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Homicide in California, 2000 contains information about the crime of homicide and its victims, demographic data on persons arrested for homicide, and information about the response of the criminal justice system. Information about the death penalty, the number of peace officers killed in the line of duty, and justifiable homicide is also included.

Information displayed in this publication comes from several databases maintained by the California Department of Justice. The primary source of information comes from the Homicide File which captures willful and justifiable homicide crime data. Other databases capture information about persons arrested for homicide, death penalty sentences, and peace officers killed in the line of duty. The reader should consider that the type of data collected, and the methods used to collect these data, differ for each data set.

In order to provide the most valid data possible the disposition section of this report has been removed. CJSC staff determined that a number of homicide arrests submitted to the Department of Justice's Automated Criminal History System (from which adult felony arrest disposition data are extracted) from 1997 to 2000 should have been submitted as arrests for attempted homicide. In addition, some correctly submitted attempted homicide arrests were programmatically treated as homicide arrests. As a result, more homicide arrests were counted during these years than occurred. This caused the percentage of homicide convictions to be too low and the percentage of assault convictions to be too high. (Both percentages were based on the number of adult felony arrests for homicide for which dispositions were received.) Based on CJSC staff findings, the reader is advised against using previously published disposition data for 1997 to 1999. It should be noted, however, that the exclusion of disposition data does not affect crime, arrest, death penalty, or other data included in this or past reports.

CJSC publications available in either printed or electronic format (via the Attorney General's website), are listed on the inside of the back cover. Customized statistical reports or additional statistical information may be requested by contacting the CJSC at the numbers provided.

## HOMICIDE CRIMES (see pages 2-23)

From 1999 to 2000, homicide crimes increased 1.7 percent in rate per 100,000 population (5.9 to 6.0). From 1991 to 2000, the homicide crime rate decreased 52.4 percent (12.6 to 6.0). (Source: Table 1.)

Since 1991, homicide rates have decreased for all gender, race/ethnic and age groups shown. Victims under age 18 experienced the highest rate of decline (down 57.6 percent). (Sources: Table 2, 3, and 4.)

- In 2000, most white victims fell into the aged "40 and over" category (53.8 percent). Most Hispanic and black victims fell into the aged "18-29" category (53.2 and 47.0 percent, respectively). (Source: Table 9.)

■ From 1991 to 2000, the majority of homicide victims knew their assailant. (Source: Table 11.)

Proportionately, females were 82 times more likely to be killed by their spouses than were males in 2000. (Source: Table 12.)
■ In 2000, seven of California's 58 counties exceeded the 2000 statewide homicide rate of 6.0 victims per 100,000 population. (Source: Table 14.)
$\square$ Generally, homicides occurred most often during the summertime. (Source: Table 15.)

■ In 2000, males were more likely to be killed on streets or sidewalks and less likely to be killed in their residences; the inverse was true for females. (See page 16 and Table 19.)

Since 1991, more homicide victims have been killed by firearms than by all other types of weapons combined. (Source: Table 21.)

In 2000, 49.8 percent of homicide victims aged 5-29 were killed as a result of gang-related or drug-related activities. (Source: Table 26.)

■ Over 52 percent of homicides were cleared by an arrest or by "exceptional means" in 2000. (Source: Table 28.)

## highlights

## HOMICIDE ARRESTS (see pages 26-29)

From 1999 to 2000, homicide arrests decreased 10.1 percent in rate per 100,000 population at risk ( 6.9 to 6.2). From 1991 to 2000, the homicide arrest rate decreased 60.8 percent (15.8 to 6.2). (Source: Table 29.)

- From 1991 to 2000, the majority of homicide arrestees and victims were male. (Source: Table 30.)
- In 2000, the largest proportion of homicide arrestees and victims were Hispanic ( 42.9 and 45.2 percent, respectively). The majority of homicide arrestees were aged 18-29 (56.1 percent) and the largest proportion of homicide victims were aged 18-29 (43.4 percent). (Source: Tables 6, 7, 31, and 32.)


## DEATH PENALTY SENTENCES (see pages 32-33)

■ By the end of 2000, 589 persons were under sentence of death in California. Of these, 33 were sentenced in 2000. (Source: Table 35.)

## PEACE OFFICERS KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY (see pages 36-37)

Since 1991, 60 peace officers have been feloniously killed in the line of duty. Two were killed in 2000. (Source: Table N-2.)

Since 1991, the homicide rate for peace officers killed in the line of duty decreased 40.8 percent per 100,000 sworn law enforcement personnel (4.9 to 2.9). (Source: Table 37.)

## Continue on to CRIMES
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## HOMICIDE CRIMES

Homicide is defined by the FBl's Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program as the "willful (nonnegligent) killing of one human being by another." The homicide category comprises murder and nonnegligent manslaughter. Attempted murder, justifiable homicide, manslaughter by negligence, and suicide are excluded. Data depicting homicide in California have been collected and published for over 45 years.

From 1999 to 2000:

- The homicide rate per 100,000 population increased 1.7 percent ( 5.9 to 6.0 ).
- The number of homicides increased 3.4 percent (from 2,006 to 2,074).

Comparing 1991 to 2000:

- The homicide rate per 100,000 population decreased 52.4 percent ( 12.6 to 6.0 ).
- The number of homicides decreased 46.5 percent (from 3,876 to 2,074).

Comparing 1952 to 2000:

- The homicide rate per 100,000 population increased 150.0 percent ( 2.4 to 6.0 ).
- The number of homicides increased 643.4 percent (from 279 to 2,074).

Table N-1
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1952-2000
Number and Rate per 100,000 Population

| Year(s) | Number | Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 ............... | 2,074 | 6.0 |
| 1999 ............... | 2,006 | 5.9 |
| 1998 ............... | 2,170 | 6.5 |
| 1997 ............... | 2,579 | 7.8 |
| 1996 ............... | 2,910 | 9.0 |
| 1995 | 3,530 | 11.0 |
| 1994 ............... | 3,699 | 11.5 |
| 1993 ............... | 4,095 | 12.9 |
| 1992 ............... | 3,920 | 12.5 |
| 1991 ............... | 3,876 | 12.6 |
| 1990 .............. | 3,562 | 12.1 |
| 1989 ............... | 3,159 | 11.0 |
| 1988 ............... | 2,947 | 10.5 |
| 1987 ............... | 2,929 | 10.7 |
| 1986 ............... | 3,030 | 11.3 |
| 1985 ............... | 2,781 | 10.7 |
| 1984 .................. | 2,724 | 10.6 |
| 1983 ............... | 2,640 | 10.5 |
| 1982 ............... | 2,778 | 11.3 |
| 1981 ............... | 3,140 | 13.1 |
| 1980 | 3,405 | 14.4 |
| 1979 | 2,941 | 12.6 |
| 1978 .............. | 2,601 | 11.4 |
| 1977 | 2,481 | 11.1 |
| 1976 ............... | 2,214 | 10.1 |
| 1975 ............... | 2,196 | 10.2 |
| 1974 .............. | 1,970 | 9.3 |
| 1973 | 1,862 | 8.9 |
| 1972 .............. | 1,789 | 8.7 |
| 1971 .............. | 1,633 | 8.0 |
| 1970 ............... | 1,355 | 6.8 |
| 1969 ............... | 1,376 | 6.9 |
| 1968 ............... | 1,171 | 6.0 |
| 1967 ............... | 1,051 | 5.4 |
| 1966 ............... | 897 | 4.7 |
| 1965 ............... | 892 | 4.8 |
| 1964 ............... | 758 | 4.2 |
| 1963 ............... | 656 | 3.7 |
| 1962 ............... | 671 | 3.9 |
| 1961 ............... | 609 | 3.7 |
| 1960 .............. | 620 | 3.9 |
| 1959 ............... | 515 | 3.4 |
| 1958 ............... | 547 | 3.7 |
| 1957 ............... | 497 | 3.5 |
| 1956 ............... | 474 | 3.5 |
| 1955 .............. | 417 | 3.2 |
| 1954 ............... | 419 | 3.3 |
| 1953 ............... | 276 | 2.3 |
| 1952 ............... | 279 | 2.4 |

## $\square$ The 2000 homicide rate increase follows a six-year decline.

Chart 1
VIOLENT CRIMES, 1991-2000
Rate per 100,000 Population


Source: Table 1.

There are four offenses classified as violent crimes by the FBI: homicide, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault. For comparison, changes in the rates of the four offensesfollow:

From 1999 to 2000:

- Homicide increased 1.7 percent ( 5.9 to 6.0 ).
- Forcible rape increased 2.5 percent (27.7 to 28.4).

■ Robbery decreased 1.0 percent (176.4 to 174.7).

■ Aggravated assault increased 0.2 percent (400.7 to 401.4).

Comparing 1991 to 2000:

- Homicide decreased 52.4 percent ( 12.6 to 6.0 ).
- Forcible rape decreased 32.7 percent (42.2 to 28.4).
- Robbery decreased 57.2 percent ( 408.2 to 174.7).

■ Aggravated assault decreased 34.9 percent (616.7 to 401.4).
$\square$ Of the four offenses classified as violent crimes by the FBI, homicide maintained the lowest rate per 100,000 population for the years shown.

## crimes

Charts 2, 3, and 4 display homicide rates per 100,000 population for victims classified by gender, race/ethnic group, and age.

In2000,
■ The total homicide rate was 6.0 per 100,000 population.

- The male homicide rate was four times that of the female homicide rate (9.6 vs. 2.4).

■ The black homicide rate was $101 / 2$ times that of whites and almost 3 times that of Hispanics (25.2 vs. 2.4 and 8.7, respectively).

Comparing 1991 to 2000:
■ The male homicide rate decreased 53.2 percent. The female homicide rate decreased 50.0 percent.

■ The white homicide rate decreased 57.1 percent, the Hispanic homicide rate decreased 54.0 percent, and the black homicide rate decreased 50.7 percent.

Chart2
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1991-2000
By Gender of Victim
Rate per 100,000 Population


Source: Table 2.

Chart 3
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1991-2000
By Race/Ethnic Group of Victim
Rate per 100,000 Population


Source: Table 3.

## $\square$ Comparing 1991 to 2000, homicide rates decreased for all gender and race/ ethnic groups shown. From 1999 to 2000, however, the male homicide rate increased 4.3 percent and the black homicide rate increased 20.0 percent.

Chart 4
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1991-2000
By Age of Victim
Rate per 100,000 Population


Source: Table 4.

In 2000,

Persons aged 18-29 had the highest homicide victimization rate (16.1 per 100,000 population).

Comparing 1991 to 2000:

- The homicide rate decreased 57.6 percent for victims under age 18, 41.5 percent for victims aged 18-29, 57.3 percent for victims aged 30-39, and 44.3 percent for victims aged 40 and over.
$\square$ Comparing 1991 to 2000, homicide rates decreased for all age categories shown. From 1999 to 2000, the homicide rate for juvenile victims (under age 18) decreased while the rates for the adult age groups (aged 18 and over) increased.

In2000,

- Males represented 80.3 percent of total homicide victims; they comprised 50.2 percent of the population.
- Females represented 19.7 percent of total homicide victims; they comprised 49.8 percent of the population.

Chart 5
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
By Gender of Victim


Source: Table 5.

Chart 6
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
Gender of Victim by Percent of Total Victims and Percent of Population

$\square$ As homicide victims, males are statistically over-represented when compared to females.

Chart 7
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
By Race/Ethnic Group of Victim


Source: Table 6.

Chart 8
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
Race/Ethnic Group of Victim by Percent of Total Victims and Percent of Population


[^0]Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.

In2000,
■ Whites represented 20.4 percent of total homicide victims; they comprised 50.3 percent of the population.

■ Hispanics represented 45.2 percent of total homicide victims; they comprised 30.8 percent of the population.

■ Blacks represented 28.5 percent of total homicide victims; they comprised 6.7 percent of the population.

■ The "other" race/ethnic group category represented 5.9 percent of total homicide victims; they comprised 12.1 percent of the population.
$\square$ In 2000, whites displayed the largest difference between their percentage of homicide victimization and their percentage of the population.

## crimes

In2000,

- Victims under age 18 represented 12.0 percent of total homicides; this age group comprised 28.2 percent of the population.
- Victims aged 18-29 represented 43.4 percent of total homicides; this age group comprised 15.9 percent of the population.
- Victims aged 30-39 represented 18.4 percent of total homicides; this age group comprised 16.2 percent of the population.
- Victims aged 40 and over represented 26.1 percent of total homicides; this age group comprised 39.7 percent of the population.
$\square$ In 2000, persons aged 30-39 displayed little difference between their percentage of homicide victimization and their percentage of the population.

Chart 9
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
By Age of Victim


Source: Table 7.
Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.

Chart 10
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
Age of Victim by Percent of Total Victims and Percent of Population


Sources: Tables 4 and 7 .
Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding

Chart 11
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
Race/Ethnic Group of Victim by Gender of Victim


Source: Table 8.

Chart 12
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
Race/Ethnic Group of Victim by Age of Victim


Source: Table 9.

In 2000,

- Proportionately, more white victims were female than were either Hispanic or black victims (34.2 vs. 15.4 and 14.3 percent, respectively).
- More Hispanic and black victims were aged $18-29$ than were white victims ( 53.2 and 47.0 vs. 19.4 percent, respectively).
- More white victims were aged 40 and over than were either Hispanic or black victims ( 53.8 vs. 15.0 and 21.1 percent, respectively).
$\square$ In 2000, the percentage of white homicide victims who were female was twice the percentage of Hispanic and black victims who were female. Additionally, white victims tended to be older, Hispanic and black victims younger.


## crimes

When homicides were examined by the relationship of the victim to the offender, it was found that:

In2000,

- 47.0 percent of victims were friends or acquaintances of offenders.
- 9.0 percent of victims were spouses of offenders.
- 7.2 percent of victims were parents or children of offenders.
- 3.1 percent of the relationships of victim to offender fell into the "other relative" category.
- 33.6 percent of victims were strangers to offenders.

Comparing 1991 to 2000:

- The proportion of homicides in which victims were friends or acquaintances of offenders decreased slightly (from 50.2 percent in 1991 to 47.0 percent in2000).
- The proportion of homicides in which victims were strangers to offenders also decreased slightly (from 35.1 percent in 1991 to 33.6 percent in 2000).

Chart 13
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
By Relationship of Victim to Offender


Source: Table 11.
Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.

Chart 14
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1991-2000
By Selected Relationships of Victims to Offenders


Source: Table 11.

Chart 15
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
Gender of Victim by Relationship of Victim to Offender


Source: Table 12

Chart 16
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
Race/Ethnic Group of Victim by Relationship of Victim to Offender


Source: Table 12.

In 2000,
More female victims were spouses of offenders (26.4 percent) than were male victims (3.1 percent).

- Proportionately, more black victims were friends or acquaintances of offenders than were either white or Hispanic victims ( 50.2 vs. 45.0 and 47.1 percent, respectively).
$\square$ In 2000, the percentage of females killed by their spouses was $81 / 2$ times larger than the percentage of males killed by their spouses.


## crimes

In2000,

- Victims under age 18 were least likely to be strangers to offenders (22.4 percent) than were victims in any other age group shown.
- More victims aged 18-29 were friends or acquaintances of offenders ( 55.2 percent) than were victims in any other age group shown.
- More victims aged 40 and over were spouses of offenders (19.4 percent) than were victims in any other age group shown.

Chart 17
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
Age of Victim by Relationship of Victim to Offender


Source: Table 13.
$\square$ Regardless of age group, the largest proportion of homicide victims were killed by friends or acquaintances.

Chart 18
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
County by Rate per 100,000 Population

$\square$ Rates not calculated
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## crimes

When homicides were examined by season of incident, it was found that:

In 2000, the incidents that led to death occurred more often in the summer than in any other season (28.8 percent).

Chart 19
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
By Season of Incident


Source: Table 15.
Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.

Chart20
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1991-2000
By Season of Incident


Source: Table 15.

With the exception of $\mathbf{1 9 9 6}$, homicides occurred most often during the summertime.

## Chart21

HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
Race/Ethnic Group of Victim by Average Daily Number of Incidents on Weekdays and Weekends


Source: Table 16.
Note: Average daily number of incidents may not add to totals because of rounding.

## Chart22

HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
Age of Victim by Average Daily Number of Incidents on Weekdays and Weekends


Source: Table 17.
Note: Average daily number of incidents may not add to totals because of rounding.

In2000,

- An average of 5.1 homicide victims were killed each weekday and 7.1 homicide victims were killed each weekend day.
- Hispanic victims had the highest average daily number of incidents on both weekdays and weekends (2.1 and 3.6, respectively) of any race/ ethnic group shown.
- Victims aged 18-29 had the highest average daily number of incidents on both weekdays and weekends (2.0 and 3.5, respectively) of any age groupshown.


## crimes

When homicides were examined by location of incident, it was found that:

In2000,
29.6 percent of victims were killed at their places of residence.

- 37.6 percent of homicides occurred on streets or sidewalks.
- 32.8 percent of homicides occurred in "all other" locations.
- More males were killed on streets or sidewalks (43.3 percent) than were females ( 14.5 percent).
- Proportionately, more females were killed at their places of residence ( 58.0 percent) than were males (22.6 percent).
$\square$ Of the locations shown, males were more likely to be killed on streets or sidewalks and less likely to be killed in their residences; the inverse was true for females.

Chart23
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
By Location of Homicide


Source: Table 19.

Chart24
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
Gender of Victim by Location of Homicide


Source: Table 19.

Chart25
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
Race/Ethnic Group of Victim by Location of Homicide


Source: Table 19.

Chart26
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
Age of Victim by Location of Homicide


[^1]In2000,
Proportionately, more whites than Hispanics or blacks were killed at their places of residence ( 50.1 vs. 25.1 and 22.3 percent, respectively).

- More Hispanics and blacks were killed on streets or sidewalks than were whites ( 41.8 and 49.0 vs. 16.4 percent, respectively).
- More victims aged 18-29 were killed on streets or sidewalks ( 45.9 percent) than were victims in any other age group shown.
- More victims aged 40 and over were killed at their places of residence ( 49.6 percent) than were victims in any other age group shown.


## $\square$ Whites were most likely to be killed in their residences; Hispanics and blacks on a street or sidewalk.

## crimes

When homicides were examined by type of weapon used, it was found that:

In2000,
70.4 percent resulted from the use of firearms.

- 60.7 percent resulted from the use of handguns.
- 9.7 percent resulted from the use of all other types of firearms.
- 13.9 percent resulted from the use of knives.
- 5.4 percent resulted from the use of personal weapons (hands, feet, etc.).
- 4.8 percent resulted from the use of blunt objects (clubs, etc.).
- 5.5 percent resulted from the use of weapons grouped in the "all other" category.

Comparing 1991 to 2000:

- The proportion of homicides that resulted from the use of firearms increased slightly (from 70.1 percent in 1991 to 70.4 percent in 2000).
- The proportion of homicides that resulted from the use of non-firearms decreased slightly (from 29.9 percent in 1991 to 29.6 percent in 2000).


## $\square$ The percentage of homicides committed with firearms varied less than 10 percent throughout the period shown.

Chart27
HOMICIDE CRIMES,2000
By Type of Weapon Used


Source: Table 21.

Chart28
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1991-2000
By Selected Types of Weapons Used


Source: Table 21.

Chart29
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
Gender of Victim by Type of Weapon Used


Source: Table 22.

Chart30
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
Race/Ethnic Group of Victim by Type of Weapon Used


Source: Table 22

In2000,
■ More males were killed with firearms (75.2 percent) than were females ( 50.1 percent).

- Proportionately, more females were killed with knives, personal weapons, or blunt objects (35.5 percent) than were males (21.5 percent).

■ More Hispanics and blacks were killed with firearms than were whites ( 73.8 and 82.9 vs. 48.3 percent, respectively).

## crimes

In2000,

- More victims aged 18 -29 were killed with firearms (83.7 percent) than were victims in any other age groupshown.

■ Proportionately, fewer victims aged 40 and over were killed with firearms ( 53.5 percent) than were victims in any other age group shown.
$\square$ Over 83 percent of homicide victims
aged 18-29 were killed with firearms.

Chart31
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
Age of Victim by Type of Weapon Used


Source: Table 23.
正

Chart 32
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
By Contributing Circumstance


Source: Table 24.
Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.

Chart 33
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1991-2000
By Selected Contributing Circumstances


Source: Table 24.

When homicides were examined by contributing circumstance, it was found that:

In2000,

- 11.7 percent occurred as a result of a rape, robbery, orburglary.
- 41.3 percent occurred as a result of an argument.

■ 28.8 percentwere gang-related.

- 4.3 percent were drug-related.
- 14.0 percent occurred as a result of "all other" contributing circumstances.

Comparing 1991 to 2000:

- The proportion of homicides in which the contributing circumstance was gang-related increased from 22.8 percent in 1991 to 28.8 percent in 2000.

■ The proportion of homicides in which the contributing circumstance was drug-related decreased from 7.8 percent in 1991 to 4.3 percent in 2000.

In 2000,

- More males were victims of gang-related homicides ( 34.0 percent) than were females ( 7.6 percent).
- More Hispanics and blacks were victims of gangrelated homicides than were whites (37.1 and 37.8 vs. 3.0 percent, respectively).
- Proportionately, more whites than Hispanics or blacks were victims of homicides which occurred as a result of an argument (57.1 vs. 36.4 and 35.7 percent, respectively).

Chart 34
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
Gender of Victim by Contributing Circumstance


## Source: Table 25.

Note: Charts 32, 35, and 36 include rape with robbery and burglary. However, for a more relevant comparison between male and female victims, rape is included in the "all other" category in Chart 34. In 2000, 2.3 percent of homicide crimes involving females were rape-related.

Chart 35
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
Race/Ethnic Group of Victim by Contributing
Circumstance


Source: Table 25.

Chart36
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
Age of Victim by Contributing Circumstance


Source: Table 26.

Chart37
HOMICIDE CRIMES CLEARED, 1991-2000
Clearance Rate


Source: Table 28.
Note: A clearance rate is the percentage of crimes (homicides) reported that have been cleared. It is calculated by dividing the number of homicides cleared by the number of homicides reported. The result is multiplied by 100. Please see "Appendix II - Criminal Justice Glossary" for a detailed explanation of clearances.

In2000,

- Most homicide victims under age 5 were killed as a result of child abuse ( 80.9 percent).
- More homicide victims aged 5-17 and aged 18-29 were killed as a result of gang- or drug-related activities ( 56.0 and 48.6 percent, respectively) than from any other contributing circumstance shown.
- The majority of homicide victims aged 30-39 and aged 40 and over were killed as a result of an argument ( 53.1 and 56.9 percent, respectively).
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## arrests

## HOMICIDE ARRESTS

Unlike crimes, which are classified by nationwide Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) standards, arrests are reported by California statute definition of the offense. ${ }^{1}$ This may cause some differences in the definitions of certain crimes and the reporting of the arrests for those crimes. For instance, the California definition of a homicide arrest includes murder and nonvehicular manslaughter. The federal definition of a homicide crime includes murder and nonnegligent(nonaccidental) manslaughter.

All California law enforcement agencies report arrest and citation information to the California Department of Justice on the "Monthly Arrest and Citation Register," which lists each arrestee; includes information about age, gender, and race/ethnic group; and specifies the "most serious" arrest offense and law enforcement disposition.

In 2000, of 1,627 arrests for homicide:
87.6 percent of arrestees $(1,426)$ were male.

- 12.4 percent (201) were female.


## $\square$ In 2000, the majority of homicide arrestees and victims were male ( 87.6 and 80.3 percent, respectively). (See Tables 5 and 30.)

[^2]Chart 38
HOMICIDE ARRESTS, 2000
By Gender of Arrestee


[^3]Chart39
HOMICIDE ARRESTS, 2000
By Race/Ethnic Group of Arrestee


Source: Table 31.

Chart 40
HOMICIDE ARRESTS, 2000
By Age of Arrestee


Source: Table 32.

In 2000, of 1,627 arrests for homicide:
23.0 percent of arrestees (374) were white.

■ 42.9 percent (698) were Hispanic.
■ 24.4 percent (397) were black.
■ 9.7 percent (158) fell into the "other" race/ethnic group category.

And,

- 9.8 percent of arrestees (160) were under age 18.
- 56.1 percent (913) were aged 18-29.
- 18.4 percent (299) were aged 30-39.
- 15.7 percent (255) were aged 40 and over.
$\square$ In 2000, the largest proportion of homicide arrestees and victims were Hispanic (42.9 and 45.2 percent, respectively). The majority of homicide arrestees were aged 18-29 ( 56.1 percent) and the largest proportion of homicide victims were aged 18-29 (43.4 percent). (See Tables 6, 7, 31, and 32.)


## arrests

In2000,
Homicide arrestees for all three race/ethnic groups shown were predominately male.

Chart41
HOMICIDE ARRESTS, 2000
Race/Ethnic Group of Arrestee by Gender of Arrestee


Source: Table 33.

Chart 42
HOMICIDE ARRESTS, 2000
Race/Ethnic Group of Arrestee by Age of Arrestee



Source: Table 33.

In 2000,

- More white arrestees were aged 40 and over than were Hispanic or black arrestees (31.3 vs. 8.7 and 12.1 percent, respectively).
- Regardless of race/ethnic group, the largest proportion of homicide arrestees fell into the aged "18-29" category.
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## DEATH PENALTY SENTENCES

This section contains information about persons sentenced to death in California courts in 2000. Death penalty data were extracted from the 2000 Offender-Based Transaction Statistics (OBTS) system. For detailed information regarding the death penalty and the criteria by which a person can be sentenced to death, refer to California Penal Code sections 190 through 190.9.

Chart 43
PERSONS UNDER CALIFORNIA
SENTENCE OF DEATH, 1978-2000


Source: Table 35.

During 2000, 33 persons were convicted of first-degree murder and sentenced to death. These were initial death sentences only and do not include persons who were resentenced to death after their death sentences were reversed on appeal. By the end of 2000, 589 persons were under sentence of death in California.

Of the 33 persons newly sentenced to death in 2000:

- Thirty-two were male; 1 was female.
- Seven were white; 8 were Hispanic; 13 were black; 5 fell into the "other" race/ethnic group category.
- The mean (average) age at arrest was 29.
- Los Angeles County sentenced the largest number: 11.

Additional information can be found in Tables 35 and 36.
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## justifiable homicides

## JUSTIFIABLE HOMICIDES

A justifiable homicide is defined by the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program as the killing of a felon by a private citizen or by a peace officer during the commission of a felony. Justifiable homicides are sometimes referred to as excusable or noncriminal homicides.

When justifiable homicides were examined, it was found that:

In2000,

- 96.1 percent of felons killed by peace officers were male; 3.9 percent were female.
- 95.7 percent of felons killed by private citizens were male; 4.3 percent were female.

Chart 45
JUSTIFIABLE HOMICIDES BY PEACE OFFICERS
OR PRIVATE CITIZENS, 2000
By Gender of Deceased


Source: Table 39.

Chart 46
JUSTIFIABLE HOMICIDES BY PEACE OFFICERS OR PRIVATE CITIZENS, 2000
By Race/Ethnic Group of Deceased


Source: Table 39.

Chart 47
JUSTIFIABLE HOMICIDES BY PEACE OFFICERS OR PRIVATE CITIZENS, 2000
By Age of Deceased


Source: Table 39.

In 2000,

- 40.8 percent of felons killed by peace officers were white, 34.0 percent were Hispanic, 21.4 percent were black, and 3.9 percent fell into the "other" race/ethnic group category.
- 17.4 percent of felons killed by private citizens were white, 39.1 percent were Hispanic, 39.1 percent were black, and 4.3 percent fell into the "other" race/ethnic group category.
- 1.9 percent of felons killed by peace officers were under age $18,41.7$ percent were aged 18-29, 26.2 percent were aged $30-39,29.1$ percent were aged 40 and over, and 1.0 percent fell into the "unknown" age category.
- No felons killed by private citizens were under age 18, 65.2 percent were aged 18-29, 8.7 percent were aged $30-39$, and 26.1 percent were aged 40 and over. ${ }^{1}$

[^4]
## justifiable homicides

When justifiable homicides were examined by location, it was found that:

In2000,

- Most felons killed by peace officers were killed on a street or sidewalk (55.3 percent).
- The largest proportion of felons killed by private citizens fell into the "citizen's, shared residence" category (39.1 percent).

Chart 48
JUSTIFIABLE HOMICIDES BY PEACE OFFICERS, 2000
By Location of Justifiable Homicide


Source: Table 40.
Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.

Chart 49
JUSTIFIABLE HOMICIDES BY PRIVATE CITIZENS, 2000
By Location of Justifiable Homicide


Source: Table 40.

Chart 50
JUSTIFIABLE HOMICIDES BY PEACE OFFICERS, 2000 By Contributing Circumstance


Source: Table 41.

Chart 51
JUSTIFIABLE HOMICIDES BY PRIVATE CITIZENS, 2000 By Contributing Circumstance


[^5]When justifiable homicides were examined by contributing circumstance, it was found that:

In2000,

- Most felons killed by peace officers were killed while attacking a peace officer ( 83.5 percent).
- Most felons killed by private citizens were killed during the commission of a crime ( 52.2 percent).
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## peace officers killed

## PEACE OFFICERS KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY

Information about peace officers killed in the line of duty was obtained from the Homicide File. Only sworn officers feloniously killed in the line of duty are included. (Sworn officers accidentally killed in the line of duty and nonsworn officers, such as security guards, are excluded.)

Data in Tables N-2 and N-3 show that:

- From 1991-2000, 60 peace officers were killed in the line of duty. The average number of peace officers killed annually was six. In 2000, two were killed.

In 2000, one peace officer was killed with a handgun and one peace officer was killed with a rifle.

Table N-2
PEACE OFFICERS KILLED
IN THE LINE OF DUTY, 1991-2000

| Year(s) | Number of <br> officers killed |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total | 60 |
| 2000 | 2 |
| 1999 | 4 |
| 1998 | 7 |
| 1997 | 7 |
| 1996 | 5 |
| 1994 | 10 |
| 1993 | 9 |
| 1992 | 8 |
| 1991 | 5 |
|  | 3 |

Table N-3
PEACE OFFICERS KILLED
IN THE LINE OF DUTY, 2000
By Type of Weapon Used

| Type of <br> weapon used | Total | Offender's | Officer's |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Handgun | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Rifle | 1 | 1 | 0 |

Table N-4
PEACE OFFICERS KILLED
IN THE LINE OF DUTY, 2000
Race/Ethnic Group of Officer by Gender of Officer

| Race/ethnic <br> group |  | Gender |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female |
| Total | 2 | 2 | 0 |
|  |  |  | 0 |
| White | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Black | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Chart44
HOMICIDE CRIMES AND PEACE OFFICERS KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY, 1991-2000
Rate per 100,000 Respective Population


Source: Table 37.

Data in Table N -4 show that:

- In 2000, both peace officers killed in the line of duty were male; one was white and one was black.

When homicide rates for the general population were compared to homicide rates for peace officers killed in the line of duty, it was found that:

In 2000,

- The general population homicide rate was 6.0 per 100,000 respective population. The homicide rate for peace officers killed in the line of duty was 2.9 per 100,000 respective population.

Comparing 1991 to 2000:

- The general population homicide rate decreased 52.4 percent ( 12.6 to 6.0 ). The homicide rate for peace officers killed in the line of duty decreased 40.8 percent ( 4.9 to 2.9 ).
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## Tables

Violent crimes, 1991-2000, number, rate per 100,000 population, and percent change (Table 1)

Homicide crimes
Gender of victim, 1991-2000, number, percent, and rate per 100,000 population (Table 2)
Race/ethnic group of victim, 1991-2000, number, percent, and rate per 100,000 population (Table 3)
Age of victim, 1991-2000, number, percent, and rate per 100,000 population (Table 4)
Gender of victim; Race/ethnic group of victim, 1991-2000 (Table 5 and Table 6)
Age of victim, 1991-2000; Race/ethnic group of victim by gender of victim, 2000 (Table 7 and Table 8)
Race/ethnic group of victim by age of victim, 2000 (Table 9)
Race/ethnic group of victim by gender and age of victim, 2000 (Table 10)
Relationship of victim to offender, 1991-2000 (Table 11)
Gender and race/ethnic group of victim by relationship of victim to offender, 2000 (Table 12)
Age of victim by relationship of victim to offender, 2000_(Table 13)
County, number and rate per 100,000 population, 1991-2000 (Table 14)
Season and month of incident, 1991-2000 (Table 15)
Gender and race/ethnic group of victim by day of incident, 2000 (Table 16)
Age of victim by day of incident, 2000 (Table 17)
Location of homicide, 1991-2000 (Table 18)
Gender and race/ethnic group of victim by location of homicide, 2000_(Table 19)
Age of victim by location of homicide, 2000 (Table 20)
Type of weapon used, 1991-2000 (Table 21)
Gender and race/ethnic group of victim by type of weapon used, 2000 (Table 22)
Age of victim by type of weapon used, 2000 (Table 23)
Contributing circumstance, 1991-2000_(Table 24)
Gender and race/ethnic group of victim by contributing circumstance, 2000 (Table 25)
Age of victim by contributing circumstance, 2000 (Table 26)
Contributing circumstance by relationship of victim to offender, 2000(Table 27) Clearances, 1991-2000, number reported, number cleared, and clearance rate (Table 28)
Felony arrests for selected violent offenses, 1991-2000, number, rate per 100,000 population at risk, and percent change_(Table 29)

## Homicide arrests

Gender of arrestee; Race/ethnic group of arrestee, 1991-2000 (Table 30 and Table 31)
Age of arrestee, 1991-2000 (Table 32)
Race/ethnic group of arrestee by gender and age of arrestee, 2000 (Table 33 and Table 34)

Death penalty sentences
Persons under California sentence of death, 1978-2000 (Table 35)
Sentencing county by gender, race/ethnic group, and age of persons sentenced to death, 2000 (Table 36)

Peace officers killed in the line of duty
Homicide crimes and peace officers killed in the line of duty, 1991-2000, number and rate per 100,000 respective population; Contributing circumstance, 2000 (Table 37 and Table 38)

Justifiable homicides
Gender, race/ethnic group, and age of deceased, 2000 (Table 39)
Location of justifiable homicide, 2000 (Table 40)
Contributing circumstance, 2000 (Table 41)
Type of weapon used, 2000 (Table 42)
Population
Population estimates, 1952-2000_(Table 43)
lable 1
VIOLENT CRIMES, 1991-2000
lumber, Rate per 100,000 Population, and Percent Chang $\epsilon$

| Year(s) | Total | Homicide | Forcible rape | Robbery | Aggravated assault |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2000. | 210,492 | 2,074 | 9,785 | 60,243 | 138,390 |
| 1999............... | 207,874 | 2,006 | 9,443 | 60,027 | 136,398 |
| 1998. | 229,766 | 2,170 | 9,777 | 68,752 | 149,067 |
| 1997............... | 257,409 | 2,579 | 10,182 | 81,413 | 163,235 |
| 1996............... | 274,675 | 2,910 | 10,238 | 94,137 | 167,390 |
| 1995............... | 304,998 | 3,530 | 10,550 | 104,581 | 186,337 |
| 1994. | 318,946 | 3,699 | 10,960 | 112,149 | 192,138 |
| 1993. | 336,100 | 4,095 | 11,754 | 126,347 | 193,904 |
| 1992.... | 345,508 | 3,920 | 12,751 | 130,867 | 197,970 |
| 1991............... | 330,916 | 3,876 | 12,942 | 125,105 | 188,993 |
| Percent change in number |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1999-2000........ | 1.3 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 0.4 | 1.5 |
| 1998-1999........ | -9.5 | -7.6 | -3.4 | -12.7 | -8.5 |
| 1997-1998....... | -10.7 | -15.9 | -4.0 | -15.6 | -8.7 |
| 1996-1997........ | -6.3 | -11.4 | -0.5 | -13.5 | -2.5 |
| 1995-1996........ | -9.9 | -17.6 | -3.0 | -10.0 | -10.2 |
| 1994-1995.... | -4.4 | -4.6 | -3.7 | -6.7 | -3.0 |
| 1993-1994........ | -5.1 | -9.7 | -6.8 | -11.2 | -0.9 |
| 1992-1993....... | -2.7 | 4.5 | -7.8 | -3.5 | -2.1 |
| 1991-1992........ | 4.4 | 1.1 | -1.5 | 4.6 | 4.7 |
| 1991-2000........ | -36.4 | -46.5 | -24.4 | -51.8 | -26.8 |
| Rate per 100,000 population ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2000............... | 610.5 | 6.0 | 28.4 | 174.7 | 401.4 |
| 1999............... | 610.7 | 5.9 | 27.7 | 176.4 | 400.7 |
| 1998.............. | 686.0 | 6.5 | 29.2 | 205.3 | 445.1 |
| 1997............... | 781.0 | 7.8 | 30.9 | 247.0 | 495.3 |
| 1996............... | 848.2 | 9.0 | 31.6 | 290.7 | 516.9 |
| 1995............... | 951.2 | 11.0 | 32.9 | 326.2 | 581.2 |
| 1994............... | 992.4 | 11.5 | 34.1 | 348.9 | 597.8 |
| 1993............... | 1,058.8 | 12.9 | 37.0 | 398.0 | 610.9 |
| 1992............... | 1,103.9 | 12.5 | 40.7 | 418.1 | 632.5 |
| 1991............... | 1,079.8 | 12.6 | 42.2 | 408.2 | 616.7 |
| Percent change in rate |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1999-2000........ | 0.0 | 1.7 | 2.5 | -1.0 | 0.2 |
| 1998-1999........ | -11.0 | -9.2 | -5.1 | -14.1 | -10.0 |
| 1997-1998....... | -12.2 | -16.7 | -5.5 | -16.9 | -10.1 |
| 1996-1997........ | -7.9 | -13.3 | -2.2 | -15.0 | -4.2 |
| 1995-1996........ | -10.8 | -18.2 | -4.0 | -10.9 | -11.1 |
| 1994-1995........ | -4.2 | -4.3 | -3.5 | -6.5 | -2.8 |
| 1993-1994........ | -6.3 | -10.9 | -7.8 | -12.3 | -2.1 |
| 1992-1993....... | -4.1 | 3.2 | -9.1 | -4.8 | -3.4 |
| 1991-1992........ | 2.2 | -0.8 | -3.6 | 2.4 | 2.6 |
| 1991-2000........ | -43.5 | -52.4 | -32.7 | -57.2 | -34.9 |

Note: Rates may not add to total because of rounding.
Rates are based on annual population estimates provided by the Demographic Research Unit, Califomia Department of Finance.

Table 2
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1991-2000
By Gender of Victim
Number, Percent, and Rate per 100,000 Population

| Gender of victim | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 1991- \\ 2000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1999- \\ & 2000 \end{aligned}$ |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of victims.......... | 3,876 | 3,920 | 4,095 | 3,699 | 3,530 | 2,910 | 2,579 | 2,170 | 2,006 | 2,074 | -46.5 | 3.4 |
| Percent of victims.......... | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |  |  |
| Population.................... | 30,646,000 | 31,300,000 | 31,742,000 | 32,140,000 | 32,063,000 | 32,383,000 | 32,957,000 | 33,494,000 | 34,036,000 | 34,480,000 | 12.5 | 1.3 |
| Percent of population..... | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |  |  |
| Rate............................ | 12.6 | 12.5 | 12.9 | 11.5 | 11.0 | 9.0 | 7.8 | 6.5 | 5.9 | 6.0 | -52.4 | 1.7 |
| Male ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of victims........ | 3,140 | 3,220 | 3,338 | 3,090 | 2,901 | 2,368 | 2,097 | 1,727 | 1,568 | 1,666 | -46.9 | 6.3 |
| Percent of total victims | 81.0\% | 82.1\% | 81.5\% | 83.5\% | 82.2\% | 81.4\% | 81.3\% | 79.6\% | 78.2\% | 80.3\% |  |  |
| Population.................. | 15,345,534 | 15,680,019 | 15,826,148 | 16,302,037 | 16,643,729 | 16,979,256 | 17,135,207 | 16,810,163 | 17,099,812 | 17,398,995 | 13.4 | 1.7 |
| Percent of population.. | 50.1\% | 50.1\% | 49.9\% | 50.1\% | 50.1\% | 50.1\% | 50.0\% | 50.2\% | 50.2\% | 50.2\% |  |  |
| Rate.......................... | 20.5 | 20.5 | 21.1 | 19.0 | 17.4 | 13.9 | 12.2 | 10.3 | 9.2 | 9.6 | -53.2 | 4.3 |
| Female |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of victims........ | 736 | 700 | 757 | 609 | 629 | 542 | 482 | 443 | 438 | 408 | -44.6 | -6.8 |
| Percent of total victims | 19.0\% | 17.9\% | 18.5\% | 16.5\% | 17.8\% | 18.6\% | 18.7\% | 20.4\% | 21.8\% | 19.7\% |  |  |
| Population.................. | 15,300,542 | 15,620,115 | 15,868,588 | 16,218,103 | 16,545,201 | 16,884,383 | 17,159,994 | 16,696,243 | 16,972,666 | 17,254,400 | 12.8 | 1.7 |
| Percent of population.. | 49.9\% | 49.9\% | 50.1\% | 49.9\% | 49.9\% | 49.9\% | 50.0\% | 49.8\% | 49.8\% | 49.8\% |  |  |
| Rate......................... | 4.8 | 4.5 | 4.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.2 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 2.6 | 2.4 | -50.0 | -7.7 |

Notes: Rates are based on annual population estimates provided by the Demographic Research Unit, Califomia Department of Finance.
Population breakdowns by gender will not add to total because of variations in population source data
The "percent of population" category formale and female wascalculated using the sum of the male and female populations.
${ }^{1}$ The "male" category includes homicide victims whose gender could not be determined: 1992 includes one, 1993 includes two, 1994 includes seven, 1995 includes six, 1997 includes five, and 2000 includes two.

Table 3
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1991-2000
By Race/Ethnic Group of Vic tim
Number, Percent, and Rate per 100,000 Population

| Race/ethnic group of victim | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 1991- \\ 2000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1999- \\ & 2000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of victims........... | 3,876 | 3,920 | 4,095 | 3,699 | 3,530 | 2,910 | 2,579 | 2,170 | 2,006 | 2,074 | -46.5 | 3.4 |
| Percent of victims........... | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |  |  |
| Population..................... | 30,646,000 | 31,300,000 | 31,742,000 | 32,140,000 | 32,063,000 | 32,383,000 | 32,957,000 | 33,494,000 | 34,036,000 | 34,480,000 | 12.5 | 1.3 |
| Percent of population....... | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |  |  |
| Rate............................. | 12.6 | 12.5 | 12.9 | 11.5 | 11.0 | 9.0 | 7.8 | 6.5 | 5.9 | 6.0 | -52.4 | 1.7 |
| White |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of victims......... | 971 | 914 | 952 | 771 | 726 | 617 | 547 | 523 | 446 | 421 | -56.6 | -5.6 |
| Percent of total victims.. | 25.1\% | 23.3\% | 23.2\% | 20.8\% | 20.6\% | 21.2\% | 21.2\% | 24.1\% | 22.2\% | 20.3\% |  |  |
| Population.................. | 17,291,782 | 17,362,245 | 17,324,679 | 17,511,489 | 17,593,222 | 17,787,715 | 17,849,510 | 17,258,003 | 17,339,690 | 17,421,511 | 0.8 | 0.5 |
| Percent of population.... | 56.4\% | 55.5\% | 54.7\% | 53.8\% | 53.0\% | 52.5\% | 52.0\% | 51.5\% | 50.9\% | 50.3\% |  |  |
| Rate.......................... | 5.6 | 5.3 | 5.5 | 4.4 | 4.1 | 3.5 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 2.6 | 2.4 | -57.1 | -7.7 |
| Hispanic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of victims........ | 1,542 | 1,686 | 1,631 | 1,572 | 1,615 | 1,291 | 1,154 | 964 | 909 | 933 | -39.5 | 2.6 |
| Percent of total victims.. | 39.8\% | 43.0\% | 39.8\% | 42.5\% | 45.8\% | 44.4\% | 44.7\% | 44.4\% | 45.3\% | 45.0\% |  |  |
| Population.................. | 8,146,876 | 8,561,349 | 8,906,439 | 9,340,495 | 9,764,691 | 10,114,228 | 10,421,039 | 10,022,551 | 10,352,763 | 10,688,752 | 31.2 | 3.2 |
| Percent of population.... | 26.6\% | 27.4\% | 28.1\% | 28.7\% | 29.4\% | 29.9\% | 30.4\% | 29.9\% | 30.4\% | 30.8\% |  |  |
| Rate.......................... | 18.9 | 19.7 | 18.3 | 16.8 | 16.5 | 12.8 | 11.1 | 9.6 | 8.8 | 8.7 | -54.0 | -1.1 |
| Black |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of vic tims......... | 1,101 | 1,073 | 1,249 | 1,111 | 922 | 794 | 682 | 523 | 488 | 589 | -46.5 | 20.7 |
| Percent of total victims.. | 28.4\% | 27.4\% | 30.5\% | 30.0\% | 26.1\% | 27.3\% | 26.4\% | 24.1\% | 24.3\% | 28.4\% |  |  |
| Population.................. | 2,155,334 | 2,191,898 | 2,179,651 | 2,255,738 | 2,293,634 | 2,330,391 | 2,314,836 | 2,309,152 | 2,320,916 | 2,337,935 | 8.5 | 0.7 |
| Percent of population.... | 7.0\% | 7.0\% | 6.9\% | 6.9\% | 6.9\% | 6.9\% | 6.7\% | 6.9\% | 6.8\% | 6.7\% |  |  |
| Rate.......................... | 51.1 | 49.0 | 57.3 | 49.3 | 40.2 | 34.1 | 29.5 | 22.6 | 21.0 | 25.2 | -50.7 | 20.0 |
| Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of victims........ | 247 | 234 | 247 | 226 | 254 | 198 | 177 | 147 | 157 | 121 | -51.0 | -22.9 |
| Percent of total victims.. | 6.4\% | 6.0\% | 6.0\% | 6.1\% | 7.2\% | 6.8\% | 6.9\% | 6.8\% | 7.8\% | 5.8\% |  |  |
| Population.................. | 3,052,084 | 3,184,642 | 3,283,967 | 3,412,418 | 3,537,383 | 3,631,305 | 3,709,816 | 3,916,700 | 4,059,109 | 4,205,197 | 37.8 | 3.6 |
| Percent of population..... | 10.0\% | 10.2\% | 10.4\% | 10.5\% | 10.7\% | 10.7\% | 10.8\% | 11.7\% | 11.9\% | 12.1\% |  |  |
| Rate.......................... | 8.1 | 7.3 | 7.5 | 6.6 | 7.2 | 5.5 | 4.8 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 2.9 | -64.2 | -25.6 |
| Unknown |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of victims........ | 15 | 13 | 16 | 19 | 13 | 10 | 19 | 13 | 6 | 10 | - | - |
| Percent of total victims.. | 0.4\% | 0.3\% | 0.4\% | 0.5\% | 0.4\% | 0.3\% | 0.7\% | 0.6\% | 0.3\% | 0.5\% |  |  |
| Population.................. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Percent of population.... | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Rate.......................... | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | $-$ |

Notes: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding
Rates are based on annual population estimates provided by the Demographic Research Unit, C alifomia Department of Finance.
Population breakdowns by race/ethnic group will not add to total because of variations in population source data
Dash indicates that the percent of population and rate for the "unknown" category cannot be calculated because there are no unknown race/ethnic group population data
The "percent of population" category for race/ethnic group wascalculated using the sum of the race/ethnic group populations.

Table 4
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1991-2000
By Age of Victim
Number, Percent, and Rate per 100,000 Population

| Age of victim | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1991- \\ & 2000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1999- \\ 2000 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of victims......... | 3,876 | 3,920 | 4,095 | 3,699 | 3,530 | 2,910 | 2,579 | 2,170 | 2,006 | 2,074 | -46.5 | 3.4 |
| Percent of victims.......... | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |  |  |
| Population.................... | 30,646,000 | 31,300,000 | 31,742,000 | 32,140,000 | 32,063,000 | 32,383,000 | 32,957,000 | 33,494,000 | 34,036,000 | 34,480,000 | 12.5 | 1.3 |
| Percent of population..... | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |  |  |
| Rate.......................... | 12.6 | 12.5 | 12.9 | 11.5 | 11.0 | 9.0 | 7.8 | 6.5 | 5.9 | 6.0 | -52.4 | 1.7 |
| Under 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of victims........ | 483 | 489 | 512 | 470 | 519 | 421 | 361 | 306 | 276 | 246 | -49.1 | -10.9 |
| Percent of total victims. | 12.5\% | 12.5\% | 12.5\% | 12.7\% | 14.7\% | 14.5\% | 14.0\% | 14.1\% | 13.8\% | 11.9\% |  |  |
| Population................. | 8,123,819 | 8,391,266 | 8,651,941 | 8,917,191 | 9,191,662 | 9,456,115 | 9,701,218 | 9,426,168 | 9,587,332 | 9,770,687 | 20.3 | 1.9 |
| Percent of population... | 26.5\% | 26.8\% | 27.3\% | 27.4\% | 27.7\% | 27.9\% | 28.3\% | 28.1\% | 28.1\% | 28.2\% |  |  |
| Rate......................... | 5.9 | 5.8 | 5.9 | 5.3 | 5.6 | 4.5 | 3.7 | 3.2 | 2.9 | 2.5 | -57.6 | $-13.8$ |
| 18-29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of vic tims........ | 1,717 | 1,719 | 1,763 | 1,603 | 1,510 | 1,183 | 1,068 | 933 | 840 | 888 | -48.3 | 5.7 |
| Percent of total victims. | 44.3\% | 43.9\% | 43.1\% | 43.3\% | 42.8\% | 40.7\% | 41.4\% | 43.0\% | 41.9\% | 42.8\% |  |  |
| Population................. | 6,246,754 | 6,171,771 | 5,863,383 | 5,934,537 | 5,854,943 | 5,770,311 | 5,537,727 | 5,474,990 | 5,511,604 | 5,523,472 | -11.6 | 0.2 |
| Percent of population... | 20.4\% | 19.7\% | 18.5\% | 18.2\% | 17.6\% | 17.0\% | 16.1\% | 16.3\% | 16.2\% | 15.9\% |  |  |
| Rate......................... | 27.5 | 27.9 | 30.1 | 27.0 | 25.8 | 20.5 | 19.3 | 17.0 | 15.2 | 16.1 | -41.5 | 5.9 |
| 30-39 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of victims....... | 863 | 842 | 934 | 861 | 737 | 630 | 534 | 428 | 364 | 377 | -56.3 | 3.6 |
| Percent of total victims. | 22.3\% | 21.5\% | 22.8\% | 23.3\% | 20.9\% | 21.6\% | 20.7\% | 19.7\% | 18.1\% | 18.2\% |  |  |
| Population................. | 5,510,403 | 5,656,892 | 5,747,693 | 5,874,969 | 5,942,572 | 5,968,805 | 5,942,241 | 5,654,098 | 5,629,424 | 5,597,411 | 1.6 | -0.6 |
| Percent of population... | 18.0\% | 18.1\% | 18.1\% | 18.1\% | 17.9\% | 17.6\% | 17.3\% | 16.9\% | 16.5\% | 16.2\% |  |  |
| Rate......................... | 15.7 | 14.9 | 16.2 | 14.7 | 12.4 | 10.6 | 9.0 | 7.6 | 6.5 | 6.7 | -57.3 | 3.1 |
| 40 and over |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of victims........ | 754 | 834 | 842 | 698 | 719 | 636 | 580 | 480 | 505 | 534 | -29.2 | 5.7 |
| Percent of total victims. | 19.5\% | 21.3\% | 20.6\% | 18.9\% | 20.4\% | 21.9\% | 22.5\% | 22.1\% | 25.2\% | 25.7\% |  |  |
| Population................. | 10,765,100 | 11,080,205 | 11,431,719 | 11,793,443 | 12,199,753 | 12,668,408 | 13,114,015 | 12,951,150 | 13,344,118 | 13,761,825 | 27.8 | 3.1 |
| Percent of population... | 35.1\% | 35.4\% | 36.1\% | 36.3\% | 36.8\% | 37.4\% | 38.2\% | 38.7\% | 39.2\% | 39.7\% |  |  |
| Rate......................... | 7.0 | 7.5 | 7.4 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 5.0 | 4.4 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 3.9 | -44.3 | 2.6 |
| Unknown |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of victims....... | 59 | 36 | 44 | 67 | 45 | 40 | 36 | 23 | 21 | 29 | - | - |
| Percent of total victims. | 1.5\% | 0.9\% | 1.1\% | 1.8\% | 1.3\% | 1.4\% | 1.4\% | 1.1\% | 1.0\% | 1.4\% |  |  |
| Population................. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Percent of population... | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Rate......................... | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Notes: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding
Rates are based on annual population estimates provided by the Demographic Research Unit, Califomia Department of Finance.
Population breakdowns by age will not add to total because of vanations in population source data
Dash indic ates that the percent of population and rate for the "unknown" category cannot be calculated because there are no unknown age population data.
The "percent of population" category forage group wascalculated using the sum of the age populations.

TABLE 5
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1991-2000
By Gender of Victim

| Year(s) | Total |  | Male ${ }^{1}$ |  | Female |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 2000 ........... | 2,074 | 100.0 | 1,666 | 80.3 | 408 | 19.7 |
| 1999 ........... | 2,006 | 100.0 | 1,568 | 78.2 | 438 | 21.8 |
| 1998 ........... | 2,170 | 100.0 | 1,727 | 79.6 | 443 | 20.4 |
| 1997 ........... | 2,579 | 100.0 | 2,097 | 81.3 | 482 | 18.7 |
| 1996 ........... | 2,910 | 100.0 | 2,368 | 81.4 | 542 | 18.6 |
| 1995 ........... | 3,530 | 100.0 | 2,901 | 82.2 | 629 | 17.8 |
| 1994 ........... | 3,699 | 100.0 | 3,090 | 83.5 | 609 | 16.5 |
| 1993 ........... | 4,095 | 100.0 | 3,338 | 81.5 | 757 | 18.5 |
| 1992 ........... | 3,920 | 100.0 | 3,220 | 82.1 | 700 | 17.9 |
| 1991 ........... | 3,876 | 100.0 | 3,140 | 81.0 | 736 | 19.0 |

${ }^{1}$ The "male" category includes homicide victims whose gender could not be determined: 1992 includes one, 1993 includes two, 1994 includes seven, 1995 includes six, 1997 includes five, and 2000 includes two.

TABLE 6
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1991-2000
By Race/Ethnic Group of Victim

| Year(s) | Total including unknown | Unknown | Known race/ethnic group of victim |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Total |  | White |  | Hispanic |  | Black |  | Other |  |
|  |  |  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 2000 ........... | 2,074 | 10 | 2,064 | 100.0 | 421 | 20.4 | 933 | 45.2 | 589 | 28.5 | 121 | 5.9 |
| 1999 ........... | 2,006 | 6 | 2,000 | 100.0 | 446 | 22.3 | 909 | 45.5 | 488 | 24.4 | 157 | 7.9 |
| 1998 ........... | 2,170 | 13 | 2,157 | 100.0 | 523 | 24.2 | 964 | 44.7 | 523 | 24.2 | 147 | 6.8 |
| 1997 ........... | 2,579 | 19 | 2,560 | 100.0 | 547 | 21.4 | 1,154 | 45.1 | 682 | 26.6 | 177 | 6.9 |
| 1996 ........... | 2,910 | 10 | 2,900 | 100.0 | 617 | 21.3 | 1,291 | 44.5 | 794 | 27.4 | 198 | 6.8 |
| 1995 ........... | 3,530 | 13 | 3,517 | 100.0 | 726 | 20.6 | 1,615 | 45.9 | 922 | 26.2 | 254 | 7.2 |
| 1994 ........... | 3,699 | 19 | 3,680 | 100.0 | 771 | 21.0 | 1,572 | 42.7 | 1,111 | 30.2 | 226 | 6.1 |
| 1993 ........... | 4,095 | 16 | 4,079 | 100.0 | 952 | 23.3 | 1,631 | 40.0 | 1,249 | 30.6 | 247 | 6.1 |
| 1992 ........... | 3,920 | 13 | 3,907 | 100.0 | 914 | 23.4 | 1,686 | 43.2 | 1,073 | 27.5 | 234 | 6.0 |
| 1991 ........... | 3,876 | 15 | 3,861 | 100.0 | 971 | 25.1 | 1,542 | 39.9 | 1,101 | 28.5 | 247 | 6.4 |

[^6]TABLE 7
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1991-2000
By Age of Victim

| Year(s) | Total including unknown | Unknown | Known age of victim |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Total |  | Under 18 |  | 18-29 |  | 30-39 |  | 40 and over |  |
|  |  |  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 2000 ........... | 2,074 | 29 | 2,045 | 100.0 | 246 | 12.0 | 888 | 43.4 | 377 | 18.4 | 534 | 26.1 |
| 1999 ........... | 2,006 | 21 | 1,985 | 100.0 | 276 | 13.9 | 840 | 42.3 | 364 | 18.3 | 505 | 25.4 |
| 1998 ........... | 2,170 | 23 | 2,147 | 100.0 | 306 | 14.3 | 933 | 43.5 | 428 | 19.9 | 480 | 22.4 |
| 1997 ........... | 2,579 | 36 | 2,543 | 100.0 | 361 | 14.2 | 1,068 | 42.0 | 534 | 21.0 | 580 | 22.8 |
| 1996 ........... | 2,910 | 40 | 2,870 | 100.0 | 421 | 14.7 | 1,183 | 41.2 | 630 | 22.0 | 636 | 22.2 |
| 1995 ........... | 3,530 | 45 | 3,485 | 100.0 | 519 | 14.9 | 1,510 | 43.3 | 737 | 21.1 | 719 | 20.6 |
| 1994 ........... | 3,699 | 67 | 3,632 | 100.0 | 470 | 12.9 | 1,603 | 44.1 | 861 | 23.7 | 698 | 19.2 |
| 1993 ........... | 4,095 | 44 | 4,051 | 100.0 | 512 | 12.6 | 1,763 | 43.5 | 934 | 23.1 | 842 | 20.8 |
| 1992 ........... | 3,920 | 36 | 3,884 | 100.0 | 489 | 12.6 | 1,719 | 44.3 | 842 | 21.7 | 834 | 21.5 |
| 1991 ........... | 3,876 | 59 | 3,817 | 100.0 | 483 | 12.7 | 1,717 | 45.0 | 863 | 22.6 | 754 | 19.8 |

Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.

TABLE 8
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
Race/Ethnic Group of Victim by Gender of Victim

| Gender of victim | Total |  | White |  | Hispanic |  | Black |  | Other |  | Unknown |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total........................................ | 2,074 | 100.0 | 421 | 100.0 | 933 | 100.0 | 589 | 100.0 | 121 | 100.0 | 10 | 100.0 |
|  | 1,666 | 80.3 | 277 | 65.8 | 789 | 84.6 | 505 | 85.7 | 89 | 73.6 | 6 | - |
| Female ................................... | 408 | 19.7 | 144 | 34.2 | 144 | 15.4 | 84 | 14.3 | 32 | 26.4 | 4 | - |

Note: Dash indicates that percent distributions are not calculated when the base number is less than 50 .
${ }^{1}$ The "male" category includes two homicide victims whose gender could not be determined.

Table 9
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
Race/Ethnic Group of Victim by Age of Victim

| Age of victim | Total |  | White |  | Hispanic |  | Black |  | Other |  | Unknown |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total including unknown. | 2,074 |  | 421 |  | 933 |  | 589 |  | 121 |  | 10 |  |
| Unknown................... | 29 |  | 3 |  | 14 |  | 2 |  | 2 |  | 8 |  |
| Total known............... | 2,045 | 100.0 | 418 | 100.0 | 919 | 100.0 | 587 | 100.0 | 119 | 100.0 | 2 | 100.0 |
| Under 18................. | 246 | 12.0 | 35 | 8.4 | 137 | 14.9 | 60 | 10.2 | 12 | 10.1 | 2 | - |
| 18-29.. | 888 | 43.4 | 81 | 19.4 | 489 | 53.2 | 276 | 47.0 | 42 | 35.3 | 0 | - |
| 30-39..................... | 377 | 18.4 | 77 | 18.4 | 155 | 16.9 | 127 | 21.6 | 18 | 15.1 | 0 | - |
| 40 and over............ | 534 | 26.1 | 225 | 53.8 | 138 | 15.0 | 124 | 21.1 | 47 | 39.5 | 0 | - |

Notes: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.
Dash indicates that percent distributions are not calculated when the base number is less than 50
lable 10
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
Race/thnnic Group of Victım by Gender and Age of Victım

| Genderand age of victim | Total |  | White |  | Hispanic |  | Black |  | Other |  | Unknown |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total................. | 2,074 | 100.0 | 421 | 100.0 | 933 | 100.0 | 589 | 100.0 | 121 | 100.0 | 10 | 100.0 |
| Under 18......... | 246 | 11.9 | 35 | 8.3 | 137 | 14.7 | 60 | 10.2 | 12 | 9.9 | 2 | - |
| 18-19............. | 191 | 9.2 | 16 | 3.8 | 110 | 11.8 | 57 | 9.7 | 8 | 6.6 | 0 | - |
| 20-24............. | 395 | 19.0 | 30 | 7.1 | 229 | 24.5 | 119 | 20.2 | 17 | 14.0 | 0 | - |
| 25-29............. | 302 | 14.6 | 35 | 8.3 | 150 | 16.1 | 100 | 17.0 | 17 | 14.0 | 0 | - |
| 30-34............. | 222 | 10.7 | 43 | 10.2 | 95 | 10.2 | 78 | 13.2 | 6 | 5.0 | 0 | - |
| 35-39............. | 155 | 7.5 | 34 | 8.1 | 60 | 6.4 | 49 | 8.3 | 12 | 9.9 | 0 | - |
| 40-44............. | 167 | 8.1 | 51 | 12.1 | 56 | 6.0 | 49 | 8.3 | 11 | 9.1 | 0 | - |
| 45-49............. | 117 | 5.6 | 39 | 9.3 | 33 | 3.5 | 35 | 5.9 | 10 | 8.3 | 0 | - |
| 50-54............. | 73 | 3.5 | 38 | 9.0 | 13 | 1.4 | 15 | 2.5 | 7 | 5.8 | 0 | - |
| 55 and over..... | 177 | 8.5 | 97 | 23.0 | 36 | 3.9 | 25 | 4.2 | 19 | 15.7 | 0 | - |
| Unknown......... | 29 | 1.4 | 3 | 0.7 | 14 | 1.5 | 2 | 0.3 | 2 | 1.7 | 8 | - |
| Male ${ }^{1} . . . . . . . . . . . . . ~$ | 1,666 | 100.0 | 277 | 100.0 | 789 | 100.0 | 505 | 100.0 | 89 | 100.0 | 6 | 100.0 |
| Under 18...... | 184 | 11.0 | 19 | 6.9 | 108 | 13.7 | 48 | 9.5 | 9 | 10.1 | 0 | - |
| 18-19.......... | 168 | 10.1 | 11 | 4.0 | 102 | 12.9 | 49 | 9.7 | 6 | 6.7 | 0 | - |
| 20-24.......... | 358 | 21.5 | 22 | 7.9 | 214 | 27.1 | 107 | 21.2 | 15 | 16.9 | 0 | - |
| 25-29.......... | 251 | 15.1 | 23 | 8.3 | 129 | 16.3 | 87 | 17.2 | 12 | 13.5 | 0 | - |
| 30-34.......... | 188 | 11.3 | 32 | 11.6 | 81 | 10.3 | 70 | 13.9 | 5 | 5.6 | 0 | - |
| 35-39.......... | 116 | 7.0 | 20 | 7.2 | 46 | 5.8 | 42 | 8.3 | 8 | 9.0 | 0 | - |
| 40-44........... | 121 | 7.3 | 33 | 11.9 | 40 | 5.1 | 39 | 7.7 | 9 | 10.1 | 0 | - |
| 45-49.......... | 89 | 5.3 | 28 | 10.1 | 27 | 3.4 | 28 | 5.5 | 6 | 6.7 | 0 | - |
| 50-54.......... | 52 | 3.1 | 27 | 9.7 | 7 | 0.9 | 14 | 2.8 | 4 | 4.5 | 0 | - |
| 55 and over.. | 118 | 7.1 | 59 | 21.3 | 25 | 3.2 | 21 | 4.2 | 13 | 14.6 | 0 | - |
| Unknown...... | 21 | 1.3 | 3 | 1.1 | 10 | 1.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 2.2 | 6 | - |
| Female.......... | 408 | 100.0 | 144 | 100.0 | 144 | 100.0 | 84 | 100.0 | 32 | 100.0 | 4 | 100.0 |
| Under 18...... | 62 | 15.2 | 16 | 11.1 | 29 | 20.1 | 12 | 14.3 | 3 | - | 2 | - |
| 18-19.......... | 23 | 5.6 | 5 | 3.5 | 8 | 5.6 | 8 | 9.5 | 2 | - | 0 | - |
| 20-24.......... | 37 | 9.1 | 8 | 5.6 | 15 | 10.4 | 12 | 14.3 | 2 | - | 0 | - |
| 25-29.......... | 51 | 12.5 | 12 | 8.3 | 21 | 14.6 | 13 | 15.5 | 5 | - | 0 | - |
| 30-34.......... | 34 | 8.3 | 11 | 7.6 | 14 | 9.7 | 8 | 9.5 | 1 | - | 0 | - |
| 35-39.......... | 39 | 9.6 | 14 | 9.7 | 14 | 9.7 | 7 | 8.3 | 4 | - | 0 | - |
| 40-44........... | 46 | 11.3 | 18 | 12.5 | 16 | 11.1 | 10 | 11.9 | 2 | - | 0 | - |
| 45-49.......... | 28 | 6.9 | 11 | 7.6 | 6 | 4.2 | 7 | 8.3 | 4 | - | 0 | - |
| 50-54.......... | 21 | 5.1 | 11 | 7.6 | 6 | 4.2 | 1 | 1.2 | 3 | - | 0 | - |
| 55 and over.. | 59 | 14.5 | 38 | 26.4 | 11 | 7.6 | 4 | 4.8 | 6 | - | 0 | - |
| Unknown...... | 8 | 2.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 2.8 | 2 | 2.4 | 0 | - | 2 | - |

Notes: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.
The "mand

Table 11
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1991-2000
By Relationship of Victim to Offender

| Relationship of victim to offender | 1991 |  | 1992 |  | 1993 |  | 1994 |  | 1995 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total including unknown.... | 3,876 |  | 3,920 |  | 4,095 |  | 3,699 |  | 3,530 |  |
| Unknown......................... | 1,318 |  | 1,011 |  | 1,166 |  | 994 |  | 947 |  |
| Total known...................... | 2,558 | 100.0 | 2,909 | 100.0 | 2,929 | 100.0 | 2,705 | 100.0 | 2,583 | 100.0 |
| Friend, acquaintance ${ }^{1}$. | 1,285 | 50.2 | 1,677 | 57.6 | 1,706 | 58.2 | 1,680 | 62.1 | 1,359 | 52.6 |
| Spouse, parent, child....... | 286 | 11.2 | 291 | 10.0 | 270 | 9.2 | 239 | 8.8 | 260 | 10.1 |
| Spouse ${ }^{2} . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ~$ | 146 | 5.7 | 139 | 4.8 | 130 | 4.4 | 113 | 4.2 | 123 | 4.8 |
| Parent, child ${ }^{3}$............... | 140 | 5.5 | 152 | 5.2 | 140 | 4.8 | 126 | 4.7 | 137 | 5.3 |
| All other relatives............. | 90 | 3.5 | 86 | 3.0 | 87 | 3.0 | 77 | 2.8 | 77 | 3.0 |
| Stranger........................ | 897 | 35.1 | 855 | 29.4 | 866 | 29.6 | 709 | 26.2 | 887 | 34.3 |


| Relationship <br> of vic tim to offender (cont.) | 1996 |  | 1997 |  | 1998 |  | 1999 |  | 2000 |  | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1991- \\ & 2000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1999- \\ & 2000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Total including unknown..... | 2,910 |  | 2,579 |  | 2,170 |  | 2,006 |  | 2,074 |  |  |  |
| Unknown......................... | 728 |  | 859 |  | 625 |  | 761 |  | 796 |  |  |  |
| Total known..................... | 2,182 | 100.0 | 1,720 | 100.0 | 1,545 | 100.0 | 1,245 | 100.0 | 1,278 | 100.0 | -50.0 | 2.7 |
| Friend, acquaintance ${ }^{1}$. | 1,075 | 49.3 | 869 | 50.5 | 766 | 49.6 | 632 | 50.8 | 601 | 47.0 | -53.2 | -4.9 |
| Spouse, parent, child....... | 261 | 12.0 | 203 | 11.8 | 192 | 12.4 | 202 | 16.2 | 207 | 16.2 | -27.6 | 2.5 |
| Spouse ${ }^{2}$...................... | 115 | 5.3 | 89 | 5.2 | 83 | 5.4 | 85 | 6.8 | 115 | 9.0 | -21.2 | 35.3 |
| Parent, child ${ }^{3}$............... | 146 | 6.7 | 114 | 6.6 | 109 | 7.1 | 117 | 9.4 | 92 | 7.2 | -34.3 | -21.4 |
| All other relatives............. | 43 | 2.0 | 46 | 2.7 | 41 | 2.7 | 49 | 3.9 | 40 | 3.1 | -55.6 | - |
| Stranger........................ | 803 | 36.8 | 602 | 35.0 | 546 | 35.3 | 362 | 29.1 | 430 | 33.6 | -52.1 | 18.8 |

Notes: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 bec a use of rounding.
Dash indicates that a percent change is not calculated when the base number is less than 50.
${ }^{1}$ Includes ex-husband, ex-wife, employer, employee, gang member, etc.
${ }^{2}$ Includes "common-law" ma miage partner.
${ }^{3}$ Inc ludes stepmother, stepfather, stepdaughter, and stepson.

Table 12
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
Gender and Race/Ethnic Group of Victim by Relationship of Victim to Ottender

| Relationship of victim to offender | Total | Gender |  | Race/ethnic group |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male ${ }^{1}$ | Female | White | Hispanic | Black | Other | Unknown |
| Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total including unknown........ | 2,074 | 1,666 | 408 | 421 | 933 | 589 | 121 | 10 |
| Unknown.......................... | 796 | 710 | 86 | 92 | 368 | 286 | 41 | 9 |
| Total known...................... | 1,278 | 956 | 322 | 329 | 565 | 303 | 80 | 1 |
| Friend, a cquaintance ${ }^{2} . . .$. | 601 | 484 | 117 | 148 | 266 | 152 | 35 | 0 |
| Spouse, parent, child....... | 207 | 79 | 128 | 82 | 69 | 39 | 17 | 0 |
|  | 115 | 30 | 85 | 53 | 33 | 19 | 10 | 0 |
| Parent, child ${ }^{4}$................ | 92 | 49 | 43 | 29 | 36 | 20 | 7 | 0 |
| All other relatives............ | 40 | 26 | 14 | 14 | 18 | 7 | 1 | 0 |
| Stranger......................... | 430 | 367 | 63 | 85 | 212 | 105 | 27 | 1 |
| Percent based on total known |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total known...................... | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Friend, a c qua intance ${ }^{2} . . . .$. | 47.0 | 50.6 | 36.3 | 45.0 | 47.1 | 50.2 | 43.8 | - |
| Spouse, parent, child....... | 16.2 | 8.3 | 39.8 | 24.9 | 12.2 | 12.9 | 21.3 | - |
| Spouse ${ }^{3} . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ~$ | 9.0 | 3.1 | 26.4 | 16.1 | 5.8 | 6.3 | 12.5 | - |
| Parent, child ${ }^{4} . . . . . . . . . . . . .$. | 7.2 | 5.1 | 13.4 | 8.8 | 6.4 | 6.6 | 8.8 | - |
| All other relatives............. | 3.1 | 2.7 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 3.2 | 2.3 | 1.3 | - |
| Stranger........................ | 33.6 | 38.4 | 19.6 | 25.8 | 37.5 | 34.7 | 33.8 | - |

Notes: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 bec a use of rounding.
Dash indic ates that percent distributions are not calculated when the base number is less than 50 .
${ }^{1}$ The "male" category includes two homicide victims whose gender could not be determined.
${ }^{2}$ Includes ex-husband, ex-wife, employer, employee, gang member, etc.
${ }^{3}$ Includes "common-law" ma ria ge partner.
${ }^{4}$ Includes stepmother, stepfather, stepdaughter, and stepson.

Table 13
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
Age of Victim by Relationship of Victim to Ottender

| Relationship of victim to offender | Total | Under $18$ | 18-29 | 30-39 | $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ \text { and over } \end{gathered}$ | Unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total including unknown.... | 2,074 | 246 | 888 | 377 | 534 | 29 |
| Unknown........................ | 796 | 63 | 408 | 150 | 158 | 17 |
| Total known..................... | 1,278 | 183 | 480 | 227 | 376 | 12 |
| Friend, a cquaintance ${ }^{1}$... | 601 | 73 | 265 | 114 | 145 | 4 |
| Spouse, parent, child..... | 207 | 56 | 20 | 25 | 103 | 3 |
| Spouse ${ }^{2} . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ~$ | 115 | 0 | 18 | 23 | 73 | 1 |
| Pa rent, child ${ }^{3} . . . . . . . . . . .$. | 92 | 56 | 2 | 2 | 30 | 2 |
| All other relatives.......... | 40 | 13 | 4 | 6 | 16 | 1 |
| Stranger....................... | 430 | 41 | 191 | 82 | 112 | 4 |
| Percent based on total known |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total known..................... | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Friend, a cqua inta nce ${ }^{1} .$. | 47.0 | 39.9 | 55.2 | 50.2 | 38.6 | - |
| Spouse, parent, child..... | 16.2 | 30.6 | 4.2 | 11.0 | 27.4 | - |
| Spouse ${ }^{2} . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ~$ | 9.0 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 10.1 | 19.4 | - |
| Parent, child ${ }^{3} . . . . . . . . . . .$. | 7.2 | 30.6 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 8.0 | - |
| All other relatives.......... | 3.1 | 7.1 | 0.8 | 2.6 | 4.3 | - |
| Stranger....................... | 33.6 | 22.4 | 39.8 | 36.1 | 29.8 | - |

Notes: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 because of rounding.
Dash indicates that percent distributions are not calculated when the base number is less than 50
${ }^{\text {a }}$ Includes ex-husband, ex-wife, employer, employee, gang member, etc.
< Includes "common-law" ma miage partner.
${ }^{\circ}$ Includes stepmother, stepfather, stepdaughter, and stepson.

Number and Rate per 100,000 Population

| County | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rate per 100,000 population |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Statewide total....... | 12.6 | 12.5 | 12.9 | 11.5 | 11.0 | 9.0 | 7.8 | 6.5 | 5.9 | 6.0 |
| Alameda............ | 15.3 | 16.1 | 14.9 | 13.8 | 14.5 | 10.4 | 10.2 | 7.5 | 5.9 | 7.5 |
| Alpine............... | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Amador............. | - | - |  | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |
| Butte................ | 5.8 | 7.2 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 2.5 | 5.1 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.9 |
| Calaveras......... |  | - |  |  |  | - | - | - | - | - |
| Colusa.............. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Contra Costa...... | 12.9 | 10.2 | 13.1 | 13.7 | 9.2 | 8.1 | 7.0 | 5.9 | 6.1 | 5.8 |
| Del Norte........... | - | - |  | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |
| El Dorado.......... | 8.1 | 5.8 | 3.5 | 4.8 | 2.8 | 1.4 | 2.7 | 4.7 | 2.0 | 1.9 |
| Fresno................ | 11.5 | 17.4 | 17.1 | 16.1 | 13.9 | 12.1 | 10.8 | 7.3 | 5.4 | 4.7 |
| Glenn................ | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Humboldt........... | 7.4 | 4.8 | 7.9 | 5.5 | 6.4 | 2.4 | 6.3 | 4.0 | 9.5 | 3.1 |
| Imperial.............. | 7.8 | 11.3 | 3.8 | 4.3 | 6.6 | 9.2 | 3.5 | 5.6 | 1.4 | 2.7 |
| Inyo................. |  | - |  | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |
| Kem................ | 10.7 | 8.2 | 11.9 | 14.8 | 11.5 | 8.3 | 8.7 | 8.6 | 8.0 | 5.5 |
| Kings................ | 5.7 | 3.7 | 8.0 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 8.6 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.8 | 2.2 |
| Lake................ | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - |
| Lassen.............. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Los Angeles....... | 20.6 | 21.0 | 21.1 | 18.1 | 18.0 | 14.9 | 12.3 | 9.9 | 9.1 | 10.3 |
| Madera............... | - | 11.0 | 9.6 | 13.9 | 11.3 | 10.0 | 5.3 | 10.5 | 5.1 | 7.8 |
| Marin.................. | 4.3 | 4.6 | 1.7 | 0.8 | 2.9 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 2.0 |
| Mariposa............ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mendocino......... | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Merced.............. | 3.8 | 5.8 | 10.7 | 8.0 | 5.5 | 4.0 | 8.4 | 8.3 | 6.8 | 2.8 |
| Modoc............... | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mono................ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Monterey............ | 6.9 | 8.8 | 8.5 | 10.8 | 7.2 | 6.4 | 8.7 | 7.0 | 7.4 | 6.1 |
| Napa................ | 4.4 | 5.2 | 3.4 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.8 | 1.6 | 2.4 |
| Nevada.............. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Orange.............. | 6.3 | 6.8 | 7.6 | 6.5 | 6.3 | 4.2 | 3.8 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 1.9 |

Table 14-continued
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1991-2000
By County
Number and Rate per 100,000 Population

| County | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rate per 100,000 population |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Placer................ | 3.3 | 1.0 | 4.6 | 3.9 | 3.4 | 2.4 | 1.4 | 3.1 | 0.4 | 2.0 |
| Plumas.............. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Riverside........... | 12.5 | 9.8 | 11.9 | 12.0 | 9.7 | 8.0 | 7.7 | 7.1 | 5.9 | 5.0 |
| Sacramento........ | 11.0 | 8.2 | 12.9 | 11.1 | 9.2 | 8.2 | 7.6 | 6.3 | 6.8 | 6.0 |
| San Benito......... | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| San Bemardino... | 14.4 | 15.1 | 16.2 | 15.1 | 14.2 | 11.6 | 9.0 | 8.9 | 6.6 | 8.3 |
| San Diego........... | 10.8 | 9.3 | 9.2 | 7.6 | 7.4 | 6.2 | 4.5 | 3.1 | 3.7 | 3.4 |
| San Francisco...... | 13.3 | 15.7 | 17.2 | 12.2 | 13.2 | 10.7 | 7.6 | 7.3 | 8.0 | 7.5 |
| San J oaquin........ | 13.1 | 13.7 | 12.5 | 12.2 | 11.8 | 12.4 | 13.5 | 7.6 | 6.9 | 6.8 |
| San Luis Obispo.. | 1.8 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 2.2 | 2.1 | 2.9 | 1.7 | 1.2 |
| San Mateo.......... | 6.8 | 8.1 | 4.8 | 3.8 | 5.1 | 1.6 | 3.9 | 3.2 | 2.5 | 1.4 |
| Santa Barbara..... | 4.8 | 4.1 | 3.1 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 1.2 | 2.5 |
| Santa Clara......... | 5.1 | 4.4 | 3.9 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 2.9 | 3.7 | 2.6 | 2.2 | 2.0 |
| Santa Cruz.......... | 6.1 | 2.5 | 3.8 | 2.5 | 3.3 | 4.1 | 1.6 | 3.6 | 1.6 | 3.5 |
| Shasta ............... | 6.4 | 5.6 | 7.4 | 7.3 | 5.0 | 5.6 | 4.3 | 4.2 | 6.7 | 1.8 |
| Sierra................. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Siskiyou.............. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Solano............... | 8.3 | 6.5 | 7.2 | 11.7 | 7.3 | 5.9 | 3.2 | 3.6 | 4.1 | 5.2 |
| Sonoma............. | 4.7 | 1.5 | 5.7 | 4.2 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 1.8 | 2.4 |
| Sta nisla us.......... | 6.2 | 9.7 | 5.6 | 6.5 | 7.7 | 6.7 | 6.8 | 5.8 | 5.7 | 3.5 |
| Sutter................ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Tehama............. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Trinity................. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Tulare................ | 10.5 | 9.8 | 8.1 | 11.9 | 11.1 | 6.2 | 8.1 | 6.1 | 6.6 | 4.5 |
| Tuolumne.......... | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ventura .............. | 5.6 | 4.2 | 6.0 | 3.9 | 3.6 | 4.6 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 2.5 | 3.1 |
| Yolo................... | 6.8 | 3.4 | 6.7 | 7.3 | 6.0 | 4.6 | 4.5 | 5.1 | 3.8 | 3.5 |
| Yuba.................. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Notes: Dash indicates that a rate is not computed when a county's population is less than 100,000 in a given year.
Rates are based on annual population estimates provided by the Demographic Research Unit, Califomia Department of Finance.

Table 15
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1991-2000
By Season and Month of Incident

| Season and month of incident | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total including unknown... | 3,876 | 3,920 | 4,095 | 3,699 | 3,530 | 2,910 | 2,579 | 2,170 | 2,006 | 2,074 |
| Unknown..................... | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total known................. | 3,876 | 3,920 | 4,095 | 3,699 | 3,530 | 2,910 | 2,579 | 2,170 | 2,006 | 2,074 |
| Spring...................... | 872 | 942 | 1,002 | 925 | 806 | 682 | 651 | 517 | 451 | 464 |
| March.................... | 271 | 293 | 328 | 316 | 272 | 201 | 226 | 197 | 142 | 126 |
| April...................... | 284 | 315 | 315 | 307 | 255 | 225 | 217 | 156 | 147 | 162 |
| May...................... | 317 | 334 | 359 | 302 | 279 | 256 | 208 | 164 | 162 | 176 |
| Summer.................... | 1,121 | 1,060 | 1,134 | 942 | 978 | 745 | 678 | 568 | 562 | 597 |
| J une....................... | 380 | 312 | 391 | 307 | 270 | 254 | 212 | 177 | 157 | 205 |
| J uly....................... | 350 | 372 | 383 | 305 | 333 | 272 | 232 | 171 | 199 | 185 |
| August................... | 391 | 376 | 360 | 330 | 375 | 219 | 234 | 220 | 206 | 207 |
| Fall.......................... | 1,034 | 998 | 1,033 | 930 | 956 | 699 | 662 | 522 | 516 | 497 |
| September.............. | 352 | 333 | 337 | 310 | 326 | 256 | 228 | 159 | 171 | 173 |
| October.................. | 372 | 319 | 369 | 345 | 345 | 212 | 240 | 178 | 174 | 174 |
| November............... | 310 | 346 | 327 | 275 | 285 | 231 | 194 | 185 | 171 | 150 |
| Winter...................... | 849 | 920 | 926 | 902 | 790 | 784 | 588 | 563 | 477 | 516 |
| December............... | 306 | 307 | 332 | 293 | 281 | 238 | 194 | 207 | 166 | 210 |
| J a nuary.................. | 289 | 310 | 304 | 315 | 279 | 296 | 203 | 199 | 183 | 175 |
| February................. | 254 | 303 | 290 | 294 | 230 | 250 | 191 | 157 | 128 | 131 |
| Percent based on total known |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total known................. | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Spring....................... | 22.5 | 24.0 | 24.5 | 25.0 | 22.8 | 23.4 | 25.2 | 23.8 | 22.5 | 22.4 |
| March.................... | 7.0 | 7.5 | 8.0 | 8.5 | 7.7 | 6.9 | 8.8 | 9.1 | 7.1 | 6.1 |
| April....................... | 7.3 | 8.0 | 7.7 | 8.3 | 7.2 | 7.7 | 8.4 | 7.2 | 7.3 | 7.8 |
| May...................... | 8.2 | 8.5 | 8.8 | 8.2 | 7.9 | 8.8 | 8.1 | 7.6 | 8.1 | 8.5 |
| Summer.................... | 28.9 | 27.0 | 27.7 | 25.5 | 27.7 | 25.6 | 26.3 | 26.2 | 28.0 | 28.8 |
| J une....................... | 9.8 | 8.0 | 9.5 | 8.3 | 7.6 | 8.7 | 8.2 | 8.2 | 7.8 | 9.9 |
| J uly....................... | 9.0 | 9.5 | 9.4 | 8.2 | 9.4 | 9.3 | 9.0 | 7.9 | 9.9 | 8.9 |
| August................... | 10.1 | 9.6 | 8.8 | 8.9 | 10.6 | 7.5 | 9.1 | 10.1 | 10.3 | 10.0 |
| Fall.......................... | 26.7 | 25.5 | 25.2 | 25.1 | 27.1 | 24.0 | 25.7 | 24.1 | 25.7 | 24.0 |
| September.............. | 9.1 | 8.5 | 8.2 | 8.4 | 9.2 | 8.8 | 8.8 | 7.3 | 8.5 | 8.3 |
| October.................. | 9.6 | 8.1 | 9.0 | 9.3 | 9.8 | 7.3 | 9.3 | 8.2 | 8.7 | 8.4 |
| November.............. | 8.0 | 8.8 | 8.0 | 7.4 | 8.1 | 7.9 | 7.5 | 8.5 | 8.5 | 7.2 |
| Winter...................... | 21.9 | 23.5 | 22.6 | 24.4 | 22.4 | 26.9 | 22.8 | 25.9 | 23.8 | 24.9 |
| December............... | 7.9 | 7.8 | 8.1 | 7.9 | 8.0 | 8.2 | 7.5 | 9.5 | 8.3 | 10.1 |
| J a nuary.................. | 7.5 | 7.9 | 7.4 | 8.5 | 7.9 | 10.2 | 7.9 | 9.2 | 9.1 | 8.4 |
| February................. | 6.6 | 7.7 | 7.1 | 7.9 | 6.5 | 8.6 | 7.4 | 7.2 | 6.4 | 6.3 |

Table 16
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
Genderand Race/Ethnic Group of Victim by Day of Incident

| Day of incident | Total | Gender |  | Race/ethnic group |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male ${ }^{1}$ | Female | White | Hispanic | Black | Other | Unknown |
| Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total including unknown... | 2,074 | 1,666 | 408 | 421 | 933 | 589 | 121 | 10 |
| Unknown...................... | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total known................... | 2,074 | 1,666 | 408 | 421 | 933 | 589 | 121 | 10 |
| Weekday.................... | 1,317 | 1,039 | 278 | 276 | 554 | 403 | 78 | 6 |
| Monday................... | 272 | 215 | 57 | 47 | 114 | 97 | 14 | 0 |
| Tuesday.................. | 253 | 198 | 55 | 50 | 104 | 82 | 15 | 2 |
| Wednesday............. | 264 | 210 | 54 | 74 | 95 | 79 | 15 | 1 |
| Thursday................ | 263 | 199 | 64 | 54 | 105 | 87 | 14 | 3 |
| Frid ay...................... | 265 | 217 | 48 | 51 | 136 | 58 | 20 | 0 |
| Weekend................... | 757 | 627 | 130 | 145 | 379 | 186 | 43 | 4 |
| Saturday................. | 362 | 302 | 60 | 67 | 173 | 96 | 23 | 3 |
| Sunday................... | 395 | 325 | 70 | 78 | 206 | 90 | 20 | 1 |
| Percent based on total known |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total known................... | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Weekday.................... | 63.5 | 62.4 | 68.1 | 65.6 | 59.4 | 68.4 | 64.5 | - |
| Monday................... | 13.1 | 12.9 | 14.0 | 11.2 | 12.2 | 16.5 | 11.6 | - |
| Tuesday.................. | 12.2 | 11.9 | 13.5 | 11.9 | 11.1 | 13.9 | 12.4 | - |
| Wednesday............. | 12.7 | 12.6 | 13.2 | 17.6 | 10.2 | 13.4 | 12.4 | - |
| Thursday................ | 12.7 | 11.9 | 15.7 | 12.8 | 11.3 | 14.8 | 11.6 | - |
| Friday..................... | 12.8 | 13.0 | 11.8 | 12.1 | 14.6 | 9.8 | 16.5 | - |
| Weekend................... | 36.5 | 37.6 | 31.9 | 34.4 | 40.6 | 31.6 | 35.5 | - |
| Saturday................. | 17.5 | 18.1 | 14.7 | 15.9 | 18.5 | 16.3 | 19.0 | - |
| Sunday................... | 19.0 | 19.5 | 17.2 | 18.5 | 22.1 | 15.3 | 16.5 | - |
| Average daily number of incidents ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weekday.................... | 5.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 2.1 | 1.6 | 0.3 | 0.0 |
| Weekend.................... | 7.1 | 5.9 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 3.6 | 1.8 | 0.4 | 0.0 |

Notes: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 because of rounding.
Dash indicates that percent distributions are not calculated when the base number is less than 50 .
Average daily number of incidents may not add to totals because of rounding.
The "male" category includes two homicide victims whose gender could not be determined.
${ }^{\text {}}$ There were 366 days in 2000; 260 weekdays and 106 weekend days. The average daily number of incidents for weekdays was calculated by dividing weekday totals by 260. The average daily number of incidents for weekends was calculated by dividing weekend totals by 106

Table 17
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
Age of Victim by Day of Incident

| Day of incident | Total | Under 18 | 18-29 | 30-39 | $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ \text { and over } \end{gathered}$ | Unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total including unknown.... | 2,074 | 246 | 888 | 377 | 534 | 29 |
| Unknown....................... | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total known.................. | 2,074 | 246 | 888 | 377 | 534 | 29 |
| Weekday.................... | 1,317 | 167 | 522 | 247 | 361 | 20 |
| Monday................... | 272 | 32 | 121 | 43 | 76 | 0 |
| Tuesday.................. | 253 | 31 | 94 | 50 | 74 | 4 |
| Wednesday.............. | 264 | 36 | 98 | 51 | 75 | 4 |
| Thursday................. | 263 | 37 | 101 | 52 | 68 | 5 |
| Friday..................... | 265 | 31 | 108 | 51 | 68 | 7 |
| Weekend.................... | 757 | 79 | 366 | 130 | 173 | 9 |
| Saturday.................. | 362 | 32 | 169 | 60 | 95 | 6 |
| Sunday.................... | 395 | 47 | 197 | 70 | 78 | 3 |
| Percent based on total known |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total known................... | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Weekday................... | 63.5 | 67.9 | 58.8 | 65.5 | 67.6 | - |
| Monday.................. | 13.1 | 13.0 | 13.6 | 11.4 | 14.2 | - |
| Tuesday.................. | 12.2 | 12.6 | 10.6 | 13.3 | 13.9 | - |
| Wednesday............. | 12.7 | 14.6 | 11.0 | 13.5 | 14.0 | - |
| Thursday................. | 12.7 | 15.0 | 11.4 | 13.8 | 12.7 | - |
| Friday..................... | 12.8 | 12.6 | 12.2 | 13.5 | 12.7 | - |
| Weekend.................... | 36.5 | 32.1 | 41.2 | 34.5 | 32.4 | - |
| Saturday.................. | 17.5 | 13.0 | 19.0 | 15.9 | 17.8 | - |
| Sunday.................... | 19.0 | 19.1 | 22.2 | 18.6 | 14.6 | - |
| Average daily number of incidents ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weekday................... | 5.1 | 0.6 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 0.1 |
| Weekend.................... | 7.1 | 0.7 | 3.5 | 1.2 | 1.6 | 0.1 |

Notes: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 bec a use of rounding.
Dash indic ates that percent distributions are not calculated when the base number is less than 50 .
Average daily number of incidents may not add to totals because of rounding.
${ }^{1}$ There were 366 days in 2000; 260 weekdays and 106 weekend days. The average daily number of incidents for weekdays was calculated by dividing weekday totals by 260 . The average daily number of incidents for weekends was calculated by dividing weekend totals by 106.
by location ot Homicide

| Location of homicide | 1991 |  | 1992 |  | 1993 |  | 1994 |  | 1995 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total including unknown........... | 3,876 |  | 3,920 |  | 4,095 |  | 3,699 |  | 3,530 |  |
| Unknown.............................. | 194 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Total known......................... | 3,682 | 100.0 | 3,920 | 100.0 | 4,095 | 100.0 | 3,699 | 100.0 | 3,530 | 100.0 |
| Victim's, shared residence... | 951 | 25.8 | 1,041 | 26.6 | 1,076 | 26.3 | 944 | 25.5 | 943 | 26.7 |
| Victim's residence............ | 602 | 16.3 | 658 | 16.8 | 742 | 18.1 | 636 | 17.2 | 626 | 17.7 |
| Shared residence............. | 349 | 9.5 | 383 | 9.8 | 334 | 8.2 | 308 | 8.3 | 317 | 9.0 |
| Street, sidewalk................. | 1,349 | 36.6 | 1,501 | 38.3 | 1,526 | 37.3 | 1,429 | 38.6 | 1,466 | 41.5 |
| All other............................ | 1,382 | 37.5 | 1,378 | 35.2 | 1,493 | 36.5 | 1,326 | 35.8 | 1,121 | 31.8 |
| Hotel, motel.................... | 46 | 1.2 | 34 | 0.9 | 55 | 1.3 | 38 | 1.0 | 27 | 0.8 |
| Other residence............... | 269 | 7.3 | 270 | 6.9 | 228 | 5.6 | 256 | 6.9 | 206 | 5.8 |
| Liquor store.................... | 14 | 0.4 | 9 | 0.2 | 14 | 0.3 | 10 | 0.3 | 7 | 0.2 |
| Bar............................... | 55 | 1.5 | 77 | 2.0 | 85 | 2.1 | 61 | 1.6 | 57 | 1.6 |
| Other business............... | 122 | 3.3 | 144 | 3.7 | 161 | 3.9 | 140 | 3.8 | 110 | 3.1 |
| Parking lot...................... | 172 | 4.7 | 142 | 3.6 | 190 | 4.6 | 163 | 4.4 | 164 | 4.6 |
| Vehicle........................... | 348 | 9.5 | 409 | 10.4 | 434 | 10.6 | 373 | 10.1 | 295 | 8.4 |
| Field, park...................... | 305 | 8.3 | 236 | 6.0 | 293 | 7.2 | 247 | 6.7 | 224 | 6.3 |
| School .......................... | 6 | 0.2 | 29 | 0.7 | 9 | 0.2 | 7 | 0.2 | 6 | 0.2 |
| Other............................. | 45 | 1.2 | 28 | 0.7 | 24 | 0.6 | 31 | 0.8 | 25 | 0.7 |


| Location of homicide (cont.) | 1996 |  | 1997 |  | 1998 |  | 1999 |  | 2000 |  | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 1991- \\ 2000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 1999- \\ 2000 \end{array}$ |
| Total including unknown............ | 2,910 |  | 2,579 |  | 2,170 |  | 2,006 |  | 2,074 |  |  |  |
| Unknown............................. | 2 |  | 1 |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 4 |  |  |  |
| Total known......................... | 2,908 | 100.0 | 2,578 | 100.0 | 2,168 | 100.0 | 2,002 | 100.0 | 2,070 | 100.0 | -43.8 | 3.4 |
| Victim's, shared residence... | 807 | 27.8 | 746 | 28.9 | 629 | 29.0 | 686 | 34.3 | 612 | 29.6 | -35.6 | -10.8 |
| Victim's residence............ | 545 | 18.7 | 487 | 18.9 | 404 | 18.6 | 520 | 26.0 | 439 | 21.2 | -27.1 | -15.6 |
| Shared residence............. | 262 | 9.0 | 259 | 10.0 | 225 | 10.4 | 166 | 8.3 | 173 | 8.4 | -50.4 | 4.2 |
| Street, sidewalk................. | 1,165 | 40.1 | 994 | 38.6 | 823 | 38.0 | 710 | 35.5 | 779 | 37.6 | -42.3 | 9.7 |
| All other............................ | 936 | 32.2 | 838 | 32.5 | 716 | 33.0 | 606 | 30.3 | 679 | 32.8 | -50.9 | 12.0 |
| Hotel, motel.................... | 35 | 1.2 | 17 | 0.7 | 26 | 1.2 | 28 | 1.4 | 23 | 1.1 | - | - |
| Other residence............... | 204 | 7.0 | 175 | 6.8 | 132 | 6.1 | 119 | 5.9 | 162 | 7.8 | -39.8 | 36.1 |
| Liquor store.................... | 4 | 0.1 | 5 | 0.2 | 4 | 0.2 | 5 | 0.2 | 4 | 0.2 | - | - |
| Bar............................... | 39 | 1.3 | 29 | 1.1 | 32 | 1.5 | 35 | 1.7 | 37 | 1.8 | -32.7 | - |
| Other business............... | 104 | 3.6 | 90 | 3.5 | 84 | 3.9 | 54 | 2.7 | 76 | 3.7 | -37.7 | 40.7 |
| Parking lot..................... | 101 | 3.5 | 77 | 3.0 | 68 | 3.1 | 59 | 2.9 | 72 | 3.5 | -58.1 | 22.0 |
| Vehicle.......................... | 242 | 8.3 | 226 | 8.8 | 182 | 8.4 | 139 | 6.9 | 156 | 7.5 | -55.2 | 12.2 |
| Field, park..................... | 178 | 6.1 | 191 | 7.4 | 157 | 7.2 | 129 | 6.4 | 120 | 5.8 | -60.7 | -7.0 |
| School .......................... | 5 | 0.2 | 5 | 0.2 | 9 | 0.4 | 5 | 0.2 | 2 | 0.1 | - | - |
| Other............................ | 24 | 0.8 | 23 | 0.9 | 22 | 1.0 | 33 | 1.6 | 27 | 1.3 | - | - |

[^7]Dash indicates that a percent change is not calculated when the base number is less than 50

Table 19
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
Gender and Race/Ethnic Group of Victim by Location of Homicide

| Location of homicide | Total | Gender |  | Race/ethnic group |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male ${ }^{1}$ | Female | White | Hispanic | Black | Other | Unknown |
| Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total including unknown........... | 2,074 | 1,666 | 408 | 421 | 933 | 589 | 121 | 10 |
| Unknown............................. | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Total known......................... | 2,070 | 1,663 | 407 | 421 | 931 | 588 | 121 | 9 |
| Victim's, shared residence... | 612 | 376 | 236 | 211 | 234 | 131 | 35 | 1 |
| Victim's residence........... | 439 | 302 | 137 | 140 | 174 | 100 | 24 | 1 |
| Shared residence............ | 173 | 74 | 99 | 71 | 60 | 31 | 11 | 0 |
| Street, sidewalk................. | 779 | 720 | 59 | 69 | 389 | 288 | 31 | 2 |
| All other............................ | 679 | 567 | 112 | 141 | 308 | 169 | 55 | 6 |
| Hotel, motel................... | 23 | 18 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 0 |
| Other residence.............. | 162 | 146 | 16 | 35 | 80 | 38 | 8 | 1 |
| Liquor store.................... | 4 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Bar................................ | 37 | 32 | 5 | 10 | 19 | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| Other business................ | 76 | 65 | 11 | 21 | 33 | 8 | 14 | 0 |
| Parking lot...................... | 72 | 67 | 5 | 11 | 35 | 22 | 4 | 0 |
| Vehicle........................... | 156 | 137 | 19 | 9 | 79 | 60 | 7 | 1 |
| Field, park...................... | 120 | 79 | 41 | 38 | 47 | 25 | 7 | 3 |
| School........................... | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Other............................. | 27 | 18 | 9 | 11 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 1 |
| Percent based on total known |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total known......................... | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Victim's, shared residence... | 29.6 | 22.6 | 58.0 | 50.1 | 25.1 | 22.3 | 28.9 | - |
| Victim's resid ence........... | 21.2 | 18.2 | 33.7 | 33.3 | 18.7 | 17.0 | 19.8 | - |
| Shared residence... | 8.4 | 4.4 | 24.3 | 16.9 | 6.4 | 5.3 | 9.1 | - |
| Street, sidewalk................. | 37.6 | 43.3 | 14.5 | 16.4 | 41.8 | 49.0 | 25.6 | - |
| All other............................ | 32.8 | 34.1 | 27.5 | 33.5 | 33.1 | 28.7 | 45.5 | - |
| Hotel, motel................... | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 1.2 | 3.3 | - |
| Other residence............... | 7.8 | 8.8 | 3.9 | 8.3 | 8.6 | 6.5 | 6.6 | - |
| Liquor store..................... | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.8 | - |
| Bar................................ | 1.8 | 1.9 | 1.2 | 2.4 | 2.0 | 0.5 | 4.1 | - |
| Other business................ | 3.7 | 3.9 | 2.7 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 1.4 | 11.6 | - |
| Parking lot...................... | 3.5 | 4.0 | 1.2 | 2.6 | 3.8 | 3.7 | 3.3 | - |
| Vehicle........................... | 7.5 | 8.2 | 4.7 | 2.1 | 8.5 | 10.2 | 5.8 | - |
| Field, park...................... | 5.8 | 4.8 | 10.1 | 9.0 | 5.0 | 4.3 | 5.8 | - |
| School........................... | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | - |
| Other............................. | 1.3 | 1.1 | 2.2 | 2.6 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 4.1 | - |

[^8]${ }^{1}$ The "male" category includes two homicide victims whose gender could not be determined.

HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
Age of Victim by Location of Homicide

| Location of homicide | Total | Under $18$ | 18-29 | 30-39 | $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ \text { and over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total including unknown........... | 2,074 | 246 | 888 | 377 | 534 | 29 |
| Unknown.............................. | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Total known.......................... | 2,070 | 245 | 886 | 377 | 534 | 28 |
| Victim's, shared residence.... | 612 | 92 | 141 | 106 | 265 | 8 |
| Victim's residence............ | 439 | 45 | 115 | 85 | 187 | 7 |
| Shared residence............. | 173 | 47 | 26 | 21 | 78 | 1 |
| Street, sidewalk.................. | 779 | 94 | 407 | 136 | 133 | 9 |
| All other............................. | 679 | 59 | 338 | 135 | 136 | 11 |
| Hotel, motel..................... | 23 | 3 | 9 | 2 | 7 | 2 |
| Other residence............... | 162 | 15 | 86 | 30 | 28 | 3 |
| Liquor store..................... | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Bar................................ | 37 | 0 | 21 | 11 | 5 | 0 |
| Other business................. | 76 | 3 | 27 | 17 | 29 | 0 |
| Parking lot....................... | 72 | 2 | 39 | 15 | 16 | 0 |
| Vehicle........................... | 156 | 14 | 98 | 29 | 14 | 1 |
| Field, park....................... | 120 | 14 | 49 | 28 | 25 | 4 |
| School............................ | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Other.............................. | 27 | 7 | 8 | 3 | 8 | 1 |
| Percent based on total known |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total known.......................... | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Victim's, shared residence.... | 29.6 | 37.6 | 15.9 | 28.1 | 49.6 | - |
| Victim's resid ence............ | 21.2 | 18.4 | 13.0 | 22.5 | 35.0 | - |
| Shared residence............. | 8.4 | 19.2 | 2.9 | 5.6 | 14.6 | - |
| Street, sidewalk.................. | 37.6 | 38.4 | 45.9 | 36.1 | 24.9 | - |
| All other............................. | 32.8 | 24.1 | 38.1 | 35.8 | 25.5 | - |
| Hotel, motel..................... | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 1.3 | - |
| Other residence............... | 7.8 | 6.1 | 9.7 | 8.0 | 5.2 | - |
| Liquor store..................... | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.6 | - |
| Bar................................. | 1.8 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 2.9 | 0.9 | - |
| Other business................. | 3.7 | 1.2 | 3.0 | 4.5 | 5.4 | - |
| Parking lot....................... | 3.5 | 0.8 | 4.4 | 4.0 | 3.0 | - |
| Vehicle........................... | 7.5 | 5.7 | 11.1 | 7.7 | 2.6 | - |
| Field, park....................... | 5.8 | 5.7 | 5.5 | 7.4 | 4.7 | - |
| School............................ | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | - |
| Other............................. | 1.3 | 2.9 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 1.5 | - |

[^9]Dash indic ates that percent distributions are not calculated when the base number is less than 50 .

Table 21
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1991-2000
By Type of Weapon Used

| Type <br> of weapon used | 1991 |  | 1992 |  | 1993 |  | 1994 |  | 1995 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | ercent | Number | Percent |
| Total including unknown........ | 3,876 |  | 3,920 |  | 4,095 |  | 3,699 |  | 3,530 |  |
| Unknown............................ | 36 |  | 28 |  | 34 |  | 33 |  | 29 |  |
| Total known......................... | 3,840 | 100.0 | 3,892 | 100.0 | 4,061 | 100.0 | 3,666 | 100.0 | 3,501 | 100.0 |
| Firearm............................ | 2,692 | 70.1 | 2,839 | 72.9 | 3,007 | 74.0 | 2,778 | 75.8 | 2,590 | 74.0 |
| Handgun........................ | 2,255 | 58.7 | 2,426 | 62.3 | 2,609 | 64.2 | 2,441 | 66.6 | 2,288 | 65.4 |
| All other firea ms.............. | 437 | 11.4 | 413 | 10.6 | 398 | 9.8 | 337 | 9.2 | 302 | 8.6 |
| Rifle............................ | 176 | 4.6 | 164 | 4.2 | 154 | 3.8 | 141 | 3.8 | 140 | 4.0 |
| Shotgun....................... | 187 | 4.9 | 176 | 4.5 | 167 | 4.1 | 165 | 4.5 | 123 | 3.5 |
| Other firea rm............... | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Fiream - unknown type.. | 74 | 1.9 | 73 | 1.9 | 77 | 1.9 | 31 | 0.8 | 39 | 1.1 |
| Nonfirearm........................ | 1,148 | 29.9 | 1,053 | 27.1 | 1,054 | 26.0 | 888 | 24.2 | 911 | 26.0 |
|  | 577 | 15.0 | 543 | 14.0 | 470 | 11.6 | 427 | 11.6 | 405 | 11.6 |
| Blunt object ${ }^{2} . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ~$ | 207 | 5.4 | 161 | 4.1 | 204 | 5.0 | 157 | 4.3 | 156 | 4.5 |
| Personal weapon ${ }^{3}$............ | 186 | 4.8 | 168 | 4.3 | 139 | 3.4 | 156 | 4.3 | 165 | 4.7 |
| All other......................... | 178 | 4.6 | 181 | 4.7 | 241 | 5.9 | 148 | 4.0 | 185 | 5.3 |
|  | 84 | 2.2 | 87 | 2.2 | 114 | 2.8 | 81 | 2.2 | 75 | 2.1 |
| Drugs.......................... | 3 | 0.1 | 3 | 0.1 | 5 | 0.1 | 4 | 0.1 | 2 | 0.1 |
| Other.......................... | 91 | 2.4 | 91 | 2.3 | 122 | 3.0 | 63 | 1.7 | 108 | 3.1 |


| Type of weapon used (cont.) | 1996 |  | 1997 |  | 1998 |  | 1999 |  | 2000 |  | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 1991- \\ 2000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 1999- \\ 2000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Total including unknown........... | 2,910 |  | 2,579 |  | 2,170 |  | 2,006 |  | 2,074 |  |  |  |
| Unknown............................. | 45 |  | 40 |  | 36 |  | 29 |  | 28 |  |  |  |
| Total known......................... | 2,865 | 100.0 | 2,539 | 100.0 | 2,134 | 100.0 | 1,977 | 100.0 | 2,046 | 100.0 | -46.7 | 3.5 |
| Firea m............................ | 2,055 | 71.7 | 1,835 | 72.3 | 1,469 | 68.8 | 1,334 | 67.5 | 1,440 | 70.4 | -46.5 | 7.9 |
| Handgun........................ | 1,866 | 65.1 | 1,633 | 64.3 | 1,315 | 61.6 | 1,152 | 58.3 | 1,242 | 60.7 | -44.9 | 7.8 |
| All other firea ms.............. | 189 | 6.6 | 202 | 8.0 | 154 | 7.2 | 182 | 9.2 | 198 | 9.7 | -54.7 | 8.8 |
| Rifle............................ | 95 | 3.3 | 115 | 4.5 | 89 | 4.2 | 62 | 3.1 | 66 | 3.2 | -62.5 | 6.5 |
| Shotgun....................... | 86 | 3.0 | 72 | 2.8 | 57 | 2.7 | 63 | 3.2 | 55 | 2.7 | -70.6 | -12.7 |
| Other firearm............... | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.0 | - | - |
| Fiream - unknown type.. | 8 | 0.3 | 15 | 0.6 | 8 | 0.4 | 57 | 2.9 | 76 | 3.7 | 2.7 | 33.3 |
| Nonfirearm........................ | 810 | 28.3 | 704 | 27.7 | 665 | 31.2 | 643 | 32.5 | 606 | 29.6 | -47.2 | -5.8 |
|  | 341 | 11.9 | 307 | 12.1 | 289 | 13.5 | 254 | 12.8 | 285 | 13.9 | -50.6 | 12.2 |
| Blunt object ${ }^{2}$.................... | 147 | 5.1 | 108 | 4.3 | 117 | 5.5 | 134 | 6.8 | 98 | 4.8 | -52.7 | -26.9 |
| Personal weapon ${ }^{3}$............ | 156 | 5.4 | 148 | 5.8 | 112 | 5.2 | 106 | 5.4 | 111 | 5.4 | -40.3 | 4.7 |
| All other......................... | 166 | 5.8 | 141 | 5.6 | 147 | 6.9 | 149 | 7.5 | 112 | 5.5 | -37.1 | -24.8 |
|  | 61 | 2.1 | 56 | 2.2 | 63 | 3.0 | 60 | 3.0 | 40 | 2.0 | -52.4 | -33.3 |
| Drugs.......................... | 8 | 0.3 | 6 | 0.2 | 2 | 0.1 | 8 | 0.4 | 3 | 0.1 | - | - |
| Other.......................... | 97 | 3.4 | 79 | 3.1 | 82 | 3.8 | 81 | 4.1 | 69 | 3.4 | -24.2 | -14.8 |

[^10]Genderand Race/Ethnic Group of Victim by Type of Weapon Used

| Type of weapon used | Total | Gender |  | Race/ethnic group |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male ${ }^{1}$ | Female | White | Hispanic | Black | Other | Unknown |
| Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total including unknown.. | 2,074 | 1,666 | 408 | 421 | 933 | 589 | 121 | 10 |
| Unknown.............................. | 28 | 11 | 17 | 7 | 11 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| Total known.......................... | 2,046 | 1,655 | 391 | 414 | 922 | 585 | 118 | 7 |
| Firearm. | 1,440 | 1,244 | 196 | 200 | 680 | 485 | 73 | 2 |
| Handgun......................... | 1,242 | 1,064 | 178 | 169 | 606 | 405 | 61 | 1 |
| All other firearms.............. | 198 | 180 | 18 | 31 | 74 | 80 | 12 | 1 |
| Rifle............................ | 66 | 60 | 6 | 8 | 25 | 30 | 3 | 0 |
| Shotgun....................... | 55 | 51 | 4 | 16 | 21 | 15 | 3 | 0 |
| Other firearm................ | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Fiream - unknown type.. | 76 | 69 | 7 | 7 | 27 | 35 | 6 | 1 |
| Nonfirearm........................ | 606 | 411 | 195 | 214 | 242 | 100 | 45 | 5 |
|  | 285 | 211 | 74 | 90 | 136 | 38 | 20 | 1 |
| Blunt object ${ }^{3}$.................... | 98 | 74 | 24 | 45 | 32 | 12 | 9 | 0 |
| Personal weapon ${ }^{4} . . . . . . . . . .$. | 111 | 70 | 41 | 40 | 35 | 26 | 10 | 0 |
| All other......................... | 112 | 56 | 56 | 39 | 39 | 24 | 6 | 4 |
|  | 40 | 15 | 25 | 17 | 12 | 7 | 3 | 1 |
| Drugs.......................... | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Other........................... | 69 | 40 | 29 | 20 | 27 | 16 | 3 | 3 |
| Percent based on total known |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total known.......................... | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Firearm............................. | 70.4 | 75.2 | 50.1 | 48.3 | 73.8 | 82.9 | 61.9 | - |
| Handgun......................... | 60.7 | 64.3 | 45.5 | 40.8 | 65.7 | 69.2 | 51.7 | - |
| All other firea ms.............. | 9.7 | 10.9 | 4.6 | 7.5 | 8.0 | 13.7 | 10.2 | - |
| Rifle............................ | 3.2 | 3.6 | 1.5 | 1.9 | 2.7 | 5.1 | 2.5 | - |
| Shotgun....................... | 2.7 | 3.1 | 1.0 | 3.9 | 2.3 | 2.6 | 2.5 | - |
| Other firearm................ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - |
| Fiream - unknown type.. | 3.7 | 4.2 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 2.9 | 6.0 | 5.1 | - |
| Nonfiream........................ | 29.6 | 24.8 | 49.9 | 51.7 | 26.2 | 17.1 | 38.1 | - |
|  | 13.9 | 12.7 | 18.9 | 21.7 | 14.8 | 6.5 | 16.9 | - |
| Blunt object ${ }^{3}$.................... | 4.8 | 4.5 | 6.1 | 10.9 | 3.5 | 2.1 | 7.6 | - |
| Personal weapon ${ }^{4} . . . . . . . . . .$. | 5.4 | 4.2 | 10.5 | 9.7 | 3.8 | 4.4 | 8.5 | - |
| All other......................... | 5.5 | 3.4 | 14.3 | 9.4 | 4.2 | 4.1 | 5.1 | - |
|  | 2.0 | 0.9 | 6.4 | 4.1 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 2.5 | - |
| Drugs.......................... | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | - |
| Other........................... | 3.4 | 2.4 | 7.4 | 4.8 | 2.9 | 2.7 | 2.5 | - |

Notes: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 because of rounding
Dash indic ates that percent distributions are not calculated when the base number is less than 50 .
${ }^{1}$ The "male" category includestwo homicide victims whose gender could not be determined.
${ }^{2}$ Any instrument used to cut or stab.
${ }^{3}$ Club, etc.
${ }^{3}$ Club, etc.
${ }^{5}$ Any instrument used to hang or strangle.
lable 23
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
Age of Victim by Type of Wea pon Used

| Type of weapon used | Total | Under 18 | 18-29 | 30-39 | $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ \text { and over } \end{gathered}$ | Unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total including unknown............ | 2,074 | 246 | 888 | 377 | 534 | 29 |
| Unknown............................. | 28 | 4 | 10 | 6 | 7 | 1 |
| Total known.......................... | 2,046 | 242 | 878 | 371 | 527 | 28 |
| Firearm.. | 1,440 | 145 | 735 | 268 | 282 | 10 |
| Handgun......................... | 1,242 | 124 | 628 | 239 | 243 | 8 |
| All other firea ms.............. | 198 | 21 | 107 | 29 | 39 | 2 |
| Rifle........................... | 66 | 9 | 36 | 10 | 11 | 0 |
| Shotgun....................... | 55 | 6 | 21 | 10 | 18 | 0 |
| Other firea m................ | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Firea m - unknown type.. | 76 | 6 | 50 | 9 | 9 | 2 |
| Nonfirea m......................... | 606 | 97 | 143 | 103 | 245 | 18 |
|  | 285 | 24 | 99 | 65 | 91 | 6 |
| Blunt object ${ }^{2} . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ~$ | 98 | 10 | 16 | 11 | 60 | 1 |
| Personal weapon ${ }^{3} . . . . . . . . . .$. | 111 | 42 | 8 | 13 | 43 | 5 |
| All other........................... | 112 | 21 | 20 | 14 | 51 | 6 |
|  | 40 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 21 | 1 |
| Drugs........................... | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Other............................ | 69 | 16 | 13 | 7 | 28 | 5 |
| Percent based on total known |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total known.......................... | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Firearm............................. | 70.4 | 59.9 | 83.7 | 72.2 | 53.5 | - |
| Handgun......................... | 60.7 | 51.2 | 71.5 | 64.4 | 46.1 | - |
| All other firea ms.............. | 9.7 | 8.7 | 12.2 | 7.8 | 7.4 | - |
| Rifle............................ | 3.2 | 3.7 | 4.1 | 2.7 | 2.1 | - |
| Shotgun....................... | 2.7 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.7 | 3.4 | - |
| Other firea m................ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | - |
| Fiream - unknown type.. | 3.7 | 2.5 | 5.7 | 2.4 | 1.7 | - |
| Nonfiream... | 29.6 | 40.1 | 16.3 | 27.8 | 46.5 | - |
|  | 13.9 | 9.9 | 11.3 | 17.5 | 17.3 | - |
| Blunt object ${ }^{2} . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ~$ | 4.8 | 4.1 | 1.8 | 3.0 | 11.4 | - |
| Personal weapon ${ }^{3} . . . . . . . . . .$. | 5.4 | 17.4 | 0.9 | 3.5 | 8.2 | - |
| All other.......................... | 5.5 | 8.7 | 2.3 | 3.8 | 9.7 | - |
|  | 2.0 | 1.7 | 0.8 | 1.9 | 4.0 | - |
| Drugs........................... | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | - |
| Other........................... | 3.4 | 6.6 | 1.5 | 1.9 | 5.3 | - |

[^11]Dash indicates that percent distributions are not calculated when the base number is less than 50 .
${ }^{1}$ Any instrument used to cut or stab
${ }^{2}$ Club, etc.
${ }_{4}^{3}$ Hands, feet, etc.

Table 24
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1991-2000
By Contributing Circ umstance

| Contributing circumstance | 1991 |  | 1992 |  | 1993 |  | 1994 |  | 1995 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total including unknown...... | 3,876 |  | 3,920 |  | 4,095 |  | 3,699 |  | 3,530 |  |
| Unknown....................... | 632 |  | 581 |  | 643 |  | 527 |  | 595 |  |
| Total known.................... | 3,244 | 100.0 | 3,339 | 100.0 | 3,452 | 100.0 | 3,172 | 100.0 | 2,935 | 100.0 |
| Rape, robbery, burglary. | 532 | 16.4 | 519 | 15.5 | 515 | 14.9 | 409 | 12.9 | 385 | 13.1 |
| Rape....................... | 41 | 1.3 | 31 | 0.9 | 21 | 0.6 | 19 | 0.6 | 14 | 0.5 |
| Robbery.................... | 473 | 14.6 | 455 | 13.6 | 476 | 13.8 | 366 | 11.5 | 342 | 11.7 |
| Burglary................... | 18 | 0.6 | 33 | 1.0 | 18 | 0.5 | 24 | 0.8 | 29 | 1.0 |
| Argument..................... | 1,396 | 43.0 | 1,478 | 44.3 | 1,532 | 44.4 | 1,374 | 43.3 | 1,207 | 41.1 |
| Domestic violence...... | - | - | 280 | 8.4 | 329 | 9.5 | 224 | 7.1 | 179 | 6.1 |
| All other a rgument...... | - | - | 1,198 | 35.9 | 1,203 | 34.8 | 1,150 | 36.3 | 1,028 | 35.0 |
| Gang-, drug-related....... | 992 | 30.6 | 1,029 | 30.8 | 1,113 | 32.2 | 1,137 | 35.8 | 1,059 | 36.1 |
| Gang-related.............. | 740 | 22.8 | 742 | 22.2 | 840 | 24.3 | 880 | 27.7 | 867 | 29.5 |
| Drug-related............... | 252 | 7.8 | 287 | 8.6 | 273 | 7.9 | 257 | 8.1 | 192 | 6.5 |
| All other....................... | 324 | 10.0 | 313 | 9.4 | 292 | 8.5 | 252 | 7.9 | 284 | 9.7 |


| Contributing circumstance (cont.) | 1996 |  | 1997 |  | 1998 |  | 1999 |  | 2000 |  | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 1991- \\ 2000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 1999- \\ 2000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Total including unknown...... | 2,910 |  | 2,579 |  | 2,170 |  | 2,006 |  | 2,074 |  |  |  |
| Unknown........................ | 389 |  | 424 |  | 336 |  | 304 |  | 314 |  |  |  |
| Total known.. | 2,521 | 100.0 | 2,155 | 100.0 | 1,834 | 100.0 | 1,702 | 100.0 | 1,760 | 100.0 | -45.7 | 3.4 |
| Rape, robbery, burglary. | 320 | 12.7 | 240 | 11.1 | 206 | 11.2 | 157 | 9.2 | 206 | 11.7 | -61.3 | 31.2 |
| Rape......................... | 11 | 0.4 | 12 | 0.6 | 9 | 0.5 | 16 | 0.9 | 8 | 0.5 | - | - |
| Robbery..................... | 294 | 11.7 | 219 | 10.2 | 183 | 10.0 | 127 | 7.5 | 186 | 10.6 | -60.7 | 46.5 |
| Burgla ry.................... | 15 | 0.6 | 9 | 0.4 | 14 | 0.8 | 14 | 0.8 | 12 | 0.7 | - | - |
| Argument...................... | 1,070 | 42.4 | 928 | 43.1 | 857 | 46.7 | 710 | 41.7 | 726 | 41.3 | -48.0 | 2.3 |
| Domestic violence...... | 130 | 5.2 | 128 | 5.9 | 120 | 6.5 | 128 | 7.5 | 147 | 8.4 | - | 14.8 |
| All other a rgument...... | 940 | 37.3 | 800 | 37.1 | 737 | 40.2 | 582 | 34.2 | 579 | 32.9 | - | -0.5 |
| Gang-, drug-related....... | 784 | 31.1 | 704 | 32.7 | 512 | 27.9 | 487 | 28.6 | 581 | 33.0 | -41.4 | 19.3 |
| Gang-related.............. | 620 | 24.6 | 544 | 25.2 | 404 | 22.0 | 402 | 23.6 | 506 | 28.8 | -31.6 | 25.9 |
| Drug-related............... | 164 | 6.5 | 160 | 7.4 | 108 | 5.9 | 85 | 5.0 | 75 | 4.3 | -70.2 | -11.8 |
| All other........................ | 347 | 13.8 | 283 | 13.1 | 259 | 14.1 | 348 | 20.4 | 247 | 14.0 | -23.8 | -29.0 |

Notes: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 bec ause of rounding.
Dash indicates that data are unavailable or that a percent change is not calculated when the base number is less than 50 .

Table 25
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
Genderand Race/Ethnic Group of Victim by Contributing Circumstance

| Contributing c irc umstance | Total | Gender |  | Race/ethnic group |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male ${ }^{1}$ | Female | White | Hispanic | Black | Other | Unknown |
| Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total including unknown...... | 2,074 | 1,666 | 408 | 421 | 933 | 589 | 121 | 10 |
| Unknown......................... | 314 | 259 | 55 | 57 | 119 | 118 | 15 | 5 |
| Total known..................... | 1,760 | 1,407 | 353 | 364 | 814 | 471 | 106 | 5 |
| Rape, robbery, burglary. | 206 | 169 | 37 | 62 | 79 | 42 | 23 | 0 |
| Rape......................... | 8 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Robbery, burglary........ | 198 | 169 | 29 | 59 | 77 | 39 | 23 | 0 |
| Robbery.................. | 186 | 162 | 24 | 54 | 72 | 37 | 23 | 0 |
| Burgla ry.................. | 12 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Argument...................... | 726 | 527 | 199 | 208 | 296 | 168 | 53 | 1 |
| Domestic violence...... | 147 | 34 | 113 | 56 | 49 | 29 | 13 | 0 |
| All other a rgument....... | 579 | 493 | 86 | 152 | 247 | 139 | 40 | 1 |
| Gang-, drug-related....... | 581 | 547 | 34 | 23 | 338 | 204 | 16 | 0 |
| Gang-related.............. | 506 | 479 | 27 | 11 | 302 | 178 | 15 | 0 |
| Drug-related............... | 75 | 68 | 7 | 12 | 36 | 26 | 1 | 0 |
| All other........................ | 247 | 164 | 83 | 71 | 101 | 57 | 14 | 4 |
| Percent based on total known |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total known..................... | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Rape, robbery, burglary. | 11.7 | 12.0 | 10.5 | 17.0 | 9.7 | 8.9 | 21.7 | - |
| Rape......................... | 0.5 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.0 | - |
| Robbery, burglary........ | 11.3 | 12.0 | 8.2 | 16.2 | 9.5 | 8.3 | 21.7 | - |
| Robbery.................. | 10.6 | 11.5 | 6.8 | 14.8 | 8.8 | 7.9 | 21.7 | - |
| Burglary.................. | 0.7 | 0.5 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.0 | - |
| Argument..................... | 41.3 | 37.5 | 56.4 | 57.1 | 36.4 | 35.7 | 50.0 | - |
| Domestic violence....... | 8.4 | 2.4 | 32.0 | 15.4 | 6.0 | 6.2 | 12.3 | - |
| All other a rgument....... | 32.9 | 35.0 | 24.4 | 41.8 | 30.3 | 29.5 | 37.7 | - |
| Gang-, drug-related....... | 33.0 | 38.9 | 9.6 | 6.3 | 41.5 | 43.3 | 15.1 | - |
| Gang-related.............. | 28.8 | 34.0 | 7.6 | 3.0 | 37.1 | 37.8 | 14.2 | - |
| Drug-related............... | 4.3 | 4.8 | 2.0 | 3.3 | 4.4 | 5.5 | 0.9 | - |
| All other........................ | 14.0 | 11.7 | 23.5 | 19.5 | 12.4 | 12.1 | 13.2 | - |

[^12]Table 26
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
Age of Victim by Contributing Circumstance

| Contributing circumstance | Total | Under 5 | 5-17 | 18-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60-69 | 70 and over | Unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total including unknown....... | 2,074 | 69 | 177 | 888 | 377 | 284 | 120 | 59 | 71 | 29 |
| Unknown......................... | 314 | 1 | 18 | 128 | 70 | 51 | 23 | 6 | 6 | 11 |
| Total known..................... | 1,760 | 68 | 159 | 760 | 307 | 233 | 97 | 53 | 65 | 18 |
| Rape, robbery, burglary.. | 206 | 0 | 5 | 58 | 52 | 37 | 12 | 17 | 23 | 2 |
| Rape........................ | 8 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Robbery..................... | 186 | 0 | 3 | 54 | 49 | 33 | 10 | 17 | 20 | 0 |
| Burglary..................... | 12 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Argument..................... | 726 | 3 | 31 | 270 | 163 | 140 | 65 | 25 | 25 | 4 |
| Domestic violence....... | 147 | 1 | 3 | 35 | 32 | 38 | 19 | 9 | 9 | 1 |
| All other argument....... | 579 | 2 | 28 | 235 | 131 | 102 | 46 | 16 | 16 | 3 |
| Gang-, drug-related........ | 581 | 4 | 89 | 369 | 72 | 31 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 4 |
| Gang-related.............. | 506 | 3 | 88 | 337 | 47 | 18 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 2 |
| Drug-related............... | 75 | 1 | 1 | 32 | 25 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Child abuse................... | 68 | 55 | 11 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 |
| All other........................ | 179 | 6 | 23 | 63 | 20 | 25 | 11 | 8 | 17 | 6 |
| Percent based on total known |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total known..................... | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Rape, robbery, burglary.. | 11.7 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 7.6 | 16.9 | 15.9 | 12.4 | 32.1 | 35.4 | - |
| Rape......................... | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | - |
| Robbery..................... | 10.6 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 7.1 | 16.0 | 14.2 | 10.3 | 32.1 | 30.8 | - |
| Burglary..................... | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 3.1 | - |
| Argument..................... | 41.3 | 4.4 | 19.5 | 35.5 | 53.1 | 60.1 | 67.0 | 47.2 | 38.5 | - |
| Domestic violence....... | 8.4 | 1.5 | 1.9 | 4.6 | 10.4 | 16.3 | 19.6 | 17.0 | 13.8 | - |
| All other a rgument...... | 32.9 | 2.9 | 17.6 | 30.9 | 42.7 | 43.8 | 47.4 | 30.2 | 24.6 | - |
| Gang-, drug-related........ | 33.0 | 5.9 | 56.0 | 48.6 | 23.5 | 13.3 | 9.3 | 5.7 | 0.0 | - |
| Gang-related.............. | 28.8 | 4.4 | 55.3 | 44.3 | 15.3 | 7.7 | 8.2 | 5.7 | 0.0 | - |
| Drug-related............... | 4.3 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 4.2 | 8.1 | 5.6 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - |
| Child abuse................... | 3.9 | 80.9 | 6.9 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| All other........................ | 10.2 | 8.8 | 14.5 | 8.3 | 6.5 | 10.7 | 11.3 | 15.1 | 26.2 | - |

[^13]Dash indic ates that data are not applicable or that percent distributions are not calculated when the base number is less than 50 .

Table 27
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2000
Contributing Circumstance by Relationship of Victim to Offender

| Relationship of victim to offender | Total | Rape | Robbery, burglary | Argument ${ }^{1}$ | Gang-, drugrelated | Child abuse | All other | Unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total including unknown....... | 2,074 | 8 | 198 | 726 | 581 | 68 | 179 | 314 |
| Unknown......................... | 796 | 4 | 71 | 83 | 281 | 3 | 67 | 287 |
| Total known..................... | 1,278 | 4 | 127 | 643 | 300 | 65 | 112 | 27 |
| Friend, a cqua intance ${ }^{2} \ldots$. | 601 | 0 | 31 | 310 | 194 | 13 | 48 | 5 |
| Spouse ${ }^{3} . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ~$ | 115 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 1 |
| Parent, child ${ }^{4}$................ | 92 | 0 | 1 | 32 | 0 | 47 | 11 | 1 |
| All other relatives........... | 40 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 1 |
| Stranger....................... | 430 | 4 | 95 | 176 | 106 | 0 | 30 | 19 |
| Percent based on total known |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total known..................... | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Friend, a cqua inta nce ${ }^{2} \ldots$. | 47.0 | - | 24.4 | 48.2 | 64.7 | 20.0 | 42.9 | - |
|  | 9.0 | - | 0.0 | 15.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 12.5 | - |
| Parent, child ${ }^{4}$................ | 7.2 | - | 0.8 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 72.3 | 9.8 | - |
| All other relatives............ | 3.1 | - | 0.0 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 8.0 | - |
| Stranger....................... | 33.6 | - | 74.8 | 27.4 | 35.3 | 0.0 | 26.8 | - |

Notes: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.
Dash indic ates that percent distributions are not calculated when the base number is less than 50 .
${ }^{1}$ Includes domestic violence
${ }^{2}$ Includes ex-husband, ex-wife, employer, employee, gang member, etc
${ }^{3}$ Includes "common-law" ma miage partner
${ }^{4}$ Includes stepmother, stepfather, stepdaughter, a nd stepson.

Table 28
HOMICIDE CRIMES CLEARED, 1991-2000 Number Reported, Number Cleared, and Clearance Rate

| Year(s) | Number of homicides reported | Number of homicides cleared | Clearance rate ${ }^{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000............... | 2,074 | 1,082 | 52.2 |
| 1999............... | 2,006 | 1,200 | 59.8 |
| 1998............... | 2,170 | 1,369 | 63.1 |
| 1997............... | 2,579 | 1,489 | 57.7 |
| 1996............... | 2,910 | 1,743 | 59.9 |
| 1995............. | 3,530 | 1,916 | 54.3 |
| 1994............... | 3,699 | 2,091 | 56.5 |
| 1993............... | 4,095 | 2,274 | 55.5 |
| 1992............... | 3,920 | 2,198 | 56.1 |
| 1991............... | 3,876 | 2,362 | 60.9 |

${ }^{1}$ A clearance rate is the percentage of crimes (homicides) reported have been cleared. It is calculated by dividing the number of hor cleared by the number of homicides reported. The result is multipli by 100 .

## Table 29

FELONY ARRESTS FOR
SELECTED VIOLENT OFFENSES, 1991-2000
Vumber, Rate per 100,000 Population at Risk, and Percent Change

| Year(s) | Total | Homicide | Forcible rape | Robbery | Assault |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2000... | 130,259 | 1,627 | 2,702 | 17,122 | 108,808 |
| 1999. | 134,319 | 1,770 | 2,887 | 18,753 | 110,909 |
| 1998................. | 142,498 | 2,117 | 3,032 | 21,507 | 115,842 |
| 1997................. | 153,279 | 2,212 | 3,108 | 23,824 | 124,135 |
| 1996................. | 149,795 | 2,535 | 3,202 | 26,014 | 118,044 |
| 1995................ | 155,053 | 2,821 | 3,199 | 27,641 | 121,392 |
| 1994.. | 151,906 | 2,963 | 3,305 | 27,984 | 117,654 |
| 1993................. | 147,603 | 3,276 | 3,572 | 29,567 | 111,188 |
| 1992....... | 148,225 | 3,387 | 4,037 | 31,141 | 109,660 |
| 1991.................. | 143,970 | 3,720 | 4,417 | 31,346 | 104,487 |
| Percent change in number |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1999 to 2000....... | -3.0 | -8.1 | -6.4 | -8.7 | -1.9 |
| 1998 to 1999....... | -5.7 | -16.4 | -4.8 | -12.8 | -4.3 |
| 1997 to 1998....... | -7.0 | -4.3 | -2.4 | -9.7 | -6.7 |
| 1996 to 1997....... | 2.3 | -12.7 | -2.9 | -8.4 | 5.2 |
| 1995 to 1996....... | -3.4 | -10.1 | 0.1 | -5.9 | -2.8 |
| 1994 to 1995.... | 2.1 | -4.8 | -3.2 | -1.2 | 3.2 |
| 1993 to 1994....... | 2.9 | -9.6 | -7.5 | -5.4 | 5.8 |
| 1992 to 1993....... | -0.4 | -3.3 | -11.5 | -5.1 | 1.4 |
| 1991 to 1992....... | 3.0 | -9.0 | -8.6 | -0.7 | 5.0 |
| 1991 to 2000....... | -9.5 | -56.3 | -38.8 | -45.4 | 4.1 |
| Rate per 100,000 population at risk ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2000.................. | 497.1 | 6.2 | 10.3 | 65.3 | 415.2 |
| 1999.................. | 522.4 | 6.9 | 11.2 | 72.9 | 431.4 |
| 1998................. | 564.1 | 8.4 | 12.0 | 85.1 | 458.5 |
| 1997................. | 595.0 | 8.6 | 12.1 | 92.5 | 481.9 |
| 1996... | 586.2 | 9.9 | 12.5 | 101.8 | 461.9 |
| 1995................. | 617.2 | 11.2 | 12.7 | 110.0 | 483.2 |
| 1994................. | 614.9 | 12.0 | 13.4 | 113.3 | 476.3 |
| 1993................ | 606.6 | 13.5 | 14.7 | 121.5 | 456.9 |
| 1992................ | 618.2 | 14.1 | 16.8 | 129.9 | 457.4 |
| 1991.................. | 610.4 | 15.8 | 18.7 | 132.9 | 443.0 |
| Percent change in rate |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1999 to 2000....... | -4.8 | -10.1 | -8.0 | -10.4 | -3.8 |
| 1998 to 1999....... | -7.4 | -17.9 | -6.7 | -14.3 | -5.9 |
| 1997 to 1998....... | -5.2 | -2.3 | -0.8 | -8.0 | -4.9 |
| 1996 to 1997....... | 1.5 | -13.1 | -3.2 | -9.1 | 4.3 |
| 1995 to 1996....... | -5.0 | -11.6 | -1.6 | -7.5 | -4.4 |
| 1994 to 1995....... | 0.4 | -6.7 | -5.2 | -2.9 | 1.4 |
| 1993 to 1994....... | 1.4 | -11.1 | -8.8 | -6.7 | 4.2 |
| 1992 to 1993....... | -1.9 | -4.3 | -12.5 | -6.5 | -0.1 |
| 1991 to 1992....... | 1.3 | -10.8 | -10.2 | -2.3 | 3.3 |
| 1991 to 2000....... | -18.6 | -60.8 | -44.9 | -50.9 | -6.3 |

Notes: Rates may not add to total because of rounding. Rates are based on annual population estimates provided by the Demogra Research Unit, Califomia Department of Finance.

- Includes estimated annual
Oakland Police Departmen

Rates are based on the total population at nisk (10-69 years of age).

TABLE 30
HOMICIDE ARRESTS, 1991-2000
By Gender of Arrestee

| Year(s) | Total |  | Male |  | Female |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 2000 ........... | 1,627 | 100.0 | 1,426 | 87.6 | 201 | 12.4 |
| 1999 ........... | 1,770 | 100.0 | 1,579 | 89.2 | 191 | 10.8 |
| 1998 ........... | 2,117 | 100.0 | 1,870 | 88.3 | 247 | 11.7 |
| 1997 ........... | 2,212 | 100.0 | 1,990 | 90.0 | 222 | 10.0 |
| 1996 ........... | 2,535 | 100.0 | 2,286 | 90.2 | 249 | 9.8 |
| $1995{ }^{\text {a }}$.......... | 2,821 | 100.0 | 2,564 | 90.9 | 257 | 9.1 |
| 1994 ........... | 2,963 | 100.0 | 2,709 | 91.4 | 254 | 8.6 |
| 1993 ........... | 3,276 | 100.0 | 2,975 | 90.8 | 301 | 9.2 |
| 1992 ........... | 3,387 | 100.0 | 3,082 | 91.0 | 305 | 9.0 |
| 1991 ........... | 3,720 | 100.0 | 3,427 | 92.1 | 293 | 7.9 |

a Includes estimated annual data for the Bakersfield Police Department and the Oakland Police Department.

TABLE 31
HOMICIDE ARRESTS, 1991-2000
By Race/Ethnic Group of Arrestee

| Year(s) | Total |  | White |  | Hispanic |  | Black |  | Other |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 2000 ................ | 1,627 | 100.0 | 374 | 23.0 | 698 | 42.9 | 397 | 24.4 | 158 | 9.7 |
| 1999 ................ | 1,770 | 100.0 | 382 | 21.6 | 845 | 47.7 | 417 | 23.6 | 126 | 7.1 |
| 1998 ................ | 2,117 | 100.0 | 484 | 22.9 | 987 | 46.6 | 470 | 22.2 | 176 | 8.3 |
| 1997 ................ | 2,212 | 100.0 | 447 | 20.2 | 1,017 | 46.0 | 586 | 26.5 | 162 | 7.3 |
| 1996 ................ | 2,535 | 100.0 | 537 | 21.2 | 1,110 | 43.8 | 663 | 26.2 | 225 | 8.9 |
| $1995^{\text {a }}$............. | 2,821 | 100.0 | 580 | 20.6 | 1,284 | 45.5 | 743 | 26.3 | 214 | 7.6 |
| 1994 ................ | 2,963 | 100.0 | 675 | 22.8 | 1,175 | 39.7 | 850 | 28.7 | 263 | 8.9 |
| 1993 ................ | 3,276 | 100.0 | 698 | 21.3 | 1,299 | 39.7 | 998 | 30.5 | 281 | 8.6 |
| 1992 ................ | 3,387 | 100.0 | 714 | 21.1 | 1,457 | 43.0 | 1,016 | 30.0 | 200 | 5.9 |
| 1991 ................ | 3,720 | 100.0 | 821 | 22.1 | 1,578 | 42.4 | 1,123 | 30.2 | 198 | 5.3 |

Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ Includes estimated annual data for the Bakersfield Police Department and the Oakland Police Department.

Table 32
HOMICIDE ARRESTS, 1991-2000
By Age of Arrestee

| Year(s) | Total |  | Under 18 |  | 18-29 |  | 30-39 |  | 40 and over |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 2000... | 1,627 | 100.0 | 160 | 9.8 | 913 | 56.1 | 299 | 18.4 | 255 | 15.7 |
| 1999............. | 1,770 | 100.0 | 182 | 10.3 | 1,037 | 58.6 | 317 | 17.9 | 234 | 13.2 |
| 1998............. | 2,117 | 100.0 | 308 | 14.5 | 1,244 | 58.8 | 302 | 14.3 | 263 | 12.4 |
| 1997............. | 2,212 | 100.0 | 353 | 16.0 | 1,267 | 57.3 | 326 | 14.7 | 266 | 12.0 |
| 1996............. | 2,535 | 100.0 | 389 | 15.3 | 1,430 | 56.4 | 427 | 16.8 | 289 | 11.4 |
| 1995 ${ }^{\text {a ........... }}$ | 2,821 | 100.0 | 521 | 18.5 | 1,570 | 55.7 | 462 | 16.4 | 268 | 9.5 |
| 1994............. | 2,963 | 100.0 | 542 | 18.3 | 1,625 | 54.8 | 483 | 16.3 | 313 | 10.6 |
| 1993............. | 3,276 | 100.0 | 618 | 18.9 | 1,804 | 55.1 | 525 | 16.0 | 329 | 10.0 |
| 1992............. | 3,387 | 100.0 | 645 | 19.0 | 1,877 | 55.4 | 511 | 15.1 | 354 | 10.5 |
| 1991............. | 3,720 | 100.0 | 696 | 18.7 | 2,073 | 55.7 | 611 | 16.4 | 340 | 9.1 |

[^14]Race/Ethnic Group of Arrestee by Gender and Age of Arrestee

| Genderand age of a rrestee | Total |  | White |  | Hispanic |  | Black |  | Other |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total................... | 1,627 | 100.0 | 374 | 100.0 | 698 | 100.0 | 397 | 100.0 | 158 | 100.0 |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male................ | 1,426 | 87.6 | 299 | 79.9 | 639 | 91.5 | 343 | 86.4 | 145 | 91.8 |
| Female............ | 201 | 12.4 | 75 | 20.1 | 59 | 8.5 | 54 | 13.6 | 13 | 8.2 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 18.......... | 160 | 9.8 | 17 | 4.5 | 81 | 11.6 | 36 | 9.1 | 26 | 16.5 |
| 18-29............... | 913 | 56.1 | 150 | 40.1 | 444 | 63.6 | 232 | 58.4 | 87 | 55.1 |
| 30-39.............. | 299 | 18.4 | 90 | 24.1 | 112 | 16.0 | 81 | 20.4 | 16 | 10.1 |
| 40 and over....... | 255 | 15.7 | 117 | 31.3 | 61 | 8.7 | 48 | 12.1 | 29 | 18.4 |

Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.

Table 34
HOMICIDE ARRESTS, 2000
Race/Ethnic Group of Arrestee by Gender and Age of Arrestee

| Gender and age of a rrestee | Total |  | White |  | Hisp a nic |  | Black |  | Other |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total.................. | 1,627 | 100.0 | 374 | 100.0 | 698 | 100.0 | 397 | 100.0 | 158 | 100.0 |
| Under 18......... | 160 | 9.8 | 17 | 4.5 | 81 | 11.6 | 36 | 9.1 | 26 | 16.5 |
| 18-19............... | 261 | 16.0 | 33 | 8.8 | 125 | 17.9 | 63 | 15.9 | 40 | 25.3 |
| 20-24.............. | 399 | 24.5 | 60 | 16.0 | 204 | 29.2 | 100 | 25.2 | 35 | 22.2 |
| 25-29.............. | 253 | 15.6 | 57 | 15.2 | 115 | 16.5 | 69 | 17.4 | 12 | 7.6 |
| 30-34.............. | 161 | 9.9 | 44 | 11.8 | 64 | 9.2 | 44 | 11.1 | 9 | 5.7 |
| 35-39............... | 138 | 8.5 | 46 | 12.3 | 48 | 6.9 | 37 | 9.3 | 7 | 4.4 |
| 40-44............... | 96 | 5.9 | 34 | 9.1 | 28 | 4.0 | 20 | 5.0 | 14 | 8.9 |
| 45-49.............. | 60 | 3.7 | 31 | 8.3 | 15 | 2.1 | 9 | 2.3 | 5 | 3.2 |
| 50-54.............. | 41 | 2.5 | 21 | 5.6 | 7 | 1.0 | 8 | 2.0 | 5 | 3.2 |
| 55 and over...... | 58 | 3.6 | 31 | 8.3 | 11 | 1.6 | 11 | 2.8 | 5 | 3.2 |
| Male................ | 1,426 | 100.0 | 299 | 100.0 | 639 | 100.0 | 343 | 100.0 | 145 | 100.0 |
| Under 18....... | 144 | 10.1 | 12 | 4.0 | 76 | 11.9 | 31 | 9.0 | 25 | 17.2 |
| 18-19............ | 241 | 16.9 | 27 | 9.0 | 118 | 18.5 | 60 | 17.5 | 36 | 24.8 |
| 20-24............ | 363 | 25.5 | 53 | 17.7 | 188 | 29.4 | 89 | 25.9 | 33 | 22.8 |
| 25-29........... | 224 | 15.7 | 52 | 17.4 | 104 | 16.3 | 58 | 16.9 | 10 | 6.9 |
| 30-34............ | 133 | 9.3 | 32 | 10.7 | 56 | 8.8 | 38 | 11.1 | 7 | 4.8 |
| 35-39............ | 114 | 8.0 | 36 | 12.0 | 45 | 7.0 | 27 | 7.9 | 6 | 4.1 |
| 40-44............ | 75 | 5.3 | 25 | 8.4 | 22 | 3.4 | 15 | 4.4 | 13 | 9.0 |
| 45-49............ | 47 | 3.3 | 20 | 6.7 | 14 | 2.2 | 8 | 2.3 | 5 | 3.4 |
| 50-54............ | 37 | 2.6 | 17 | 5.7 | 7 | 1.1 | 8 | 2.3 | 5 | 3.4 |
| 55 and over... | 48 | 3.4 | 25 | 8.4 | 9 | 1.4 | 9 | 2.6 | 5 | 3.4 |
| Female............ | 201 | 100.0 | 75 | 100.0 | 59 | 100.0 | 54 | 100.0 | 13 | 100.0 |
| Under 18........ | 16 | 8.0 | 5 | 6.7 | 5 | 8.5 | 5 | 9.3 | 1 | - |
| 18-19............ | 20 | 10.0 | 6 | 8.0 | 7 | 11.9 | 3 | 5.6 | 4 | - |
| 20-24............ | 36 | 17.9 | 7 | 9.3 | 16 | 27.1 | 11 | 20.4 | 2 | - |
| 25-29............ | 29 | 14.4 | 5 | 6.7 | 11 | 18.6 | 11 | 20.4 | 2 | - |
| 30-34............ | 28 | 13.9 | 12 | 16.0 | 8 | 13.6 | 6 | 11.1 | 2 | - |
| 35-39............ | 24 | 11.9 | 10 | 13.3 | 3 | 5.1 | 10 | 18.5 | 1 | - |
| 40-44............ | 21 | 10.4 | 9 | 12.0 | 6 | 10.2 | 5 | 9.3 | 1 | - |
| 45-49............ | 13 | 6.5 | 11 | 14.7 | 1 | 1.7 | 1 | 1.9 | 0 | - |
| 50-54............ | 4 | 2.0 | 4 | 5.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | - |
| 55 and over... | 10 | 5.0 | 6 | 8.0 | 2 | 3.4 | 2 | 3.7 | 0 | - |

Notes: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.
Dash indic ates that percent distributions are not calculated when the base number is less than 50 .

Table 35
PERSONS UNDER CALIFORNIA SENTENCE OF DEATH, 1978-2000

| Year(s) | Initial sentences | ( + ) Resentences | (-) Removals ${ }^{1}$ | (=) <br> Persons under sentence of death ${ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000............... | 33 | 3 | 5 | 589 |
| 1999............... | 42 | 0 | 2 | 558 |
| 1998.............. | 32 | 2 | 9 | 518 |
| 1997............... | 40 | 0 | 8 | 493 |
| 1996.............. | 40 | 1 | 6 | 461 |
| 1995............... | 38 | 0 | 3 | 426 |
| 1994............... | 21 | 1 | 5 | 391 |
| 1993.............. | 34 | 0 | 5 | 374 |
| 1992 ${ }^{\text {a }}$............. | 40 | 6 | 5 | 345 |
| 1991 ${ }^{\text {b }}$............ | 26 | 3 | 2 | 305 |
| 1990............... | 33 | 3 | 4 | 279 |
| 1989 ${ }^{\text {c............. }}$ | 33 | 4 | 11 | 247 |
| $1988^{\text {d }}$............. | 34 | 3 | 15 | 223 |
| 1987 ${ }^{\text {.............. }}$ | 25 | 4 | 6 | 203 |
| 1986.............. | 21 | 5 | 6 | 179 |
| 1985............... | 16 | 2 | 20 | 159 |
| 1984.............. | 27 | 2 | 11 | 161 |
| 1983'............. | 35 | 2 | 5 | 143 |
| 1982............... | 39 | 0 | 6 | 113 |
| 1981.............. | 39 | 1 | 2 | 80 |
| 1980............... | 23 | 1 | 7 | 42 |
| 1979.............. | 20 | 0 | 2 | 25 |
| 1978.............. | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 |

Source: Califomia Appellate Project
${ }^{1}$ Persons no longer under sentence of death because of execution, sentence reversal, natural death, suicide, etc
${ }^{2}$ Total persons under sentence of death on December 31 of each year. Persons with death sentences from more than one county are counted once.
a In 1992, one person already under sentence of death received an additional death sentence.
Forty initial sentences were imposed with 39 new persons being sentenced.

- In 1991, one person already under sentence of death received an additional death sentence

Twenty-six initial sentences were imposed with 25 new persons being sentenced.
In 1989, two persons already under sentence of death received additional death sentences.
Thirty-three initial sentences were imposed with 31 new persons being sentenced.
${ }^{\circ}$ In 1988, two persons already under sentence of death received additional death sentences. Thirty-four initial sentences were imposed with 32 new persons being sentenced
${ }^{e}$ In 1987, although six death sentences were reversed, only five persons were no longer under sentence of death. The sixth person had an additional death sentence from another county In 1983, two persons already under sentence of death received additional death sentences. Thirty-five initial sentences were imposed with 33 new persons being sentenced.

Table 36
PERSONS SENTENCED TO DEATH, 2000
Sentencing County by Gender, Race/Ethnic Group, and Age

| Sentencing county | Total | Gender |  | Race/ethnic group |  |  |  | Age at arrest |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male Female |  | White Hispanic Black Other |  |  |  | Under 20 | 20-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35-39 | 40 and over |
| Total.................... | 33 | 32 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 13 | 5 | 1 | 8 | 13 | 4 | 6 | 1 |
| Alameda............ | 4 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Contra Costa..... | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Imperial............ | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kem................. | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kings............... | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Lake................ | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Los Angeles...... | 11 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Orange.............. | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Riverside........... | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Sacramento....... | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| San Bema rdino.. | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Sonoma........... | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Tulare.............. | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

Note: This table does not include persons resentenced to death after their death sentence was reversed on appeal.

TABLE 45
HOMICIDE CRIMES AND PEACE OFFICERS KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY, 1991-2000
Number and Rate per 100,000 Respective Population

| Year(s) | California population | Homicides |  | Sworn law enforcement personnel ${ }^{2}$ | Peace officers killed in the line of duty |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number ${ }^{1}$ | Rate |  | Number | Rate |
| 2000 ... | 34,480,000 | 2,074 | 6.0 | 69,029 | 2 | 2.9 |
| 1999 ................ | 34,036,000 | 2,006 | 5.9 | 69,363 | 4 | 5.8 |
| 1998 ................ | 33,494,000 | 2,170 | 6.5 | 67,035 | 7 | 10.4 |
| 1997 ................ | 32,957,000 | 2,579 | 7.8 | 65,416 | 7 | 10.7 |
| 1996 ............... | 32,383,000 | 2,910 | 9.0 | 63,984 | 5 | 7.8 |
| 1995 ............... | 32,063,000 | 3,530 | 11.0 | 62,150 | 10 | 16.1 |
| 1994 ............... | 32,140,000 | 3,699 | 11.5 | 59,340 | 9 | 15.2 |
| 1993 ............... | 31,742,000 | 4,095 | 12.9 | 58,861 | 8 | 13.6 |
| 1992 ................ | 31,300,000 | 3,920 | 12.5 | 59,386 | 5 | 8.4 |
| $1991 . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ~$ | 30,646,000 | 3,876 | 12.6 | 60,901 | 3 | 4.9 |

Note: Rates are based on annual population estimates provided by the Demographic Research Unit, California Department of Finance.
${ }^{1}$ Includes peace officers feloniously killed in the line of duty.
${ }^{2}$ Personnel in the Department of Justice and other state regulatory agencies are not included.

TABLE 46
PEACE OFFICERS KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY, 2000
By Contributing Circumstance

| Contributing circumstance | Number | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total.................................................. | 2 | 100.0 |
| Ambush ........................................... | 1 | - |
| Attempted arrest ............................... | 1 | - |

[^15]Table 39
JUSTIFIABLE HOMICIDES BY PEACE OFFICERS
OR PRIVATE CITIZENS, 2000
OR PRIVATE CITIZENS, 2000
By Gender, Race/Ethnic Group, and Age of Deceased

| ```Gender,None``` | Total |  | Peace officer justifiable |  | Citizen justifiable |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total.................. | 126 | 100.0 | 103 | 100.0 | 23 | 100.0 |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male............... | 121 | 96.0 | 99 | 96.1 | 22 | 95.7 |
| Female........... | 5 | 4.0 | 4 | 3.9 | 1 | 4.3 |
| Race/ethnic group |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White............... | 46 | 36.5 | 42 | 40.8 | 4 | 17.4 |
| Hispanic .......... | 44 | 34.9 | 35 | 34.0 | 9 | 39.1 |
| Black............... | 31 | 24.6 | 22 | 21.4 | 9 | 39.1 |
| Other............... | 5 | 4.0 | 4 | 3.9 | 1 | 4.3 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 18......... | 2 | 1.6 | 2 | 1.9 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 18-19............... | 6 | 4.8 | 2 | 1.9 | 4 | 17.4 |
| 20-24.............. | 33 | 26.2 | 25 | 24.3 | 8 | 34.8 |
| 25-29............... | 19 | 15.1 | 16 | 15.5 | 3 | 13.0 |
| 30-34.............. | 12 | 9.5 | 11 | 10.7 | 1 | 4.3 |
| 35-39............... | 17 | 13.5 | 16 | 15.5 | 1 | 4.3 |
| 40-44............... | 16 | 12.7 | 15 | 14.6 | 1 | 4.3 |
| 45-49............... | 11 | 8.7 | 7 | 6.8 | 4 | 17.4 |
| 50-54.............. | 3 | 2.4 | 3 | 2.9 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 55 and over...... | 6 | 4.8 | 5 | 4.9 | 1 | 4.3 |
| Unknown.......... | 1 | 0.8 | 1 | 1.0 | 0 | 0.0 |

Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.

By Location of J ustitia ble Homicide

| Location of justifia ble homicide | Number | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total |  |  |
| Total.................................... | 126 |  |
| Peace offic er justifia ble |  |  |
| Total.................................. | 103 | 100.0 |
| Felon's residence. | 23 | 22.3 |
| Other residence................. | 6 | 5.8 |
| Street, sidewalk................. | 57 | 55.3 |
| Commercial establishment. | 4 | 3.9 |
| Liquor store.................... | 0 | 0.0 |
| Bar............................... | 0 | 0.0 |
| Other business............... | 4 | 3.9 |
| All other........................... | 13 | 12.6 |
| Parking lot...................... | 4 | 3.9 |
| Vehicle.......................... | 4 | 3.9 |
| Field, park...................... | 2 | 1.9 |
| School......................... | 0 | 0.0 |
| Other............................. | 3 | 2.9 |
| Citizen justifia ble |  |  |
| Total................................... | 23 | 100.0 |
| Citizen's, shared residence.. | 9 | 39.1 |
| Citizen's residence......... | 6 | 26.1 |
| Shared residence............ | 3 | 13.0 |
| Other residence................. | 0 | 0.0 |
| Victim's residence............ | 0 | 0.0 |
| Other residence................ | 0 | 0.0 |
| Street, sidewalk................. | 6 | 26.1 |
| Commercial establishment. | 6 | 26.1 |
| Liquor store.................... | 0 | 0.0 |
| Bar............................... | 3 | 13.0 |
| Other business............... | 3 | 13.0 |
| All other........................... | 2 | 8.7 |
| Parking lot...................... | 0 | 0.0 |
| Vehicle.......................... | 1 | 4.3 |
| Field, park...................... | 1 | 4.3 |
| School.......................... | 0 | 0.0 |
| Other............................ | 0 | 0.0 |

Note: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 because of rounding

Table 41
JUSTIFIABLE HOMICIDES BY PEACE OFFICERS
OR PRIVATE CITIZENS, 2000
By Contributing Circumstance

| Contributing circumstance | Number | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total |  |  |
| Total..................................................... | 126 |  |
| Peace officer justifia ble |  |  |
| Total................................................... | 103 | 100.0 |
| Felon attacked peace officer. | 86 | 83.5 |
| Felon killed during commission of crime | 16 | 15.5 |
| Felon resisted a rrest.......................... | 0 | 0.0 |
| All other.......................................... | 1 | 1.0 |
| Felon attacked a nother peace officer | 0 | 0.0 |
| Felon atta cked citizen...................... | 1 | 1.0 |
| Felon attempted flight..................... | 0 | 0.0 |
| Citizen justifiable |  |  |
| Total.................................................... | 23 | 100.0 |
| Felon attacked citizen.......................... | 10 | 43.5 |
| Felon killed during commission of crime | 12 | 52.2 |
| All other......................................... | 1 | 4.3 |

Table 42
JUSTIFIABLE HOMICIDES BY PEACE OFFICERS
OR PRIVATE CITIZENS, 2000
By Type of Weapon Used

| Type of weapon used | Total |  | Peace officer justifiable |  | Citizen justifiable |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total................................ | 126 | 100.0 | 103 | 100.0 | 23 | 100.0 |
| Firearm........................... | 120 | 95.2 | 102 | 99.0 | 18 | 78.3 |
| Handgun...................... | 109 | 86.5 | 93 | 90.3 | 16 | 69.6 |
| Rifle............................ | 7 | 5.6 | 6 | 5.8 | 1 | 4.3 |
| Shotgun....................... | 4 | 3.2 | 3 | 2.9 | 1 | 4.3 |
| Firea m - unknown type.. | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 4 | 3.2 | 1 | 1.0 | 3 | 13.0 |
| Blunt object ${ }^{2} . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .$. | 1 | 0.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 4.3 |
| Personal weapon ${ }^{3} \ldots \ldots . . .$. | 1 | 0.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 4.3 |

Note: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 because of rounding.
${ }^{1}$ Any instrument used to cut or stab
${ }^{2}$ Club, etc.
${ }^{3}$ Hands, feet, etc

Iable 43
POPULATION ESTIMATES, 1952-2000

| Year(s) | Total population | Population at risk |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total ${ }^{1}$ | Adult ${ }^{2}$ | J uvenile ${ }^{3}$ |
| 2000.... | 34,480,000 | 26,203,950 | 22,198,297 | 4,005,653 |
| 1999... | 34,036,000 | 25,711,892 | 21,855,190 | 3,856,702 |
| 1998. | 33,494,000 | 25,263,064 | 21,498,170 | 3,764,894 |
| 1997.............. | 32,957,000 | 25,760,375 | 21,934,916 | 3,825,459 |
| 1996. | 32,383,000 | 25,554,242 | 21,825,735 | 3,728,507 |
| 1995. | 32,063,000 | 25,122,782 | 21,505,839 | 3,616,943 |
| 1994.............. | 32,140,000 | 24,703,379 | 21,193,571 | 3,509,808 |
| 1993. | 31,742,000 | 24,334,534 | 20,923,632 | 3,410,902 |
| 1992. | 31,300,000 | 23,975,578 | 20,661,120 | 3,314,458 |
| 1991. | 30,646,000 | 23,585,168 | 20,356,984 | 3,228,184 |
| 1990... | 29,557,836 | 23,178,961 | 20,027,633 | 3,151,328 |
| 1989... | 28,771,207 | 22,524,392 | 19,451,763 | 3,072,629 |
| 1988. | 28,060,746 | 21,969,953 | 18,885,349 | 3,084,604 |
| 1987.... | 27,388,477 | 21,483,563 | 18,378,758 | 3,104,805 |
| 1986.............. | 26,741,621 | 21,009,362 | 17,903,122 | 3,106,240 |
| 1985. | 26,112,632 | 20,563,314 | 17,468,941 | 3,094,373 |
| 1984... | 25,587,254 | 20,167,923 | 17,083,479 | 3,084,444 |
| 1983. | 25,075,581 | 19,860,746 | 16,763,095 | 3,097,651 |
| 1982. | 24,546,566 | 19,510,945 | 16,415,571 | 3,095,374 |
| 1981. | 24,038,711 | 19,172,812 | 16,082,355 | 3,090,457 |
| 1980.... | 23,668,145 | 18,824,197 | 15,778,999 | 3,045,198 |
| 1979. | 23,255,000 | 18,371,691 | 15,323,376 | 3,048,315 |
| 1978..... | 22,839,000 | 18,012,901 | 14,916,032 | 3,096,869 |
| 1977... | 22,350,000 | 17,619,453 | 14,470,680 | 3,148,773 |
| 1976..... | 21,935,000 | 17,269,884 | 14,080,872 | 3,189,012 |
| 1975.... | 21,537,000 | 16,914,556 | 13,694,793 | 3,219,763 |
| 1974.... | 21,173,000 | 16,563,671 | 13,339,906 | 3,223,765 |
| 1973... | 20,868,000 | 16,237,031 | 13,031,007 | 3,206,024 |
| 1972. | 20,585,000 | 15,926,249 | 12,758,809 | 3,167,440 |
| 1971. | 20,346,000 | 15,657,238 | 12,542,795 | 3,114,443 |
| 1970... | 20,039,000 | 15,378,312 | 12,339,580 | 3,038,732 |
| 1969... | 19,856,000 | 14,697,200 | 11,657,600 | 3,039,600 |
| 1968. | 19,554,000 | 14,379,400 | 11,403,700 | 2,975,700 |
| 1967... | 19,478,000 | 14,065,700 | 11,159,800 | 2,905,900 |
| 1966... | 19,132,000 | 13,696,700 | 10,872,500 | 2,824,200 |
| 1965... | 18,756,000 | 13,377,400 | 10,620,600 | 2,756,800 |
| 1964... | 18,234,000 | 12,981,700 | 10,311,100 | 2,670,600 |
| 1963............... | 17,675,000 | 12,564,600 | 10,047,700 | 2,516,900 |
| 1962............... | 17,044,000 | 12,099,200 | 9,740,000 | 2,359,200 |
| 1961.............. | 16,445,000 | 11,697,900 | 9,469,100 | 2,228,800 |
| 1960............... | 15,860,000 | 11,314,900 | 9,203,300 | 2,111,600 |
| 1959... | 15,280,000 | - | - | - |
| 1958. | 14,752,000 | - |  | - |
| 1957... | 14,190,000 |  |  | - |
| 1956... | 13,600,000 | - | - | - |
| 1955............... | 13,035,000 | - | - | - |
| 1954.............. | 12,595,000 |  |  | - |
| 1953.............. | 12,101,000 | - | - | - |
| 1952............... | 11,638,000 | - | - | - |

Source: Population estimates were provided by the Demographic Research Unit, Califomia Department of Finance.
Note: Population data by age are not available prior to 1960.
'Total population at risk, 10-69 years of age.
${ }^{\text {A }}$ Adult population at risk, $18-69$ years of age.
J uvenile population at nisk, 10 -17 years of age.
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## COMPUTATIONAL FORMULAS

ARREST RATE - An arrest rate describes the number of arrests made by law enforcement agencies per 100,000 total population or per 100,000 population considered to be at risk for arrest. Regardless of the population used, both rates are calculated in the same manner. An arrest rate is calculated by dividing the number of reported arrests by the respective population; the result is multiplied by 100,000 . For example, in 2000 there were 1,627 homicide arrests. The total population was $34,480,000$ and the total population at risk (10-69 years of age) was 26,203,950.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1,627}{34,480,000}=0.0000471 \times 100,000=4.7 \text { per } 100,000 \text { population } \\
& \frac{1,627}{26,203,950}=0.0000620 \times 100,000=6.2 \text { per } 100,000 \text { population at risk }
\end{aligned}
$$

CLEARANCE RATE - A clearance rate is the percentage of crimes reported that have been cleared. A clearance rate is calculated by dividing the number of crimes cleared by the number of crimes reported. The result is multiplied by 100 . For example, in 2000 there were 1,082 homicides cleared and 2,074 homicides reported. This equals a homicide clearance rate of 52.2 percent.

$$
\frac{1,082}{2,074}=0.5216972 \times 100=52.2 \text { percent }
$$

CRIME RATE - A crime rate describes the number of crimes reported to law enforcement agencies per 100,000 total population. A crime rate is calculated by dividing the number of reported crimes by the total population; the result is multiplied by 100,000. For example, in 2000 there were 2,074 homicides in California and the population was $34,480,000$. This equals a homicide crime rate of 6.0 per 100,000 general population.

$$
\frac{2,074}{34,480,000}=0.0000601 \times 100,000=6.0
$$

PERCENT CHANGE - A percent change describes a change in number or rate from one year to another. A percent change is calculated by subtracting base year data from current year data. The result is divided by base year data and multiplied by 100. For example, in 2000 the homicide crime rate was 6.0. In 1991 the homicide crime rate was 12.6. The percent change in rate from 1991 to 2000 is a 52.4 percent decrease.

$$
\frac{6.0-12.6}{12.6}=-0.5238095 \times 100=-52.4 \text { percent }
$$

POPULATION AT RISK - Arrest section data tables include three comparison populations: total (10-69 years of age), adult (18-69 years of age), and juvenile (10-17 years of age).
When a series of rates are calculated using different populations, the rate calculated for the total will not be equal to the sum of the rates calculated for each subtotal. For example, the total arrest rate (calculated using the total at-risk population) will not equal the sum of the adult arrest rate (calculated using the adult at-risk population) and the juvenile arrest rate (calculated using the juvenile at-risk population).

## CRIMINAL JUSTICE GLOSSARY

ACQUITTAL: a judgment of a court, based either on the verdict of a jury or a judicial officer, that the defendant is not guilty of the offense(s) for which he/she was tried.

ADULT: a person 18 years of age or older.
AGGRAVATED ASSAULT: an unlawful attack or attempted attack by one person upon another for the purpose of inflicting severe or aggravated bodily injury. This type of assault usually is accompanied by the use of a weapon or by means likely to produce death or great bodily harm (UCR definition).

APPEAL: a petition initiated by a defendant for a rehearing in an appellate court regarding a previous sentence or motion.

ARREST: ". . . taking a person into custody, in a case and in the manner authorized by law. An arrest may be made by a peace officer or by a private person" (834 PC).

ARREST RATE: the number of arrests per 100,000 population. See "Computational Formulas" preceding this glossary for further explanation.

## CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF THE YOUTH AUTHORITY

(CYA): the state agency which has jurisdiction over and maintains institutions as correctional schools for the reception of wards of the juvenile court and other persons committed from trial courts.

CLEARANCE: an offense is "cleared by arrest" or solved, for crime reporting purposes, when at least one person is arrested, charged with the commission of an offense, and turned over to a court for prosecution. Although no physical arrest is made, a clearance by arrest can be claimed when an offender is a person under 18 years of age and is cited to appear in juvenile court or before other juvenile authorities. An offense can also be "cleared exceptionally" for crime reporting purposes when an investigation has definitely established the identity of an offender; there is enough information to support an arrest; and the exact location of an offender is known but, for some reason, law enforcement cannot take the offender into custody.

CLEARANCE RATE: the percentage of crimes reported that have been cleared.

COMBINED CASES: cases rejected by the prosecutor in favor of other counts/cases.

COMPLAINT: a verified written accusation, filed by a prosecuting attorney with a local criminal court, which charges one or more persons with the commission of one or more offenses.

CONVICTION: a judgment, based either on the verdict of a jury or a judicial officer or on the guilty plea of the defendant, that the defendant is guilty.

COURT: an agency of the judicial branch of government, authorized or established by statute or constitution, having one or more judicial officers on its staff. A court has the authority to decide upon controversies in law and disputed matters of fact brought before it. Because of court consolidation we no longer distinguish between lower court and superior court.

CRIME: ". . . an act committed or omitted in violation of a law forbidding or commanding it. . ." (15 PC).

CRIME RATE: the number of reported crimes per 100,000 general population. See "Computational Formulas" preceding this glossary for further explanation.

CYA: see "California Department of the Youth Authority."
DISMISSAL: a decision by a judicial officer to terminate a case without a determination of guilt or innocence.

DISPOSITION - COURT: an action taken as the result of an appearance in court by a defendant. Examples are: adults - dismissed, acquitted, or convicted; juveniles dismissed, transferred, or remanded to adult court.

DISPOSITION-LAW ENFORCEMENT: an action taken as the result of an arrest. Examples of police dispositions are: adults - released by law enforcement, referred to another jurisdiction, or a misdemeanor or felony complaint sought; juveniles - handled within the department, referred to another agency, or referred to the probation department or juvenile court.

DISPOSITION - PROSECUTOR: an action taken as the result of a complaint requested by an arresting agency. Dispositions include granting a misdemeanor or a felony complaint or denying a complaint for reasons such as lack of sufficient evidence or complainant refuses to testify.

DIVERSION: a disposition of a criminal defendant either before adjudication or following adjudication, but prior to sentencing, in which the court directs the defendant to participate in a work, educational, or rehabilitative program.

DIVERSION DISMISSED: the successful completion of a diversion program.

FELON: one who has committed a felony.
FELONY: a crime which is punishable by death or by imprisonment in a state prison (17 \& 18 PC ).

FILING: a document filed with the court clerk or county clerk by a prosecuting attorney alleging that a person committed or attempted to commit a crime.

FORCIBLE RAPE: the carnal knowledge of a female forcibly and against her will. Assaults or attempts to commit rape by force or threat of force are included (UCR definition).

HOMICIDE: the willful (nonnegligent) killing of one human being by another. Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter are included (UCR definition).

JAIL: a county or city facility for incarceration of sentenced and unsentenced persons.

JUVENILE: a person under the age of 18.
MISDEMEANOR: a crime punishable by imprisonment in a county jail for up to one year.

MONTHLY ARREST AND CITATION REGISTER (MACR): a reporting system used to collect information on adult and juvenile arrests and citations by police and sheriffs' departments. This register contains data on arrest offenses, arrestee characteristics (age, gender, and race/ethnic group), and law enforcement dispositions.

## OFFENDER-BASED TRANSACTION STATISTICS (OBTS):

a system designed to collect statistical information on the various processes within the criminal justice system that occur between the point of the felony arrest of an adult and the point of final disposition.

OFFENSE: the charged offense is the crime for which the defendant was arrested or filed on by the district attorney. The convicted offense is the offense the defendant was convicted of or pled guilty to in court.

PC (PENAL CODE): the California Penal Code contains statutes that define criminal offenses and specify corresponding punishments. Criminal justice system mandates and procedures are also included.

POPULATION AT RISK: that portion of the total population, who because of like characteristics to the specific study group, are considered "at risk." For example, if one were studying juvenile arrestees, all persons between 10 and 17 years of age would constitute the at-risk population.

PRISON: a state correctional facility where persons are confined following conviction for a felony offense.

PROBATION: a judicial requirement that a person fulfill certain conditions of behavior in lieu of a sentence to confinement. See "Straight Probation."

PROBATION WITH JAIL: a type of disposition given upon conviction which imposes a jail term as a condition of probation.

RATE: a comparison of a number of events to a population.

REMAND: to send back (a case) to another court for further action.

ROBBERY: the taking or attempting to take anything of value from the care, custody, or control of a person or persons by force or threat of force or violence and/or by creating fear in the victim (UCR definition).

SENTENCE: the penalty imposed by a court upon a convicted person.

STRAIGHT PROBATION: probation granted to adults without condition or stipulation that the defendant serve time in jail as a condition of probation.

UNIFORM CRIME REPORTING (UCR): a federal reporting system which compiles crime data based on information submitted by law enforcement agencies throughout the nation. In California, the Department of Justice administers and forwards these law enforcement data to the federal program.

VIOLENT CRIMES: crimes committed against people. This category includes homicide, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault.

YOUTH AUTHORITY: see "California Department of the Youth Authority."
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[^0]:    Sources: Tables 3 and 6.

[^1]:    Source: Table 20

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ The following penal codes for homicide arrest offenses were valid at the time of the closeout of the 2000 arrest offense code file: 128, 187(a), 189, 192(a), 192(b), 193(a), 193(b), 273ab, 399, and 12310(a).

[^3]:    Source: Table 30

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.

[^5]:    Source: Table 41

[^6]:    Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.

[^7]:    Notes: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 because of rounding.

[^8]:    Notes: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 because of rounding.

[^9]:    Notes: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 because of rounding.

[^10]:    Notes: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 because of rounding
    Dash indicatesthat a percent change is not calculated when the base number is less than 50.
    ${ }^{1}$ Any instrument used to cut or stab.
    ${ }^{2}$ Club, etc.
    ${ }^{4}$ Any instrument used to hang or strangle.

[^11]:    Notes: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 because of rounding

[^12]:    Notes: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 bec a use of rounding.
    Dash indicates that percent distributions are not calculated when the base number is less than 50 .
    ${ }^{1}$ The "male" category includes two homicide victims whose gender could not be determined.

[^13]:    Notes: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 bec ause of rounding.

[^14]:    Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding
    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Includes estimated annual data for the Bakersfield Police Department and the Oakland Police Department.

[^15]:    Note: Dash indicates that percent distributions are not calculated when the base number is less than 50

