

REALIGNMENT AND CRIME IN 2014: CALIFORNIA'S VIOLENT CRIME IN DECLINE



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

August 2015

Research Report

Introduction

In 2011, the United States Supreme Court ordered California to reduce prison overcrowding to 137.5 percent of design capacity, or around 113,700 people, by June 2013.¹ To reduce the state prison population and minimize recidivism, California implemented Public Safety Realignment (“Realignment”) under Assembly Bill (AB) 109 in October 2011. This policy redirected people convicted of non-serious, non-violent, and non-sexual offenses (non-non-non offenses) from state to county jurisdiction. Most people convicted of these low-level offenses now serve their sentences in county jails rather than state prison and are supervised by county probation rather than state parole. Realignment also required most people who violate parole and return to custody to be incarcerated in county jail rather than state prison.

When Realignment was implemented, concerns emerged that the new policy would increase crime. However, after Realignment, both violent crime and property crime rates generally declined, continuing the trends of the last two decades. Previous reports published by the Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice have found no evidence of a causal relationship between Realignment and crime (CJCJ, 2013; 2014), although other analyses suggest small effects for motor vehicle theft (PPIC, 2013; 2015b). This report presents comprehensive analyses of new data, detailing both statewide and county crime rates as well as state imprisonment rates for non-violent offenses, again finding no causal relationship between Realignment and county crime.

Method

To evaluate the population affected by Realignment (the “Realigned population”), this report reviews several data sets:

- Updated California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR, 2015) data showing the prison population as categorized by commitment offense and county as of December 31 in 2010 and 2013.
- The most recent (2010-2014) Part I violent (aggravated assault, murder, rape, and robbery) and property (burglary, larceny/theft, and vehicle theft) offenses reported to police, organized by county, year, and type of offense as collected annually by the Criminal Justice Statistics Center (CJSC, 2015).
- Populations by county and year from the California Department of Finance’s Demographic Research Unit (DRU, 2015).

These data are used to calculate and compare the changes in (a) the rate of county commitments of people with non-violent offenses to state prisons in 2010 and 2013, and (b) reported offenses by county for the latest period prior

¹ California’s state prison population peaked at approximately 170,000 in 2007 and stood at around 161,000 in 2010. After Realignment in October 2011 and other reforms, prison population reduction proceeded rapidly through mid-2012 to 133,000, then stalled in 2013 and 2014 at approximately 136,000. It fell again to 128,416 as of August 19, 2015, after the November 2014 implementation of Proposition 47 (reducing felony penalties for low level drug and property offenses to misdemeanors). While the CDCR lists the institutional prison population at just 115,200 as of August 19, 2015, there are over 13,000 prisoners being held in alternative facilities, which include camps (3,800), out-of-state prisons (6,900), and other local, private, and special facilities (CDCR, 2015a). It is not clear that these alternatives will remain viable, long-term solutions or avoid new constitutional issues.

to Realignment (January-December 2010) and after Realignment (January-December 2013 for prison population by commitment offense and county; January-December 2014 for all offenses reported). Los Angeles County is reported separately due to discrepancies in tabulating reported offenses by the Los Angeles Police Department (Poston and Rubin, 2014).

Statewide crime has generally declined under Realignment

Table 1 shows that, comparing 2014 to 2010, both violent and property crime generally declined after Realignment took effect on October 1, 2011, with a small increase in 2012 more than offset by declines in 2013 and 2014. . These trends are similar to those that prevailed before Realignment and are well within the range of normal year-to-year fluctuations. Analyses of crime data in this time period have also found that violent crime trends do not seem to have been affected by Realignment; in fact, counties with lower commitment rates of people with non-violent offenses to state prison experienced more favorable violent crime trends (CJCJ, 2014). However, one analysis concluded that Realignment had “modest” effects: no apparent impact on violent crime and a small effect on property crime, consisting mostly of a lesser decline in motor vehicle theft compared to neighboring states (PPIC, 2013; 2015b). Determining to what extent these effects are influenced by Realignment awaits longer-term evaluation, including whether counties that have the lowest rates of state imprisonment of people with non-violent offenses experienced different crime trends than counties with higher state imprisonment rates.

Table 1. Reported Part I offenses in California (2010–2014)

Year	All Part I	All Violent	Assault	Murder	Rape*	Robbery	All Property	Burglary	Larceny/ Theft	Vehicle Theft
2010 (before Realignment)	3,123.4	439.3	256.5	4.8	22.3	155.7	2,630.1	612.8	1,608.7	408.6
2011 (transition)	3,007.0	413.3	243.4	4.6	20.4	144.7	2,593.7	612.9	1,589.5	391.3
2012 (after Realignment)	3,197.3	424.7	249.6	5.0	20.7	149.3	2,772.6	649.3	1,677.8	445.5
2013 (after Realignment)	3,062.4	396.9	232.5	4.8	19.5	140.4	2,665.5	607.0	1,626.0	432.5
2014 (after Realignment)	2,852.7	393.7	238.1	4.4	24.4	126.4	2,459.0	526.1	1,538.6	394.3
Change, 2014 vs. 2010	-9%	-10%	-7%	-8%	*	-19%	-7%	-14%	-4%	-3%

Notes: Rate is per 100,000 population. “Change” compares the change in rates of committed offenses, 2014 versus 2010. Sources: CJS (2015); DRU (2015). *Definition of rape expanded by the Department of Justice (DOJ) in 2014 to include a broader range of sex offenses and is not comparable to prior years.

Crime at the county level

When analyzing Realignment’s effect on crime, it is crucial to evaluate county-specific crime rates. One of the primary concerns with Realignment was that redirecting people with non-non-non offenses would overcrowd county jails, causing more early releases and thus increasing local crime. Examining how counties manage their Realigned populations — for example, whether they rely on state prisons or local supervision — combined with county-specific crime changes reveals the lack of correlation between a county’s increased Realigned population and local crime. This method further seeks to address the recent research (PPIC, 2013; 2015b) that found Realignment responsible for increased motor vehicle theft.

The state’s 57 counties (Los Angeles is shown separately due to data discrepancies) are divided into three groups of 19 each, reflecting the rates of non-violent state imprisonment per 100,000 population. The *high state imprisonment* counties consist of those that committed higher rates of people to state prison for non-violent offenses than the 2014 average; *low state imprisonment* counties are those with low rates of state commitments for non-violent offenses; and *middle range* counties are those in between (see Appendix A for individual counties).

Rates of specific offenses are compared for 2014 (the most recent year available) versus 2010 (the last year before Realignment took effect) to estimate whether high state imprisonment counties experienced different overall crime trends from low state imprisonment counties in 2014.

Table 2. Average change in crime rates according to county levels of state imprisonment

	High State Imprisonment	Middle Range	Low State Imprisonment	Los Angeles**	Statewide
Persons in state prison for non-violent offenses					
Rate, 12/31/2013	159.9	100.6	44.1	129.9	102.4
Change, 2013 vs. 2010	-41%	-42%	-54%	-39%	-43%
Change in crime rate, 2014 vs. 2010					
All Part I offenses	-5%	-14%	2%	-10%	-7%
All Violent	-6%	-11%	-5%	-17%	-10%
Assault	-4%	-7%	-6%	-9%	-7%
Murder	3%	-2%	-13%	-17%	-7%
Rape*	*	*	*	*	*
Robbery	-12%	-22%	-7%	-28%	-19%
All Property	-5%	-15%	3%	-9%	-6%
Burglary	-12%	-23%	-8%	-12%	-14%
Larceny/Theft	-4%	-11%	2%	-5%	-4%
Vehicle Theft	4%	-16%	19%	-18%	-3%

Note: Rate is per 100,000 population. For counties in each category, see Appendix A. Sources: CDCR (2015); CJS (2015: 2015a); DRU (2015). *Definition of rape expanded by the Department of Justice (DOJ) in 2014 to include a broader range of sex offenses and is not comparable to prior years. **Los Angeles County reported separately due to discrepancies in Los Angeles Police Department crime figures and should be viewed with caution (Poston and Rubin, 2014).

All three sets of counties and Los Angeles show considerable reductions in non-violent prison populations over the four-year period. While individual counties show very large discrepancies in reported crime rates, particularly for rarer offenses such as homicide and rape (see Appendix A), the average changes in rates of reported Part I offenses for the three sets of counties show little correlation either with the rate of, or change in, non-violent prison populations. For most violent and property offenses, the counties in the middle range showed larger reductions in crime than either low or high state imprisonment counties. The only offense to show a linear relationship to non-violent imprisonment rates is homicide, which declined more rapidly in low state imprisonment counties and actually rose in high state imprisonment counties. Other offenses show mixed results.

Analyzing individual counties reveals the variation in counties’ post-Realignment experiences. For example, Orange County, a low state imprisonment county, shows large reductions in overall state prison commitments and low state commitment rates for non-violent offenses between 2010 and 2013, but is seeing large declines in crime; adjacent Riverside County, a high state imprisonment county, has made fewer reductions to California’s prison population with higher rates of non-violent state imprisonment, and has experienced less favorable changes in crime. Finally, trends in vehicle theft were extremely erratic in individual jurisdictions (down 35 percent in Fresno County; up 102 percent in Shasta County, for example) and for all three sets of counties as a whole, but no trend is evident based on degree of a county’s rate of non-violent state imprisonment.

Nine model counties

The practical application of these trends and rates are indicated in Table 3. Nine counties of varying size and geography show particular success after Realignment in that from 2010 to 2013/2014, they (a) had lower rates of non-violent state imprisonment than the 2013 state average, (b) actively reduced their non-violent state imprisonment rate after Realignment more than the 2013 state average, and (c) achieved greater than average reductions in total, violent, and property crime for 2014.

Table 3. Nine counties show particular success in reducing both non-violent state imprisonment and crime after Realignment

County	State Prison Population with Non-violent Offenses per 100,000 population		Change in Crime Rates, 2014 vs. 2010:			
	Rate, 12/31/2013	Change, 2013 vs. 2010	Total crime	Violent	Property	Vehicle Theft
Marin	35.4	-49%	-14%	-14%	-14%	-3%
Plumas	45.7	-62%	-13%	-15%	-13%	-6%
Mono	47.9	-54%	-41%	-41%	-41%	-3%
San Benito	55.3	-61%	-40%	-12%	-44%	-33%
Orange	59.4	-53%	-13%	-12%	-13%	1%
Napa	66.9	-47%	-17%	-19%	-17%	-4%
Placer	79.6	-54%	-19%	-27%	-18%	-20%
Colusa	82.6	-54%	-30%	-18%	-31%	-38%
San Diego	86.7	-47%	-15%	-12%	-15%	-27%
Nine model counties	62.2	-54%	-22%	-19%	-23%	-15%
Statewide	102.4	-43%	-7%	-10%	-6%	-3%

Note: Rate is per 100,000 population. Sources: CDCR (2015); CJSC (2015); DRU (2015).

These counties, ranging in population from 15,000 to 3.2 million and varying in physical location, show both greatly reduced contributions to the state prison population and double-digit decreases in crime can occur simultaneously – including for motor vehicle theft, which, though other analyses suggested a statewide increase (PPIC, 2013; 2015b), showed reductions in eight of the nine counties. The practices in these counties merit special attention as potential models for counties with less favorable trends.

To pinpoint areas of continued high incarceration, Appendix B ranks counties by non-violent state imprisonment for selected sentencing offense groups (property, drug, drug possession, and marijuana only) in 2013. Major counties such as Stanislaus and Contra Costa vary by up to 40-fold in state imprisonment rates per felony arrest for drug possession, indicating areas where the prison population can be further reduced.

Conclusion

Though all counties show considerable reductions in non-violent prison populations since 2010, crime in California continued to generally decline after Realignment took effect. Contrary to alarms raised about potential increases in crime, consistent reports examining offenses at the county level over time show Realignment and crime do not have a causal relationship. Vehicle theft, and theft in general, also do not appear to be worsening in counties with lower rates of non-violent imprisonments compared to those with the highest rates.

However, individual county experiences vary widely. Objective analysis of policy measures and alternatives to incarceration in counties that have managed to both reduce their reliance on state prison, and have also seen large reductions in reported crime, is essential for implementing effective, statewide decarceration policies (e.g., CJCJ, 2012; BSCC, 2015; PPIC, 2015).

Sources

Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC). (2015). Realignment. Community corrections partnership plans.

At: http://www.bscc.ca.gov/s_californiapublicsafetyrealignment.php

California Attorney General (AG). (2015). Defendant’s March 2015 status & benchmark report in response to February 10, 2014 order. Case 2:90-cv-00520-KJM-DAD Document 5289 Filed 03/16/15. At: <http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/News/docs/3JP-Mar-2015/March-2015-Status-Report.pdf>

- California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR). (2015). Felon institution population for December 31, 2013, by commitment county, ethnicity, gender and offense group. Number of felon new admission and parole violators with a new term admitted during calendar year 2013 by commitment county, ethnicity, gender and offense group as of December 31, 2013. Provided by special data request by the Data Analysis Unit [data set], Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation; on file with author.
- California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR). (2015a). Weekly report of population as of midnight August 19, 2015. At: http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Reports_Research/Offender_Information_Services_Branch/WeeklyWed/TPOP1A/TPOP1Ad150819.pdf
- California Department of Finance (CDF). (2015). E-4 Historical Population Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2011-2014, with 2010 Census Benchmark. At: <http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/estimates/e-4/2011-20/view.php>
- Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice (CJCJ). (2012). Lessons learned: The Santa Cruz County story. June 2012. At: http://www.cjcj.org/uploads/cjcj/documents/Santa_Cruz_Case_Study.pdf
- Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice (CJCJ). (2013). California's Urban Crime Increase in 2012: Is "Realignment" to Blame? At: http://www.cjcj.org/uploads/cjcj/documents/california_urban_crime_increase_2012.pdf
- Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice (CJCJ). (2014). California's 58 Crime Rates: Realignment and Crime in 2012. January 2014. At: http://www.cjcj.org/uploads/cjcj/documents/CJCJ_2014_Realignment_Report.pdf
- Criminal Justice Statistics Center (CJSC). (2015). California Criminal Justice Profiles. Interactive crime tables. Arrests [data set]. California Department of Justice. At: <https://oag.ca.gov/crime/cjsc/criminal-justice-profiles>
- Criminal Justice Statistics Center (CJSC). (2015a). California Criminal Justice Profiles. Interactive crime tables. Crime and clearances [data set]. California Department of Justice. At: <https://oag.ca.gov/crime/cjsc/stats/crimes-clearances>
- Demographic Research Unit (DRU). (2015). California Department of Finance. E-2. California County Population Estimates and Components of Change by Year — July 1, 2010–2014 [data set]. At: <http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/estimates/e-2/view.php>
- Poston, B., and Rubin J. (2015). Times investigation: LAPD misclassified nearly 1,200 crimes as minor offenses. *Los Angeles Times*, August 9, 2014. At: <http://www.latimes.com/local/la-me-crimestats-lapd-20140810-story.html#page=1>
- Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC). (2013). Public Safety Realignment and Crime Rates in California. At: http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_1213MLR.pdf
- Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC). (2015). Alternatives to Incarceration in California. At: http://www.ppic.org/main/publication_quick.asp?i=1146
- Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC). (2015a). California's Changing Prison Population. At: http://www.ppic.org/main/publication_show.asp?i=702
- Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC). (2015b). Realignment, Incarceration, and Crime Trends in California. At: http://www.ppic.org/main/publication_quick.asp?i=1151

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, (415) 621-5661 x. 121, www.cjcj.org

Appendix A. Counties categorized by rate of non-violent state imprisonment

High state imprisonment counties

Ranked by Non-violent Rate	Non-violent Prison Admissions		Change in Crime Rate, 2014 vs. 2010								
	Rate, 2013	Change	Total	Violent	Property	Homicide	Robbery	Assault	Burglary	MV Theft	Larceny
Kings	399.5	-29%	22%	33%	20%	138%	-14%	35%	-9%	-3%	39%
Shasta	263.5	-40%	11%	-13%	18%	165%	23%	-18%	-12%	102%	22%
Tuolumne	254.8	16%	-1%	27%	-3%	1%	-61%	50%	-6%	30%	-6%
Tehama	236.7	-46%	-3%	-14%	-1%	495%	41%	-21%	-15%	91%	-7%
Kern	201.8	-36%	-10%	-11%	-10%	-23%	-12%	-12%	-12%	-12%	-9%
Amador	199.2	-37%	-22%	-23%	-21%	5%	5%	-22%	-23%	-19%	-21%
Lassen	197.7	14%	13%	27%	10%	115%	7%	33%	4%	-8%	17%
Sierra	192.0	51%	-36%	-40%	-35%	-	-	-40%	24%	-	-54%
Yolo	167.6	-46%	-6%	43%	-10%	29%	26%	63%	-15%	4%	-11%
Del Norte	167.6	14%	-3%	51%	-11%	-66%	53%	75%	-8%	30%	-26%
Butte	163.3	-46%	8%	-12%	10%	55%	-6%	-14%	-11%	30%	18%
Lake	162.1	-39%	-1%	5%	-2%	49%	-31%	8%	1%	21%	-8%
Stanislaus	146.9	-41%	-11%	3%	-13%	8%	-13%	11%	-24%	-23%	-4%
Tulare	144.7	-49%	-28%	-11%	-30%	-1%	-18%	-9%	-28%	-20%	-33%
Riverside	142.4	-30%	-1%	-9%	0%	3%	-12%	-9%	-18%	8%	7%
Siskiyou	141.2	-42%	-13%	-2%	-15%	-1%	24%	0%	-28%	1%	-11%
Yuba	138.4	-49%	23%	16%	23%	-2%	9%	22%	8%	27%	31%
San Bernardino	137.7	-51%	-4%	-10%	-3%	3%	-13%	-9%	2%	18%	-11%
Madera	136.1	-28%	5%	33%	0%	-12%	-25%	56%	-9%	-26%	17%
Average	189.1	-27%	-3%	5%	-4%	53%	-1%	10%	-9%	14%	-3%

Note: Rate is per 100,000 population. "Change" compares the change in rates of non-violent prison admissions, 2013 versus 2010. Rape is not included on this table because the definition of rape was expanded by the Department of Justice (DOJ) in 2014 to include a broader range of sex offenses and is not comparable to prior years. Sources: CDCR (2015); CJSC (2015; 2015a); DRU (2015).

Middle range state imprisonment counties

Ranked by Non-violent Rate	Non-violent Prison Admissions		Change in Crime Rate, 2014 vs. 2010								
	Rate, 2013	Change	Total	Violent	Property	Homicide	Robbery	Assault	Burglary	MV Theft	Larceny
Glenn	135.9	-34%	-6%	68%	-15%	-2%	-15%	62%	-16%	-35%	-9%
Trinity	132.1	-6%	26%	2%	32%	-	104%	-17%	73%	-41%	48%
Fresno	127.2	-38%	-19%	-11%	-20%	-9%	-26%	-6%	-16%	-33%	-17%
Sacramento	121.7	-35%	-21%	-15%	-23%	-5%	-29%	-7%	-30%	-27%	-18%
San Joaquin	116.3	-39%	-13%	-6%	-14%	3%	-22%	2%	-28%	12%	-13%
Monterey	115.1	-26%	-2%	-12%	0%	-24%	0%	-20%	-15%	70%	-10%
Mariposa	112.1	-37%	1%	95%	-10%	-	52%	110%	-34%	-70%	12%
Merced	111.9	-38%	-14%	-1%	-16%	8%	-13%	5%	-28%	3%	-15%
Sutter	107.6	-53%	-6%	-13%	-5%	-100%	4%	-14%	1%	4%	-9%
Mendocino	106.1	-34%	2%	4%	1%	49%	17%	8%	-6%	6%	4%
Calaveras	98.8	-19%	19%	21%	19%	-100%	-36%	36%	-4%	-9%	43%
San Diego	86.7	-47%	-15%	-12%	-15%	7%	-21%	-9%	-24%	-27%	-9%

Ranked by Non-violent Rate	Non-violent Prison Admissions		Change in Crime Rate, 2014 vs. 2010								
	Rate, 2013	Change	Total	Violent	Property	Homicide	Robbery	Assault	Burglary	MV Theft	Larceny
Colusa	82.6	-54%	-30%	-18%	-31%	-	-26%	-10%	-21%	-38%	-35%
San Luis Obispo	82.1	-32%	-2%	62%	-9%	-51%	-25%	85%	-10%	23%	-11%
Placer	79.6	-54%	-19%	-27%	-18%	-4%	-37%	-27%	-14%	-20%	-19%
Santa Barbara	79.4	-51%	-4%	-31%	2%	42%	-18%	-40%	0%	97%	-7%
Imperial	76.2	-33%	-7%	-8%	-7%	-3%	4%	-13%	-33%	-21%	12%
El Dorado	75.8	-31%	7%	-17%	12%	-1%	-24%	-21%	-26%	70%	33%
Humboldt	71.2	-68%	9%	-8%	11%	83%	13%	-18%	-20%	24%	26%
Average	101.0	-38%	-5%	4%	-6%	-7%	-5%	6%	-13%	-1%	0%

Note: Rate is per 100,000 population. "Change" compares the change in rates of non-violent prison admissions, 2013 versus 2010. Rape is not included on this table because the definition of rape was expanded by the Department of Justice (DOJ) in 2014 to include a broader range of sex offenses and is not comparable to prior years. Sources: CDCR (2015); CJSC (2015; 2015a); DRU (2015).

Low state imprisonment counties

Ranked by Non-violent Rate	Non-violent Prison Admissions		Change in Crime Rate, 2014 vs. 2010								
	Rate, 2013	Change	Total	Violent	Property	Homicide	Robbery	Assault	Burglary	MV Theft	Larceny
Napa	66.9	-47%	-17%	-19%	-17%	146%	-18%	-24%	-13%	-4%	-20%
Inyo	64.5	-55%	30%	54%	24%	-	-25%	46%	16%	-25%	35%
Ventura	64.0	-43%	3%	6%	3%	9%	6%	-1%	3%	25%	0%
Orange	59.4	-53%	-13%	-12%	-13%	-12%	-27%	-9%	-18%	1%	-13%
Santa Cruz	56.8	-21%	-6%	-15%	-4%	-37%	-14%	-20%	-23%	61%	-6%
San Benito	55.3	-61%	-40%	-12%	-44%	282%	-34%	-12%	-53%	-33%	-38%
Santa Clara	49.8	-53%	1%	-4%	2%	53%	2%	-11%	18%	31%	-10%
Sonoma	49.2	-49%	-4%	-5%	-4%	15%	-16%	-6%	-15%	27%	-4%
Mono	47.9	-54%	-41%	-41%	-41%	-	93%	-37%	-53%	-3%	-38%
Solano	47.0	-69%	6%	9%	5%	-20%	-12%	29%	-4%	3%	12%
Plumas	45.7	-62%	-13%	-15%	-13%	-	-100%	-7%	-31%	-6%	4%
San Mateo	44.3	-40%	-10%	-16%	-10%	-47%	-21%	-23%	-3%	-14%	-11%
Modoc	42.2	-33%	52%	194%	33%	-	-	280%	-3%	2%	83%
Marin	35.4	-49%	-14%	-14%	-14%	23%	-29%	-7%	-11%	-3%	-16%
Nevada	29.6	-42%	8%	0%	10%	202%	-13%	5%	21%	68%	-1%
Contra Costa	23.3	-42%	-1%	-18%	1%	-30%	-10%	-26%	-11%	-2%	9%
Alameda	21.0	-68%	7%	-5%	10%	-26%	-1%	-7%	-21%	29%	17%
San Francisco	14.9	-77%	31%	14%	34%	-9%	-2%	27%	11%	51%	35%
Alpine	0.0	-100%	-67%	-59%	-68%	-	-	-56%	-32%	-100%	-75%
Average	43.0	-54%	-5%	2%	-6%	39%	-13%	7%	-12%	6%	-2%

Note: Rate is per 100,000 population. "Change" compares the change in rates of non-violent prison admissions, 2013 versus 2010. Rape is not included on this table because the definition of rape was expanded by the Department of Justice (DOJ) in 2014 to include a broader range of sex offenses and is not comparable to prior years. Sources: CDCR (2015); CJSC (2015; 2015a); DRU (2015).

Appendix B. Counties ranked by non-violent state imprisonment rate, with rates of select sentencing offense categories (2013)

Ranked by Non-violent Rate	All Non-violent Prison Admissions Rate	State Imprisonment Rate, select non-violent offense categories				Non-violent Prison Admissions as Percent of Total Prison Population
		Property	Drug	Drug Possession	Marijuana	
Kings	133.9	165.6	127.6	52.2	33.1	53%
Riverside	86.0	123.2	57.6	70.7	12.7	55%
Sutter	85.6	96.4	62.8	45.9	50.8	52%
Tuolumne	85.6	152.6	68.7	53.5	62.5	71%
San Joaquin	85.5	98.9	49.2	23.5	16.5	57%
Butte	84.9	89.5	60.5	63.4	15.9	58%
Amador	84.3	171.4	68.2	84.7	34.5	61%
Kern	81.0	99.5	57.8	46.1	16.5	68%
Monterey	79.9	88.8	55.6	40.1	4.1	53%
Madera	79.1	102.1	60.8	112.4	12.2	58%
Los Angeles	76.6	97.1	54.7	103.5	21.8	57%
Yuba	73.9	91.9	37.8	10.8	23.5	47%
San Bernardino	72.7	78.3	37.9	31.7	16.8	54%
Shasta	66.9	89.3	55.6	64.6	24.4	50%
Merced	66.9	73.6	42.1	51.1	4.1	53%
Sacramento	66.6	84.1	35.3	69.5	15.6	54%
Calaveras	66.1	110.2	49.1	36.4	22.2	70%
Yolo	63.1	102.0	55.8	57.3	5.2	58%
Lake	59.7	78.2	55.3	60.3	14.9	49%
Statewide	59.6	81.2	39.8	41.1	12.3	55%
San Luis Obispo	59.5	100.9	28.5	22.0	0.0	49%
Santa Barbara	56.5	68.6	41.9	13.4	4.7	51%
Stanislaus	53.5	77.6	38.9	132.8	6.4	65%
San Diego	53.4	89.0	32.3	18.4	14.0	55%
Mariposa	52.6	102.6	12.3	0.0	0.0	47%
Colusa	50.8	120.7	20.4	14.5	0.0	65%
Orange	49.4	71.2	35.8	36.4	7.7	58%
Mendocino	48.9	42.9	33.2	11.6	16.2	50%
San Mateo	48.9	79.8	26.4	19.0	0.0	56%
Lassen	46.5	56.2	30.9	16.8	0.0	45%
El Dorado	46.5	97.1	21.6	10.7	9.0	59%
Tulare	46.1	58.9	35.4	13.3	11.9	52%
Ventura	44.9	67.3	35.8	12.5	2.6	59%
Glenn	43.7	51.3	50.0	15.9	0.0	43%
Fresno	43.3	84.3	32.2	54.5	6.4	52%
Santa Clara	41.8	73.2	16.6	14.1	8.5	50%
Tehama	41.5	68.5	20.8	14.2	5.8	51%
Del Norte	41.0	58.1	28.2	16.9	23.8	47%
Siskiyou	38.1	86.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	61%
Placer	36.1	53.1	25.1	34.2	10.8	60%

Ranked by Non-violent Rate	All Non-violent Prison Admissions Rate	State Imprisonment Rate, select non-violent offense categories				Non-violent Prison Admissions as Percent of Total Prison Population
		Property	Drug	Drug Possession	Marijuana	
Inyo	36.0	85.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	45%
Imperial	33.9	42.1	33.7	16.9	15.5	60%
Santa Cruz	33.3	58.1	19.4	8.7	9.8	42%
Napa	31.3	45.6	21.4	16.5	11.0	47%
Sierra	31.3	62.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	100%
Humboldt	29.9	47.5	19.9	18.3	5.1	52%
Plumas	28.1	61.2	15.4	7.7	0.0	45%
Solano	26.7	31.8	18.4	15.3	3.1	45%
Nevada	25.5	42.7	9.0	10.3	0.0	50%
Sonoma	24.7	40.9	8.6	7.0	3.5	46%
Trinity	23.0	43.5	18.7	115.4	0.0	67%
San Benito	22.6	25.2	12.9	0.0	37.0	32%
Alameda	19.5	24.8	5.1	2.6	2.2	30%
Marin	17.1	31.2	5.0	5.2	0.0	43%
Contra Costa	15.0	21.6	6.7	3.4	0.0	39%
Modoc	11.2	19.2	16.1	30.3	0.0	17%
San Francisco	8.6	21.0	5.7	6.3	3.8	39%
Mono	7.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14%
Alpine	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	*

Note: Non-violent admission rates are per 1,000 nonviolent felony arrests; property-crime admissions are per 1,000 arrests for which a property crime is the primary sentencing offense; etc. Sources: CDCR (2015); DRU (2015).