

***Alameda County Probation
Department
A Look into Probation
Monthly Report***

July 2013



***Chief LaDonna M. Harris
Chief Probation Officer
400 Broadway
Oakland, California 94607
510-268-7233***

Executive Summary

This statistical report provides a brief summary of trends for adults and juveniles who have received services from the Alameda County Probation Department (ACPD) in July 2013. The purpose of this report is to promote greater understanding of the breadth and depth of services provided by the department and a snapshot of the populations we serve. This report is produced bi-monthly. The next report will be for September 2013.

This report was developed by the Alameda County Probation Department's Data Analysis Research & Reporting Team (DARRT). We welcome your feedback. For questions or comments, please feel free to contact Colin Bell or Carissa Pappas, Management Analysts at: ProbationDataRequest@acgov.org

Table of Contents		
Adult Services	Figure	Page Number
Adult Probation Counts	1	3
Adult Offense Types	2	3
Gender and Race of Adult Clients	3	4
Adults on Probation by Location	4	4
Primary Service Needs	5	5
Re-Aligned Population		
PRCS Cases Received	6	6
PRCS Gender and Race/Ethnicity Composition	7	6
PRCS Violation Types	8	7
Offense Types on Violations Filed for New Arrests of PRCS Clients	9	7
Juvenile Field Services		
Juvenile Probation Counts	10	8
Offense Types for Youth on Probation	11	8
Juveniles on Probation by Location	12	9
Juvenile Services-Referrals		
Referral Offense Types	13	10
Source for Referrals	14	10
Juvenile Referral Decisions by Month	15	11
Gender and Race of Youth Referred to Probation Department	16	11
Juvenile Referrals by Gender and Race/Ethnicity	17	12
Juvenile Facilities and Detention Alternatives		
Juvenile Hall/Secure Detention Counts	18	13
Juvenile Hall Admit Trends CY 2011, 2012and 2013	19	13
Juvenile Hall Release Trends CY 2011, 2012, and 2013	20	14
Juvenile Hall Detaining Offense Breakdown	21	14
Juvenile Hall Detaining Offenses by Race and Sex	22	15
GPS Monitoring	23	16
GPS Admit Trends CY 2011, 2012, and 2013	24	16
GPS Release Trends CY 2011, 2012, and 2013	25	17
Home Supervision Counts	26	18
Home Supervision Admit Trends CY 2011, 2012, and 2013	27	18
Home Supervision Release Trends CY 2011, 2012, and 2013	28	19
Camp Sweeney Counts	29	20
Offense Types for Youth Ordered to Camp Sweeney	30	20
Appendix		
Concentration of Juveniles on Probation per City/Zip Code by Age	31	21
Concentration of Juveniles on Probation per City/Zip Code by Race	32	22-23


Adult Services- Probation July 2013

Figure 1

Demographics	Start of July		Cases Opened in July		Cases Closed in July		End of July		Avg. Years on Probation
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Female	2,138	16%	32	12%	11	24%	2,159	16%	4 Years
Male	11,091	84%	236	88%	34	76%	11,293	84%	5 Years
Total	13,270	100%	268	100%	45	100%	13,452	100%	5 Years
Black	6,630	50%	118	44%	18	40%	6,730	50%	4 Years
Latino	2,766	21%	72	27%	10	22%	2,828	21%	5 Years
White	2,711	20%	55	21%	13	29%	2,753	20%	5 Years
Asian	575	4%	12	4%	2	4%	585	4%	5 Years
Other	547	4%	11	4%	2	4%	556	4%	----
Total	13,229	100%	268	100%	45	100%	13,452	100%	5 Years


- Figure 1 displays an aggregate summary of the clients during July 2013 for adult clients. The table also displays the number of clients who are on probation at the start of the month and allows the reader to “drill down” and review the data by gender and race. On July 1, 2013 there were 13,229 adults on probation. Throughout the month of July, there were 268 new cases opened and 45 adults released from probation. On July 31, 2013 there were 13,452 adults on probation. The average length of time on probation for adults was 5 years.

Figure 2



- Figure 2 displays the offense type breakdown for the total adult client population in July 2013. Over 95% of adult clients supervised are convicted felons. The majority of clients are placed on probation for a property (36%) or drug (26%) offense, while only 20% of clients were placed on probation for offenses against persons, and 20% for “Other Felony” offenses.

Figure 3




- Figure 3 displays an aggregate summary of demographic information for adult probation clients. Males account for 84% of the population, while females represent 16%. African-Americans make up half of the population, Latinos clients account for 21% while Whites 20% of the client population. The remaining clients are Asian (4%) and "Other Races" (4%).

Figure 4


**Adult Probation Clients by Location
July 2013**

Alameda County (82%)	#	%
OAKLAND	5,510	41%
HAYWARD	1,736	13%
SAN LEANDRO	816	6%
FREMONT	658	5%
BERKELEY	475	4%
UNION CITY	387	3%
LIVERMORE	359	3%
ALAMEDA	265	2%
NEWARK	251	2%
CASTRO VALLEY	218	2%
SAN LORENZO	200	1%
PLEASANTON	112	1%
DUBLIN	84	1%
EMERYVILLE	55	0%
ALBANY	26	0%
SUNOL	0	0%
Out of County Totals	2,390	18%
SAN FRANCISCO	258	2%
RICHMOND	198	1%
SAN JOSE	151	1%
All Other Out of County	1,783	13%
Overall Totals	13,542	100%



- Figure 4 displays the locations where adults on probation reside. The majority of adult clients reside in Oakland (41%) and Hayward (13%). San Leandro (at 6%) and Fremont (at 5%) are the next largest home residence cities for adult clients. Other communities that make up less than five percent each of the total client group. Please note: Figure 4 displays some cities which are not in Alameda County.


Figure 5



- Service needs are identified during the initial investigation by a Deputy Probation Officer who makes a personal assessment of a client's primary service need. Figure 5 displays primary service needs for the Banked and Formal Supervision populations. Drug and alcohol service needs make nearly half (46%) of the Banked populations' primary needs and 36% for clients under formal supervision. Employment needs also rate high for each population, 20% and 17% respectively.


Re-Aligned Population July 2013

Figure 6




- Between October 2011 and July 2013, 1,205 Post-Release Community Supervision (PRCS) clients were released from the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) to Alameda County Probation Department for supervision services after the passage of AB109. Figure 6 shows the number of cases received per month. In July 2013, there were 618 active cases and the remaining 587 cases were either closed or transferred to another jurisdiction.

Figure 7




- The majority of PRCS clients released from CDCR to date are African-American males and overall, non-white clients account for 96% of all PRCS clients. Females make up 8% of the total population, while males make up 92%.

Figure 8



- As Figure 8 shows, there have been 587 violations filed on the 1,234 (48%) PRCS clients in Alameda County. Out of all violations filed, the majority (43%) have been for new arrests. 24% of violations have been filed for AWOL status which means the client stopped reporting to the ACPD sometime after their first meeting. An additional 24% were filed for no show status which means the client never reported to their first meeting with ACPD upon release from CDCR custody. The remaining clients who had violations filed were for a combination of a new arrest and a no show (3%) and Other Violations (2%).

Figure 9



- There have been 225 violations filed on PRCS clients for new arrests. Figure 9 shows the percent of offense types represented by the new arrests. Most new arrest violations were for drug/alcohol arrests (35%), property offenses (27%), and offenses against persons (19%). Weapons offenses accounted for 5% of violations, while offenses against the public made up 6% of new arrest violations. Arrests in the "Other" category made up the remaining 8% of offense types. The majority of "Other" arrests were for misdemeanor offenses.

Juvenile Field Services- Probation July 2013


Figure 10

Demographics	Start of July		Cases Opened in July		Cases Closed in July		End of July		Avg. Months on Probation
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Female	348	16%	28	17%	28	15%	348	16%	12 months
Male	1,799	84%	137	83%	162	85%	1,773	84%	18 months
Total	2,147	100%	164	100%	190	100%	2,121	100%	17 months
Black	1,238	50%	84	44%	106	56%	1,216	50%	20 months
Latino	579	21%	53	27%	52	27%	580	21%	14 months
White	182	20%	14	21%	21	11%	175	21%	10 months
Asian	97	4%	4	4%	6	3%	95	5%	12 months
Other	51	4%	9	4%	5	3%	55	4%	6 months
Total	2,147	100%	164	100%	190	100%	2,121	100%	17 months

- Figure 10 displays an aggregate summary of the cases that were active in July 2013 for juvenile probationers. The table also displays the number of youth who were on juvenile probation at the start of July 2013, as well as the average length of stay for those whose cases have closed. The table allows the reader to “drill down” and review the data broken down by gender and race. On July 1, 2013 there were 2,147 youth on juvenile probation. Throughout the month of July, there were 164 youth newly placed on probation and 190 youth whose cases were closed from probation. The average length of stay for youth on juvenile probation was 17 months. *Average length of stay is only calculated for those cases that closed during the month.

Figure 11


Offense Types for Youth on Probation July 2013



- Figure 11 displays the offense type breakdown for the total juvenile client population in July 2013. The majority of clients were placed on probation for a property (28%) or person offense (26%), while 26% of clients were placed on probation for failing to obey a court order. The remaining juveniles were placed on probation for weapons offenses (7%), offenses against the public (7%), drug offenses (5%), and other offenses (1%).

Figure 12


City of Residence for Youth on Probation July 2013



- Figure 12 displays the locations where juveniles on probation in Alameda County live. The majority of youth reside in Oakland (47%) and Hayward (15%). The remaining 38% of youth reside in a variety of communities throughout Alameda County. The “Out of County” category includes 4% of clients who reside in cities outside of Alameda County.


Juvenile Services- Referrals July 2013

Figure 13




- In July 2013, referrals for property offenses composed the largest portion (22%) of all juvenile referrals to ACPD. Referrals for warrants were the next largest category (17%), followed by offenses against persons (16%), violations of probation (VOP 9%), and offenses against the public (7%). Both a warrant and violation of probation made up 7% of all referrals in July. Referrals for drug and alcohol offenses represented 8%, while the remaining referrals were made up of weapons offenses (3%), status offenses (1%) and "Other" offenses (10%). (Please refer to Figure 17 for a more detailed description of each offense type.)

Figure 14




- Oakland and Hayward Police and Sheriffs were responsible for 46% of all referrals in July 2013. The other categories comprise just over half (54%) and include the police departments and other local law enforcement agencies throughout Alameda County.

Figure 15



- In 2013, the number of youth referred to ACPD has remained fairly stable over the first three months and declined slightly in June and July. The percent of youth who were booked into Juvenile Hall after being referred to Probation was also consistent during this period. Youth who are not booked into Juvenile Hall are given a Notice to Appear (NTA) in Court and released.

Figure 16



- Figure 16 displays an aggregate summary of demographic information for youth referred to probation. Males account for 73% of the population, while females represent 27%. African-Americans make up over half (62%) of the population, Latino clients account for 22%, while White clients make up 9% of the population. The remaining clients are Asian (3%) and "Other Races" (4%).

Figure 17

Juvenile Referrals by Gender and Race/Ethnicity - July 2013								
Persons Offenses	All Youth	Male	Female	White	Amer	Latino	Asian	Other
Robbery	20	18	2	1	12	6		1
Assault and Battery	17	15	2	1	16			
Assault	4	4			4			
Threaten	3	1	2	1	1	1		
Sex Offense	1		1		1			
Total Persons Referrals	45	38	7	3	34	7	0	1
% of Total Persons Referrals	100%	84%	16%	7%	76%	16%	0%	2%
Property Offenses	All Youth	Male	Female	White	Amer	Latino	Asian	Other
Petty Theft	20	13	7	5	10	4		1
Burglary	16	9	7		10	5		1
Theft	13	9	4		10		2	1
Vandalism	10	9	1		7	3		
Auto Theft	5	3	2		4			1
Possession Burglary Tools	4	3	1		3			1
Attempted Motor Vehicle Theft	1	1			1			
Total Property Referrals	69	47	22	5	45	12	2	5
% of Total Property Referrals	100%	68%	32%	7%	65%	17%	3%	7%
Offenses Against the Public	All Youth	Male	Female	White	Amer	Latino	Asian	Other
Obstruction of Justice	9	8	1		5	4		
Weapons	9	7	2	1	5	3		
Other Public Order Offense	6	5	1	1	2	2	1	
Disorderly Conduct	3	1	2		2			1
Traffic Offense	2	1	1	1	1			
Attempted Perjury	1	1			1			
Contempt of Court	1	1			1			
Prostitution	1	1				1		
Total Public Referrals	32	25	7	3	17	10	1	1
% of Total Public Referrals	100%	78%	22%	9%	53%	31%	3%	3%
Drug & Alcohol Offenses	All Youth	Male	Female	White	Amer	Latino	Asian	Other
Liquor Possession	8	2	6	2	2	2	1	1
Drug Possession	12	9	3		9	2	1	
Total Drug & Alcohol Referrals	20	11	9	2	11	4	2	1
% of Total Drug & Alcohol Referrals	100%	55%	45%	10%	55%	20%	10%	5%
Status Offenses	All Youth	Male	Female	White	Amer	Latino	Asian	Other
Truancy	1	1		1				
Total Status Referrals	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
% of Total Status Referrals	100%	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
"Other" Types of Referrals	All Youth	Male	Female	White	Afr-	Latino	Asian	Other
Warrant	50	35	15	4	22	19	1	4
Change of Placement	16	13	3	3	11	2		
Transfer	16	14	2	2	10	3	1	
GPS Failure	10	3	7		9	1		
Placement Runaway	10	7	3	1	7	1	1	
Violation of Probation	7	6	1		6	1		
Home Supervision Failure	2	1	1	1	1			
Camp Runaway	1	1				1		
Miscellaneous	1	1			1			
Other Status	3	3		1	2			
Total Other Referrals	116	84	32	12	69	28	3	4
% of Total "Other" Referrals	100%	72%	28%	10%	59%	24%	3%	3%
Total Referrals	283	206	77	26	176	61	8	12
% of Total Referrals	100%	73%	27%	9%	62%	22%	3%	4%

Juvenile Facilities and Alternatives to Detention July 2013


Juvenile Hall

Figure 18

Demographics	Start of July		Admits in July		Releases in July		End of July		Avg. Length of Stay
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Female	34	17%	30	19%	38	19%	26	16%	17 Days
Male	164	83%	125	81%	157	81%	132	84%	19 Days
Total	198	100%	155	100%	195	100%	158	100%	18 Days
Black	137	69%	86	55%	116	59%	107	68%	25 Days
Latino	39	20%	48	31%	51	26%	36	23%	24 Days
White	14	7%	14	9%	18	9%	10	6%	11 Days
Asian	5	3%	5	3%	8	4%	2	1%	7 Days
Other	3	2%	2	1%	2	1%	3	2%	4 Days
Total	198	100%	155	100%	195	100%	158	100%	24 Days


- Figure 18 displays an aggregate summary of youth who were admitted/released to secure detention in July 2013. The table also displays the number of youth who were detained at the start of the month, as well as the average length of stay. The table allows the reader to “drill down” and review the data broken down by gender and race. On July 1, 2013 there were 198 youth at Juvenile Hall. Throughout the month of July, there were 155 new admissions and 195 releases from the facility. On July 31, 2013 there were 158 youth at Juvenile Hall. The average length of stay for youth in the Hall was 24 days.

Figure 19




- Figure 19 displays a summary of the number of youth who were admitted per month at Juvenile Hall during calendar years 2011, 2012, and 2013. The number of youth booked into Juvenile Hall decreased in July 2013 to 249 (down 3% from July 2012 when 258 youth were booked into the Hall and down 2% from July 2011 when 253 youth were admitted).

Figure 20



- Figure 20 displays a summary of the number of youth who were released per month from Juvenile Hall during calendar years 2011, 2012, and 2013. The number of youth released in July 2013 decreased from the previous year (down 27% from July 2012 when 332 youth were released from the Hall and down 20% from July 2011 when 306 youth were released from Juvenile Hall).

Figure 21



- The majority of juveniles held in the Alameda County Juvenile Hall were detained for status offenses (35%). Person offenses were the next most prevalent offense (30%), followed by property offenses at 19%, with the remaining offenses composed of public order (5%), drugs (3%), and warrant violations (3%) and the remaining offenses making up 2% or less. (Please refer to Figure 22 for a more detailed description of each offense type.)

Figure 22

Most Serious Detaining Offenses for all Youth at Juvenile Hall by Race and Sex July 2013								
Person Offenses	All Youth	Males	Females	White	Afr-Amer	Latino	Asian	Other
Robbery	91	76	15	7	53	30	1	0
Assault	23	19	4	1	16	4	2	0
Assault and Battery	4	4	0	1	2	1	0	0
Murder	4	3	1	0	3	0	1	0
Other Person/Sex Offense	4	4	0	1	1	2	0	0
Felony Assault	2	1	1	0	2	0	0	0
Sex Offenses	2	2	0	1	1	0	0	0
Threatening	2	2	0	0	2	0	0	0
Forcible Rape	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Kidnapping	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Total Person Referrals	134	113	21	11	81	37	5	0
% of Persons Referrals	100%	84%	16%	8%	60%	28%	4%	0%
Property Offenses	All Youth	Males	Females	White	Afr-Amer	Latino	Asian	Other
Burglary	37	34	3	3	22	12	0	0
Auto Theft	30	25	5	3	20	6	1	0
Theft	16	14	2	3	7	5	0	1
Forgery/Fraud	3	2	1	0	2	1	0	0
Total Property Referrals	86	75	11	9	51	24	1	1
% of Property Referrals	100%	87%	13%	10%	59%	28%	1%	1%
Offenses Against the Public	All Youth	Males	Females	White	Afr-Amer	Latino	Asian	Other
Weapons	18	15	3	1	12	3	1	1
Prostitution	8	7	1	0	4	3	1	0
Obstruction	7	6	1	0	3	4	0	0
Lewd or Lascivious	4	4	0	0	3	1	0	0
Traffic	3	2	1	0	1	2	0	0
Other Public Order Offense	2	2	0	0	2	0	0	0
DUI	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	1
Perjury	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Total Public Offense Referrals	45	38	7	1	27	13	2	2
% of Public Offense Referrals	100%	84%	16%	2%	60%	29%	4%	4%
Drug & Alcohol	All Youth	Males	Females	White	Afr-Amer	Latino	Asian	Other
Marijuana	4	1	3	0	4	0	0	0
Narcotics	4	2	2	2	2	0	0	0
Other Drug Offense	2	2	0	1	0	1	0	0
Total Drug & Alcohol Referrals	10	5	5	3	6	1	0	0
% of Drug & Alcohol Referrals	100%	50%	50%	30%	60%	10%	0%	0%
Other Types of Petitions	All Youth	Males	Females	White	Afr-Amer	Latino	Asian	Other
Warrant	58	45	13	3	35	15	3	2
Change of Placement	52	41	11	2	35	12	2	1
Transfer	23	19	4	2	11	9	0	1
GPS Failure	21	15	6	2	17	1	1	0
Violation of Probation	7	7	0	0	4	2	1	0
Camp Runaway	6	4	2	1	5	0	0	0
Truancy	3	2	1	0	2	0	1	0
Home Supervision Failure	2	2	0	0	0	2	0	0
Courtesy Hold	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Escape	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Miscellaneous	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Total Other Types of Referrals	175	135	40	10	111	42	8	4
% of Other Types of Referrals	100%	77%	23%	6%	63%	24%	5%	2%
Total Youth Detained	450	366	84	34	276	117	16	7
% of Total Referrals	100%	81%	19%	8%	61%	26%	4%	2%

Juvenile Detention Alternatives July 2013


GPS Monitoring

Figure 23

Demographics	Start of July		Admits in July		Releases in July		End of July		Avg. Length of Stay
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Female	27	15%	20	22%	19	16%	28	18%	34 Days
Male	154	85%	72	78%	101	84%	125	82%	33 Days
Total	181	100%	92	100%	120	100%	153	100%	33 Days
Black	90	50%	45	49%	52	43%	83	54%	34 Days
Latino	65	36%	32	35%	43	36%	54	35%	33 Days
White	15	8%	12	13%	15	13%	12	8%	21 Days
Asian	5	3%	2	2%	6	5%	1	1%	56 Days
Other	6	3%	1	1%	4	3%	3	2%	31 Days
Total	181	100%	92	100%	120	100%	153	100%	33 Days


- Figure 23 displays an aggregate summary of youth who were admitted/released in the Global Positioning Satellite (GPS) detention alternative program in July 2013. The table also displays the number of youth who were in GPS at the start of the month, as well as the average length of stay for those who have closed out of the program. The table allows the reader to “drill down” and review the data broken down by gender and race. On July 1, 2013 there were 181 youth in the GPS program. Throughout the month of July, there were 92 youth newly placed in the program and 120 youth released from the program. The average length of stay for youth in the program was 33 days.

Figure 24



- Figure 24 displays a summary of the number of youth who were admitted per month to the GPS program during calendar years 2011, 2012, and 2013.

Figure 25



- Figure 25 displays a summary of the number of youth who were released per month from the GPS program during calendar years 2011, 2012, and 2013.


Home Supervision Program

Figure 26

Demographics	Start of July		Admits in July		Releases in July		End of July		Avg. Length of Stay
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Female	10	27%	3	23%	5	28%	8	25%	13 Days
Male	27	73%	10	77%	13	72%	24	75%	38 Days
Total	37	100%	13	100%	18	100%	32	100%	31 Days
Black	26	70%	6	46%	10	56%	22	69%	35 Days
Latino	8	22%	3	23%	5	28%	6	19%	31 Days
White	3	8%	3	23%	2	11%	4	13%	26 Days
Asian	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	-
Other	0	0%	1	8%	1	6%	0	0%	-
Total	37	100%	13	100%	18	100%	32	100%	31 Days


- Figure 26 displays an aggregate summary of youth who were admitted/released in the Home Supervision (HS) detention alternative program in July 2013. The table also displays the number of youth who were in HS at the start of July 2013, as well as the average length of stay. The table allows the reader to “drill down” and review the data broken down by gender and race. On July 1, 2013 there were 37 youth in the Home Supervision program. Throughout the month of July, there were 13 youth newly placed in the program and 18 youth released from the program. The average length of stay for youth in the program was 31 days.

Figure 27



- Figure 27 displays a summary of the number of youth who were admitted per month to the Home Supervision program during calendar years 2011, 2012, and 2013.

Figure 28



- Figure 28 displays a summary of the number of youth who were released per month from the Home Supervision program during calendar years 2011, 2012, and 2013.


Camp Sweeney July 2013

Figure 29

Demographics	Start of July		Admits in July		Releases in July		End of July		Avg. Length of Stay
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Male	49	100%	21	100%	28	100%	42	100%	77 Days
Total	49	100%	21	100%	28	100%	42	100%	
Black	21	43%	14	67%	19	68%	16	38%	73 Days
Latino	20	41%	4	19%	5	18%	19	45%	83 Days
White	1	2%	1	5%	1	4%	1	2%	129 Days
Asian	6	12%	2	10%	3	11%	5	12%	70 Days
Other	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	-
Total	49	100%	21	100%	28	100%	42	100%	77 Days

- Figure 29 displays an aggregate summary of youth who were admitted/released to Camp Sweeney in July 2013. The table also displays the number of youth who were placed at the start of the month. The table allows the reader to “drill down” and review the data broken down by gender and race. On July 1, 2013 there were 49 youth at Camp Sweeney. Throughout the month of July, there were 21 new admissions and 28 releases from the facility. On July 31, 2013 there were 77 youth at Camp Sweeney.

Figure 30



- The majority of juveniles placed at Camp Sweeney in July 2013, were adjudicated for a failure to obey court orders (42%) and for property offenses (23%). Youth who committed persons offenses made up the next largest category (27%), while 4% of youth were ordered to Camp Sweeney as a weapons offense (4%) or a drug offense (4%).

Appendix

Concentration of Juveniles on Probation per City/Zip Code by AGE

Figure 31

City	Zip Code	# of Youth	% of Youth	12&<	%	13-15	%	16-18	%	19-24	%
Alameda	94501	17	100%	0	0%	7	100%	10	100%	0	0%
Alameda	94502	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Subtotal		17	100%	0	0%	7	100%	10	100%	0	0%
Albany	94706	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%
Subtotal		3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%
Berkeley	94701	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Berkeley	94702	12	0%	0	0%	4	0%	8	0%	0	0%
Berkeley	94703	6	19%	0	0%	1	10%	5	23%	0	0%
Berkeley	94704	4	13%	0	0%	0	0%	4	18%	0	0%
Berkeley	94705	2	6%	0	0%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%
Berkeley	94707	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Berkeley	94708	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Berkeley	94709	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Berkeley	94710	8	25%	0	0%	3	30%	5	23%	0	0%
Subtotal		32	63%	0	0%	10	60%	22	64%	0	0%
Castro Valley	94546	19	100%	0	0%	7	100%	12	100%	0	0%
Castro Valley	94552	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Subtotal		19	100%	0	0%	7	100%	12	100%	0	0%
Dublin	94568	8	100%	0	0%	0	0%	7	100%	1	100%
Subtotal		8	100%	0	0%	0	0%	7	100%	1	100%
Emeryville	94608	37	100%	0	0%	6	100%	27	100%	4	100%
Subtotal		37	100%	0	0%	6	100%	27	100%	4	100%
Fremont	94536	17	33%	0	0%	3	100%	14	30%	0	0%
Fremont	94537	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Fremont	94538	15	29%	0	0%	0	0%	15	32%	0	0%
Fremont	94539	4	8%	0	0%	0	0%	4	9%	0	0%
Fremont	94555	16	31%	0	0%	0	0%	14	30%	2	0%
Subtotal		52	100%	0	0%	3	100%	47	100%	2	0%
Hayward	94541	40	28%	0	0%	5	19%	35	31%	0	0%
Hayward	94542	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%	0	0%
Hayward	94544	78	54%	0	0%	19	73%	54	47%	5	100%
Hayward	94545	25	17%	0	0%	2	8%	23	20%	0	0%
Hayward	94547	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Subtotal		145	100%	0	0%	26	100%	114	100%	5	100%
Livermore	94550	11	46%	0	0%	3	75%	7	39%	1	50%
Livermore	94551	13	54%	0	0%	1	25%	11	61%	1	50%
Subtotal		24	100%	0	0%	4	100%	18	100%	2	100%
Newark	94560	13	100%	0	0%	1	100%	12	100%	0	0%
Subtotal		13	100%	0	0%	1	100%	12	100%	0	0%
Oakland	94601	72	19%	0	0%	13	19%	55	20%	4	11%
Oakland	94602	17	4%	0	0%	2	3%	12	4%	3	9%
Oakland	94603	60	16%	0	0%	15	21%	39	14%	6	17%
Oakland	94604	1	0%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%
Oakland	94605	73	19%	1	50%	19	27%	45	16%	8	23%
Oakland	94606	24	6%	0	0%	8	11%	14	5%	2	6%
Oakland	94607	39	10%	0	0%	0	0%	31	11%	8	23%
Oakland	94609	18	5%	0	0%	2	3%	16	6%	0	0%
Oakland	94610	5	1%	0	0%	1	1%	2	1%	2	6%
Oakland	94611	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Oakland	94612	5	1%	1	50%	1	1%	3	1%	0	0%
Oakland	94614	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Oakland	94615	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Oakland	94617	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Oakland	94618	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Oakland	94619	15	4%	0	0%	2	3%	13	5%	0	0%
Oakland	94621	53	14%	0	0%	6	9%	45	16%	2	6%
Oakland	94643	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Oakland	94662	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Subtotal		382	100%	2	100%	70	100%	275	100%	35	100%

(figure 31, continued)

Subtotal		382	100%	2	100%	70	100%	275	100%	35	100%
Pleasanton	94566	5	45%	0	0%	0	0%	5	45%	0	0%
Pleasanton	94588	6	55%	0	0%	0	0%	6	55%	0	0%
Subtotal		11	100%	0	0%	0	0%	11	100%	0	0%
San Leandro	94577	19	40%	0	0%	6	55%	11	35%	2	33%
San Leandro	94578	23	48%	0	0%	5	45%	14	45%	4	67%
San Leandro	94579	6	13%	0	0%	0	0%	6	19%	0	0%
Subtotal		48	100%	0	0%	11	100%	31	100%	6	100%
San Lorenzo	94580	23	100%	0	0%	7	100%	15	100%	1	100%
Subtotal		23	100%	0	0%	7	100%	15	100%	1	100%
Sunol	94586	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Subtotal		0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Union City	94587	19	100%	0	0%	2	100%	16	100%	1	100%
Subtotal		19	100%	0	0%	2	100%	16	100%	1	100%
Total (with % as County breakdown)		833		2	0.2%	154	18.8%	620	75.5%	57	6.9%

Concentration of Juveniles on Probation per City/Zip Code by Race

Figure 32

City	Zip Code	# of Youth	% of Youth	Asian	%	Black	%	Latino	%	Other	%	White	%
Alameda	94501	17	100%	0	0%	7	100%	7	100%	0	0%	3	100%
Alameda	94502	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Subtotal		17	100%	0	0%	7	100%	7	100%	0	0%	3	100%
Albany	94706	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Subtotal		3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Berkeley	94701	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Berkeley	94702	12	38%	3	100%	5	21%	4	80%	0	0%	0	0%
Berkeley	94703	6	19%	0	0%	5	21%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
Berkeley	94704	4	13%	0	0%	4	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Berkeley	94705	2	6%	0	0%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Berkeley	94707	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Berkeley	94708	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Berkeley	94709	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Berkeley	94710	8	25%	0	0%	8	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Subtotal		32	100%	3	100%	24	100%	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Castro Valley	94546	19	100%	1	100%	3	100%	5	100%	4	100%	6	100%
Castro Valley	94552	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Subtotal		19	100%	1	100%	3	100%	5	100%	4	100%	6	100%
Dublin	94568	8	100%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%	5	100%
Subtotal		8	100%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%	5	100%
Emeryville	94608	37	100%	0	0%	34	100%	2	100%	0	0%	1	100%
Subtotal		37	100%	0	0%	34	100%	2	100%	0	0%	1	100%
Fremont	94536	17	33%	1	13%	7	39%	6	33%	0	0%	3	38%
Fremont	94537	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Fremont	94538	15	29%	2	25%	0	0%	9	50%	0	0%	4	50%
Fremont	94539	4	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3	17%	0	0%	1	13%
Fremont	94555	16	31%	5	63%	11	61%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Subtotal		52	100%	8	100%	18	100%	18	100%	0	0%	8	100%
Hayward	94541	40	28%	0	0%	10	18%	15	23%	0	0%	15	88%
Hayward	94542	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	0	0%
Hayward	94544	78	54%	0	0%	33	58%	43	67%	0	0%	2	12%
Hayward	94545	25	17%	2	100%	14	25%	6	9%	3	60%	0	0%
Hayward	94547	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Subtotal		145	100%	2	100%	57	100%	64	100%	5	100%	17	100%
Livermore	94550	11	46%	0	0%	1	50%	3	27%	1	100%	6	86%
Livermore	94551	13	54%	3	100%	1	50%	8	73%	0	0%	1	14%
Subtotal		24	100%	3	100%	2	100%	11	100%	1	100%	7	100%
Newark	94560	13	100%	3	100%	2	100%	8	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Subtotal		13	100%	3	100%	2	100%	8	100%	0	0%	0	0%

(figure 32, continued)

City	Zip Code	# of Youth	% of Youth	Asian	%	Black	%	Latino	%	Other	%	White	%
Oakland	94601	72	19%	1	20%	44	15%	26	34%	1	50%	0	0%
Oakland	94602	17	4%	0	0%	14	5%	2	3%	0	0%	1	25%
Oakland	94603	60	16%	0	0%	36	12%	24	32%	0	0%	0	0%
Oakland	94604	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Oakland	94605	73	19%	0	0%	64	22%	8	11%	1	50%	0	0%
Oakland	94606	24	6%	4	80%	14	5%	4	5%	0	0%	2	50%
Oakland	94607	39	10%	0	0%	38	13%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%
Oakland	94609	18	5%	0	0%	18	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Oakland	94610	5	1%	0	0%	4	1%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%
Oakland	94611	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Oakland	94612	5	1%	0	0%	5	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Oakland	94614	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Oakland	94615	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Oakland	94617	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Oakland	94618	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Oakland	94619	15	4%	0	0%	14	5%	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%
Oakland	94621	53	14%	0	0%	43	15%	10	13%	0	0%	0	0%
Oakland	94643	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Oakland	94662	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Subtotal		382	100%	5	100%	295	100%	76	100%	2	100%	4	100%
Pleasanton	94566	5	45%	1	100%	0	0%	1	14%	0	0%	3	100%
Pleasanton	94588	6	55%	0	0%	0	0%	6	86%	0	0%	0	0%
Subtotal		11	100%	1	100%	0	0%	7	100%	0	0%	3	100%
San Leandro	94577	19	40%	0	0%	13	42%	3	43%	1	33%	2	29%
San Leandro	94578	23	48%	0	0%	17	55%	4	57%	2	67%	0	0%
San Leandro	94579	6	13%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	5	71%
Subtotal		48	100%	0	0%	31	100%	7	100%	3	100%	7	100%
San Lorenzo	94580	23	100%	1	100%	9	100%	10	100%	0	0%	3	100%
Subtotal		23	100%	1	100%	9	100%	10	100%	0	0%	3	100%
Sunol	94586	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Subtotal		0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Union City	94587	19	100%	3	100%	2	100%	12	100%	1	100%	1	100%
Subtotal		19	100%	3	100%	2	100%	12	100%	1	100%	1	100%
Total		833		30	4%	484	58%	238	29%	16	2%	65	8%