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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This memorandum report provides the Council with updated information regarding the status of warrants management (as previously described in OLO’s original report of 1996 and subsequent 1998 update). Highlights of this report include:

- descriptions of the processes employed by the County Sheriff’s Office, Police Department, and Department of Correction and Rehabilitation to record, track, and serve adult arrest warrants.
- detail on criminal, civil, and traffic warrants outstanding as of December 1, 1999,
- Police and Sheriff resources currently devoted to managing warrants, and
- changes implemented since September 1996 to ensure efficient management of outstanding warrants.

At July 1, 1995, the County’s warrant database contained 19,069 open and unserved items. By October 1, 1998, the warrant database had increased to 22,661 unserved items. As of December 1, 1999, open items had decreased slightly (from the year before) to 21,392 open and unserved warrants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>16,839</td>
<td>20,828</td>
<td>19,695</td>
<td>+17.0%</td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>2,230</td>
<td>1,793</td>
<td>1,697</td>
<td>-23.9%</td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19,069</td>
<td>22,661</td>
<td>21,392</td>
<td>+12.2%</td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of outstanding warrants managed by the Sheriff declined 5.4 percent since last reported by OLO. Examination of activities from calendar year 1995 through 1999, showed an average closure rate of 103 percent of the warrants received by the Sheriff’s Office (actual closure rate in 1999 = 105%). In recent years, Sheriff deputies could devote more time towards decreasing the backlog because they received fewer new warrants to serve than experienced in previous years.

Reversing the previous trend, the number of outstanding Police warrants decreased by 5.4 percent since last reported by OLO. Examination of activities from calendar year 1995 through 1999, showed that MCPD average closure rate of 84 percent of the warrants received. This closure rate represents an improvement over the 75 percent rate previously reported by OLO (actual closure rate in 1999 = 97%). Although the MCPD warrants backlog grew over the five-year period, the rate of increase declined significantly since 1997 because of special initiatives taken by the MCPD Warrant Control and Fugitive Units.
I. BACKGROUND AND ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

A. Background

In FY 96, Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) issued Report 96-4, Description and Evaluation of Warrant Processing in Montgomery County. The study reviewed jurisdictional and agency responsibilities for recording, tracking, and serving arrest warrants in Montgomery County. The report also included a time series of data (through calendar year 1994) about warrants managed by the Police Department and Sheriff’s Office.

On November 25, 1998, OLO provided the County Council with an update on the status of issued, served, and unserved arrest warrants through 12/31/97. That update also contained information about County resources devoted to recording, tracking, and serving warrants and any recent changes or plans related to more efficient management of the processes.

This OLO memorandum report provides an update on warrant activity through 12/31/99. The report also includes an overview of the processes and resources that County departments and offices (Police, Sheriff, and Corrections) use to record, track, and serve adult arrest warrants.

B. Organization of the Report

The remainder of this report is organized as follows:

Chapter II, Warrants Management by Police, Sheriff, and Corrections

Describes how the Montgomery County Police Department, Sheriff’s Office, and Department of Correction and Rehabilitation meet their responsibilities to record, track and serve adult arrest warrants.

Chapter III, Update on Unserved Arrest Warrants in Montgomery County

Examines the number of outstanding arrest warrants currently managed by the County’s Police Department and Sheriff’s Office.

Chapter IV, Sheriff and Police Activities to Reduce Outstanding Warrants

Describes the various approaches used by the Sheriff and Police to better manage their warrant workloads. Both agencies strive to increase their likelihood of locating the subject of warrants, to achieve high rates of warrant service, and to identify long outstanding warrants for State’s Attorney review.
II. WARRANTS MANAGEMENT BY POLICE AND SHERIFF, AND CORRECTIONS

This chapter provides an overview about how the Department of Correction and Rehabilitation, Montgomery County Police Department (MCPD), and Sheriff’s Office research, track, and serve warrants.

A. Department of Correction and Rehabilitation, Central Processing Unit

The Department of Correction and Rehabilitation operates a Centralized Processing Unit (CPU) in Rockville to serve warrants and process arrestees (see organization chart at Appendix A). Among other duties, CPU staff locate and serve any outstanding warrants on subjects brought in, fingerprint and photograph arrestees, arrange for appearance before a district court commissioner, and return completed warrants to the Sheriff’s Office or MCPD for final disposition. The FY 00 approved personnel complement for the CPU shows 34 positions, totaling 35.5 workyears (including 21 correctional officers).

Police officers and Sheriff deputies, who detain persons in conjunction with investigations or locate subjects of arrest warrants, transport the individuals to the CPU for processing. The apprehending officers prepare any applicable paperwork (i.e., statement of charges, event report), then return to duty. Staff in the CPU record and package the evidence and personal property, take fingerprints and photographs of the arrestee, and take the arrestee before a district court commissioner. This arrangement enables police officers and sheriff deputies to return to the field sooner.

B. Montgomery County Sheriff’s Office

Although funded locally, the Office of the Sheriff was established by the State of Maryland. In Montgomery County, the duties and responsibilities of the Sheriff’s Office are: provide courtroom security for the circuit court, transport prisoners between the detention center and the courts, and serve papers as directed by the courts (see organization chart at Appendix B). Papers requiring service include subpoenas, summonses, and warrants. Sheriff deputies serve papers issued by the district court related to civil matters and all papers issued by the circuit court.

Two units in the Sheriff’s Office manage papers referred by the courts for serving. These units record, track, and serve summonses, subpoenas, warrants, and notices of eviction issued by the courts or referred by other jurisdictions to the Sheriff for serving. The Civil Unit manages and serves all the court papers that are not warrants. The Warrant Unit handles the warrants referred by the courts and other jurisdictions for serving.

Sheriff’s Criminal Warrants Unit

The FY 00 approved personnel complement for the Unit shows 16 positions for a total of 18.4 workyears. This staff includes 16 sworn officers and 2 administrative aides.

The Criminal Warrants Unit handles all arrest warrants received from the circuit courts in Montgomery County and the civil arrest warrants issued by the County district courts. Each year, the courts send the Unit about 2,800 new criminal warrants to record, track, and serve.
(The Criminal Warrants Unit also handles all district court civil body attachments, circuit court criminal warrants sent from other jurisdictions, and extradition processes on fugitives located in other jurisdictions.)

The Criminal Warrants Unit records and tracks all arrest warrants in a County database, and the MILES (State), and NCIC (Federal) databases. The MILES/NCIC entries require periodic validation, which entails fully researching the warrants for validity and updating the database with current information. Each month the State sends a validation list of warrants to all agencies entering warrants into the MILES database. Any agency that does not complete and update information on their warrants could be denied access to the system. Currently, the Sheriff’s Office validates more than 100 warrants per month.

The flowchart below shows the processes that Sheriff staff follow to manage their warrant workload.

**WARRANTS PROCESSING BY THE SHERIFF’S OFFICE**

1. **Receive warrants from courts and other jurisdictions**
2. **Type warrant index card and start file folders**
3. **Review warrant documents for completeness**
4. **Check open and closed files for other warrants on subjects**
5. **Return the completed warrants to courts or jurisdictions**
6. **Indicate closed status in the Warrants Index System and remove records from MILES/NCIC**
7. **Detain and process subjects or transport them to the CPU for processing**
8. **Copy information from warrants and files to warrant worksheets**
9. **Assign warrants with photos of subjects to deputies or forward to other jurisdictions for serving**
10. **Run queries of MILES/NCIC and CJIS databases and research through surrounding MVA’s**
11. **Weekly review County police mug shots to locate photos**
12. **Enter warrants data into the Warrant Index System and MILES/NCIC**
13. **Add information to worksheets and review for quality control**
14. **Review closures daily**
C. Montgomery County Police Department

The Montgomery County Police Department (MCPD) is an Executive Branch department that was established in 1922 as the primary law enforcement agency for the County. Organizationally, MCPD consists of the Office of the Police Chief and three major bureaus: Field Services, Investigative Services, and Management Services (see organization chart at Appendix C). Various staff in each of the bureaus may become involved in obtaining, managing, or serving arrest warrants.

However, there are two primary units in the Management Services Bureau’s Information and Support Services Division that manage the majority of arrest warrants: the MCPD Warrant Control Unit and the Fugitive Unit. Warrants and summonses sent to MCPD by other jurisdictions are managed and served by staff in the Fugitive Unit. Warrants acquired by MCPD officers or detectives in the course of investigations are forwarded to the Warrant Control Unit for centralized management. The officer-generated warrants are immediately assigned to individual Fugitive investigators for follow-up.

Patrol officers, working out of five district police stations located throughout the County, are apprised of or assigned outstanding warrants. Officers who locate the subjects of warrants detain and transport the individuals to a Central Processing Unit (CPU), where the individuals are served the warrants and brought before a district court commissioner.

1. MCPD Warrant Control Unit

The FY00 approved personnel complement for the MCPD Warrant Control Unit includes nine and a half positions (6.5 permanent employees, 2.0 contractual staffers, and one long-term light duty officer) for a total of 8.5 workyears. This Unit receives all warrants issued by the district courts in conjunction with criminal or traffic cases. Personnel in this Unit research databases for criminal history as necessary; enter information into the Warrant Index System, MILES, and NCIC databases; maintain centralized files to control access to the original warrant documents; and actively pursue wanted subjects through desktop investigations.

The flowchart on the next page shows the steps taken by personnel in the MCPD Warrant Control Unit to record and track warrants.

In 1999, the MCPD, through the Warrant Control Unit, forged an agreement with the State’s Attorney’s Office to recall old (more than 3 years) misdemeanor warrants unworthy of prosecution. Through this Recall Program, approximately 2,000 warrants have been eliminated. These 2,000 recalled warrants were from calendar years 1991-1993. We are currently reviewing 1994 warrants and anticipate the recall of many more warrants through this effort.

Additionally, a light-duty police sergeant has recently been assigned to do Cold Case Review. Cold cases are those that are more than 3 years old and were not recalled through the Recall Program. Currently, the sergeant is reviewing the 1991-1993 warrants to identify new leads for follow-up by Fugitive investigators.
WARRANT TRACKING BY THE MCPD WARRANT CONTROL UNIT
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All warrants recorded in the Statewide Maryland Interagency Law Enforcement System (MILES) must be periodically validated (the warrant information must be verified by the jurisdiction that entered the data). Each month, the State agency that oversees MILES sends to the jurisdictions that have warrants in the database a listing of warrants for validation. System administrators periodically purge unvalidated warrants from the database. If jurisdictions fail to perform the majority of validations required, then the jurisdictions risk being precluded from entering information into the database. The verification process can take up to 60 minutes per warrant. The MCPD Warrant Control Unit maintains information in MILES on between 70 and 80 percent of its warrants—the determining factor being the severity of the crime.

The MCPD Warrant Control Unit receives about 11,000 new warrants per year that staff must research and record in the County database. The MCPD Warrant Unit estimates that this effort takes 60 to 75 minutes for each warrant received. Staff spend an additional 15 minutes to enter each of the warrants they maintain in MILES (70 to 80 percent of warrants received). Validation for each warrant maintained in the MILES database requires an additional 60 minutes of effort.

The Warrant Control Unit also manages the return to Montgomery County of those persons arrested by other states upon the waiver or completion of the extradition process. Individuals wanted in Montgomery County but arrested in other jurisdictions are transported back to the County by either patrol officers (for short distances) or a contract service (for longer distances). Warrant Control Unit staff arrange for the transport of these fugitives.

The MCPD Warrant Control Unit currently has one part-time, six and one half full-time career positions, two contractual positions and one light duty police officer (9.5 positions) that spend about 75 percent of their time on research and data entry activities. From time to time, light duty officers also temporarily assist in the Unit.

2. MCPD Fugitive Unit

The FY 00 approved personnel complement for this Unit shows eight positions for a total of 8.0 workyears. This includes seven law enforcement officers and one administrative position. A major responsibility of the Unit is to process and serve warrants and summonses issued in other jurisdictions for individuals who are thought to be located in Montgomery County. The Unit directly receives warrants and summonses from various law enforcement agencies, departments of correction, and parole and probation offices in Maryland and other jurisdictions throughout the country.

When the Fugitive Unit receives a warrant or summons from another Maryland jurisdiction, the administrative secretary records the information into the new CJIS database. An officer researches the County’s warrant database, MILES/NCIC, MVA records, and other databases to obtain any additional information that may be available on the wanted person (description, criminal history, current addresses).
Other sources of information include State parole and probation records, the State offender-based incarceration database, County arrest files, and forwarding addresses filed with the post office. A Fugitive Unit officer then attempts to serve the warrant or summons and follow through with the arrest process. The Fugitive Unit does not have a backlog of warrants from other jurisdictions. If Unit officers cannot locate an individual to serve a warrant or summons, they return the unserved document to the originating jurisdiction.

The Fugitive Unit also conducts the follow-up investigations for all arrests made for out-of-state fugitives. The investigators follow through with any steps necessary to return the individual to the demanding jurisdiction. Fugitive Unit officers track the case until the fugitive is returned to the originating jurisdiction or released.

Officers in the Fugitive Unit also handle transports of prisoners from other states pursuant to the Interstate Agreement on Detainers (IAD). These IAD transports are made specifically to bring a person to trial in Montgomery County while they are serving time for another conviction outside of Maryland. The return transport (to Montgomery County) is the sole responsibility of the Fugitive Unit.

In addition to handling fugitive and extradition matters, the Fugitive Unit serves MCPD traffic and criminal warrants selected from the warrant database. These warrants are distributed among the officers in the Fugitive Unit for additional researching and serving.

Under a Warrant Reduction Initiative, established in May 1997, Fugitive Unit officers place top priority on serving MCPD warrants. Under this initiative, Fugitive Unit officers close from 2,500 to 3,000 warrants per year. These closures represent a vast improvement over the 600 to 800 warrants per year closed out by the Unit before establishment of the Warrant Reduction Initiative.

3. MCPD District Stations

MCPD divides the County into five police districts; each of which is further divided into a number of beats for patrol purposes. (The County is in the process of establishing a sixth police district.) There is currently one full-service County police station located in each police district with additional satellite stations located in some parts of the County. The five police districts are named: Rockville, Germantown, Wheaton-Glenmont, Silver Spring, and Bethesda.

Before the Central Processing Unit (CPU) was established in September 1995, patrol officers working out of the district stations served the warrants that were sent to MCPD from the district court in Montgomery County. The district courts still send arrest warrants to the MCPD Warrant Control Unit, but patrol officers working out of the district stations no longer serve warrants. Instead, the officers detain and transport the wanted individuals to the CPU, and that staff serve the warrants and process the arrestees.
The MCPD Warrant Control Unit generates lists of outstanding warrants for printing at the district stations. District station staff separate and distribute the lists by beat. MCPD expects patrol officers to review the lists and attempt to locate wanted persons as time permits. In addition, MCPD expects patrol officers to be "on the lookout" for wanted persons at all times, including during traffic stops and routine investigations of incidents. When patrol officers locate and apprehend individuals with outstanding warrants, they contact the Warrant Control Unit to fax the warrants to the CPU. The patrol officers transport the wanted individuals to the CPU for processing, and return to their patrols.

Prior to the CPU's establishment (September 1995), warrant officers in four of the district stations periodically sent letters to notify the subjects of warrants and request that they call the station to make arrangements to be served. This letter-writing effort was generally limited to warrants for misdemeanors and traffic offenses. The warrant officers processed those individuals who voluntarily responded to the letters, and actively pursued other warrants as time allowed. The warrant officer in the Germantown district also began assigning one or two warrants per month for serving by each patrol officer.

During FY 96, the warrant control officers were reassigned to other duties and the positions have not been re-established in the district stations. There is now a sworn officer or member of the district station administrative staff who coordinates patrol officer efforts on locating the subjects of outstanding warrants.

This effort has generally been limited to distributing warrant listings and encouraging officers to be on the lookout for or to locate individuals as time allows. In the Germantown district, the warrant coordinator (an Americorps volunteer) assigns two warrants per month to the patrol officers for serving. In October 1998, additional Americorps volunteers began working in the other police districts to assign two to four warrants per month to individual officers. These programs were put into effect as an extension of the Warrant Reduction Initiative.

The flowchart on page 9 shows the steps taken in the MCPD district stations to manage outstanding warrants.
MANAGING WARRANTS IN THE MCPD DISTRICT STATIONS

Receive report on outstanding warrants from the MCPD Warrant Control Unit

Assign 2 to 4 warrants per patrol officer for serving

If subjects of warrants are located or surrender, recheck the active status of the warrants and bring subjects to CPU for processing

Distribute lists of outstanding warrants to officers (by beat)

CPU staff obtain FAX copies from the MCPD Warrant Control Unit, serve the warrants, and process arrestees. Staff also FAX completed copies and subsequently mail the copies with original signatures to MCPD Warrant Control

Arresting officer returns to patrol

III. UPDATE ON UNSERVED WARRANTS IN MONTGOMERY COUNTY

This chapter updates information presented in OLO’s previous two reports to the Council, and reviews data contained in the warrant database as of December 1, 1999

A. Montgomery County Sheriff’s Office

As outlined in Chapter II, the Sheriff’s Criminal Warrants Unit manages all arrest warrants issued by the circuit courts (civil, traffic, and criminal) and any civil arrest warrants issued by the district courts. This Unit also receives and serves warrants issued in other jurisdictions for persons believed to be located in Montgomery County. Sheriff staff enter information about these warrants into the County’s warrant database within 24 hours of receipt in the Sheriff’s Office. Staff also enter warrants data into the State and Federal databases (MILES/NCIC), generally within 24 hours of receipt.
The Sheriff’s Office has teams of deputies who actively pursue locating the subjects of all warrants received. However, a backlog of unserved warrants always exists because:

- the subject of a warrant moved away;
- the subject actively avoids being apprehended;
- the subject is being held in another jurisdiction; or
- the name or other identifying information on the subject is inaccurate or false.
- extradition limits may restrict return of a located subject back to Maryland (i.e. subject located in Utah, but the extradition limit is only if located east of the Mississippi). A subsequent check is made with the State’s Attorney Office about subject’s location, and if a change in the extradition limit is authorized.

The table below summarizes data on the Sheriff’s volume and status of warrants over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OLO Report 96-4 5 years of data (90-94)</th>
<th>1998 Update 5 years of data (93-97)</th>
<th>1999 Update Last 5 years (95-99)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volume of warrants received</td>
<td>about 320 per month</td>
<td>about 237 per month</td>
<td>About 205 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume of warrants closed</td>
<td>about 300 per month</td>
<td>about 240 per month</td>
<td>About 213 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase to backlog</td>
<td>about 20 per month</td>
<td>about 3 per month</td>
<td>About 7 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unserved warrants</td>
<td>2,230 at 6/30/95</td>
<td>1,793 as of 10/01/98</td>
<td>1,692 as of 12/01/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted backlog</td>
<td>2,350 by 6/30/96</td>
<td>1,750 by 1/1/2000</td>
<td>1,525 by 1/1/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current resources for serving</td>
<td>16 deputies</td>
<td>no change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown below, the number of outstanding warrants decreased by 414 over the last five calendar years. The closure rate for the five-year period was 103 percent of the warrants received for serving. The chart of page 11 depicts information on the warrants received and closed quarterly during the five years; the table below shows the details by year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received</td>
<td>2,815</td>
<td>2,758</td>
<td>2,519</td>
<td>2,007</td>
<td>2,042</td>
<td>12,141</td>
<td>2,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>2,911</td>
<td>2,799</td>
<td>2,613</td>
<td>2,093</td>
<td>2,139</td>
<td>12,555</td>
<td>2,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect on Backlog</td>
<td>-96</td>
<td>-41</td>
<td>-94</td>
<td>-86</td>
<td>-97</td>
<td>-414</td>
<td>-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure Rate</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>105%</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td>103%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Montgomery County Police Department

The MCPD Warrant Control Unit controls access to all the warrant documents, and records and tracks warrant data in the County’s warrant databases. Personnel in the Unit entered information on the warrants into the Warrant Index System within 48 hours of receipt. Unit staff also enter information on warrants issued for serious offenses into the State and Federal databases (MILES/NCIC) within 30 to 45 days after receipt.

Patrol officers operating out of the five district stations try to locate the subjects of warrants as one of their many duties. These officers are “on the lookout” for persons named in arrest warrants, but are not generally “out looking” for the individuals. Beginning in 1995, officers in one police district were assigned specific warrants for serving, and the program extended to the other police districts in October 1998.

The MCPD Fugitive Unit handles warrants issued in other jurisdictions for persons believed to be located in Montgomery County. These warrants are sent directly to the Fugitive Unit from the requesting jurisdictions. Fugitive Unit staff record information about these warrants into a stand-alone database on a personal computer.
Officers assigned to the Unit actively pursue serving the warrants received from the other jurisdictions. The Fugitive Unit does not have a backlog of unserved warrants, since all warrants are eventually returned to the originating jurisdiction. Officers in the Fugitive Unit are also assigned MCPD warrants for serving.

The Police Department has a large backlog of unserved County warrants. A warrant remains unserved for a number of reasons, including:

- the subject of a warrant moved away;
- the subject actively avoids being apprehended;
- the subject is being held in another jurisdiction;
- the name or other identifying information on the subject is inaccurate or false;
- few officers are assigned to actively pursue serving warrants; and,
- bench warrants are not recorded into MILES/NCIC for 30 to 45 days after received.

The table below provides data on MCPD’s volume and status of MCPD warrants over time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OLO Report 96-4 5 year period (90-94)</th>
<th>1998 Update 5 year period (93-97)</th>
<th>1999 Update 5 year period (95-99)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volume of warrants received</td>
<td>about 825 per month</td>
<td>about 845 per month</td>
<td>About 885 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume of warrants closed</td>
<td>about 535 per month</td>
<td>about 630 per month</td>
<td>About 740 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase to backlog</td>
<td>about 290 per month</td>
<td>about 215 per month</td>
<td>About 145 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated unserved warrants</td>
<td>about 16,840 at 7/1/95</td>
<td>about 20,870 at 10/1/98</td>
<td>About 19,700 at 12/1/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted backlog</td>
<td>about 19,000 by 6/30/96</td>
<td>about 23,900 by 1/1/2000</td>
<td>About 20,000 by 1/1/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current MCPD Warrant Control Unit resources for tracking warrants</td>
<td>1 sworn, 5 civilian, and 2 temporary duty</td>
<td>1 sworn, 6.5 civilian, and 1 temporary duty</td>
<td>6.5 civilian, 2 contractors 1 temporary duty officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown below, the number of unserved MCPD warrants increased by 8,571 between 1995 and 1999. The average closure rate was 84 percent of the warrants received for serving during the five-year period. The chart on page 13 depicts information on the warrants received and closed annually during the five years; the table below shows information by year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received</td>
<td>11,046</td>
<td>10,081</td>
<td>10,108</td>
<td>10,635</td>
<td>11,168</td>
<td>53,038</td>
<td>10,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>7,697</td>
<td>6,716</td>
<td>8,813</td>
<td>10,411</td>
<td>10,830</td>
<td>44,467</td>
<td>8,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect on Backlog</td>
<td>+ 3,349</td>
<td>+ 3,365</td>
<td>+ 1,295</td>
<td>+ 224</td>
<td>+ 338</td>
<td>+ 8,571</td>
<td>+ 1,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure Rate</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MCPD Warrant Control Unit does not manage warrants received from other jurisdictions or record them in the County’s warrant database. The numbers shown in this chapter of the report for arrest warrants received and closed by County police represent only County documents that the MCPD Warrant Control Unit tracks.
C. Snapshots of the Warrant Index System Database

At OLO’s request, staff in the Sheriff’s Office queried the Warrant Index System to extract information on the status of warrants as of December 1, 1999. The extracted information provides numerous views of the data contained in the warrant database. This section of the report presents several views as snapshots to provide detail on the workload associated with recording and serving warrants.

The snapshots on pages 14-16 graphically display the following detail:

- There were 21,392 open and unserved warrants in the County database as of December 1, 1999. (County police also have about 2,000 warrants to record into either the Warrant or MILES databases).
- Of the open items, 64 percent relate to criminal cases, 33 percent relate to traffic cases, and 3 percent relate to civil cases.
- Open items include 12,632 warrants issued by the courts for failure to appear.
- 18,486 items (86.4 percent) were issued for persons with different names, so 13.6 percent of the individuals in the database have more than one warrant outstanding.
- MCPD has responsibility to manage 19,695 (92 percent) of the open items, including 12,987 criminal warrants and 6,708 traffic warrants.
- The Sheriff’s office has responsibility to manage 1,697 (8 percent) of the open items, including 866 criminal warrants; 254 traffic warrants, and 577 civil warrants.
C. Snapshots of the Warrant Index System Database

At OLO's request, staff in the Sheriff's Office queried the Warrant Index System to extract information on the status of warrants as of December 1, 1999. The extracted information provides numerous views of the data contained in the warrant database. This section of the report presents several views as snapshots to provide detail on the workload associated with recording and serving warrants.

The snapshots on pages 14-16 graphically display the following detail:

- There were 21,392 open and unserved warrants in the County database as of December 1, 1999. (County police also have about 7,000 warrants to record into either the Warrant or MILES databases).
- Of the open items, 64 percent relate to criminal cases, 33 percent relate to traffic cases, and 3 percent relate to civil cases.
- Open items include 12,632 warrants issued by the courts for failure to appear.
- 18,486 items (86.4 percent) were issued for persons with different names, so 13.6 percent of the individuals in the database have more than one warrant outstanding.
- MCPD has responsibility to manage 19,695 (92 percent) of the open items, including 12,987 criminal warrants and 6,708 traffic warrants.
- The Sheriff's office has responsibility to manage 1,697 (8 percent) of the open items, including 866 criminal warrants; 254 traffic warrants, and 577 civil warrants.
There were 21,392 open (unserved) items in the database at 12/1/99. Of these open items:

- 13,858 were issued in relation to criminal cases
- 6,962 were issued in relation to traffic cases
- 577 were issued in relation to civil cases

18,486 (86.4 percent) of the unserved warrants were issued for persons with different names

12,632 (59.1 percent) of the unserved warrants were issued for failure to appear

Responsibility to manage and serve:
- County police = 19,695
- Sheriff's office = 1,697
Open Items in Database as of 12/1/99

Civil: 5
Traffic: 6,708
Criminal: 12,987

Detail of Unserved Items in Database

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Traffic Cases</th>
<th>Civil Cases</th>
<th>Criminal Cases</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>6,708</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>12,987</td>
<td>19,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>1,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,962</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>13,853</td>
<td>21,392</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traffic Cases

- Sheriff: 4%
- Police: 96%

Criminal Cases

- Sheriff: 6%
- Police: 94%

Sheriff Workload

- Civil: 577 (34%)
- Traffic: 254 (15%)

Police Workload

- Criminal: 6,708 (34%)
- Traffic: 12,987 (66%)
Age Groupings of Warrants Unserved at 12/1/99

13,295 of the warrants were issued between 1/1/95 and 11/30/99

- Civil 3%: 388
- Traffic 33%: 4,338
- Criminal 64%: 8,569

6,405 of the warrants were issued between 1/1/90 and 12/31/94

- Civil 2%: 134
- Traffic 38%: 2,434
- Criminal 60%: 3,837

1,576 of the warrants were issued between 1/1/85 and 12/31/89

- Civil 2%: 27
- Traffic 11%: 177
- Criminal 87%: 1,372

26 of the warrants were issued between 1/1/80 and 12/31/84

- Civil 46%: 12
- Traffic 8%: 2
- Criminal 46%: 12

90 of the warrants were issued before 1/1/80

- Civil 18%: 16
- Traffic 12%: 11
- Criminal 70%: 63
IV. SHERIFF AND POLICE EFFORTS TO REDUCE OUTSTANDING WARRANTS

A. Sheriff's Office

The Sheriff’s office uses the media to obtain citizen assistance in locating wanted persons. The Sheriff’s office places weekly notices of wanted persons in the Gazette newspaper, periodically features a wanted person on Channel 21, and posts information on wanted persons for child support cases on the Internet.

Sheriff staff cannot quantify the results of using newspaper ads and the Internet as a means of locating the subjects of outstanding warrants. The office does not ask informants whether they are responding to a newspaper, television, or Internet feature.

Sheriff deputies access records and databases outside the department to help locate wanted persons. The Warrant Unit uses post office records, residential phone listings, Haines Criss Cross Directory, Social Security Administration information, and the Maryland Department of Economic Development databases to locate wanted persons.

Central processing of arrestees enables Sheriff deputies to return to duty sooner. Having the Central Processing Unit also increases the number of warrants that deputies can serve in a short period of time, which allows for more efficient sweeps (concentration of efforts in specific areas). Deputies conduct sweeps three or four times each year.

Staff also examine older warrants for viability and request the State’s Attorney to review certain cases for possible recall.

In 1999, Sheriff staff and the Police Department staff participated in a Federal Task Force called TALON. Sheriff staff provided the Department of Agriculture with a database of existing warrants. The Department of Agriculture ran the warrants through their database of individuals receiving public assistance. When matches were made, new addresses were provided to each department to attempt warrant service.

The Internet proves to be a valuable search tool used by deputies in the Sheriff office. The only drawback to this process is that only 3 people assigned to this section are permitted to use it and those people only work during the week. Deputies on the midnight or weekend shifts conduct most of the Internet research on warrants.

A “child support computer” was installed in this section which enables deputies to get more up-to-date information on the employment status of defendants.

The Motor Vehicle Administration cooperates with the Sheriffs office by providing MVA photos via a fax machine within 24 hours after a request is made. This enables deputies to know who they are searching for when they go to the door. This system prevents defendants from lying about their identities.
Baltimore County's Department of Economic Development assists the Sheriff Department with locating defendant's using social security numbers. The system enables the Sheriff department to search Baltimore County by submitting the social security numbers of people that have warrants.

B. Police Department

MCPD believes their use of media sources to locate wanted persons produces some small results, although staff have not tracked or quantified which additional warrants were served as a result of their postings. The department regularly features wanted persons on the Internet and four to six wanted persons in the Capital Crusader, a free newspaper produced by a non-profit organization.

Americorps volunteers coordinate assignment of two to four warrants to the patrol officers in the district stations. The program became operational in the Germanown station in 1995. MCPD extended this program to the other police districts in October 1998.

During-FY 97, MCPD established a Warrant Reduction Initiative to concentrate efforts in the Warrant Control Unit and the Fugitive Unit to reduce the number of outstanding warrants. The initiative became possible because both units had additional temporary personnel for a period of time.

Staff in the Warrant Control and Fugitive Units coordinated their efforts to take a more proactive approach to locating persons wanted on charges within the County. As part of the initiative, Warrant Control Unit staff made phone calls and sent notices to individuals requesting them to contact the police to arrange for officers to serve the warrants. In addition, officers in the Fugitive Unit concentrated on serving selected County warrants. As a result of these efforts, MCPD served 33 percent more warrants in calendar year 1997.

MCPD eventually reassigned the additional staffing and Warrant Control Unit staff began to have difficulty keeping up with the notification campaign. However, Fugitive Unit officers continued concentrating their efforts on serving MCPD warrants, and MCPD requested and received two additional investigators in the FY 00 budget.

The MCPD Warrant Control Unit accesses records and databases outside the department to help locate wanted persons. The Unit also uses phone company records, Haines-Criss Cross, residential phone listings, post office records, wage reporting from the State and several other state and local agencies that have agreed to assist the Warrant Control Unit in locating wanted persons.

Staff in the MCPD Warrant Control Unit examine older warrants for viability and request the State’s Attorney to review certain cases. Earlier this year, the department forged an agreement with the State’s Attorney’s Office and the District Court Clerk’s Office to review older misdemeanor warrants (3+ years outstanding) for viability. MCPD staff screened the warrants according to established criteria and forwarded likely nolle prosequi warrants to the District Court Clerk for possible closure. As a result of this effort, the State’s Attorney nolled about 1,700 warrants, and MCPD closed them in the warrants database.
Last year, MCPD conducted an informal survey of several officers having responsibility for serving warrants. The officers indicated that *central processing of arrestees* significantly reduces the time they spend dealing with arrestees. According to these officers, the time saved enables them to more effectively use their time for other duties, including warrant service.

The Police use civilians, temporary personnel, and volunteers. The MCPD Warrant Control Unit is currently using two *light duty officers* to concentrate their efforts on older warrants (outstanding 7-8 years) that were not initially recalled.

MCPD also *temporarily assigned* more than a dozen patrol officers to spend 60-90 days learning the business of the Fugitive Unit. These officers contributed heavily to the Unit's output and will be more effective in their warrant service because of the experience.

The USDA-led *task force* (Operation TALON) netted 200 Montgomery County arrests through December 1999. The final phase of the joint effort will conclude the early part of calendar year 2000.

As part of an initiative to lower outstanding warrants, the WCU in 1997 instituted the policy of entering all but the most minor of crimes into Miles/NCIC. Today over *99% of all warrants received from the district court are entered into Miles/NCIC*. This means that persons with warrants in Montgomery County can be identified by other jurisdictions throughout Maryland.
Dept. of Correction and Rehabilitation
(based on organizational reporting structure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office of the Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.0 WYs FY99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.3 WYs FY00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Trial Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9 WYs FY99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9 WYs FY00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Trial Services Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5 WYs FY99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5 WYs FY00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Program for Substance Abusers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0 WYs FY99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 WYs FY00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Community Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.0 WYs FY99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0 WYs FY00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central Processing Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30.4 WYs FY99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.4 WYs FY00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detention Services Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.0 WYs FY99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.0 WYs FY00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Custody and Security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5 WYs FY99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5 WYs FY00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inmate Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.5 WYs FY99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5 WYs FY00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mental Health Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.0 WYs FY99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 WYs FY00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 WYs FY99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 WYs FY00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medical Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.8 WYs FY99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.6 WYs FY00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.0 WYs FY99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 WYs FY00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Release Services Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 WYs FY99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 WYs FY00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43.4 WYs FY99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.7 WYs FY00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offender Assessment and Treatment Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 WYs FY99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 WYs FY00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Accountability and Reintegration Treatment Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.7 WYs FY99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.7 WYs FY00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Department Summary
FY99  375.4 WYs
FY00  385.8 WYs