



## Comparison Data

*A Supplement to The Structured Decision Making® System  
in Child Welfare Services in California*

Report Date: May 2019

Report Period: January 1 – December 31, 2018

Table 1

**Emergency Response Referrals  
CWS/CMS Screening Decision**

County	Accept		Evaluate Out		N
	n	%	n	%	
Alameda	4,512	49%	4,747	51%	<b>9,259</b>
Alpine	36	50%	36	50%	<b>72</b>
Amador	286	42%	401	58%	<b>687</b>
Butte	973	32%	2,050	68%	<b>3,023</b>
Calaveras	356	53%	312	47%	<b>668</b>
Colusa	162	58%	115	42%	<b>277</b>
Contra Costa	3,809	51%	3,624	49%	<b>7,433</b>
Del Norte	527	60%	349	40%	<b>876</b>
El Dorado	1,259	53%	1,107	47%	<b>2,366</b>
Fresno	8,659	64%	4,867	36%	<b>13,526</b>
Glenn	419	57%	314	43%	<b>733</b>
Humboldt	1,249	40%	1,895	60%	<b>3,144</b>
Imperial	1,695	72%	644	28%	<b>2,339</b>
Inyo	211	58%	151	42%	<b>362</b>
Kern	6,186	48%	6,598	52%	<b>12,784</b>
Kings	1,376	57%	1,045	43%	<b>2,421</b>
Lake	424	46%	495	54%	<b>919</b>
Lassen	298	50%	298	50%	<b>596</b>
Los Angeles	61,378	75%	20,247	25%	<b>81,625</b>
Madera	1,911	65%	1,013	35%	<b>2,924</b>
Marin	375	31%	829	69%	<b>1,204</b>
Mariposa	117	66%	61	34%	<b>178</b>
Mendocino	1,246	52%	1,137	48%	<b>2,383</b>
Merced	1,994	50%	1,990	50%	<b>3,984</b>
Modoc	244	57%	184	43%	<b>428</b>
Mono	106	44%	134	56%	<b>240</b>
Monterey	2,105	44%	2,689	56%	<b>4,794</b>
Napa	765	50%	764	50%	<b>1,529</b>
Nevada	735	45%	912	55%	<b>1,647</b>
Orange	11,612	38%	18,885	62%	<b>30,497</b>
Placer	1,074	29%	2,600	71%	<b>3,674</b>
Plumas	176	78%	51	22%	<b>227</b>
Riverside	22,635	80%	5,615	20%	<b>28,250</b>

Table 1

**Emergency Response Referrals  
CWS/CMS Screening Decision**

County	Accept		Evaluate Out		N
	n	%	n	%	
Sacramento	10,281	45%	12,382	55%	<b>22,663</b>
San Benito	367	50%	374	50%	<b>741</b>
San Bernardino	18,373	63%	10,656	37%	<b>29,029</b>
San Diego	23,055	52%	21,431	48%	<b>44,486</b>
San Francisco	1,313	30%	3,002	70%	<b>4,315</b>
San Joaquin	4,718	53%	4,235	47%	<b>8,953</b>
San Luis Obispo	1,664	42%	2,269	58%	<b>3,933</b>
San Mateo	1,776	38%	2,884	62%	<b>4,660</b>
Santa Barbara	3,900	62%	2,424	38%	<b>6,324</b>
Santa Clara	8,622	76%	2,698	24%	<b>11,320</b>
Santa Cruz	1,409	54%	1,205	46%	<b>2,614</b>
Shasta	1,826	51%	1,757	49%	<b>3,583</b>
Sierra	24	63%	14	37%	<b>38</b>
Siskiyou	531	78%	147	22%	<b>678</b>
Solano	2,278	48%	2,435	52%	<b>4,713</b>
Sonoma	2,266	39%	3,491	61%	<b>5,757</b>
Stanislaus	2,765	43%	3,647	57%	<b>6,412</b>
Sutter	343	32%	738	68%	<b>1,081</b>
Tehama	652	40%	970	60%	<b>1,622</b>
Trinity	117	40%	176	60%	<b>293</b>
Tulare	5,749	64%	3,204	36%	<b>8,953</b>
Tuolumne	275	34%	529	66%	<b>804</b>
Ventura	4,397	43%	5,815	57%	<b>10,212</b>
Yolo	1,214	49%	1,249	51%	<b>2,463</b>
Yuba	391	32%	821	68%	<b>1,212</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>237,216</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>174,712</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>411,928</b>

Table 2

## SDM® Screening Completion Rate

County	Completed		Not Completed		N
	n	%	n	%	
Alameda	8,874	96%	385	4%	<b>9,259</b>
Alpine	69	96%	3	4%	<b>72</b>
Amador	683	99%	4	1%	<b>687</b>
Butte	2,984	99%	39	1%	<b>3,023</b>
Calaveras	645	97%	23	3%	<b>668</b>
Colusa	260	94%	17	6%	<b>277</b>
Contra Costa	7,368	99%	65	1%	<b>7,433</b>
Del Norte	873	100%	3	<1%	<b>876</b>
El Dorado	2,063	87%	303	13%	<b>2,366</b>
Fresno	11,640	86%	1,886	14%	<b>13,526</b>
Glenn	732	100%	1	<1%	<b>733</b>
Humboldt	3,116	99%	28	1%	<b>3,144</b>
Imperial	2,271	97%	68	3%	<b>2,339</b>
Inyo	340	94%	22	6%	<b>362</b>
Kern	12,689	99%	95	1%	<b>12,784</b>
Kings	2,383	98%	38	2%	<b>2,421</b>
Lake	845	92%	74	8%	<b>919</b>
Lassen	582	98%	14	2%	<b>596</b>
Los Angeles	81,397	100%	228	<1%	<b>81,625</b>
Madera	2,890	99%	34	1%	<b>2,924</b>
Marin	1,126	94%	78	6%	<b>1,204</b>
Mariposa	169	95%	9	5%	<b>178</b>
Mendocino	2,317	97%	66	3%	<b>2,383</b>
Merced	3,253	82%	731	18%	<b>3,984</b>
Modoc	428	100%	0	0%	<b>428</b>
Mono	235	98%	5	2%	<b>240</b>
Monterey	4,754	99%	40	1%	<b>4,794</b>
Napa	1,519	99%	10	1%	<b>1,529</b>
Nevada	1,614	98%	33	2%	<b>1,647</b>
Orange	30,307	99%	190	1%	<b>30,497</b>
Placer	3,208	87%	466	13%	<b>3,674</b>
Plumas	183	81%	44	19%	<b>227</b>
Riverside	28,047	99%	203	1%	<b>28,250</b>
Sacramento	22,614	100%	49	<1%	<b>22,663</b>

Table 2

## SDM® Screening Completion Rate

County	Completed		Not Completed		N
	n	%	n	%	
San Benito	724	98%	17	2%	<b>741</b>
San Bernardino	28,831	99%	198	1%	<b>29,029</b>
San Diego	42,812	96%	1,674	4%	<b>44,486</b>
San Francisco	4,275	99%	40	1%	<b>4,315</b>
San Joaquin	8,771	98%	182	2%	<b>8,953</b>
San Luis Obispo	3,887	99%	46	1%	<b>3,933</b>
San Mateo	4,033	87%	627	13%	<b>4,660</b>
Santa Barbara	6,315	100%	9	<1%	<b>6,324</b>
Santa Clara	11,209	99%	111	1%	<b>11,320</b>
Santa Cruz	2,584	99%	30	1%	<b>2,614</b>
Shasta	3,423	96%	160	4%	<b>3,583</b>
Sierra	34	89%	4	11%	<b>38</b>
Siskiyou	650	96%	28	4%	<b>678</b>
Solano	4,679	99%	34	1%	<b>4,713</b>
Sonoma	5,657	98%	100	2%	<b>5,757</b>
Stanislaus	6,120	95%	292	5%	<b>6,412</b>
Sutter	965	89%	116	11%	<b>1,081</b>
Tehama	1,605	99%	17	1%	<b>1,622</b>
Trinity	275	94%	18	6%	<b>293</b>
Tulare	8,583	96%	370	4%	<b>8,953</b>
Tuolumne	798	99%	6	1%	<b>804</b>
Ventura	10,143	99%	69	1%	<b>10,212</b>
Yolo	2,289	93%	174	7%	<b>2,463</b>
Yuba	1,006	83%	206	17%	<b>1,212</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>402,146</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>9,782</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>411,928</b>

Table 3

## Final SDM® Screening Decision

County	In-Person Response		Evaluate Out		N
	n	%	n	%	
Alameda	4,233	48%	4,641	52%	<b>8,874</b>
Alpine	36	52%	33	48%	<b>69</b>
Amador	279	41%	404	59%	<b>683</b>
Butte	1,026	34%	1,958	66%	<b>2,984</b>
Calaveras	371	58%	274	42%	<b>645</b>
Colusa	156	60%	104	40%	<b>260</b>
Contra Costa	3,809	52%	3,559	48%	<b>7,368</b>
Del Norte	530	61%	343	39%	<b>873</b>
El Dorado	1,284	62%	779	38%	<b>2,063</b>
Fresno	8,215	71%	3,424	29%	<b>11,639</b>
Glenn	422	58%	310	42%	<b>732</b>
Humboldt	1,288	41%	1,828	59%	<b>3,116</b>
Imperial	1,695	75%	576	25%	<b>2,271</b>
Inyo	179	53%	161	47%	<b>340</b>
Kern	6,787	53%	5,902	47%	<b>12,689</b>
Kings	1,402	59%	981	41%	<b>2,383</b>
Lake	392	46%	453	54%	<b>845</b>
Lassen	290	50%	292	50%	<b>582</b>
Los Angeles	62,939	77%	18,456	23%	<b>81,395</b>
Madera	1,929	67%	960	33%	<b>2,889</b>
Marin	373	33%	753	67%	<b>1,126</b>
Mariposa	114	67%	55	33%	<b>169</b>
Mendocino	1,264	55%	1,053	45%	<b>2,317</b>
Merced	1,979	61%	1,274	39%	<b>3,253</b>
Modoc	244	57%	184	43%	<b>428</b>
Mono	122	52%	113	48%	<b>235</b>
Monterey	2,106	44%	2,648	56%	<b>4,754</b>
Napa	865	57%	654	43%	<b>1,519</b>
Nevada	839	52%	775	48%	<b>1,614</b>
Orange	11,543	38%	18,764	62%	<b>30,307</b>
Placer	1,346	42%	1,862	58%	<b>3,208</b>
Plumas	167	91%	16	9%	<b>183</b>
Riverside	23,526	84%	4,521	16%	<b>28,047</b>

Table 3

## Final SDM® Screening Decision

County	In-Person Response		Evaluate Out		N
	n	%	n	%	
Sacramento	10,375	46%	12,239	54%	<b>22,614</b>
San Benito	403	56%	321	44%	<b>724</b>
San Bernardino	22,244	77%	6,570	23%	<b>28,814</b>
San Diego	27,550	64%	15,261	36%	<b>42,811</b>
San Francisco	1,330	31%	2,945	69%	<b>4,275</b>
San Joaquin	4,654	53%	4,117	47%	<b>8,771</b>
San Luis Obispo	1,654	43%	2,233	57%	<b>3,887</b>
San Mateo	1,794	44%	2,239	56%	<b>4,033</b>
Santa Barbara	3,969	63%	2,345	37%	<b>6,314</b>
Santa Clara	8,675	77%	2,532	23%	<b>11,207</b>
Santa Cruz	1,405	54%	1,179	46%	<b>2,584</b>
Shasta	1,744	51%	1,679	49%	<b>3,423</b>
Sierra	24	71%	10	29%	<b>34</b>
Siskiyou	523	80%	127	20%	<b>650</b>
Solano	2,270	49%	2,409	51%	<b>4,679</b>
Sonoma	2,357	42%	3,300	58%	<b>5,657</b>
Stanislaus	2,723	45%	3,396	55%	<b>6,119</b>
Sutter	400	41%	565	59%	<b>965</b>
Tehama	654	41%	950	59%	<b>1,604</b>
Trinity	136	49%	139	51%	<b>275</b>
Tulare	5,572	65%	3,011	35%	<b>8,583</b>
Tuolumne	275	34%	523	66%	<b>798</b>
Ventura	4,544	45%	5,599	55%	<b>10,143</b>
Yolo	1,220	53%	1,069	47%	<b>2,289</b>
Yuba	380	38%	626	62%	<b>1,006</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>248,625</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>153,494</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>402,119</b>

Table 4

## SDM® Screening Overrides

County	No Override		Override to In-Person Response, No Criteria Selected		Override to Evaluate Out		N
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Alameda	7,180	85%	234	3%	1,005	12%	<b>8,419</b>
Alpine	59	91%	1	2%	5	8%	<b>65</b>
Amador	559	96%	8	1%	15	3%	<b>582</b>
Butte	2,743	94%	57	2%	107	4%	<b>2,907</b>
Calaveras	559	92%	37	6%	11	2%	<b>607</b>
Colusa	216	86%	10	4%	24	10%	<b>250</b>
Contra Costa	6,952	98%	81	1%	25	<1%	<b>7,058</b>
Del Norte	782	95%	26	3%	16	2%	<b>824</b>
El Dorado	1,886	96%	31	2%	43	2%	<b>1,960</b>
Fresno	9,389	83%	34	<1%	1,837	16%	<b>11,260</b>
Glenn	599	93%	10	2%	34	5%	<b>643</b>
Humboldt	2,526	96%	52	2%	49	2%	<b>2,627</b>
Imperial	2,181	97%	60	3%	15	1%	<b>2,256</b>
Inyo	261	92%	5	2%	19	7%	<b>285</b>
Kern	11,988	97%	4	<1%	385	3%	<b>12,377</b>
Kings	2,207	98%	13	1%	27	1%	<b>2,247</b>
Lake	793	99%	1	<1%	10	1%	<b>804</b>
Lassen	564	98%	1	<1%	8	1%	<b>573</b>
Los Angeles	70,923	95%	1,160	2%	2,574	3%	<b>74,657</b>
Madera	2,230	89%	35	1%	236	9%	<b>2,501</b>
Marin	1,069	99%	2	<1%	6	1%	<b>1,077</b>
Mariposa	154	94%	1	1%	8	5%	<b>163</b>
Mendocino	1,909	93%	4	<1%	132	6%	<b>2,045</b>
Merced	3,207	99%	5	<1%	16	<1%	<b>3,228</b>
Modoc	409	99%	0	0%	4	1%	<b>413</b>
Mono	189	92%	1	<1%	16	8%	<b>206</b>
Monterey	4,275	96%	98	2%	60	1%	<b>4,433</b>
Napa	1,361	98%	4	<1%	20	1%	<b>1,385</b>
Nevada	1,309	92%	16	1%	96	7%	<b>1,421</b>
Orange	25,844	98%	61	<1%	433	2%	<b>26,338</b>
Placer	3,051	99%	10	<1%	19	1%	<b>3,080</b>
Plumas	171	98%	0	0%	4	2%	<b>175</b>
Riverside	26,359	95%	401	1%	947	3%	<b>27,707</b>



Table 4

## SDM® Screening Overrides

County	No Override		Override to In-Person Response, No Criteria Selected		Override to Evaluate Out		N
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Sacramento	20,296	98%	81	<1%	285	1%	<b>20,662</b>
San Benito	628	95%	0	0%	35	5%	<b>663</b>
San Bernardino	24,379	95%	44	<1%	1,292	5%	<b>25,715</b>
San Diego	37,201	96%	371	1%	1,013	3%	<b>38,585</b>
San Francisco	3,876	98%	13	<1%	53	1%	<b>3,942</b>
San Joaquin	7,987	96%	210	3%	101	1%	<b>8,298</b>
San Luis Obispo	3,309	98%	7	<1%	73	2%	<b>3,389</b>
San Mateo	3,863	97%	75	2%	65	2%	<b>4,003</b>
Santa Barbara	5,476	93%	40	1%	379	6%	<b>5,895</b>
Santa Clara	10,364	93%	81	1%	673	6%	<b>11,118</b>
Santa Cruz	2,565	100%	0	0%	0	0%	<b>2,565</b>
Shasta	3,257	97%	25	1%	60	2%	<b>3,342</b>
Sierra	31	100%	0	0%	0	0%	<b>31</b>
Siskiyou	573	91%	0	0%	54	9%	<b>627</b>
Solano	4,303	97%	89	2%	32	1%	<b>4,424</b>
Sonoma	5,386	97%	20	<1%	159	3%	<b>5,565</b>
Stanislaus	5,666	96%	79	1%	157	3%	<b>5,902</b>
Sutter	871	94%	2	<1%	55	6%	<b>928</b>
Tehama	1,422	97%	21	1%	28	2%	<b>1,471</b>
Trinity	239	91%	3	1%	22	8%	<b>264</b>
Tulare	7,223	96%	124	2%	196	3%	<b>7,543</b>
Tuolumne	713	92%	3	<1%	55	7%	<b>771</b>
Ventura	8,405	96%	39	<1%	331	4%	<b>8,775</b>
Yolo	2,037	96%	27	1%	49	2%	<b>2,113</b>
Yuba	814	83%	28	3%	139	14%	<b>981</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>354,788</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>3,845</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>13,512</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>372,145</b>

Note: A total of 27 referrals were excluded from analysis due to an error in the assessment; this exclusion did not affect results. Additionally, referrals evaluated out during the preliminary screening are not included in this table as the override section was not complete for these referrals.

Table 5

## Final SDM® Response Priority Level

County	Immediate/24 Hours		10 Days*		N
	n	%	n	%	
Alameda	1,816	45%	2,181	55%	<b>3,997</b>
Alpine	9	26%	26	74%	<b>35</b>
Amador	94	35%	176	65%	<b>270</b>
Butte	295	31%	666	69%	<b>961</b>
Calaveras	149	45%	185	55%	<b>334</b>
Colusa	30	21%	116	79%	<b>146</b>
Contra Costa	667	18%	3,056	82%	<b>3,723</b>
Del Norte	146	29%	356	71%	<b>502</b>
El Dorado	247	20%	1,002	80%	<b>1,249</b>
Fresno	2,790	34%	5,377	66%	<b>8,167</b>
Glenn	72	17%	340	83%	<b>412</b>
Humboldt	258	21%	972	79%	<b>1,230</b>
Imperial	606	37%	1,029	63%	<b>1,635</b>
Inyo	34	20%	140	80%	<b>174</b>
Kern	2,484	37%	4,291	63%	<b>6,775</b>
Kings	604	44%	784	56%	<b>1,388</b>
Lake	132	34%	258	66%	<b>390</b>
Lassen	95	33%	194	67%	<b>289</b>
Los Angeles	14,463	23%	47,172	77%	<b>61,635</b>
Madera	522	28%	1,372	72%	<b>1,894</b>
Marin	84	23%	286	77%	<b>370</b>
Mariposa	35	31%	78	69%	<b>113</b>
Mendocino	223	18%	1,036	82%	<b>1,259</b>
Merced	901	46%	1,073	54%	<b>1,974</b>
Modoc	122	50%	122	50%	<b>244</b>
Mono	19	16%	102	84%	<b>121</b>
Monterey	698	35%	1,304	65%	<b>2,002</b>
Napa	187	22%	655	78%	<b>842</b>
Nevada	137	17%	686	83%	<b>823</b>
Orange	2,479	22%	8,980	78%	<b>11,459</b>
Placer	178	13%	1,158	87%	<b>1,336</b>
Plumas	16	10%	151	90%	<b>167</b>
Riverside	3,695	16%	19,429	84%	<b>23,124</b>
Sacramento	3,907	38%	6,381	62%	<b>10,288</b>

Table 5

## Final SDM® Response Priority Level

County	Immediate/24 Hours		10 Days*		N
	n	%	n	%	
San Benito	68	17%	335	83%	<b>403</b>
San Bernardino	2,697	12%	19,490	88%	<b>22,187</b>
San Diego	10,794	40%	16,375	60%	<b>27,169</b>
San Francisco	613	47%	698	53%	<b>1,311</b>
San Joaquin	1,128	25%	3,306	75%	<b>4,434</b>
San Luis Obispo	526	33%	1,058	67%	<b>1,584</b>
San Mateo	434	25%	1,284	75%	<b>1,718</b>
Santa Barbara	646	17%	3,267	83%	<b>3,913</b>
Santa Clara	2,928	34%	5,660	66%	<b>8,588</b>
Santa Cruz	370	26%	1,035	74%	<b>1,405</b>
Shasta	290	17%	1,427	83%	<b>1,717</b>
Siskiyou	54	10%	469	90%	<b>523</b>
Solano	777	36%	1,381	64%	<b>2,158</b>
Sonoma	657	28%	1,677	72%	<b>2,334</b>
Stanislaus	891	34%	1,752	66%	<b>2,643</b>
Sutter	88	22%	310	78%	<b>398</b>
Tehama	130	21%	503	79%	<b>633</b>
Trinity	26	20%	107	80%	<b>133</b>
Tulare	1,598	29%	3,850	71%	<b>5,448</b>
Tuolumne	66	24%	206	76%	<b>272</b>
Ventura	836	19%	3,668	81%	<b>4,504</b>
Yolo	409	34%	783	66%	<b>1,192</b>
Yuba	189	54%	163	46%	<b>352</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>64,412</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>179,959</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>244,371</b>

\*Five days in Los Angeles County.

Note: For counties with fewer than 25 assessments available for analysis, results are included in the total but not listed by county. Therefore, the sums of the columns do not equal the numbers in the "Total" row. Due to underlying issues in the assessment, 419 (<1%) response priority assessments were excluded from the analysis, which did not affect findings.

Table 6

## SDM® Response Priority Override Rate

County	No Override		Override to Immediate/24 Hours		Override to 10 Days*		N
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Alameda	3,226	81%	179	4%	592	15%	<b>3,997</b>
Alpine	29	83%	5	14%	1	3%	<b>35</b>
Amador	239	89%	14	5%	17	6%	<b>270</b>
Butte	866	90%	71	7%	24	2%	<b>961</b>
Calaveras	296	89%	22	7%	16	5%	<b>334</b>
Colusa	138	95%	4	3%	4	3%	<b>146</b>
Contra Costa	3,612	97%	68	2%	43	1%	<b>3,723</b>
Del Norte	467	93%	13	3%	22	4%	<b>502</b>
El Dorado	1,140	91%	48	4%	61	5%	<b>1,249</b>
Fresno	7,718	95%	282	3%	167	2%	<b>8,167</b>
Glenn	381	92%	23	6%	8	2%	<b>412</b>
Humboldt	1,124	91%	42	3%	64	5%	<b>1,230</b>
Imperial	1,594	97%	36	2%	5	<1%	<b>1,635</b>
Inyo	162	93%	8	5%	4	2%	<b>174</b>
Kern	5,888	87%	570	8%	317	5%	<b>6,775</b>
Kings	1,281	92%	54	4%	53	4%	<b>1,388</b>
Lake	362	93%	12	3%	16	4%	<b>390</b>
Lassen	264	91%	24	8%	1	<1%	<b>289</b>
Los Angeles	53,153	86%	1,562	3%	6,920	11%	<b>61,635</b>
Madera	1,746	92%	119	6%	29	2%	<b>1,894</b>
Marin	325	88%	4	1%	41	11%	<b>370</b>
Mariposa	103	91%	5	4%	5	4%	<b>113</b>
Mendocino	1,195	95%	42	3%	22	2%	<b>1,259</b>
Merced	1,759	89%	202	10%	13	1%	<b>1,974</b>
Modoc	190	78%	51	21%	3	1%	<b>244</b>
Mono	114	94%	4	3%	3	2%	<b>121</b>
Monterey	1,764	88%	139	7%	99	5%	<b>2,002</b>
Napa	793	94%	21	2%	28	3%	<b>842</b>
Nevada	787	96%	24	3%	12	1%	<b>823</b>
Orange	9,941	87%	247	2%	1,271	11%	<b>11,459</b>
Placer	1,285	96%	23	2%	28	2%	<b>1,336</b>
Plumas	164	98%	2	1%	1	1%	<b>167</b>
Riverside	21,679	94%	746	3%	699	3%	<b>23,124</b>

Table 6

## SDM® Response Priority Override Rate

County	No Override		Override to Immediate/24 Hours		Override to 10 Days*		N
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Sacramento	9,255	90%	265	3%	768	7%	<b>10,288</b>
San Benito	390	97%	7	2%	6	1%	<b>403</b>
San Bernardino	20,088	91%	468	2%	1,631	7%	<b>22,187</b>
San Diego	24,619	91%	1,299	5%	1,251	5%	<b>27,169</b>
San Francisco	1,208	92%	42	3%	61	5%	<b>1,311</b>
San Joaquin	3,783	85%	86	2%	565	13%	<b>4,434</b>
San Luis Obispo	1,426	90%	80	5%	78	5%	<b>1,584</b>
San Mateo	1,495	87%	35	2%	188	11%	<b>1,718</b>
Santa Barbara	3,742	96%	94	2%	77	2%	<b>3,913</b>
Santa Clara	7,476	87%	522	6%	590	7%	<b>8,588</b>
Santa Cruz	1,388	99%	10	1%	7	<1%	<b>1,405</b>
Shasta	1,575	92%	31	2%	111	6%	<b>1,717</b>
Siskiyou	507	97%	8	2%	8	2%	<b>523</b>
Solano	1,972	91%	71	3%	115	5%	<b>2,158</b>
Sonoma	2,128	91%	62	3%	144	6%	<b>2,334</b>
Stanislaus	2,418	91%	160	6%	65	2%	<b>2,643</b>
Sutter	385	97%	9	2%	4	1%	<b>398</b>
Tehama	598	94%	16	3%	19	3%	<b>633</b>
Trinity	109	82%	8	6%	16	12%	<b>133</b>
Tulare	4,857	89%	407	7%	184	3%	<b>5,448</b>
Tuolumne	257	94%	14	5%	1	<1%	<b>272</b>
Ventura	4,241	94%	158	4%	105	2%	<b>4,504</b>
Yolo	1,051	88%	128	11%	13	1%	<b>1,192</b>
Yuba	249	71%	87	25%	16	5%	<b>352</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>219,025</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>8,734</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>16,612</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>244,371</b>

\*Five days in Los Angeles County.

Note: For counties with fewer than 25 assessments available for analysis, results are included in the total but not listed by county. Therefore, the sums of the columns do not equal the numbers in the "Total" row. Due to underlying issues in the assessment, 419 (<1%) response priority assessments were excluded from the analysis, which did not affect findings.

Table 7

## SDM® Safety Assessment Completion Rate

County	Completed		Not Completed		N
	n	%	n	%	
Alameda	3,676	86%	619	14%	<b>4,295</b>
Alpine	29	81%	7	19%	<b>36</b>
Amador	220	79%	57	21%	<b>277</b>
Butte	643	73%	234	27%	<b>877</b>
Calaveras	287	86%	48	14%	<b>335</b>
Colusa	107	73%	39	27%	<b>146</b>
Contra Costa	2,525	69%	1,115	31%	<b>3,640</b>
Del Norte	391	87%	57	13%	<b>448</b>
El Dorado	929	81%	224	19%	<b>1,153</b>
Fresno	6,392	81%	1,541	19%	<b>7,933</b>
Glenn	264	70%	112	30%	<b>376</b>
Humboldt	995	83%	211	17%	<b>1,206</b>
Imperial	1,125	74%	399	26%	<b>1,524</b>
Inyo	131	62%	80	38%	<b>211</b>
Kern	5,235	93%	383	7%	<b>5,618</b>
Kings	1,069	83%	223	17%	<b>1,292</b>
Lake	264	70%	111	30%	<b>375</b>
Lassen	218	82%	49	18%	<b>267</b>
Los Angeles	51,355	87%	7,827	13%	<b>59,182</b>
Madera	1,385	82%	296	18%	<b>1,681</b>
Marin	332	93%	26	7%	<b>358</b>
Mariposa	86	77%	25	23%	<b>111</b>
Mendocino	881	80%	223	20%	<b>1,104</b>
Merced	1,719	91%	175	9%	<b>1,894</b>
Modoc	214	95%	11	5%	<b>225</b>
Mono	95	90%	10	10%	<b>105</b>
Monterey	1,765	89%	211	11%	<b>1,976</b>
Napa	631	85%	108	15%	<b>739</b>
Nevada	524	81%	124	19%	<b>648</b>
Orange	9,892	87%	1,435	13%	<b>11,327</b>
Placer	861	87%	127	13%	<b>988</b>
Plumas	116	68%	54	32%	<b>170</b>
Riverside	18,815	89%	2,301	11%	<b>21,116</b>
Sacramento	8,553	90%	997	10%	<b>9,550</b>

Table 7

## SDM® Safety Assessment Completion Rate

County	Completed		Not Completed		N
	n	%	n	%	
San Benito	325	90%	35	10%	<b>360</b>
San Bernardino	14,900	88%	2,015	12%	<b>16,915</b>
San Diego	18,646	88%	2,471	12%	<b>21,117</b>
San Francisco	1,174	92%	100	8%	<b>1,274</b>
San Joaquin	3,690	86%	594	14%	<b>4,284</b>
San Luis Obispo	1,402	88%	197	12%	<b>1,599</b>
San Mateo	1,279	76%	407	24%	<b>1,686</b>
Santa Barbara	3,554	96%	160	4%	<b>3,714</b>
Santa Clara	7,515	90%	848	10%	<b>8,363</b>
Santa Cruz	1,227	90%	138	10%	<b>1,365</b>
Shasta	1,581	89%	195	11%	<b>1,776</b>
Siskiyou	464	97%	12	3%	<b>476</b>
Solano	1,733	83%	358	17%	<b>2,091</b>
Sonoma	1,806	84%	341	16%	<b>2,147</b>
Stanislaus	2,040	76%	649	24%	<b>2,689</b>
Sutter	233	75%	76	25%	<b>309</b>
Tehama	559	91%	57	9%	<b>616</b>
Trinity	105	93%	8	7%	<b>113</b>
Tulare	4,348	80%	1,060	20%	<b>5,408</b>
Tuolumne	239	97%	8	3%	<b>247</b>
Ventura	3,705	88%	518	12%	<b>4,223</b>
Yolo	928	79%	246	21%	<b>1,174</b>
Yuba	251	68%	116	32%	<b>367</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>193,443</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>30,074</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>223,517</b>

Note: For counties with fewer than 25 assessments available for analysis, results are included in the total but not listed by county. Therefore, the sums of the columns do not equal the numbers in the "Total" row. The safety assessment completion rates shown include only assessments completed for allegation households.

Table 8

## SDM® Safety Assessment Results

County	Safe		Safe With Plan		Unsafe		N
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Alameda	3,054	83%	315	9%	307	8%	<b>3,676</b>
Alpine	22	76%	6	21%	1	3%	<b>29</b>
Amador	178	81%	31	14%	11	5%	<b>220</b>
Butte	391	61%	130	20%	122	19%	<b>643</b>
Calaveras	203	71%	59	21%	25	9%	<b>287</b>
Colusa	64	60%	26	24%	17	16%	<b>107</b>
Contra Costa	1,884	75%	444	18%	197	8%	<b>2,525</b>
Del Norte	324	83%	41	10%	26	7%	<b>391</b>
El Dorado	688	74%	175	19%	66	7%	<b>929</b>
Fresno	5,156	81%	701	11%	535	8%	<b>6,392</b>
Glenn	187	71%	42	16%	35	13%	<b>264</b>
Humboldt	841	85%	50	5%	104	10%	<b>995</b>
Imperial	808	72%	129	11%	188	17%	<b>1,125</b>
Inyo	89	68%	41	31%	1	1%	<b>131</b>
Kern	4,523	86%	377	7%	335	6%	<b>5,235</b>
Kings	807	75%	172	16%	90	8%	<b>1,069</b>
Lake	159	60%	78	30%	27	10%	<b>264</b>
Lassen	150	69%	42	19%	26	12%	<b>218</b>
Los Angeles	41,947	82%	6,941	14%	2,467	5%	<b>51,355</b>
Madera	1,193	86%	93	7%	99	7%	<b>1,385</b>
Marin	224	67%	93	28%	15	5%	<b>332</b>
Mariposa	68	79%	14	16%	4	5%	<b>86</b>
Mendocino	648	74%	174	20%	59	7%	<b>881</b>
Merced	1,351	79%	219	13%	149	9%	<b>1,719</b>
Modoc	171	80%	26	12%	17	8%	<b>214</b>
Mono	67	71%	27	28%	1	1%	<b>95</b>
Monterey	1,349	76%	300	17%	116	7%	<b>1,765</b>
Napa	504	80%	76	12%	51	8%	<b>631</b>
Nevada	464	89%	40	8%	20	4%	<b>524</b>
Orange	8,481	86%	804	8%	607	6%	<b>9,892</b>
Placer	597	69%	230	27%	34	4%	<b>861</b>
Plumas	67	58%	44	38%	5	4%	<b>116</b>
Riverside	17,117	91%	1,353	7%	345	2%	<b>18,815</b>
Sacramento	5,291	62%	2,839	33%	423	5%	<b>8,553</b>



Table 8

## SDM® Safety Assessment Results

County	Safe		Safe With Plan		Unsafe		N
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
San Benito	265	82%	40	12%	20	6%	<b>325</b>
San Bernardino	12,131	81%	1,480	10%	1,289	9%	<b>14,900</b>
San Diego	16,482	88%	1,649	9%	515	3%	<b>18,646</b>
San Francisco	753	64%	268	23%	153	13%	<b>1,174</b>
San Joaquin	3,090	84%	404	11%	196	5%	<b>3,690</b>
San Luis Obispo	806	57%	482	34%	114	8%	<b>1,402</b>
San Mateo	1,125	88%	115	9%	39	3%	<b>1,279</b>
Santa Barbara	3,269	92%	199	6%	86	2%	<b>3,554</b>
Santa Clara	5,765	77%	1,410	19%	340	5%	<b>7,515</b>
Santa Cruz	951	78%	229	19%	47	4%	<b>1,227</b>
Shasta	962	61%	504	32%	115	7%	<b>1,581</b>
Siskiyou	370	80%	65	14%	29	6%	<b>464</b>
Solano	1,398	81%	222	13%	113	7%	<b>1,733</b>
Sonoma	1,378	76%	329	18%	99	5%	<b>1,806</b>
Stanislaus	1,737	85%	151	7%	152	7%	<b>2,040</b>
Sutter	162	70%	52	22%	19	8%	<b>233</b>
Tehama	396	71%	119	21%	44	8%	<b>559</b>
Trinity	44	42%	52	50%	9	9%	<b>105</b>
Tulare	3,445	79%	704	16%	199	5%	<b>4,348</b>
Tuolumne	123	51%	88	37%	28	12%	<b>239</b>
Ventura	3,118	84%	448	12%	139	4%	<b>3,705</b>
Yolo	588	63%	230	25%	110	12%	<b>928</b>
Yuba	76	30%	133	53%	42	17%	<b>251</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>157,511</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>25,510</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>10,422</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>193,443</b>

Note: Results for counties with fewer than 25 investigations available for analysis are included in the total but not listed by county. Therefore, the sums of the columns do not equal the numbers in the "Total" row.

Table 9

## Three Most Prevalent Safety Threats Identified in Removal Households

Safety Threat	n	%
<b>Alameda (N = 307)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met*	186	61%
Physical harm†	100	33%
Caregiver unable or unwilling to protect‡	72	23%
<b>Butte (N = 122)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	77	63%
Hazardous living conditions§	57	47%
Physical harm	48	39%
<b>Calaveras (N = 25)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	13	52%
Physical harm	12	48%
Hazardous living conditions	8	32%
<b>Contra Costa (N = 197)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	106	54%
Caregiver unable or unwilling to protect	69	35%
Physical harm	67	34%
<b>Del Norte (N = 26)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	12	46%
Physical harm	11	42%
Previous maltreatment**	5	19%
Hazardous living conditions	5	19%
<b>El Dorado (N = 66)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	35	53%
Previous maltreatment	21	32%
Physical harm	20	30%
Caregiver unable or unwilling to protect	20	30%
<b>Fresno (N = 535)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	310	58%
Physical harm	195	36%
Caregiver unable or unwilling to protect	151	28%
<b>Glenn (N = 35)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	25	71%
Hazardous living conditions	18	51%
Caregiver unable or unwilling to protect	16	46%

Table 9

## Three Most Prevalent Safety Threats Identified in Removal Households

Safety Threat	n	%
<b>Humboldt (N = 104)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	63	61%
Physical harm	36	35%
Caregiver unable or unwilling to protect	21	20%
<b>Imperial (N = 188)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	110	59%
Hazardous living conditions	49	26%
Caregiver unable or unwilling to protect	48	26%
<b>Kern (N = 335)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	186	56%
Physical harm	119	36%
Hazardous living conditions	79	24%
<b>Kings (N = 90)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	47	52%
Physical harm	33	37%
Caregiver unable or unwilling to protect	31	34%
<b>Lake (N = 27)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	14	52%
Physical harm	10	37%
Hazardous living conditions	10	37%
<b>Lassen (N = 26)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	17	65%
Hazardous living conditions	9	35%
Physical harm	7	27%
<b>Los Angeles (N = 2,467)</b>		
Physical harm	1,067	43%
Child immediate needs not met	1,054	43%
Other	621	25%
<b>Madera (N = 99)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	51	52%
Physical harm	36	36%
Caregiver unable or unwilling to protect	36	36%
<b>Mendocino (N = 59)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	37	63%
Caregiver unable or unwilling to protect	22	37%
Physical harm	20	34%

Table 9

## Three Most Prevalent Safety Threats Identified in Removal Households

Safety Threat	n	%
<b>Merced (N = 149)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	105	70%
Caregiver unable or unwilling to protect	61	41%
Physical harm	60	40%
<b>Monterey (N = 116)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	65	56%
Physical harm	48	41%
Caregiver unable or unwilling to protect	30	26%
<b>Napa (N = 51)</b>		
Caregiver unable or unwilling to protect	38	75%
Physical harm	29	57%
Child immediate needs not met	27	53%
<b>Orange (N = 607)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	267	44%
Physical harm	234	39%
Caregiver unable or unwilling to protect	135	22%
<b>Placer (N = 34)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	16	47%
Physical harm	12	35%
Previous maltreatment	12	35%
Caregiver unable or unwilling to protect	12	35%
<b>Riverside (N = 345)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	216	63%
Physical harm	161	47%
Caregiver unable or unwilling to protect	103	30%
<b>Sacramento (N = 423)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	194	46%
Physical harm	190	45%
Caregiver unable or unwilling to protect	101	24%
<b>San Bernardino (N = 1,289)</b>		
Physical harm	618	48%
Child immediate needs not met	594	46%
Caregiver unable or unwilling to protect	449	35%
<b>San Diego (N = 515)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	266	52%
Physical harm	175	34%
Caregiver unable or unwilling to protect	108	21%

Table 9

## Three Most Prevalent Safety Threats Identified in Removal Households

Safety Threat	n	%
<b>San Francisco (N = 153)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	104	68%
Physical harm	60	39%
Previous maltreatment	27	18%
<b>San Joaquin (N = 196)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	114	58%
Physical harm	82	42%
Hazardous living conditions	39	20%
<b>San Luis Obispo (N = 114)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	67	59%
Physical harm	43	38%
Caregiver unable or unwilling to protect	36	32%
Other	36	32%
<b>San Mateo (N = 39)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	16	41%
Physical harm	10	26%
Caregiver unable or unwilling to protect	8	21%
<b>Santa Barbara (N = 86)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	55	64%
Caregiver unable or unwilling to protect	24	28%
Physical harm	22	26%
<b>Santa Clara (N = 340)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	183	54%
Physical harm	125	37%
Caregiver unable or unwilling to protect	119	35%
<b>Santa Cruz (N = 47)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	28	60%
Physical harm	13	28%
Previous maltreatment	10	21%
<b>Shasta (N = 115)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	72	63%
Previous maltreatment	44	38%
Physical harm	38	33%
<b>Siskiyou (N = 29)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	17	59%
Caregiver unable or unwilling to protect	15	52%
Hazardous living conditions	11	38%

Table 9

## Three Most Prevalent Safety Threats Identified in Removal Households

Safety Threat	n	%
<b>Solano (N = 113)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	68	60%
Physical harm	31	27%
Hazardous living conditions	29	26%
<b>Sonoma (N = 99)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	48	48%
Physical harm	39	39%
Caregiver unable or unwilling to protect	30	30%
<b>Stanislaus (N = 152)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	75	49%
Physical harm	58	38%
Previous maltreatment	39	26%
<b>Tehama (N = 44)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	34	77%
Physical harm	21	48%
Hazardous living conditions	16	36%
<b>Tulare (N = 199)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	86	43%
Physical harm	68	34%
Hazardous living conditions	54	27%
<b>Tuolumne (N = 28)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	18	64%
Previous maltreatment	10	36%
Hazardous living conditions	10	36%
<b>Ventura (N = 139)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	79	57%
Physical harm	66	47%
Hazardous living conditions	37	27%
<b>Yolo (N = 110)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	69	63%
Physical harm	55	50%
Caregiver unable or unwilling to protect	55	50%
<b>Yuba (N = 42)</b>		
Child immediate needs not met	25	60%
Physical harm	22	52%
Hazardous living conditions	14	33%

**Table 9**

**Three Most Prevalent Safety Threats Identified in Removal Households**

Safety Threat	n	%
<b>COMBINED (N = 10,422; includes all safety threats on the assessment and all counties in the state)</b>		
<b>Child Immediate Needs Not Met</b>	<b>5,335</b>	<b>51%</b>
<b>Physical Harm</b>	<b>4,174</b>	<b>40%</b>
<b>Caregiver Unable or Unwilling to Protect</b>	<b>2,809</b>	<b>27%</b>

Note: Results for counties with fewer than 25 assessments completed during the period are included in the total but not listed by county. Therefore, the rows in the table do not add up to the combined totals.

\*3. Caregiver does not meet the child’s immediate needs for supervision, food, clothing, and/or medical or mental health care.

†1. Caregiver caused serious physical harm to the child or made a plausible threat to cause serious physical harm in the current investigation . . .

#6. Caregiver is unable OR unwilling to protect the child from serious harm or threatened harm by others. This may include physical abuse, sexual abuse, or neglect.

§4. The physical living conditions are hazardous and immediately threatening to the health and/or safety of the child.

\*\*9. Current circumstances, combined with information that the caregiver has or may have previously maltreated a child in his/her care, suggest that the child’s safety may be of immediate concern based on the severity of the previous maltreatment or the caregiver’s response to the previous incident.

Table 10

## SDM® Risk Assessment Completion Rate: Substantiated and Inconclusive Investigations

County	Completed		Not Completed		N
	n	%	n	%	
Alameda	1,280	94%	81	6%	<b>1,361</b>
Amador	113	97%	3	3%	<b>116</b>
Butte	427	77%	130	23%	<b>557</b>
Calaveras	147	76%	47	24%	<b>194</b>
Colusa	58	81%	14	19%	<b>72</b>
Contra Costa	1,001	88%	143	13%	<b>1,144</b>
Del Norte	243	100%	1	<1%	<b>244</b>
El Dorado	607	95%	32	5%	<b>639</b>
Fresno	3,229	90%	360	10%	<b>3,589</b>
Glenn	160	86%	27	14%	<b>187</b>
Humboldt	426	95%	23	5%	<b>449</b>
Imperial	621	84%	114	16%	<b>735</b>
Kern	2,741	96%	111	4%	<b>2,852</b>
Kings	651	96%	25	4%	<b>676</b>
Lake	210	80%	51	20%	<b>261</b>
Lassen	96	99%	1	1%	<b>97</b>
Los Angeles	41,831	96%	1,577	4%	<b>43,408</b>
Madera	635	94%	40	6%	<b>675</b>
Marin	281	96%	11	4%	<b>292</b>
Mariposa	14	50%	14	50%	<b>28</b>
Mendocino	632	96%	23	4%	<b>655</b>
Merced	408	61%	256	39%	<b>664</b>
Modoc	60	90%	7	10%	<b>67</b>
Mono	48	80%	12	20%	<b>60</b>
Monterey	719	95%	38	5%	<b>757</b>
Napa	294	95%	14	5%	<b>308</b>
Nevada	290	94%	20	6%	<b>310</b>
Orange	5,900	98%	131	2%	<b>6,031</b>
Placer	476	90%	52	10%	<b>528</b>
Plumas	39	36%	68	64%	<b>107</b>
Riverside	7,359	95%	380	5%	<b>7,739</b>



Table 10

## SDM® Risk Assessment Completion Rate: Substantiated and Inconclusive Investigations

County	Completed		Not Completed		N
	n	%	n	%	
Sacramento	5,456	93%	391	7%	<b>5,847</b>
San Benito	98	84%	18	16%	<b>116</b>
San Bernardino	4,894	86%	799	14%	<b>5,693</b>
San Diego	10,127	96%	389	4%	<b>10,516</b>
San Francisco	481	86%	80	14%	<b>561</b>
San Joaquin	2,642	93%	205	7%	<b>2,847</b>
San Luis Obispo	664	97%	19	3%	<b>683</b>
San Mateo	443	88%	61	12%	<b>504</b>
Santa Barbara	1,323	95%	68	5%	<b>1,391</b>
Santa Clara	4,940	95%	240	5%	<b>5,180</b>
Santa Cruz	846	97%	24	3%	<b>870</b>
Shasta	946	97%	29	3%	<b>975</b>
Siskiyou	375	98%	7	2%	<b>382</b>
Solano	640	83%	133	17%	<b>773</b>
Sonoma	1,044	88%	145	12%	<b>1,189</b>
Stanislaus	1,628	94%	103	6%	<b>1,731</b>
Sutter	109	68%	52	32%	<b>161</b>
Tehama	210	63%	125	37%	<b>335</b>
Trinity	81	99%	1	1%	<b>82</b>
Tulare	1,430	98%	31	2%	<b>1,461</b>
Tuolumne	139	88%	19	12%	<b>158</b>
Ventura	1,880	95%	93	5%	<b>1,973</b>
Yolo	620	86%	104	14%	<b>724</b>
Yuba	191	78%	53	22%	<b>244</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>112,233</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>6,997</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>119,230</b>

Note: Results for counties with fewer than 25 investigations available for analysis are included in the total but not listed by county. Therefore, the sums of the columns do not equal the numbers in the "Total" row.

Table 11

## Final SDM® Risk Level

County	Low		Moderate		High		Very High		N
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Alameda	253	20%	603	47%	304	24%	120	9%	<b>1,280</b>
Amador	10	9%	55	49%	29	26%	19	17%	<b>113</b>
Butte	33	8%	174	41%	142	33%	78	18%	<b>427</b>
Calaveras	15	10%	68	46%	46	31%	18	12%	<b>147</b>
Colusa	6	10%	21	36%	17	29%	14	24%	<b>58</b>
Contra Costa	181	18%	473	47%	263	26%	84	8%	<b>1,001</b>
Del Norte	31	13%	94	39%	90	37%	28	12%	<b>243</b>
El Dorado	88	14%	323	53%	156	26%	40	7%	<b>607</b>
Fresno	484	15%	1,504	47%	926	29%	315	10%	<b>3,229</b>
Glenn	17	11%	47	29%	61	38%	35	22%	<b>160</b>
Humboldt	35	8%	126	30%	171	40%	94	22%	<b>426</b>
Imperial	127	20%	266	43%	162	26%	66	11%	<b>621</b>
Kern	240	9%	1,108	40%	946	35%	447	16%	<b>2,741</b>
Kings	144	22%	269	41%	189	29%	49	8%	<b>651</b>
Lake	22	10%	101	48%	74	35%	13	6%	<b>210</b>
Lassen	9	9%	31	32%	39	41%	17	18%	<b>96</b>
Los Angeles	6,379	15%	17,770	42%	13,293	32%	4,389	10%	<b>41,831</b>
Madera	153	24%	290	46%	144	23%	48	8%	<b>635</b>
Marin	43	15%	169	60%	46	16%	23	8%	<b>281</b>
Mendocino	62	10%	277	44%	213	34%	80	13%	<b>632</b>
Merced	55	13%	208	51%	99	24%	46	11%	<b>408</b>
Modoc	1	2%	15	25%	27	45%	17	28%	<b>60</b>
Mono	11	23%	21	44%	11	23%	5	10%	<b>48</b>
Monterey	110	15%	352	49%	177	25%	80	11%	<b>719</b>
Napa	41	14%	135	46%	90	31%	28	10%	<b>294</b>
Nevada	62	21%	153	53%	60	21%	15	5%	<b>290</b>
Orange	1,467	25%	2,681	45%	1,385	23%	367	6%	<b>5,900</b>
Placer	59	12%	240	50%	136	29%	41	9%	<b>476</b>
Plumas	5	13%	19	49%	9	23%	6	15%	<b>39</b>
Riverside	1,086	15%	3,509	48%	2,124	29%	640	9%	<b>7,359</b>
Sacramento	781	14%	2,612	48%	1,576	29%	487	9%	<b>5,456</b>

Table 11

## Final SDM® Risk Level

County	Low		Moderate		High		Very High		N
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
San Benito	8	8%	47	48%	32	33%	11	11%	<b>98</b>
San Bernardino	731	15%	2,117	43%	1,418	29%	628	13%	<b>4,894</b>
San Diego	1,755	17%	4,688	46%	2,882	28%	802	8%	<b>10,127</b>
San Francisco	50	10%	160	33%	169	35%	102	21%	<b>481</b>
San Joaquin	590	22%	1,389	53%	519	20%	144	5%	<b>2,642</b>
San Luis Obispo	70	11%	257	39%	254	38%	83	13%	<b>664</b>
San Mateo	97	22%	212	48%	97	22%	37	8%	<b>443</b>
Santa Barbara	288	22%	647	49%	305	23%	83	6%	<b>1,323</b>
Santa Clara	959	19%	2,378	48%	1,225	25%	378	8%	<b>4,940</b>
Santa Cruz	127	15%	416	49%	238	28%	65	8%	<b>846</b>
Shasta	98	10%	421	45%	312	33%	115	12%	<b>946</b>
Siskiyou	60	16%	204	54%	82	22%	29	8%	<b>375</b>
Solano	115	18%	330	52%	155	24%	40	6%	<b>640</b>
Sonoma	106	10%	505	48%	313	30%	120	11%	<b>1,044</b>
Stanislaus	349	21%	820	50%	339	21%	120	7%	<b>1,628</b>
Sutter	13	12%	55	50%	32	29%	9	8%	<b>109</b>
Tehama	28	13%	91	43%	62	30%	29	14%	<b>210</b>
Trinity	4	5%	32	40%	33	41%	12	15%	<b>81</b>
Tulare	190	13%	593	41%	487	34%	160	11%	<b>1,430</b>
Tuolumne	12	9%	51	37%	56	40%	20	14%	<b>139</b>
Ventura	289	15%	979	52%	501	27%	111	6%	<b>1,880</b>
Yolo	110	18%	274	44%	164	26%	72	12%	<b>620</b>
Yuba	22	12%	104	54%	47	25%	18	9%	<b>191</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>18,083</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>50,506</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>32,740</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>10,904</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>112,233</b>

Note: Results for counties with fewer than 25 investigations available for analysis are included in the total but not listed by county. Therefore, the sums of the columns do not equal the numbers in the "Total" row.

Table 12

## SDM® Risk Assessment Override Rate

County	No Override		Policy Override		Discretionary Override		N
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Alameda	1,196	93%	34	3%	50	4%	<b>1,280</b>
Amador	111	98%	1	1%	1	1%	<b>113</b>
Butte	401	94%	8	2%	18	4%	<b>427</b>
Calaveras	146	99%	1	1%	0	0%	<b>147</b>
Colusa	56	97%	0	0%	2	3%	<b>58</b>
Contra Costa	949	95%	15	1%	37	4%	<b>1,001</b>
Del Norte	241	99%	0	0%	2	1%	<b>243</b>
El Dorado	600	99%	1	<1%	6	1%	<b>607</b>
Fresno	3,174	98%	25	1%	30	1%	<b>3,229</b>
Glenn	160	100%	0	0%	0	0%	<b>160</b>
Humboldt	400	94%	8	2%	18	4%	<b>426</b>
Imperial	577	93%	4	1%	40	6%	<b>621</b>
Kern	2,666	97%	22	1%	53	2%	<b>2,741</b>
Kings	640	98%	3	<1%	8	1%	<b>651</b>
Lake	205	98%	1	<1%	4	2%	<b>210</b>
Lassen	93	97%	3	3%	0	0%	<b>96</b>
Los Angeles	38,545	92%	305	1%	2,981	7%	<b>41,831</b>
Madera	612	96%	3	<1%	20	3%	<b>635</b>
Marin	271	96%	2	1%	8	3%	<b>281</b>
Mendocino	614	97%	0	0%	18	3%	<b>632</b>
Merced	398	98%	1	<1%	9	2%	<b>408</b>
Modoc	59	98%	0	0%	1	2%	<b>60</b>
Mono	47	98%	0	0%	1	2%	<b>48</b>
Monterey	691	96%	11	2%	17	2%	<b>719</b>
Napa	284	97%	2	1%	8	3%	<b>294</b>
Nevada	287	99%	0	0%	3	1%	<b>290</b>
Orange	5,511	93%	52	1%	337	6%	<b>5,900</b>
Placer	470	99%	1	<1%	5	1%	<b>476</b>
Plumas	37	95%	0	0%	2	5%	<b>39</b>
Riverside	7,180	98%	31	<1%	148	2%	<b>7,359</b>
Sacramento	5,290	97%	28	1%	138	3%	<b>5,456</b>

Table 12

## SDM® Risk Assessment Override Rate

County	No Override		Policy Override		Discretionary Override		N
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
San Benito	96	98%	2	2%	0	0%	<b>98</b>
San Bernardino	4,544	93%	103	2%	247	5%	<b>4,894</b>
San Diego	9,914	98%	45	<1%	168	2%	<b>10,127</b>
San Francisco	441	92%	7	1%	33	7%	<b>481</b>
San Joaquin	2,590	98%	10	<1%	42	2%	<b>2,642</b>
San Luis Obispo	650	98%	1	<1%	13	2%	<b>664</b>
San Mateo	426	96%	8	2%	9	2%	<b>443</b>
Santa Barbara	1,279	97%	5	<1%	39	3%	<b>1,323</b>
Santa Clara	4,607	93%	44	1%	289	6%	<b>4,940</b>
Santa Cruz	841	99%	1	<1%	4	<1%	<b>846</b>
Shasta	924	98%	19	2%	3	<1%	<b>946</b>
Siskiyou	374	100%	0	0%	1	<1%	<b>375</b>
Solano	621	97%	6	1%	13	2%	<b>640</b>
Sonoma	990	95%	14	1%	40	4%	<b>1,044</b>
Stanislaus	1,591	98%	4	<1%	33	2%	<b>1,628</b>
Sutter	109	100%	0	0%	0	0%	<b>109</b>
Tehama	198	94%	6	3%	6	3%	<b>210</b>
Trinity	75	93%	0	0%	6	7%	<b>81</b>
Tulare	1,391	97%	10	1%	29	2%	<b>1,430</b>
Tuolumne	135	97%	0	0%	4	3%	<b>139</b>
Ventura	1,826	97%	5	<1%	49	3%	<b>1,880</b>
Yolo	577	93%	5	1%	38	6%	<b>620</b>
Yuba	183	96%	2	1%	6	3%	<b>191</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>106,336</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>859</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>5,038</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>112,233</b>

Note: Results for counties with fewer than 25 investigations available for analysis are included in the total but not listed by county. Therefore, the sums of the columns do not equal the numbers in the "Total" row.

Table 13

## SDM® Family Strengths and Needs Assessment Completion Rate

County	Completed Within 60 Days and Prior to Case Plan		Completed Within 60 Days		Not Completed Within 60 Days		N
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Alameda	227	44%	63	12%	223	43%	<b>513</b>
Amador	18	60%	2	7%	10	33%	<b>30</b>
Butte	13	6%	0	0%	220	94%	<b>233</b>
Calaveras	43	52%	6	7%	33	40%	<b>82</b>
Colusa	1	2%	0	0%	48	98%	<b>49</b>
Contra Costa	44	10%	21	5%	398	86%	<b>463</b>
Del Norte	9	16%	3	5%	45	79%	<b>57</b>
El Dorado	8	5%	1	1%	152	94%	<b>161</b>
Fresno	686	58%	248	21%	243	21%	<b>1,177</b>
Glenn	3	4%	1	1%	68	94%	<b>72</b>
Humboldt	6	2%	0	0%	377	98%	<b>383</b>
Imperial	244	74%	28	9%	56	17%	<b>328</b>
Kern	662	76%	68	8%	140	16%	<b>870</b>
Kings	87	35%	14	6%	145	59%	<b>246</b>
Lake	5	16%	0	0%	27	84%	<b>32</b>
Lassen	1	3%	0	0%	28	97%	<b>29</b>
Los Angeles	12,508	70%	796	4%	4,674	26%	<b>17,978</b>
Madera	48	20%	1	<1%	192	80%	<b>241</b>
Marin	40	69%	8	14%	10	17%	<b>58</b>
Mendocino	8	6%	3	2%	125	92%	<b>136</b>
Merced	217	55%	41	10%	137	35%	<b>395</b>
Monterey	99	31%	20	6%	196	62%	<b>315</b>
Napa	46	43%	1	1%	59	56%	<b>106</b>
Nevada	30	50%	2	3%	28	47%	<b>60</b>
Orange	1,090	64%	136	8%	471	28%	<b>1,697</b>
Placer	16	12%	3	2%	117	86%	<b>136</b>
Plumas	2	4%	0	0%	55	96%	<b>57</b>
Riverside	619	41%	96	6%	798	53%	<b>1,513</b>
Sacramento	878	61%	175	12%	387	27%	<b>1,440</b>
San Benito	9	30%	4	13%	17	57%	<b>30</b>
San Bernardino	2,073	63%	357	11%	874	26%	<b>3,304</b>
San Diego	796	55%	120	8%	542	37%	<b>1,458</b>
San Francisco	270	63%	48	11%	114	26%	<b>432</b>
San Joaquin	205	39%	64	12%	255	49%	<b>524</b>
San Luis Obispo	65	36%	0	0%	118	64%	<b>183</b>

Table 13

## SDM® Family Strengths and Needs Assessment Completion Rate

County	Completed Within 60 Days and Prior to Case Plan		Completed Within 60 Days		Not Completed Within 60 Days		N
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
San Mateo	43	42%	21	21%	38	37%	<b>102</b>
Santa Barbara	57	20%	13	5%	211	75%	<b>281</b>
Santa Clara	655	41%	434	27%	525	33%	<b>1,614</b>
Santa Cruz	42	40%	3	3%	59	57%	<b>104</b>
Shasta	3	2%	0	0%	189	98%	<b>192</b>
Siskiyou	0	0%	0	0%	55	100%	<b>55</b>
Solano	112	52%	18	8%	85	40%	<b>215</b>
Sonoma	109	24%	24	5%	328	71%	<b>461</b>
Stanislaus	317	59%	20	4%	197	37%	<b>534</b>
Sutter	11	13%	2	2%	69	84%	<b>82</b>
Tehama	6	7%	1	1%	77	92%	<b>84</b>
Trinity	7	26%	2	7%	18	67%	<b>27</b>
Tulare	124	19%	65	10%	461	71%	<b>650</b>
Tuolumne	0	0%	1	2%	43	98%	<b>44</b>
Ventura	251	59%	27	6%	148	35%	<b>426</b>
Yolo	128	36%	75	21%	153	43%	<b>356</b>
Yuba	0	0%	0	0%	109	100%	<b>109</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>22,945</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>3,039</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>14,194</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>40,178</b>

Note: Results for counties with fewer than 25 investigations available for analysis are included in the total but not listed by county. Therefore, the sums of the columns do not equal the numbers in the "Total" row.

Table 14

## SDM® Risk Reassessment Completion Rate

County	Not Completed		Completed		N
	n	%	n	%	
Alameda	136	33%	274	67%	<b>410</b>
Amador	7	26%	20	74%	<b>27</b>
Butte	96	76%	30	24%	<b>126</b>
Calaveras	8	21%	31	79%	<b>39</b>
Colusa	20	80%	5	20%	<b>25</b>
Contra Costa	104	35%	190	65%	<b>294</b>
Del Norte	25	66%	13	34%	<b>38</b>
El Dorado	70	85%	12	15%	<b>82</b>
Fresno	188	39%	294	61%	<b>482</b>
Glenn	12	48%	13	52%	<b>25</b>
Humboldt	24	22%	87	78%	<b>111</b>
Imperial	52	41%	76	59%	<b>128</b>
Kern	72	14%	452	86%	<b>524</b>
Kings	50	42%	68	58%	<b>118</b>
Los Angeles	3,834	30%	8,767	70%	<b>12,601</b>
Madera	47	36%	84	64%	<b>131</b>
Marin	19	51%	18	49%	<b>37</b>
Mariposa	14	52%	13	48%	<b>27</b>
Mendocino	32	32%	67	68%	<b>99</b>
Merced	15	9%	154	91%	<b>169</b>
Monterey	84	32%	179	68%	<b>263</b>
Napa	21	21%	78	79%	<b>99</b>
Nevada	32	94%	2	6%	<b>34</b>
Orange	253	26%	716	74%	<b>969</b>
Placer	80	86%	13	14%	<b>93</b>
Plumas	28	62%	17	38%	<b>45</b>
Riverside	496	49%	507	51%	<b>1,003</b>



Table 14

## SDM® Risk Reassessment Completion Rate

County	Not Completed		Completed		N
	n	%	n	%	
Sacramento	168	19%	706	81%	<b>874</b>
San Bernardino	646	43%	869	57%	<b>1,515</b>
San Diego	273	29%	676	71%	<b>949</b>
San Francisco	63	24%	199	76%	<b>262</b>
San Joaquin	130	52%	119	48%	<b>249</b>
San Luis Obispo	60	64%	34	36%	<b>94</b>
San Mateo	103	58%	74	42%	<b>177</b>
Santa Barbara	62	44%	78	56%	<b>140</b>
Santa Clara	134	13%	880	87%	<b>1,014</b>
Santa Cruz	22	33%	45	67%	<b>67</b>
Shasta	63	82%	14	18%	<b>77</b>
Siskiyou	12	40%	18	60%	<b>30</b>
Solano	9	10%	80	90%	<b>89</b>
Sonoma	99	36%	173	64%	<b>272</b>
Stanislaus	41	12%	301	88%	<b>342</b>
Sutter	23	59%	16	41%	<b>39</b>
Tulare	124	34%	244	66%	<b>368</b>
Tuolumne	4	11%	31	89%	<b>35</b>
Ventura	107	35%	196	65%	<b>303</b>
Yolo	101	80%	26	20%	<b>127</b>
Yuba	14	31%	31	69%	<b>45</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,140</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>17,030</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>25,170</b>

Note: Results for counties with fewer than 25 investigations available for analysis are included in the total but not listed by county. Therefore, the sums of the columns do not equal the numbers in the "Total" row.

Table 15

## SDM® Risk Reassessment Level After Overrides

County	Low		Moderate		High		Very High		N
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Alameda	139	51%	123	45%	12	4%	0	0%	<b>274</b>
Butte	11	37%	19	63%	0	0%	0	0%	<b>30</b>
Calaveras	5	16%	24	77%	2	6%	0	0%	<b>31</b>
Contra Costa	79	42%	110	58%	1	1%	0	0%	<b>190</b>
Fresno	102	35%	170	58%	21	7%	1	<1%	<b>294</b>
Humboldt	5	6%	79	91%	3	3%	0	0%	<b>87</b>
Imperial	33	43%	40	53%	3	4%	0	0%	<b>76</b>
Kern	76	17%	302	67%	69	15%	5	1%	<b>452</b>
Kings	28	41%	39	57%	1	1%	0	0%	<b>68</b>
Los Angeles	3,154	36%	4,961	57%	596	7%	56	1%	<b>8,767</b>
Madera	15	18%	60	71%	6	7%	3	4%	<b>84</b>
Mendocino	10	15%	43	64%	14	21%	0	0%	<b>67</b>
Merced	19	12%	126	82%	6	4%	3	2%	<b>154</b>
Monterey	49	27%	117	65%	12	7%	1	1%	<b>179</b>
Napa	23	29%	46	59%	6	8%	3	4%	<b>78</b>
Orange	295	41%	390	54%	27	4%	4	1%	<b>716</b>
Riverside	166	33%	305	60%	34	7%	2	<1%	<b>507</b>
Sacramento	216	31%	457	65%	33	5%	0	0%	<b>706</b>
San Bernardino	330	38%	511	59%	28	3%	0	0%	<b>869</b>
San Diego	137	20%	441	65%	91	13%	7	1%	<b>676</b>
San Francisco	49	25%	140	70%	10	5%	0	0%	<b>199</b>
San Joaquin	15	13%	99	83%	5	4%	0	0%	<b>119</b>
San Luis Obispo	4	12%	30	88%	0	0%	0	0%	<b>34</b>
San Mateo	27	36%	46	62%	1	1%	0	0%	<b>74</b>
Santa Barbara	5	6%	64	82%	8	10%	1	1%	<b>78</b>
Santa Clara	294	33%	539	61%	46	5%	1	<1%	<b>880</b>
Santa Cruz	10	22%	35	78%	0	0%	0	0%	<b>45</b>
Solano	20	25%	49	61%	11	14%	0	0%	<b>80</b>
Sonoma	32	18%	116	67%	25	14%	0	0%	<b>173</b>
Stanislaus	86	29%	193	64%	22	7%	0	0%	<b>301</b>
Tulare	79	32%	156	64%	9	4%	0	0%	<b>244</b>
Tuolumne	4	13%	24	77%	3	10%	0	0%	<b>31</b>
Ventura	60	31%	132	67%	3	2%	1	1%	<b>196</b>
Yolo	10	38%	13	50%	3	12%	0	0%	<b>26</b>
Yuba	15	48%	15	48%	1	3%	0	0%	<b>31</b>

**Table 15**

**SDM® Risk Reassessment Level After Overrides**

County	Low		Moderate		High		Very High		N
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,654</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>10,157</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>1,131</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>17,030</b>

Note: Results for counties with fewer than 25 investigations available for analysis are included in the total but not listed by county. Therefore, the sums of the columns do not equal the numbers in the "Total" row.

Table 16

## SDM® Reunification Reassessment Completion Rate

County	Not Completed		Completed		N
	n	%	n	%	
Alameda	101	31%	222	69%	<b>323</b>
Amador	11	34%	21	66%	<b>32</b>
Butte	156	79%	42	21%	<b>198</b>
Calaveras	7	19%	30	81%	<b>37</b>
Colusa	14	52%	13	48%	<b>27</b>
Contra Costa	234	70%	100	30%	<b>334</b>
El Dorado	91	82%	20	18%	<b>111</b>
Fresno	701	91%	69	9%	<b>770</b>
Humboldt	111	83%	23	17%	<b>134</b>
Imperial	123	78%	34	22%	<b>157</b>
Kern	200	39%	313	61%	<b>513</b>
Kings	40	28%	101	72%	<b>141</b>
Lake	31	89%	4	11%	<b>35</b>
Lassen	24	92%	2	8%	<b>26</b>
Los Angeles	3,140	43%	4,171	57%	<b>7,311</b>
Madera	59	46%	70	54%	<b>129</b>
Mendocino	65	54%	56	46%	<b>121</b>
Merced	68	37%	114	63%	<b>182</b>
Monterey	116	73%	43	27%	<b>159</b>
Napa	17	34%	33	66%	<b>50</b>
Nevada	25	100%	0	0%	<b>25</b>
Orange	460	55%	381	45%	<b>841</b>
Placer	52	67%	26	33%	<b>78</b>
Riverside	573	59%	405	41%	<b>978</b>
Sacramento	541	75%	184	25%	<b>725</b>
San Bernardino	936	44%	1,209	56%	<b>2,145</b>
San Diego	408	50%	402	50%	<b>810</b>
San Francisco	62	37%	106	63%	<b>168</b>
San Joaquin	246	57%	189	43%	<b>435</b>
San Luis Obispo	95	71%	38	29%	<b>133</b>
San Mateo	52	90%	6	10%	<b>58</b>
Santa Barbara	101	86%	17	14%	<b>118</b>
Santa Clara	171	49%	176	51%	<b>347</b>
Santa Cruz	30	46%	35	54%	<b>65</b>
Shasta	170	88%	23	12%	<b>193</b>

Table 16

## SDM® Reunification Reassessment Completion Rate

County	Not Completed		Completed		N
	n	%	n	%	
Siskiyou	12	27%	33	73%	<b>45</b>
Solano	21	19%	88	81%	<b>109</b>
Sonoma	96	64%	54	36%	<b>150</b>
Stanislaus	248	79%	67	21%	<b>315</b>
Sutter	44	76%	14	24%	<b>58</b>
Tehama	75	88%	10	12%	<b>85</b>
Tulare	222	52%	204	48%	<b>426</b>
Ventura	135	56%	104	44%	<b>239</b>
Yolo	133	84%	26	16%	<b>159</b>
Yuba	65	86%	11	14%	<b>76</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>10,356</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>9,364</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>19,720</b>

Note: Results for counties with fewer than 25 investigations available for analysis are included in the total but not listed by county. Therefore, the sums of the columns do not equal the numbers in the "Total" row.

Table 17

## SDM® Reunification Reassessment Permanency Plan Recommendation

County	Terminate Services		Continue Services		Return Home		N
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Alameda	84	38%	44	20%	94	42%	<b>222</b>
Butte	9	21%	11	26%	22	52%	<b>42</b>
Calaveras	16	53%	5	17%	9	30%	<b>30</b>
Contra Costa	34	34%	23	23%	43	43%	<b>100</b>
Fresno	41	59%	10	14%	18	26%	<b>69</b>
Imperial	15	44%	8	24%	11	32%	<b>34</b>
Kern	162	52%	60	19%	91	29%	<b>313</b>
Kings	35	35%	24	24%	42	42%	<b>101</b>
Los Angeles	1,669	40%	887	21%	1,615	39%	<b>4,171</b>
Madera	8	11%	9	13%	53	76%	<b>70</b>
Mendocino	24	43%	4	7%	28	50%	<b>56</b>
Merced	27	24%	30	26%	57	50%	<b>114</b>
Monterey	18	42%	10	23%	15	35%	<b>43</b>
Napa	8	24%	14	42%	11	33%	<b>33</b>
Orange	160	42%	58	15%	163	43%	<b>381</b>
Placer	7	27%	7	27%	12	46%	<b>26</b>
Riverside	184	45%	91	22%	130	32%	<b>405</b>
Sacramento	82	45%	45	24%	57	31%	<b>184</b>
San Bernardino	509	42%	192	16%	508	42%	<b>1,209</b>
San Diego	203	50%	73	18%	126	31%	<b>402</b>
San Francisco	43	41%	28	26%	35	33%	<b>106</b>
San Joaquin	73	39%	50	26%	66	35%	<b>189</b>
San Luis Obispo	12	32%	8	21%	18	47%	<b>38</b>
Santa Clara	64	36%	25	14%	87	49%	<b>176</b>
Santa Cruz	14	40%	11	31%	10	29%	<b>35</b>
Siskiyou	13	39%	8	24%	12	36%	<b>33</b>
Solano	36	41%	20	23%	32	36%	<b>88</b>
Sonoma	23	43%	6	11%	25	46%	<b>54</b>
Stanislaus	17	25%	12	18%	38	57%	<b>67</b>
Tulare	76	37%	48	24%	80	39%	<b>204</b>
Ventura	46	44%	33	32%	25	24%	<b>104</b>
Yolo	9	35%	9	35%	8	31%	<b>26</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,802</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>1,903</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>3,659</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>9,364</b>

Note: Results for counties with fewer than 25 investigations available for analysis are included in the total but not listed by county. Therefore, the sums of the columns do not equal the numbers in the "Total" row.