

ADDENDUM C

Select Cost Estimates for Activities Resulting from
New Jersey Criminal Justice Reform

My name is Daraius Irani and I am the Chief Economist of the Regional Economic Studies Institute. I have my Ph.D. from the University of California, Santa Barbara and I have been working as an economist for the last 22 years. My organization and I have completed well over 325 economic and fiscal studies in the last nineteen years. These studies range from tort reform, medical insurance for disabled workers, privatization of child support enforcement, competition in gas stations among the studies.

While we have not conducted an analysis of the proposed pretrial services for New York State, I believe our analysis for of the estimated expenses of establishing pretrial services in New Jersey will provide guidance to the New York, assuming New York's legislation is modelled closely to New Jersey's legislation. Just to give a comparison of scale, in 2015, there were about 280,000 arrests in NJ versus 478,000 arrests in NY in 2016.

For our analysis of New Jersey's proposed (now implemented) pre-trial services legislation, and through the use of current pretrial service statistics, RESI enumerated the potential cost to New Jersey based on three separate categories:

- **Start-up costs** consist of the spending necessary to launch the NJPSA. These costs include the hiring and training of staff, the purchasing of equipment and the furnishing of the workspace required.
- **Operating costs** were those incurred through the year-to-year functioning of the NJPSU. These costs included employee expenses, software licenses, facilities and upkeep, and programming provisions.
- **Indirect costs** quantify the potential expenses that would be incurred by the State as a result of the change in judicial practices as the bills mandate or as a result of actions by the NJPSU. These costs were collected from additional public defender and courtroom usage, and the failure to appear (FTA) and recidivism of released defendants. FTA and recidivism cost money to the state through rearrest costs and damages to the community. These costs can increase if levels pretrial misconduct are not properly managed through supervision and programming.

Figure 1: Cost Estimates by Expense Category

Expense	Cost Estimate
Start-Up Costs	\$16,591,360
Operating Costs	\$379,589,599
Indirect Costs	\$65,069,321

Source: RESI

As shown in Figure 1, RESI projected that NJPSU start-up costs would amount to approximately \$16.6 million; the annual operating cost of the NJPSU was estimated to be \$379.6 million; and the indirect cost to the state that would be induced by the bills could potentially reach at least \$65.1 million.

This cost projection was modeled off of the DCPSA program because it best reflects the legislation provided for the NJPSU, because it must provide for similar costs of living, and because it is widely regarded as the most effective pretrial release program. It is important to note that the NJPSU also has a provision that requires it to consider monetary release conditions only as a final resort when non-financial conditions will not reasonably assure the safety of the community and the appearance of the defendant in court. In comparison the DCPSA is to first consider monetary conditions before assigning DCPSA program release. Ultimately, this provides the potential for the NJPSU to experience even higher levels of program spending per arrest than the DCPSA.

RESI also considered the cost saving that would be generated by diverting pretrial defendants away from jail and prison due to release. Using figures from New Jersey's "Report of the Joint Committee on Criminal Justice," RESI found that decreasing the level of pretrial detention by 50 percent could save the New Jersey state budget approximately \$164 million dollars. However, there are several things to consider with this figure. First, the committee's assumption that approximately 50 percent of pretrial detainees are being held needlessly is very generous, because most populations see a total release rate of approximately 50 percent. Furthermore, with each release there is an increased change of FTA and recidivism, incurring additional costs against the state. Finally, still considering the \$164 million in potential savings, RESI projects that the annual operating costs of the NJPSU would still result in a net budget cost of more than \$215 million per year.

Figure 2: Potential Net Cost

Expense	Cost Estimate
Operating Costs	\$379,589,599
Pretrial Detainment Savings	\$164,250,000
Net Cost	\$215,339,599

Source: RESI

The NJPSU and associated legislation was designed to shorten the aggregate time-to-trial and, as a result, reduce the time defendants remain in pretrial detention. From streamlining the pretrial process in such a way, a goal of the bills is to save the State money on the pretrial defendants. However, several provisions from the bills will likely extend the time-to-trial and the associated costs, including:

- Changing the "initial appearance" phase from an informational court appearance into something that more closely resembles an adversarial hearing.
- Granting defendants the right to appeal the release decision made in aforementioned hearing.
- The use of non-monetary release conditions compared to monetary bonds, which can result in a substantial increase in the time-to-pretrial release of a defendant. This does not affect the overall time to trial, but affects the underlying source of cost (time in pretrial detention).

Time-to-trial is also affected by the judicial caseload. The additional appearances that will be necessary will have to be dispersed among an already overloaded judiciary.

The bills also establish the 21st Century Justice Improvement Fund, and grant the Supreme Court the power to increase statutory fees on filings and other matters, funds which are meant to then be distributed to several state judicial departments. However, considering the funding goals and the limit on additional fees (maximum of \$50 per instance), there would need to be approximately:

- 300,000 applicable crimes committed to meet the \$15 million dollar funding cap for the NJPSU
- 640,000 applicable crimes committed to meet the \$17 million funding cap for the e-court initiative
- 842,000 applicable crimes committed to meet the \$10.1 million funding cap for Legal Services of New Jersey.

The number of applicable crimes needed to meet the Legal Services cap is more than twice the number of arrests in 2012 (301,744) and would constitute the commission of an applicable crime by almost 1 of every 10 citizens of New Jersey. The funding of the later programs may become difficult depending on where the courts find it applicable to increase fees.

The bills are also likely to negatively impact the commercial bonding industry, and likewise hurt the New Jersey economy. If New Jersey enacts the NJPSU it will divert pretrial release traffic to non-financial conditional release, and away from commercial bondsman. The resulting loss in commercial bail usage will be manifested in the loss of commercial bail employees and eventually the closing of commercial bonding firms. RESI conducted an economic impact analysis using IMPLAN modeling software. For every 10 employees lost in the commercial bail bonds industry, New Jersey would:

- Lose an additional 7 jobs.
- Lose nearly \$2.1 million in output.
- Lose nearly \$0.6 million in wages.
- Resulting in a loss of approximately \$103,000 in tax revenues.

Some of these losses could possibly be offset by the effects of employment gains in the NJPSU; however, the resulting wages would come from the budget of the state government, rather than from the private sector. Spending and employment by commercial bonding firms created a positive net fiscal impact; when the private employment changes to public employment, the net fiscal impact on the state government will be substantially negative.

A review of pretrial research illustrated the importance of maintaining a highly effective pretrial justice process. The presence of supervision on non-monetary releases is highly important, as the level of pretrial misconduct is highly correlated with the presence of proper supervision over all defendants. This indicates the importance of maintaining high quality supervision for non-monetary releases. Other research also further reinforced the importance of rapid pretrial processing; as the length of pretrial detention was directly correlated with the likelihood of FTA and recidivism. Finally, research indicated that pretrial detention is directly correlated with the trial outcome and imprisonment. Though this correlation is often seen to be an injustice to detained defendants, it could also be an indication that the judiciary has substantial insight into correctly detaining those defendants who are likely to be guilty.

RESI found the net costs to the State of New Jersey of instituting Senate Bill No. 946 and Assembly Bill No. 1910 to be at least \$215,339,599 considering all potential savings. This cost could likely be higher if the NJPSU does not function quickly and effectively. Depending on the losses experienced by the commercial bail industry, the New Jersey State Government could also lose anywhere from \$100,000 to millions in tax revenue. Additionally, reductions in spending that stem from reductions in programming are likely to bring even greater costs in the form of FTA and recidivism. Considering the use of conservative figures throughout this report, RESI holds a \$215,339,599 cost to be a conservative estimate of the cost of Senate Bill No. 946, Assembly Bill No. 1910, and the NJPSU.

One area not fully discussed was the expense to the counties in New Jersey of implementing this legislation.

As a follow up on work done previously in New Jersey relating to economic analysis of criminal justice reforms, the Regional Economic Studies Institute (RESI) of Towson University has estimated the costs induced on the county governments of New Jersey as a result of the New Jersey Criminal Justice Reform (NJCJR). The costs were estimated for three categories of county level criminal and judicial activities that will be affected by the reform. These three categories include prosecutor staffing, sheriff staffing, and facility improvements.

The analysis was conducted using preliminary cost projections by pilot and non-pilot counties as reported in the *Criminal Justice Reform County Impact Statement 2016*, in conjunction with arrest data provided within the *Uniform Crime Report: State of New Jersey 2014*. Based on this data, RESI estimates that:

- Total county costs for the first year of implementation of NJCJR will amount to \$65,971,395.
- Subsequent years will incur an estimated cost of \$27,496,427 per year.
- Implementation will result in 404 additional staff at the county level.

Using estimates from a previous RESI analysis of state government costs in combination with the new county level estimates resulted in:

- State and county government estimated operating costs totaling to \$445,560,994.
- Adding estimated state level indirect costs to the total state and county operating costs results in a total yearly cost of \$510,630,315.

The county level estimates were calculated using only the available data from reporting counties and does not include any sources of secondary costs that may be associated with both staff and facility additions. These costs include but are not limited to:

- Ongoing costs such as maintenance and upkeep, depreciation, and utility costs.
- Secondary staff costs such as benefits and pensions, employee turnover, and training costs.
- The necessary county level support staff for new positions were not part of the cost estimate.

The county level costs estimates do not include other expenses that may be imposed upon the counties and include but are not limited to

- Additional costs imposed upon local police departments,
- Loss of forfeited bail bond revenue,
- Increased logistical demands arising from increased transport and detention hearing needs, and
- Costs that may result from potential increases in failure to appear and recidivism.
- Costs to the state government associated with the implementation of the NJCJR

We would conclude that our analysis only represents portion of the costs that the counties could be forced to bear when this bill is fully implemented. We conservatively estimate that the costs not calculated are about 60% to 80% of our estimated costs.

Using the finding from RESI's previous study, *Estimating the Cost of the Proposed New Jersey Pretrial Service Unit and the Accompanying Legislation*, an operating cost estimate for both the state and select county costs could be calculated.¹

- The previous study found that the yearly operating cost to the state government came to \$379,589,599.
- Adding this to the select county costs results in a total operating cost for both state and county governments of \$445,560,994

Additionally the previous study estimated indirect costs of the NJCJR, which included the costs of changing court procedures, adding public defender, and costs of failure to appear and recidivism.

- These indirect costs totaled to \$65,069,321
- Adding indirect costs to the total state and county operating costs results in a total yearly cost of \$510,630,315.

¹ Regional Economic Studies Institute, Towson University, "Estimating the Cost of the Proposed New Jersey Pretrial Service Unit and the Accompanying Legislation," 2014.

ADDENDUM B

Testimony of Daraius Irani, Ph.D., Towson University

January 26, 2018

Select Cost Estimates for Activities Resulting from New Jersey Criminal Justice Reform

Daraius Irani, Ph.D., Chief Economist
Zachary Jones, Associate

08/09/2016



TOWSON UNIVERSITY™
Regional Economic Studies Institute

Towson, Maryland 21252 | 410-704-3326 | www.towson.edu/resi

1.0 Executive Summary

1.1 County Costs

As a follow up on work done previously in New Jersey relating to economic analysis of criminal justice reforms, the Regional Economic Studies Institute (RESI) of Towson University has estimated the costs induced on the county governments of New Jersey as a result of the New Jersey Criminal Justice Reform (NJCJR). The costs were estimated for three categories of county level criminal and judicial activities that will be affected by the reform. These three categories include prosecutor staffing, sheriff staffing, and facility improvements.

The analysis was conducted using preliminary cost projections by pilot and non-pilot counties as reported in the *Criminal Justice Reform County Impact Statement 2016*, in conjunction with arrest data provided within the *Uniform Crime Report: State of New Jersey 2014*. Based on this data, RESI estimates that:

- Total county costs for the first year of implementation of NJCJR will amount to \$65,971,395.
- Subsequent years will incur an estimated cost of \$27,496,427 per year.
- Implementation will result in 404 additional staff at the county level.

Using estimates from a previous RESI analysis of state government costs in combination with the new county level estimates resulted in:

- State and county government estimated operating costs totaling to \$445,560,994.
- Adding estimated state level indirect costs to the total state and county operating costs results in a total yearly cost of \$510,630,315.

The county level estimates were calculated using only the available data from reporting counties and does not include any sources of secondary costs that may be associated with both staff and facility additions. These costs include but are not limited to:

- Ongoing costs such as maintenance and upkeep, depreciation, and utility costs.
- Secondary staff costs such as benefits and pensions, employee turnover, and training costs.
- The necessary county level support staff for new positions were not part of the cost estimate.

The county level costs estimates do not include other expenses that may be imposed upon the counties and include but are not limited to

- Additional costs imposed upon local police departments,
- Loss of forfeited bail bond revenue,
- Increased logistical demands arising from increased transport and detention hearing needs, and
- Costs that may result from potential increases in failure to appear and recidivism.

- Costs to the state government associated with the implementation of the NJCJR

We would conclude that our analysis only represents portion of the costs that the counties could be forced to bear when this bill is fully implemented. We conservatively estimate that the costs not calculated are about 60% to 80% of our estimated costs.

1.2 State and County Costs

Using the finding from RESI's previous study, *Estimating the Cost of the Proposed New Jersey Pretrial Service Unit and the Accompanying Legislation*, an operating cost estimate for both the state and select county costs could be calculated.¹

- The previous study found that the yearly operating cost to the state government came to \$379,589,599.
- Adding this to the select county costs results in a total operating cost for both state and county governments of \$445,560,994

Additionally the previous study estimated indirect costs of the NJCJR, which included the costs of changing court procedures, adding public defender, and costs of failure to appear and recidivism.

- These indirect costs totaled to \$65,069,321
- Adding indirect costs to the total state and county operating costs results in a total yearly cost of \$510,630,315.

¹ Regional Economic Studies Institute, Towson University, "Estimating the Cost of the Proposed New Jersey Pretrial Service Unit and the Accompanying Legislation," 2014.

2.0 Previous Findings

The scope of this study focuses solely on costs that may be incurred on the county level. However, RESI conducted a study in 2014, *Estimating the Cost of the Proposed New Jersey Pretrial Service Unit and the Accompanying Legislation*, that enumerated the potential costs of NJCJR at the state level. A summary of those findings can be found below.

2.1 Summary

Through the use of current pretrial service statistics, RESI enumerated the potential cost to the state of New Jersey based on three separate categories, as described below.

- **Start-up costs** consist of the spending necessary to launch the NJPSA. These costs include the hiring and training of staff, the purchasing of equipment, and the furnishing of the workspace required.
- **Operating costs** were those incurred through the year-to-year functioning of the NJPSU. These costs included employee expenses, software licenses, facilities and upkeep, and programming provisions.
- **Indirect costs** quantify the potential expenses that would be incurred by the State as a result of the change in judicial practices as the bills mandate or as a result of actions by the NJPSU. These costs were collected from additional public defender and courtroom usage, and the failure to appear (FTA) and recidivism of released defendants. FTA and recidivism cost money to the state through rearrest costs and damages to the community. These costs can increase if levels pretrial misconduct are not properly managed through supervision and programming.

The estimated costs for the implementation of the NJCJR for the about three categories can be found in **Table 1: Cost Estimates by Expense Category**.

Table 2: Cost Estimates by Expense Category

Expense	Cost Estimate
Start-Up Costs	\$16,591,360
Operating Costs	\$379,589,599
Indirect Costs	\$65,069,321

Source: RESI

3.0 County Cost Estimate

3.1 Scope of Analysis

In June of 2016, New Jersey Governor Chris Christie signed Executive Order 211 that called for an evaluation by the Attorney General on the potential costs, savings, and administrative challenges of implementing NJCJR. The evaluation will focus on specifically on "County Prosecutors' Offices, county jails, and local police departments."² RESI used available information on to enumerate 3 of the potential costs involved in the services listed above:

- Facility Improvements
- Additional Prosecutor Staff
- Additional Sheriff Staff

To estimate this portion of the cost of NJCJR on New Jersey counties, RESI utilized the existing cost estimates provided by New Jersey Counties. The most recent county cost estimates were found in the *Criminal Justice Reform County Impact Statement 2016* provided by the New Jersey Association of Counties.³ Cost projections for each county were reported with five cost variables: Court Facility Improvements, Additional Prosecutor Staff, Projected Prosecutor Staff Cost, Additional Sheriff Staff, and Projected Sheriff Staff Cost.

In conjunction with the county cost estimates, RESI used total county level adult arrest data from the *Uniform Crime Report State of New Jersey* as an indicator of pretrial service program participation levels.⁴ The use of arrest data ensured a consistent inter-county variable as a base for pretrial activity levels.

3.2 Methodology

Using the *Criminal Justice Reform County Impact Statement 2016* and the *Uniform Crime Report State of New Jersey*, RESI created an index for each cost variable in two steps. First, the average cost of additional staff and facilities per arrest was calculated for each county that reported.⁵ The counties' respective estimated costs per arrest were then conglomerated into a statewide average estimated cost per arrest.⁶

Extrapolating using the above index of average costs, RESI calculated the costs for the counties that did not report cost estimates to the New Jersey Association of Counties in the 2016 impact statement. **Figure 1: Cost Estimates by County** contains the results of the above calculations, as well as the cost projections reported by counties, and reflects the estimated total cost by county.

² New Jersey Governor Chris Christie, Executive Order 211, 2016

³ New Jersey Association Counties, "Criminal Justice Reform County Impact Statement 2016," 2016

⁴ State of New Jersey, Division of State Police, "Uniform Crime Report State of New Jersey 2014," 2015, 56-57

⁵ Appendix A: Figure 4

⁶ Appendix A: Figure 5

Select County Government Cost Estimates for Activities Resulting from New Jersey Criminal Justice Reform RESI of Towson University

Figure 1: Cost Estimates by County

County	Adult Arrests	Court Facility Improvements	Additional Prosecutor Staff	Projected Prosecutor Staff Cost	Additional Sheriff Staff	Projected Sheriff Staff Cost	Total Cost for County
Atlantic	12,247	\$1,733,802.45	14*	\$1,124,830.00*	7*	\$376,000.00*	\$3,234,632.45
Bergen	19,163	\$2,712,897.55	16	\$1,465,801.07	12	\$555,282.88	\$4,733,981.51
Burlington	18,992	\$2,688,689.16	5*	\$392,022.13**	4*	\$230,232.00*	\$3,310,943.29
Camden	25,396	\$900,000.00*	14*	\$680,000.00*	16	\$735,895.43	\$2,315,895.43
Cape May	6,842	\$100,000.00*	3*	\$225,000.00*	6*	\$175,000.00*	\$500,000.00*
Cumberland	8,088	\$3,345,000.00*	8*	\$747,000.00*	3*	\$100,000.00*	\$4,192,000.00*
Essex	29,867	\$4,228,258.17	25	\$2,284,562.99	19	\$865,450.81	\$7,378,271.97
Gloucester	13,126	\$1,858,242.10	6*	\$548,000.00*	5*	\$225,000.00*	\$2,631,242.10
Hudson	15,958	\$2,259,167.10	13*	\$990,285.00*	10	\$462,412.16	\$3,711,864.26
Hunterdon	2,438	\$345,146.60	2	\$186,485.57	2	\$70,645.50	\$602,277.67
Mercer	14,517	\$2,055,165.36	12	\$1,110,422.91	9	\$420,656.56	\$3,586,244.83
Middlesex	18,983	\$2,687,415.03	16	\$1,452,032.66	12	\$550,067.06	\$4,689,514.74
Monmouth	24,894	\$3,524,232.72	21	\$1,904,172.20	16	\$721,349.06	\$6,149,753.99
Morris	9,742	\$1,000,000.00*	15*	\$1,500,000.00*	5*	\$373,000.00*	\$2,873,000.00
Ocean	15,870	\$2,246,708.98	13	\$1,213,915.52	10	\$459,862.20	\$3,920,486.70
Passaic	14,451	\$2,045,821.77	12	\$1,105,374.49	14*	\$700,000.00*	\$3,851,196.26
Salem	4,021	\$569,251.22	3	\$307,571.16	3	\$116,515.81	\$993,338.19
Somerset	7,211	\$1,020,858.13	6	\$551,578.12	5	\$208,951.88	\$1,781,388.13
Sussex	3,237	\$458,260.68	5*	\$457,379.00*	2	\$93,797.98	\$1,009,437.66
Union	15,512	\$2,196,027.08	11*	\$705,500.00*	18*	\$731,862.00*	\$3,633,389.08
Warren	3,532	\$500,023.70	3	\$270,166.96	2	\$102,346.14	\$872,536.80
Total All Counties	284,087	\$38,474,967.78	225	\$19,222,099.78	179	\$8,274,327.49	\$65,971,395.04

* Indicates values reported by counties in *Criminal Justice Reform County Impact Statement 2016*

** See Appendix B – Burlington County Data Note

Source: RESI, State of New Jersey, New Jersey Association of Counties

4.0 Conclusion

RESI found total costs to the counties for the first year of implementation to be \$65,971,395. This figure includes the Court Facility Improvements, Projected Prosecutor Staff Cost, and Projected Sheriff Staff Cost cost variables. The total sustaining costs were estimated at \$27,496,427 per year. The sustaining costs included the Projected Prosecutor Staff Cost and Projected Sheriff Staff Cost cost variables, as RESI assumes that all of the Court Facility Improvements will be conducted only in the first year. Additionally, RESI estimates that the implementation will result in 404 additional staff at the county level.

However, RESI's cost estimates did not factor in numerous other costs that include but are not limited to:

- Ongoing costs such as maintenance and upkeep, depreciation, and utility costs.
- Secondary staff costs such as benefits and pensions, employee turnover, and training costs.
- The necessary county level support staff for new positions were not part of the cost estimate.
- Additional costs imposed upon local police departments,
- Loss of forfeited bail bond revenue,
- Increased logistical demands arising from increased transport and detention hearing needs, and
- Costs that may result from potential increases in recidivism.

We conservatively estimate that the costs not calculated are about 60% to 80% of our estimated costs.

Appendix A—Data Tables

Figure 2: Uniform Crime Report Adult Arrests by County

County	Number of Arrests
Atlantic	12,247
Bergen	19,163
Burlington	18,992
Camden	25,396
Cape May	6,842
Cumberland	8,088
Essex	29,867
Gloucester	13,126
Hudson	15,958
Hunterdon	2,438
Mercer	14,517
Middlesex	18,983
Monmouth	24,894
Morris	9,742
Ocean	15,870
Passaic	14,451
Salem	4,021
Somerset	7,211
Sussex	3,237
Union	15,512
Warren	3,532
Total All Counties	284,087

Source: State of New Jersey, Division of State Police

Select County Government Cost Estimates for Activities Resulting from New Jersey Criminal Justice Reform RESI of Towson University

Figure 3: Projected Costs by Reporting County

County	Court Facility Improvements	Additional Prosecutor Staff	Projected Prosecutor Staff Cost	Additional Sheriff Staff	Projected Sheriff Staff Cost
Atlantic	TBD	14	\$1,124,830.00	7	\$376,000.00
Burlington	TBD	5	TBD	4	\$230,232.00
Camden	\$900,000.00	14	\$680,000.00	TBD	TBD
Cape May	\$100,000.00	3	\$225,000.00	6	\$175,000.00
Cumberland	\$3,345,000.00	8	\$747,000.00	3	\$100,000.00
Gloucester	TBD	6	\$548,000.00	5	\$225,000.00
Hudson	TBD	13	\$990,285.00	TBD	TBD
Morris	\$1,000,000.00	15	\$1,500,000.00	5	\$373,000.00
Passaic	TBD	TBD	TBD	14	\$700,000.00
Sussex	TBD	5	\$457,379.00	TBD	TBD
Union	TBD	11	\$705,500.00	18	\$731,862.00

Source: New Jersey Association of Counties

Figure 4: Projected Costs per Adult Arrest by Reporting County

County	Adult Arrests	Court Facility Improvements	Additional Prosecutor Staff	Projected Prosecutor Staff Cost	Additional Sheriff Staff	Projected Sheriff Staff Cost
Atlantic	12,247	N/A	0.00114	\$91.84535	0.00057	\$30.70140
Burlington	18,992	N/A	0.00026	N/A	0.00021	\$12.12258
Camden	25,396	\$35.43865	0.00055	\$26.77587	N/A	N/A
Cape May	6,842	\$14.61561	0.00044	\$32.88512	0.00088	\$25.57732
Cumberland	8,088	\$413.57567	0.00099	\$92.35905	0.00037	\$12.36400
Gloucester	13,126	N/A	0.00046	\$41.74920	0.00038	\$17.14155
Hudson	15,958	N/A	0.00081	\$62.05571	N/A	N/A
Morris	9,742	\$102.64833	0.00154	\$153.97249	0.00051	\$38.28783
Passaic	14,451	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.00097	\$48.43955
Sussex	3,237	N/A	0.00154	\$141.29719	N/A	N/A
Union	15,512	N/A	0.00071	\$45.48092	0.00116	\$47.18038

Source: RESI

Figure 5: Average Projected Cost per Adult Arrest

	Court Facility Improvements	Additional Prosecutor Staff	Projected Prosecutor Staff Cost	Additional Sheriff Staff	Projected Sheriff Staff Cost
Average	\$141.56956	0.00085	\$76.49121	0.00063	\$28.97682

Source: RESI



Appendix B— Burlington County Data Note

As reported by the New Jersey Association of Counties, Burlington County provided a number of projected prosecutor staff without providing a projected prosecutor staff cost. This was a unique instance within the data wherein a projection for additional staff was provided without a projected cost. Burlington projected 5 additional staff. If RESI were to use the average per arrest cost to calculate an estimated staff cost for Burlington based solely on the number of arrest, the resulting cost would be \$1,452,721.09. This figure is disproportionately high compared to the projected additional staff. This is likely the result of the projected staff per arrest figure in Burlington County being significantly lower than the average of the other New Jersey Counties. In the interest of providing a more conservative figure, RESI instead used the average cost per prosecutor staff from the other reporting counties (\$78,404.43 per staff member) in conjunction with the 5 additional staff projection to produce a more conservative figure of \$392,022.13 in estimated prosecutor staff costs in Burlington County.