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 from and based on sentencing documents submitted by courts to the Commission.¹ Data is reported on an annual basis in the Commission's *Annual Report* and *Sourcebook of Federal Sentencing Statistics*.²

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 of offenses involving crack cocaine prior to November 1, 2007.

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 §2D1.1 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 promulgate Amendment 713, which added Amendment 706 as amended by 711, to the amendments listed in subsection © in §1B1.10 that apply retroactively. The Commission voted to make Amendment 713 effective on March 3, 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.

¹ 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).

² See the Commission's website, www.ussc.gov, for electronic copies of the 1995-2009 *Annual Report* and *Sourcebook of Federal Sentencing Statistics*.

³ 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 concerning motions decided through November 15, 2010, and for which court documentation was received, coded, and edited at the U.S. Sentencing Commission by November 29, 2010. 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	ed	Denie	d			Grant	ed	Denie	d
District	N	N	%	N	%	District	N	N	%	N	%
TOTAL	25,041	16,228	64.8	8,813	35.2						
Eastern Virginia	1,623	1,047	64.5	576	35.5	Massachusetts	199	131	65.8	68	34.2
Middle Florida	1,351	726	53.7	625	46.3	Kansas	197	194	98.5	3	1.5
Western North Carolina	954	427	44.8	527	55.2	Northern Mississippi	184	152	82.6	32	17.4
South Carolina	936	726	77.6	210	22.4	Western Kentucky	182	90	49.5	92	50.5
Eastern North Carolina	880	477	54.2	403	45.8	Western Wisconsin	180	128	71.1	52	28.9
Western Virginia	846	516	61.0	330	39.0	Southern Iowa	171	101	59.1	70	40.9
Western Texas	663	445	67.1	218	32.9	Northern New York	164	114	69.5	50	30.5
Eastern Texas	581	440	75.7	141	24.3	Eastern Arkansas	161	105	65.2	56	34.8
Northern Florida	578	240	41.5	338	58.5	Western Pennsylvania	156	121	77.6	35	22.4
Southern Florida	567	278	49.0	289	51.0	Eastern Kentucky	153	79	51.6	74	48.4
Eastern Missouri	519	452	87.1	67	12.9	Eastern Wisconsin	144	102	70.8	42	29.2
Southern New York	477	199	41.7	278	58.3	Middle Alabama	139	132	95.0	7	5.0
Maryland	477	331	69.4	146	30.6	New Jersey	135	108	80.0	27	20.0
Middle Georgia	459	319	69.5	140	30.5	Colorado	130	69	53.1	61	46.9
Northern Texas	457	274	60.0	183	40.0	Northern Georgia	127	77	60.6	50	39.4
Southern Georgia	450	218	48.4	232	51.6	Maine	111	60	54.1	51	45.9
Northern West Virginia	433	428	98.8	5	1.2	Middle Louisiana	111	76	68.5	35	31.5
Eastern Louisiana	432	199	46.1	233	53.9	Southern Indiana	108	63	58.3	45	41.7
Central Illinois	413	160	38.7	253	61.3	Central California	107	66	61.7	41	38.3
Western Missouri	391	226	57.8	165	42.2	New Hampshire	94	49	52.1	45	47.9
Southern West Virginia	387	266	68.7	121	31.3	Eastern California	94	93	98.9	1	1.1
Southern Texas	386	279	72.3	107	27.7	Western Oklahoma	93	91	97.8	2	2.2
Southern Alabama	381	255	66.9	126	33.1	Western Arkansas	86	53	61.6	33	38.4
Middle North Carolina	380	202	53.2	178	46.8	Northern Oklahoma	77	43	55.8	34	44.2
Western Louisiana	365	209	57.3	156	42.7	Alaska	71	42	59.2	29	40.8
Middle Pennsylvania	354	226	63.8	128	36.2	Rhode Island	70	57	81.4	13	18.6
Southern Illinois	349	307	88.0	42	12.0	Nevada	67	58	86.6	9	13.4
Northern Ohio	347	309	89.0	38	11.0	Middle Tennessee	61	48	78.7	13	21.3
Nebraska	316	250	79.1	66	20.9	Western Washington	48	47	97.9	1	2.1
Eastern Tennessee	306	188	61.4	118	38.6	New Mexico	47	43	91.5	4	8.5
Western Michigan	291	158	54.3	133	45.7	Northern California	42	42	100.0	0	0.0
Northern Alabama	286	134	46.9	152	53.1	Delaware	35	26	74.3	9	25.7
Northern Illinois	283	249	88.0	34	12.0	Hawaii	29	25	86.2	4	13.8
Connecticut	281	178	63.3	103	36.7	Vermont	23	23	100.0	0	0.0
Minnesota	273	188	68.9	85	31.1	Oregon	20	19	95.0	1	5.0
Northern Indiana	271	218	80.4	53	19.6	Eastern Oklahoma	17	13	76.5	4	23.5
Puerto Rico	270	95	35.2	175	64.8	Utah	17	16	94.1	1	5.9
Eastern Pennsylvania	266	217	81.6	49	18.4	Eastern Washington	16	9	56.3	7	43.8
Northern Iowa	261	147	56.3	114	43.7	Southern California		13	100.0	0	0.0
Southern Ohio	251	215	30.3 85.7	36	14.3	Montana	13 8	4	50.0	4	50.0
Southern Onto Eastern Michigan	246	215	85.7 88.6	28	14.3	Nontana South Dakota	8 7	7	100.0	0	0.0
ū	235	218 197	83.8	28 38	16.2		5	5	100.0	0	0.0
Southern Mississippi						Virgin Islands				0	
District of Columbia	224	213	95.1	11	4.9	Arizona	3	3	100.0	0 1	0.0
Western New York	218	137	62.8	81	37.2	Idaho	3	2	66.7	-	33.3
Western Tennessee	213	143	67.1	70	32.9	Wyoming	1	1	100.0	0	0.0
Eastern New York	208	102	49.0	106	51.0						

Table 2

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

Circuit	N	Granted	Denied
TOTAL	25,041	16,228	8,813
FOURTH CIRCUIT	6,916	4,420	2,496
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT	4,338	2,379	1,959
FIFTH CIRCUIT	3,414	2,271	1,143
EIGHTH CIRCUIT	2,185	1,529	656
SIXTH CIRCUIT	2,050	1,448	602
SEVENTH CIRCUIT	1,748	1,227	521
SECOND CIRCUIT	1,371	753	618
THIRD CIRCUIT	951	703	248
FIRST CIRCUIT	744	392	352
TENTH CIRCUIT	579	470	109
NINTH CIRCUIT	521	423	98
D.C. CIRCUIT	224	213	11

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	24,427	15,863	64.9	8,564	35.1
2009	64	3	4.7	61	95.3
2008	633	155	24.5	478	75.5
2007	3,501	2,364	67.5	1,137	32.5
2006	3,372	2,379	70.6	993	29.4
2005	2,933	1,973	67.3	960	32.7
2004	2,452	1,684	68.7	768	31.3
2003	2,305	1,529	66.3	776	33.7
2002	1,777	1,171	65.9	606	34.1
2001	1,421	943	66.4	478	33.6
2000	1,265	798	63.1	467	36.9
1999	1,018	660	64.8	358	35.2
1998	798	498	62.4	300	37.6
1997	639	396	62.0	243	38.0
1996	597	370	62.0	227	38.0
1995	433	257	59.4	176	40.6
1994	408	214	52.5	194	47.5
1993	295	166	56.3	129	43.7
1992	220	129	58.6	91	41.4
1991	125	71	56.8	54	43.2
1990	119	66	55.5	53	44.5
1989	52	37	71.2	15	28.8

¹Of the 25,041 cases, 614 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 AMENDMENT¹

		Defend	Defendant		Director BOP ²		· t	
CIRCUIT	N	N	%	N	%	N	%	
TOTAL	14,804	12,446	84.1	0	0.0	2,358	15.9	
D.C. CIRCUIT	187	183	97.9	0	0.0	4	2.1	
FIRST CIRCUIT	381	325	85.3	0	0.0	56	14.7	
SECOND CIRCUIT	702	487	69.4	0	0.0	215	30.6	
THIRD CIRCUIT	603	597	99.0	0	0.0	6	1.0	
FOURTH CIRCUIT	4,085	3,493	85.5	0	0.0	592	14.5	
FIFTH CIRCUIT	1,968	1,457	74.0	0	0.0	511	26.0	
SIXTH CIRCUIT	1,332	1,187	89.1	0	0.0	145	10.9	
SEVENTH CIRCUIT	1,195	1,164	97.4	0	0.0	31	2.6	
EIGHTH CIRCUIT	1,458	1,355	92.9	0	0.0	103	7.1	
NINTH CIRCUIT	333	298	89.5	0	0.0	35	10.5	
TENTH CIRCUIT	461	441	95.7	0	0.0	20	4.3	
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT	2,099	1,459	69.5	0	0.0	640	30.5	

¹Of the 16,228 cases in which the court granted a motion for a sentence reduction due to retroactive application of the crack cocaine amendment, 1,484 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, 14,804 origins were cited for the 14,744 cases.

²In nine 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

	Granted		ed	Denied	l^1
Race/Ethnicity	Total	N	%	N	%
White	1,032	939	5.9	93	4.8
Black	15,368	13,667	86.1	1,701	87.1
Hispanic	1,267	1,121	7.1	146	7.5
Other	152	138	0.9	14	0.7
Total	17,819	15,865		1,954	
Citizenship					
U.S. Citizen	16,720	14,860	94.8	1,860	95.1
Non-Citizen	914	819	5.2	95	4.9
Total	17,634	15,679		1,955	
Gender					
Male	16,908	15,047	94.1	1,861	95.0
Female	1,040	943	5.9	97	5.0
Total	17,948	15,990		1,958	
Average Age					
	30	30		30	

¹The 1,958 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 6,855 cases in which the court denied the request for a sentence reduction, 4,461 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 2,394 cases, 569 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, 622 were excluded from this analysis because the offender was not sentenced for a drug offense, 954 were excluded from this analysis because crack cocaine was not involved in the offense, and 249 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

	All Cases	Granted	Denied ¹
	%	%	%
Weapon			_
Weapon Specific Offense Characteristic	24.6	24.1	28.2
Firearms Mandatory Minimum Applied	10.4	10.0	13.7
Safety Valve	8.9	9.5	4.3
Guideline Role Adjustments			
Aggravating Role (USSG §3B1.1)	10.4	9.3	18.4
Mitigating Role (USSG §3B1.2)	2.9	2.7	4.5
Obstruction Adjustment (USSG §3C1.1)	6.3	6.1	7.5
Sentence Relative to the Guideline Range			
Within Range	69.3	71.0	55.9
Above Range	0.4	0.3	1.0
Below Range	30.3	28.7	43.0
Criminal History Category			
I	21.8	22.5	15.6
II	12.9	12.9	12.8
III	22.9	23.1	21.9
IV	16.9	17.3	13.7
V	10.4	10.3	11.1
VI	15.1	13.9	24.9

¹The 1,958 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 6,855 cases in which the court denied the request for a sentence reduction, 4,461 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 2,394 cases, 569 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, 622 were excluded from this analysis because the offender was not sentenced for a drug offense, 954 were excluded from this analysis because crack cocaine was not involved in the offense, and 249 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 AMENDMENT¹

	ORIGINAL SENTENCE		CURRENT SENTENCE	
	N	%	N	%
TOTAL	6,441	100.0	6,441	100.0
Guideline Minimum	4,139	64.3	4,281	66.5
Lower Half of Range	1,138	17.7	878	13.6
Midpoint of Range	307	4.8	478	7.4
Upper Half of Range	435	6.8	398	6.2
Guideline Maximum	422	6.6	406	6.3

¹Of the 16,228 cases in which a motion for retroactive application of the crack cocaine amendment was granted, 8,405 received a sentence within the guideline range at both their original and current sentencing. Of these, 1,964 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 (1,417), the case is missing sentence length or guideline relevant statutory information from the original sentence (475), the new sentence had a guideline minimum and maximum that were identical (193) or the original sentence had a guideline minimum and maximum that were identical (35).

DEGREE OF DECREASE IN SENTENCE DUE TO RETROACTIVE APPLICATION OF CRACK COCAINE AMENDMENT¹

		Average	Average		
		Current	New	Average Decrease	Average Percent
CIRCUIT		Sentence	Sentence	in Months From	Decrease From
District	N	in Months	in Months	Current Sentence	Current Sentence
TOTAL	14,641	149	123	26	17.0
D.C. CIRCUIT	144	134	112	22	16.2
District of Columbia	144	134	112	22	16.2
FIRST CIRCUIT	338	122	100	22	17.3
Maine	60	126	104	22	16.8
Massachusetts	94	144	120	24	16.9
New Hampshire	47	96	78	19	19.3
Puerto Rico	89	108	87	21	18.0
Rhode Island	48	126	106	20	15.8
SECOND CIRCUIT	643	124	104	20	15.8
Connecticut	153	116	96	20	17.2
New York					
Eastern	89	125	103	22	17.2
Northern	80	134	113	21	15.6
Southern	179	144	121	22	14.8
Western	126	103	89	15	14.5
Vermont	16	97	78	18	18.6
THIRD CIRCUIT	595	132	110	22	16.2
Delaware	25	165	136	30	17.6
New Jersey	104	120	101	19	15.9
Pennsylvania					
Eastern	176	147	121	26	16.4
Middle	182	126	105	20	16.3
Western	107	123	104	19	15.6
Virgin Islands	1				
FOURTH CIRCUIT	4,060	157	130	27	16.9
Maryland	290	162	133	29	17.5
North Carolina					
Eastern	465	172	143	29	16.5
Middle	196	155	129	26	16.5
Western	337	191	160	31	15.4
South Carolina	701	155	127	28	17.5
Virginia					
Eastern	958	159	131	28	16.9
Western	491	152	129	24	15.5
West Virginia					
Northern	367	118	96	22	18.2
Southern	255	139	113	26	18.6

Table 8 (continued)

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

CIRCUIT		Average Current Sentence	Average New Sentence	Average Decrease in Months From	Average Percent Decrease From
District	N	in Months	in Months	Current Sentence	Current Sentence
FIFTH CIRCUIT	2,080	144	119	25	17.2
Louisiana	_,				
Eastern	188	135	117	19	13.8
Middle	67	125	105	20	15.9
Western	190	165	137	29	17.1
Mississippi					
Northern	137	123	101	22	18.0
Southern	178	124	103	21	17.4
Texas	170	121	103	21	17
Eastern	433	138	111	26	18.7
Northern	260	176	144	32	18.1
Southern	228	153	127	26	16.2
Western	399	140	115	24	17.3
Western	399	140	113	24	17.3
SIXTH CIRCUIT	1,360	129	108	21	16.1
Kentucky					
Eastern	71	104	87	18	16.3
Western	89	126	108	18	14.5
Michigan					
Eastern	169	155	128	28	16.7
Western	156	124	105	19	15.2
Ohio					
Northern	305	107	89	18	17.2
Southern	209	133	112	22	16.3
Tennessee					
Eastern	184	138	117	20	14.5
Middle	43	153	124	29	17.0
Western	134	138	115	24	16.9
SEVENTH CIRCUIT	1,123	158	129	29	17.7
Illinois					
Central	145	167	138	29	17.0
Northern	222	146	121	25	16.7
Southern	300	180	146	35	18.0
Indiana					
Northern	209	131	108	22	17.2
Southern	50	194	163	31	15.6
Wisconsin					
Eastern	95	133	109	24	18.7
Western	102	165	129	36	21.2
EIGHTH CIRCUIT	1,364	141	117	25	16.9
Arkansas					
Eastern	83	141	116	25	17.9
Western	53	102	86	17	16.7
Iowa					
Northern	127	164	135	29	17.6
Southern	95	159	133	27	16.4
Minnesota	160	174	143	32	17.0
Missouri				-	
Eastern	421	116	97	19	16.1
Western	180	159	131	29	17.0
Nebraska	239	140	115	25	16.9
North Dakota	0				
South Dakota	6	137	78	60	44.1
	· ·	10,	, 3		

Table 8 (continued)

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

		Average	Average	A vione de Deemeege	Avono do Donoont
CIRCUIT		Current Sentence	New Sentence	Average Decrease in Months From	Average Percent Decrease From
District	N	in Months	in Months	Current Sentence	Current Sentence
NINTH CIRCUIT	376	145	121	24	16.2
Alaska	38	157	136	22	14.1
Arizona	3	213	171	42	19.8
California	5	-15	1/1		17.10
Central	56	168	136	32	18.6
Eastern	82	143	119	24	16.4
Northern	39	115	99	16	14.0
Southern	9	154	133	21	14.5
Guam	0				
Hawaii	18	125	104	21	16.3
Idaho	2				
Montana	4	102	90	12	13.1
Nevada	56	155	129	26	16.3
Northern Mariana Islands	0				
Oregon	14	112	95	17	16.7
Washington					
Eastern	9	138	121	17	12.1
Western	46	143	115	28	17.3
THE STATE OF CASE					
TENTH CIRCUIT	424	152	126	27	17.2
Colorado	65	161	132	29	17.5
Kansas	175	129	107	22	16.8
New Mexico Oklahoma	42	144	119	25	16.8
Eastern	12	171	124	27	10.4
Northern	13 40	161 191	134 159	27 32	18.4 16.2
Western	74	187	153	35	18.5
Utah	14	120	100	20	16.0
Wyoming	1				10.0
wyoning	1				
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT	2,134	167	137	30	17.6
Alabama	,				
Middle	130	176	145	31	17.0
Northern	104	142	120	22	14.4
Southern	249	192	156	36	18.1
Florida					
Middle	687	164	133	32	18.4
Northern	206	232	189	43	18.1
Southern	264	141	117	24	16.9
Georgia					
Middle	246	130	105	25	19.2
Northern	70	186	152	33	17.8
Southern	178	162	138	23	14.0

¹Of the 25,041 cases, 614 were excluded from this analysis because the case cannot be matched with an original case in the Commission's records and 8,564 were excluded from this analysis because the court denied the motion for a sentence reduction. Of the remaining 15,863 cases, 1,222 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	N	%
Offense does not involve crack cocaine	1,033	10.7
Case does not involve crack cocaine	860	8.9
Sentence is determined by a non-drug guideline	173	1.8
Offender not eligible under §1B1.10	6,406	66.3
Career Offender or Armed Career Criminal provisions control sentence	2,337	24.2
Statutory mandatory minimum controls sentence	2,324	24.0
Case involved more than 4.5 kg of crack cocaine	871	9.0
Guideline range does not change	307	3.2
Base offense level does not change (due to multiple drugs)	264	2.7
Original sentence has been served	211	2.2
Statutory maximum sentence is less than applicable guideline range	85	0.9
Base offense level is 12 or lower	7	0.1
Base offense level is 43	0	0.0
Denied on the merits	1,460	15.1
Offender has already benefitted from departure or variance	495	5.1
Offender subject to guideline reduction at original sentencing	278	2.9
18 U.S.C § 3553(a) factors	232	2.4
Protection of the public	205	2.1
Post-sentencing or post-conviction conduct	160	1.7
Denial because of binding plea	90	0.9
No reason provided/Other reason	769	8.0
No reason provided	431	4.5
Other	338	3.5

¹Courts 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, 9,668 reasons were cited for the 8,813 cases. Of the 431 cases in which the court did not give a reason for the denial, 280 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 280 cases, a statutory mandatory minimum controlled the sentence in 45 cases, in 30 cases the quantity of crack cocaine in the case exceeded 4.5 Kg, in 40 cases the sentence was determined by a non-drug guideline, in 14 cases no change in the guideline range was found, in 53 cases crack cocaine was not involved, in 60 cases Career Offender or Armed Career Criminal provisions controlled the sentence, in 24 cases the offender was predicted to have been released, in nine cases the Bureau of Prisons informed the Commission that the offender was no longer serving time for the instant offense, in one case the base offense level was 12 or lower, in three cases the base offense level was 43 and in one case there was no record on file with the Bureau of Prisons.