

# County of Alpine

---

## 2011 Public Safety Realignment Initial Implementation Plan

Presented by Alpine County Community Corrections Partnership

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

BACKGROUND.....	1
SUMMARY OF LEGISLATION CHANGES.....	2
Local Sentence.....	2
Post-Release Community Supervision (PRCS).....	2
Parole Revocations.....	3
Community Corrections Partnership (CCP).....	4
CCP Executive Committee.....	5
FUNDING.....	6
PROJECTED IMPACTS FOR ALPINE COUNTY.....	6
GOALS.....	8
CURRENT RESOURCES.....	8
Jail Capacity.....	8
Jail Programs.....	8
Probation Department.....	9
Health Services Department.....	9
IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (Year 1).....	9
BUDGET.....	10
ATTACHMENTS.....	
#1-Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) Membership.....	11
#2-2011-12 AB 109 Funding Allocation.....	12
#3-Average Daily Population at Full Rollout.....	13

# 2011 Public Safety Realignment

## Alpine County - Initial Implementation Plan

### BACKGROUND

On April 4, 2011, Governor Jerry Brown signed into law Assembly Bill (AB) 109, referred to as 2011 Public Safety Realignment. AB 109 was later modified by AB 117. Both bills taken together create extensive changes to existing law which will reduce the number of offenders incarcerated in state prison and "realigns" these offenders to local entities who are now responsible to manage the specified offenders. This realignment and change in law is a response and partial solution to the state's budget crisis and a U.S. Supreme Court order requiring the state to reduce prison overcrowding. Public Safety Realignment was proposed as a method to lower state prison inmate population in the safest possible way by allowing for county level management and supervision of certain offenders, as opposed to the alternative option of massive releases of state prison inmates to communities with no further supervision or accountability.

The intent of the realignment is to allow maximum local flexibility within the statutory framework set forth in these two pieces of legislation. The legislation requires a local collaborative planning and implementation process which emphasizes community based corrections and punishment, use of evidence based practices, and improved supervision strategies. Further, the legislation states "the purpose of justice reinvestment is to manage and allocate criminal justice populations more cost effectively, generating savings that can be reinvested in evidence base strategies that increase public safety while holding offenders accountable.

The provisions of the public safety realignment were operative on October 1, 2011 and are prospective. Therefore, as offenders are sentenced on or after October 1 or released to community supervision on or after October 1, they will be the responsibility of the county, if they meet the criteria for the realigned population. No one in prison on October 1 will transfer to county jails and no one currently on state parole supervision will transfer to the local jurisdiction.

## SUMMARY OF LEGISLATIVE CHANGES

The provisions of 2011 Public Safety Realignment change the jurisdiction of specified populations from state to local control to complete their sentences:

### **Local Sentence**

Revises the definition of a felony to specify certain non-violent, non-serious, non-sex offenses will be punishable for more than one year in county jail or other local alternative sentencing options, but cannot be sentenced to state prison.

Does not change length of sentences; entire sentence imposed will be served locally and can exceed three (3) years in some instances.

Options at sentencing for specified felony offenses: Jail instead of prison for the entire sentence; felony probation; jail with early release to alternative custody; or split sentence (sentence of jail custody combined with mandatory probation which cannot exceed the maximum sentence allowed by law).

Options in custody: The Sheriff retains all existing tools to manage this population as they do with the current population. In addition, counties may use new alternative custody options and electronic monitoring and home detention (1203.018 PC), and/or contract back with the state to house some inmates.

### **Post-Release Community Supervision (PRCS)**

Any offender convicted of a non-serious, non-violent felony and is not deemed a high risk sex offender who is released from prison after October 1 will be supervised in the community by the Probation Department as previously designated by the Board of Supervisors.

All others will remain subject to state parole supervision provided by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR).

CDCR must notify the county who the offender is being release to PRCS thirty days prior to release and is required to provide relevant background and assessment information concerning the offender.

Level of supervision and case plan is determined by the local supervision agency (Probation Department).

General conditions of supervision established by law and supervision agency can add addition relevant conditions.

PRCS terminates by operation of law at the end of 3 years. PRCS may discharge after 6 months of no violations and shall discharge after a continuous year of no violations.

Supervision agency can impose intermediate sanctions for violations of PRCS without Court involvement.

Intermediate sanctions include: Short term "flash incarceration" in jail for up to 10 days; intensive community supervision; home detention with electronic or GPS monitoring; community service work; education and vocational programs; work release program; day reporting programs; substance abuse treatment programs; drug testing; community-based residential programs; and other appropriate counseling and treatment programs.

The Court is responsible for any final revocation hearings for violations. Maximum sentence for PRCS revocation is 6 months confinement in county jail. Cannot be returned to prison for violation of PRCS.

### **Parole Revocations**

All parole revocations for state parolees (except those with a life term) will be served in county jail but capped a 180 days and receive day for day credit.

County cannot "contract back" with CDCR to house parole violators in state prison.

After parolee completes jail sentence for a parole violation, they return to state parole jurisdiction for supervision in the community.

Parole revocation hearings for state parolees will continue to be done by the Board of Parole Hearings (BPH) until July 2013 when this responsibility transfers to local courts.

### **Community Corrections Partnership (CCP)**

Membership of the CCP was originally established by law in 2009 in Penal Code §1230 and consists of:

The chief probation officer (chair)

The presiding judge of the superior court, or his or her designee

A county supervisor or chief administrative officer for the county

The district attorney

The public defender

The sheriff

The head of the county department of social services

The head of the county department of mental health

The head of the county department of employment

The head of the county alcohol and substance abuse programs

The head of the county office of education

A representative from a community based organization with experience successfully providing rehabilitative services to persons who have been convicted of a criminal offense.

An individual who represents the interests of victims

#### **CCP Executive Committee**

The 2011 Public Safety Realignment legislation expanded the role of the CCP in each county to now act as a planning body for 2011 Public Safety Realignment. As established in Penal Code §1230.1, membership of the executive committee of the CCP consists of:

The chief probation officer (chair)

The Sheriff

The district attorney

The public defender

The presiding judge of the superior court, or his or her designee

The head of the county Department of Social Services or head of the county department of mental health, or the head of the county alcohol and substance abuse programs, as designated by the county board of supervisors” for purposes related to the development and presentation of the plan.”

Pursuant to Penal Code §1230.1(c), “The plan shall be deemed accepted by the county board of supervisors unless the board rejects the plan by a vote of four-fifths of the board, in which case the plan goes back to the Community Corrections Partnership for further consideration.”

Additionally, the legislation established Penal Code §1230.1(d), which states, "Consistent with local needs and resources, the plan may include recommendations to maximize the effective investment of criminal justice resources in evidenced-based correctional sanctions and programs, including, but not limited to, day reporting center, drug courts, residential multi-service center, mental health treatment programs, electronic and GPS monitoring programs, victim restitution programs, counseling programs, community service programs, educational programs, and work training programs."

Realignment, under AB 109, shifts a number of offenders from State supervision to local supervision. This includes both PRCS offenders being released from state prison and additional offenders no longer eligible to sentence to state prison. Intense supervision of offenders is a key component to public safety and the Probation Department will be a significant partner with all law enforcement agencies throughout Alpine County.

### **FUNDING**

AB 118, the budget trailer bill that creates the funding framework for 2011 Public Safety Realignment, requires the county to create the County Local Revenue Fund 2011 (Government Code §30025(f)(1)). Within the County Local Revenue Fund 2011, each county must also establish a:

Local Community Corrections Account

Trial Court Security Account

District Attorney and Public Defender Account

Juvenile Justice Account

Health and Human Services Account

Supplemental Law enforcement Account

The allocations for each county for Fiscal Year 2011/2012 were determined by the California Department of Finance and were divided into four distinct aspects of 2011 Public Safety Realignment:

AB 109 Adult Population Shifts

District Attorney & Public Defender Revocation Costs

One-time grant CCP Planning

### **PROJECTED IMPACTS FOR ALPINE COUNTY**

With these changes comes an increase of County responsibilities. The additional inmates include offenders convicted of non-violent, non-serious, non-sex-related offenses (non-nons) and parole violators. The California Department of Finance has projected the AB

109 population impacts for each county in the state upon full implementation. These AB 109 population figures are expressed as an Average Daily Population (ADP), which reflect one inmate in one bed for one year. ADP does not represent the number of discrete individuals moving in and out of the system, but instead captures annual bed/slot numbers, given that a single bed/slot can be occupied by more than one person over the period of a year.

In summary, for Alpine County, the projected ADP for Total Inmates is 2. The projected ADP for the Post-Release Community Supervision population is 2. Based on this figure the impact to the county is small, however this does not reflect any new convictions that would be sent for prison commitments or revocations of PRCS.

Approximately 30 to 60 days prior to release, the Probation Department will receive notification from the CDCR regarding which offenders are to be released on PRCS. The CPO will review the material provided by CDCR and complete a Risk assessment.

This information will assist in the development of any special conditions that may need to be added to the PRCS offender's program. Once identified, any special conditions will be forwarded to CDCR for inclusion in the offender's Terms of Release.

Prior to the offender's release from custody, CDCR will review the general and special terms and conditions of PRCS with the offender and the offender will sign the Terms of Release. Each offender will be ordered to report to the Probation Department within two working days of his or her release. CDCR will forward the signed Terms of Release form to the Probation Department.

Each offender will be assigned one of the following risk classifications:

Low-one office visit every 45 days and field visits and testing will be conducted randomly.

Moderate-one office visit every 45 days, one field visit every three months, and random urinalysis.

High Priority-one office visit per month, one field visit every 45 days, and random urinalysis.

Within 14 days of release, the Probation Department will conduct one home visit and one office visit with the offender.

Pursuant to AB 109, any offender who has been on PRCS for a period of six consecutive months with no violations of his or her conditions may be considered for successful discharge from PRCS by the Chief Probation Officer. Additionally, as mandated by AB 109, an offender who has been on PRCS continuously for 12 months with no violations of his or her conditions shall be discharged from supervision within 30 days. Upon serving a three-



year term on PRCS, the offender shall be discharged immediately from community supervision.

### GOALS

- Maintain offender accountability and public safety
- Responsibly manage impact on jail population capacity
- Successful alternative sentencing options
- Inspire public confidence
- Offender rehabilitation

### CURRENT RESOURCES

#### Jail Capacity

As Alpine County does not have a jail facility a contract must be established for jail services at the Jail facilities operated by the El Dorado County Sheriff's Office in South Lake Tahoe and Placerville California. Although the El Dorado County Jail is expecting some increases in daily population, trends for the jail facilities have been trending downward 2.3% for the past three years and total bookings have dropped 8.8%. Therefore, jail bed space should be available to manage our response to the shift of this offender population from the State to the County.

#### Jail Programs

Currently the El Dorado County Jail in South Lake Tahoe has the following programs available to inmates:

Addiction Recovery

Work Release (would be supervised by Alpine County)

GED

Employment Success

English as a Second Language

Culinary Arts

Anger Management (is currently offered at the Placerville Jail.)

### **Probation Department**

The Probation Department has in place policies, procedures, training and Evidenced-Based Practices (EBP) to effectively address this population. A key component of correctional EBP is the use of a validated assessment tool and case management program to establish the risk an offender presents and to identify the needs of an offender. The Probation Department does not have an assessment tool or case management program in place to date, but is considering several different applications at this time.

### **Health Services Department**

Health Services Department alcohol, drug and mental health programs have expertise in providing assessments, treatment matching, case management and outpatient treatment services. The Implementation Plan includes funding for a contract .4 FTE counselor to provide these services to offenders. The El Dorado County Jail in South Lake Tahoe has the HEARTS Program, consisting of 48 hours of substance abuse treatment and education to offenders in custody.

### **IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (Year 1)**

Due to the short period of time for planning purposes, given that the Public Safety Realignment was effective October 1, 2011, the CCP created an initial implementation plan to address immediate issues presented by population shift, and will continue to plan throughout FY 11/12 to create a long-range plan. The CCP believes only one new part time staff position is required at this time and future AB 109 funding will continue to support the costs as the one time initial costs discontinue.

The top priority to be addressed in initial implementation planning for Public Safety Realignment is to responsibly manage the population of the jail to ensure jail capacity is not exceeded, while maintaining public safety. Alpine County is fortunate to have jail space available at the current time in the El Dorado County Jail South Lake Tahoe, but as multi-year sentenced inmates increase, jail capacity will likely be exceeded without the use of alternative sentencing programs. Additionally, it is necessary to reduce the number of inmates returning to jail after release by using evidenced based practices to address the causes of their criminality and recidivism.

At this time it is difficult to predict the future implications of this legislation in Alpine County; however Evidence Base Practices (EBP) has been applied for some time. In addition the natural geographical limitations of the county as well as population reduce the criminal elements. There will be impacts over which the county will have no control, such as jail capacities and rehabilitation programs. Today the county is experiencing the lowest criminal filings since 2002; however AB 109 will change the way we do business in the criminal justice system.

**REALIGNMENT IMPLEMENTATION PLAN INITIAL BUDGET**

In order to achieve the proposed plan, the allocations for a full fiscal year based on assumed State funding total of \$76,883.00, would be as follows.

<b>Implementation Plan Component</b>	<b>Initial Funding Level</b>
In-Custody Supervision (Alpine County Sheriff)	\$55,000
Community-Based Supervision (Probation)	\$15,000
Community-Based Services and Supports	\$ 6,883
<b>Total County Allocation</b>	<b>\$76,883</b>

The Realignment legislation also provides two sums of one time "start up" funding in the amounts of \$100,000 and \$5,425 for a total of 105,425. The proposed allocations of these funds are as follows.

<b>Department/Entity</b>	<b>One Time "Start up Funding"</b>
Sheriff's Office	\$75,906
Probation Department	\$21,085
Health Services Department	\$ 8,434
<b>Total Allocated</b>	<b>\$105,425</b>

**COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIP MEMBERS**

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:**

Gordon Morse, Chief Probation Officer (chair)  
Dave DeVore, Alpine County Superior Court Judge  
John Crawford, Sheriff  
Terese A. Drabec, District Attorney  
Rick Meyer, Public Defender  
Pamela Knorr, Director of Health and Human Services

**OTHER POSSIBLE PARTNERSHIP MEMBERS**

Robert Levy, Undersheriff and Coroner  
Rick Stephens, Bear Valley Public Safety Supervisor  
Sarah Simis, Mental Health Services Coordinator  
Chris Stewart, Behavioral Health Services, MFT-Clinician  
Richard Harvey, MD-Public Health Officer  
Mathieu David, Social Worker III, Health & Human Services  
David Hathaway, Social Worker III, Health & Human Services  
Thomas D. Kolpacoff, Alpine County Superior Court Judge  
Martin Fine, County Counsel

**Average Daily Population at Full Rollout (Year 4) of AB 109 by County (Department of Finance estimates)**

County	Low Level (N/N/N) Offenders			Postrelease	
	Total Inmates	Short-term Inmates	Long-term Inmates	Community Supervision	RTC ADP
	N/N/N no Prior S/V ADP 1, 2, 5	N/N/N w/no Prior S/V w Sentence Length < 3 Years 1, 2, 3, 5, 6	N/N/N w/no Prior S/V w Sentence Length > 3 Years 1, 2, 4, 5, 6	Population Totals 1	30-Day ALOS 1, 7
Alameda	267	181	86	848	132
Alpine	2	2	-	-	-
Amador	53	35	38	43	6
Butte	268	161	108	181	36
Calaveras	21	12	8	25	5
Colusa	23	16	6	9	1
Contra Costa	104	60	44	318	56
Del Norte	11	2	9	20	5
El Dorado	68	45	23	81	10
Fresno	518	357	161	971	218
Glenn	28	18	10	19	3
Humboldt	137	108	29	126	15
Imperial	90	53	37	107	11
Inyo	15	7	7	15	3
Kern	1,019	784	236	1,040	154
Kings	321	201	120	185	39
Lake	73	39	34	75	11
Lassen	32	19	13	26	6
Los Angeles	8,342	5,767	2,576	9,791	530
Madera	111	67	44	150	24
Marin	66	27	39	53	8
Mariposa	13	9	5	11	2
Mendocino	75	38	37	50	8
Merced	171	100	71	214	42
Modoc	2	1	1	3	1
Mono	3	2	1	7	1
Monterey	308	176	132	309	34
Napa	70	44	26	69	7
Nevada	23	16	7	17	6
Orange	1,464	1,038	427	1,750	220
Placer	251	133	118	153	25
Plumas	9	7	3	12	1
Riverside	1,601	990	611	1,683	262
Sacramento	895	505	390	1,203	208
San Benito	52	30	22	23	4
San Bernardino	2,301	1,638	663	2,521	348
San Diego	1,821	1,043	778	2,038	256
San Francisco	164	114	50	421	61
San Joaquin	450	311	138	639	126
San Luis Obispo	140	88	52	136	22
San Mateo	208	139	70	351	33
Santa Barbara	294	181	112	288	37
Santa Clara	693	402	291	1,067	115
Santa Cruz	78	72	6	69	17
Shasta	326	147	178	201	40
Sierra	1	1	-	1	-
Siskiyou	34	12	21	23	8
Solano	278	162	116	363	53
Sonoma	231	116	115	164	21
Stanislaus	540	316	224	426	66
Sutter	103	67	35	108	21
Tehama	154	94	60	50	13
Trinity	9	8	1	9	1
Tulare	520	292	228	388	70
Tuolumne	47	13	33	33	4
Ventura	380	210	170	363	60
Yolo	277	130	147	215	37
Yuba	94	64	30	88	19
<b>Total Projected:</b>	<b>25,651</b>	<b>16,673</b>	<b>8,978</b>	<b>29,550</b>	<b>3,525</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>58,726</b>				

- 1 Numbers are based upon full implementation.
- 2 Numbers have been adjusted for excluded crimes.
- 3 Numbers reflect sentence lengths 3 years or less.
- 4 Numbers reflect sentence lengths above 3 years. Population serving longer than 3 years will be significantly less due to day for day credit earning.
- 5 Judicial decisions could decrease this population dramatically.
- 6 This population is a subset of the total low level offender population.
- 7 Assumes 30-Day Average Length of Stay for Locally Supervised Violators and State Parole Violators.

### Final crime Exclusion List

67	PC	Bribing an Executive Officer
68	PC	Executive or Ministerial Officer Accepting a Bribe
85	PC	Bribing a Legislator
86	PC	Legislator Excepting a Bribe
92/93	PC	Judicial Bribery
113	PC	Manufacture/Distribution of False Documents for Citizenship Purposes
114	PC	Use of False Documents for Citizenship Purposes
141	PC	Peace Officer Intentionally Planting Evidence
165	PC	Local Official Accepting a Bribe
186.11	PC	Felony convictions with a Penal Code Section 186.11 enhancement
186.22	PC	Criminal Gang Activity
186.26	PC	Street Gang Activity
186.33	PC	Gang Registration Violation
191.5 (c)	PC	Vehicular Manslaughter While Intoxicated
222	PC	Administering stupefying drugs to assist in commission of a felony
243.7	PC	Battery against a juror
243.9	PC	Gassing of a peace officer or local detention facility employee
245(d)	PC	Assault on a Peace Officer
266a	PC	Abduction or procurement by fraudulent inducement for prostitution
266e	PC	Purchasing a person for purposes of prostitution or placing a person for immoral purposes
266f	PC	Sale of a person for immoral purposes
266h	PC	Pimping and pimping a minor
266i	PC	Pandering and pandering with a minor
266j	PC	Procurement of a child under age 16 for lewd or lascivious acts
272(b)	PC	Persuading, Luring, or Transporting a Minor Under 13
273a	PC	Felony child abuse likely to produce great bodily injury or death
273ab	PC	Assault resulting in death of a child under age 8
273.5	PC	Felony domestic violence
298.2	PC	Knowingly Facilitates the Collection of Wrongfully Attributed DNA Specimens
299.5	PC	Wrongful Use of DNA Specimens
347	PC	Poisoning or adulterating food, drink, medicine, pharmaceutical product, spring, well, etc.
368b	PC	Felony physical abuse of an elder or dependent adult
417(c)	PC	Brandishing Firearm in Presence of Peace Officer
417.8	PC	Brandishing firearm or deadly weapon to avoid arrest
424	PC	Misappropriation of Public Funds
452	PC	Unlawfully causing a fire that causes an inhabited structure or inhabited property to burn
504/514	PC	Embezzlement of Public Funds
598c	PC	Possession or Importation of Horse Meat
598d	PC	Sale of Horse Meat
646.9	PC	Felony stalking
653f(b)	PC	Solicitation for murder
4532	PC	Escape
12021/12021.1	PC	Possession of a firearm by a prohibited person
12303.2	PC	Possession of an explosive or destructive device
11353	HS	Employment of Minor to Sell Controlled Substance
11354	HS	Employment of Minor to Sell Controlled Substance
11380(a)	HS	Use of Minor to Transport/Possess/Possess for Sale
11370.1	HS	Possession of a controlled substance while armed with a firearm
11361(a)(b)	HS	Employment of Minor to Sell Marijuana
120291	HS	Knowingly Exposes Someone to HIV
20001	VC	Hit and run driving causing death or injury
23153	VC	Felony driving under the influence causing injury
2800.2	VC	Evading a peace officer by driving in a willful or wanton disregard for safety of persons or property
2800.3	VC	Evading a peace officer causing death or serious bodily injury
1090/1097	GC	Conflict of Interest by Public Officer or Employee
1195	GC	Taking Subordinate Pay
1855	GC	Destruction of Documents
18501	EC	Public Official Who Aids and Abets Voter Fraud

## 2011-12 AB 109 Allocations

	[1] 2011-12 Allocation for AB 109 PROGRAMS	[2] 2011-12 Allocation for AB 109 DA/PD Activities (revocation)	[3] 2011-12 allocation for training, retention purposes (one-time)	[4] 2011-12 allocation for Comm Corrections Partnership planning (one-time) *
ALAMEDA	\$9,221,012	\$330,530	\$650,650	\$200,000
ALPINE	\$76,883	\$2,756	\$5,425	\$100,000
AMADOR	\$543,496	\$19,482	\$38,350	\$100,000
BUTTE	\$2,735,905	\$98,069	\$193,050	\$150,000
CALAVERAS	\$350,757	\$12,573	\$24,750	\$100,000
COLUSA	\$214,352	\$7,684	\$15,125	\$100,000
CONTRA COSTA	\$4,572,950	\$163,919	\$322,675	\$200,000
DEL NORTE	\$221,438	\$7,938	\$15,625	\$100,000
EL DORADO	\$1,210,643	\$43,396	\$85,425	\$100,000
FRESNO	\$8,838,368	\$316,814	\$623,650	\$200,000
GLENN	\$331,271	\$11,875	\$23,375	\$100,000
HUMBOLDT	\$1,526,679	\$54,724	\$107,725	\$100,000
IMPERIAL	\$1,296,384	\$46,469	\$91,475	\$100,000
INYO	\$190,968	\$6,845	\$13,475	\$100,000
KERN	\$10,834,140	\$388,353	\$764,475	\$200,000
KINGS	\$2,862,035	\$102,591	\$201,950	\$100,000
LAKE	\$820,913	\$29,426	\$57,925	\$100,000
LASSEN	\$384,770	\$13,792	\$27,150	\$100,000
LOS ANGELES	\$112,558,276	\$4,034,688	\$7,942,300	\$200,000
MADERA	\$1,688,240	\$60,516	\$119,125	\$100,000
MARIN	\$1,304,178	\$46,749	\$92,025	\$150,000
MARIPOSA	\$165,458	\$5,931	\$11,675	\$100,000
MENDOCINO	\$993,812	\$35,624	\$70,125	\$100,000
MERCED	\$2,498,524	\$89,560	\$176,300	\$150,000
MODOC	\$76,883	\$2,756	\$5,425	\$100,000
MONO	\$100,267	\$3,594	\$7,075	\$100,000
MONTEREY	\$3,846,989	\$137,897	\$271,450	\$150,000
NAPA	\$1,051,917	\$37,706	\$74,225	\$100,000
NEVADA	\$515,152	\$18,466	\$36,350	\$100,000
ORANGE	\$23,078,393	\$827,253	\$1,628,450	\$200,000
PLACER	\$2,986,395	\$107,048	\$210,725	\$150,000
PLUMAS	\$153,766	\$5,512	\$10,850	\$100,000
RIVERSIDE	\$21,074,473	\$755,421	\$1,487,050	\$200,000
SACRAMENTO	\$13,140,278	\$471,018	\$927,200	\$200,000
SAN BENITO	\$547,748	\$19,634	\$38,650	\$100,000
SAN BERNARDINO	\$25,785,600	\$924,293	\$1,819,475	\$200,000
SAN DIEGO	\$25,105,698	\$899,922	\$1,771,500	\$200,000
SAN FRANCISCO	\$5,049,838	\$181,013	\$356,325	\$200,000
SAN JOAQUIN	\$6,785,908	\$243,243	\$478,825	\$150,000
SAN LUIS OBISPO	\$2,200,557	\$78,880	\$155,275	\$150,000
SAN MATEO	\$4,222,902	\$151,371	\$297,975	\$150,000
SANTA BARBARA	\$3,878,876	\$139,040	\$273,700	\$150,000
SANTA CLARA	\$12,566,312	\$450,444	\$886,700	\$200,000
SANTA CRUZ	\$1,662,730	\$59,601	\$117,325	\$150,000
SHASTA	\$2,988,875	\$107,137	\$210,900	\$100,000
SIERRA	\$76,883	\$2,756	\$5,425	\$100,000
SISKIYOU	\$445,001	\$15,951	\$31,400	\$100,000
SOLANO	\$3,807,662	\$136,487	\$268,675	\$150,000
SONOMA	\$3,240,428	\$116,154	\$228,650	\$150,000
STANISLAUS	\$6,010,700	\$215,456	\$424,125	\$150,000
SUTTER	\$1,167,419	\$41,847	\$82,375	\$100,000
TEHAMA	\$1,212,415	\$43,459	\$85,550	\$100,000
TRINITY	\$144,554	\$5,182	\$10,200	\$100,000
TULARE	\$5,657,817	\$202,806	\$399,225	\$150,000
TUOLUMNE	\$598,767	\$21,463	\$42,250	\$100,000
VENTURA	\$5,696,790	\$204,203	\$401,975	\$200,000
YOLO	\$2,974,703	\$106,629	\$209,900	\$150,000
YUBA	\$1,005,858	\$36,055	\$70,975	\$100,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$354,300,000</b>	<b>\$12,700,000</b>	<b>\$25,000,000</b>	<b>\$7,850,000</b>

\* Allocation based on population

County population	Grant level
Up to 200,000	\$100,000
200,001 to 749,999	\$150,000
Over 750,000	\$200,000