
POLICE FELONY FILINGS
LEJ06-0001-1999



Snohomish County
Performance Audit Division

Final Report

Issued to:

Performance Audit Committee

May 1, 2001

Issued By:

Performance Audit Division



Snohomish County

Auditor's Office

Performance Audit Division

Date: May 1, 2001
To: Performance Audit Committee
From: Dean Ritchhart
Subject: Police Felony Filings (LEJ06-0001-1999)

Bob Terwilliger
County Auditor

Carolyn Ableman
Chief Deputy Auditor

M/S #505
3000 Rockefeller Avenue
Everett, WA 98201-4059
(425) 388-3006
FAX (425) 259-2777

This report presents the results of our review on Police Felony Filings within the Prosecutor's Office. The primary purpose of the project, as documented in the approved work plan, was to "Analyze the felony case processing system from referrals through filings. The objective is to determine impacts of each action on the criminal justice resource system. Develop recommendations with input from impacted L&J offices for potential improvements in processing procedures that appear to be beneficial as measured by better service, reduced processing time, and/or reduced costs".

Government Auditing Standards require us to review workplans when preparing for actual fieldwork. GAO Standard 6.4 states "auditors should design the methodology to provide sufficient, competent and relevant evidence to achieve the objectives of the audit". During this initial audit-planning phase, and from preliminary interviews and requests for information, we determined full completion of the review could not be accomplished. Without measurement criteria, we had no ability to interpret the data provided. We collected and identified many trends, but with no criteria to measure against, we could not interpret what we developed.

However, recommendations were made covering two areas. The first deals with data collection parameters for the County's proposed Integrated Law & Justice Database currently under discussion, and the second recommendation deals with management tools, related criteria, and their effective use. The Prosecutor's Office was in general agreement with the recommendations.

We wish to acknowledge the efforts Snohomish County Prosecutor, James H. Krider and his staff in providing full access to data and staff time. The project review was lead by Martin T. Standel and was assisted by Steve Torrence.

Dean L. Ritchhart
Performance Audit Manager



Executive Summary

During the August 5, 1999 meeting, the Performance Audit Committee authorized a review of Police Felony Filings. Due to concurrent audit assignments, the opening conference was not held until July 6, 2000. Also, because of the data's extremely sensitive nature, our review was limited to records captured within the Prosecutor's database.

ORGANIZATIONAL BACKGROUND

The Prosecutor's Office's purpose as identified by its mission is to "...fulfill its legal and constitutional obligations to the citizens of the County and State; to vigorously, fairly, and efficient prosecute those who commit crimes in Snohomish County; to provide high quality professional advice and service to Snohomish County and State of Washington governments; and to be knowledgeable advocates for improvements in the justice system". The Prosecutor's office delivers its services through 168 staff and the following, three primary service areas:

- **Criminal Division** – responsible for prosecuting all adult and juvenile felony cases referred by County law enforcement agencies, and all misdemeanor cases referred by the County Sheriff, State Patrol, all state agencies, and cities who have contracted with the County for misdemeanor prosecution services. It provides advocacy services for crime victims. Also, it maintains a pre-prosecution diversion program which holds selected first-time offenders accountable for their offenses while avoiding case filing, court, and incarceration costs.
- **Civil Division** – as authorized in RCW 36.27.020, it defends or prosecutes civil cases on behalf of County government and its employees. It provides legal advice, contract and document review and drafting for all county departments, boards and commissions. The Civil Division also represents the mental health division of Human Services in involuntary commitment proceedings.
- **Family Support Unit** – as authorized in RCW 74.20.220, it litigates issues regarding child support in cases referred by the State Department of Social & Health Services-Division of Child Support. The Unit primarily performs paternity establishment; child support order modifications; contempt child support order payment enforcement; and dissolution cases where the State of Washington has an interest in children receiving financial benefits.

RISK ASSESSMENT

Risk Assessment is an audit responsibility and is the act or practice of identifying the risk drivers and their magnitude. It requires the auditor to review and identify risks that may adversely affect a department or organization. The risk assessment process requires a disciplined approach and enhances the audit process by identifying, analyzing, and assessing the likelihood of risk occurrence and consequences; estimating an organization's assessed risk exposure and possible impacts; and determining an acceptable risk level. As a component of pre-audit analysis, risk assessment uses previous audits and planning assessments to rank risk impact of a department or organization.

Our pre-project risk assessment for Police Felony Filings deemed it to have medium risk. This assessment was based on the purpose of the review to determine if County facilities, such as Corrections, were being used efficiently, and if County costs associated with Sheriff and Police pursuit of cases, which cannot be prosecuted due to legal flaws or other weaknesses, were appropriate.

APPROACH

Our approach was to analyze the electronic files the Prosecutor provided us. These files contained 13,203 records of "felony declines" between 1994 - 1999. By using pivot tables, the information was sorted by unit, status, agency and DPA. We classified each record by jurisdiction and graphed the resulting data.

Findings

Government Auditing Standards (1994 Revision) Planning 6.3, require us to review workplans when preparing for actual fieldwork, and GAO Standard 6.4 states "auditors should design the methodology to provide sufficient, competent and relevant evidence to achieve the objectives of the audit". During this initial audit-planning phase, and from preliminary interviews and requests for information, we determined full completion of the review could not be accomplished. Without measurement criteria, we had no ability to interpret the data provided.

We collected and identified many trends, but with no criteria to measure against, we could not interpret what we developed. For example, using pivot tables, the number of



declines resulting from Snohomish County Sheriff referrals is 2,152. Specifically, we identified the number of declines by each Deputy Prosecuting Attorney (DPA) by year. During 1999, the DPA who declined the most Snohomish County Sheriff's Office referrals had 65, but we were not able to interpret this data. (See Attachment 1.)

We also requested specific data from Corrections regarding jail bed days. We wanted to identify the number of bed days used by individuals arrested, but not charged, or individuals arrested, charged, but not convicted. This was an attempt to quantify the portion of jail capacity used by these activities. When we originally requested this from the Prosecutor's Office, we were informed they only collect this type of data on individuals who are arrested, charged and convicted. Also, the process to capture this data is not currently available. Mr. Bly (Corrections) stated, while the information may be of interest, it has never been requested. Nor does their current system have the capability to develop or capture it.

Recommendations

Our recommendations concern two major areas. The first deals with data collection parameters for the County's proposed Integrated Law & Justice Database currently under discussion. A second recommendation deals with management tools, related criteria, and their effective use.

DATA COLLECTION

Each Department within the County's Law & Justice function collects specific data needed for their individual management and reporting requirements. Unfortunately, all Law & Justice data needed by County Departments are not maintained in a single database. This results in management being unable to fully identify and analyze all elements necessary for more efficient operations, and costs savings for the County and its citizens.

Recommendation 1: We recommend, with proper security procedures, the proposed Law & Justice integrated system be designed to track all data elements deemed appropriate by Department management.



MANAGEMENT TOOLS

When managing, understanding of and motivating support to achieve critical work requirements is crucial to success. A primary motivating tool is setting goals and measuring group performance against them. When people work in groups, there are two distinct and critical issues involved. The first issue is the task and problems associated with getting the job done, and the second is the group dynamics process. It is management's challenge to enhance the group's worth and morale through goal setting and measurement of critical work requirements, and then improving them. Setting critical work requirement goals and determining criteria for successful goal accomplishment may require significant management time, but are necessary for organizational improvements. Without goals and criteria, there is limited organizational direction, motivation, and advancement.

Recommendation 2: We recommend the Prosecutor's Office consider developing management goals and criteria guidelines for caseload management after the information addressed in Recommendation 1 above becomes available.

Response

We discussed our recommendations with the Prosecutor's Office and they are in general agreement with both recommendations.



Table of Contents

Management Letter	i
Executive Summary	ii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. Organizational Background	1
B. 2001 Adopted Budget Statistics.....	3
II. QUESTIONS, RISK, OBJECTIVES, SCOPE AND APPROACH	4
A. Audit Committee Questions	4
B. Risk Assessment	4
C. Audit Objectives & Scope	5
D. Approach	5
III. AUDITING STANDARDS, & PUBLIC INFORMATION	5
A. Auditing Standards, Authority.....	5
B. Public Information	6
IV. FINDINGS	6
V. RECOMMENDATIONS	7
A. Data Collections	8
B. Management Tools	8
VI. RESPONSES	10



Table of Exhibits

Exhibit 1	Prosecutor's Organization Chart	2
Exhibit 2	Prosecutor Staffing by Fund.....	3
Exhibit 3	2001 Adopted Budget Expenditures.....	3

Attachment 1

Declines by Year	1
Declines by Status	2
Declines by Status by Year	3
Declines by Agency	4
Declines by Agency by Year	5
Declines by Unit	6
Declines by Unit by Year	7
Status by Agency	8 - 9
Snohomish County Sheriff's Office	10
Everett PD	11
Lynnwood PD	12
Edmonds PD	13
Marysville PD	14
Declines by DPA	15 - 21



I. Introduction

During the August 5, 1999 meeting, the Performance Audit Committee authorized a review of Police Felony Filings. Due to concurrent audit assignments, the opening conference was not held until July 6, 2000.

This project's underlying rationale is best identified by its "Purpose" as accepted by the Performance Audit Committee. "Analyze the felony case processing system from referrals through filings. The objective is to determine impacts of each action on the criminal justice resource system. Develop recommendations with input from impacted L&J offices for potential improvements in processing procedures that appear to be beneficial as measured by better service, reduced processing time, and/or reduced costs."

Due to the extremely sensitive nature of the data, our review was limited to a review of records captured within the Prosecutor's database.

A. ORGANIZATIONAL BACKGROUND

The Prosecutor's Office's purpose as identified by its mission is to "...fulfill its legal and constitutional obligations to the citizens of the County and State; to vigorously, fairly, and efficiently prosecute those who commit crimes in Snohomish County; to provide high quality professional advice and service to Snohomish County and State of Washington governments; and to be knowledgeable advocates for improvements in the justice system".


The Prosecutor's office delivers its services through 168 staff and the following, three primary service areas:

- **Criminal Division** – responsible for prosecuting all adult and juvenile felony cases referred by County law enforcement agencies, and all misdemeanor cases referred by the County Sheriff, State Patrol, all state agencies, and cities who have contracted with the County for misdemeanor prosecution services. It provides advocacy services for crime victims. Also, it maintains a pre-prosecution diversion program which holds selected first-time offenders accountable for their offenses while avoiding case filing, court, and incarceration costs.



- **Civil Division** – as authorized in RCW 36.27.020, it defends or prosecutes civil cases on behalf of County government and its employees. It provides legal advice, contract and document review and drafting for all county departments, boards and commissions. The Civil Division also represents the mental health division of Human Services in involuntary commitment proceedings.
- **Family Support Unit** – as authorized in RCW 74.20.220, it litigates issues regarding child support in cases referred by the State Department of Social & Health Services- Division of Child Support. The Unit primarily performs paternity establishment; child support order modifications; contempt child support order payment enforcement; and dissolution cases where the State of Washington has an interest in children receiving financial benefits.

Exhibit 1 - Prosecutor's Organization Chart



Source: Snohomish County Adopted 2001 Budget



The County Prosecuting Attorney's Offices were created by the State Constitution, Article 11 §5, titled County Government. The Prosecuting Attorney is an elected position with a four-year term. The office is responsible for prosecuting all adult and juvenile felony cases referred by County law enforcement agencies, and all misdemeanor and gross misdemeanor cases referred by the County Sheriff, State Patrol, state agencies, and cities who have contracted with the County for misdemeanor prosecution services. The office litigates issues regarding child support; serves as the legal advisor to all county departments and agencies; and defends or prosecutes civil cases on behalf of County government. Further, the office provides a pre-prosecution diversion program which holds selected first-time offenders accountable for their offenses while avoiding case filing, court, and incarceration costs.

B. 2001 ADOPTED BUDGET STATISTICS

In the Adopted 2001 Budget, the current office staffing level is 169, an increase of two positions from the 2000 Adopted Budget. Exhibit 2 show the Prosecutor's 2001 staffing resources supported by fund.

Exhibit 2 - Prosecutor Staffing by Fund

Funding Source	Staffing FTE
General Fund	119
Crime Victims/Witness	3
Grant Control	37
Snohomish County Insurance	10
Total Staffing (FTE)	169

Source: Snohomish County Adopted 2001 Budget

The office is supported by a mixture of General Funds, STOP & Drug Prosecution grants, and dedicated funding for Family Support, Victim/Witness, Antiprofiterring, and Continuum of Care programs. For 2001, the Prosecutor's total budget is \$14,345,625.

Exhibit 3 - 2001 Adopted Budget Expenditures

General Fund	\$ 10,352,987
Special Revenue	\$ 3,052,830
Internal Services	\$ 939,808
Total	\$ 14,345,625

Source: Snohomish County Adopted 2001 Budget - Exhibit 7

II. Questions, Risk, Objectives, Scope, and Approach

The following section outlines the process used by the Performance Audit Division to conduct this Police Felony Filings review.

Authority to review Police Felony Filings was through Performance Audit Committee approval of a submitted project. Upon approval, the project was incorporated into the annual Division audit plan. A more detailed risk assessment was performed, along with development of a detailed Police Felony Filings audit plan, which included scope and methodology. The audit goal is to develop a plan that ultimately answers questions identified by the Performance Audit Committee during its project approval process.

A. AUDIT COMMITTEE QUESTIONS

- What are the reasons given for decline decisions.
- Based upon the Prosecutor's criteria, how many felony cases are accepted, processed and filed; how many are declined by reason categories such as legal flaws and insufficient evidence; and how many are referred as misdemeanors.
- How many cases are neither filed nor declined but simply not yet reviewed by the Prosecutor? (Average backlog as defined by the Prosecutor).
- How many of the cases that are ultimately declined were originally booked into the jail?

B. RISK ASSESSMENT

Risk Assessment is an audit responsibility and is the act or practice of identifying the risk drivers and their magnitude. It requires the auditor to review and identify risks that may adversely affect a department or organization. The risk assessment process requires a disciplined approach and enhances the audit process by identifying, analyzing, and assessing the likelihood of risk occurrence and consequences; estimating an organization's assessed risk exposure and possible impacts; and determining an acceptable risk level. As a component of pre-audit analysis, risk assessment uses previous audits and planning assessments to rank risk impact of a department or organization.

Our pre-project risk assessment for Police Felony Filings deemed it to have medium risk. This assessment was based on the purpose of the review to determine if County

facilities, such as Corrections, were being used efficiently, and if County costs associated with Sheriff and Police pursuit of cases, which cannot be prosecuted due to legal flaws or other weaknesses, were appropriate.

C. AUDIT OBJECTIVES & SCOPE

Audit objectives were to:

- Compile historical data on volumes of felony cases (referrals) identified by category of treatment protocol including filings and decline decisions. (As defined by the Prosecutor).
- Assess the impact of each category of felony case processing protocol on the Prosecutor's office (staffing resources and other impacts).
- Assess the impact of each category of felony case processing protocol on the County jail (jail days served for referrals filed and for referrals declined) including pre- and post-conviction data.
- Assess the impact of each category of felony case processing protocol on the Sheriff's workload.

The audit's scope included all Prosecutor database records for 1994 - 1999.

D. APPROACH

Our approach was to analyze the electronic files the Prosecutor provided us. These files contained 13,203 records of "felony declines" between 1994 - 1999. By using pivot tables, the information was sorted down to unit, status, agency and DPA. We classified each record into several statuses by jurisdiction and made graphs of the resulting data.

III. Auditing Standards, & Public Information

A. AUDITING STANDARDS, AUTHORITY

Snohomish County Code (Chapter 2.700.020) states all performance audits and or reviews are conducted in accordance with government auditing standards. Per Division policy, this review adhered to Government Accounting Office Standards concerning

procedures to develop findings and for communicating results with responsible managers and officials.

According to GAO Standards, a finding or set of findings is complete to the extent the objectives are satisfied and the report clearly relates those objectives to the finding elements. Unlike a financial audit finding, a review finding is a statement a condition exists. This may not necessarily imply a problem or some corrective action must be implemented.

We conducted our review in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and the Government Auditing Standards issued by the Comptroller General of the United States (1994 Revision). Those standards required we plan and perform the review to obtain reasonable assurance the Prosecutor's Office provides critical financial management and operational controls and oversight.

B. PUBLIC INFORMATION

This report is intended initially to provide information to the County Executive, County Council, and Department Directors. All of this report is a matter of public record and distribution should not be limited. **However, confidential information is not public record and will not be distributed.** Information extracted from this report may serve as a method to disseminate information to the public as a reporting tool to help citizens assess government operations. All audit division reports are reviewed internally by responsible managers and officials, and their formal written responses are incorporated into final reports in accordance with Performance Audit Committee policy and government auditing standards (GAO Standard 7.38).

IV. Findings

Government Auditing Standards (1994 Revision) Planning 6.3, require us to review workplans when preparing for actual fieldwork, and GAO Standard 6.4 states "auditors should design the methodology to provide sufficient, competent and relevant evidence to achieve the objectives of the audit". During this initial audit-planning phase, and from preliminary interviews and requests for information, we determined full completion of the review could not be accomplished. Without measurement criteria, we had no ability to interpret the data provided.

Also, we examined the questions to be answered and recognized several questions, as written, were subjective, and required specialized skills and knowledge to answer; the Performance Audit Division currently does not have those skills. For example:

- Why are so many more cases referred than are filed? – While we developed the numbers of cases referred versus those filed, we do not have the legal background to interpret the results.
- Does the Prosecutor's Office use a timely and efficient method for reviewing cases presented to it? - GAO Standard 6.5 states, the auditor..."must identify criteria needed to evaluate matters subject to audit". We could find no stated standard and the Prosecutor's office had no internal standard we could use as a basis for measurement.

We collected and identified many trends, but with no criteria to measure against, we could not interpret what we developed. For example, using pivot tables, the number of declines resulting from Snohomish County Sheriff referrals is 2,152. Specifically, we identified the number of declines by each Deputy Prosecuting Attorney (DPA) by year. During 1999, the DPA who declined the most Snohomish County Sheriff's Office referrals had 65, but we were not able to interpret this data. (See Attachment 1.)

We also requested specific data from Corrections regarding jail bed days. We wanted to identify the number of bed days used by individuals arrested, but not charged, or individuals arrested, charged, but not convicted. This was an attempt to quantify the portion of jail capacity used by these activities. When we originally requested this from the Prosecutor's Office, we were informed they only collect this type of data on individuals who are arrested, charged and convicted.

Per Chris Bly (Corrections), the process to capture this data is not currently available. Mr. Bly stated, while the information may be of interest, it has never been requested. Nor does their current system have the capability to develop or capture it.

V. Recommendations

Our recommendations concern two major areas. The first deals with data collection parameters for the County's proposed Integrated Law & Justice Database currently



under discussion. A second recommendation deals with management tools, related criteria, and their effective use.

A. DATA COLLECTION

Each Department within the County's Law & Justice function collects specific data needed for their individual management and reporting requirements. Unfortunately, all Law & Justice data needed by County Departments are not maintained in a single database. This results in management being unable to fully identify and analyze all elements necessary for more efficient operations, and costs savings for the County and its citizens.

With proper security and design, integrated databases can store data needed by all users. With Law & Justice privacy requirements, certain information would require unique identifiers for individual Department input and control, but much of the input could be shared. In such a system, any Department could input, store, access and analyze its own key data using their unique security identifier, but unsecured data input would be available to all Law & Justice agencies, and joint, unsecured data could be input one time and all would benefit. Importantly, greater available joint data (now held in individual databases) would allow Departments an opportunity to access, correlate, and analyze it for operational efficiencies, and data input costs could be reduced.

Recommendation 1: We recommend, with proper security procedures, the proposed Law & Justice integrated system be designed to track all data elements deemed appropriate by Department management.

B. MANAGEMENT TOOLS

When managing, understanding of and motivating support to achieve critical work requirements is crucial to success. A primary motivating tool is setting goals and measuring group performance against them. When people work in groups, there are two distinct and critical issues involved. The first issue is the task and problems associated with getting the job done, and the second is the group dynamics process. It is management's challenge to enhance the group's worth and morale through goal setting and measurement of critical work requirements, and then improving them. Setting critical work requirement goals and determining criteria for successful goal accomplishment may require significant management time, but are necessary for organizational improvements. Without goals and criteria, there is limited organizational direction, motivation, and advancement.



Such information should allow management within the Prosecutor's Office to better understand their own processes and used to measure the Departments progress in achieving their goals.

Recommendation 2: We recommend the Prosecutor's Office consider developing management goals and criteria guidelines for caseload management after the information addressed in Recommendation 1 above becomes available.

VI. Response

We discussed our recommendations with the Prosecutor's Office and they are in general agreement with both recommendations.

JAMES H. KRIDER
PROSECUTING ATTORNEY OF SNOHOMISH COUNTY
3000 ROCKEFELLER AVENUE, M/S 504
EVERETT, WASHINGTON 98201-4046
PHONE:(425)388-3333 FAX:(425)388-3572

JIM TOWNSEND
CHIEF CRIMINAL DEPUTY

DIANE LIBBY
CHIEF CIVIL DEPUTY

DOUGLAS McNALL
CHIEF DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR

CIVIL DIVISION-388-6333

JUVENILE UNIT-259-6520

DISTRICT COURT UNIT-388-3333

FAMILY SUPPORT UNIT-388-7280

PRE-PROSECUTION DIVERSION-388-3427

VICTIM/WITNESS ASSISTANCE-388-3370

April 16, 2001

Memorandum

TO: Martin Standel, Performance Auditor

FROM: Jim Krider, Prosecuting Attorney

RE: Police Felony Filings (LEJ06-0001-1999) Final Draft

The Prosecutor's Office is in general agreement with the Performance Audit recommendations. However, it should be kept in mind that under the law all charging decisions in criminal cases are subject to prosecutorial discretion.



Snohomish County

County Executive's Office

M/S #407

3000 Rockefeller Avenue

Everett, WA

98201

(425) 388-3460

FAX (425) 388-3434

MEMORANDUM

TO: Martin T. Standel, Performance Auditor Division

FROM: Margery Hite & Stephen Holt, Executive Directors

RE: Final Draft – Police Felony Filings (LEJ06-0001-1999)
Formal Written Responses

DATE: April 23, 2001

M.H. Holt
S.H. Holt

Thank you for providing us with a final draft for Executive Office review. We have no additional response at this time.

cc: Gary Weikel, Deputy Executive
County Council
Dean Ritchhart & Steve Torrence

POLICE FELONY FILINGS
LEJ06-0001-1999




Snohomish County
Performance Audit Division

Attachment 1


Snohomish County Declines by Year 1994 - 1999

Count of Year	Year						
	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	Grand Total
Total	1,624	1,933	1,968	2,506	2,645	2,527	13,203



Snohomish County Declines by Status 1994 - 1999

Year	(All)	
Count of Status		
Status	Total	Percent
Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	6,140	46.5%
Evidentiary Problems	2,239	17.0%
Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	1,166	8.8%
To City Agency for Prosecution	1,129	8.6%
Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up	712	5.4%
No Action - Other	688	5.2%
Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness	590	4.5%
Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion	449	3.4%
Referred to Other Jurisdiction	81	0.6%
Referred to Juvenile Diversion	8	0.1%
Turned 18/Referred to Adult Court	1	0.0%
Grand Total	13,203	100.0%




**Snohomish County
Declines by Status by Year
1994 - 1999**

Count of Status	Year						Grand Total
Status	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	
Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	778	909	899	1,068	1,221	1,265	6,140
Evidentiary Problems	319	251	341	389	540	399	2,239
Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	158	163	171	190	248	236	1,166
To City Agency for Prosecution	176	159	142	197	245	210	1,129
Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up	52	104	148	207	85	116	712
No Action - Other	47	94	106	190	172	79	688
Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness	21	163	103	154	39	110	590
Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion	66	43	49	102	89	100	449
Referred to Other Jurisdiction	5	47	7	7	5	10	81
Referred to Juvenile Diversion	2		2	1	1	2	8
Turned 18/Referred to Adult Court				1			1
Grand Total	1,624	1,933	1,968	2,506	2,645	2,527	13,203

Snohomish County Declines by Agency 1994 - 1999

Year	(All)
------	-------

Agency	Total	Percent
SNOCO Sheriff's Office	4,370	33.10%
Everett PD	3,703	28.05%
Lynnwood PD	1,007	7.63%
Edmonds PD	396	3.00%
Marysville PD	392	2.97%
Office of Special Investigations	361	2.73%
Mountlake Terrace PD	329	2.49%
Washington State Patrol	283	2.14%
Arlington PD	244	1.85%
Mukilteo PD	231	1.75%
Monroe PD	214	1.62%
Mill Creek PD	208	1.58%
Regional Narcotics Task Force	197	1.49%
Washington State Reformatory	195	1.48%
Snohomish PD	163	1.23%
Sultan PD	127	0.96%
Standwood PD	109	0.83%
Lake Stevens PD	105	0.80%
Bothell PD	97	0.73%
Other	93	0.70%
Granite Falls PD	83	0.63%
Out of County Drug Cases	77	0.58%
South County Narcotics	75	0.57%
Brier PD	69	0.52%
Darrington PD	43	0.33%
Dept. of Corrections	12	0.09%
Employment Security	8	0.06%
Gold BAR PD	4	0.03%
Dept. of L&I	2	0.02%
Bad Data Input	2	0.02%
Naval Criminal Division	2	0.02%
Agency not Recorded	1	0.01%
Seattle PD	1	0.01%
Grand Total	13,203	100.00%




**Snohomish County
Declines by Agency by Year
1994 - 1999**

Count of Status	Year						Grand Total
Agency	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	Grand Total
SNOCO Sheriff's Office	601	656	610	759	874	870	4,370
Everett PD	353	482	591	791	815	671	3,703
Lynnwood PD	164	164	147	182	177	173	1,007
Edmonds PD	47	55	71	79	57	87	396
Marysville PD	35	57	50	87	89	74	392
Office of Special Investigations	44	62	39	78	80	58	361
Mountlake Terrace PD	45	57	40	61	51	75	329
Washington State Patrol	22	43	34	50	67	67	283
Arlington PD	31	27	29	34	54	69	244
Mukilteo PD	36	30	32	25	57	51	231
Monroe PD	18	23	30	43	50	50	214
Mill Creek PD	28	37	21	44	32	46	208
Regional Narcotics Task Force	48	54	48	31	7	9	197
Washington State Reformatory	17	31	29	55	46	17	195
Snohomish PD	26	14	26	29	31	37	163
Sultan PD	13	14	19	39	25	17	127
Standwood PD	9	9	29	13	19	30	109
Lake Stevens PD	24	20	15	7	17	22	105
Bothell PD	12	16	22	14	14	19	97
Other	15	17	18	17	13	13	93
Granite Falls PD	7	12	12	13	21	18	83
Out of County Drug Cases		10	12	20	10	25	77
South County Narcotics	12	21	26	3	5	8	75
Brier PD	3	7	8	24	14	13	69
Darrington PD	5	13	5	3	13	4	43
Dept. of Corrections			3	1	5	3	12
Employment Security	4	1		2	1		8
Gold BAR PD	2	1		1			4
Dept. of L&I	1		1				2
Bad Data Input	2						2
Naval Criminal Division					1	1	2
Agency not Recorded			1				1
Seattle PD				1			1
Grand Total	1,624	1,933	1,968	2,506	2,645	2,527	13,203

Snohomish County Declines by Unit 1994 - 1999

Year	(All)
------	-------

Unit	Total	Percent
Non-Violent Crimes	5,483	41.5%
Drug Unit	2,910	22.0%
Violent Crimes	2,828	21.4%
Special Assault Unit	1,686	12.8%
Pre-Prosecution Diversion	204	1.5%
Records	81	0.6%
Not Identified	5	0.0%
Victim/Witness Unit	5	0.0%
District Court	1	0.0%
Grand Total	13,203	100.0%



**Snohomish County
Declines by Unit by Year
1994 - 1999**

Count of Unit	Year						Grand Total
Unit	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	Grand Total
Non-Violent Crimes	542	740	812	1,143	1,188	1,058	5,483
Drug Unit	322	410	424	549	574	631	2,910
Violent Crimes	425	435	396	474	553	545	2,828
Special Assault Unit	264	301	284	246	303	288	1,686
Pre-Prosecution Diversion	65	28	28	53	26	4	204
Records	2	15	22	41		1	81
Not Identified	3		1		1		5
Victim/Witness Unit	1	4					5
District Court			1				1
Grand Total	1,624	1,933	1,968	2,506	2,645	2,527	13,203

**Snohomish County
Status by Agency
1994 - 1999**

Snohomish County Sheriff Office

Count of Status	Year						Grand Total	Percent
	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999		
Status	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	Grand Total	Percent
Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	318	332	276	307	443	476	2,152	49.2%
Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	107	110	111	138	167	179	812	18.6%
Evidentiary Problems	114	75	66	94	164	124	637	14.6%
Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up	18	36	67	104	23	15	263	6.0%
Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness	9	82	52	63	12	38	256	5.9%
No Action - Other	16	14	25	36	52	20	163	3.7%
Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion	16	5	11	12	9	12	65	1.5%
To City Agency for Prosecution	1		1	4	4	4	14	0.3%
Referred to Other Jurisdiction	2	2	1			2	7	0.2%
Referred to Juvenile Diversion				1			1	0.0%
Grand Total	601	656	610	759	874	870	4,370	100.0%

Count of Status	Year						Grand Total	Percent
	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999		
Unit	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	Grand Total	Percent
Non-Violent Crimes				474	874	250	1,598	36.6%
Violent Crimes	601	605					1,206	27.6%
Special Assault Unit		50	610	235			895	20.5%
Drug Unit					620		620	14.2%
Pre-Prosecution Diversion				37			37	0.8%
Records				9			9	0.2%
Not Identified				4			4	0.1%
Victim/Witness Unit		1					1	0.0%
Grand Total	601	656	610	759	874	870	4,370	100.0%

Everett Police Department

Count of Status	Year						Grand Total	Percent
	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999		
Status	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	Grand Total	Percent
Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	170	225	282	400	399	328	1,804	48.7%
To City Agency for Prosecution	88	80	81	109	148	120	626	16.9%
Evidentiary Problems	56	55	112	119	162	101	605	16.3%
No Action - Other	8	26	28	61	51	22	196	5.3%
Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness	7	48	26	48	11	27	167	4.5%
Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up	8	15	36	34	22	46	161	4.3%
Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion	8	11	8	12	10	16	65	1.8%
Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	6	5	12	7	8	8	46	1.2%
Referred to Other Jurisdiction		17	4	1	3	1	26	0.7%
Referred to Juvenile Diversion	2		2		1	2	7	0.2%
Grand Total	353	482	591	791	815	671	3,703	100.0%

Count of Status	Year						Grand Total	Percent
	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999		
Unit	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	Grand Total	Percent
Non-Violent Crimes	127	182	273	362	340	245	1,529	41.3%
Drug Unit	51	95	147	213	234	222	962	26.0%
Violent Crimes	118	133	105	148	164	124	792	21.4%
Special Assault Unit	49	60	55	56	75	79	374	10.1%
Pre-Prosecution Diversion	8	6	7	6	2	1	30	0.8%
Records		6	4	6			16	0.4%
Grand Total	353	482	591	791	815	671	3,703	100.0%

Lynnwood Police Department

Count of Status	Year						Grand Total	Percent
	1999	1994	1998	1997	1996	1995		
Status	1999	1994	1998	1997	1996	1995	Grand Total	Percent
Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	83	72	75	86	85	79	480	47.7%
Evidentiary Problems	32	36	36	30	27	20	181	18.0%
To City Agency for Prosecution	16	36	30	17	10	19	128	12.7%
Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up	20	5	7	14	6	16	68	6.8%
No Action - Other	6	4	10	12	9	11	52	5.2%
Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion	10	6	10	10	5	7	48	4.8%
Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness	5	2	6	12	3	6	34	3.4%
Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	1	2	2	1	2	1	9	0.9%
Referred to Other Jurisdiction		1	1			5	7	0.7%
Grand Total	173	164	177	182	147	164	1,007	100.0%

Count of Status	Year						Grand Total	Percent
	1999	1994	1998	1997	1996	1995		
Unit	1999	1994	1998	1997	1996	1995	Grand Total	Percent
Non-Violent Crimes	81	74	81	76	70	66	448	44.5%
Drug Unit	52	30	47	51	30	37	247	24.5%
Violent Crimes	30	32	32	32	22	31	179	17.8%
Special Assault Unit	10	21	12	13	20	23	99	9.8%
Pre-Prosecution Diversion		7	5	9	2	5	28	2.8%
Records				1	3	2	6	0.6%
Grand Total	173	164	177	182	147	164	1,007	100.0%

Edmonds Police Department

Count of Status	Year						Grand Total	Percent
	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999		
Status	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	Grand Total	Percent
Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	33	26	22	29	19	36	165	41.7%
Evidentiary Problems	4	7	14	15	9	19	68	17.2%
To City Agency for Prosecution	4	6	11	11	12	12	56	14.1%
No Action - Other	4	2	16	8	7	4	41	10.4%
Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness		1	2	7	1	8	19	4.8%
Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up		7	4	2	3	1	17	4.3%
Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion	2	1	2	4	4	2	15	3.8%

Count of Unit	Year						Grand Total	Percent
	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999		
Unit	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	Grand Total	Percent
Non-Violent Crimes	16	25	29	31	23	50	174	43.9%
Violent Crimes	11	12	21	16	14	18	92	23.2%
Drug Unit	12	10	11	18	12	14	77	19.4%
Special Assault Unit	6	7	7	10	4	5	39	9.8%
Pre-Prosecution Diversion	2			2	4		8	2.0%
Records		1	2	2			5	1.3%
Not Identified				1			1	0.3%

**Snohomish County
Status by Agency
1994 - 1999**

Referred to Other Jurisdiction		3			1	5	9	2.3%
Referred to Misdemeanor Unit		2		3	1		6	1.5%
Grand Total	47	55	71	79	57	87	396	100.0%

Grand Total	47	55	71	79	57	87	396	100.0%
--------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	------------	---------------

Marysville Police Department

Count of Status	Year						Grand Total	Percent
	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999		
Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	19	22	23	32	52	39	187	47.7%
Evidentiary Problems	5	11	10	7	13	14	60	15.3%
Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up	2	10	3	24	5	11	55	14.0%
To City Agency for Prosecution	7	6	7	6	7	4	37	9.4%
No Action - Other		1	3	13	11		28	7.1%
Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness		2	1	3		4	10	2.6%
Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion	2		2	1	1	2	8	2.0%
Referred to Other Jurisdiction		5					5	1.3%
Referred to Misdemeanor Unit			1	1			2	0.5%
Grand Total	35	57	50	87	89	74	392	100.0%

Count of Unit	Year						Grand Total	Percent
	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999		
Unit								
Non-Violent Crimes	11	25	30	54	47	35	202	51.5%
Drug Unit	5	14	11	21	31	21	103	26.3%
Violent Crimes	8	8	3	3	10	10	42	10.7%
Special Assault Unit	9	6	5	8	1	8	37	9.4%
Victim/Witness Unit		4					4	1.0%
Pre-Prosecution Diversion	2						2	0.5%
Records			1	1			2	0.5%
Grand Total	35	57	50	87	89	74	392	100.0%

**Snohomish County
Snohomish County Sheriff's Office
1994 - 1999**

Snohomish County Sheriff's Office

Count of Status	Unit		Violent Crimes	Special Assault Unit	Pre-Prosecution Diversion	Non-Violent Crimes	Records	Not Identified	Victim/Witness Unit	Grand Total
	Year	Drug Unit								
Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	1994		318							318
	1995		308	24						332
	1996			276						276
	1997			119	20	165	2	1		307
	1998					443				443
	1999					145				476
Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor Total		331	626	419	20	753	2	1		2,152
To City Agency for Prosecution	1994		1							1
	1996			1						1
	1997			2		2				4
	1998					4				4
	1999	3				1				4
To City Agency for Prosecution Total		3	1	3		7				14
No Action - Other	1994		16							16
	1995		11	3						14
	1996			25						25
	1997			6	3	27				36
	1998					52				52
	1999	10				10				20
No Action - Other Total		10	27	34	3	89				163
Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness	1994		9							9
	1995		80	2						82
	1996			52						52
	1997			11	3	48	1			63
	1998					12				12
	1999	22				16				38
Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness Total		22	89	65	3	76	1			252
Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up	1994		18							18
	1995		36							36
	1996			67						67
	1997			23	1	78	2			104
	1998					23				23
	1999	9				6				15
Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up Total		9	54	90	1	107	2			263
Evidentiary Problems	1994		114							114
	1995		66	9						75
	1996			66						66
	1997			31	4	56	2	1		94
	1998					164				164
	1999	96				28				124
Evidentiary Problems Total		96	180	106	4	248	2	1		637
Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	1994		107							107
	1995		98	11					1	110
	1996			111						111
	1997			40	4	90	2	2		138
	1998					167				167
	1999	140				39				179
Referred to Misdemeanor Unit Total		140	205	162	4	296	2	2	1	812
Referred to Juvenile Diversion	1997			1						1
Referred to Juvenile Diversion Total				1						1
Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion	1994		16							16
	1995		4	1						5
	1996			11						11
	1997			2	2	8				12
	1998					9				9
	1999	7				5				12
Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion Total		7	20	14	2	22				65
Referred to Other Jurisdiction	1994		2							2
	1995		2							2
	1996			1						1
	1999	2								2
Referred to Other Jurisdiction Total		2	4	1						7
Grand Total		620	1,206	895	37	1,598	9	4	1	4,370

**Snohomish County
Everett PD
1994 - 1999**

Everett PD

Count of Status	Year	Unit					Records	Grand Total
		Drug Unit	Violent Crimes	Special Assault Unit	Pre-Prosecution Diversion	Non-Violent Crimes		
Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	1994	19	59	33			59	170
	1995	51	58	34			82	225
	1996	83	37	19			143	282
	1997	112	54	30			204	400
	1998	121	66	53			159	399
	1999	101	33	65			129	328
Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor Total		487	307	234			776	1,804
To City Agency for Prosecution	1994	14	42	3			29	88
	1995	12	34	3			31	80
	1996	17	24				40	81
	1997	24	44				41	109
	1998	48	52	2			46	148
	1999	34	52	2			32	120
To City Agency for Prosecution Total		149	248	10			219	626
No Action - Other	1994	2	1			1	4	8
	1995	9	3	3			11	26
	1996	6	3	1			18	28
	1997	12	5	4		1	39	61
	1998	6	4	9			32	51
	1999	11	1	7			3	22
No Action - Other Total		46	17	24		2	107	196
Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness	1994	1	2	1			3	7
	1995		27	12			9	48
	1996	1	17	6			2	26
	1997	2	32	7			14	48
	1998		3	7			1	11
	1999		16	2			9	27
Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness Total		4	97	28			38	167
Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up	1994	3					5	8
	1995	6					9	15
	1996	6	8	14			8	36
	1997	11	3	12			8	34
	1998	17					5	22
	1999	31	3				12	46
Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up Total		74	14	26			47	161
Evidentiary Problems	1994	11	12	11			22	56
	1995	13	7	8		1	26	55
	1996	32	12	10		3	55	112
	1997	51	9	9			50	119
	1998	42	34				86	162
	1999	44	12				45	101
Evidentiary Problems Total		193	86	38		4	284	605
Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	1994	1	1	1			3	6
	1995	2	1				2	5
	1996		3	4			5	12
	1997	1	1	1			4	7
	1998		4	1			3	8
	1999		5	1			2	8
Referred to Misdemeanor Unit Total		4	15	8			19	46
Referred to Juvenile Diversion	1994		1				1	2
	1996			1			1	2
	1998			1			1	1
	1999		2				2	2
Referred to Juvenile Diversion Total			3	2			2	7
Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion	1994					7	1	8
	1995					5		11
	1996					4	6	8
	1997					5	6	12
	1998					2	8	10
	1999	1		1		1	13	16
Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion Total		1		1		24	23	65
Referred to Other Jurisdiction	1995	2	3				12	17
	1996	2	1				1	4
	1997						1	1
	1998		1	2				3
	1999			1				1
Referred to Other Jurisdiction Total		4	5	3			14	26
Grand Total		962	792	374		30	1,529	3,703

**Snohomish County
Lynnwood PD
1994 - 1999**

Lynnwood PD

Count of Status		Unit							
Status	Year	Violent Crimes	Drug Unit	Special Assault Unit	Records	Pre-Prosecution Diversion	Non-Violent Crimes	Grand Total	
Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	1999	14	29	9			31	83	
	1994	10	11	18		1	32	72	
	1998	18	21	5			31	75	
	1997	14	29	4			39	86	
	1996	13	15	13			44	85	
	1995	14	13	16			36	79	
Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor Total		83	118	65		1	213	480	
To City Agency for Prosecution	1999	5	5				6	16	
	1994	14	5				17	36	
	1998	3	13	2			12	30	
	1997	7	4				6	17	
	1996	8					2	10	
	1995	10	6	1			2	19	
To City Agency for Prosecution Total		47	33	3			45	128	
Evidentiary Problems	1999	6	5				21	32	
	1994	6	9	3			18	36	
	1998	10	6				20	36	
	1997	2	11	5			12	30	
	1996		12	2			13	27	
	1995	1	5	3			11	20	
Evidentiary Problems Total		25	48	13			95	181	
Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness	1999	3		1			1	5	
	1994						2	2	
	1998			3			3	6	
	1997	8					4	12	
	1996			1			2	3	
	1995	4		2			2	6	
Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness Total		15		7			12	34	
Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up	1999	2	8				10	20	
	1994		4				1	5	
	1998		4				3	7	
	1997		4	4			6	14	
	1996	1	1	4			6	6	
	1995	1	10				5	16	
Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up Total		4	31	8			25	68	
Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	1999		1				1	1	
	1994		1				1	2	
	1998	1	1					2	
	1997		1					1	
	1996						2	2	
	1995	1						1	
Referred to Misdemeanor Unit Total		2	4				3	9	
No Action - Other	1999		3				3	6	
	1994	2					2	4	
	1998		2	1			7	10	
	1997	1	2				9	12	
	1996		2				7	9	
	1995		2	1			8	11	
No Action - Other Total		3	11	2			36	52	
Referred to Other Jurisdiction	1994						1	1	
	1998			1				1	
	1995		1				4	5	
Referred to Other Jurisdiction Total			1	1			5	7	
Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion	1999		1				9	10	
	1994					6		6	
	1998					5	5	10	
	1997				1	9		10	
	1996				3	2		5	
	1995				2	5		7	
Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion Total			1		6	27	14	48	
Grand Total		179	247	99	6	28	448	1,007	

**Snohomish County
Edmonds PD
1994 - 1999**

Edmonds PD

Count of Status		Unit							Grand Total
Status	Year	Violent Crimes	Drug Unit	Special Assault Unit	Records	Pre-Prosecution Diversion	Non-Violent Crimes	Not Identified	Grand Total
Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	1999	3	7	3			23		36
	1994	5	10	6			12		33
	1998	6	6	2		2	3		19
	1997	3	9	6			11		29
	1996	5	8	1			8		22
	1995	3	6	6			11		26
Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor Total		25	46	24		2	68		165
To City Agency for Prosecution	1999	5		1			6		12
	1994	1	1				2		4
	1998	5	3	1			3		12
	1997	5	2				4		11
	1996	5					6		11
	1995	5					1		6
To City Agency for Prosecution Total		26	6	2			22		56
Evidentiary Problems	1999	2	4				13		19
	1994	2	1				1		4
	1998	1	2				6		9
	1997	1	5	3			6		15
	1996	1	1	3			9	1	14
	1995	2	2	1			4		7
Evidentiary Problems Total		6	15	7			39	1	68
Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness	1999	8							8
	1998			1					1
	1997	5					2		7
	1996	2							2
	1995	1							1
Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness Total		16		1			2		19
Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up	1999						1		1
	1998						3		3
	1997		1	1					2
	1996		1	3					4
	1995	1	2					4	7
Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up Total		1	4	4			8		17
Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	1998						1		1
	1997	1					2		3
	1996						2		2
	1995						5		6
Referred to Misdemeanor Unit Total		1					10		12
No Action - Other	1999		3				1		4
	1994	3					1		4
	1998	1					6		7
	1997	1	1				6		8
	1996	9	1				6		16
	1995	1					1		2
No Action - Other Total		15	5				21		41
Referred to Other Jurisdiction	1999						5		5
	1998	1							1
	1996	1					2		3
	1995						7		9
Referred to Other Jurisdiction Total		2					14		17
Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion	1999			1			1		2
	1994						2		2
	1998		1				2	1	4
	1997				2		2		4
	1996						2		2
	1995				1				1
Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion Total			1	1	5		6	2	15
Grand Total		92	77	39	5		8	174	396

**Snohomish County
Marysville PD
1994 - 1999
Marysville PD**

Count of Status	Year	Unit				Records	Pre-Prosecution Diversion	Non-Violent Crimes	Victim/Witness Unit	Grand Total
		Violent Crimes	Drug Unit	Special Assault Unit						
Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	1999	2	12	8				17		39
	1994	2	3	8				6		19
	1998	3	19	1				29		52
	1997	2	6	4				20		32
	1996	1	6	1				15		23
	1995	3	5	3				10	1	22
Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor Total		13	51	25				97	1	187
To City Agency for Prosecution	1999	2	1					1		4
	1994	5						2		7
	1998	3	4							7
	1997		5	1						6
	1996	1	1					5		7
	1995	3	3							6
To City Agency for Prosecution Total		14	14	1				8		37
Evidentiary Problems	1999	2	3					9		14
	1994	1		1				3		5
	1998		4					9		13
	1997		1	2				4		7
	1996		3	2				5		10
	1995		1	1				9		11
Evidentiary Problems Total		3	12	6				39		60
Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness	1999	4								4
	1997		1					2		3
	1996	1								1
	1995		1	1						2
Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness Total		5	2	1				2		10
Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up	1999		4					7		11
	1994		2							2
	1998	1	4							5
	1997	1	6	1				16		24
	1996			2				1		3
	1995	1	3	1				2	3	10
Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up Total		3	19	4				26	3	55
Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	1997							1		1
	1996							1		1
Referred to Misdemeanor Unit Total								2		2
No Action - Other	1998	3						8		11
	1997		2					11		13
	1996		1					2		3
	1995							1		1
No Action - Other Total		3	3					22		28
Referred to Other Jurisdiction	1995	1	1					3		5
Referred to Other Jurisdiction Total		1	1					3		5
Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion	1999		1				2	1		2
	1994									2
	1998							1		1
	1997				1					1
	1996				1			1		2
Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion Total			1		2		2	3		8
Grand Total		42	103	37	2		2	202	4	392

**Snohomish County
Declines by DPA
1994 - 1999**

Count of Status		Year						Grand Total
DPA	Status	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	
BJL	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor			1	2			3
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit					2		2
	No Action - Other					4		4
	Evidentiary Problems			2	7			9
BJL Total				3	15			18
BWM	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	18	25	90	15	7		155
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	1	4	12		3		20
	No Action - Other	1	3	1	4			9
	To City Agency for Prosecution	2	9	6	1	1		19
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness		11	8	1			20
	Evidentiary Problems	11	3	40	2	2		58
	Referred to Other Jurisdiction	1						1
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up	6		2				8
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion			3	3	5	6	17
BWM Total		40	55	162	26	18	6	307
BXF	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	10						10
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness	1						1
	Evidentiary Problems	2						2
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion		2					2
BXF Total		13	2					15
BXT	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor				2	4		6
	No Action - Other						1	1
BXT Total					2	4	1	7
CAM	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	3	16	5	47	52	12	135
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	2			12	9		23
	No Action - Other		3		8	6	1	18
	To City Agency for Prosecution		3		8	9		20
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness				1	2	5	8
	Evidentiary Problems		5	2	14	17		38
	Referred to Other Jurisdiction	1						1
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up	8	3	7	9			27
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion				2	3	1	6
CAM Total		3	38	10	99	107	19	276
CDS	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor			97	27	35	9	168
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit			17	12	7	5	41
	No Action - Other			10	5	2		17
	To City Agency for Prosecution			20	3	2		25
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness			1	17	3	4	25
	Evidentiary Problems			16	11	7	6	40
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up	1		1	2			4
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion			2	5	1	2	10
	CDS Total		1		164	82	55	28
CDT	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	9	44	37				90
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit		8	14				22
	No Action - Other		11	1				12
	To City Agency for Prosecution		7	9				16
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness	1	11	1				13
	Evidentiary Problems	1	22	25				48
	Referred to Other Jurisdiction	1						1
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up	1		6				7
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion				7	1	5	13
	Referred to Juvenile Diversion			1				1
CDT Total		11	105	94	7	1	5	223
CFB	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	5	17	6	3			31
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	1	1	5	5			12
	No Action - Other		4	5				9
	To City Agency for Prosecution	3	3	1	1			8
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness		4	4	4			8
	Evidentiary Problems	4	4	15	4			27
	Referred to Other Jurisdiction			1				1
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up	5		1				6
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion			1		1		2
CFB Total		18	33	35	17	1		104
CJD	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	45	22	17	38	50	16	188
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	14	2			2		18
	No Action - Other	6			1	1		8
	To City Agency for Prosecution	22	3		8	5	4	42
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness	1	21	9	1	1	14	47
	Evidentiary Problems	32		5	9	20	2	68
	Referred to Other Jurisdiction	1	1					2
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up	1	6	14	5	11	3	40
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion	1			7	2		10
CJD Total		123	55	45	69	92	39	423

**Snohomish County
Declines by DPA
1994 - 1999**

Count of Status		Year						Grand Total
DPA	Status	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	
CMH	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor					3	2	5
	Evidentiary Problems					1	1	2
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up						1	1
CMH Total						4	4	8
CSM	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	47	37	80	87	28	34	313
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	2	5	14	21	1	6	49
	No Action - Other	2		4	16	11	3	36
	To City Agency for Prosecution	9	4	20	12		3	48
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness		9	11	10	2	16	48
	Evidentiary Problems	1	3	13	27	1	4	49
	Referred to Other Jurisdiction		1				1	2
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up	1	2	4	16	1	3	27
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion	2			4	2	5	13
	Referred to Juvenile Diversion					1		1
CSM Total		62	63	146	193	47	75	586
DAK	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	8	10	16	25	19	52	130
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	1	2	4	14	5	6	32
	No Action - Other				1			1
	To City Agency for Prosecution				1	9	4	16
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness		1	1	7		3	12
	Evidentiary Problems			2	3	1	2	8
	Referred to Other Jurisdiction	1	1					2
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up			6			4	10
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion				1			1
	DAK Total		10	14	30	60	29	69
DFH	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	1	27	57	34	23	19	161
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit		5	4	8	5	1	23
	No Action - Other	1	1	5	6	4		17
	To City Agency for Prosecution		6	15	12	8	4	45
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness		1	1	8		4	14
	Evidentiary Problems	1	9	20	8	7	5	50
	Referred to Other Jurisdiction		5	1				6
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up	1		1	16		1	19
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion		1		3	7	2	13
	DFH Total		4	55	104	95	54	36
DJF	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	94		1	26	5	1	127
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	24			1	2		27
	No Action - Other				4	2		6
	To City Agency for Prosecution	28			5	1		34
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness	3			3			6
	Evidentiary Problems	49			7	2		58
	Referred to Other Jurisdiction		1		4			5
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up	6			1			7
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion	1	2	3	16	8	1	31
	DJF Total		205	3	4	67	20	2
DRG	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor				1		1	2
	To City Agency for Prosecution				1			1
	Evidentiary Problems						1	1
DRG Total				2				4
EES	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	38	100	18	4	16	14	190
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	9	15	1		2		27
	No Action - Other		12	4			4	20
	To City Agency for Prosecution	7	25	3		11	6	52
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness		4	1				5
	Evidentiary Problems	20	18	2	15	7	2	64
	Referred to Other Jurisdiction		15					15
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up		9			3	1	13
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion	1		1	12	7	10	31
	Referred to Juvenile Diversion	1						1
EES Total		76	198	30	31	46	37	418
EJF	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	3						3
EJF Total		3						3
FUG	No Action - Other	1	2					3
	Referred to Other Jurisdiction		1					1
FUG Total		1	3					4
GFA	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	5	14	26	23	3	5	76
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit		6	2				8
	No Action - Other			3	13			16
	To City Agency for Prosecution	1	4	7	4		2	18
	Evidentiary Problems		15	22	10		8	55
	Referred to Other Jurisdiction				1			1
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up		14	5	3	4	1	27
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion				3	1	2	6

**Snohomish County
Declines by DPA
1994 - 1999**

Count of Status		Year						Grand Total
DPA	Status	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	
GFA Total		6	53	65	57	8	18	207
GMM	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	2						2
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion		1		1	1		3
GMM Total		2	1		1	1		5
HCB	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	13	30	33	50	26	125	277
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	1			5	8	10	24
	No Action - Other			3	4	2	3	12
	To City Agency for Prosecution	1	3	1	12	10	15	42
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness				1			1
	Evidentiary Problems	6	6	34	22	16	21	105
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up	11	2	2	7	13	17	52
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion	1			2	1	1	5
HCB Total		33	41	73	103	76	192	518
HMK	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor				2	44	76	122
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit				3	35	15	53
	No Action - Other				4	5	2	11
	To City Agency for Prosecution				4	37	22	63
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness				3	1	1	5
	Evidentiary Problems				9	88	79	176
	Referred to Other Jurisdiction						1	1
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up				1	4	7	12
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion					1	3	4
HMK Total					26	215	206	447
JAT	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor				1	2	2	5
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit						3	3
	Evidentiary Problems						2	2
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up					1	4	5
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion						2	2
JAT Total					1	3	13	17
JCA	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor					24	32	56
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit					22	43	65
	No Action - Other					2	1	3
	To City Agency for Prosecution					15	33	48
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness						11	11
	Evidentiary Problems					25	22	47
	Referred to Other Jurisdiction					1		1
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up						1	1
JCA Total						89	143	232
JCT	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	39	9	3		1		52
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	1	2			1		4
	No Action - Other		2	2				4
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness		1					1
	Evidentiary Problems	1	1	4				6
	Referred to Other Jurisdiction		1		1	1		3
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up		1					1
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion		1	6	4	8	25	44
JCT Total		41	18	15	5	11	25	115
JEE	No Action - Other	1						1
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion					1		1
JEE Total		1				1		2
JES	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	19	118	13			11	161
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	3	28	5	1		3	40
	No Action - Other	3	9					12
	To City Agency for Prosecution		26	2			4	32
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness		23	10			16	49
	Evidentiary Problems	7	35	7	1		17	67
	Referred to Other Jurisdiction		8					8
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up		3	1				4
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion			3	1	1		5
JES Total		32	250	41	3	1	51	378
JJJ	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor				14	47	38	99
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit					3	7	10
	No Action - Other			3	10	10	1	24
	To City Agency for Prosecution					18	15	33
	Evidentiary Problems				4	21	23	48
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up		1		12	5	5	23
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion					5		5
JJJ Total			1	3	40	109	89	242
JOV	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor		2	8	20	16	11	57
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit				1	1	6	8
	No Action - Other			5	6	8	9	28
	To City Agency for Prosecution		2		1	1	9	13
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness					7	2	9

**Snohomish County
Declines by DPA
1994 - 1999**

Count of Status		Year						Grand Total
DPA	Status	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	
	Evidentiary Problems		1	5	11	8	17	42
	Referred to Other Jurisdiction						1	1
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up				3		4	7
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion						2	2
JOV Total			5	18	44	41	59	167
JRC	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	18	13	11	4			46
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	1	1	3	1			6
	No Action - Other			3				3
	To City Agency for Prosecution	3			2			5
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness		5	3				8
	Evidentiary Problems	13	19	17	18			67
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up	1	2	4				7
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion	1	1	1				3
JRC Total		37	41	42	25			145
JSA	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor		12	25	28	5	7	77
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit		3	4	1			8
	No Action - Other			2	1		3	6
	To City Agency for Prosecution			1				1
	Evidentiary Problems		9	12	3			24
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up			2			1	3
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion						1	1
	Turned 18/Referred to Adult Court				1			1
JSA Total			24	46	34	5	12	121
JTC	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	13	6	5	62	119	89	294
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	11	3	6	4	8	4	36
	No Action - Other	1			4	3	2	10
	To City Agency for Prosecution	4	2	1	2	6		15
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness	1	4			2		7
	Evidentiary Problems	6	1		7			14
	Referred to Other Jurisdiction					3	1	4
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up	1	1	26	27			55
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion			1				1
	Referred to Juvenile Diversion				1			1
JTC Total		37	17	39	107	141	96	437
JVM	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	12	3					15
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	2	2					4
	No Action - Other	2	1					3
	To City Agency for Prosecution	15	1					16
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness	1	11					12
	Evidentiary Problems	20	1					21
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up	1						1
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion			1				1
JVM Total		53	19	1				73
JXV	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit			2				2
	No Action - Other			1				1
	Evidentiary Problems			4				4
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up		1	1				2
JXV Total			1	8				9
KAK	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor			1		16	26	43
	No Action - Other					1	1	2
	To City Agency for Prosecution					3	1	4
	Evidentiary Problems					12	16	28
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up						10	10
KAK Total				1		32	54	87
KAS	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	1						1
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	1	4					5
	Evidentiary Problems	5						5
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up	1						1
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion		1	2	3			6
KAS Total		8	5	2	3			18
KLC	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	7						7
	Evidentiary Problems	2			1			3
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up	2						2
KLC Total		11			1			12
LDP	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	49	25	30	26	75	214	419
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	3	4	5	2	16	40	70
	No Action - Other	2		3	2	1	2	10
	To City Agency for Prosecution	1		5	4	8	28	46
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness	1	6	14	19		11	51
	Evidentiary Problems	3	2		2	6	25	38
	Referred to Other Jurisdiction						4	4
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up		1	2	2		13	18
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion					1	1	2

**Snohomish County
Declines by DPA
1994 - 1999**

Count of Status		Year						Grand Total	
DPA	Status	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999		
LDP Total		59	38	59	57	107	338	658	
MCB	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor				16	19	34	69	
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	1		1	1	1	2	6	
	No Action - Other				7	13	3	23	
	To City Agency for Prosecution					1		1	
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness						1	1	
	Evidentiary Problems	1			3	18	13	35	
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up					1	6	7	
Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion						2	2	4	
MCB Total		2		1	28	60	55	146	
MCH	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor		32	26	25	9	24	116	
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit		1	1		1	1	4	
	No Action - Other		1	2	1	12	2	18	
	To City Agency for Prosecution		4					4	
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness		5	3				8	
	Evidentiary Problems		1	3	1	8	15	28	
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up			11	8			19	
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion					4	5	9	
Referred to Juvenile Diversion				1				1	
MCH Total			44	47	35	34	47	207	
MDM	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	34	56	31	41	43	34	239	
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	40	36	37	38	32	31	214	
	No Action - Other	3	4	10	2		5	24	
	To City Agency for Prosecution	44	46	27	38	20	18	193	
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness		5	16	14	1	1	37	
	Evidentiary Problems	2	4	5	4	3	1	19	
	Referred to Other Jurisdiction		7	1				9	
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion				1			1	
	Referred to Juvenile Diversion							2	2
	MDM Total		123	158	127	138	99	93	738
MJR	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	1	4	13	22	8	9	57	
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit				1		4	5	
	No Action - Other		1	11	17	8	2	39	
	To City Agency for Prosecution						4	8	
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness				4	11	2	17	
	Evidentiary Problems		6	12	14		7	39	
	Referred to Other Jurisdiction						1	1	
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up		7			1	2	10	
Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion					2	2	2	6	
MJR Total		1	18	36	64	30	33	182	
MKP	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	66	26	21	13	21	31	178	
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	4	2	4	1	6	8	25	
	No Action - Other	3	3		1			7	
	To City Agency for Prosecution	9	2	2	1	4	3	21	
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness	6	9	1	1			17	
	Evidentiary Problems	27	3	5	4	2	3	44	
	Referred to Other Jurisdiction	1	1					2	
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up	1		1	2			4	
Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion		1	1		4			6	
MKP Total		118	47	34	27	33	45	304	
MKR	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	52	32	13	23	32	18	170	
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	5	7	3	1	1	1	18	
	No Action - Other	8	3		2	4	2	19	
	To City Agency for Prosecution	6	4				2	12	
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness	1	16	9		5	8	39	
	Evidentiary Problems	13	5	5	2		1	26	
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up			22	7			29	
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion				1			1	
	Referred to Juvenile Diversion		1						1
MKR Total		86	67	52	36	42	32	315	
MTD	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	7	8	5	3		5	28	
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	10	3	1			2	16	
	No Action - Other		1	3	1			5	
	To City Agency for Prosecution	3	4	1				8	
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness		1					1	
	Evidentiary Problems	13	29	4	1	1		48	
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up	1	3	1				5	
Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion					4	1	3	8	
MTD Total		34	49	15	9	2	10	119	
PXS	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	34	39	22	20	31	22	168	
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit			1	1	6	3	11	
	No Action - Other	1	3	2	1	8	3	18	
	To City Agency for Prosecution				3	2	1	6	

**Snohomish County
Declines by DPA
1994 - 1999**

Count of Status		Year						Grand Total
DPA	Status	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness		3	2	15		4	24
	Evidentiary Problems	3	2	9	3	6	3	26
	Referred to Other Jurisdiction	1						1
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up		2	10	10	2	1	25
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion						2	2
PXS Total		39	49	46	53	57	37	281
RJQ	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	14		26	56	83	10	189
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	4		8	8	12		32
	No Action - Other	1		1	4		2	8
	To City Agency for Prosecution	5		3	17	16	4	45
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness			9	17	1	2	29
	Evidentiary Problems	14		2	18	11	3	48
	Referred to Other Jurisdiction						1	1
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up				8			8
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion	1					1	2
RJQ Total		39		49	129	123	22	362
RWD	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	19	19	14	22	14	76	164
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	3	3	2	4	4	6	22
	No Action - Other	1	3		4	3	5	16
	To City Agency for Prosecution			3	3	2	7	15
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness			7	3	6	1	17
	Evidentiary Problems	2	4	4	4	8	22	44
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up			4			20	24
RWD Total		25	36	30	43	31	137	302
RWY	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor						18	18
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit						1	1
	No Action - Other						1	1
	To City Agency for Prosecution						2	2
RWY Total							22	22
SCB	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor		1	8	10			19
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit			3	1			4
	No Action - Other			6	19			25
	To City Agency for Prosecution					1		1
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness						1	1
	Evidentiary Problems				8			8
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion						1	1
SCB Total			1	17	40	1		59
SDJ	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	25	14					39
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	5	2					7
	No Action - Other	3	2					5
	To City Agency for Prosecution	7						7
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness		3					3
	Evidentiary Problems	15	3					18
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up	10	6					16
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion	1	1	3		1		6
SDJ Total		66	31	3		1		101
SJK	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor			1	2	25	29	57
	No Action - Other				8	26	1	35
	To City Agency for Prosecution						1	1
	Evidentiary Problems		2		2	5		9
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up			1		2		3
SJK Total			2	2	12	58	31	105
SML	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	5		53	189	87	2	336
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	3		8	27	22		60
	No Action - Other			2	9	3		14
	To City Agency for Prosecution			5	35	12		52
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness				14			14
	Evidentiary Problems	4		6	92	94		196
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up		1	5	57	7		70
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion		1	1			9	11
SML Total		12	2	80	423	225	11	753
SWO	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	45	48	4				97
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	4	1	1				6
	No Action - Other	1	8		2			11
	To City Agency for Prosecution	1	1					2
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness	2						2
	Evidentiary Problems	32	11	3				46
	Referred to Other Jurisdiction		1	2				3
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up	1		1				2
SWO Total		86	70	11	2			169
TMC	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	1	4	13				18
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit				1			1
	No Action - Other		12	4				16

**Snohomish County
Declines by DPA
1994 - 1999**

Count of Status		Year						Grand Total
DPA	Status	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	
DPA	To City Agency for Prosecution			2				2
	Evidentiary Problems		5	4			1	10
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up		5	2				7
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion				2			2
TMC Total		1	26	25	3		1	56
TRS	No Action - Other					1		1
TRS Total						1		1
TSD	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	12	65	23	55	129	98	382
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	1	5	1	10	26	22	65
	No Action - Other	1	1	3	10	26	7	48
	To City Agency for Prosecution	3		3	1	27	14	48
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness		2		7	3	4	16
	Evidentiary Problems	6	12	7	13	101	52	191
	Referred to Other Jurisdiction		2	1				3
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up	1	18	3	5	5	12	44
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion	1	1	1	2	15	11	30
TSD Total		24	106	42	103	332	220	827
UNA	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor		4	4		3	1	12
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit	3	5	1		3	1	13
	No Action - Other	1	1	1	2	1		6
	Evidentiary Problems	1				1		2
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion				1			1
UNA Total		5	10	6	3	8	2	34
WJS	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor				1	11	25	37
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit					1	2	3
	No Action - Other						4	4
	To City Agency for Prosecution					1		1
	Evidentiary Problems				1	9	3	13
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up				1	2	2	5
WJS Total					3	24	36	63
WRJ	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	3	27	38	29	86	26	209
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit		1	1	2	2	3	9
	No Action - Other			6	5	8	9	28
	To City Agency for Prosecution	1		3	6	21	3	34
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness	1						1
	Evidentiary Problems	2	8	23	23	32	15	103
	Referred to Other Jurisdiction			1				1
	Legally Insufficient/No Follow-up		10	6	6	9	3	34
Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion			3	1	3		7	
WRJ Total		7	46	81	72	161	59	426
ZLF	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor			1	1		7	9
	Referred to Misdemeanor Unit				1	1		2
	To City Agency for Prosecution					2	1	3
	Evidentiary Problems						7	7
ZLF Total				1	2	3	15	21
ZZZ	Legally Insufficient/Per Prosecutor	1		2				3
	No Action - Other	4	3		2	1		10
	To City Agency for Prosecution	1						1
	Uncooperative/Unavailable Witness	2						2
	Evidentiary Problems		2	2	1			5
	Completed Pre-Prosecutin Diversion	58	28	17	8	1		112
ZZZ Total		66	33	21	11	2		133
Grand Total		1624	1933	1968	2506	2645	2527	13203