

# COUNTIES' CONTINUED DISPARITIES IN REALIGNMENT IMPLEMENTATION



Mike Males, Senior Research Fellow  
Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice

---

September 2013

Fact Sheet

Realignment (AB 109) redirects offenders convicted of low-level, non-violent, non-sex crimes from state to county supervision as of October 1, 2011. Among other goals, the law is intended to reduce unconstitutional levels of prison overcrowding per U.S. Supreme Court mandate<sup>1</sup>. This fact sheet compares county-by-county prison admissions in the 21 months before and after the enactment of Realignment.<sup>2</sup> It includes an analysis of new prison admissions by quarter and county during January 1, 2010 through June 30, 2013.

- **Counties continue to demonstrate large disparities in prison admissions that are not related to crime rates.**

Counties show wide disparities in rates of prison admissions, creating a system of justice by geography (see Table 1). The 17 counties with higher than average prison admission rates per felony arrest have imprisonment rates 60.7 percent higher than the 40 counties with lower than average rates (CDCR, 2013; CJSC, 2013). Los Angeles County, analyzed separately due to its unique population size, also demonstrated a higher than average prison admission rate.

- **Stabilizing prison admission rates statewide to levels demonstrated by lower imprisoning counties would reduce the prison population to court mandated levels.**

For example, people arrested for felonies in Monterey County are 4.6 times more likely to serve time in state prison as those in San Francisco. If the higher imprisoning counties reduced their new admissions to the much lower rate of Fresno County, for example, prison admission numbers would fall by around 7,000 per quarter.

- **California will not meet its mandate to reduce prison populations without additional measures to reduce county disparities in sentencing.**

Realignment has been a significant measure to achieve the necessary prison population reduction; however, it will not be enough to meet the judicial mandate. California must address its system of justice by geography. Current legislation, such as Assembly Bill 721 (Bradford) and advisory bodies such as a Sentencing Commission are opportunities for California's complex sentencing structure to be re-examined to reduce unnecessary incarceration and create consistency in application statewide.

## Sources:

California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR), Data Analysis Unit. (2013). Commitment Status, Total Felon Admissions (special data provision). Characteristics of Felon Admissions to Prison. Population Reports. At: [http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Reports\\_Research/Offender\\_Information\\_Services\\_Branch/Offender\\_Information\\_Reports.html](http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Reports_Research/Offender_Information_Services_Branch/Offender_Information_Reports.html)

Criminal Justice Statistics Center (CJSC), California Department of Justice (2013). Crime data. At: <http://oag.ca.gov/crime>

**Please note:** Each year, every county submits their data to the official statewide databases maintained by appointed governmental bodies. While every effort is made to review data for accuracy and to correct information upon revision, CJCJ cannot be responsible for data reporting errors made at the county, state, or national level.

**Contact:** [cjcjmedia@cjcj.org](mailto:cjcjmedia@cjcj.org), (415) 621-5661 x. 123, [www.cjcj.org](http://www.cjcj.org)

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Brown v. Plata* (2011), No. 09–1233

<sup>2</sup> As of this writing, the most recent available data is for the second quarter of 2013.

**Table 1. New prison admissions by county per 1,000 felony arrests, 21 months before and after Realignment**

County (ranked high to low)	Counties ranked high to low in post-Realignment admission rate			Prison admits		Felony arrests	
	Before	After	Change	Before	After	Before	After
Kings	405.5	186.6	-54%	1,068	711	2,634	3,810
Riverside	196.1	127.6	-35%	6,312	4,414	32,191	34,582
Butte	260.4	122.2	-53%	906	541	3,479	4,426
Monterey	176.5	118.7	-33%	1,203	812	6,817	6,842
Yolo	200.9	115.7	-42%	768	415	3,822	3,587
Yuba	162.8	115.3	-29%	345	263	2,119	2,281
Shasta	258.6	114.3	-56%	867	508	3,352	4,446
San Joaquin	145.1	113.4	-22%	1,953	1,575	13,459	13,883
San Bernardino	198.3	107.0	-46%	10,007	5,377	50,471	50,249
Madera	158.7	101.7	-36%	371	295	2,338	2,901
Amador	179.0	99.9	-44%	151	80	844	801
Sacramento	138.2	98.8	-29%	3,887	2,660	28,118	26,923
Kern	174.2	96.5	-45%	4,068	2,327	23,357	24,111
Tehama	196.4	95.6	-51%	374	195	1,905	2,040
Santa Barbara	182.5	93.1	-49%	1,105	574	6,055	6,166
Merced	98.2	92.5	-6%	591	543	6,017	5,867
<u>Sutter</u>	<u>202.8</u>	<u>89.7</u>	<u>-56%</u>	<u>394</u>	<u>172</u>	<u>1,943</u>	<u>1,917</u>
17 higher imprisonment counties	181.9	110.2	-39%	34,370	21,462	188,918	194,833
Los Angeles County*	172.4	105.3	-39%	32,227	19,159	186,911	181,992
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>150.2</b>	<b>89.6</b>	<b>-40%</b>	<b>101,825</b>	<b>61,192</b>	<b>678,142</b>	<b>682,910</b>
San Luis Obispo	145.8	88.2	-39%	572	378	3,923	4,284
Santa Clara	151.2	82.4	-45%	3,333	1,687	22,050	20,468
Del Norte	62.4	82.4	32%	57	65	914	789
Lake	131.9	82.4	-37%	243	164	1,843	1,990
San Diego	137.1	82.3	-40%	6,777	3,985	49,417	48,431
Orange	162.4	82.1	-49%	6,401	3,263	39,423	39,756
San Benito	143.1	81.3	-43%	125	66	873	812
Mendocino	85.0	75.6	-11%	203	189	2,388	2,501
Tulare	126.5	74.5	-41%	1,477	862	11,676	11,573
Glenn	116.2	74.2	-36%	89	53	766	715
Lassen	180.8	71.9	-60%	103	42	570	585
Fresno	121.2	71.1	-41%	3,073	2,331	25,360	32,799
El Dorado	100.3	70.9	-29%	293	215	2,922	3,032
Stanislaus	124.2	70.6	-43%	1,640	1,056	13,203	14,965
Calaveras	111.0	69.9	-37%	86	63	775	901
San Mateo	131.5	69.8	-47%	1,094	577	8,319	8,269
Mariposa	101.7	68.3	-33%	41	23	403	337
Tuolumne	88.4	65.5	-26%	128	98	1,449	1,495
Napa	110.0	58.9	-46%	273	159	2,483	2,699
Sierra	101.6	58.6	-42%	7	5	69	85
Alameda	83.9	58.6	-30%	2,051	1,225	24,456	20,904
Ventura	94.3	58.4	-38%	1,272	787	13,493	13,465
Colusa	107.7	55.9	-48%	51	31	474	555
Siskiyou	123.5	54.7	-56%	126	58	1,021	1,060
Sonoma	88.2	54.2	-39%	742	434	8,414	8,007
Humboldt	142.0	53.0	-63%	496	213	3,493	4,017
Placer	100.2	52.7	-47%	578	325	5,770	6,168
Solano	139.9	50.6	-64%	1,038	424	7,417	8,379
Santa Cruz	54.5	50.2	-8%	261	244	4,788	4,858
Marin	65.9	45.1	-32%	180	129	2,730	2,859
Inyo	108.2	44.3	-59%	39	17	360	384
Imperial	80.8	43.0	-47%	347	196	4,296	4,558
Plumas	106.1	41.5	-61%	51	19	481	458
Contra Costa	48.9	37.6	-23%	876	675	17,899	17,974
Trinity	55.7	36.2	-35%	29	25	521	690
Nevada	55.4	35.7	-36%	72	45	1,299	1,259
Modoc	40.9	33.2	-19%	10	12	245	362
San Francisco	57.6	25.5	-56%	925	343	16,064	13,432
Mono	51.0	17.7	-65%	12	3	235	170
<u>Alpine</u>	<u>127.2</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>-100%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>38</u>
40 lower imprisonment counties	116.4	66.9	-42%	35,175	20,486	302,312	306,085

\* Due to its large population Los Angeles County distorts statewide trends. Consequently, Los Angeles has been isolated to appear in its own category.

Source: CDCR, 2013; CJSC, 2013.