WHEN THE SMOKE CLEARS

Racial Disparities in California's Marijuana Arrests





WHEN THE SMOKE CLEARS:

RACIAL DISPARITIES IN MARIJUANA ARRESTS

Table of Contents

Executive Summary
Overview
Trends in Marijuana Charges by Race
Arrest Rates by Race
County Patterns in Arrest Rates
Arrest Rates and Disparities in Arrests in Cities
Booking/Arrest Rates in Tracts for Select Law Enforcement Agencies (LEA) 10
Methodology
End Notes
Appendix A: Marijuana Arrest Rates By Law Enforcement Agency
Appendix B: Marijuana Arrest Rates By County
Appendix C: Marijuana-Related Arrest Trends By County

WHEN THE SMOKE CLEARS:

RACIAL DISPARITIES IN MARIJUANA ARRESTS

Executive Summary

This report is commissioned by Public Health Advocates and prepared by the University of California, Davis, Center for Regional Change (CRC). It documents racial disparities in marijuana arrests in California from 1996-2016 based on an analysis of data from the California Department of Justice Criminal Offender Record

If you're a person of color and you have a drug offense, they see you as a drug dealer. If you talk to young white men with a drug offense, they would say— hey, they were in college, everybody does it in college.

----ERIC GUERRA, SACRAMENTO CITY COUNCILMEMBER

Information. To enrich the report, CRC collaborated with Million Dollar Hood Project (MDH), University of California, Los Angeles, to document disparities in marijuana-related arrests at the tract level in select law enforcement agencies in California.

REPORT HIGHLIGHTS

- The number of marijuana-related arrests and the type of charges has changed over time. However, racial disparities have persisted, such that Blacks are still nearly four times more likely to be arrested and charged with marijuana crime than whites.
- The highest arrest rates occur in marijuana-producing counties such as Mendocino, where the Black arrest rate in 2016 was almost 4,500 per 100,000 population. For the given year, the Black arrest rate is nearly ten times higher than the white arrest rate of 480 per 100,000 white population.
- The lowest arrest rate for Blacks, 21 marijuana-related arrests, occurred in Lassen County in 2013, and the highest arrest rate was 5,731 per 100,000 in Mendocino County in 2009.
- Large counties, like Alameda, Contra Costa, Fresno, Los Angeles, Merced, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, Solano, and Ventura, have

seen some minor improvements in closing the black-white arrest gap. However, in some smaller counties with low numbers of Black residents, Black arrest rates have been increasing (e.g., Amador County, Butte County, Nevada County, San Benito County, Shasta County, Siskiyou County, Tuolomne County). The arrest rate analysis is limited to population data obtained from both decennial US census and American Community Survey estimates. Population estimates are more precise for larger counties/ cities than for smaller counties/ cities.

- Among the cities included in this analysis, cities' of Palo Alto, South Gate, Newport Beach, Richmond,
 Santa Monica, San Francisco, Torrance, Pasadena, Glendale, Mountain View, Long Beach, Downey and
 Whittier had a relatively high average black arrest rate. They also have high disparities with a high
 average black-white ratio. For instance, the city of South Gate had a very high disparity, with a Black-white
 arrest rate ratio of almost 26 to 1. It also had a very high arrest rate for Blacks, at 422 per 100,000 people.
 Not all arrests by police are of city residents; however, lacking information about where the arrested
 persons live, this is our best estimate.
- In collaboration with MDH, this report documents booking/arrest rates at the tract level based on the home address of the individual for four LEAs: Kern County Sheriff's Department, Sacramento County Sheriff's Department, Long Beach Police Department, and Los Angeles Sheriff's Department. Across the four LEAs, Sacramento and Kern have the highest arrest/booking rates at the tract level. In these LEAs, the majority of the tracts with the highest arrest/ booking rates are also considered severely disadvantaged communities. The California Department of Water Resources defines a 'severely disadvantaged community' as a community with an annual median household income that is less than 80% of the statewide MHI.

If you look at the people who are profiting today from the green rush, it's predominately non-African Americans. It's incumbent upon policymakers to step up and have proper interventions and services to ensure we focus on the communities we left behind.

WHEN THE SMOKE CLEARS:

RACIAL DISPARITIES IN MARIJUANA ARRESTS

Research Report

OVERVIEW

This report documents racial disparities in marijuana arrests in California from 1996 – 2016, based on an analysis of data from the California Department of Justice Criminal Offender Record Information, conducted by the UC Davis Center for Regional Change.¹ In addition, this report documents disparities in marijuana-related arrests for select law enforcement agencies in When I got my first car, I was being pulled over weekly, and every time I was being searched. They were constantly looking for something, whether they had a reason to or not.

-OAKLAND RESIDENT

California from 2010 – 2016 based on data and analysis from the Million Dollar Hood Project, University of California, Los Angeles.²

In 1996, roughly 70 per 100,000 California residents had an arrest that included a charge for a marijuana-related crime. The marijuana arrest rate increased to a high of 90 per 100,000 in 2009, then decreased to 48 per 100,000 in 2016, with the biggest single year drops in 2011 and 2014, when penalties were reduced.³ The number of marijuana-related arrests and the type of charges has changed over time, but racial disparities have persisted, such that Blacks are still nearly four times more likely to be arrested and charged with marijuana crime than whites.

TRENDS IN MARIJUANA CHARGES BY RACE

In 1996, the most common charge for Blacks and Hispanics was 11359 - possession of marijuana with intent to sell, followed by 11360(A) - selling marijuana. For whites, 11359 - possession for sale is also the most common charge, followed by 11358 - cultivation of marijuana, then 11360(A) - selling marijuana. While 60% of all marijuana-related charges for Blacks is 11359 - possession with intent to sell, only 47% of whites have an arrest that includes this charge. Arrests for 11358 - cultivation of marijuana, account for 21% of all marijuana-related charges for whites, compared to 6.5% for

Hispanics and 4.2% for Blacks. Selling marijuana, 11360(A), constituted 26% of charges brought against Hispanics, compared to 20% of charges for Blacks and 17% for whites.



Charges by Race, 1996

Possession of marijuana for sale remained the most prevalent charge in 2016 for each race group, but it constituted a higher percentage of all marijuana-related arrests for Blacks (55%) than for Hispanics (44%) or whites (41%). By 2016, very few charges were brought for 11360 - transporting marijuana for sale, or 11360(A) - giving away marijuana. There was a large increase in the percentage of marijuana arrests for possession of concentrated cannabis, 11357(A), across race groups. In 2016, this charge is the second most common for whites after possession of marijuana for sale. Blacks and Hispanics experienced an increase in the share of charges that was for cultivating marijuana, 11358. For whites, the percentage of charges that were for cultivation declined from 21% in 1996 to 16% in 2016.



Charges by Race, 2016

Figure 2. Percent of all marijuana-related charges for the most prevalent charges in 2016, by race.

Figure 1. Percent of all marijuana-related charges for the most prevalent charges in 1996, by race.

ARREST RATES BY RACE

Examination of statewide arrest rates for non-Hispanic Blacks, Hispanics, and non-Hispanic whites reveals stark disparities. The arrest rate for whites and Hispanics has remained between about 40 per 100,000 population and 90 per 100,000, compared to a range of 157 – 429 per 100,000 population for blacks. The arrest rate for Blacks increased by 80% between 1996 and 2008, but only 54%

Blacks are still nearly four times more likely to be arrested and charged with marijuana crime than whites.

for whites. By 2009, when the black arrest rate peaked, it was nearly twice as high as it had been in 1996. The marijuana arrest rate for Hispanics was highest in 1996, but declined so much that by 2006, it was lower than the white arrest rate and has remained very close to the white arrest rate ever since.

Marijuana arrest rates have been declining since 2008-2009 in every group, but faster for Blacks than whites or Hispanics. However, there was a larger relative drop in the white arrest rate than the Black arrest rate in 2015 and 2016, such that the ratio of the black arrest rate to the white arrest increased during those two years from its low 3.4. The largest disparity in arrest rates for Blacks relative to whites occurred in 2009, when the Black-white arrest rate ratio stood at 6.8. In that year, Blacks were about 7 times more likely than whites to be charged with marijuana crimes.



Marijuana Arrest Rate by Race, California

Figure 3. Trends in marijuana arrest rates by race in the state of California.

COUNTY PATTERNS IN ARREST RATES

Comparing arrest rates by county and looking at trends over time from 2000 - 2016, we find that most counties have experienced a decline and are closing the Black-white gap, especially in recent years (e.g. Alameda County, Contra Costa County, Fresno County, Los Angeles County, Merced County, Orange

My dad was incarcerated for drug use, not selling. He was incarcerated for years because every time he used and got caught, he was arrested. And instead of it being treated like a public health crisis, it was treated as a crime.

-SCORZA

County, Riverside County, San Bernardino County, San Diego County, San Francisco County, Solano County, Ventura County). In some smaller counties with low numbers of Black residents, however, Black arrest rates have been increasing (e.g. Amador County, Butte County, Nevada County, San Benito County, Shasta County, Siskiyou County, Tuolomne County).

The highest arrest rates occur in marijuana-producing counties such as Mendocino, where the Black arrest rate in 2016 was almost 4,500 per 100,000 population, nearly ten times higher than the white arrest rate of 480 per 100,000 white population. Humboldt County, where the arrest rate for Blacks has also been very high, saw an increase of about 50% from 2014 to 2016, from a rate of almost 1,000 per 100,000 Black population to nearly 1,500 per 100,000 Black population. Trinity County has a very small Black population and a very high Black arrest rate of about 3,600 in 2016, compared to a white rate of 682.

The lowest arrest rate for Blacks, 21 marijuana-related arrests, occurred in Lassen County in 2013, and the highest arrest rate was 5,731 per 100,000 in Mendocino County in 2009. For Hispanics, the lowest rate was 9.6 per 100,000 in Yuba County in 2000, and the highest rate was 2,333 in Trinity County in 2014. The lowest marijuana arrest rate experienced by whites was 19 per 100,000 in both Marin County and San Mateo County in 2000, and the highest rate for whites was 735 in 2010 in Mendocino County. [Appendix B and Appendix C include charts that display trends in arrest rates for counties in California.]

ARREST RATES & DISPARITIES IN ARRESTS IN CITIES

Arrest rates within cities were calculated by combining arrests made by municipal police departments with population data for the city. This method is imprecise, because not all arrests by police are of city residents, but lacking information about where the arrested persons live, this is our best estimate. After arrest rates for Blacks and whites were calculated, the arrest rate ratio was calculated by dividing the Black arrest rate by the white arrest rate. This measure assesses the degree of the disparity between blacks and whites, with values greater than 1 indicating blacks are arrested at a higher rate than whites, and the larger the number, the greater the disparity.

In order to compare cities to each other, arrest rates were averaged across years for which data were available for each city. This captures historical patterns of disparities rather than focusing on a single year. Some cities with the highest disparities in arrest rates have the lowest overall arrest rates, and vice versa. In order to capture these patterns, the average arrest rate for Blacks and the average Black-white arrest rate ratio were ranked and divided into three equally sized groups (low, medium and high), then combined into a single measure that characterizes a city as on the two dimensions. For example, of the cities included in this analysis, South Gate ranked among the highest with average arrest rate for Blacks, at 422 per 100,000 people. It also had a very high disparity, with a Black-white arrest rate ratio of almost 26 to 1. This city is characterized as being high on both dimensions. In contrast, the city of Pittsburg also had a high Black arrest rate (211), but a very low Black-white disparity (2.4:1), so it is characterized as being high-low. At the other end of the spectrum, Pleasanton was low on both dimensions, with a Black arrest rate of 1.8 and racial disparity of 0.77. These categories were assigned to the respective LEAs in each city and the map below displays the LEAs by category.



Figure 4. Marijuana-related Arrest Rates Disparities Across LEAs in California (1996 – 2016) (for detailed information, see Appendix A.

BOOKING/ARREST RATES IN TRACTS FOR SELECT LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES (LEA)

Booking/Arrest rates were calculated at the tract level for four different law enforcement agencies. These include: 1) Kern County Sheriff's Department; 2) Long Beach Police Department; 3) Los Angeles Sheriff's Department and; 4) Sacramento County Sheriff's department.

The following maps present the booking/ arrest rates at the tract level for the four The relationships in the community, the relationships with the Police Department, all of those things weigh heavily on the chances of success for young people.

—JAY SCHIENER

LEAs based on the home address of the individual.⁵ Sacramento and Kern have the highest arrest/booking rates at the tract level across the four LEAs. The majority of the tracts with the highest arrest/ booking rates are also considered severely disadvantaged communities. The California Department of Water Resources (DWR), defines a disadvantaged community (DAC) as a community with an annual median household income (MHI) that is less than 80% of the statewide annual MHI.⁶ Furthermore, those census geographies (tracts) with an annual MHI less than 60% of the statewide annual MHI are considered "Severely Disadvantaged Communities" (SDAC).



Figure 5. Marijuana/Cannabis-related bookings by home census tract: Kern County Sheriff's Department (2010-2016).

Within the jurisdiction of the Kern County Sheriff's Department and the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department, the tracts with the top five booking rates are severely disadvantaged communities.

In the Long Beach Police Department's jurisdiction, four out of the five tracts with the top five arrest rates are severely disadvantaged. In the Los Angeles Sheriff's department's jurisdiction, three out of the five tracts with the top five booking rates are severely disadvantaged.



Figure 6. Median household income of tracts with the top 5 cannabis-related bookings rates: Kern County Sheriff's Department (2010-2016).

11

We have allowed the system to decimate communities of color, African American communities, poor communities.

—ALLEN WARREN, SACRAMENTO CITY COUNCILMEMBER



Figure 7. Marijuana/Cannabis-related arrests by home census tract: Long Beach Police Department (2010-2016).



Figure 8. Median household income of tracts with the top 5 cannabis-related arrest rates: Long Beach Police Department (2010-2016).



Figure 9. Marijuana/Cannabis-related bookings by home census tract: Los Angeles Sheriff's Department (2012-2016)



Figure 10. Median household income of tracts with the top 5 cannabis-related booking rates: Los Angeles's Sheriff's Department (2012-2016)



Figure 11. Marijuana/Cannabis-related bookings by home census tract: Sacramento County Sheriff's Department (2010-2016)



Figure 12. Median household income of tracts with the top 5 cannabis-related booking rates: Sacramento County Sheriff's Department (2010-2016).

METHODOLOGY

This report includes data collection and analysis of marijuana-related arrests that was conducted in two parts. For the first part of the report regarding arrest rates at the LEA level, data was collected from the California Department of Justice Criminal Offender Record Information (CORI) and analyzed by the UC Davis Center for Regional Change. Detailed methodology for this section is provided in the following paragraph. For the second part encompassing tract-level analyses, arrest/ booking rates at the tract level were obtained from the Million Dollar Hoods Project team. More information about this data and the methodology can be found in the Million Dollar Hoods project reports.⁷ Additional analysis of the data provided by the Million Dollar Hoods Project was conducted by the Center for Regional Change.

This section presents the detailed methodology of the first part. All arrests that included marijuana-related charges were extracted from the CORI data.⁸ Multiple charges can be brought in a single arrest, some or all of which can be for violations of laws pertaining to cannabis. This analysis focuses primarily on arrests that included at least one marijuana charge as the unit of analysis, even if there were more serious charges in the same arrest.

The number of arrests that included at least one marijuana charge were aggregated first by county, year, and race and then by law enforcement agency (LEA), year, and race. These data were then merged with population data for counties and cities, and arrest rates were calculated by dividing the number of arrests in a given year and for a given race with the population estimate for the same year and race. When population data was not available for a given race group in a given year, the arrest rate could not be calculated. For LEAs, only municipal police departments in cities with a population over 65,000 in the year 2016 were examined. This analysis does not account for any mismatches between city boundaries and police department jurisdictional boundaries.

Once the race-specific rates were calculated, disparities in arrest rates were identified by calculating rate ratios. The Black-white ratio is the Black arrest rate divided by the white arrest rate. A value of 1 indicates parity – Blacks and whites are arrested at the same rate. Values greater than 1 indicate that more Blacks are arrested per 100,000 Black people than the number of whites who are arrested per 100,000 white people. Values less than 1 indicate that the arrest rate for whites is higher than the arrest rate for Blacks. If the arrest rate for whites is 0, the ratio cannot be calculated. We also calculated the Hispanic-white rate ratio. Other race and ethnic groups had too few arrests, or populations too small to calculate reliable arrest rates and rate ratios in all counties and cities.

The DOJ data span the years 1997-2016, but given the lack of reliable race-specific population estimates, the arrest rate analysis is limited to census years (2000, 2010) and years for which American Community Survey 5-year estimates are available (2009 – 2016).⁹ When calculating arrest rates using the ACS 5-year estimates for the race-specific population size, we use the average of the race-specific arrest count over the same 5 year period.

For example, the Hispanic arrest rate for 2009 is calculated in this manner:

(TOTAL # ARRESTS FOR HISPANICS IN 2005/2009) / 5

(ACS 5-YEAR ESTIMATE OF THE HISPANIC POPULATION FOR 2005-09) / 100,000

Note that there may be other charges filed for the same arrest, and individuals may have been arrested multiple times. LEAs are not required to report the location of the arrest or the arrested individual's residential location, so it was not possible to determine whether an individual arrested in a given city or county resided there, nor was it possible to use this data to analyze spatial patterns in arrest disparities.

The margin of error (MOE) for the black-white ratio for each year was calculated in the following manner:

MOE (AB/AW * PW/PB) = AB/AW * MOE(PW/PB), where the MOE(PW/PB) was calculated using the MOE formula of the ratio from the ACS guide.¹⁰

MOE (PW/PB) =
$$\frac{1}{PB} \sqrt{[MOE(PW)]^2 + (\frac{PW}{PB})^2 * [MOE(PB)]^2}$$

Where, AB = Black arrests; AW = White arrests; PW = White population; and PB = Black population.

Then, the MOE of each ratio was used to calculate the MOE of the average ratio. The MOE of the average ratio was calculated in the following manner:

MOE(average ratio) =
$$\pm \frac{1}{n} \sqrt{[MOE(X_1)^2 + [MOE(X_2)^2 + ... + [MOE(X_n)]^2]}$$

Note: For cities that had zero white arrests, the black-white ratio could not be calculated. The n was adjusted accordingly excluding the years for which the ratio could not be calculated.

END NOTES

¹ The UC Davis and California Department of Justice Institutional Review Boards approved this research.

² For detailed data collection, methodology, and analysis please refer to: Lee, Eric; Bryan, Isaac; Dupuy, Danielle; Tso, Mariah; Kochaphum, Albert; and Lytle-Hernandez, Kelly (2019). "Cannabis in Kern County: Bookings into the Kern County; Bryan, Isaac; Dupuy, Danielle; Luz Maria Flores; Tso, Mariah; Kochaphum, Albert; and Lytle-Hernandez, Kelly (2019). "Cannabis in Los Angeles: Bookings into the Los Angeles County Jail, 2012-2016". Los Angeles, CA. The Million Dollar Hoods Project.; Bryan, Isaac; Dupuy, Danielle; Jones, DaMonte; Tso, Mariah; Kochaphum, Albert; and Lytle-Hernandez, Kelly. (2019). "Cannabis in Long Beach: Arrests by the Long Beach Police Department, 2010-2016". Los Angeles, CA. The Million Dollar Hoods Project.; Navarro, Joanna Itzel; Bryan, Isaac; Dupuy, Danielle; Tso, Mariah; Kochaphum, Albert; and Lytle-Hernandez, Kelly (2019). "Cannabis in Sacramento County: Arrests by the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department, 2010-2016". Los Angeles, CA. The Million Dollar Hoods Project.; Navarro, Hoods Project.

³ Effective January 1, 2011, the penalty for possession of one ounce or less of marijuana was reduced from a misdemeanor to an infraction. (*Marijuana Enforcement Disparities In California: A Racial Injustice.* May, 2016. American Civil Liberties Union of California & Drug Policy Alliance). Several felony offenses were reclassified as misdemeanors after the passage of Proposition 47 on November 4, 2014, taking effect immediately.

⁴ In the law enforcement location dataset, police department locations for Moreno Valley, Perris, Victorville, and Lakewood were missing.

⁵ See endnote 2

⁶ California Department of Water Resources (2016). *Disadvantaged Communities Mapping Tool.* For more information please visit: https://water.ca.gov/Work-With-Us/Grants-And-Loans/Mapping-Tools. Last accessed December 19, 2019.

⁷ See endnote 2

⁸ The following set of offense codes were identified by searching for "marijuana" or "cannabis" in the offense description.

11357(A) HS — POSSESS CONCENTRATED CANNABIS 11357(B) HS — POSS MARIJUANA OVER 1 OZ/28.5 GRAM 11357(C) HS — POSS MARIJ: SPECIFIC CIRCUMSTANCES 11358 HS — PLANT/CULTIVATE/ETC MARIJUANA/HASH 11358(A) HS — PLANT/CULTIVATE/ETC MARIJ/HASHISH 11358(B) HS — PLANT/CULTIVATE/ETC MARIJUANA W/PRIOR 11358(C) HS — CULTIVATE MARIJUANA 6+ PLANTS 11359 HS — POSSESS MARIJUANA FOR SALE 11359(A) HS — POSSESS MARIJUANA/HASH FOR SALE 11360 HS — SELL/TRANSPORT/ETC MARIJUANA/HASH

11360(A) HS - GIVE/ETC MARIJ OVER 1 0Z/28.5 GRM

11360(A) HS - SELL OR TRANSPORT MARIJUANA/HASH

11360(A) HS - SELL/FURNISH/ETC MARIJUANA/HASH

11360(A) HS - SELL/GIVE/TRANSPORT/ETC MARIJUANA

11361 HS — INDUCE/ETC MINOR USE/SELL MARIJUANA

11361(A) HS - USE/INDUCE/SELL MINOR MARIJUANA

11361(B) HS - FURNISH/ETC MINOR WITH MARIJUANA

11530.1 HS - PLANT/CULTIVATE/ETC MARIJUANA

11530.5 HS - POSSESS MARIJUANA FOR SALE

11531 HS - SELL OR TRANSPORT MARIJUANA

11532 HS — OVER 21 FURNISH MARIJUANA TO MINOR

23222(B) VC - POSS MARIJUANA 1 OZ OR LES W/DRIVE

⁹ For added context in the years between 2000 and 2009, the authors used the ACS 1-year estimates for 2007 to estimate arrest rates for that year. The statewide arrest rate estimates use a combination of sources for the population numbers, including the decennial census (2000, 2010), California Department of Finance Population Estimates E-8 (1996-99, 2001-04), and ACS 1-year estimates (2005-09, 2011-16).

¹⁰ For additional information, refer to pg. 57 on ACS guide available at https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/ guidance/handbooks/general.html, accessed April 5, 2020.

Report by Cassie Hartzog and Asiya Natekal. 2019. "Racial Disparities in Marijuana Arrests: Insights from California." Report commissioned by Public Health Advocates and conducted by the UC Davis Center for Regional Change.

The authors would like to acknowledge Danielle Dupuy, Mariah Tso, and Eric Lee of Million Dollar Hoods Mapping Project for their substantial contribution to the report by sharing their data, analysis, and creating maps; and Sara Watterson for contributing to the analysis.

The UC Davis Center for Regional Change produces innovative and collaborative research to help build healthy, prosperous, sustainable, and equitable regions in California and beyond.

regionalchange.ucdavis.edu

APPENDIX A

MARIJUANA ARREST RATES BY LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY

Law Enforcement	Black to White	Black to White	Black
Agency	Arrest Ratio (x)	Margin of Error (+/-)	Arrest Rate
Alameda	11.5	0.59	38.9
Alhambra	4.29	0.52	156.8
Anaheim	2.45	0.09	84.63
Antioch	3.87	0.1	124.69
Bakersfield	3.62	0.08	4.41
Baldwin Park	6.86	1.58	270.95
Berkeley	24.56	0.87	27.25
Buena Park	4.8	0.36	189.72
Burbank	5.91	0.37	309.58
Chico	5.17	0.36	117.83
Chino	0.81	0.07	5.17
Chula Vista	2.22	0.07	25.57
Citrus Heights	20.79	2.97	6.93
Clovis	3.52	0.29	181.72
Concord	4.6	0.28	189.38
Corona	2.75	0.12	33.22
Costa Mesa	2.95	0.28	71.43
Daly City	4.13	0.3	13.19
Davis	4.39	0.42	28.42
Downey	7.77	0.38	93.83
El Monte	2.12	0.45	72.16
Fairfield	5.15	0.13	35.5
Fontana	1.74	0.06	21.33
Fremont	22.58	1.46	18.78
Fresno	5.42	0.05	144.06
Fullerton	2.47	0.15	114.07
Garden Grove	4.64	0.44	73.84
Glendale	6.57	0.41	333.22
Hawthorne	5.06	0.16	211.52
Hayward	3.11	0.12	5.94
Hemet	14.1	0.91	49.5

MARIJUANA ARREST RATES

BY LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY

Law Enforcement	Black to White	Black to White	Black
Agency	Arrest Ratio (x)	Margin of Error (+/-)	Arrest Rate
Huntington Beach	5.58	0.46	152.93
Indio	18.37	4	36.96
Inglewood	2.41	0.11	101.38
Irvine	3.18	0.21	28.71
Livermore	6.35	0.89	12.86
Long Beach	8.15	0.1	306.54
Manteca	3.95	0.29	178.9
Merced	9.35	0.43	35.93
Milpitas	5.78	0.6	18.8
Modesto	2.87	0.11	29.54
Moreno Valley	3.49	0.09	15.45
Mountain View	8.26	0.79	94.19
Murrieta	2.52	0.18	10.15
Napa	12.46	2.01	34.95
Newport Beach	12.43	2.6	421.83
Oakland	25.45	0.29	15.13
Oceanside	1.57	0.21	0.37
Ontario	1.96	0.09	26.09
Orange	7.21	0.44	82.88
Oxnard	1.65	0.1	16.29
Palo Alto	26.22	3.01	105.76
Pasadena	8.99	0.21	230.71
Perris	2.35	0.16	24.48
Pittsburg	2.42	0.08	210.94
Pleasanton	0.77	0.28	1.84
Pomona	4.36	0.12	94.83
Redding	5.99	0.4	111.87
Redlands	5.65	0.49	32.31
Redondo Beach	6.46	0.62	209.94
Redwood City	12.06	1.17	40.72
Rialto	2.17	0.11	9.22

MARIJUANA ARREST RATES

BY LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY

Law Enforcement	Black to White	Black to White	Black
Agency	Arrest Ratio (x)	Margin of Error (+/-)	Arrest Rate
Richmond	10.87	0.21	272.72
Riverside	3.94	0.14	13.45
Roseville	5.27	0.36	252.46
Sacramento	28.57	0.44	10.32
Salinas	5	0.42	45.63
San Bernardino	6.99	0.15	31.13
San Diego	4.3	0.03	2.05
San Francisco	9.56	0.05	289.72
San Jose	8.53	0.13	37.33
San Leandro	2.58	0.11	7.45
San Mateo	9.6	0.78	20.11
San Ramon	8.56	1.14	36.43
Santa Ana	1.96	0.13	30.73
Santa Barbara	2.99	0.26	25.72
Santa Clara	4.66	0.3	29.46
Santa Maria	3.18	0.49	11.01
Santa Monica	10.37	0.53	271.06
Santa Rosa	7.58	0.29	30.73
Simi Valley	1.2	0.18	5.02
South Gate	25.95	6.28	422.28
South San Francisco	21.73	2.56	48.16
Sunnyvale	3.22	0.36	9.94
Torrance	8.5	0.44	357.57
Tracy	3.12	0.16	154.15
Tustin	7.11	0.5	65.81
Union City	2.09	0.21	4.18
Upland	3.67	0.23	14.38
Vacaville	1.83	0.05	19.52
Vallejo	7.78	0.19	27.87
Victorville	3.17	0.17	10.1
Visalia	5.14	0.27	24.78

MARIJUANA ARREST RATES

BY LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY

Law Enforcement Agency	Black to White Arrest Ratio (x)	Black to White Margin of Error (+/-)	Black Arrest Rate
Walnut Creek	8.08	0.81	53.55
West Covina	3.27	0.17	116.68
Westminster	2.87	0.95	32.98
Whittier	7.39	0.8	256.6
Yuba City	2.33	0.12	49.23

APPENDIX B

MARIJUANA ARREST RATES BY COUNTY

County	Black to White Arrest Ratio (x)	Black to White Margin of Error (+/-)	Black Arrest Rate
Alameda	8.36	0.02	440.10
Alpine	0.00	0.00	0.00
Amador	1.29	0.06	190.87
Butte	4.49	0.13	554.48
Calaveras	3.66	0.78	395.14
Colusa	6.83	1.77	1,556.93
Contra Costa	7.75	0.03	353.49
Del Norte	0.65	0.03	136.55
El Dorado	3.27	0.32	233.49
Fresno	4.67	0.04	255.15
Glenn	6.16	0.52	758.22
Humboldt	3.33	0.11	1,023.01
Imperial	1.60	0.01	247.74
Inyo	0.99	0.02	189.44
Kern	4.95	0.03	278.77
Kings	2.54	0.03	187.62
Lake	1.70	0.03	392.55
Lassen	0.46	0.00	37.17
Los Angeles	6.69	0.01	296.51
Madera	2.20	0.04	167.04
Marin	5.22	0.06	229.80
Mariposa	1.87	0.28	310.55
Mendocino	7.28	0.54	4,106.58
Merced	4.37	0.05	359.81
Modoc	1.68	0.03	904.28
Mono	5.38	8.77	1,916.40
Monterey	4.03	0.05	338.05
Napa	3.68	0.05	313.17
Nevada	6.89	0.92	684.61
Orange	4.17	0.02	203.29
Placer	4.92	0.11	278.28

MARIJUANA ARREST RATES BY COUNTY

County	Black to White Arrest Ratio (x)	Black to White Margin of Error (+/-)	Black Arrest Rate
Plumas	12.55	21.93	682.02
Riverside	4.14	0.01	190.75
Sacramento	6.58	0.03	296.04
San Benito	2.73	0.10	289.72
San Bernardino	5.34	0.02	359.85
San Diego	3.48	0.01	233.96
San Francisco	7.89	0.03	1,153.45
San Joaquin	3.77	0.02	188.46
San Luis Obispo	2.50	0.04	165.86
San Mateo	9.44	0.08	285.46
Santa Barbara	3.61	0.06	202.11
Santa Clara	5.73	0.04	248.99
Santa Cruz	5.62	0.24	390.09
Shasta	3.99	0.11	519.52
Sierra	0.00	0.00	0.00
Siskiyou	2.71	0.11	418.62
Solano	3.63	0.02	288.55
Sonoma	4.77	0.11	661.39
Stanislaus	3.92	0.05	278.17
Sutter	3.43	0.52	244.57
Tehama	5.04	1.00	1361.46
Trinity	4.10	1.62	2,202.59
Tulare	4.04	0.09	237.21
Tuolomne	1.30	0.05	205.88
Ventura	2.91	0.04	114.51
Yolo	4.90	0.14	420.65
Yuba	1.80	0.17	240.37

APPENDIX C

ALAMEDA COUNTY





ALPINE COUNTY

MARIJUANA-RELATED ARREST RATES





26

AMADOR COUNTY





BUTTE COUNTY





CALAVERAS COUNTY





COLUSA COUNTY





CONTRA COSTA COUNTY





DEL NORTE COUNTY





EL DORADO COUNTY





FRESNO COUNTY





GLENN COUNTY





HUMBOLDT COUNTY




IMPERIAL COUNTY





INYO COUNTY MARIJUANA-RELATED ARREST RATES





KERN COUNTY MARIJUANA-RELATED ARREST RATES

300 200 100 0 2002 2002 2004 2006 2008 2010 2012 2014 2016 Race - Black - Hispanic - Other - White



39

KINGS COUNTY





LAKE COUNTY MARIJUANA-RELATED ARREST RATES





LASSEN COUNTY





LOS ANGELES COUNTY





MADERA COUNTY





MARIN COUNTY





MARIPOSA COUNTY





MENDOCINO COUNTY





MERCED COUNTY





MODOC COUNTY





MONO COUNTY





MONTEREY COUNTY





NAPA COUNTY MARIJUANA-RELATED ARREST RATES





NEVADA COUNTY





ORANGE COUNTY





PLACER COUNTY





PLUMAS COUNTY





RIVERSIDE COUNTY





SACRAMENTO COUNTY





SAN BENITO COUNTY





SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY





SAN DIEGO COUNTY





SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY





SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY





SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY





SAN MATEO COUNTY





SANTA BARBARA COUNTY





SANTA CLARA COUNTY





SANTA CRUZ COUNTY





SHASTA COUNTY





SIERRA COUNTY





SISKIYOU COUNTY





SOLANO COUNTY





SONOMA COUNTY





STANISLAUS COUNTY





SUTTER COUNTY





TEHAMA COUNTY





TRINITY COUNTY





TULARE COUNTY





TUOLUMNE COUNTY





VENTURA COUNTY





YOLO COUNTY





YUBA COUNTY



