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Executive Summary

Changes in crime at a city level are often viewed through relatively short windows of time, such as six months or a year. Newspapers report how current levels of crime compare to the previous year. Elected officials talk about changes in crime since they took office. However, as crime is a tremendously complex issue that can be entrenched in certain geographic areas for decades, an understanding of real and sustained changes in crime levels requires a longer-term view. This report attempts to do that by taking a 25-year look at crime in the City of Oakland, covering the years 1987 through 2012. It also provides context by comparing crime levels in Oakland to the state overall and to four cities: Fresno, Richmond, Sacramento, and Stockton.

- In 2012, 77% of crimes reported to the Oakland police were property crimes, which is the combination of larceny-theft, auto theft, and burglary, and less than one-quarter was violent crime (23%), which is the combination of aggravated assault, homicide, rape, and robbery.

![Percent of Oakland Crimes by Type (2012)](image)

- To minimize the impact of year-to-year changes we compare average crimes rates over the five-year period 1987 to 1991 with average crime rates over the five-year period 2008 to 2012. Recent property crime rates in Oakland are 48% lower than 25-years ago. Violent crime in Oakland is the only category that did not experience dramatic reductions over the last 25 years, as violent crime rates in Oakland in recent years were essentially the same as 25 years ago (-1%).

![Percent Change in Crime Rates, Comparing Five-Year Averages](image)
• Between the peak in 1988 and the low point in 2009 Oakland’s property crime declined by a remarkable 58%. However, between 2009 and 2012 property crime in Oakland was on the rise again, and yet at the same time in the comparison cities and the state overall it remained relatively stable. Despite these gains, for 25 years Oakland has consistently had significantly higher property crime rates compared to the state overall.

![Property Crime Rate per 100,000 (1987 - 2012)](image)

• Violent crime in Oakland experienced wide fluctuations over the last quarter century but has consistently been higher than comparison cities and the state overall. The rate of violent crime in Oakland peaked in 1992, after which it began a sharp decline and reached a low in the year 2000, which was a 52% decrease over an eight-year period. After several years of relative stability, Oakland’s violent crime rate has generally been increasing again since 2005.

![Violent Crime Rate per 100,000 Residents (1987 - 2012)](image)
The story of crime in Oakland over the last 25 years is a nuanced one, as there are both positive and negative aspects of the crime trends. Overall, crime in Oakland experienced dramatic decreases in crime since the peak years of the early 1990’s. These longer-term declines have been sustained and a return to crime levels the city experienced 20 to 25 years ago seems very unlikely in the foreseeable future. That said, Oakland continues to have a very serious violence problem. Over the last 25 years, Oakland’s crime rates have been higher, and in some years significantly higher, than the state average.

The fact that crime trends in Oakland have largely mirrored the four comparison cities – in terms of direction if not magnitude – implies that regional trends were at play. However, since 2009/2010 Oakland crime trends seemed to be diverging from the comparison cities for the first time in 25 years, as Oakland crime began to uptick while crime in other cities remained relatively stable or continued modest declines. The next few years will help shed light on whether these are normal fluctuations or early indications of more serious problems with staying power.

In short, the city of Oakland has made remarkable progress in public safety improvements since the peak years of the early 1990’s but there is still much work to be done.
Introduction

Changes in crime at a city level are often viewed through relatively short windows of time, such as six months or a year. Newspapers report how current levels of crime compare to the previous year. Elected officials talk about changes in crime since they took office. However, as crime is a tremendously complex issue that is often entrenched in certain geographic areas for decades, year-to-year assessments seem shortsighted. An understanding of real and sustained changes in crime levels requires a longer-term view. This report attempts to do that by taking a 25-year look at crime in the City of Oakland, covering the years 1987 through 2012 by addressing the following questions:

- What have overall crime trends in Oakland looked like over the last 25 years?
- To what extent have crime trends varied by the type of crime?
- How do crime trends in Oakland compare to other cities in the region and to the state of California overall?

This report examines crime trends in the City of Oakland and compares them with California overall and four greater Bay Area cities: Fresno, Richmond, Sacramento, and Stockton. The intent is to understand changes in Oakland’s crime levels in the context of what happened in the greater Bay Area and the state overall. The primary data source is annual reported crimes from the FBI’s Uniform Crime Report (UCR) program (see the Methodology section for more detail about the data sources used).

It is our hope that a longer-term, “bigger picture” look at Oakland crime in the context of wider state and regional trends can assist policymakers in making better informed decisions about public safety investments in Oakland, including Measure Y and related community policing and violence prevention efforts.

Overview of Oakland

The following section presents profiles of Oakland and the four comparison cities in terms of population trends, demographic characteristics, and selected housing and economic measures.

Population Growth

The City of Oakland is the largest municipality in Alameda County and the third-largest city in the San Francisco Bay Area. As of 2012 Oakland had an estimated population of just fewer than 401,000 residents over a geographic area of 55.8 square miles, giving it a relatively-high population density among California cities, with a ratio of more than 7,000 residents per square mile. Between 1987 and 2012, the City of Oakland experienced very little population growth and has seen a population decline over the past decade (Figure 1). The number of Oakland residents peaked at 414,161 in 2002, and has generally been on the decline since. The population in 2012 approximates the population from the 2000 Census. Changes in population in Oakland are in stark contrast to

---

1 2012 is the most recent year for which data is available at a city level from the FBI.
2 See the Methodology section of this report for information about how these cities were selected.
what happened in California overall and the four comparison jurisdictions in particular. In 2012 Oakland’s population was just 9% higher than it was in 1987, while the average growth in the cities of Fresno, Richmond, Sacramento, and Stockton was 56% and the state population growth was 38% during this same 25-year period (see Figure 2).⁴

**Figure 1. Population (1987 - 2012)**

**Figure 2. Percent Change in Population (1987 - 2012)**

---

Race and Ethnicity

Oakland is one of the most racially and ethnically diverse cities in California. Oakland has a higher share of Black residents compared to the state overall (26% versus 6%), a lower share of Hispanic/Latino residents (27% versus 38%), and lower share of White residents (27% versus 39%). As shown in Figure 3, the comparison cities are also more racially and ethnically diverse relative to the state as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oakland</th>
<th>Fresno</th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Sacramento</th>
<th>Stockton</th>
<th>California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Native persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian persons</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black persons</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons of Hispanic or</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons reporting two or</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more races</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White persons, not</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Race/Ethnicity in Oakland, Comparison Cities, and California (2012)\(^5\)

Housing and Economic Measures

Figure 4 presents selected housing and economic measures for Oakland, the four comparison cities, and California overall as contextual factors for changes in crime over the last two and a half decades. The story that emerges is a nuanced one, as Oakland has a high school graduation rate that is in line with the state average (81% and 82%, respectively) and above average housing values. The value of owner occupied housing in Oakland is significantly higher than the comparison cities and 14% higher than the state average ($399,700 versus $349,400).

At the same time residents of Oakland, a city with a high cost of living, struggle economically, as evidenced by data on persons living below poverty, median income, and the unemployment rate. Twenty-two percent of residents were living below the poverty level in 2012 compared to 17% statewide. Oakland also struggles with higher than average unemployment at 13.7% compared to 10.5% statewide in 2012. Oakland’s homeownership rate (39%) is lower than all four of the comparison cities and the statewide average. In terms of income, Oakland is in the middle range of the comparison cities but 17% lower than the state average ($48,196 versus $58,328).

### Figure 4. Selected Housing and Economic Measures (2012)\(^6,7\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oakland</th>
<th>Fresno</th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Sacramento</th>
<th>Stockton</th>
<th>California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate or higher (age 25+)</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of persons below poverty level</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership rate</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median value of owner-occupied housing units</td>
<td>$399,700</td>
<td>$159,000</td>
<td>$231,800</td>
<td>$210,200</td>
<td>$156,600</td>
<td>$349,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median household income</td>
<td>$48,196</td>
<td>$38,386</td>
<td>$51,765</td>
<td>$48,346</td>
<td>$43,321</td>
<td>$58,328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Police Staffing

Before delving into the crime data, the number of sworn police officers since the mid-1990’s is presented as an additional contextual piece. Since 1995, the Oakland Police Department has experienced dramatic ups and downs in the number of sworn officers, ranging from a low of 626 sworn officers in 1996 and 2012 to a high of 814 in 2002. Recently, the Department has experienced significant cuts in the number of sworn officers over a relatively short period of time, decreasing 21% (or 167 officers) in just three years (2009 to 2012).

It is worth noting that the relationship between the number of sworn police officers and crime rates is a complex one. While most people would agree that the number of police officers plays a significant role in crime rates at a city level, it is only one of many factors that impact levels of crime in a city. Said another way, sworn officer staffing levels are provided as context for this report and drawing conclusions about whether decreases in officers caused increases in crime is beyond the scope of this effort.

Figure 5. Total Sworn Officers in Oakland Police Department (1995 - 2012)

Police departments across the country use different approaches to providing police services to their residents. The extent to which civilians are responsible for administrative and investigative duties varies greatly across cities, and many cities are increasingly relying on non-sworn personnel, a process known as civilianization. In addition, the balance of full-time and part-time staff can be very different from department to department. For these reasons, among others, comparisons of the number of sworn officers across cities are not presented.

FBI UCR, Police Employee Data.
Types of Crime

This report looks at reported property crimes and reported violent crimes using data from the FBI’s Uniform Crime Report (UCR) program. Crimes are classified into seven offense categories:

- Property Crime: Auto Theft, Burglary, Larceny-Theft
- Violent Crime: Aggravated Assault, Homicide, Rape, Robbery

A total of 34,300 incidents for these seven crime types were reported to the Oakland Police Department in 2012. As shown in Figure 6, larceny-theft was the most commonly reported crime, with 13,198 incidents. Robbery was the most commonly reported violent crime, with 4,338 incidents. In percentage terms, property crimes generally account for the large majority of reported crimes and in 2012 they represented 77% of all reported crimes, compared to 23% of reported crimes that were violent crimes (Figure 7).

Figure 6. Total Number of Crimes by Offense Category (2012)

10 See the Methodology section for more information about the FBI Uniform Crime Report data. Note that this data does not include crimes that are not reported to the police department.
While violent crimes accounted for less than a quarter of all crime in Oakland in 2012, violent crime as a percentage of total crime was higher in Oakland than in California overall and in the four comparison cities (Figure 8). Violent crime in Oakland accounted for a full 23% of all reported crimes, significantly higher than the state overall and higher than three of the four comparison cities. Violent crimes made up 13% of reported offenses for the state overall and 15% of reported offenses in the comparison cities in 2012.
Total Crime

Over the last 25 years Oakland has experienced significant declines in crime rates for many of the major crime types. As shown in Figure 8, crime rates during the 2000’s were significantly lower compared to the peak levels of the late 1980’s and early 1990’s. However, despite a generally positive trend over the longer term in recent years Oakland has experienced increases in some crime types, particularly robberies, which will be further detailed below.

Figure 8. Total, Violent, and Property Crimes per 100,000 in Oakland (1987-2012)

A Note About 2013 Crime Data

The period of analysis for this longer-term look at crime in Oakland ends at 2012, which is the most recent year for which city-level data is available from the FBI. As of the publishing of this report, data for 2013 for individual cities has yet to be published by the FBI. It is this centrally-compiled, single source of data that makes cross-jurisdictional comparisons possible.

As 2013 drew to a close and 2014 began a series of media articles were published that examined crime levels in 2013 compared to the previous year using data published by the Oakland Police Department. By most accounts, the news for Oakland relative to the previous year was generally positive and the crime increases of recent years seemed to be slowing in 2013. For example, homicides experienced a large decrease between 2012 and 2013. Robberies, however, continued to increase and Oakland still ranks near the top statewide and nationwide in robbery rates.11

Changes in crime rates are often presented as percentage increases or decreases between two points in time (e.g., a 15% decrease between 2008 and 2011). One limitation of this approach is that year-to-year fluctuations can change a story depending on the endpoints. To minimize the impact of year-to-year changes we compare average crimes rates over the five-year period 1987 to 1991 with average crime rates over the five-year period 2008 to 2012. Figure 9 presents a generally positive story about crime trends in Oakland, the comparison cities, and the state overall. Crime rates in California in recent years are essentially half of what they were in the late 1980’s and early 1990’s, as the property crime rate decreased by 52% and the violent crime rate decreased by 55% across the state.

While the declines are not as great, Oakland and the comparison cities also experienced dramatic decreases in crime since the late 1980’s and early 1990’s. For example recent property crime rates in Oakland are 48% lower than they were 25 years ago and 50% lower in the four comparison cities. The one obvious outlier from Figure 9 is violent crime in Oakland. That is the only category that did not experience dramatic reductions over the last 25 years, as violent crime rates in Oakland in recent years were essentially the same as 25 years ago (-1%).

While Oakland has made tremendous progress in total crime (a reduction of 41% over the last 25 years) the city has consistently remained one of the highest-crime cities in the state of California. Figure 10 charts the 2012 total crime rate for every California city with a population of 20,000 or more. Oakland had the highest total crime rate of these cities with 8,587 total crimes per 100,000 residents compared to the state average of 3,182 total crimes per 100,000.

Figure 10. City-Level Total Crime Rate Ranked Highest to Lowest (2012)
Property Crime

Over the last 25 years property crime in Oakland generally declined and, despite recent increases, property crime still remains lower than the late 1980’s through the mid 1990’s. The property crime rates of the four comparison cities of Fresno, Richmond, Sacramento, and Stockton tracked with Oakland fairly closely for most of the 25-year period, implying a regional trend. All five cities and the state overall experienced sustained and dramatic reductions in overall property crime rates between 1987 and 2010. Between the peak in 1988 and the low point in 2009 Oakland’s property crime declined by a notable 58%. However, between 2009 and 2012 property crime in Oakland was on the rise again, and yet at the same time in the comparison cities and the state overall it remained relatively stable. These last few years are the first time in which Oakland’s property crime rate was going in a different direction than the comparison cities. It will be interesting to see how Oakland’s property crime rate compares to the other cities in 2013 once the data are available.

The significant decrease in property crime is only one part of the story that is portrayed in Figure 11. For 25 years Oakland has consistently had significantly higher property crime rates compared to the state overall, and in many years it was more than twice as large. So while great progress has been made, the city still has a long way to go to become closer in-line with the state overall.

Figure 11. Property Crime Rate per 100,000 (1987 - 2012)
**Burglary**

Consistent with state and comparison city trends, Oakland experienced a long and dramatic reduction in burglary rates (nearly 70%) between 1987 and 2000. The rate of burglaries started to increase in 2000 and the city has experienced a generally steady increase in burglaries since then.

![Figure 12. Burglary Rate per 100,000 (1987 - 2012)](image)

**Larceny-Theft**

Of the seven major crime categories, Oakland has seen the most sustained and dramatic reductions in its larceny-theft rate over the past 25 years. Between 1987 and 2010, the larceny-theft rate in the city declined by nearly 70%, a proportional decline far greater than state or comparison city trends. Larceny-theft is one of the few crimes in which the rates in Oakland were notably lower than the comparison cities and approximated the state average at a few points in time. However, larceny-thefts have been rebounding somewhat in 2011 and 2012.

![Figure 13. Larceny Theft Rate per 100,000 (1987 - 2012)](image)
**Auto Theft**

Oakland has experienced wide swings in the rate of auto thefts over the past 25 years. Oakland experienced a dramatic spike in auto thefts in the mid-2000s, but it was relatively short lived, falling by more than 50% over the following four years to a low of 1,189 in 2010. However, auto thefts have begun rising again over the last few years with 1,746 per 100,000 in 2012.

**Figure 14. Auto Theft Rate per 100,000 (1987 - 2012)**
**Violent Crime**

Unlike the more gradual trends in property crime, violent crime in Oakland experienced wide fluctuations over the last quarter century as illustrated in Figure 15. Over the 25-year period, the rate of violent crime in the city peaked at 2,626 incidents per 100,000 residents in 1992, after which it began a sharp decline and reached a low of 1,261 in the year 2000, which is a remarkable 52% decrease over an eight-year period. After several years of relative stability, Oakland’s violent crime rate has generally been increasing since 2005. While the comparison cities generally tracked Oakland in terms of the direction of the trends, the magnitude of the changes was higher in Oakland. The violent crime rate trend in Oakland began to diverge from the comparison cities around 2005. In 2012, Oakland’s violent crime rate was 1,993 per 100,000 residents, approximating levels in 1998, 2007, and 2008. It will be interesting to see if the divergence between Oakland and the comparison cities continues in 2013 and 2014 and if recent improvements in the homicide rate are sustained and carry over to other types of violent crime.

*Figure 15. Violent Crime Rate per 100,000 Residents (1987 - 2012)*
**Homicide**

The annual number of homicides in Oakland experienced large fluctuations over the 25-year period, ranging from a high of 165 in 1992 to a low of 60 in 1999. After several years of decline since 2006, the number of homicides in Oakland increased in 2011 (104) and 2012 (127). In 2013 there were 90 homicides, which is an encouraging sign that these increases are not early indications of a longer-term trend. Similar to violent crime overall, the homicide rate in Oakland generally mirrored the trends in the comparison cities, but was more pronounced. The trends diverged over the last few years but 2013 data starts to counter that divergence.

**Figure 16. Total Homicides in Oakland (1987 - 2013)**

**Figure 17. Homicide Rate per 100,000 (1987 - 2012)**

12 2013 homicide data has not been published by the FBI, making cross-city comparisons not possible, so unlike Figure 16, which goes through 2013, Figure 17 only goes through 2012.
Rape
The number of rapes per 100,000 in Oakland has declined dramatically over the last 25 years, with 68 reported incidents per 100,000 residents in 2012, down from a peak of 147 in 1987, which is a decrease of 54%. However, despite these dramatic declines, Oakland's number of rape per 100,000 continues to be consistently and significantly higher than the state average and the four comparison cities, as Oakland's 2012 rate was more than three-times higher than the comparison cities.

Figure 18. Rape Rate per 100,000 (1987 - 2012)

Robbery
Robbery rates in Oakland experienced a dramatic and steady decline between the peak in 1993, and the low point in 2000, decreasing by 60% over this seven-year period. However, the rate of robberies has generally been increasing since then and in 2012 it was more than double what it was in 2000. The robbery rate in Oakland generally followed the same trends as the four-city average until the mid-2000s when Oakland, yet again, began to diverge from the other cities.

Figure 19. Robbery Rate per 100,000 (1987 - 2012)
**Aggravated Assault**

The final type of violent crime, aggravated assault, also experienced volatility over the last 25 years, with a dramatic surge and peak in 1991 and a long generally steady decline over the next 14 years until 2005. The aggravated assault rate since then has fluctuated but still remains higher than the early 2000’s. Similar to robberies, the rate of aggravated assault in Oakland generally followed the state average and the comparison cities until 2005 when the trends began to diverge.

![Figure 20. Aggravated Assault Rate per 100,000 residents by Year (1987 - 2012)](image)
Conclusion

Changes in crime rates is a complex issue that is driven by many factors and it can take years to assess whether changes in crime seem to have “staying power” or, rather, are expected year-to-year fluctuations. The intent of this report is to get beyond 12-month examinations and take a bigger picture look at Oakland crime trends over the last quarter-century. In addition, we presented crime trends for four comparison cities from the greater Bay area (Fresno, Richmond, Stockton, and Sacramento) and the state overall to allow Oakland’s crime trends to be viewed in the context of what was happening in other cities and across the state.

The story of crime in Oakland over the last 25 years is a nuanced one, as there are both positive and negative elements. Highlights of positive developments in public safety in Oakland include:

- Overall, crime in Oakland experienced dramatic decreases since the peak years of the early 1990’s. This is especially true for property crime, which was an average of 48% lower over the five-year period 2008-2012 compared to the five-year period 1987-1991.
- In general, these longer-term declines have been sustained and a return to crime levels the city experienced 20 to 25 years ago seems very unlikely in the foreseeable future.

That said, anyone who is familiar with Oakland knows that serious public safety challenges continue to plague the city.

- Oakland continues to have a very serious violence problem. Over the last 25 years, Oakland’s crime rates have been higher, and in some years significantly higher, than the state average for the four types of violent crimes (homicide, robbery, aggravated assault, and rape). The share of all crime that is violent crime is higher in Oakland than in the comparison cities and the state overall (23% versus 15% and 13%, respectively).
- Oakland continues to rank among the top cities in California in terms of high crime rates for most crimes, but violent crimes in particular.
- Recent crime levels are worrisome in that all seven of the crime types included in this report have begun to rise over the last two to three years.

The fact that crime trends in Oakland have largely mirrored the four comparison cities – in terms of direction if not magnitude – implies that regional trends were at play. However, since 2009/2010 Oakland crime trends seemed to be diverging from the comparison cities for the first time in 25 years, as Oakland crime began to uptick while crime in other cities remained relatively stable or continued modest declines. The next few years will help shed light on whether these are normal fluctuations or early indications of more serious problems with staying power. A complete analysis of 2013 data and keeping an eye on 2014 crime levels will help us get a sense of whether the city can stem recent crime increases and return to general alignment with comparable cities that are experiencing relative stability or continued modest declines.

In sum, the city of Oakland has made remarkable progress in public safety improvements since the peak years of the early 1990’s, but there is still much work to be done.
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Appendix A: Methodology

This report takes a longer-term look at crime trends and presents population and demographic profiles of Oakland and four comparison cities. Descriptions of the data sources and the process for selecting the comparison cities are included below.

Uniform Crime Reporting: Crime offense data for this report comes from the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program, a standardized law-enforcement data collection system that is compiled by local law enforcement agencies and regularly submitted to the FBI. The UCR system includes a total count of all reported criminal offenses within each jurisdiction during a calendar year, as well as annual population counts/estimates for the purpose of per-capita or crime rate estimations. Individual crimes are classified into one of seven major UCR offense categories. The categories are as follows:

- Violent Crime: Aggravated Assault, Homicide, Rape, Robbery
- Property Crime: Auto Theft, Burglary, Larceny-Theft

For the purposes of this report, crime rates (or crimes per capita) have been calculated on a per-100,000 residents basis, which is a standard in crime analysis. The per-capita rates are used to compare the level of crime in different cities by controlling for population and are the primary unit of analysis used to compare crime between cities in this report. In this report, “rate” is calculated as:

\[
\frac{\text{Total Offense Count}}{\frac{\text{Total Population}}{100,000}} = \text{Crime Rate}
\]

For the years 1990, 2000, and 2010, population figures cited in the UCR data are compiled by the FBI from the decennial US Census population. For the intervening years, the FBI applies growth projection estimates for each city created by the US Census Bureau.

Offense data from the UCR database contains only reported crimes, meaning offenses that were either discovered by officers or filed with the department by a victim, witness, or other party. Crimes that are not reported to authorities are not included in this data.

American Community Survey: The demographic profiles for the City of Oakland and the comparison jurisdictions are based on data from the American Community Survey (ACS) conducted by the US Census Bureau. This data is compiled from a survey of approximately 250,000 US homes each month, the results of which are used to provide statistical estimates of demographic information on the population of the United States in order to supplement the decennial US Census. ACS data provides statistical estimates for 2012 for Oakland and the comparison cities on a number of measures such as age, sex, ethnicity, housing status, and educational attainment.14

---

Bureau of Labor Statistics: Select economic measures, such as unemployment rates, are from the US Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) Current Employment Statistics (CES) database. The CES is a survey of approximately 145,000 businesses and government agencies in the United States conducted monthly by the BLS. This survey sample is used by the BLS to provide estimates of aggregate employment, economic, and industry data for approximately 400 individual cities and metropolitan areas, as well as each of the 50 states and the nation as a whole.¹⁵

Comparison Cities

In addition to state-level data, data on four comparable Bay Area / Upper Central Valley cities is included. This comparative analysis is intended to help better understand the changes in Oakland and Oakland’s crime rate in the context of overall trends in crime rates among comparably-situated cities in the region, as well as the state overall. The comparison cities were selected to match Oakland’s overall profile as closely as possible based on four key criteria:

**Population:** Oakland is a city of approximately 400,000 residents. The population of comparison cities falls in the range of 100,000 to 600,000 residents to capture any potential macro-level issues that could affect crime trends in cities of this size that may be less relevant in cities smaller than 100,000 and larger than 600,000.

**Crime Rates:** Oakland’s crime rates are among the highest in the state and generally higher than state averages. Comparison cities include jurisdictions with higher than average crime rates.

**Geography:** Comparison cities were selected from the Greater Bay Area / Upper Central Valley in order to account for any factors that drive crime trends in the region as a whole.

**Economic Profile:** Between 2007 and 2011, the average median income of Oakland households was $51,144, with 19.6% of residents living below the poverty line – each is significantly lower and higher, respectively, than the statewide averages. Comparison cities were selected to have generally similar income and poverty profiles to Oakland in order to capture any structural economic issues that may impact crime.

Based on these criteria, Fresno, Richmond, Sacramento, and Stockton were selected as comparison jurisdictions.¹⁶ A summary table of the relevant selection metrics for these cities is provided as Appendix B. Where appropriate, tables and charts include data for these four individual cities. However, for most charts in this report an average weighted by population for the four cities is used for ease of comparison.

¹⁶ Two of the Bay Area’s major cities, San Francisco and San Jose, were excluded as comparison cities because both have significantly higher populations and do not experience the same levels of chronic crime and economic challenges. Cities outside of California were excluded from consideration because variations in such things as criminal statutes, US population shifts, and incarceration rates, among other factors, make meaningful comparisons with cities in other states difficult.
### Appendix B: Comparison City Data

#### Census/American Community Survey Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>Fresno</th>
<th>Oakland</th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Sacramento</th>
<th>Stockton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population, 2012 estimate</td>
<td>313,914,040</td>
<td>38,041,430</td>
<td>505,870</td>
<td>400,740</td>
<td>106,526</td>
<td>475,524</td>
<td>297,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population, percent change, 2000 to 2012</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons under 5 years, percent</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons under 18 years, percent</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons 65 years and over, percent</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female persons, percent</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Fresno County</th>
<th>Alameda County</th>
<th>Contra Costa County</th>
<th>Sacramento County</th>
<th>San Joaquin County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White persons, percent</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black persons, percent</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian persons, percent</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, percent</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons reporting two or more races, percent</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons of Hispanic or Latino origin, percent</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White persons not Hispanic, percent</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Living in same house 1 year & over, percent | 85.0% | 84.6% | 80.2% | 84.0% | 84.1% | 78.7% | 80.2% |
| Foreign born persons, percent | 13.0% | 27.1% | 21.6% | 27.1% | 29.6% | 21.9% | 24.9% |
| Language other than English spoken at home, percent age 5+, | 21.0% | 44.3% | 41.3% | 40.9% | 46.8% | 36.3% | 45.1% |
| High school graduate or higher, percent of persons age 25+ | 86.4% | 81.5% | 74.8% | 80.5% | 78.6% | 83.4% | 75.7% |
| Bachelor's degree or higher, percent of persons age 25+ | 29.1% | 30.9% | 19.4% | 38.8% | 24.7% | 29.3% | 17.9% |
| Veterans | 21,280,865 | 1,857,748 | 21,533 | 14,530 | 3,298 | 25,867 | 12,401 |
| Housing units | 132,452,249 | 13,708,197 | 175,406 | 171,084 | 41,219 | 192,172 | 99,854 |
| Homeownership rate | 63.9% | 54.0% | 45.7% | 39.3% | 47.7% | 47.6% | 49.1% |
| Housing units in multi-unit structures, percent | 26.2% | 31.4% | 33.9% | 52.1% | 41.1% | 32.6% | 26.4% |
| Median value of owner-occupied housing units | 171,900 | 139,400 | 159,000 | 139,700 | 231,800 | 210,200 | 156,600 |
| Households | 115,969,540 | 12,552,658 | 162,149 | 156,482 | 38,952 | 177,325 | 90,754 |
| Persons per household | 2.37 | 2.78 | 2.88 | 2.34 | 2.58 | 2.47 | 2.98 |
| Per capita money income in the past 12 months (2012 dollars) | $27,319 | $28,341 | $18,360 | $31,130 | $26,751 | $24,882 | $16,477 |
| Median household income | 551,371 | 558,328 | 538,386 | 548,196 | 551,765 | 548,546 | 543,321 |
| Persons below poverty level, percent | 15.9% | 17.0% | 31.5% | 22.0% | 18.8% | 23.4% | 24.7% |
| Unemployment rate (2012 avg) | 8.1% | 10.5% | 14.3% | 13.7% | 14.6% | 12.4% | 18.3% |

### Geography QuickFacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>Fresno</th>
<th>Oakland</th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Sacramento</th>
<th>Stockton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land area in square miles</td>
<td>155,779.22</td>
<td>111.96</td>
<td>55.79</td>
<td>30.07</td>
<td>97.92</td>
<td>61.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons per square mile</td>
<td>244.20</td>
<td>4,518.31</td>
<td>7,183.01</td>
<td>3,542.60</td>
<td>4,856.25</td>
<td>4,831.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIPS Code</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27000</td>
<td>53000</td>
<td>60620</td>
<td>64000</td>
<td>75000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counties</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Fresno County</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>Contra Costa County</td>
<td>Sacramento County</td>
<td>San Joaquin County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>