

---

**DETAILED COST-EFFECTIVENESS RESULTS**

---

This appendix provides the detailed derivation of this report's results. The plan of the appendix is first to review the key parameter estimates that determine the results and second to summarize the results, so that the objective of the derivations is clear. Then, finally, we will present the derivations in a series of overview equations and detailed calculation tables.

**KEY PARAMETERS**

The conclusions of this analysis are a consequence of the parameter estimates in Table B.1, which were obtained from the literature discussed in Chapter Three and in Table B.2. The first row of Table B.1 gives the proportion of the total youth cohort that each program can address. The smaller that proportion, the greater the targeting ratio (see row three of the table). Cost per program participant (row two) and the determinants of program effectiveness (rows four through seven) vary greatly across the programs.

**RESULTS**

The central results in this analysis are summarized in Tables B.3 and B.4. (These tables provide the plotting points for Figures 1, 2, and 3 in this report.) The results answer three interesting questions:

- How cost-effective are early-intervention crime-prevention programs compared with California's three-strikes law that reduces crime by increasing prison sanctions?

**Table B.1**  
**Assumptions in the Analysis of Early-Intervention Programs**

Assumption	Home Visit/ Day Care	Parent Training	Graduation Incentives	Delinquent Supervision
Percentage of cohort treatable by program	25	25	10	5
Cost per person treated	29400	3000	12520	10000
Targeting ratio: crime per person in treatment group vs. that in population cohort	2	2	3	4.5
Pilot prevention rate: percentage of treatment-group crime prevented by treatment in pilot program	50	60	70	10
Modifiers of pilot prevention rate:				
Percentage penalty due to scale-up	40	40	20	15
Additional % decay for juveniles	20	20	0	0
Additional % decay for adults	70	70	10	5

SOURCES: Costs per person treated and pilot program prevention rates from literature sources discussed in Chapter Three. Targeting ratio for graduation incentives program from Table B.2. The smaller targeting ratios estimated for home visits and parent training reflect the broader reach of those very early interventions, and the greater targeting ratio for delinquent supervision reflects that program's focus on persons who have already started criminal careers. The modifiers that shrink the pilot program prevention rate, and the percentage of a youth cohort that is potentially treatable by a full-scale program, are rough estimates consistent with the targeting ratio and with the closeness of program intervention to the start of criminal careers.

**Table B.2**  
**Targeting Ratio for Graduation-Incentives Program**

Item	Amount
Arrests per person during juvenile years in control group of QOP program	0.58
Juvenile arrests per year in California (000)	93.6
Size of California annual youth cohort (000)	481
Estimated arrests per person during juvenile years of California population	0.195
Targeting ratio of QOP program	2.97

SOURCES: Control group arrests in the graduation incentives program from the report on the Quantum Opportunity Program in Taggart (1995, p. 8). California juvenile arrests, in 1992, from Greenwood et al. (1994, Table D.5, p. 56). Size of California annual youth cohort (number of 0 to 17 year olds in 1993 divided by 18) from California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit.

**Table B.3**  
**Serious Crime Prevented per Million Program Dollars**

Age of Offender	California	Early-Intervention Program			
	Three-Strikes Sanctions	Home Visit/ Day Care	Parent Training	Graduation Incentives	Delinquent Supervision
Juvenile	0	6	91	82	22
Adult	61	5	67	176	50
All ages	61	11	157	258	72

SOURCES: California three-strikes estimate from Greenwood et al. (1994, p. 18). Note that the three-strikes law only affects adults and so has no effect on juvenile crime. Early-intervention program estimates from Table B.13.

**Table B.4**  
**Criminal Justice System (CJS) Cost Savings (\$ 000) per Million Program Dollars**

Status of CJS Law	Home Visit/ Day Care	Parent Training	Graduation Incentives	Delinquent Supervision
Without three-strikes law	16	233	631	179
With three-strikes law fully implemented	27	397	1078	306

SOURCE: Table B.16.

**Table B.5**  
**Characteristics of a Full-Scale Program for an Annual Cohort: California**

Item	California	Early Intervention Program			
	Three-Strikes Sanctions	Home Visit/ Day Care	Parent Training	Graduation Incentives	Delinquent Supervision
Percentage serious crime prevented	21.4	5.5	6.6	15.5	1.8
Annual program cost (\$ million)	5520	3155	361	568	241
Cost (\$ million) per 1% cut in crime	258	573	55	37	131

SOURCE: Estimates for early-intervention programs from Table B.17. Crime prevention by three strikes from Table B.18. Costs of three strikes from Greenwood et al. (1994, Table 4.2, p. 18).

- What savings in criminal-justice costs do the early-intervention programs generate?
- What proportion of overall crime would full-scale early-intervention programs prevent?

The results show that early intervention works best when it is neither too early nor too late. Neither home visits during infancy nor counseling for children who are already delinquents works as well as providing training to parents of preteens or graduation incentives to teenagers. Both the graduation incentives and parent-training programs provide crime reductions per million program dollars substantially greater than those provided by the three-strikes program. Moreover, the cost offsets due to savings in criminal-justice costs from fewer criminal careers are also substantial for those two programs. Finally, full-scale implementation of those two early-intervention programs accomplish crime reductions that, if added together, equal that of the three-strikes law, at a total cost that is 80 percent less than the cost of the three-strikes program.

### COST-EFFECTIVENESS

This analysis measures program effectiveness by reductions in “serious” crime, as defined by California’s Penal Code. About one-third of the FBI’s index crimes are serious by this definition (see Table B.6). Tables B.7 and B.8 provide the information necessary to estimate the crime rates for the populations treated by the different

**Table B.6**

**Index Crimes (000/year): California**

Age of Offender	Serious Crime	Other Index Crime	Total Index Crime
Juvenile	293	567	860
Adult	995	1557	2552
All ages	1288	2124	3412

SOURCES: Greenwood et al. (1994, Table D.5, p. 56). Primary source was FBI’s Uniform Crime Report for 1992, corrected for underreporting.

NOTES: “Serious crimes” are homicide, rape, robbery, assault, arson, and 60% of burglary, making “other index crimes” the remaining 40% of burglary, theft, and motor vehicle theft. The definitions are those in California’s Penal Code.

**Table B.7****Offender Status of Persons in Annual Cohort: California**

Item	Non-Offenders	Low-Rate Offenders	High-Rate Offenders	All Offenders	Total Population
Number (000)	375	85	21	106	481
Distribution (%)	77.96	17.67	4.37	22.04	100.00

SOURCES: Size of California youth cohort estimated as 1/18th of the 8.653 million people in California who were 0 to 17 years old in 1993. Members of the 1993 cohort initiating a criminal career estimated from the analysis in Greenwood et al. (1994, Table E.1, p. 67).

**Table B.8****Characteristics of Criminal Careers: California**

Item	Low-Rate Offenders	High-Rate Offenders
Input Data		
Active adult offenders on street (000)	797	195
Annual initiations of adult criminal careers (000)	85	21
Serious crime per active adult offender-year	0.24	4.13
Derived Estimates		
Adult street-years in criminal career <sup>a</sup>	9.38	9.29
Adult serious crimes per offender career <sup>b</sup>	2.25	38.35
Juvenile serious crimes per offender career <sup>c</sup>	0.66	11.29

SOURCES: Offenders in population, in 1993, from Greenwood et al. (1994, Table D.4, p. 55). Annual initiations from Table B.7. Annual offender crime rates from Greenwood et al. (1994, Table 4.1, p. 17).

<sup>a</sup>“Street-years” are the years that an offender is an active criminal (as opposed to having desisted, or to being incarcerated). They are estimated by dividing the offender population on the street by annual initiations.

<sup>b</sup>Annual offense rate times street-years.

<sup>c</sup>Adult serious crimes in an offender career times the ratio of juvenile to adult serious crimes from Table B.6.

early-intervention programs (see Table B.9). Then, multiplying those crime rates by crime-prevention rates yields the crime prevented by each program (see Table B.10).

**Table B.9**  
**Crime Rates by Treatment Group**

Type of Person	General Population	Treatment Group			Delinquent Supervision
		Home Visit/ Day Care	Parent Training	Graduation Incentives	
Distribution of Persons in Cohort by Offender Status (%)					
Nonoffender	77.96	55.93	55.93	33.89	0.83
Low-rate offender	17.67	35.34	35.34	53.01	79.52
High-rate offender	4.37	8.73	8.73	13.10	19.65
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Serious Crimes During Career of Average Person in Group					
Juvenile	0.61	1.22	1.22	1.83	2.75
Adult	2.07	4.14	4.14	6.22	9.32
Total	2.68	5.36	5.36	8.05	12.07

SOURCES: Tables B.1, B.7, and B.8.

NOTES: Percentages of low- and high-rate offenders in treatment groups equal the population percentages from Table B.7 times the targeting ratios from Table B.1. Multiplying the low- and high-rate offender percentages by the career crime rates from Table B.8 yields the estimated serious crimes during the career of the average person in a group.

**Table B.10**  
**Serious Crimes Prevented per Person Treated**

Age of Person	Home Visit/ Day Care	Parent Training	Graduation Incentives	Delinquent Supervision
Percentage of Treatment Group's Crime Prevented by Treatment				
Juveniles	24.0	28.8	56.0	8.5
Adults	7.2	8.6	50.4	8.1
Serious Crimes Prevented per Average Person Treated				
Juvenile	0.293	0.351	1.025	0.233
Adult	0.298	0.358	3.133	0.753
Total	0.591	0.709	4.158	0.986

SOURCES: Tables B.1 and B.9.

NOTES: Crime-prevention rates are the pilot program prevention rates from Table B.1 modified by the scale-up and juvenile and adult attenuation factors also in Table B.1. These factors account for full-scale programs rarely being as effective as small pilot programs, and for the tendency of program effects to decay with time since intervention. Multiplying the resultant effective prevention rates by the treatment group's number of career crimes per person, from Table B.9, gives the number of crimes prevented per program participant.

Finally, both program costs and crime-reduction benefits have to be discounted to the start of the intervention programs (see Tables B.11 and B.12) before being compared in Table B.13.

The following equation provides an overview of the estimated crimes prevented per program participant. The numerical examples present the calculation for the juvenile and adult portions of criminal careers as affected by the graduation-incentives program.

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{(Crimes over career per average person in population cohort)} \\ & \times \text{(targeting ratio)} \\ & \times \text{(prevention rate)} \\ & \times \text{(discount factor)} \\ & = \text{NPV serious crimes prevented per program participant.} \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Graduation incentives, juvenile: } (0.61)(3)(0.560)(0.94) = 0.97$$

$$\text{Graduation incentives, adult: } (2.07)(3)(0.504)(0.66) = 2.08.$$

The product of the first two factors in the equation (obtained from Tables B.9 and B.1) is the crimes per average person in the program cohort. Multiplying by the remaining factors (obtained from Tables B.10 and B.12) yields the number of those cohort crimes that are pre-

**Table B.11**  
**Discounted Program Cost per Participant**

Cohort Year	Home Visit/ Day Care	Parent Training	Graduation Incentives	Delinquent Supervision
1	2700	3000	3130	10000
2	2700		3130	0
3	6000	0	3130	0
4	6000	0	3130	0
5	6000	0	0	0
6	6000	0	0	0
Sum	29400	3000	12520	10000
NPV	26238	3000	11816	10000

SOURCE: Table B.1, annual discount rate used to compute net present value is 4%.

NOTES: For distribution of costs by year, see "Program Cost" in Chapter Three.

**Table B.12**  
**Discounted Serious Crimes Prevented per Participant**

Cohort Year	Home Visit/ Day Care	Parent Training	Graduation Incentives	Delinquent Supervision
Serious Crimes Prevented by Cohort Year				
1	0.000	0.000	0.256	0.058
2	0.000	0.000	0.256	0.058
3	0.000	0.000	0.256	0.058
4	0.000	0.000	0.256	0.058
5	0.000	0.000	0.335	0.080
6	0.000	0.088	0.301	0.072
7	0.000	0.088	0.271	0.065
8	0.000	0.088	0.244	0.059
9	0.000	0.088	0.220	0.053
10	0.000	0.040	0.198	0.048
11	0.000	0.036	0.178	0.043
12	0.000	0.033	0.160	0.038
13	0.000	0.029	0.144	0.035
14	0.073	0.026	0.130	0.031
15	0.073	0.024	0.117	0.028
16	0.073	0.021	0.105	0.025
17	0.073	0.019	0.095	0.023
18	0.040	0.017	0.085	0.020
19	0.036	0.016	0.077	0.018
20	0.032	0.014	0.069	0.017
21	0.029	0.013	0.062	0.015
22	0.026	0.011	0.056	0.013
23	0.024	0.010	0.050	0.012
24	0.021	0.009	0.045	0.011
25	0.019	0.008	0.041	0.010
26	0.017	0.007	0.037	0.009
27	0.015	0.007	0.033	0.008
28	0.014	0.006	0.030	0.007
29	0.013	0.005	0.027	0.006
30	0.011	0.005	0.024	0.006
Sum of Serious Crimes Prevented per Participant				
Juvenile	0.293	0.351	1.025	0.233
Adult	0.298	0.358	3.133	0.753
Total	0.591	0.709	4.158	0.986
NPV of Serious Crimes Prevented per Participant				
Juvenile	0.166	0.273	0.967	0.220
Adult	0.129	0.200	2.077	0.499
Total	0.295	0.472	3.045	0.719

SOURCE: Table B.10; annual discount rate used to compute net present value is 4%.

NOTES: Juvenile crime spread evenly over participant ages 14 through 17. Adult crime spread over years from participant age 18 through cohort year 30, with a 10% per year desistance factor. Treatment starts at participant age 1 year for home visits, 9 years for parent training, and 14 years for the graduation incentives and delinquent-supervision programs.

**Table B.13**  
**Serious Crimes Prevented per Million Program Dollars**

Item	Home Visit/ Day Care	Parent Training	Graduation Incentives	Delinquent Supervision
NPV Cost per Average Person Treated				
Cost	26238	3000	11816	10000
NPV Serious Crimes Prevented per Average Person Treated				
Juvenile serious crime	0.166	0.273	0.967	0.220
Adult serious crime	0.129	0.200	2.077	0.499
All serious crime	0.295	0.472	3.045	0.719
Serious Crime Prevented per Million Program Dollars				
Juvenile serious crime	6	91	82	22
Adult serious crime	5	67	176	50
All serious crime	11	157	258	72

SOURCES: Tables B.11 and B. 12.

NOTES: Discounted costs come from Table B.11. Discounted crime prevented comes from Table B.12.

vented by the program and then expresses that result as the present value as of the start of the intervention program.

The total serious crime prevented per average participant in the graduation-incentives program, 3.05, is the sum of the crimes prevented during the juvenile and adult years. Dividing that total by the \$11,800 cost per participant (as of the start of the intervention, see Table B.11), produces the 258 serious crimes prevented per million program dollars that is reported in Table B.13.

### **CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM COST SAVINGS**

By preventing some criminal careers, the early-intervention programs would save criminal-justice-system money. Fewer criminals would lead to fewer crimes, arrests, convictions, and imprisonment. Those reductions in criminal-justice system (CJS) activity generate

cost savings that are offsets to the direct costs of the early-intervention programs.<sup>1</sup>

The model of the criminal-justice system developed for the analysis in Greenwood et al. (1994) depends on the realization that criminal-justice activity per adult<sup>2</sup> criminal career varies greatly with the offender (see Table B.14). Low- and high-rate offenders are defined in that analysis to divide the crime-rate distribution of imprisoned criminals in halves. The differential CJS activity leads to the differential CJS costs of criminal careers reported in Table B.15.

**Table B.14**

**Adult Criminal Justice System Sanctions per Criminal Career: California**

Sanction	Low-Rate Offender	High-Rate Offender	Average Offender
Without Three-Strikes Law			
Arrests	2.11	5.71	2.82
Years in jail	0.34	1.04	0.48
Years in prison	0.31	2.07	0.66
Total years incarcerated	0.64	3.11	1.13
With Three-Strikes Law Fully Implemented			
Arrests	2.07	4.21	2.50
Years in jail	0.33	0.82	0.43
Years in prison	0.53	4.91	1.40
Total years incarcerated	0.86	5.72	1.83

SOURCES: Runs of the California criminal justice model described in Greenwood et al. (1994). The model was run varying the number of low- and high-rate offenders starting adult criminal careers in year 1 of the 25-year simulation to find the CJS effects per low- and high-rate offender career.

<sup>1</sup>How those cost savings are used is a separate issue. They might be used to help pay for the early-intervention programs. Alternatively, they might be spent to increase the prison sentences for the criminals whose careers are not prevented by the early-intervention programs. The latter could happen if actual prison sentences served are currently being truncated due to prison congestion and would get longer if the inflow of new prisoners was reduced.

<sup>2</sup>The model in Greenwood et al. (1994) includes only the adult portion of criminal careers, because only adults are affected by California's three-strikes law. Consequently, our estimate of CJS cost savings from early-intervention programs is an underestimate due to the omission of savings in the juvenile-justice system.

**Table B.15**  
**Adult Criminal Justice System Costs per Criminal Career**

Cost Component	Low-Rate Offender	High-Rate Offender	Average Offender
Without Three-Strikes Law			
Arrest and adjudication	4284	11713	5756
Jail	3384	10407	4776
Prison	7736	53583	16819
Total	15405	75703	27350
With Three-Strikes Law Fully Implemented			
Arrest and adjudication	4213	8733	5108
Jail	3348	8161	4301
Prison	14287	130441	37299
Total	21847	147335	46708

SOURCES: Runs of the California criminal justice model described in Greenwood et al. (1994). The model was run varying the number of low- and high-rate offenders starting adult criminal careers in year 1 of the 25-year simulation to find the CJS effects per low- and high-rate offender career.

NOTES: Costs in the analysis are in 1993 dollars, and the total CJS cost over a criminal career is given as the present value at the start of an adult criminal career using a 4% annual discount rate. Arrest and adjudication costs include police costs to accomplish the arrest and court costs (through trial if necessary) to process the arrest. Jail and prison costs include both operating and capital costs.

Applying these cost estimates to the number of low- and high-rate criminal careers prevented by early-intervention programs generates the cost-saving estimates in Table B.16.

The cost-savings calculation is summarized in the following equation. Once again, the numerical example is for the graduation-incentives program.

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (\text{Adult criminal careers prevented per million dollars}) \\
 & \times (\text{CJS cost, \$000, of an adult criminal career}) \\
 & \times (\text{discount factor}) \\
 & = \text{NPV CJS cost savings (\$000) per million program dollars.}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Graduation incentives, low-rate offenders: } (22.6)(15.4)(0.82) = 284$$

$$\text{Graduation incentives, high-rate offenders: } (5.6)(75.7)(0.82) = 347.$$

**Table B.16**  
**Adult Criminal-Justice System Cost Savings per**  
**000 Program Dollars**

Item	Home Visit/ Day Care	Parent Training	Graduation Incentives	Delinquent Supervision
Adult Criminal Careers Prevented per Million Program Dollars				
Low-rate offender	0.97	10.18	22.61	6.42
High-rate offender	0.24	2.51	5.59	1.59
Total offenders	1.21	12.69	28.20	8.01
Adult CJS Costs (\$ 000) Prevented per Million Program Dollars: NPV at Start of Adult Criminal Career				
Without three-strikes law	33	347	771	219
With three-strikes law	56	593	1317	374
Adult CJS Costs (\$ Million) Prevented per Million Program Dollars: NPV at Start of Cohort Treatment				
Without three-strikes law	16	233	631	179
With three-strikes law	27	397	1078	306

SOURCES: Tables B.9, B.10, B.13, and B.15.

NOTES: The percentages of a cohort that are low- and high-rate offenders can be thought of as the numbers of low- and high-rate criminal careers per person in a treatment cohort. Multiplying those percentages, from Table B.9, by the prevention rate, from Table B.10, and dividing by program cost per program participant, from Table B.13, gives criminal careers prevented per program dollar (top panel of table). Multiplying by CJS costs per criminal career, from Table B.15, gives CJS costs saved per program dollar, in present value as of the start of an adult criminal career (middle panel of table). Discounting those costs, respectively, to 18, 10, 5, and 5 years earlier expresses the cost savings as the present value as of the start of cohort treatment (bottom panel of table).

The total cost savings, \$631,000 per million program dollars, is the sum of the savings from the low- and high-rate criminal careers prevented. Note that this is the CJS savings that the graduation-incentives program would generate without the three-strikes law. If the three-strikes law is fully implemented (thereby causing longer prison sentences and hence more prison costs per criminal career), then the CJS savings from the crime-prevention program would be even larger (see Table B.16).

## FULL-SCALE PROGRAMS

It is possible for a crime-control program to be very cost-effective and yet still not be very useful in combating crime. This happens if the program, even at maximum size, can attack only a very small part of the crime problem. Tables B.17 and B.18 address this issue by showing what full-scale early-intervention programs could accomplish (Table B.17) and comparing it with what a fully implemented three-strikes program would accomplish (Table B.18).

The calculation of crime prevented by full-scale early-intervention programs is summarized in the following equation. The numerical example is for the graduation-incentives program.

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{(Annual cohort size)} \\ & \times \text{(proportion treatable by a full-scale program)} \\ & \times \text{(serious crimes in career)} \\ & \times \text{(prevention rate)} \\ & = \text{serious crimes prevented annually by a full-scale program.} \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Graduation incentives, juvenile: } (481)(0.10)(1.83)(0.560) = 49$$

$$\text{Graduation incentives, adult: } (481)(0.10)(6.22)(0.504) = 151.$$

The sources of the factors in this equation are, respectively, Tables B.7, B.1, B.9, and B.10. The total serious crime prevented in an annual youth cohort, 200, is the sum of that prevented in the juvenile and adult portions of criminal careers. This is a 15.5 percent reduction from the amount of crime the cohort would generate if there were no graduation incentives program (see Table B.17).

**Table B.17**  
**Characteristics of Full-Scale Program for an Annual Cohort: California**

Item	General Population	Treatment Group			
		Home Visit/ Day Care	Parent Training	Graduation Incentives	Delinquent Supervision
Size of Full-Scale Annual Cohort					
Cohort size (000)	481	120	120	48	24
Serious Crimes from Career of Full-Scale Annual Cohort					
Juvenile serious crime (000)	293	147	147	88	66
Adult serious crime (000)	997	498	498	299	224
Total serious crime (000)	1290	645	645	387	290
% of serious crime in population	100.0	50.0	50.0	30.0	22.5
Serious Crimes Prevented by Full-Scale Treatment of Annual Cohort					
Juvenile serious crime (000)	NA	35	42	49	6
Adult serious crime (000)	NA	36	43	151	18
Total serious crime (000)	NA	71	85	200	24
% of serious crime in population	NA	5.5	6.6	15.5	1.8
Cost of Full-Scale Treatment of Annual Cohort					
Cost of treating cohort (\$ million)	NA	3155	361	568	241
Cost (\$ million) per 1% cut in crime	NA	573	55	37	131

SOURCES: Tables B.1, B.7, B.9, B.10, and B.11.

NOTES: Total cohort population in California, from Table B.7, times proportion treatable in a full-scale program, from Table B.1, gives the size of a full-scale program in California. Multiplying by serious crime in offender careers, from Table B.9, gives the crimes that would be committed by participants in a full-scale program if there were no treatment. Finally, multiplying by the prevention rates in Table B.10 yields the crimes prevented by a full-scale program. Dividing by the 1,290,000 crimes in the total cohort converts the result into the proportion of crimes that would be prevented by a full-scale program. The cost per program participant, from Table B.11, times cohort size gives the cost of a full-scale program. Note that in this table program costs are discounted to the start of treatment, as usual in this analysis. The accounts of crimes from criminal careers, however, are not discounted. Rather, they are the undiscounted totals from cohort careers. This is not a problem because, since neither the total crime from the cohort nor the crime prevented by a program is discounted, the percentage reduction in crime achieved by the full-scale program is correctly estimated.

**Table B.18**  
**Serious Crime in California:**  
**Annual Average (000), 1994–2018**

Type of Offender	Previous Law	Three-Strikes Law	Change	Percentage Change
Juvenile	360	360	0	0.0
Adult	1219	881	-338	-27.7
Total	1579	1241	-338	-21.4

SOURCE: Greenwood et al. (1994).

NOTES: Reduction in adult serious crime from Greenwood et al. (1994, Table 4.2, p. 18). "Annual average" is the annualized value of 25 projection years using a 4% discount rate. Juvenile crime under previous law estimated from ratios of juvenile to adult crime from Greenwood et al. (1994, Table D.5, p. 56) allocated to California's definition of serious crime using Greenwood et al. (1994, Table B.1, p. 46). Juvenile crime under the three-strikes law is the same as under the previous law because three-strikes sanctions affect only adults.