

I. Criminal Justice Data Sources and Formatting for Visualization

The criminal justice data used in this visualization are all publicly available data requested from Washington government and law enforcement agencies. Only criminal enforcement activity related to adults eighteen and older is considered. This section sets out the source of each type of data, as well as a discussion of how it should be interpreted, including any known weaknesses in the data.

Arrests

Arrest data were obtained from the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC) via a public records request. WASPC data are collected monthly from law enforcement agencies participating in the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program. These data includes the total number of persons, 18 and older, arrested, cited, or summoned to appear in a court of law, for which a marijuana crime was recorded as the most serious offense leading to their arrest. Marijuana arrests are recorded as arising either from possession or sale of marijuana (which would include possession with intent to sell, as well as manufacture or delivery).

The data provided by WASPC identify the law enforcement agency responsible for carrying out the arrest, which allows the county in which the arrest occurred to be identified, with the exception of arrests made by the Washington State Patrol. These arrests are included in the statewide totals, but because they do not identify the location at which each arrest took place, they are not included in the county-level data.

WASPC relies on individual law enforcement agencies to report the information used to generate their data. Although the majority of police agencies in Washington participate, a number of the agencies do not, or do not participate fully. In its 2010 report on Crime in Washington, WASPC identified 46 police agencies that either provided no data, or provided incomplete data. (see WASPC, 2010, page 30). For this reason, the number of arrests reported is almost certainly less than the number that actually occurred.

Another weakness in the data is that arrests are recorded hierarchically, with only the most serious crime being reported. Regardless of the number of crimes committed at one time, only one charge is listed. It is likely that many arrests occurred in which marijuana crimes were involved, but that do not appear in these data because the person arrested was also charged with a more serious crime. For example, if a person was arrested for a violent crime like assault, and was found to be in possession of marijuana, the arrest would only list "assault" as the offense, even if the person were later convicted of marijuana possession as a result of the incident. Therefore, these figures underestimate the number of arrests in which marijuana is involved.

This dataset also excludes a number of arrests related to drug paraphernalia for which the arrest report does not specify which drug or drugs are involved, making it impossible to tell whether a marijuana crime was the

¹ The calculations and methodology for the ACLU of Washington - Marijuana Law Enforcement Costs Data Visualization were produced by Rachel Stoermer, JD, MPA, in connection with her Master's Degree Project titled "Marijuana Law Enforcement In Washington State, 2001-2010, and its Cost to Washington Citizens", submitted and approved in June 2012. The data visualization was created by the ACLU of Washington.

basis of the arrest. For example, someone may get arrested for possession of a used pipe that is believed to be illicit paraphernalia, but it will not be known whether the pipe contains marijuana or cocaine residue. As a result, it is likely that the WASPC arrest data underestimates the actual number of marijuana arrests.

In addition to excluding some marijuana arrests, these data probably contains arrests that would have been made even if marijuana were not involved (or marijuana was not prohibited). If the person arrested committed another less serious offense at the same time, such as driving with a suspended license, they would likely still have been arrested. Because of the method of reporting used, it is impossible to say exactly how many of these arrests would have been made for another cause if marijuana were not involved.

Because of these limitations, the arrest figures included in the visualization should be viewed as an estimate of the number of people arrested for marijuana crimes, but it should not necessarily be interpreted as the number of arrests that would have been avoided if marijuana were legalized. This distinction will be discussed further in the section below regarding cost estimates.

Filings

This visualization also includes data related to court filings, which were provided in response to a public records request to the Washington State Administrative Office of the Courts. Each filing represents the initiation of a case, in which the facts of a case are formally submitted to the court, and identifies the law that the defendant is charged with violating. Each criminal defendant has a separate filing even if they are involved in the same incident. Also, a separate charge is filed for each law that the defendant is alleged to have broken, so a single defendant may have multiple filings for the same incident.

The data obtained from the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) identified each filing by a charge code, which is associated with the criminal provision that the defendant was accused of violating. Due to the large number of charge codes used in the AOC system, the code manual provided by the AOC was used to identify filings related to marijuana. A subtotal for each county's marijuana filings was created for this visualization.

One of the limitations of these data is that the law identified is sometimes related to drugs, but does not differentiate between types of drugs involved. For example, many filings show the charge as simply "Violation of the Uniform Controlled Substance Act" or "Drug Paraphernalia," and do not indicate whether marijuana was involved, or if the defendant is accused of being involved with some other drug, like cocaine or methamphetamine. This is particularly true for felony cases, while most misdemeanor marijuana possession cases are charged under a different statute, and therefore can be more easily identified as a marijuana charge.

Because there is no reliable way to distinguish whether felony drug filings relate to marijuana, all filings that fail to specify the drug involved have been excluded from the estimates used to generate this visualization. This means that the data excludes many felony marijuana filings, and likely underestimates the total number of marijuana cases.

It is possible to get a very general sense of how many felonies are missing from this data set from information provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts in its fiscal note for House Bill 1550 (a marijuana legalization bill proposed in the 2011-2012 legislative session). In the fiscal note, the AOC estimated that

there were a total of 9908 filings for marijuana cases in 2010, of which 670 were felony cases, and 9308 were misdemeanor cases. Assuming this to be a typical ratio between felony and misdemeanor cases, the number of felony cases that are left out of this data set is not insignificant, but also not so large that its absence makes the remaining data not worth examining.

Convictions

The data used in this visualization showing the number of people convicted of marijuana crimes also come from the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), and have many of the same weaknesses as the filing data discussed above.

Many felony drug offenses are categorized simply as violations of the Uniform Controlled Substance Act, or another violation that does not specify the drug involved, so it is impossible to tell how many of them are marijuana-only crimes. As with filings, this report includes only the convictions that were explicitly reported as resulting from marijuana crimes. This excludes many felony marijuana convictions; therefore the visualization likely underestimates of the actual number of marijuana convictions.

It should also be noted that a defendant can receive more than one conviction for a single incident, such as possessing marijuana while driving with a suspended license, so the number of convictions is not necessarily equal to the number of people, or to the number of trials that are conducted to result in those convictions.

Incarceration and Probation

The conviction data available for this visualization cannot differentiate between felony marijuana cases and felonies involving other drugs, due to the issues described in the case filing section above. So, only the penalties for misdemeanor cases are used. These cases can result in a maximum sentence of 90 days, to be served in a local jail facility. A judge is responsible for sentencing, and may elect to impose a shorter sentence or to impose probation in addition to jail time (Washington law requires at least 24 hours of the sentence be served in jail). In some cases the jail may release people without serving their full sentence, in which case they may be placed under supervision.

Unfortunately, there is no readily accessible data source showing exactly how many days of jail or probation time were ordered for marijuana offenders, or how many of them are actually served. Many jails use a system called the Jail Booking Reporting System (JBRS), which is overseen by WASPC and operated by a private company called Appriss, Inc. WASPC recently made some of the data in this system available to the ACLU-WA in response to a public records request, but it appears that individual jails use different conventions in entering data, resulting in a large amount of ambiguity and uncertainty in the data set. As a result, the JBRS data was not used in generating this visualization.

Instead, the visualization uses figures from the Local Government Fiscal Note Program (within the Washington State Department of Commerce) to estimate the amount of jail and probation/parole time for marijuana cases. This method uses a 2009 estimate provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts, indicating that the average jail sentence for possession of marijuana of less than 40 grams was 82.7 days, with all but 4.4 days suspended, to estimate the total number of jail days related to marijuana convictions. For the

remaining 78.3 days the average misdemeanor would be on probation, under what is known as “local supervision.”

This estimate is not entirely satisfactory, in that it does not reflect changes that may have occurred to sentencing practices over time, and does not reflect any regional variation in sentencing. It would not be surprising if people convicted of marijuana crimes in different counties had different average sentence lengths, or different rates of jail time vs. probation.

However, in the absence of any more reliable method, these figures are used to estimate the number of days of jail time and probation time that were served based on the number of recorded convictions for misdemeanor possession of marijuana.

II. Cost Estimation

The state incurs substantial cost in connection with each step of the criminal justice process described above. The visualization attempts to estimate the costs of criminal justice activities for marijuana crimes as accurately as possible based on the data available, but in doing so some assumptions had to be made, which are discussed in detail below. Before presenting the cost estimates, there are a few concepts that are important to note:

Marginal vs. Average Costs

In estimating costs, state agencies frequently use the average cost per unit of whatever is being measured, which may be arrests, days of jail time, etc. (see, for example, the Fiscal Note to 2011 House Bill 1550). While this is not an unreasonable method, it is more accurate to use marginal costs when that information is available. Unlike average cost, which is simply the total cost divided by the number of units, marginal cost is the amount by which cost would increase or decrease with a one unit change.

The difference between marginal and average costs can be very significant, particularly when the activity being measured includes a lot of costs related to facilities. For example, if a jail increased its inmate population from 100 to 110 inmates, it would immediately need 10% more food, but it would probably not need 10% more electricity. The cost to operate the jail would increase with those new inmates, but not by a full 10%. (For more information about the use of marginal costs in conducting benefit cost analyses in the criminal justice sector, see the Cost Benefit Knowledge Bank for Criminal Justice at <http://cbkb.org/toolkit/marginal-costs/>).

Unfortunately, marginal costs are much more difficult to calculate than average costs, as they involve a deeper analysis of spending and service delivery over time. They also require some decisions to be made about how immediate a cost must be in order to be considered a marginal cost. For instance, in the example noted above with an increase in the number of prisoners in a jail, the jail might not feel it needed to hire an additional corrections officer until the population increased to 120 inmates. This additional officer would not be needed if the population of the jail had not increased, but the expense would not occur immediately with each new inmate.

The Washington State Institute for Public Policy (“WSIPP”), which produced several of the marginal cost estimates used in this report, uses what they call the “longer-run” marginal cost, which estimates the additional cost that would be incurred in connection with a one unit increase in the relevant activity (e.g. one more arrest, or one more person incarcerated for one year), including both the immediate increases for items like food, and the slightly delayed increases like hiring of additional staff (Lee et al, 2012). Their estimates exclude the cost of capital (e.g. building new jail facilities), which are set out as a separate cost in their models. Where their estimates have been used, the analysis for this visualization does not add the cost of capital, on the assumption that the number facilities like police stations and courts built are not meaningfully impacted by marijuana crimes.

In several cases for this visualization it was not possible to locate any reliable estimates of marginal costs. In these cases, discounted average figures are used, as noted in the discussion below.

Geographic Cost Variability

It is reasonable to assume that some criminal justice costs are higher in some parts of the state than they are in others. For example, salaries may be higher in parts of the state where the cost of living is higher, or transportation costs might be higher in rural areas where criminal justice personnel need to travel larger distances to reach their facilities. For purposes of this visualization it was not possible to obtain local cost data for a sufficient number of areas to address this issue. As a result, state estimates are used.

Rising Costs of Criminal Justice

WSIPP notes that most of the criminal justice costs it reviewed have been rising faster than inflation (Lee, et al, 2012, Exhibit D2). For example, average adult jail operating costs rose about 2.2% per year in real terms from 1993 to 2008. Estimates taken from WSIPP’s research have been adjusted for each year to reflect the rate of real (inflation-adjusted) cost. Cost estimates obtained from other sources for which a real growth rate was not estimated, like the survey data collected for the Local Government Fiscal Notes, are assumed to be constant over time.

Inflation

All of the estimates presented here are in 2012 dollars. Where estimates generated in other years are used (or using another year’s dollar value), the 2012 value has been determined using the United States Consumer Price Index calculator, as published by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics (http://www.bls.gov/data/inflation_calculator.htm).

Police Costs

The estimate of the cost of police activity used in this visualization, measured on a per arrest basis, is taken from the WSIPP's 2012 report on its Benefit-Cost analysis tool (Lee, et al, 2012, Technical Appendix D2). They performed a series of analyses on panel data from each of Washington's 39 counties from 2001 to 2007, and estimated that the marginal cost per arrest was \$670 in 2009 dollars, with a real escalation rate of 0.027. By applying this escalation rate, and converting all figures to 2012 dollars, the following estimates of the marginal cost per arrest were generated:

2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
\$560	\$575	\$591	\$608	\$624	\$642	\$660	\$678	\$697	\$716	\$735

Table 1: Estimated Marginal Costs of Police Service per Arrest, in 2012 Dollars

As discussed above, the estimated number of arrests includes some arrests that would have occurred even if the suspect had not been charged with a marijuana crime. Unfortunately, completely accurate data is not available to determine how many of these cases exist due to the hierarchical reporting method for arrests. As a result, the visualization assumes that all arrests would have occurred regardless of other crimes being committed. This assumption is justified in light of the fact that the visualization does not take into account arrests for drug paraphernalia cases, a large percentage of which are likely for marijuana. For reference purposes, there were 8,625 arrests for drug paraphernalia in 2008 (Fiscal Note for HB 1550).

Courts, Prosecution, and Public Defense

The next phase of the criminal justice system in which public costs are incurred is the court process. This includes costs for the court system itself (judges, bailiffs, etc.), for prosecution, which is typically the responsibility of the City Attorney or County Prosecuting Attorney, and, in a majority of cases, for public defense, which is typically funded by the county.

The estimates of the cost of the court system for this visualization are based on data from the Administrative Office of the Court, as released in the fiscal note they prepared for House Bill 1550, for the 2011-2012 legislative session, a measure that would have legalized marijuana for adult consumption.

The estimates used for the cost of prosecution and public defense are based on figures generated by the Local Government Fiscal Note Program, which is housed in the Washington State Department of Commerce. The purpose of the program is to provide objective estimates of the financial impact of proposed state legislation on counties, cities, and special districts.

Estimates from the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) are not used for these costs, because their cost estimates for the judicial process exclude any estimates for District and Municipal Courts, where misdemeanor cases are heard. WSIPP's estimates also exclude the cost of public defense (also known as indigent defense) because they did not have sufficient data to reliably calculate a marginal cost.

As with arrests, there are people who had charges filed against them for marijuana crimes, and also had charges for other offenses that were part of the same incident. It seems reasonable to assume that in situations where multiple charges are filed against the same individual for the same incident, the marginal cost

of the additional charges will be much lower. The amount of time spent by court officers, prosecutors, and defense attorneys, almost certainly does not double if a second charge is filed for the same incident. Under ideal circumstances, the cost estimation for court procedures would be adjusted downward to reflect that some individuals who would still have been charged with other crimes, causing the state to incur some of the same costs.

However, as mentioned above, many filings for marijuana crimes were not captured in our data set because of the way charges are described in the Administrative Office of the Courts' data (i.e. not identifying the particular controlled substance involved). For this reason, it would be ideal to adjust the cost estimation for court procedures upward to reflect the number of cases that were not captured in our data set.

Unfortunately it was not possible to obtain sufficient data to make reasonable adjustments based on either of the above factors. Since they would produce conflicting effects upon the overall estimate, no adjustments were made for either of them, in the hope that they will balance out in the final analysis.

Courts

In providing an estimate of the amount of cost savings that could be expected if marijuana were legalized, the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) did not explicitly set out the cost of each case—rather, it identified the expected workload decrease for the courts, and the total cost savings that could be expected. From these figures, unit costs can be calculated as follows:

In the Fiscal Note for HB 1550, the AOC estimated a potential cost savings of \$888,111 to cities, for reduction in caseload of municipal courts. They estimated that there had been 2604 filings for marijuana possession in municipal courts in 2010, so the cost per case (as estimated by the number of filings) can be calculated at about \$341.

For counties which operate Superior Courts and District Courts, the AOC estimated that marijuana legalization could result in cost savings of \$2,443,204. They had estimated a total of 7374 filings in 2010 for marijuana cases in Superior and District Courts (670 for felony cases, and 6704 misdemeanor cases). Although the felony cases almost certainly represent higher costs, the estimates the AOC provide do not allow for an accurate estimate of the cost for each. The average cost per filing across both types of court, based on their estimate of cost savings, is about \$331.

Because the figures for municipal and county operated courts are relatively close together, the visualization is based on an estimate of the cost of court operations at \$331 per filing. This is the smaller of the two figures, and represents a larger number of cases, so it is the more conservative estimate of the two.

Although they do not describe it as such, it seems that the AOC is presenting these as marginal cost figures, since they are estimating the amount of cost savings if a certain class of filings (those for marijuana crimes) were removed. However, some adjustment is necessary in order to appropriately estimate the marginal cost of marijuana law enforcement on the courts.

The cost of operating the courts is offset by revenue received when people pay fines as a part of their sentence. The AOC notes that the current revenue from fines assessed for these crimes is unknown, “due to

finer being paid over time on cases that might include other charges” (HB 1550 Fiscal Note). For the purposes of the 1550 fiscal note, and based on historical payment data, it assumed that fines and costs assessed for a misdemeanor marijuana conviction average approximately \$500, and that the collection rate is 20%. They did not include any estimate of revenue for fines on felony marijuana cases, noting that the collection rate for felony fines is very low.

The AOC estimated a total of 4569 convictions for misdemeanor marijuana possession by adults in 2010, which represents about 49% of all the filings it identified for misdemeanor marijuana crimes. Assuming, then, that 49% of filings result in a \$500 fine, and 20% of those are paid, the average revenue from a filing would be \$49. Deducting this from the average cost calculated above results in an estimated cost per filing of \$282. Because the report was provided in 2011, it has been adjusted to \$288 in 2012 dollars.

Prosecution

According to the Local Government Fiscal Note survey (as cited in the Fiscal Note for 2011 HB 1550), the average cost to prosecute a misdemeanor marijuana case was \$983 in 2009. Converting this to 2012 dollars, the average figure is \$1102. Because this is an estimate of average cost rather than marginal cost, it is probably an overestimate of the cost that should be attributed to each case.

In reviewing the research done by WSIPP on costs in other aspects of the criminal justice system, there does not appear to be any general rule for the relationship between marginal and average costs. For example, they found the marginal cost of a prisoner held in an adult jail facility is about 65% of the average cost, while the marginal cost of an arrest is only about 15% of the average cost. For lack of any better method of estimating, the visualization assumes that the marginal cost of prosecution is 50% of the average cost. Although this is admittedly a very arbitrary measure, it seems reasonable in light of the fact that a large portion of the cost of prosecution is the salaries of attorneys and support personnel, the need for which is closely tied to the number of cases filed.

Using this method, the visualization estimates the marginal cost of a misdemeanor marijuana prosecution as \$551 per case filed.

Public Defense

Again using estimates from the Local Government Fiscal Note Program provided in 2011 for HB 1550, which were based on their survey of local governments, the cost for public defense of a misdemeanor case is \$1204. Converting to 2012 dollars, this is equivalent to \$1228.

According to the fiscal note for HB 1550, about 93% of misdemeanor cases qualify for public defender representation. It was not possible to find any estimates of marginal costs, so the visualization assumes that the marginal cost is equal to 50% of the average cost, adjusted to exclude cases that did not qualify for public defense. Using this method, the visualization estimates public defense costs at \$571 per case filed.

Penalties – Jails and Probation

People convicted of crimes may be sentenced to time in a correctional facility (jail or prison), to supervision (probation or parole), or some combination of the two. Because felony convictions are not included in the data used in this report (as discussed above), and prison and post-prison supervision are relevant only to those convicted of felonies, only the costs for jails and local supervision have been considered for this visualization.

WSIPP estimated the marginal cost of an additional person incarcerated in adult jail facilities in 2009 as \$21,469 per year. Converting to 2012 dollars, this is equal to about \$63 per day. WSIPP estimated the cost of providing local supervision (i.e. probation or parole) at \$1,861 per year in 2009, which is equivalent to about \$5.45 per day in 2012 dollars. Using their estimate of a 0.022 real escalation rate for jail costs, and 0.064 for supervision costs, the visualization uses the following estimates for each year included in this report:

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Daily Jail Cost	\$52	\$53	\$54	\$55	\$56	\$58	\$59	\$60	\$62	\$63	\$64
Daily Supervision Cost	\$3.01	\$3.21	\$3.43	\$3.66	\$3.92	\$4.18	\$4.47	\$4.77	\$5.10	\$5.45	\$5.80

Table 3: Estimated Marginal Costs of Jail Operation and Local Supervision, Per Day, in 2012 Dollars

Indirect Costs and Cost Savings

In addition to the direct costs of marijuana law enforcement, the prohibition on marijuana has a number of indirect costs, and may also generate indirect cost savings, for example, by preventing other crimes that people might have committed if they were not already incarcerated for marijuana crimes. It is impossible to trace the exact costs and cost savings, because so many other variables are involved, but it is worth mentioning some of the potential cost impacts here.

Costs to People Arrested and Convicted

In addition to costs paid by taxpayers, substantial costs can be incurred by people who are arrested and convicted for marijuana crimes, such as legal expenses, fines, and lost wages from missed work. These costs can have a ripple effect upon the families and communities of these individuals, as they have more difficulty paying bills.

Also, drug convictions can make it more difficult for people to be productive members of society, even once their sentence has been completed. People with drug convictions have more difficulty getting jobs, particularly when unemployment is high, because employers can choose to hire people without a conviction on their record. They may also have difficulty getting student loans, limiting their ability to obtain higher wage jobs (Higher Education Act of 1965, Sec. 484(r)(1)).

Unfortunately, no reliable data is available to estimate the dollar value of these costs, so they have not been included in this analysis.

Costs Savings from Preventing Other Crimes

Another factor in estimating the cost of marijuana law enforcement that is worth considering is the impact that such enforcement has on the incidence of other crimes. In general, research by WSIPP has shown that incarcerating people reduces the incidence of other crime (Aos, et al, 2003). However, it is unclear whether this is true for marijuana crimes.

In its 2003 report, WSIPP found that, unlike property crimes, “it now costs taxpayers more to incarcerate additional drug-involved offenders than the average value of the crimes avoided.” Although WSIPP did find that incarcerating drug offenders had an impact on crime, the benefit to cost ratio in 2001 was only \$0.37 in cost savings for each \$1 spent on incarceration. This finding applied to drug offenses as a whole, and it seems likely that incarceration of marijuana offenders would show an even lower benefit, if any. The WSIPP study also noted a substantial downward trend in the benefit-cost ratio of incarcerating drug offenders over time—it had dropped from \$0.98 in 1990 to \$0.37 in 2001, so the current benefit-cost ratio could be lower still.

In Seattle, marijuana possession by adults has effectively been decriminalized since the passage of Initiative 75 in 2003, which instructed law enforcement officers to make marijuana possession by adults their lowest law enforcement priority. A December 2007 report on the effect of Initiative 75 found “there was no evidence of any adverse effect of the implementation of I-75 in any of the substantive areas examined, including: (a) no evident increase in marijuana use among young people, (b) no evident increase in crime, and (c) no adverse impact on public health,” (Seattle Marijuana Policy Review Panel, 2007).

Penalties for adult marijuana possession were further relaxed in Seattle in 2010, when the incoming City Attorney, Pete Holmes, instituted a new policy of not prosecuting marijuana possession cases. Since then, crime rates in Seattle have continued their downward trend, in spite of the reduction of people incarcerated for marijuana possession. According to the Seattle Police Department website:

“Through December [of 2010], Major Crimes were down citywide by 6% when compared with the 2009.... Adjusted for population, the crime rate per 1000 in 2010 was the lowest since 1967. The City also had the fewest homicides since 1956” (accessed August 2012 at http://www.seattle.gov/police/crime/10_stats.htm).

Given the lack of any evidence of a negative impact from the lack of marijuana incarceration in Seattle, the visualization assumes that no costs were avoided as a result of the incarcerations that did occur across the state.

Summary of Estimated Marginal Costs

The following table summarizes the cost estimates discussed above, for the period of time addressed in this report. All are presented in 2012 dollars.

Year	Police Cost (per arrest)	Court Costs (per filing)	Prosecution Costs (per filing)	Defense Costs (per filing)	Jail Costs (per day)	Supervision Costs (per day)
2000	\$560	\$288	\$551	\$571	\$52	\$3.01
2001	\$575	\$288	\$551	\$571	\$53	\$3.21
2002	\$591	\$288	\$551	\$571	\$54	\$3.43
2003	\$608	\$288	\$551	\$571	\$55	\$3.66
2004	\$624	\$288	\$551	\$571	\$56	\$3.92
2005	\$642	\$288	\$551	\$571	\$58	\$4.18
2006	\$660	\$288	\$551	\$571	\$59	\$4.47
2007	\$678	\$288	\$551	\$571	\$60	\$4.77
2008	\$697	\$288	\$551	\$571	\$62	\$5.10
2009	\$716	\$288	\$551	\$571	\$63	\$5.45
2010	\$735	\$288	\$551	\$571	\$64	\$5.80

Table 4: Estimated Marginal Costs of Criminal Justice Activities, in 2012 Dollars

To get a sense of how much it costs for a single person to go through the criminal justice system, the following table shows the average combined cost of police, trial, and sentencing for a person who was convicted of a marijuana crime in each of the years:

Year	Police Cost	Trial Cost (court, prosecution, and defense)	Cost of 4.4 Days in Jail	Cost of 78.3 days of Supervision	Total Cost
2000	\$560	\$1410	\$229	\$236	\$2,435
2001	\$575	\$1410	\$233	\$251	\$2,469
2002	\$591	\$1410	\$238	\$269	\$2,508
2003	\$608	\$1410	\$242	\$287	\$2,547
2004	\$624	\$1410	\$246	\$307	\$2,587
2005	\$642	\$1410	\$255	\$327	\$2,634
2006	\$660	\$1410	\$260	\$350	\$2,680
2007	\$678	\$1410	\$264	\$373	\$2,725
2008	\$697	\$1410	\$273	\$399	\$2,779
2009	\$716	\$1410	\$277	\$427	\$2,830
2010	\$735	\$1410	\$282	\$454	\$2,881

Table 5: Estimated Marginal Costs of a Single Person Convicted of a Marijuana Crime for Each Year, 2001-2010, in 2012 Dollars.

III. References

Aos, S. (January 2003). "The Criminal Justice System in Washington State: Incarceration Rates, Taxpayer Costs, Crime Rates, and Prison Economics," accessed at <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/rptfiles/SentReport2002.pdf>.

Washington Office of Financial Management, (2011). "Fiscal Note for HB 1550", accessed at <https://fortress.wa.gov/ofm/fnspublic/legsearch.asp?BillNumber=1550&SessionNumber=62>.

Lee, S., Aos, S., Drake, E., Pennucci, A., Miller, M., & Anderson, L. (2012). "Return on investment: Evidence-based options to improve statewide outcomes." (Document No. 12-04-1201). Olympia: Washington State Institute for Public Policy, accessed at <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/rptfiles/12-04-1201.pdf>.

Marijuana Policy Review Panel (December 4, 2007). "Final Report of the Marijuana Policy Review Panel on the Implementation of Initiative 75," accessed at http://clerk.seattle.gov/~CFS/CF_309070.pdf.

Washington State Statistical Analysis Center (2009). "The Impact of Drugs in Washington State," accessed at <http://www.ofm.wa.gov/sac/nchip/substance.pdf>.

WASPC (Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs) (2010). "Crime in Washington," accessed at <http://www.waspc.org/files.php?fid=3930>.