



Pierce County

Performance Audits

955 Tacoma Avenue South, Suite 302A
Tacoma, WA 98402
Telephone (253) 798-4927 Fax (253) 798-4906

July 21, 2008

To: Criminal Justice Task Force

From: Matt Temmel, Performance Audit Coordinator

Re: Response to Comments on "SIPs and Frequent Flyers"

We thank Mr. Phillip Brooke for his questions and comments on SIP and other issues. His e-mail message was distributed to the task force on Friday afternoon. *See Attachment 2*
This response was prepared on short notice and is limited to a few items. Some of Mr. Brooke's questions have already been answered in previous task force materials, and other questions are outside the scope of our work.

Mr. Brooke asks: "Did the study take into consideration the area of original arrest(s)? How many come from outside the City of Tacoma?" The answer is available in previous task force materials, most recently our June 19 memo.¹ Today's memo (July 21), on page 1, says in summary: "The data clearly indicate that a majority of SIPs are brought to the Pierce County jail from outside Tacoma."

¹ In the June 19 memo by William Vetter and Matt Temmel, Table 7 (page 7) shows SIPs by arresting agency for three years as percentages of total bookings. The following table recasts the data to show SIPs by arresting agency, with percentages for those arrested by the Tacoma Police Department and other agencies.

SIPs by Arresting Agency, 2006-2008

	Tacoma Police Dept		Other Arresting Agencies		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
2006	419	48%	449	52%	868	100%
2007	1440	45%	1726	55%	3166	100%
2008 (to May 31)	413	40%	626	60%	1039	100%

It is important to add that the Corrections Bureau does not report how many SIPs were jail-initiated or officer-initiated. That will soon change, we hope.

Another question asked by Mr. Brooke is: "Did the study count re-arrests of SIP's overall & make comparisons to the Study Area vis-à-vis overall County/study area population to consider balance/imbalance."

In our analysis reported today, we counted re-arrests in the study area (Hilltop and other nearby locations) of people who had previously been SIP'd. The re-arrest rate was 6.1% in 2006, 6.6% in 2007, and 3.1% in 2008 through May 31. Less than 1% of all SIPs for those years combined came from outside Tacoma and were later rearrested in the study area. (See tables 1 – 5 in the July 21 memo.)

If the task force wants a broader look, we could look into how many SIPs are later rearrested anywhere in the county. However, that approach would result in a loss of focus about the impact of the jail and its SIP policy on the Hilltop and other nearby areas.

The research question addressed in our analysis is the impact of SIPs on public safety in the Hilltop and the other nearby areas. That question was based on previous task force discussions, especially on March 26 and June 21, and on Hilltop Action Coalition (HAC) material presented at the Evergreen State College, Tacoma, on March 20.

The meeting was well attended (including several members of the task force) and included a large number of HAC handouts based on information from the Pierce County Sheriff and other sources. At the meeting, Jeanie Peterson reviewed a handout called "Overview of our Jail Problem." With regard to persons who are SIP'd, the handout said:

"They are given a phone call, but if they can't find a way home, they are a Hilltop/Tacoma problem. If they want to buy drugs they'll buy them here, if they don't have any money, they'll commit another crime to raise the money, which will be committed here."

(See Attachment 1 for the full handout, with added yellow highlighting.) Thus it was claimed that the jail's SIP policy brings to the jail a large number of arrestees from outside Tacoma, who are then released and commit crimes on the Hilltop. The claim is not supported by objective analysis of the arrest data for the Hilltop and other areas in downtown and central Tacoma.

Mr. Brooke's memo refers to "Catch and Release criminals." This reference suggests incorrectly that people who are SIP'd are accused of serious crimes rather than the mostly minor charges that are evident in the data. (See Appendix B of the June 19 memo reissued on July 21). *(See Attachment 3 of this memo.)*

Mr. Brooke suggests a need to "repatriate" arrestees to other parts of the county. We disagree because the data are clear that very few persons who were brought from outside Tacoma and then SIP'd were later re-arrested in the study area.

The data suggest that homelessness and transiency, rather than SIPs and compliance releases, have a great impact on the Hilltop and nearby areas. It is our hope that objective analysis of the arrest data will lead to reconsideration of the “dumping” issue:

1. The arrest data do not support notions that the jail’s SIP policy has the result of “dumping” non-resident criminals on the Hilltop and other nearby parts of central Tacoma.
2. The arrest data do suggest the City of Tacoma is, in effect, “dumping” its homeless and transient people by arresting and re-arresting them, and using the jail as a kind of makeshift social service agency.

The Pierce County jail provides custodial services, with medical and dental care. But does the jail provide enough treatment or other social services to help chronic reoffenders break the non-productive cycle?

At the public forum on March 20 at the Evergreen State College, Tacoma Chief of Police Donald Ramsdell said in his opening statement: “Arresting people and putting them in jail is not the solution.” Later in the meeting, Chief Ramsdell said again: “Just throwing people in jail does not work.” We agree!

We hope the Criminal Justice Task Force will agree that SIPs are a relatively minor issue and that it would be appropriate to turn our attention to issues that have a much greater impact on public safety and quality of life. The arrest data from the Hilltop, downtown, and other parts of central Tacoma indicate that a large number of homeless or transient people are being arrested and frequently re-arrested for mostly low-level crimes. The problems are of long standing and have no easy solution. It is an open question whether incarceration and re-incarceration are doing much to solve the problems.

Attachments

Overview of our jail problem...

Early releases, or no jail time spent (at all) because of overcrowding:

1. 1360 people released in 2006
2. 3990 people released in 2007

- As of Dec. 31, 2007 the jail had **85.5% felons** [County jails are designed to hold criminals with sentences of less than one year & those waiting for trial]
- Some inmates have been in the PC Jail for **2-3 years on PRE-TRIAL motions**, etc. due to court backlog.
- On 12.31.07 the jail had an **inmate population of 1,363**. 53.19% were pre-trial, 34.19% were sentenced, and 12.62% were both.
- **The Jail capacity is 1465**, they reduce the number of people at the jail through two methods:
 - **Compliance releases** [where they realize they are over the limit and release the least violent offenders and those who have already served their time]
 - **In 2006 they released 560 inmates**
 - **In 2007 they released 818 inmates**
 - 196 of the 818 cases were Tacoma releases (on Tacoma cases) (24%)
 - Which means that **622 people who are from other areas** of the County were released on the Hilltop, if they couldn't get someone to pick them up, they were just let out here
 - **Special Identification Process (SIP) releases** [where they identify the arrestee and then immediately release them. They are given a phone call, but if they can't find a way home, they are a Hilltop/Tacoma problem. If they want to buy drugs they'll buy them here, if they don't have any money, they'll commit another crime to raise the money, which will be committed here]
 - **In 2006 they SIP'd 800 people**
 - **In 2007 they SIP'd 3172 people**
 - 1607 of those people had been arrested by TPD (50.6%)
 - Which means that **1565 people who are from other areas** of the County were released on the Hilltop (i.e. even though they were arrested in Gig Harbor, Puyallup, etc. they are released here)
 - It also means that the City was charged for those releases, which means in 2007 **the city paid \$192,840** (\$120/person times 1607 Tacoma SIP's) to have the people that TPD arrested released almost immediately (this charge will be \$132 in 2008)
 - This also means that a total of **2187 offenders who were not arrested in Tacoma were released here in 2007** (1565 SIPs and 622 compliance releases)
 - As of Sept. 1, 2007, the number of **unresolved cases stood at 2,460**. Of those, 14 percent were older than nine months. The current goal is to reduce the number of pending cases to about 1,500.

ATTACHMENT 2

July 18, 2008, 4:29:04 PM

CJTF members,

The Task Force received the following email from Phil Brooke, a local citizen, with questions and concerns regarding the handouts distributed yesterday. Some of his questions may already be answered in the handouts/studies; some are outside the scope of the work that has been done. Tim Farrell would like you to see the email and consider how the concerns of the downtown and Hilltop neighborhoods can be addressed as the Task Force continues its work, short-term and/or long-term.

See you Monday.
Carolyn Pendle

Senior Legislative Analyst
Pierce County Council
(253) 798-3631
www.piercecountywa.org/council

>>> phil brooke <oldbrickhousefarm@yahoo.com> 7/17/2008 5:49 PM >>>

Hi Carolyn-

Thank you for sending. I had a couple of questions, more observations, from a citizen's perspective for CJTF consideration. I'm not so much looking for further study, or even answers, but more to question notions promulgated in the report's conclusions. Especially since the Angelou Report for improving downtown economic vitality notes that for the Tacoma Avenue corridor to be a place of private investment (& not increasing social chaos), one of the things that needs to happen are "improved jail release policies."

Did the study count re-arrests of SIP's overall & make comparisons to the Study Area vis-a-vis overall County/study area population to consider balance/imbalance?

Did the study take into consideration the area of original arrest(s)? How many come from outside the City of Tacoma? Outside of the County? I know there is now limited citizen-friendly GIS crime mapping.. Are there internal ways of easily doing more? I guess I'm really posing the question: Do people come to Tacoma to commit crimes?

The rationale which led into a 365% increase in "catch & release" between 2006 & 2007 hasn't been fully vetted in public discourse, but is no doubt a major change of direction for public policy. I would imagine most citizens assume their city or county government is legally charged within their foundational documents to 'protect the public safety of their residents'. I was surprised to discover this was not the case in Tacoma. What a wonderful public proclamation it would be to not only call for a 50% reduction in crime (which I think is a great & ambitious goal), but legislate protecting public safety as a core value of City and County government.

For the Catch and Release criminals, where are they released and where do they go when released? How many have transportation back to their own part of the County & are they otherwise repatriated via alternate modes of transportation to where they reside? How many are re-arrested within a week and where do those arrests take place?

Certain addresses are listed (Rescue Mission, Nativity House, King Center).. Can overall incident mapping of crime be evaluated to focus prevention resources in those areas. Many addresses & blocks have high #'s of 911 calls. A good risk-based approach for designating limited public safety resources might be to focus resources where incidents are occurring. Second, are released inmates sent or referred to the housing/day center agencies?

Please thank the CJTF for their thoughtful consideration.

Most sincerely,
Phillip Brooke, Citizen
Tacoma, Pierce County

SIP Charge and Re-Arrest Charge for Those not from Tacoma

SIP Charge	Re-Arrest Charge
2006 (n=8)	
RECK DRV	Obstructing A Law Enforcement Officer
ILL DRUG CONDUCT	Malicious Mischief
VIOL ADULT CABARET ORD	DWLS 3
DISORDERLY CONDUCT (SIP)	Criminal Assault
MINOR POSS LIQ	No Driver's License On Person
DWLS/DWLR	Assault 3rd Degree
ILL DRUG CONDUCT	Illegal Drug Conduct (Paraphernalia)
ILL DRUG CONDUCT	Assault 3rd Degree
2007 (n=33)	
CRIMINAL ASLT	Urinating In Public
DWLS/DWLR	DWLS 3
RECK DRV	Reckless Driving
CRIMINAL ASLT	Misdemeanor Assault/DV
SHOPLIFT	Shoplift
CRIMINAL ASLT	Shoplift
DWLS/DWLR	UPCS
ILL DRUG CONDUCT	Illegal Drug Conduct (Paraphernalia)
PROB VIOL (PROST)	Soliciting Prostitution
PETTY THEFT	Violation Of A No Contact Order
UNLAW BUS COND	Misdemeanor Assault/DV
CRIMINAL ASLT	Malicious Mischief 3rd
URINATING IN PUBLIC (SIP)	Criminal Trespass
OBSTR PUB SERV	UDCS - Unlawful Delivery Of Control Substance
POSSESS DRUG PARAPHERNALIA	Malicious Mischief 2nd
OBSTR-FALSE CHR/STATEMENTS	Misdemeanor Assault/DV
SOL PROST	Obstructing A Law Enforcement Officer
PETTY THEFT	UPCS
CRIM TRESP	DWLS 3
DWLS/DWLR	Misdemeanor Assault/DV
DWLS/DWLR	DWLS 3
NVOL	Illegal Drug Conduct (Paraphernalia)
DWI	DWLS 3
PETTY THEFT	Illegal Drug Conduct (Paraphernalia)
DWLS/DWLR	UPCS w/Intent To Distribute
CRIMINAL ASLT	Unlawful Possession Of Marijuana
DWI	DWLS 3rd
DWLS/DWLR	Illegal Drug Conduct (Paraphernalia)
DWLS/DWLR	Urinating In Public
DWI	Misdemeanor Theft
DWLS/DWLR	Assault 4th
DWLS/DWLR	UDCS - Unlawful Delivery Of Control Substance
RECK DRV	DWLS 2
2008 (n=3)	
PROSTITUTION	Illegal Drug Conduct (Paraphernalia)
PSP	Obstructing Public Servant/False Statement
DISORDERLY CONDUCT (SIP)	Assault 2nd Degree