



JUVENILE JUSTICE CRIME PREVENTION ACT

MARCH 2015
Annual Report



Juvenile Justice

Crime Prevention Act

Annual Report to the Legislature

March 2015

**Board of State and Community Corrections
2590 Venture Oaks Way, Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95833
<http://www.bscc.ca.gov>**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., GOVERNOR
BOARD OF STATE AND COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

Board Members

Linda M. Penner, Chair

Board of State and Community Corrections

Jeffrey A. Beard

Secretary

Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation

Daniel P. Stone

*Director, Division of Adult Parole Operations
Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation*

Dean Growdon

*Sheriff (jail with RC of 200 inmates or less)
County of Lassen*

Geoff Dean

*Sheriff (jail with RC over 200 inmates)
County of Ventura*

Susan Mauriello

*County Supervisor or
County Administrative Officer
County of Santa Cruz*

Michelle Brown

*Chief Probation Officer (county over 200,000 pop.)
County of San Bernardino*

Michael Ertola

*Chief Probation Officer (county under 200,000 pop.)
County of Nevada*

William R. Pounders

*Judge
Retired – County of Los Angeles*

David L. Maggard, Jr.

*Chief of Police
Irvine Police Department*

Scott Budnick

*Community provider or rehabilitative treatment
or services for adult offenders
Anti-Recidivism Coalition*

David Steinhart

*Community Provider or advocate with expertise in
effective programs, polices, and treatment of at-risk youth
and juvenile offenders
Commonweal*

Mimi H. Silbert

*Public Member
Delancey Street Foundation*

Staff

Kathleen T. Howard, Executive Director

Tracie Cone, Communications Director

Patricia M. Pechtel, General Counsel

Robert J. Takeshta, Deputy Director
Administration & Research Division

Mary Jolls, Deputy Director
Corrections Planning & Programs Division

Allison Ganter, Deputy Director
Facilities Standards & Operations Division

Evonne Garner, Deputy Director
Standards & Training for Corrections Division

Kimberly D. Bushard, Field Representative
Corrections Planning & Programs Division

Anthony Jackson, Research Program Specialist I
Administration & Research Division

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
An Overview of the Program	2-5
■ Program Administration	
■ Program Funding	
■ Program Evaluation	
■ Local Planning Process	
Statewide Evaluation	6-11
■ Program Expenditures	
■ Juvenile Justice Outcomes	
Summary	12
Appendices	
A. Statewide Expenditures and Budgeted Funds	
B. Statewide Summary of Per Capita Program Costs	
C. Results for Mandated Outcomes for Each of 13 Program Years	
D. Change in County Arrest Rates per 100,000 Juveniles Age 10-17	

Executive Summary

The Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) was created by the Crime Prevention Act of 2000 to provide a stable funding source for local juvenile justice programs aimed at curbing crime and delinquency among at-risk youth.

The number of juveniles arrested in California reached an all-time low in 2011 with 149,563 taken into custody. While many never again come in contact with the public safety system, in fiscal year 2013-14 more than 83,000 minors required therapeutic approaches.

In fiscal year 2013-2014, \$107.1 million in JJCPA funding supported 149 programs in 56 participating counties (Alpine and Sierra counties opt out). Programs that resulted in lower crime rates among juveniles include intensive family interventions, after-school programs for at-risk teens, gang and truancy prevention, job training and diversion programs.

State law requires that counties provide programs that have been demonstrated to be effective in reducing delinquency. Per capita spending by counties ranges from \$12,733 in Lake County to \$386 in San Bernardino County and \$125 in Mariposa County. Some of the variation in per capita costs is due to economies of scale.

Since inception of the JJCPA, programs it funds have consistently proven effective at helping youth rehabilitate, and this report year is no exception. This report will show that youth participating in JJCPA programs had statistically significantly lower rates of arrest (23.2 percent) and incarceration (22.5 percent) compared to youth in a comparable reference group (29.6 percent and 28.6 percent, respectively). They also had fewer probation violations (24.7 percent compared to 30.0 percent for the reference group) and were more likely to complete probation (30.6 percent compared to 26.4 percent for the reference group).

The data show that youth who do not participate in the programs are consistently 20 percent to 30 percent more likely to be arrested than youth in JJCPA-funded programs.

Like the more recently implemented adult realignment, the JJCPA is a collaboration between state, locals and stakeholders. Local officials and stakeholders determine where to direct resources through an interagency planning process. The State appropriates funds that the Controller's Office distributes to counties based on population. Community-based organizations deliver services.

This partnership acknowledges the value the State places on local discretion and multiagency collaboration in addressing the problem of juvenile crime in our communities.

An Overview of the Program

The Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) program was created by the Crime Prevention Act of 2000 (Chapter 353) to provide a stable funding source for local juvenile justice programs aimed at curbing crime and delinquency among at-risk youth.

JJCPA involves a partnership between the State of California, 56 counties¹, and various community-based organizations to enhance public safety by reducing juvenile crime and delinquency. Local officials and stakeholders determine where to direct resources through an interagency planning process; the State appropriates funds, which the Controller's Office distributes to counties on a per capita basis; and community-based organizations play a critical role in delivering services. It is a partnership that recognizes the need for juvenile justice resources and the value of local discretion and multiagency collaboration in addressing the problem of juvenile crime in our communities.

Since inception, the JJCPA program has undergone only minimal change. Existing program structure requires that counties report to the BSCC twice annually. By May 1st of each year, counties must submit plans of proposed expenditures for the upcoming fiscal year. By October 15th of each year, counties must submit outcomes and expenditures for the previous fiscal year.

Pursuant to legislation enacted in 2014 (Assembly Bill 1468/Ch. 26) the newly established Juvenile Justice Data Working Group will be reviewing the JJCPA program, along with the Youthful Offender Block Grant program, in order "to recommend options for coordinating and modernizing the juvenile justice data systems and reports that are developed and maintained by state and county agencies."

The working group includes representatives from:

- The Department of Justice
- The Board of State and Community Corrections
- The Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Division of Juvenile Justice
- The Chief Probation Officers of California
- The Judicial Council
- Other representatives deemed appropriate by the board

The working group is charged by statute with a number of tasks and deliverables including recommending a plan to the BSCC Board by April 30, 2015 to improve or streamline reporting requirements for the Youthful Offender Block Grant and Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act programs.

¹Alpine and Sierra Counties have historically chosen not to participate in this program.

Program Administration

The Legislature tasked the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) with administration of JJCPA, including submission of annual legislative reports to provide information regarding:

- Program expenditures for each county;
- Data for the six statutorily mandated outcome measures; and
- Statewide effectiveness of the local planning process.

In administering this program, the BSCC staff work closely with local agencies. At the request of counties, the BSCC provides technical assistance to identify and document programmatic strategies that have proven effective in reducing juvenile crime, determine appropriate evaluation designs for the proposed programs, and problem-solve on issues related to program implementation and evaluation.

Program Funding

As originally enacted JJCPA was supported entirely with state General Fund monies; however, funding for this program has changed significantly over time as resources have become more and more scarce. In fiscal year (FY) 2008-09, the allocation amount for JJCPA was reduced and the funding source was changed from General Fund to Vehicle License Fee (VLF). In FY 2011-12, as part of the 2011 Public Safety Realignment legislation, the Local Revenue Fund of 2011 was created. The Local Revenue Fund has a variety of subaccounts, including the Law Enforcement Services Account (LESA), which is the new funding source for JJCPA. The main revenue source for JJCPA is the Vehicle License Fee. Any shortfall in that revenue source is made up by State Sales Tax revenue. For 2013-14, the total \$107.1 million allocated to counties came from VLF.

On September 26, 2014, counties received the first ever allocation of growth funding for JJCPA. The additional \$6.7 million was from revenue generated during 2013-14 and became part of each county's total allocation for that year. However, the growth funding amount was not known until just before the counties' report due date and is, therefore, not included in any of the figures provided in this report.

The Department of Finance (DOF) is the fiduciary agent for the JJCPA program. As such, DOF is responsible for performing the annual calculation to determine allocation amounts for each county, including any allocations for growth. The individual county allocation amounts take into account changes in each county's population.

Program Evaluation

The JJCPA legislation requires funded programs to be modeled on strategies that have demonstrated effectiveness in curbing juvenile delinquency. Additionally, this legislation requires counties to collect and report information related to annual program expenditures and juvenile justice outcomes. At the local level, these evaluation activities enable stakeholders to assess progress toward desired goals, refine their programs, and target

available resources. These evaluation efforts also enable the Legislature to monitor the State's investment in JJCPA.

The data counties are statutorily required to report fall into six categories:

- Arrest rate;
- Incarceration rate;
- Probation violation rate;
- Probation completion rate;
- Restitution completion rate; and
- Community service completion rate.

Individual counties only report on outcome measures applicable to their programs. For example, a truancy prevention program serving primarily middle school students would not be expected to have an impact on the completion of probation rate. In this example, the program would only report data for relevant categories.

In addition to the mandated outcomes, some counties track and report on local outcomes specific to their individual programs. For example, some counties report on local outcomes related to academic achievement and conduct.

Local Planning Process

State policies have increasingly recognized the need to strengthen the local juvenile justice system and its array of alternatives and graduated sanctions for juvenile offenders through a comprehensive local planning process that requires probation departments to coordinate their activities with other key stakeholders.

The programs funded by JJCPA address a continuum of responses for at-risk youth and juvenile offenders—prevention, intervention, supervision, and incarceration—and respond to specific problems associated with these populations in each county.

To receive the initial JJCPA allocation, each county developed a comprehensive multi-agency juvenile justice plan that included an assessment of existing resources targeting at-risk youth, juvenile offenders, and their families, as well as a local action strategy for addressing identified gaps in the continuum of responses to juvenile crime and delinquency. Each year counties either update their plan or reapply for continuation funding for the same programs as the prior year. The application and any plan modifications must be approved by the BSCC.

In an effort to ensure coordination and collaboration among the various local agencies serving at-risk youth and young offenders, the JJCPA legislation requires the county Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC) to develop and modify the plan. The JJCC is chaired by the county's chief probation officer and its members include representatives of law enforcement and criminal justice agencies, the board of supervisors, social services, education, mental health, and community-based organizations. The JJCC meets periodically to review program progress and evaluation data.

Chief probation officers and other JJCC members have reported satisfaction with the JJCPA planning process, noting that it maximizes their ability to implement or expand successful programs tailored to the specific populations and needs of local jurisdictions. In addition to pointing out that juvenile justice planning has become more strategic, integrated, and outcome-oriented, JJCC members have underscored the value of sharing information regarding youth programs across the many disciplines involved in the JJCPA programs.

As counties also endeavor to effectively implement the 2011 Public Safety Realignment, this multiagency collaboration is more important than ever.

Statewide Evaluation

Program Expenditures

The counties participating in the JJCPA program expended \$102,632,042 in FY 2013-14. Counties also spent \$59,023 in interest earned on JJCPA funds and \$12,138,954 in non-JJCPA funds to support program activities. The total expenditures on JJCPA programs were \$114,830,019. Although the JJCPA program does not have a local match requirement, the voluntary infusion of local resources demonstrates the counties' commitment to the goals of JJCPA and leverages the State's investment in deterring youth from criminal activity. A total of 83,296 minors participated in the 149 JJCPA programs in FY 2013-14, which translates into an average per capita cost to the state (JJCPA funds) of \$1,232. See Appendices A and B for county specific details on expenditures and per capita costs.

Juvenile Justice Outcomes

As required by law, the statewide evaluation of JJCPA focuses on six legislatively mandated outcomes: arrest rate, incarceration rate, probation violation rate; and probation, restitution, and community service completion rates. The data collected by counties on these six variables continue to indicate that JJCPA programs are having the intended effect of curbing juvenile crime and delinquency in California.²

Statewide results for the six legislatively mandated outcomes for FY 2011-12 are shown in Table A. All results are averages across programs for rates measured as percentages (e.g., percent of youth with one or more arrest). As has been the practice since inception of JJCPA, programs included in the computation of these averages are those that reported results for a minimum of 15 program juveniles and 15 reference group youth.³

As reported in Table A, average rates for program juveniles for the outcomes of arrest rate, incarceration rate, completion of probation rate, and probation violation rate are all statistically significantly different in the desired direction from the average rates for reference group youth⁴.

²For most outcomes, counties assess their progress by comparing the results for participating minors to a reference group (i.e., participants prior to entering the program, prior program participants, juveniles comparable to those who received program services or some other external reference group). The length and timing of the evaluation periods vary from program to program. For example, one program might compare the arrest rate of participants for the three-month period prior to program entry with their arrest rate during the first three months of the program, whereas another program might use a longer time period and compare the arrest rate prior to program entry with the arrest rate following program exit.

³ This restriction is applied to protect against the calculation of statewide average rates from being inappropriately influenced by individual program rates that are based on very few cases and are thus subject to extreme fluctuations from year to year.

⁴ Per standard practice, statistically significant differences are those with a probability of .05 or less of occurring by chance ($p \leq .05$).

TABLE A

Results for Legislatively-Mandated Juvenile Justice Outcomes

Outcome Measure	Number of Programs	Average	
		Program Juveniles	Reference Group
Arrest Rate*	112	23.2%	29.6%
Incarceration Rate*	113	22.5%	28.6%
Completion of Probation*	99	30.6%	26.4%
Probation Violation Rate*	87	24.7%	30.0%
Completion of Restitution	58	25.3%	25.2%
Completion of Community Service	64	39.2%	38.4%

*Statistically significant group differences

As JJCPA funding for established programs has continued over the years, more and more counties have opted to switch from using an outside group of juveniles as the Reference Group, to using the program juveniles from a previous time period (usually the previous fiscal year) as the reference group. This permits across year comparisons of program outcomes. In many instances, counties have no expectation that program outcomes will improve from year to year, given that no significant changes are expected in the program and/or the youth served by the program. Thus, a large percentage of counties now expect “No Change” in program outcomes across years. All such programs (i.e., those where no differences are expected in program outcomes for the program juveniles and the reference group youth) are included in the results reported in Table A.

Table B shows the results for the legislatively-mandated outcomes for just those programs where the counties have expressed the expectation that program juveniles will achieve better results than reference group juveniles. With the exception of Probation Violation Rate, the pattern of statistically significant results mirrors those reported in Table A. Further, the magnitude of the group differences for all outcomes is larger than those reported in Table A. For example, for all programs (Table A) the average arrest rate for the program juveniles is 23.2 percent and the average arrest rate for the reference group juveniles is 29.6 percent - a difference of 6.4 percent. When results for the two groups are reported for just those programs where there is an expectation that the program juveniles will have a lower arrest rate (Table B), the difference in the average arrest rates is 11 percent (22.7 percent for program juveniles and 33.7 percent for reference group juveniles).

TABLE B

Results for Legislatively-Mandated Juvenile Justice Outcomes for Programs with Expectation that Program Group Juveniles Will Achieve Superior Results

Outcome Measure	Number of Programs	Average	
		Program Juveniles	Reference Group
Arrest Rate*	54	22.7%	33.7%
Incarceration Rate*	49	18.1%	29.6%
Completion of Probation*	35	36.6%	28.3%
Probation Violation Rate	33	22.0%	27.0%
Completion of Restitution	19	27.8%	31.7%
Completion of Community Service	25	45.9%	42.0%


*Statistically significant group differences

On balance, results for the six legislatively-mandated outcomes are very similar to those obtained in previous years. The year-to-year consistency in results is illustrated in the following two charts. Both charts provide graphic illustrations of the consistency of results for the outcome of arrest rate. Chart A graphs the average rates for program juveniles and reference group juveniles for all programs. Chart B graphs the same rates for just those programs where program juveniles were expected to have lower arrest rates. In both instances, the years covered by the graphs span FY 2001-02 to FY 2013-14.

As indicated in Chart A, the arrest rate for program juveniles has been lower than that for reference group juveniles in every year since inception of the JJCPA Program. Across years, the percent of program juveniles arrested has averaged approximately 25 percent, while for reference group juveniles the percent arrested has averaged approximately 32 percent. In every year, the percent arrested for program juveniles has been significantly lower than that for reference group juveniles.

CHART A


Average Arrest Rates by Program Year (Fiscal Year): All Programs



As reflected in Chart B, in those programs where the program juveniles were expected to achieve significantly lower arrest rates than reference group juveniles, the differences in arrest rates are even more dramatic. For these programs, the percent of program juveniles arrested has averaged approximately 26 percent and the percent of reference group juveniles arrested has averaged approximately 37 percent. Moreover, the difference between the two rates has been statistically significant in every year since program inception.

CHART B

Average Arrest Rates by Program Year (Fiscal Year): Programs with Expectation that Program Group Juveniles Will Achieve Superior Results



Similar charts for each of the six mandated outcomes are presented in Appendix C. As reflected in these charts, the results for incarceration rate and completion of probation rate are highly similar to those for arrest rate, with program juveniles consistently performing better than reference group juveniles on these outcomes. In contrast, while probation violation rates were highly similar for many years, in the last seven years these rates have been lower for program juveniles.

Charts C and D show the results for all outcomes when averaged over the 12 program years for which data are available. As would be expected, for those outcomes for which the year-to-year outcome results are highly consistent—arrest rate, incarceration rate, rate of completion of probation, and completion of community service rate—the differences in the average rates achieved for the program juveniles and reference group juveniles are also the greatest. And, for those outcomes where year-to-year group differences have not been as consistent—probation violation rate and rate of completion of restitution—the differences in the average rates between the program juveniles and the reference group juveniles are not as large.

CHART C

OUTCOME RESULTS AVERAGED OVER 13 PROGRAM YEARS (ALL PROGRAMS)





CHART D

OUTCOME RESULTS AVERAGED OVER 13 PROGRAM YEARS (ALL PROGRAMS)



The enabling legislation requires that all counties report on the annual countywide arrest rate per 100,000 juveniles age 10 to 17. Results for this measure are presented for the most recent reporting year (2013) in Appendix D.

At the individual county level, the arrest rate per 100,000 juveniles can vary significantly from year-to-year, especially in counties having small juvenile populations. Nevertheless, as reflected in the figures in Appendix D, for all but 6 of the 56 counties that receive JJCPA funding, the arrest rate per 100,000 juveniles was lower in 2013 than in 2012. Furthermore, for all 56 counties combined, the arrest rate per 100,000 juveniles decreased from 2,915 in 2012 to 2,376 in 2013. This is the 12th year-to-year decline that has occurred in the 13 years that annual reports have been submitted to the Legislature on JJCPA.

Summary

During FY 2013-14, 56 counties reported spending \$102,632,042 in JJCPA funds to provide 149 programs serving 83,296 juveniles, with a per capita cost of \$1,232 (JJCPA funds only).

Youth participating in JJCPA programs during FY 2013-14 had significantly better outcomes than youth in comparison groups. Specifically, youth in JJCPA programs had significantly lower arrest, incarceration, and probation violation rates. They also had a significantly higher rate of completion of probation. Moreover, program data for the past 13 years show that youth who participate in JJCPA programs consistently had lower arrest and incarceration rates, and consistently had higher rates of completion of probation.

While the JJCPA-funded programs were as varied as California's many counties, the common thread was the adherence to programs with proven effectiveness. The funding eligibility criteria prescribed by state law compels counties to limit JJCPA spending to "programs and approaches that have been demonstrated to be effective in reducing delinquency." Although this requirement has been in place for 13 years, it is especially relevant in light of the new responsibilities of the BSCC to facilitate the use of evidence-based practices in California. As BSCC continues to build its capacity to identify, promote and provide technical assistance regarding evidence-based programs, practices and strategies, greater emphasis will be placed on assisting counties with expanding the use of EBP within their JJCPA programs. It is anticipated that such an emphasis will only further the successes already realized in the JJCPA program.

APPENDIX A: Statewide Expenditures and Budgeted Funds⁵

County	State Fund Expenditures	Interest Expenditures	Non-JJCPA Expenditures	Total Expenditures	State Funds Budgeted
Alameda	\$2,747,908	\$1,392	\$0	\$2,749,300	\$4,332,026
Amador	\$107,830	\$0	\$69,947	\$177,777	\$105,476
Butte	\$615,233	\$0	\$723,500	\$1,338,733	\$615,233
Calaveras	\$127,900	\$3,646	\$0	\$131,546	\$127,244
Colusa	\$61,140	\$0	\$0	\$61,140	\$50,000
Contra Costa	\$3,117,335	\$0	\$337,510	\$3,454,845	\$2,975,232
Del Norte	\$28,098	\$0	\$0	\$28,098	\$82,207
El Dorado	\$557,440	\$531	\$93,242	\$651,213	\$519,727
Fresno	\$2,465,595	\$0	\$0	\$2,465,595	\$2,677,605
Glenn	\$39,857	\$0	\$0	\$39,857	\$81,535
Humboldt	\$385,222	\$605	\$1,192,185	\$1,578,012	\$385,209
Imperial	\$507,056	\$0	\$0	\$507,056	\$507,056
Inyo	\$53,067	\$0	\$0	\$53,067	\$53,067
Kern	\$2,439,754	\$0	\$0	\$2,439,754	\$2,330,157
Kings	\$373,232	\$1,126	\$0	\$374,358	\$405,218
Lake	\$177,789	\$0	\$13,201	\$190,990	\$177,789
Lassen	\$98,390	\$0	\$110,334	\$208,724	\$98,390
Los Angeles	\$26,094,900	\$0	\$0	\$26,094,900	\$28,077,199
Madera	\$365,516	\$0	\$0	\$365,516	\$510,267
Marin	\$722,499	\$0	\$0	\$722,499	\$722,499
Mariposa	\$50,480	\$0	\$0	\$50,480	\$50,480
Mendocino	\$185,778	\$876	\$0	\$186,654	\$251,172
Merced	\$697,807	\$2,265	\$229,422	\$929,494	\$717,115
Modoc	\$27,118	\$0	\$0	\$27,118	\$27,118
Mono	\$78,898	\$0	\$0	\$78,898	\$96,000
Monterey	\$1,207,459	\$0	\$1,556,149	\$2,763,608	\$1,207,459
Napa	\$420,141	\$0	\$0	\$420,141	\$385,273
Nevada	\$282,253	\$2,266	\$0	\$284,519	\$282,253
Orange	\$9,038,353	\$0	\$500,525	\$9,538,878	\$9,014,083
Placer	\$919,337	\$0	\$0	\$919,337	\$963,581
Plumas	\$6,798	\$0	\$37,195	\$43,993	\$57,028
Riverside	\$5,860,112	\$0	\$0	\$5,860,112	\$6,315,897
Sacramento	\$4,234,750	\$644	\$25,347	\$4,260,741	\$5,346,203
San Benito	\$114,749	\$0	\$0	\$114,749	\$158,395
San Bernardino	\$5,969,446	\$14,684	\$0	\$5,984,130	\$6,388,027
San Diego	\$8,816,672	\$0	\$5,223,437	\$14,040,109	\$8,562,077
San Francisco	\$2,346,147	\$3,156	\$0	\$2,349,303	\$2,317,250
San Joaquin	\$1,627,093	\$0	\$0	\$1,627,093	\$1,977,340
San Luis Obispo	\$771,670	\$0	\$22,446	\$794,116	\$771,670
San Mateo	\$2,089,455	\$0	\$648,430	\$2,737,885	\$2,089,455
Santa Barbara	\$1,331,073	\$6,512	\$289,865	\$1,627,450	\$1,204,519
Santa Clara	\$4,937,380	\$0	\$0	\$4,937,380	\$5,209,173
Santa Cruz	\$753,057	\$0	\$310,876	\$1,063,933	\$753,057
Shasta	\$510,483	\$0	\$191,517	\$702,000	\$510,484
Siskiyou	\$85,855	\$0	\$0	\$85,855	\$75,878
Solano	\$1,150,355	\$0	\$0	\$1,150,355	\$1,185,535
Sonoma	\$1,083,380	\$4,520	\$226,429	\$1,314,329	\$1,577,271
Stanislaus	\$1,151,864	\$0	\$203,444	\$1,355,308	\$1,474,287
Sutter	\$264,808	\$748	\$119,653	\$385,209	\$302,868
Tehama	\$196,627	\$0	\$0	\$196,627	\$206,315
Trinity	\$39,451	\$620	\$0	\$40,071	\$38,554
Tulare	\$1,569,443	\$8,000	\$0	\$1,577,443	\$1,242,312
Tuolumne	\$155,514	\$0	\$14,300	\$169,814	\$155,514
Ventura	\$2,794,759	\$7,432	\$0	\$2,802,191	\$2,744,006
Yolo	\$594,660	\$0	\$0	\$594,660	\$562,944
Yuba	\$183,056	\$0	\$0	\$183,056	\$180,035
TOTALS	\$102,632,042	\$59,023	\$12,138,954	\$114,830,019	\$109,233,764

⁵ Alpine and Sierra counties did not apply for JJCPA funding.


APPENDIX B: Statewide Summary of Per Capita Program Costs

County	Programs	Program Participants	Per Capita Costs	
			JJCPA Funds	All Funds
Alameda	1	498	\$5,517.89	\$5,520.68
Amador	1	61	\$1,767.70	\$2,914.38
Butte	2	793	\$775.83	\$1,688.19
Calaveras	2	42	\$3,045.24	\$3,132.05
Colusa	1	60	\$1,019.00	\$1,019.00
Contra Costa	3	933	\$3,341.20	\$3,702.94
Del Norte	1	24	\$1,170.75	\$1,170.75
El Dorado	1	332	\$1,679.04	\$1,961.48
Fresno	7	1,165	\$2,116.39	\$2,116.39
Glenn	1	31	\$1,285.71	\$1,285.71
Humboldt	2	231	\$1,667.63	\$6,831.22
Imperial	2	215	\$2,358.40	\$2,358.40
Inyo	2	262	\$202.55	\$202.55
Kern	2	400	\$6,099.38	\$6,099.38
Kings	1	124	\$3,009.94	\$3,019.02
Lake	1	15	\$11,852.60	\$12,732.67
Lassen	3	439	\$224.12	\$475.45
Los Angeles	14	29,207	\$893.45	\$893.45
Madera	1	99	\$3,692.08	\$3,692.08
Marin	4	178	\$4,058.98	\$4,058.98
Mariposa	1	403	\$125.26	\$125.26
Mendocino	1	48	\$3,870.38	\$3,888.62
Merced	1	96	\$7,268.82	\$9,682.23
Modoc	1	3	\$9,039.33	\$9,039.33
Mono	1	44	\$1,793.14	\$1,793.14
Monterey	7	5,170	\$233.55	\$534.55
Napa	3	238	\$1,765.30	\$1,765.30
Nevada	3	111	\$2,542.82	\$2,563.23
Orange	8	2,693	\$3,356.24	\$3,542.10
Placer	3	616	\$1,492.43	\$1,492.43
Plumas	1	51	\$133.29	\$862.61
Riverside	1	1,010	\$5,802.09	\$5,802.09
Sacramento	4	611	\$6,930.85	\$6,973.39
San Benito	1	18	\$6,374.94	\$6,374.94
San Bernardino	4	15,488	\$385.42	\$386.37
San Diego	5	4,585	\$1,922.94	\$3,062.18
San Francisco	5	865	\$2,712.31	\$2,715.96
San Joaquin	2	1,178	\$1,381.23	\$1,381.23
San Luis Obispo	2	259	\$2,979.42	\$3,066.08
San Mateo	5	969	\$2,156.30	\$2,825.47
Santa Barbara	2	407	\$3,270.45	\$3,998.65
Santa Clara	2	4,892	\$1,009.28	\$1,009.28
Santa Cruz	2	309	\$2,437.08	\$3,443.15
Shasta	5	373	\$1,368.59	\$1,882.04
Siskiyou	1	89	\$964.66	\$964.66
Solano	2	127	\$9,057.91	\$9,057.91
Sonoma	6	530	\$2,044.11	\$2,479.87
Stanislaus	2	533	\$2,161.10	\$2,542.79
Sutter	3	54	\$4,903.85	\$7,133.50
Tehama	1	36	\$5,461.86	\$5,461.86
Trinity	1	11	\$3,586.45	\$3,642.82
Tulare	3	4,344	\$361.29	\$363.13
Tuolumne	1	26	\$5,981.31	\$6,531.31
Ventura	4	1,646	\$1,697.91	\$1,702.42
Yolo	1	92	\$6,463.70	\$6,463.70
Yuba	2	262	\$698.69	\$698.69
All Counties	149	83,296	1,232.14	1,378.58


APPENDIX C: Results for Mandated Outcomes for Each of 13 Program Years

Average Arrest Rates by Program Year (Fiscal Year)

All Programs




Programs Where Arrest Rate Expected to be Lower for Program Juveniles




Incarceration Rates (Percent Arrest) by Program Year

All Programs




Program Where Incarceration Rate Expected to be Lower for Program Juveniles




Completion of Probation Rates by Program Year

All Programs




Programs Where Completion of Probation Rate Expected to be Higher for Program Juveniles




Probation Violation Rates by Program Year

All Programs




Programs Where Probation Violation Rate Expected to be Lower for Program Juveniles




Completion of Restitution Rates by Program Year

All Programs




Programs Where Completion of Restitution Rate Expected to be Higher for Program Juveniles




Completion of Community Service Rates by Program Year

All Programs



Programs Where Community Service Completion Rate Expected to be Higher for Program Juveniles



APPENDIX D: Change in County Arrest Rates Per 100,000 Juveniles Age 10-17

COUNTY	2012	2013	Change	Percent Change
Alameda	2,072	1,741	-331	-16.0%
Amador	1,468	2,250	782	53.2%
Butte	4,060	3,580	-480	-11.8%
Calaveras	2,273	3,185	912	40.1%
Colusa	2,936	2,185	-751	-25.6%
Contra Costa	1,968	1,547	-421	-21.4%
Del Norte	3,301	2,043	-1258	-38.1%
El Dorado	2,959	2,259	-700	-23.7%
Fresno	3,338	3,053	-285	-8.5%
Glenn	7,605	5,544	-2061	-27.1%
Humboldt	6,518	4,191	-2327	-35.7%
Imperial	2,205	1,669	-536	-24.3%
Inyo	1,657	806	-851	-51.3%
Kern	3,329	2,796	-533	-16.0%
Kings	7,941	7,547	-394	-5.0%
Lake	6,813	3,422	-3391	-49.8%
Lassen	4,190	3,190	-1000	-23.9%
Los Angeles	2,399	1,915	-484	-20.2%
Madera	2,513	2,628	115	4.6%
Marin	3,617	2,367	-1250	-34.6%
Mariposa	2,996	702	-2294	-76.6%
Mendocino	3,623	3,530	-93	-2.6%
Merced	5,446	4,721	-725	-13.3%
Modoc	6,573	4,194	-2379	-36.2%
Mono	1,732	805	-927	-53.5%
Monterey	4,026	3,677	-349	-8.7%
Napa	2,934	2,491	-443	-15.1%
Nevada	4,125	4,430	305	7.4%
Orange	2,549	2,078	-471	-18.5%
Placer	1,821	1,805	-16	-0.9%
Plumas	4,841	3,642	-1199	-24.8%
Riverside	2,143	1,552	-591	-27.6%
Sacramento	2,120	1,793	-327	-15.4%
San Benito	2,957	2,520	-437	-14.8%
San Bernardino	3,300	2,380	-920	-27.9%
San Diego	3,217	2,737	-480	-14.9%
San Francisco	2,722	2,662	-60	-2.2%
San Joaquin	4,575	3,354	-1221	-26.7%
San Luis Obispo	2,324	1,751	-573	-24.7%
San Mateo	2,726	2,221	-505	-18.5%
Santa Barbara	3,414	3,121	-293	-8.6%
Santa Clara	3,566	2,883	-683	-19.2%
Santa Cruz	3,725	2,963	-762	-20.5%
Shasta	6,529	5,290	-1239	-19.0%
Siskiyou	3,069	2,113	-956	-31.1%
Solano	3,931	3,306	-625	-15.9%
Sonoma	3,245	2,507	-738	-22.7%
Stanislaus	2,548	1,918	-630	-24.7%
Sutter	4,279	4,099	-180	-4.2%
Tehama	4,094	3,151	-943	-23.0%
Trinity	1,914	2,891	977	51.0%
Tulare	4,574	3,970	-604	-13.2%
Tuolumne	3,464	3,034	-430	-12.4%
Ventura	4,367	3,777	-590	-13.5%
Yolo	3,583	3,608	25	0.7%
Yuba	3,150	2,657	-493	-15.7%
All JJCPA Counties	2,915	2,376	-539	-18.5%