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In this report we highlight trends in state and county jail populations, from January 2019 to June 2021. Using the accompanying data tool, readers can explore these numbers in more detail. Instructions for using the tool are provided at the end of this report. Please refer to our April 2020 jail report (here) for information on data sources and calculations.

## State Level Trends

As seen in Figure 1 below, in 2019—before the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic—monthly statewide jail populations fluctuated between a high of nearly 20,000 to a low of 15,000 . Early 2020 monthly populations topped 2019 levels, but with the onset of the pandemic in the Spring of 2020, monthly statewide populations started dropping, hitting a low in July 2020 before beginning a general rebound. Monthly numbers for January through June 2021 fluctuated within a relatively narrow band. 2021 numbers were higher than 2020 months impacted by COVID (April through June) but remained below numbers for the same months in 2019.

Figure 1. Number of individuals detained in jail statewide-January 2019 through June 2021


Figure 2 shows these numbers in the format of our data tool: a bar chart of monthly populations.

Figure 2. Monthly statewide jail populations—January 2019 through June 2021


We offer one cautionary note about 2019 data: Because a significant portion of facilities did not consistently report monthly data in 2019, numbers for that period likely understate the actual population. For example, less than 70\% of facilities reported data in March 2019. As shown in Figure 3, a greater percentage of facilities reported data in 2020 and 2021. Thus, 2020 and 2021 totals should closely align with actual jail population numbers, but 2019 numbers may significantly underreport total occupancy, particularly in those months when many facilities failed to report data.

Figure 3. Share of Confinement Facilities Reporting Monthly Data—January 2019 through June 2021


## County Level Data

Because statewide data can hide variation at the local level, we also looked at county jail populations. Overall, we found that the vast majority ( $83 \%$ ) of counties had lower jail populations for the first six months of 2021 as compared to the same period in 2019 (pre-pandemic). When comparing 2021 to 2020 (pandemic to pandemic years), the percent of counties with lower numbers in 2021 fell to $70 \%$. As shown in Figure 2 above, there was a jump in statewide population numbers in May and June of 2021. When we looked at this period at the county level, we found that, consistent with statewide numbers, most counties experienced increased populations in those months of 2021. There was however a wide range in those county level increases.

When comparing the first sixth months of 2021 to 2019 (pre-pandemic), $83 \%$ of counties reporting data had a decrease in average populations. However, fourteen counties had higher populations in the first six months of 2021 as compared to the same period in 2019. Those counties are displayed in Table 1. As shown there, Graham County was an outlier in terms of percentage increase. We contacted that facility and learned that this increase was related to a change in housing during the pandemic. Specifically, that in the pre-pandemic period, the county housed the majority of its detainees in out-of-county facilities. However, during the pandemic those transfers ceased and the county was required to house all detainees locally. We remind readers that counties report only detainees physically held in-county; detainees housed out-of-county are reported by the facility that houses those persons. But even when Graham County is removed, the range of percentage increases is wide, from a low of $1.6 \%$ to a high of 26.6 \%.

Table 1. County jails with population increases in the first six months of 2021 as compared to the same period in $2019{ }^{1}$

| Counties | 2019 Average <br> Monthly <br> Population | 2021 Average <br> Monthly <br> Population | Percentage <br> Increase |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Graham | 8 | 28 | $250.0 \%$ |
| Stokes | 94 | 119 | $26.6 \%$ |
| Catawba | 188 | 238 | $26.6 \%$ |
| Pender | 52 | 65 | $25.0 \%$ |
| Chowan | 20 | 25 | $25.0 \%$ |
| Bladen | 102 | 124 | $21.6 \%$ |
| Lee | 118 | 143 | $21.2 \%$ |
| Chatham | 64 | 74 | $15.6 \%$ |
| Surry | 151 | 171 | $13.2 \%$ |
| Pasquotank | 49 | 199 | $10.6 \%$ |
| Jackson | 255 | 50 | $2.0 \%$ |
| Harnett | 296 | 260 | $2.0 \%$ |
| Craven | 63 | 301 | $1.7 \%$ |
| Madison |  | 64 | $1.6 \%$ |

[^0]When comparing the first six months of 2021 to 2020 (pandemic to pandemic years), $70 \%$ of counties reporting data had lower average jail populations in 2021; 29\% had higher average populations. Counties that had higher populations in 2020 as compared to 2021 are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. County jails with population increases in the first six months of 2021 as compared to the same period in 2020

| Counties | 2020 Average <br> Monthly Population | 2021 Average <br> Monthly Population | Percentage Increase |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Graham | 10 | 28 | 180.0\% |
| Beaufort | 21 | 42 | 100.0\% |
| Granville | 55 | 81 | 47.3\% |
| Pender | 47 | 65 | 38.3\% |
| Madison | 50 | 64 | 28.0\% |
| Lee | 113 | 143 | 26.5\% |
| Halifax | 62 | 74 | 19.4\% |
| Anson | 48 | 53 | 10.4\% |
| Franklin | 148 | 163 | 10.1\% |
| Swain | 78 | 85 | 9.0\% |
| Graven | 278 | 301 | 8.3\% |
| Durham | 317 | 340 | 7.3\% |
| Watauga | 69 | 74 | 7.2\% |
| Hamett | 243 | 260 | 7.0\% |
| Columbus | 144 | 154 | 6.9\% |
| Clay | 29 | 31 | 6.9\% |
| Iredell | 259 | 276 | 6.6\% |
| New Hanover | 497 | 528 | 6.2\% |
| Moore | 137 | 145 | 5.8\% |
| Chowan | 24 | 25 | 4.2\% |
| Surry | 165 | 171 | 3.6\% |
| Catawba | 230 | 238 | 3.5\% |
| Cleveland | 255 | 262 | 2.7\% |
| Rockingham | 170 | 174 | 2.4\% |
| Carteret | 130 | 133 | 2.3\% |
| Jackson | 49 | 50 | 2.0\% |
| Nash | 108 | 109 | 0.9\% |

Although most counties had lower average jail populations in the first six months of 2021 compared to the first six months of 2019 and 2020, Figure 2 above shows a notable increase in the statewide population in May and June 2021. This was not, however, a consistent trend at the county level. 35\% of counties that reported data had lower average jail populations in May and June 2021 as compared to earlier months of the year. $64 \%$ had increases, and there was a wide range of those increases, from $1.2 \%$ to $52.2 \%$, as shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Counties with increases in jail populations, May-June 2021, as compared to Jan.-April 2021.

| Counties | January - April <br> Average Monthly <br> Population | May - June <br> Average Monthly <br> Population | Percentage <br> Increase |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Gramille | 69 | 105 | $52.2 \%$ |
| Caswell | 24 | 34 | $41.7 \%$ |
| Davie | 33 | 46 | $39.4 \%$ |
| Orange | 72 | 97 | $34.7 \%$ |
| Alexander | 20 | 87 | $31.8 \%$ |
| Alleghany | 35 | 26 | $30.0 \%$ |
| Polk | 141 | 45 | $28.6 \%$ |
| Columbus | 96 | 180 | $27.7 \%$ |
| Randolph | 77 | 231 | $26.9 \%$ |
| Haywood | 19 | 121 | $26.0 \%$ |
| Ashe | 47 | 25 | $22.1 \%$ |
| Warren | 172 | 56 | $21.1 \%$ |
| Jackson | 112 | 299 | $19.1 \%$ |
| Rowan | 92 | 203 | $18.7 \%$ |
| Sampson | 162 | 132 | $17.9 \%$ |
| Caldwell | 70 | 108 | $17.4 \%$ |
| Cherokee | 150 | 190 | $17.3 \%$ |
| Rutherford | 82 | $17.1 \%$ |  |
| Chatham | 175 | $16.7 \%$ |  |
| Wilkes |  |  |  |


| Counties | January - April <br> Average Monthly <br> Population | May - June <br> Average Monthly <br> Population | Percentage <br> Increase |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Bertie | 61 | 70 | $14.8 \%$ |
| Watauga | 71 | 81 | $14.1 \%$ |
| Henderson | 156 | 177 | $13.5 \%$ |
| Dare | 54 | 61 | $13.0 \%$ |
| Richmond | 81 | 91 | $12.3 \%$ |
| Lincoln | 102 | 114 | $11.8 \%$ |
| Yadkin | 82 | 90 | $9.8 \%$ |
| Transylvania | 43 | 47 | $9.3 \%$ |
| Iredell | 268 | 292 | $9.0 \%$ |
| Hertford | 46 | 50 | $8.7 \%$ |
| Catawba | 231 | 251 | $8.7 \%$ |
| Qeveland | 255 | 277 | $8.6 \%$ |
| Surry | 167 | 181 | $8.4 \%$ |
| McDowell | 144 | 156 | $8.3 \%$ |
| Davidson | 231 | 249 | $7.8 \%$ |
| Clay | 30 | 32 | $6.7 \%$ |
| Union | 199 | 212 | $6.5 \%$ |
| Rockingham | 170 | 181 | $6.5 \%$ |
| Cabarrus | 205 | 218 | $6.3 \%$ |


| Counties | January - April <br> Average Monthly <br> Population | May - June <br> Average Monthly <br> Population | Percentage <br> Increase |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Durham | 333 | 354 | $6.3 \%$ |
| Edgecome | 133 | 141 | $6.0 \%$ |
| Washington | 17 | 18 | $5.9 \%$ |
| Bladen | 122 | 129 | $5.7 \%$ |
| Wayne | 323 | 340 | $5.3 \%$ |
| Onslow | 297 | 312 | $5.1 \%$ |
| Duplin | 81 | 85 | $4.9 \%$ |
| Alamance | 292 | 306 | $4.8 \%$ |
| Person | 66 | 69 | $4.5 \%$ |
| Mecklenburg | 1,400 | 1,450 | $3.6 \%$ |
| Gaston | 486 | 503 | $3.5 \%$ |
| Brunswick | 195 | 201 | $3.1 \%$ |
| Pasquotank | 197 | 203 | $3.0 \%$ |
| Halifax | 73 | 75 | $2.7 \%$ |
| Buncombe | 387 | 396 | $2.3 \%$ |
| Guilford | $6 / 6$ | 691 | $2.2 \%$ |
| Wake | 1,113 | 1,132 | $1.7 \%$ |
| New Hanower | 525 | 533 | $1.5 \%$ |
| Hamett | 259 | 262 | $1.2 \%$ |

A number of factors may account for observed trends, including the halt in and reduction of jury trials, initiation and current status of efforts to reduce jail populations during the pandemic, and changes in criminal charging to name a few.

We will continue to update this report every six months. As noted, the data tool associated with this report is here. When you go to the data tool, it will show bar charts for statewide numbers. To see those results for a specific county, open the dropdown menu in cell B1 (upper left-hand corner). Click twice on the "All" checkbox and then choose your county of interest. Click "OK" and the bar chart will automatically update. If a bar is missing for any month, that means the county did not report data for that month.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ In this table and the following tables, average populations were first rounded to the nearest single digit (e.g., 85.3 rounded to 85 ). Percentage changes in jail populations were then calculated based upon these rounded figures.

