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Jackson County voters are being asked to vote whether to create a law enforcement service district that would fund construction and operation of a new jail. Currently, because of limited space, individuals are released from the Jackson County jail due to jail overcrowding.

This report has been prepared by the Jackson County Internal Audit Program (IA) for informational purposes. This report is not an audit. We do not offer any findings, conclusions, or recommendations, which audits typically include. The purpose of this report is limited to gathering and reporting data that aids informed, public discussion and decision making.

This report provides information that includes:

- The number of individuals booked into the jail
- The number of individuals with multiple bookings
- The types of charges and lengths of stay of the individuals
- The number who get released from jail because of limited jail space
- The number with warrants for failing to appear (FTA) for prior court dates
- The number who have mental health issues
- The number who have drug use/abuse issues
- The number who are homeless and the charges leading to their arrests

Information provided in this report is based upon data from the jail’s database system and medical records. We make no claims regarding the accuracy of this data.

The jail’s database was designed for the purpose of tracking movement into and within the jail. As such we were limited in our ability to collect certain information that would have been useful for this report’s purpose. We discuss these limitations within the body of the report.

C: Board of Commissioners  
Audit Committee  
Sheriff Nathan Sickler
IN A NUTSHELL

We analyzed jail booking data received from the Sheriff’s Office for the period of September 1, 2018 thru August 31, 2019. Below is a graphic summarizing the results of that analysis.

- **13,419** Number of Bookings at the Jail
- **6,756** Number of Unique Individuals Booked at the Jail
- **2,804** Number of Individuals Forced Released at Least Once
- **1,777** Number of Individuals with at Least 1 Failure to Appear Warrant
- **1,591** Number of Individuals with at Least 1 Drug Related Charge
- **1,400** Number of Individuals Who Self-Reported being Homeless
- **365** Number of Individuals Booked 6 or more Times
- **?** Number of Individuals with Mental Health Issues (could not be determined)
Introduction and Background

The difference between detainees and inmates

The jail population consists of both “inmates” and “detainees.”

Inmates – An inmate is a person who has pled guilty or no contest, or has had his/her trial and has been found guilty and sentenced to spend time in jail (or has been found guilty and is waiting to be transferred to prison). A person who is in administrative custody because he/she has been found to be in violation of the terms and conditions of his/her probation is also classified as an inmate.

Detainees – A “detainee” is a person being detained either before or during a trial.

The Criminal Justice System as it pertains to detainees and inmates

A quick review of the steps in the criminal justice system explains why there are detainees and the limitations on detaining individuals. The steps are:

1. Arrest/booking/lodging: A city police officer, county deputy, or other law enforcement personnel who has reason to believe an individual committed a crime may make the decision to arrest that individual. The arrested person is typically brought to the jail to be booked and then lodged in the jail. ‘Booking’ refers to fingerprinting, photographing and creating a record of the arrest and lodging. Neither law enforcement nor the jail has the authority to keep an arrested person in jail indefinitely. A judge will quickly determine whether a person can be kept in jail.

When discussing the jail population, it is important to distinguish between “bookings” and “unique individuals.” Booking refers to an event (e.g., a person is arrested and brought to jail or the person is brought to jail for violating probation). Because a unique individual may be booked on more than one occasion during a year, the number of bookings is higher than the number of unique individuals.
In some instances, law enforcement officers may ‘cite and release’ an individual rather than bring the individual to jail. These individuals will be booked after arraignment but not necessarily lodged. These bookings are referred to as ‘process only bookings.’ Oregon law establishes that a cite and release is allowable when the offense is a misdemeanor or a Class C felony, unless the crime involves domestic violence.

2. Pre-arraignment: After the arrest, the District Attorney’s Office (DA) has 36 hours (excluding holidays, Saturdays, and Sundays) to review the arrest report and decide whether to file charges against an arrested person being held in jail. The pre-arraignment period is the time period between arrest and the time the arrested person must appear before a judge for an arraignment.

3. Arraignment: If the DA chooses to file charges then a formal hearing (arraignment) is held. At the arraignment, the charges are read to the defendant, the defendant is read his/her rights, appointed a lawyer if needed, and then the defendant will enter a plea of guilty or not guilty. The judge decides whether the defendant may be released until trial, whether the defendant may be released only if he/she makes bail, or whether the defendant must remain in jail until the trial.

4. Pre-trial: This refers to the period of time after arraignment and before conclusion of the trial.
How Many People get Sent to Jail in a Year?

We found:

- 6,756 unique individuals were booked at the jail from September 1, 2018 thru August 31, 2019. Of these, 5,555 were lodged at the jail. The remaining 1,201 were ‘process only bookings,’ which do not involve a lodging. Process only bookings occur when at the time of arrest, law enforcement issues a citation in lieu of arrest (commonly referred to as ‘cite and release’) rather than transporting the individual to the jail to be booked and lodged.

- In total, these 6,756 individuals were booked into the jail 13,419 times during the year.

- This averages to 37 bookings per day.

Throughout this report, we refer to the 6,756 booked individuals and not the 5,555 lodged individuals. We chose this approach because we cannot determine the extent to which jail overcrowding influenced each decision made by law enforcement to cite and release rather than arrest an individual. In addition, because some individuals were cited and released on one occasion and booked and lodged on another occasion, using all the bookings throughout this report provides more consistency and reduces the likelihood of creating confusion. When relevant, we footnote statistics based on exclusion of the process only bookings.
What Number of Individuals are Booked on Multiple Occasions Throughout the Year?

We examined jail data for the one-year period (September 1, 2018 – August 31, 2019) to determine how many times each of the 6,756 individuals was booked during the year. Please note the data below does not include bookings that happened prior to September 1, 2018 or after August 31, 2019.

We found:

- 79% were booked one or two times during the year.\(^1\) These 5,333 individuals were booked a total of 6,535 times, which equates to about half of the 13,419 bookings that occurred. Of these, 4,131 individuals were booked once and didn’t return to the jail during the year reviewed. The remaining 1,202 were booked twice during the year.\(^2\)

\(\text{A person booked twice in the 12-month period may have also been booked in the month prior to the 1}\text{st month of the 12-month period and the month just after the 12}\text{th month. In this scenario, if we had studied a 14-month time period, we would be reporting that the person had 4 bookings in the 14-months instead of reporting that the person had 2 bookings in 12 months. As a result, the statistic may underrepresent the number of individuals who have multiple bookings.}\)

- The other 21% of individuals booked during the year account for the other half of all the bookings. These 1,423 individuals were each booked three or more times. In total, they were booked 6,884 times.

A few numbers provide context to the individuals with multiple bookings:

- 365 unique individuals were booked 6 or more times in the year, an average of at least once every 2 months. These 365 individuals equate to just 5.4% of all the booked individuals but they accounted for 22.5% of all bookings.

\(^1\) If process only bookings are excluded, the percentage of individuals with one or two bookings goes down from 79% to 77% of all individuals booked during the year.

\(^2\) This includes any individuals sent to prison or still in jail, who therefore could not re-offend in the community.
• The 100 individuals with the most bookings each had 9 or more bookings.\(^3\) Together these 100 accounted for 10% of the bookings (1,344 of 13,419).

• 43 individuals were each booked 12 or more times during the year reviewed. In other words, they were each booked on average at least once a month.

• The 10 individuals with the highest number of bookings ranged from 17 bookings to 30 bookings during the year.

The chart below presents full data on how many times each of the 6,756 individuals were booked during the year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Times Booked During the Year</th>
<th>Count of Unique Individuals</th>
<th>Count of Unique Bookings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,131</td>
<td>4,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,202</td>
<td>2,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>1,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>1,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,756</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,419</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\) 114 individuals had 9 or more bookings. We chose to use the number 100 to give context to the extent that there are numerous individuals with multiple bookings.
What are the Charges these Individuals are Being Booked For?

The 6,756 individuals were booked a total of 13,419 times. These bookings involved over 30,000 charges.

Because a booking may involve multiple charges and because a person may be booked on multiple occasions during the year, it is hard to provide a short, simple answer to this question. For example, an officer may make a motor vehicle stop and find a person with a failure to appear warrant driving with a suspended license and find drugs on the person. This would result in a booking of a failure to appear (FTA), a drug-related charge, and a driving offense. Another person may be booked 5 times during the year for burglary and on 2 of the 5 times also be arrested for a drug related charge.

The table below provides a summary of the most common types of charges. Because an individual can appear in more than one category, the total count of individuals below is more than 6,756 (the number of unique individuals booked during the year).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charge Category</th>
<th>Count of Individuals</th>
<th>Example of Charges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Failure to Appear</td>
<td>1,777</td>
<td>Multiple types of charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug-Related Charge</td>
<td>1,591</td>
<td>Possession, distribution, and/or manufacturing of controlled substance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole/Probation Violation</td>
<td>1,578</td>
<td>Multiple types of charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trespass and Related Activity</td>
<td>1,413</td>
<td>Trespass, Disorderly Conduct, Mischief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving Under the Influence</td>
<td>1,271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving Related Charges</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>Driving While Suspended, Reckless Driving, Unauthorized Use of Motor Vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery and Related Activity</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>Theft, Burglary, Robbery, ID Theft (Theft was the most common charge of these charge types)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Jurisdiction Charges</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>Out of County Warrant, Federal, Fugitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interference with Law Enforcement</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>Resisting Arrest, Assaulting Officer, Interfere w/ Law Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contempt of Court</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>Violation of Restraining Order, etc.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapon Related Charges</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>Prohibited Possession of Weapon, Unlawful Purchase of Firearm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We also found that the following occurred:

- 9 individuals were booked on a charge of murder, manslaughter, or related charge
- 21 individuals were booked on a charge of rape
- 87 individuals were booked on a charge involving a sex crime, not including rape
How Many Individuals get Released Due to Jail Overcrowding?

Oregon statute allows for the establishment of a maximum allowable number of inmates that may be held in a local correctional facility and for the corresponding release of individuals so that the jail does not exceed the maximum capacity established. The terms ‘CAP Release’ (with CAP being short for capacity) and ‘Forced Release’ are commonly used in reference to this statute. A risk assessment process is used to determine which individuals pose the least risk to the community and should therefore be chosen for release when the jail is at capacity.

We found:

- 2,804 unique individuals were released due to overcrowding during the year. Some individuals were CAP released more than once, as is presented in the chart below. Together, the 2,804 individuals were CAP released a total of 4,454 times.

- The 2,804 equates to about 42% of the 6,756 individuals booked into the jail during the year.

- On average, 8 individuals are CAP released each day of the year.

- The 4,454 CAP releases equates to 33% of the 13,419 bookings that occurred during the year.

The following table provides detailed information regarding the number of times each of the 2,804 CAP released individuals were CAP released.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Time CAP Released During Year</th>
<th>Number of Individuals</th>
<th>Percent of all Unique Individuals CAP Released</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,944</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 10</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Less than 1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 ORS 169.042 – 169.046.
5 When the process only bookings are excluded, the percentage increases from 42% to 50%.
How Long Does a Person Typically Stay in Jail Before Being CAP Released?

The 2,804 individuals were CAP released a total of 4,454 times. The chart below shows the length of time spent in jail before being CAP released.

A night is measured by whether the individual was in jail before and after midnight (a person arriving at 1 AM and then released at 11 PM would be counted as staying 0 nights but a person arriving at 11 PM and then released 2 hours later at 1 AM would be counted as staying 1 night).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Nights</th>
<th>Count of Bookings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 or more</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,454</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are Individuals Who are CAP Released Likely to End up Back in Jail?

Law enforcement officials have expressed concern that releasing individuals into the community without having detained them for a period of time long enough to address underlying conditions may result in the individual re-engaging in the activities that lead to the initial arrest and booking.

They have also expressed concerns that the likelihood of getting CAP released may result in individuals being less concerned about being held accountable for criminal activity. The term ‘catch and release’ evolved out of frustration that an individual arrested one day would be back on the street committing crimes the next day.

We examined the booking records of the 853 individuals whom were CAP released during the first 3 months (September 2018 – November 2018) of the yearlong study period. We examined these records to identify how many times each of these individuals was re-booked into the Jackson County jail during the remaining 9 months of the year. Please note, arrests resulting in a ‘cite and release’ and bookings into neighboring county jails were not included in our analysis.

We caution that this information should not be used to make any conclusions regarding the causality or impact of being CAP released.

We found:

- 281 (33%) had been CAP released during the first 3 months and were not booked into the Jackson County jail again during the year.
- 572 (67%) were CAP released and then booked 1 or more times again during the year. Of these, 185 were booked once more, 128 twice more, and 259 were booked 3 or more additional times during the year.

---

6 We used the 3-month period to allow for a reasonable (9 month) time period for which to analyze re-bookings.
7 This includes any individuals sent to prison or not released from jail and therefore could not re-offend.
What About Failure to Appear Warrants?

When an individual does not appear at a scheduled criminal court hearing, a Failure to Appear warrant (FTA) is issued. If the individual has a future interaction with law enforcement, the person will be booked for the FTA warrant in addition to any other charges relating to the interaction.

We examined the histories of the 6,756 unique individuals booked into the Jackson County jail during the year.

We found:

- 1,777 (26%) of the 6,756 unique individuals booked during the year had at least one FTA warrant at the time of their booking.\(^8\)

\(^8\) When process only bookings are excluded from both the number of unique individuals and the number of bookings, the percentage increases from 26% to 32%. 7 of the 1,777 booked individuals with an FTA only had a process only booking.
Does the CAP Release Practice Encourage People to FTA?

The hypothesis has been offered that the likelihood of getting CAP released (released because of overcrowding) emboldens individuals to ignore court hearings. Though we cannot speak to people’s motives, we analyzed CAP release and FTA data to determine the extent to which there is a relationship between the two. However, because some people had multiple CAP releases, multiple FTAs, or both; because we only looked at a specific one-year period; and because we did not include data from other jails, a person should not draw any conclusions from the data presented below.

We found:

1,253 individuals with at least one FTA were also CAP released at some point during the year.

- 1,253 (71%) of the 1,777 individuals who had at least one FTA warrant were also CAP released at some point during the year.
- These 1,253 individuals equate to 45% of the 2,804 individuals who were CAP released during the year.

The diagram below provides a breakdown of the 6,756 individuals booked during the year as it pertains to FTAs and CAP releases.

1,253 were CAP released and also had an FTA at some point during the year.

1,551 were CAP released but did not have an FTA during the year.
We reviewed the records to determine what came first, the CAP release or the FTA. Regarding the 1,253 who both had an FTA and were CAP released at some point in the year, we found:

- 399 individuals had at least one FTA prior to their first CAP release and then had another FTA after their first CAP release.

- The remaining 854 were divided. 518 had an FTA before their first (or only) CAP release and 336 had their first (or only) FTA after being CAP released.

We do not offer a comparison between the individuals who were CAP released and those that weren’t. Because a risk assessment is used to determine whom should be CAP released, the two groups of individuals are distinctly different and thus can’t be compared to each other.
What is the Chronic FTA Program?

In early 2018 the jail began setting aside a number of jail beds specifically so that an individual who is arrested and who also has multiple existing FTA warrants will not be CAP released due to overcrowding. This practice became referred to as the “Chronic FTA program.” The Chronic FTA Program was intended to address the issue of individuals with a history of getting arrested, getting released, failing to appear in court, and then getting arrested for a new crime, getting released, and failing to appear in court again and again.

Chronic FTA program records provided the following information:

- 80 individuals were held as part of the Chronic FTA program in calendar year 2018. Prior to being held in the Chronic FTA program, these 80 individuals had amassed a total of about 2,800 FTA warrants. Individually, about half of the 80 individuals each had 29 or more FTAs, with one individual having 88 FTAs. The warrants stemmed from about 450 separate cases.

- 102 individuals were held as part of the Chronic FTA program in calendar year 2019. Prior to being held in the Chronic FTA program, these 102 individuals had amassed a total of about 2,600 FTA warrants. Individually, about half of the 102 individuals each had more than 20 FTAs, with one individual having 94 FTAs. The warrants stemmed from about 500 separate cases.
How Many of the Individuals Booked into the Jail have Mental Health Issues?

No one knows for sure how many lodged individuals have diagnosed mental health conditions. Complete health records do not exist for every individual booked into the jail. The majority of individuals are released before a medical assessment is required to be performed.\(^9\)

The paragraphs below share the information we were able to obtain that relates to mental health. **Please note that some of this information pertains to a person experiencing a mental health issue, which is not to be confused with a diagnosed mental health condition.**

When a person is booked into the jail, there is a screening process which includes questions regarding mental health, thoughts of suicide, and whether the person would like to see the mental health staff while in jail.

We reviewed a sample of 95 medical files and found:

- 10 of the 95 self-reported a history of mental health issues.
- 18 (who didn’t self-report a history of mental health issues) had information in their files relating to mental health. In some of the 18 files, the information was just that the individual had a prior encounter with the jail mental health staff. In other files, there was information indicating that the individual had a mental health diagnosis prior to being lodged.
- Whether the other 67 had mental health issues or a diagnosed mental health condition could not be determined based on the information in their files.

When in jail, detainees and inmates have the ability to request to be seen by the jail’s mental health staff. Additionally, jail or medical staff may request that the mental health staff see the individual.

A request to see the jail’s mental health staff does not necessarily mean the individual suffers from mental health issues. Some requests may be

---

\(^9\) Oregon jail standards require a health assessment to occur within 15 days of lodging, though an assessment is not required if the individual had previously been lodged within the last 12 months and had a health assessment while lodged and is not exhibiting any signs of a health issue during the current lodging.
the result of an individual being in jail. For example, in our review we came across requests from individuals stating that they were feeling anxious or depressed due to the jail environment and would like to talk to the mental health staff.

On average, the mental health staff received 131 requests per month during the months of September 2018 thru August 2019. Please note this number represents requests and not unique individuals. An individual may make multiple requests during the month. Similarly, an individual may make requests in more than one month.

\footnote{Some requests are made on handwritten forms and therefore we could not efficiently determine how many unique individuals had submitted requests in each month.}
How Many of the Individuals Booked into the Jail have a History of Drug Issues?

We reviewed booking information and found:

- 1,591 of the 6,756 (24%) individuals had at least one booking that included drug related charges. Please note that for each individual, the charges may relate to personal use of drugs, charges stemming from an illegal drug-related business activity such as manufacturing or distribution of drugs, or both.

Additionally, in our review of the 95 screenings, we found 4 individuals self-reported having either current or historic drug use issues. The medical files of 18 of the remaining 91 individuals indicated the individuals were going through heroin or meth withdrawal or had other current or historical medical issues relating to drug use.
How Many of the Individuals Booked into the Jail are Homeless?

The definition of ‘homeless’ is evolving and is not universally agreed upon. Our use of the term ‘homeless’ is intended to be inclusive of those living in public spaces such as the Greenway, homeless shelters, their vehicles, or temporarily staying with friends or family.

Individuals being booked into the jail self-report their address. Some individuals may have falsely stated that they were homeless to avoid having their actual address recorded and used by law enforcement to their detriment or to the detriment of others living at that address.

We stress that the information provided in this report is based upon self-reported information provided by those being booked into the jail. We were unable to verify the accuracy of this self-reported information. Additionally, the living arrangements of an individual booked multiple times in the time period studied may result in that person being homeless during one booking but not during another. Accordingly, we disclaim that the numbers reported below may be inaccurately higher or lower than the actual number of booked individuals who are or were homeless.

We found:

- Around 1,400 individuals booked during the one-year period (September 1, 2018 – August 31, 2019) self-reported that they were homeless. We use the term ‘around 1,400’ because some individuals were booked more than once and reported being homeless during one booking but not another.

- The 1,400 equates to about 21% of the individuals booked during the year.
What are the Self-Reported Homeless Individuals Charged for?

We examined 2 two-week periods (3/3/19-3/16/19 and 8/4/19-8/17/19) of the year to gain a better understanding for what reasons self-reported homeless individuals are booked.\(^{11}\)

We wanted to determine the types of charges these 300 individuals were booked for, but because many were booked for multiple charges it is hard to categorize. What we can say is that:

- 112 had drug charges. Of these, 54 had a combination of drug and other charges. The remaining 58 only had drug charges.

- Of the 188 who did not have drug charges, 43 were booked for theft, robbery, burglary or a combination of these three. 39 were booked for trespassing or disorderly conduct. 27 were booked for a driving-related charge, with some being a DUII. Additionally, 23 were booked for an assault-related charge, 3 for a sex crime, and 8 for failing to register as a sex offender. The remainder were booked for a miscellaneous assortment of offenses.

At the time of the booking 62% of the 300 individuals had an FTA, a parole/probation violation, or both.

\(^{11}\) A Greenway sweep was performed on March 13 and on August 14, and the subsequent clean-up was performed on March 14 and August 15. We do not know if the sweep influenced the number of homeless booked during these two-week periods reviewed.
This report is intended to promote the best possible management of public resources. This and other audit reports produced by the Internal Audit Program are available for viewing on the County website. Printed copies can be obtained by contacting the Internal Audit Program.