# U.S. Sentencing Commission Preliminary Crack Cocaine Retroactivity Data Report



#### Introduction

As part of its ongoing mission, the United States Sentencing Commission provides Congress, the judiciary, the executive branch, and the general public with data extracted and analyzed from sentencing documents submitted by courts to the Commission.<sup>1</sup> Data is reported on an annual basis in the Commission's *Annual Report* and *Sourcebook of Federal Sentencing Statistics*.<sup>2</sup>

The Commission also reports preliminary data for an on-going fiscal year in order to provide real-time analysis of sentencing practices in the federal courts. Since 2005, the Commission has published a series of Quarterly Reports that are similar in format and methodology to tables and figures produced in the *Sourcebook of Federal Sentencing Statistics* or in the Commission's *Final Report on the Impact of the United States v. Booker on Federal Sentencing*. The Quarterly Reports contain cumulative data for the on-going fiscal year (i.e., data from the start of the fiscal year through the most current quarter).

This report is another in the Commission's efforts to provide analysis of federal sentencing practices. It provides data concerning recent court decisions considering motions to reduce the length of imprisonment for certain offenders convicted prior to November 1, 2007 of offenses involving crack cocaine.

On May 1, 2007, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 994(a) and (p), the Commission submitted to Congress amendments to the federal sentencing guidelines that became effective on November 1, 2007. One of those amendments, Amendment 706, modified the drug quantity thresholds in the Drug Quantity Table of §2D2.1 so as to assign, for crack cocaine offenses, base offense levels corresponding to guideline ranges that include the statutory mandatory minimum penalties. Crack cocaine offenses for quantities above and below the mandatory minimum threshold quantities similarly were adjusted downward by two levels. The amendment also included a mechanism to determine a combined base offense level in an offense involving crack cocaine and other controlled substances.

On December 11, 2007, the Commission voted to approve Amendment 713 which amended §1B1.10 of the guidelines to include Amendment 706, as amended by Amendment 711, in the list of amendments that apply retroactively. The Commission voted to make Amendment 713 effective on March 1, 2008. As a result, some incarcerated offenders are eligible to receive a reduction in their sentence under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) pursuant to Amendment 706.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> In each felony or Class A misdemeanor case sentenced in federal court, sentencing courts are required to submit the following documents to the Commission: the Judgment and Commitment Order, the Statement of Reasons, the plea agreement (if applicable), the indictment or other charging document, and the presentence report. See 28 U.S.C. § 994(w).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See the Commission's website, www.ussc.gov, for electronic copies of the 1995-2006 *Annual Report* and *Sourcebook of Federal Sentencing Statistics*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> See www.ussc.gov/bf.htm for an electronic copy of the Commission's *Final Report on the Impact of United States* v. *Booker on Federal Sentencing*.

This report provides information on all cases reported to the Commission in which the court considered a motion to reduce a sentence under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) for an offender convicted of an offense involving crack cocaine. The data in this report represents information based on court documentation received and coded at the U.S. Sentencing Commission by June 12, 2008. Users of this information are cautioned that the data are preliminary only and subject to change as the Commission receives, analyzes, and reports on additional cases.

In particular, the reader is cautioned with respect to drawing conclusions based on data concerning the denial of motions for sentence reduction pursuant to the crack cocaine amendment, as the judicial districts are employing various methods to prioritize the review of these motions. For example, in many districts, contested motions have not been decided by the court. Consequently, the data the Commission has received to date concerning cases in which the motion for a sentence reduction was denied may not be representative of the decisions that ultimately may be made in all districts or the nation as a whole.

Table 1

GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF APPLICATION OF RETROACTIVE CRACK COCAINE AMENDMENT BY DISTRICT

		Grant	ted	Denie	d			Grant	ed	Denie	d
District	n	n	%	n	%	District	n	n	%	n	%
TOTAL	8,251	6,453	78.2	1,798	21.8						
Western Virginia	543	365	67.2	178	32.8	Northern Alabama	59	40	67.8	19	32.2
South Carolina	406	367	90.4	39	9.6	Eastern North Carolina	57	49	86.0	8	14.0
Eastern Virginia	399	245	61.4	154	38.6	Southern Iowa	56	35	62.5	21	37.5
Middle Florida	331	291	87.9	40	12.1	New Hampshire	54	28	51.9	26	48.1
Western Texas	299	243	81.3	56	18.7	Western Michigan	50	33	66.0	17	34.0
Northern Texas	274	163	59.5	111	40.5	Eastern California	49	49	100.0	0	0.0
Middle Georgia	273	227	83.2	46	16.8	Western Arkansas	48	33	68.8	15	31.3
Eastern Missouri	258	236	91.5	22	8.5	Eastern New York	46	38	82.6	8	17.4
Northern Florida	253	157	62.1	96	37.9	Northern Iowa	46	46	100.0	0	0.0
Eastern Louisiana	191	117	61.3	74	38.7	Eastern Wisconsin	45	41	91.1	4	8.9
Southern Texas	180	149	82.8	31	17.2	Middle Alabama	43	37	86.0	6	14.0
Southern Alabama	173	112	64.7	61	35.3	Eastern Kentucky	40	34	85.0	6	15.0
Northern West Virginia	172	172	100.0	0	0.0	Northern Georgia	40	25	62.5	15	37.5
Southern Florida	161	91	56.5	70	43.5	Colorado	37	20	54.1	17	45.9
Southern West Virginia	158	134	84.8	24	15.2	Western Tennessee	36	36	100.0	0	0.0
Middle Pennsylvania	155	113	72.9	42	27.1	Western Pennsylvania	35	29	82.9	6	17.1
Central Illinois	148	80	54.1	68	45.9	Southern Indiana	35	27	77.1	8	22.9
Southern Illinois	147	145	98.6	2	1.4	Western Washington	34	34	100.0	0	0.0
Kansas	147	145	98.6	2	1.4	Western Oklahoma	31	31	100.0	0	0.0
Northern Indiana	144	132	91.7	12	8.3	Rhode Island	29	26	89.7	3	10.3
Connecticut	139	107	77.0	32	23.0	New Jersey	29	28	96.6	1	3.4
Western Louisiana	131	90	68.7	41	31.3	Northern Oklahoma	29	7	24.1	22	75.9
Southern Ohio	130	121	93.1	9	6.9	Middle North Carolina	25	22	88.0	3	12.0
Northern Ohio	129	128	99.2	1	0.8	Middle Louisiana	25	21	84.0	4	16.0
Nebraska	126	113	89.7	13	10.3	Western Kentucky	25	19	76.0	6	24.0
Southern Georgia	125	72	57.6	53	42.4	Vermont	22	22	100.0	0	0.0
Eastern Texas	118	105	89.0	13	11.0	Northern Mississippi	20	20	100.0	0	0.0
Maryland	110	85	77.3	25	22.7	Puerto Rico	17	11	64.7	6	35.3
District of Columbia	109	101	92.7	8	7.3	New Mexico	17	17	100.0	0	0.0
Northern New York	106	93	87.7	13	12.3	Central California	15	15	100.0	0	0.0
Eastern Pennsylvania	100	95	95.0	5	5.0	Alaska	14	9	64.3	5	35.7
Southern New York	88	47	53.4	41	46.6	Northern California	14	14	100.0	0	0.0
Western New York	83	51	61.4	32	38.6	Hawaii	13	11	84.6	2	15.4
Maine	80	40	50.0	40	50.0	Oregon	10	10	100.0	0	0.0
Western Missouri	77	52	67.5	25	32.5	Middle Tennessee	9	9	100.0	0	0.0
Western Wisconsin	73	65	89.0	8	11.0	Nevada	8	7	87.5	1	12.5
Northern Illinois	72	70	97.2	2	2.8	Delaware	7	7	100.0	0	0.0
Massachusetts	70	56	80.0	14	20.0	Eastern Oklahoma	5	3	60.0	2	40.0
Southern Mississippi	68	65	95.6	3	4.4	Southern California	4	4	100.0	0	0.0
Eastern Tennessee	66	51	77.3	15	22.7	Utah	4	3	75.0	1	25.0
Minnesota	64	57	89.1	7	10.9	Idaho	2	1	50.0	1	50.0
Western North Carolina	63	46	73.0	17	27.0	Eastern Washington	2	2	100.0	0	0.0
Eastern Arkansas	63	43	68.3	20	31.7	South Dakota	1	1	100.0	0	0.0
Eastern Michigan	62	62	100.0	0	0.0						

Table 2

GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF APPLICATION OF RETROACTIVE CRACK COCAINE AMENDMENT BY JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Circuit	n	Granted	Denied
TOTAL	8,251	6,453	1,798
FOURTH CIRCUIT	1,933	1,485	448
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT	1,458	1,052	406
FIFTH CIRCUIT	1,306	973	333
EIGHTH CIRCUIT	739	616	123
SEVENTH CIRCUIT	664	560	104
SIXTH CIRCUIT	547	493	54
SECOND CIRCUIT	484	358	126
THIRD CIRCUIT	326	272	54
TENTH CIRCUIT	270	226	44
FIRST CIRCUIT	250	161	89
NINTH CIRCUIT	165	156	9
D.C. CIRCUIT	109	101	8

Table 3  $\label{eq:application} \mbox{APPLICATION OF RETROACTIVE CRACK COCAINE AMENDMENT BY } \mbox{YEAR OF ORIGINAL SENTENCE}^1$ 

Fiscal	Total	Granted	1	Denied	
Year	n	n	%	n	%
Total	8,183	6,401	78.2	1,782	21.8
2008	78	37	47.4	41	52.6
2007	1,029	798	77.6	231	22.4
2006	1,045	843	80.7	202	19.3
2005	968	755	78.0	213	22.0
2004	832	681	81.9	151	18.1
2003	844	665	78.8	179	21.2
2002	660	517	78.3	143	21.7
2001	546	439	80.4	107	19.6
2000	472	364	77.1	108	22.9
1999	362	289	79.8	73	20.2
1998	311	249	80.1	62	19.9
1997	223	170	76.2	53	23.8
1996	219	169	77.2	50	22.8
1995	149	108	72.5	41	27.5
1994	143	90	62.9	53	37.1
1993	118	81	68.6	37	31.4
1992	84	67	79.8	17	20.2
1991	43	33	76.7	10	23.3
1990	37	28	75.7	9	24.3
1989	20	18	90.0	2	10.0

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Of the 8,251 cases, 68 were excluded from this analysis because the case cannot be matched with an original case in the Commission's records.

Table 4

ORIGIN OF GRANTED MOTION FOR SENTENCE REDUCTION DUE TO RETROACTIVE APPLICATION OF CRACK COCAINE AMENDMENT<sup>1</sup>

		Defend	ant	Director E	$SOP^2$	Cour	rt
CIRCUIT	n	n	%	n	%	n	%
TOTAL	5,860	4,402	75.1	0	0.0	1,458	24.9
D.C. CIRCUIT	90	88	97.8	0	0.0	2	2.2
FIRST CIRCUIT	160	129	80.6	0	0.0	31	19.4
SECOND CIRCUIT	340	190	55.9	0	0.0	150	44.1
THIRD CIRCUIT	224	222	99.1	0	0.0	2	0.9
FOURTH CIRCUIT	1,350	970	71.9	0	0.0	380	28.2
FIFTH CIRCUIT	806	483	59.9	0	0.0	323	40.1
SIXTH CIRCUIT	461	407	88.3	0	0.0	54	11.7
SEVENTH CIRCUIT	547	537	98.2	0	0.0	10	1.8
EIGHTH CIRCUIT	590	542	91.9	0	0.0	48	8.1
NINTH CIRCUIT	122	111	91.0	0	0.0	11	9.0
TENTH CIRCUIT	223	216	96.9	0	0.0	7	3.1
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT	947	507	53.5	0	0.0	440	46.5

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Of the 6,453 cases in which the court granted a motion for a sentence reduction due to retroactive application of the crack cocaine amendment, 628 were excluded from this analysis because the information received by the Commission prevented a determination of motion origin. Additionally, courts may cite multiple origins for a motion; consequently, the total number of origins cited generally exceeds the total number of cases. In this table, 5,860 origins were cited for the 5,824 cases.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>In five cases, documents provided to the Commission indicated that the Bureau of Prisons Director made a motion. Those cases appear to be clerical errors.

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF OFFENDERS CONSIDERED FOR SENTENCE REDUCTION DUE TO APPLICATION OF RETROACTIVE CRACK COCAINE AMENDMENT

		Grante	ed	Denied	$l^1$
Race/Ethnicity	Total	n	%	n	%
White	464	431	6.8	33	6.9
Black	5,826	5,416	85.0	410	85.2
Hispanic	503	470	7.4	33	6.9
Other	62	57	0.9	5	1.0
Total	6,855	6,374		481	
Citizenship					
U.S. Citizen	6,384	5,931	94.3	453	94.2
Non-Citizen	389	361	5.7	28	5.8
Total	6,773	6,292		481	
Gender					
Male	6,355	5,912	92.2	443	91.9
Female	540	501	7.8	39	8.1
Total	6,895	6,413		482	
Average Age					
	30	30		31	

<sup>1</sup>The 482 offenders represented in this column are those whom the Commission previously identified as eligible to seek a sentence reduction but whose petition for a reduction was denied by the court. Of the remaining 1,316 cases in which the court denied the request for a sentence reduction, 941 were excluded from this analysis because the offender was not previously identified as eligible to seek a sentence reduction for one or more reasons (see Analysis of the Impact of the Crack Cocaine Amendment If Made Retroactive' (October 3, 2007) available at www.ussc.gov). Of the remaining 375 cases, 69 were excluded from this analysis because the offender had been identified as released or projected to be released prior to November 1, 2007 and so was excluded from the Commission's prior analysis of eligible offenders, 104 were excluded from this analysis because the offender was not sentenced for a drug offense, 186 were excluded from this analysis because crack cocaine was not involved in the offense, and 16 were excluded from this analysis because the reason for the court's decision cannot yet be determined.

SELECTED SENTENCING FACTORS FOR OFFENDERS WHO WERE CONSIDERED FOR SENTENCE REDUCTION DUE TO APPLICATION OF RETROACTIVE CRACK COCAINE AMENDMENT

	Total	Granted	Denied <sup>1</sup>
Weapon			
Weapon Specific Offense Characteristic	22.9%	22.7%	26.3%
Firearms Mandatory Minimum Applied	6.5%	6.1%	12.2%
Safety Valve	12.7%	13.1%	7.5%
<b>Guideline Role Adjustments</b>			
Aggravating Role (USSG §3B1.1)	8.0%	7.4%	16.2%
Mitigating Role (USSG §3B1.2)	3.9%	3.6%	6.8%
Obstruction Adjustment (USSG §3C1.1)	4.9%	4.8%	6.0%
Sentence Relative to the Guideline Range			
Within Range	68.9%	69.7%	57.9%
Above Range	0.4%	0.3%	1.0%
Below Range	30.7%	29.9%	41.0%
<b>Criminal History Category</b>			
I	26.5%	27.0%	20.2%
II	13.6%	13.6%	14.3%
III	23.1%	23.2%	21.2%
IV	15.9%	16.1%	13.3%
V	9.5%	9.3%	12.3%
VI	11.4%	10.8%	18.7%

<sup>1</sup>The 482 offenders represented in this column are those whom the Commission previously identified as eligible to seek a sentence reduction but whose petition for a reduction was denied by the court. Of the remaining 1,316 cases in which the court denied the request for a sentence reduction, 941 were excluded from this analysis because the offender was not previously identified as eligible to seek a sentence reduction for one or more reasons (*see* 'Analysis of the Impact of the Crack Cocaine Amendment If Made Retroactive' (October 3, 2007) *available at* www.ussc.gov). Of the remaining 375 cases, 69 were excluded from this analysis because the offender had been identified as released or projected to be released prior to November 1, 2007 and so was excluded from the Commission's prior analysis of eligible offenders, 104 were excluded from this analysis because the offender was not sentenced for a drug offense, 186 were excluded from this analysis because crack cocaine was not involved in the offense, and 16 were excluded from this analysis because the reason for the court's decision cannot yet be determined.

POSITION OF WITHIN RANGE SENTENCES FOR OFFENDERS GRANTED A SENTENCE REDUCTION DUE TO APPLICATION OF RETROACTIVE CRACK COCAINE AMENDMENT<sup>1</sup>

ORIGINAL SENTENCE		<b>CURRENT SENTENC</b>	
n	%	n	%
2,679	100.0	2,679	100.0
1,765	65.9	1,831	68.3
426	15.9	325	12.1
143	5.3	197	7.4
164	6.1	151	5.6
181	6.8	175	6.5
	n 2,679 1,765 426 143 164	n %  2,679 100.0  1,765 65.9  426 15.9  143 5.3  164 6.1	n         %         n           2,679         100.0         2,679           1,765         65.9         1,831           426         15.9         325           143         5.3         197           164         6.1         151

<sup>1</sup>Of the 6,453 cases in which a motion for retroactive application of the crack cocaine amendment was granted, 3,498 received a sentence within the guideline range at both their original and current sentencing. Of these, 819 cases were excluded from this analysis due to one or more of the following reasons: the case is missing sentence length or guideline relevant statutory information from the new sentence (695), the case is missing sentence length or guideline relevant statutory information from the original sentence (110), the new sentence had a guideline minimum and maximum that were identical (52) or the original sentence had a guideline minimum and maximum that were identical (13).

DEGREE OF DECREASE IN SENTENCE DUE TO RETROACTIVE APPLICATION OF CRACK COCAINE AMENDMENT  $^1$ 

		Average	Average		
		Current	New	Average Decrease	Average Percent
CIRCUIT		Sentence	Sentence	in Months From	<b>Decrease From</b>
District	n	in Months	in Months	<b>Current Sentence</b>	<b>Current Sentence</b>
TOTAL 5,4	189	128	106	23	17.4
D.C. CIRCUIT	53	123	107	15	12.5
	53	123	107	15	12.5
FIRST CIRCUIT	126	99	81	18	18.0
	40	120	98	22	17.3
Massachusetts	29	107	89	19	17.1
New Hampshire	26	68	54	13	20.1
Puerto Rico	11	68	54	14	21.0
Rhode Island	20	101	85	16	16.4
SECOND CIRCUIT	289	107	89	17	16.3
Connecticut	89	88	73	15	17.4
New York					
Eastern	34	98	83	14	16.3
Northern	65	138	116	22	15.5
	41	131	109	22	15.8
Western	45	86	74	12	15.1
Vermont	15	100	81	19	18.6
THIRD CIRCUIT	202	113	93	20	17.3
Delaware	7	137	111	26	18.9
New Jersey	27	98	82	16	16.2
Pennsylvania					
	71	134	108	26	17.6
	80	102	84	17	17.1
	17	96	79	17	18.4
Virgin Islands	0				
	322	131	108	23	17.4
<b>-</b>	53	132	111	21	16.0
North Carolina					
	49	145	119	26	16.7
Middle	22	174	142	32	17.9
Western	15	111	100	11	10.8
	360	127	104	24	18.1
Virginia					
	223	154	125	29	18.7
	356	141	119	22	15.6
West Virginia					
	118	73	59	13	18.6
Southern	126	114	93	21	18.7

### Table 8 (continued)

## DEGREE OF DECREASE IN SENTENCE DUE TO RETROACTIVE APPLICATION OF CRACK COCAINE AMENDMENT

		Average Current	Average New	Average Decrease	Average Percent
CIRCUIT District	n	Sentence in Months	Sentence in Months	in Months From Current Sentence	Decrease From Current Sentence
FIFTH CIRCUIT	837	131	109	23	17.2
Louisiana	037	131	107	23	17.2
Eastern	111	111	96	15	13.6
Middle	14	74	64	9	13.6
Western	72	111	91	19	17.3
Mississippi			, ,		
Northern	6	125	98	27	22.6
Southern	58	116	94	21	18.5
Texas					
Eastern	103	118	95	23	19.1
Northern	154	168	139	29	17.9
Southern	105	151	125	26	16.4
Western	214	129	106	22	17.7
SIXTH CIRCUIT	452	104	86	18	17.0
Kentucky					
Eastern	29	92	78	15	15.5
Western	19	97	80	18	17.3
Michigan					
Eastern	38	127	105	22	16.8
Western	32	86	76	10	13.0
Ohio					
Northern	127	94	77	18	18.7
Southern	119	112	93	19	16.9
Tennessee					
Eastern	50	112	95	18	15.1
Middle	7	107	91	16	17.0
Western	31	101	83	18	18.3
SEVENTH CIRCUIT	500	128	105	24	18.3
Illinois					
Central	72	135	112	23	16.9
Northern	56	111	92	19	17.1
Southern	145	146	118	28	18.7
Indiana					
Northern	128	114	94	20	17.8
Southern	15	191	155	36	18.3
Wisconsin					
Eastern	40	114	92	22	19.4
Western	44	113	90	24	20.8
EIGHTH CIRCUIT	506	108	90	18	16.6
Arkansas					
Eastern	27	103	86	17	16.8
Western	33	98	82	16	16.8
Iowa					
Northern	29	98	84	14	15.0
Southern	34	136	113	23	16.9
Minnesota	41	133	107	25	18.4
Missouri					
Eastern	213	102	86	16	16.2
Western	20	109	90	19	16.0
Nebraska	109	110	91	19	17.1
North Dakota	0				
South Dakota	0				

**Table 8 (continued)** 

## DEGREE OF DECREASE IN SENTENCE DUE TO RETROACTIVE APPLICATION OF CRACK COCAINE AMENDMENT

		Average	Average	. 5	
CYD CYTTE		Current	New	Average Decrease	Average Percent
CIRCUIT		Sentence	Sentence	in Months From	Decrease From
District	n	in Months	in Months		Current Sentence
NINTH CIRCUIT	129	124	103	21	17.0
Alaska	6	191	173	19	14.6
Arizona	0				
California		151	124	25	17.0
Central	14	151	126	25	17.2
Eastern	39	109	90	19	17.0
Northern	12	101	85	16	15.5
Southern	3	173	143	30	17.4
Guam	0				
Hawaii Idaho	7	99	79	20	19.8
Montana	1				
Nevada	0 7	156			10.7
Northern Mariana Islands		156	126	29	18.7
	0 5	 76	 60	 15	20.2
Oregon Washington	3	70	00	13	20.2
Eastern	2				
Western		 121	100		16.7
western	33	131	108	22	16.7
TENTH CIRCUIT	197	129	106	22	17.2
Colorado	18	130	108	23	16.9
Kansas	129	118	98	20	16.9
New Mexico	17	114	93	21	18.1
Oklahoma					
Eastern	3	186	154	32	16.7
Northern	4	241	196	45	18.9
Western	24	167	136	31	19.0
Utah	2				
Wyoming	0				
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT	876	161	130	31	18.5
Alabama					
Middle	37	146	119	27	18.0
Northern	19	133	114	19	13.4
Southern	109	195	158	37	18.6
Florida					
Middle	269	156	124	32	19.2
Northern	128	228	184	44	18.2
Southern	85	135	111	23	17.3
Georgia					
Middle	169	117	93	24	20.0
Northern	21	151	125	27	17.9
Southern	39	160	136	24	13.8

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Of the 8,251 cases, 68 were excluded from this analysis because the case cannot be matched with an original case in the Commission's records and 1,782 were excluded from this analysis because the court denied the motion for a sentence reduction. Of the remaining 6,401 cases, 912 were excluded from this analysis because the offender was sentenced to time served and the resulting term of imprisonment could not be determined from the records received by the Commission.

Table 9  $\label{eq:courts} \textbf{REASONS GIVEN BY SENTENCING COURTS FOR DENIAL OF MOTION}^1$ 

REASONS	Number	Percent
Offense does not involve crack cocaine	187	9.5
Case does not involve crack cocaine	162	8.3
Sentence is determined by a non-drug guideline	25	1.3
Offender not eligible under §1B1.10	1,298	66.2
Statutory mandatory minimum controls sentence	478	24.4
Career Offender or Armed Career Criminal provisions control sentence	406	20.7
Case involved more than 4.5 kg of crack cocaine	191	9.7
Base offense level does not change (due to multiple drugs)	78	4.0
Guideline range does not change	68	3.5
Original sentence has been served	50	2.6
Statutory maximum sentence is less than applicable guideline range	22	1.1
Base offense level is 12 or lower	3	0.2
Base offense level is 43	2	0.1
Denied on the merits	286	14.6
Offender has already benefitted from departure or variance	150	7.7
Protection of the public	49	2.5
18 U.S.C § 3553(a) factors	46	2.3
Post-sentencing or post-conviction conduct	41	2.1
No reason provided/Other reason	189	9.6
Other	103	5.3
No reason provided	86	4.4

<sup>1</sup>Courts may cite multiple reasons for denying a motion; consequently, the total number of reasons cited generally exceeds the total number of cases. In this table, 1,960 reasons were cited for the 1,798 cases. Of the 86 cases in which the court did not give a reason for the denial, 50 were previously identified as ineligible by the Commission for sentence reduction (*see* 'Analysis of the Impact of the Crack Cocaine Amendment If Made Retroactive' (October 3, 2007) *available at* www.ussc.gov). Of those 50 cases, a statutory mandatory minimum controlled the sentence in 13 cases, in eight cases the quantity of crack cocaine in the case exceeded 4.5 Kg, in five cases the sentence was determined by a non-drug guideline, in five cases no change in the guideline range was found, in eight cases crack cocaine was not involved, in six cases Career Offender or Armed Career Criminal provisions controlled the sentence, in three cases the offender was predicted to have been released, and in one case the Bureau of Prisons informed the Commission that the offender was no longer serving time for the instant offense.