8	8	7.34	77.98
9	7	6.42	84.40
10	7	6.42	90.83
11	10	9.17	100.00

-----+-----
Total | 109 100.00

Additional Sentencing Factors

. tab FINE if INTDUM==1

DOLLAR |

AMOUNT OF |

FINE |

ORDERED | Freq. Percent Cum.

-----+-----

No fine	80	73.39	73.39
25	1	0.92	74.31
50	1	0.92	75.23
75	1	0.92	76.15
100	2	1.83	77.98
150	2	1.83	79.82
225	2	1.83	81.65
250	5	4.59	86.24

325		1	0.92	87.16
475		1	0.92	88.07
500		4	3.67	91.74
725		1	0.92	92.66
1000		2	1.83	94.50
1100		1	0.92	95.41
20000		1	0.92	96.33
22000		1	0.92	97.25
25000		1	0.92	98.17
50000		1	0.92	99.08
261483		1	0.92	100.00

-----+-----
Total | 109 100.00

. tab AMTREST if INTDUM==1

DOLLAR AMOUNT OF |

RESTITUTION		Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-------------	--	-------	---------	------

-----+-----
No restitution ordered | 67 62.04 62.04

23		1	0.93	62.96
684		1	0.93	63.89
1592		1	0.93	64.81
6575		1	0.93	65.74
7609		1	0.93	66.67
9627		1	0.93	67.59
9956		1	0.93	68.52

11850		1	0.93	69.44
12275		1	0.93	70.37
14403		1	0.93	71.30
16975		1	0.93	72.22
17992		1	0.93	73.15
19819		1	0.93	74.07
20500		1	0.93	75.00
20676		1	0.93	75.93
21705		1	0.93	76.85
23420		1	0.93	77.78
26728		1	0.93	78.70
28526		1	0.93	79.63
28980		1	0.93	80.56
32244		1	0.93	81.48
40137		1	0.93	82.41
47756		1	0.93	83.33
50000		1	0.93	84.26
50212		1	0.93	85.19
52442		1	0.93	86.11
59740		1	0.93	87.04
71023		1	0.93	87.96
74290		1	0.93	88.89
106844		1	0.93	89.81
117392		1	0.93	90.74
127919		1	0.93	91.67
167325		1	0.93	92.59
177096		1	0.93	93.52

179280		1	0.93	94.44
214495		1	0.93	95.37
221818		1	0.93	96.30
255065		1	0.93	97.22
700536		1	0.93	98.15
1436508		1	0.93	99.07
1942484		1	0.93	100.00

-----+-----

Total		108	100.00
-------	--	-----	--------

. tab TYPEMONY if INTDUM==1

FINE/COST OF SUPERVISION OR RESTITUTION		Freq.	Percent	Cum.
---	--	-------	---------	------

-----+-----

No fine / cost of supervision, nor rest		37	33.94	33.94
Restitution ordered, no fine / cost of		37	33.94	67.89
Fine / cost of supervision, no restitut		30	27.52	95.41
Both fine / cost of supervison and rest		5	4.59	100.00

-----+-----

Total		109	100.00
-------	--	-----	--------

. tab CRIMHIST if INTDUM==1

DOES DEFENDANT HAVE ANY CRIMINAL

HISTORY		Freq.	Percent	Cum.
---------	--	-------	---------	------

-----+-----

No criminal history	30	31.58	31.58
Yes, there is a criminal history	65	68.42	100.00

-----+-----

Total	95	100.00	
-------	----	--------	--

. tab OFFTYPE2 if INTDUM==1

PRIMARY OFFENSE TYPE GENERATED FROM |

CONVICTION WITH HIGHEST STATUTORY MAX	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
---------------------------------------	-------	---------	------

-----+-----

Assault	3	2.75	2.75
Drugs: trafficking	18	16.51	19.27
Drugs: communication facilities	1	0.92	20.18
Drugs: simple possession	1	0.92	21.10
Firearms: use (incl'd offtype=14, firear	7	6.42	27.52
Auto theft	1	0.92	28.44
Larceny	11	10.09	38.53
Fraud	21	19.27	57.80
Embezzlement	2	1.83	59.63
Forgery/counterfeiting	3	2.75	62.39
Bribery	3	2.75	65.14
Tax offenses	2	1.83	66.97
Money laundering	4	3.67	70.64
Racketeering (includes offtype=8, extor	1	0.92	71.56
Immigration	2	1.83	73.39
Admin just (inc access after fact, misp	5	4.59	77.98
Environmental, game, fish, and wildlife	1	0.92	78.90
Traf viols other offns (incl'd offtype=3	23	21.10	100.00

-----+-----
Total | 109 100.00

. tab XCRHISSR if INTDUM==1

DEFENDANTS |

FINAL |

CRIMINAL |

HISTORY |

CATEGORY | Freq. Percent Cum.

-----+-----

1	72	67.29	67.29
2	16	14.95	82.24
3	7	6.54	88.79
4	10	9.35	98.13
5	1	0.93	99.07
6	1	0.93	100.00

-----+-----

Total | 107 100.00

. tab XFOLSOR if INTDUM==1

FINAL |

OFFENSE |

LEVEL | Freq. Percent Cum.

-----+-----

4	25	23.36	23.36
---	----	-------	-------

5	1	0.93	24.30
6	3	2.80	27.10
7	1	0.93	28.04
8	5	4.67	32.71
9	2	1.87	34.58
10	9	8.41	42.99
12	7	6.54	49.53
13	14	13.08	62.62
14	1	0.93	63.55
15	4	3.74	67.29
16	2	1.87	69.16
17	9	8.41	77.57
18	1	0.93	78.50
19	6	5.61	84.11
20	2	1.87	85.98
21	4	3.74	89.72
23	5	4.67	94.39
24	1	0.93	95.33
25	2	1.87	97.20
26	1	0.93	98.13
27	1	0.93	99.07
34	1	0.93	100.00

-----+-----

Total | 107 100.00

. tab ZONE if INTDUM ==1

SENTENCE			
TABLE GROUP	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
A	23	21.50	21.50
B	21	19.63	41.12
C	18	16.82	57.94
D	45	42.06	100.00
-----+			
Total	107	100.00	

Texas West Results for 2020-2021

tab INTDUM if DISTRICT==42

RECEIPT OF			
INTERMITTEN			
T			
CONFINEMENT	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
No	5,190	98.99	98.99
Yes	53	1.01	100.00
-----+			
Total	5,243	100.00	

. tab MOINTCON if DISTRICT==42 & INTDUM==1

TERM OF INTERMITTENT CONFINEMENT |

ORDERED	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	1	1.89	1.89
12	2	3.77	5.66
Intermittent confinement ordered, but n	50	94.34	100.00
Total	53	100.00	

. tab AGECAT if DISTRICT==42 & INTDUM==1

DEFENDANT'S |

AGE AT TIME |

OF |

SENTENCING |

CATEGORIZED | Freq. Percent Cum.

< 20	10	18.87	18.87
21 thru 25	10	18.87	37.74
26 thru 30	14	26.42	64.15
31 thru 35	4	7.55	71.70
36 thru 40	2	3.77	75.47
41 thru 50	8	15.09	90.57
51 thru 60	3	5.66	96.23
> 61	2	3.77	100.00
Total	53	100.00	

. tab NEWEDUC if DISTRICT==42 & INTDUM==1

EDUCATION OF DEFENDANT	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----			
Less than H.S. graduate	20	37.74	37.74
H.S. graduate	21	39.62	77.36
Some college	11	20.75	98.11
College graduate	1	1.89	100.00
-----+-----			
Total	53	100.00	

. tab NEWRACE if DISTRICT==42 & INTDUM==1

RACE OF	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
DEFENDANT			
-----+-----			
White	8	15.09	15.09
Black	2	3.77	18.87
Hispanic	43	81.13	100.00
-----+-----			
Total	53	100.00	

. tab NUMDEPEN if DISTRICT==42 & INTDUM==1

NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS WHOM DEFENDANT	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
SUPPORTS			
-----+-----			

No dependents	21	39.62	39.62
1	11	20.75	60.38
2	10	18.87	79.25
3	7	13.21	92.45
4	1	1.89	94.34
5	2	3.77	98.11
6	1	1.89	100.00

Total	53	100.00	
-------	----	--------	--

. tab CITIZEN if DISTRICT==42 & INTDUM==1

NATURE OF DEFENDANT'S CITIZENSHIP	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
United States citizen	53	100.00	100.00
Total	53	100.00	

. tab MONSEX if DISTRICT==42 & INTDUM==1

DEFENDANT'S |

GENDER	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Male	26	49.06	49.06
Female	27	50.94	100.00
Total	53	100.00	

. tab TYPEMONEY if DISTRICT==42 & INTDUM==1

FINE/COST OF SUPERVISION OR RESTITUTION	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----			
No fine / cost of supervision, nor rest	41	77.36	77.36
Restitution ordered, no fine / cost of	4	7.55	84.91
Fine / cost of supervision, no restitut	7	13.21	98.11
Both fine / cost of supervision and res	1	1.89	100.00
-----+-----			
Total	53	100.00	

. tab CASETYPE if DISTRICT==42 & INTDUM==1

TYPE OF CASE	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----			
Felony	53	100.00	100.00
-----+-----			
Total	53	100.00	

. tab CRIMHIST if DISTRICT==42 & INTDUM==1

DOES DEFENDANT HAVE ANY CRIMINAL			
HISTORY	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----			
No criminal history	19	35.85	35.85
Yes, there is a criminal history	34	64.15	100.00

```
-----+-----
Total |      53  100.00
```

```
. tab OFFGUIDE if DISTRICT==42 & INTDUM==1
```

```
PRIMARY TYPE OF CRIME FOR |
```

```
THE CASE |  Freq.  Percent  Cum.
-----+-----
Child Pornography |      1   1.89   1.89
Drug Trafficking |     39  73.58  75.47
Fraud/Theft/Embezzlement |      2   3.77  79.25
Immigration |     11  20.75  100.00
```

```
-----+-----
Total |      53  100.00
```

```
. tab XCRHISSR if DISTRICT==42 & INTDUM==1
```

```
DEFENDANTS |
```

```
FINAL |
```

```
CRIMINAL |
```

```
HISTORY |
```

```
CATEGORY |  Freq.  Percent  Cum.
-----+-----
1 |     38  71.70  71.70
2 |      5   9.43  81.13
3 |      7  13.21  94.34
4 |      2   3.77  98.11
```

5 | 1 1.89 100.00

-----+-----

Total | 53 100.00

. tab XFOLSOR if DISTRICT==42 & INTDUM==1

FINAL |

OFFENSE |

LEVEL | Freq. Percent Cum.

-----+-----

6 | 1 1.89 1.89

8 | 2 3.77 5.66

10 | 6 11.32 16.98

11 | 4 7.55 24.53

12 | 1 1.89 26.42

13 | 3 5.66 32.08

17 | 1 1.89 33.96

19 | 1 1.89 35.85

20 | 1 1.89 37.74

23 | 6 11.32 49.06

24 | 4 7.55 56.60

25 | 3 5.66 62.26

26 | 4 7.55 69.81

27 | 11 20.75 90.57

28 | 2 3.77 94.34

29 | 3 5.66 100.00

-----+-----

Total | 53 100.00

. tab ZONE if DISTRICT==42 & INTDUM==1

SENTENCE |

TABLE GROUP | Freq. Percent Cum.

-----+-----

A | 3 5.66 5.66

B | 9 16.98 22.64

C | 4 7.55 30.19

D | 37 69.81 100.00

-----+-----

Total | 53 100.00