

# **HENNEPIN COUNTY COMMUNITY JUSTICE INITIATIVE**

## **END OF GRANT REPORT FOR:**

**Minnesota Department of Public Safety  
Office of Drug Policy and Violence Prevention**



**September 2002**

**Submitted by:**

**Judge H. Richard Hopper, Project Director**

**Dr. Deborah A. Eckberg, Principal Research Analyst**

## **Introduction**

This report will serve as the final report which details how the second Community Justice grant received from the Minnesota Department of Public Safety, Office of Drug Policy and Violence Prevention was used. This second grant ran from October 1, 2000 – June 30, 2002.<sup>1</sup> The funds from this second grant were used primarily to enhance the Community Court calendars and to bolster the community service and neighborhood probation aspects of the Community Justice Project.

### **Background of the Fourth Judicial District's Community Court Calendars**

From the beginning, the Fourth Judicial District has used Community Justice Project grant money to expedite the processing of livability offense cases, increase defendants' level of compliance with court-ordered community service, and increase community members' satisfaction with the handling of low-level livability crimes. The first court calendar which directly resulted from the Community Justice Project grant money was the pretrial calendar for the Third Precinct in Minneapolis. This calendar, which began in June 1999, was the first Community Court calendar in the country to handle felony level, as well as gross misdemeanor and misdemeanor level crimes.

The reason for including felonies came directly out of a partnership with the community the court was intended to serve. Community members expressed concerns with crime that affected their daily lives in their neighborhoods, whether these crimes were petty misdemeanor public drunkenness or felony car theft. As the Fourth Judicial District's Community Court calendar was created, and as the Community Justice Project continues to this day, the inclusion of felony crimes has allowed for a partnership with

---

<sup>1</sup> There were several reports which referred to the first grant and were sent out at the end of the first grant period. Copies of these are available from the authors upon request.

the County Attorney's office, which prosecutes felonies, as well as the Minneapolis City Attorney's office, which prosecutes misdemeanors. In addition, the Community Justice Project has enabled the court to partner with the county Public Defender department, the Community Corrections (i.e., probation) department, and many social services agencies.

The calendar began in the Third Precinct of Minneapolis because research determined the livability crime problem to be greatest in this area of South Minneapolis. Prostitution crimes, for example, were most heavily concentrated in this area at the time that the planning data for the project was being collected. Community Justice Project Director Judge Richard Hopper has presided over the Third Precinct community court calendar since its inception.

### **Property Court**

In October 2000 the court began the process of incorporating the principles of the pretrial Community Court into the way in which all felony property crimes are processed. Because of the success the pretrial Community Court calendar had in handling felony property crimes that affected one specific community (the Third Precinct of Minneapolis), the Fourth Judicial District bench decided to apply the same approach to felony property crimes in downtown Minneapolis. The newly formed Hennepin County Property Court involves teams of judges, prosecutors and probation officers and processes all felony property offenses in Hennepin County. It aims to meet some of the same goals as the Community Court calendars: efficient case processing, restorative justice, and defendant accountability. Attached to this document as Appendix A is an evaluation of Property Court after its first year of operation, written by the Research Division of Hennepin County District Court.

Property court is organized by days of the week according to the community where the offense occurred. For example, offenses which occur in Minneapolis' Third Precinct are heard on Thursdays, and offenses which occur in Bloomington are heard on Fridays. Since Judge Hopper was already conducting a pretrial calendar of Third Precinct felonies on Thursdays, he was made a member of the Property Court team of judges and was assigned Thursdays. Downtown Command felonies were added to Thursday because downtown borders the Third Precinct and produces the second largest group of livability offenders.

Consequently, Judge Hopper now has a Thursday calendar of Third Precinct misdemeanor and gross misdemeanor livability offenders and felony livability offenders from the Third Precinct and the Downtown Command. This calendar has the full complement of Community Court resources at its disposal, including courtroom referred community service (i.e., Sentencing to Service, which is described in detail later in this report), intensive supervision in the community, and community based social services.

### **Community Impact Calendar**

As the Fourth Judicial District and its criminal justice system partners observed the success of the Community Court pretrial calendar, they saw an opportunity for the Community Justice Project principles to be expanded to include the entire city of Minneapolis. With the support of the Hennepin County judiciary, Judge Hopper agreed to begin handling the Minneapolis out of custody arraignment calendar in January 2000. The court renamed this calendar the "Community Impact Calendar," and thus created another avenue within which to apply the community justice principles of restorative justice, defendant accountability, and efficient processing of livability crimes.

With the creation of the Community Impact calendar, the Fourth Judicial District made some significant changes to the processing of Minneapolis out of custody misdemeanors. For example, traffic cases that come to court but typically do not need to see a judge began to be handled in the afternoon with the City Attorney and a Hearing Officer from the Traffic and Violations Bureau (TVB) present. The reason for this was so that judicial resources could be spent where they were most needed: to make connections with criminal defendants who need the most services and have, in the past, had the most trouble complying with court conditions. Defendants charged with prostitution, for example, have a poor track record appearing for court appearances and carrying out the orders of the court.

The Community Impact Calendar was designed to address the following clearly delineated goals:

1. Reduce overall number of minor traffic cases coming to criminal court from the Violations Bureau (TVB)
2. Shorten length of time between arraignment and disposition for these cases
3. Dispose of more cases at arraignment
4. Reduce number of bench warrants for these cases
5. Increase compliance with Sentencing to Service (STS)

Table 1 summarizes the results for the first two years of the Community Impact Calendar. The figures in Table 1 clearly show that the development of the Community Impact calendar has enabled the Fourth Judicial District and the Community Justice project to meet its goals with regard to the timely processing of livability offenses in Minneapolis. For example, parking and minor traffic cases are being handled by Hearing Officers, so very few are taking judicial resources in the courtroom. That way, the judge can spend more time on the cases that most need judicial attention. In addition, the number of days from the first appearance on a case to the resolution of that case has

decreased by 32%, and the number of hearings has decreased 7%, meaning that these cases are being processed quickly and efficiently, rather than creating backlogs for the court. Eight percent more cases are now disposed at arraignment, and we have cut the number of bench warrants (for non-appearance) in half.

## Summary of Cases in Courtroom 1156: “Community Impact Calendar”

		1999	2000	2001	Long Term Change 1999-2001	Short Term Change 2000-2001
		Pre- Community Impact Calendar	First Year of Community Impact Calendar	Second Year of Community Impact Calendar		
<b>Goal 1: Reduce Overall Number of Minor Traffic Cases Coming to Criminal Court from TVB</b>	Total New Cases Arraigned	32,401	28,488	22,437	-30%	-21%
	<i>Moving Violations Cases</i>	3,457	3,111	2,268	-34%	-27%
	<i>Parking Cases</i>	3,287	1,476	441	-87%	-70%
<b>Goal 2: Shorten Length of Time Between Arraignment and Disposition</b>	Percent disposed in same calendar year as arraigned	80%	84%	82%	+2%	-2%
	Conviction rate	29%	28%	37%	+8%	+9%
	Average # Days to Disposition	31 days	20 days	21 days	-32%	+5%
	Average Number of Hearings	2.14 hearings	1.92 hearings	1.98 hearings	-7%	+3%
<b>Goal 3: Dispose of More Cases at Arraignment</b>	% Disposed at Arraignment	50%	63%	58%	+8%	-5%
<b>Goal 4: Reduce Number of Bench Warrants</b>	Total Number of Bench Warrants	7,239	4,386	3,331	-54%	-24%
	Percentage of Cases with At Least one Bench Warrant Ordered	22%	15%	15%	-7%	no change

## **Sentencing to Service (STS)**

The Sentencing to Service (STS) program is a community service program that is used as a sanction by the court, and has been used extensively in both the Community Court pretrial calendar and the Minneapolis Community Impact calendar. Offenders are assigned to work crews that work on community service projects throughout Hennepin County. The work involved ranges from picking up litter at bus stops to sorting clothes at the Salvation Army. Offenders are given a certain number of days of work and a period of time in which to complete them.

Prior to changes made by the Community Justice Project, offenders were sanctioned by the court and sent to the probation office in another part of the building. There they were given a time and place to appear for an orientation meeting. At the orientation meeting they were given a work assignment for a future date. These processes resulted in the reduction of the immediacy of the sanction and in many cases, complete non-compliance.

To address this problem, seats were removed from the courtroom and an office cubicle was installed. An STS Coordinator was hired and stationed in the courtroom. Now an offender goes from the judge's bench where he receives his sanction to the STS Coordinator where he is given his orientation and his work assignment. Thus, the first three steps of the STS process are accomplished in one day before leaving the courtroom. This increases immediacy and prevents offenders from getting lost in the system.

The purpose of placing an STS Coordinator in the courtroom was to increase the immediacy of and compliance with the program by giving a work day assignment to the offender then and there. Normally, an offender is given a work assignment and is told to report to a pick-up point at 8 AM on a certain day. He is then picked up by a van and transported with the rest of the crew to the work site.

In an effort to streamline the process even further, a work crew was developed that leaves the courthouse at noon. This helps the Coordinator in two ways. First, offenders can be assigned to the noon crew and begin serving their STS sanction on the same day as they appear in court. This helps many defendants who are employed to be able to keep their jobs by only having to take off one day from work, rather than needing a second day off to complete their sentence. Second, each day the Coordinator receives a list of offenders who have failed to appear at the 8 AM pick-up sight. By 8:15AM she is on the telephone to them and they are told to appear at the courthouse at noon on that day and serve on the noon work crew. The use of the Coordinator and the noon crew has resulted in an STS compliance rate of 84% for the Community Impact Calendar, as compared to the general compliance rate of 70% court wide. This increase is even more remarkable considering the type of offender that appears on the Community Impact Calendar. These offenders have committed street crimes and have fewer social skills than the typical traffic offender from the suburbs.

Between January 1, 2002 and August 1, 2002, over one thousand (1,067) offenders were referred to the STS program from the Minneapolis Community Impact Calendar. Of those 1,067 defendants, 740 (69%) have already completed their days sentenced. The total number of hours worked in the community by defendants completing community service projects during that same time period was 18,256, which translates to 2,282 eight hour days. Currently there are 265 active offenders on the STS program.

### **Neighborhood Probation**

One of the hallmarks of the Community Court has been the revitalization of neighborhood probation. Minneapolis, like many other urban jurisdictions, instituted a system of probation whereby defendants were required to make monthly visits to a

centralized reporting center. The impetus for this system was the growing number of persons on probation and limited amounts of resources.

The reporting system proved to be completely unworkable for livability offenders. These defendants need weekly, if not daily, supervision with simple, concrete conditions. Thus, Community Court defendants are placed on probation to a probation officer whose office is located in the community where the offenders live. Offenders are given strict reporting requirements in order to sustain continued contact. The probation officer visits where they live to ensure that it is safe and not conducive to criminal behavior.

Community court defendants are not only connected with social services in the community but also are given social and geographical restrictions to encourage law-abiding behavior. For example, women who engage in prostitution often have self-destructive relationships with men considered to be boyfriends. These men are, in reality, “pimps” that keep these women dependent on them for life’s necessities, addicted to drugs, and an object of physical and emotional abuse. The court often makes and the probation officer enforces an order of “no contact.” Unless this relationship is severed, a woman will never be able to leave prostitution.

These same women often need geographical restrictions as well, as geographical locations can also trigger criminal behavior. For example, one woman was able to leave prostitution and stay off of drugs for more than a year as long as she lived in St. Paul. A trip to South Minneapolis and a fight with her boyfriend caused a relapse into prostitution. A lengthy period of incarceration in the workhouse followed by a return to St. Paul was required to break the cycle and return her to the road toward rehabilitation.

Due to the success of neighborhood probation in South Minneapolis, Hennepin County Probation has begun a process of duplicating this model in other parts of the city. Community Court has demonstrated that increased use of probation resources for this

level of offender will save resources spent on arrest, booking, and incarceration in the future.

### **Summary and Conclusions**

In short, the second phase of grant money used to make significant changes to processing of low level crimes in Minneapolis has changed the way we do business as a court system, while meeting the goals of the Community Justice Project. We have met each problem faced in adequately dispensing justice for the community head on. The following brief outline matches problems with solutions.

1.     **Problem:**       How do we give more attention to livability offenses?  
**Answer:**           Eliminate cases that don't need to see a judge.  
**Result:**           87% less parking tickets and 28% more prostitution cases
  
2.     **Problem:**       Livability cases take too long to process.  
**Answer:**           Develop an arraignment calendar that promotes dispositions.  
**Results:**           Disposition at arraignment up 8%.  
                          Time to disposition down 32%.  
                          Number of court appearances down 7%.  
                          Number of bench warrants due to non-appearance down 54%.
  
3.     **Problem:**       Livability offenders need consequences.  
**Answer:**           Impose STS  
                          Expand work opportunities  
                          In-courtroom coordinator  
                          Noontime crews  
                          Expedited warrants  
**Results:**           84% compliance for Community Impact calendar defendants  
                          (14% higher than general STS compliance rate)

## ***Appendix A: Property Court after One Year***

Hennepin County's Property Court began in the late fall of 2000. For this review, we will consider that all of 2001 was under the new Property Court format and will compare the processing of cases to prior years, most specifically, 2000.

### **How many new cases have we handled?**

Over the last nine years there has been an increase of 19% in new felony level property cases being filed with the court. In the last year, since the court began, there has been an increase of less than 1% in new filings: in 2000 we had 2,306 new cases, accounting for over 39% of all felony filings whereas in 2001 2,322 new cases, also accounting for 39% of all felony filings. This is a change from the six month look at filings which showed that property type felonies had decreased 12% since last year. We obviously made up that 12% in the last six months of 2001.

Property Court is composed of a number of different types of property case types. Table 2 shows the variety of cases that funnel through Property Court and how these cases have changed over time. These case types include burglary, arson, theft, property damage, receiving stolen property and motor vehicle theft.

Since 1993 two of the most serious case types, burglary and arson have decreased, as has theft-related cases and motor vehicle thefts. The remaining case types have increased over the long term.

Since last year, arson, receiving stolen property and motor vehicle theft has decreased most significantly, while forgery/fraud cases, property damage, theft and theft-related crimes have increased.

### **How have we done handling these cases?**

#### ***Active Cases***

Currently, Property Court cases are close to meeting the internally set goal of 90 days with an average age of 105 days for active cases (see Table 3). When bench warrant time (time when cases are out on bench warrant) is removed we not only meet but exceed the internal goal by resolving the cases in 69 days. Only about ¼ of the Property Court cases exceed the goal.

There were eleven cases out of the 587 active cases that were considered statistical outliers. If these cases could be handled more quickly then the length of time to dispose of Property Court cases would be reduced to 57 days.

The Court is mandated to follow the Supreme Court guidelines for felony cases. This guideline is to have 99% of the cases resolved within one year. Clearly the active cases in Property Court, on average, are well within these guidelines.

#### ***Resolved Cases***

We resolved slightly less cases (decrease of 4% in Table 4) in 2001 compared to 2000. However, the number of cases requesting and receiving trials have nearly doubled since Property court. These requests were mostly for court trials not jury trials. Even though there have been significantly more trials, the percentage of cases ultimately convicted has remained fairly stable.

Table 4 shows that the various dispositions have changed very little for cases moving through Property Court. In general 45%-48% of the cases are found or plead guilty, about 16-19% are acquitted or dismissed. The rest of the cases are given some alternative disposition that necessitates the defendant following court orders prior to the charges being dismissed (between 35-36%).

Table 5 compares the number of days and appearances necessary for case resolution of property felonies for the last two years. Both adjusted and unadjusted means are presented. Adjusted means are averages where an outlier analysis has been performed to remove the cases that exceed 3 standard deviations. Many people believe that these adjusted means depict a truer average and therefore the adjusted averages will be interpreted here.

The longest part of processing property felonies is the time between the offense date and the date that the county attorney decides to prosecute the case (an average of 120 days in 2000 and 114 days in 2001 – see Table 5). For other felony cases, these prosecution decisions occur more quickly (on average for all felonies at about 2 ½ months) because cases are brought into court by complaint or indictment. For Property Court over 65% of the cases are brought to court by summons. This method takes longer since letters are sent to the defendant and court dates are set out in advance.

It takes another 16-19 days on average to move between the filing of the case and the first hearing or appearance on the case (16 in 2001). The timing for this stage is similar for property offenses when compared to other type of felonies.

The piece that is most under the court's control is the time between first appearance and case resolution. This part takes slightly over 3 months in Hennepin County District Court for property cases. Non-property felonies were processed from first appearance to disposition in a similar amount of time. Property Court was able to reduce this stage of the process by 7 days or about 1 week.

The number of appearances remained stable – an average of 4.2 in both years. This is a positive finding since the number of court trials has increased so significantly. Other felonies required an average of 5 appearances in order to resolve the case.

#### ***Scheduling of Daily Appearances***

Table 6 shows the days of the week that appearances were scheduled to handle the property felonies. These appearances include post-disposition appearances as well as the appearances that were necessary to resolve the case. Prior to the beginning of Property Court Tuesdays and Thursdays were the heaviest court days. In 2001, Mondays and Thursdays were the heaviest days for appearances.

Table 7 shows the type of appearance that was scheduled on each day for each year. In 2000, over half of each day's appearances were composed of first appearances. By 2001, this had dropped to less than half of each day. Mondays were particularly busy with trials in 2001 under Property Court (16%) while in the previous year these appearances only accounted for 8% of the court business that day.

#### ***Restitution***

One final issue for Property Court has to do with imposing and collecting restitution. One of the goals for Property Court was to impose restitution more quickly and to collect the money for the victims in a more expeditious manner. Community Corrections collects this information since restitution is part of the probation agreement with the defendant. An attachment of their analysis is included at the end of this report. They report that restitution was imposed and collected more quickly once Property Court was in existence. I have attached Figure 2 of their report to the tables here but their full report is attached as well.

Although the 2001 numbers for Property Court are all in the desired direction none of them have reached statistical significance.

**Table 1. New Cases Filed for  
Property Felonies**

<b>Year of Court Acceptance</b>	<b>1993</b>	<b>Count</b>	1,965
		<b>Row %</b>	38.3%
	<b>1994</b>	<b>Count</b>	1,891
		<b>Row %</b>	37.9%
	<b>1995</b>	<b>Count</b>	1,848
		<b>Row %</b>	37.7%
	<b>1996</b>	<b>Count</b>	2,041
		<b>Row %</b>	40.0%
	<b>1997</b>	<b>Count</b>	2,095
		<b>Row %</b>	35.3%
	<b>1998</b>	<b>Count</b>	2,032
		<b>Row %</b>	33.8%
	<b>1999</b>	<b>Count</b>	2,331
		<b>Row %</b>	39.5%
	<b>2000</b>	<b>Count</b>	2,315
		<b>Row %</b>	39.2%
	<b>2001</b>	<b>Count</b>	2,322
		<b>Row %</b>	39.0%
<b>Long Term Percent Change 1993-2001</b>			<b>+18%</b>
<b>Short Term Percent Change 2000-2001</b>			<b>+0.3%</b>

**Table 2. Type of Property Felony Filed by Year the Case began**

		Type of Property Felony										Total
		Burglary	Fraud - Forgery	Arson	Misc. Property	Property Damage	Receiving Stolen Property	Theft	Theft Related	MV Theft		
Year Case was Filed	1993	Count	167	343	13	8	70	120	433	571	240	1,965
		Row %	8.5%	17.5%	.7%	.4%	3.6%	6.1%	22.0%	29.1%	12.2%	100.0%
	1994	Count	155	400	6	11	68	128	420	489	214	1,891
		Row %	8.2%	21.2%	.3%	.6%	3.6%	6.8%	22.2%	25.9%	11.3%	100.0%
	1995	Count	107	390	7	8	72	133	350	588	193	1,848
		Row %	5.8%	21.1%	.4%	.4%	3.9%	7.2%	18.9%	31.8%	10.4%	100.0%
	1996	Count	115	415	8	11	79	143	368	721	181	2,041
		Row %	5.6%	20.3%	.4%	.5%	3.9%	7.0%	18.0%	35.3%	8.9%	100.0%
	1997	Count	94	430	2	23	92	170	453	614	217	2,095
		Row %	4.5%	20.5%	.1%	1.1%	4.4%	8.1%	21.6%	29.3%	10.4%	100.0%
	1998	Count	117	416	10	21	91	161	482	486	248	2,032
		Row %	5.8%	20.5%	.5%	1.0%	4.5%	7.9%	23.7%	23.9%	12.2%	100.0%
	1999	Count	120	508	9	42	137	140	568	487	320	2,331
		Row %	5.1%	21.8%	.4%	1.8%	5.9%	6.0%	24.4%	20.9%	13.7%	100.0%
	2000	Count	104	438	11	42	129	165	690	460	276	2,315
		Row %	4.5%	18.9%	.5%	1.8%	5.6%	7.1%	29.8%	19.9%	11.9%	100.0%
	2001	Count	107	509	5	43	145	122	664	526	201	2,322
		Row %	4.6%	21.9%	.2%	1.9%	6.2%	5.3%	28.6%	22.7%	8.7%	100.0%
	<b>Long Term Change 1993-2001</b>		-36%	+48%	-62%	+81%	+107%	+2%	+53%	-8%	-16%	+18%
	<b>Short Term Change 2000-2001</b>		+3%	+16%	-55%	+2%	+12%	-26%	-4%	+14%	-27%	+0.3%

### Table 3. Timing Statistics for ACTIVE Property Felony Cases

As of December 31, 2001

How are we doing with respect to our goals:

If we handled the longest cases:

<b>Type of Case</b>	Total Active Cases	<i>Current Average Number of Days Old</i>	<i>Average Time (Bench Warrant Time Removed)</i>	<b>Target Goal in Days</b>	Cases longer than the Goal		Number of Cases that are Statistical Outliers*	Number of Days represented by the statistical outliers*	<i>Adjusted Average Number of Days</i>
Property	578	<i>105 days</i>	<b><i>69 days</i></b>	<b>90 days</b>	134 23.2%		11	364 days or longer	<b><i>57 days</i></b>

\* Over 3 standard deviations away from the average (with bench warrant time removed).

**Table 4. Property Court Cases:  
Type of Disposition by Year of Disposition**

		Year of Resolution		
		2000	2001	
<b>Found Guilty</b>	<b>Count</b>	42	83	+97%
	<b>Column %</b>	1.9%	3.9%	
<b>Pled Guilty</b>	<b>Count</b>	1,045	869	-17%
	<b>Column %</b>	46.5%	40.5%	
<b>Continue for Dismissal</b>	<b>Count</b>	61	47	-23%
	<b>Column %</b>	2.7%	2.2%	
<b>De Novo</b>	<b>Count</b>	726	729	-0-
	<b>Column %</b>	32.3%	34.0%	
<b>Diversion</b>	<b>Count</b>	3	3	-0-
	<b>Column %</b>	.1%	.1%	
<b>Acquittal</b>	<b>Count</b>	5	7	-40%*
	<b>Column %</b>	.2%	.3%	
<b>Dismissal</b>	<b>Count</b>	363	408	+12%
	<b>Column %</b>	16.2%	19.0%	
<b>Total</b>	<b>Count</b>	2,245	2,146	-4%
	<b>Column %</b>	100.0%	100.0%	

\* Very small cell numbers should be interpreted with caution

**Table 5. Case Processing Indicators for Property Court**

*Unadjusted Means and Adjusted Means\**

Property Court Cases	Number of cases		Days from offense to filing		Days from filing to first appearance		Days from first appearance to case resolution		Number of appearances to case resolution	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
	2,245	2,146	176	157	29	27	141	129	4.3	4.3
	2,045	2,001	120	114	19	16	107	100	4.2	4.2

\*\*\* BENCH WARRANT TIME IS NOT REMOVED FROM THIS ANALYSIS \*\*\*

**Table 6. DAY of the WEEK for appearances by Year of Final Case Resolution**

			Year of Final Case Resolution		Total	
			2000	2001		
DAY of the WEEK	MONDAY	Count	2,594	2,468	5,062	
		Column %	20.3%	23.7%	21.8%	
	TUESDAY	Count	2,865	2,028	4,893	
		Column %	22.4%	19.5%	21.1%	
	WEDNESDAY	Count	2,787	2,099	4,886	
		Column %	21.8%	20.2%	21.1%	
	THURSDAY	Count	2,981	2,290	5,271	
		Column %	23.3%	22.0%	22.7%	
	FRIDAY	Count	1,566	1,507	3,073	
		Column %	12.2%	14.5%	13.3%	
	Total		Count	12,793	10,392	23,185
			Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 7. Type of Appearance by DAY of the WEEK by Final Disposition Year**

Year of Final Resolution			DAY of the WEEK					Total
			MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY	
2000	First Appearance	Count	1,426	1,723	1,623	1,676	734	7,182
		Column %	55.7%	61.0%	59.1%	57.6%	48.4%	57.2%
	Second Appearance	Count	448	314	307	353	304	1,726
		Column %	17.5%	11.1%	11.2%	12.1%	20.0%	13.7%
	Pretrial-Preliminary Appearance	Count	147	200	206	341	146	1,040
		Column %	5.7%	7.1%	7.5%	11.7%	9.6%	8.3%
	Plea Appearance	Count	11	17	19	25	9	81
		Column %	.4%	.6%	.7%	.9%	.6%	.6%
	Sentencing Appearance	Count	85	139	169	124	55	572
		Column %	3.3%	4.9%	6.1%	4.3%	3.6%	4.6%
	Trial Appearance	Count	207	168	141	98	45	659
		Column %	8.1%	5.9%	5.1%	3.4%	3.0%	5.2%
	Revocation Appearance	Count	107	163	141	152	76	639
		Column %	4.2%	5.8%	5.1%	5.2%	5.0%	5.1%
	Post Review Appearance	Count	118	90	132	113	119	572
		Column %	4.6%	3.2%	4.8%	3.9%	7.8%	4.6%
	Miscellaneous Appearance	Count	9	10	10	28	29	86
		Column %	.4%	.4%	.4%	1.0%	1.9%	.7%
	Total	Count	2,558	2,824	2,748	2,910	1,517	12,557
		Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 7. (continued) Type of Appearance by DAY of the WEEK by Final Disposition Year**

Year of Final Resolution			DAY of the WEEK					Total
			MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY	
2001	First Appearance	Count	971	891	936	1054	669	4,521
		Column %	39.8%	44.6%	45.8%	46.7%	45.7%	44.3%
	Second Appearance	Count	290	213	193	210	188	1,094
		Column %	11.9%	10.7%	9.4%	9.3%	12.8%	10.7%
	Pretrial-Preliminary Appearance	Count	540	541	571	664	419	2,735
		Column %	22.1%	27.1%	27.9%	29.4%	28.6%	26.8%
	Plea Appearance	Count	19	11	22	15	6	73
		Column %	.8%	.6%	1.1%	.7%	.4%	.7%
	Sentencing Appearance	Count	117	126	104	105	70	522
		Column %	4.8%	6.3%	5.1%	4.6%	4.8%	5.1%
	Trial Appearance	Count	396	127	67	50	16	656
		Column %	16.2%	6.4%	3.3%	2.2%	1.1%	6.4%
	Revocation Appearance	Count	35	8	29	53	16	141
		Column %	1.4%	.4%	1.4%	2.3%	1.1%	1.4%
	Post Review Appearance	Count	60	71	111	80	65	387
		Column %	2.5%	3.6%	5.4%	3.5%	4.4%	3.8%
	Miscellaneous Appearance	Count	10	12	12	28	15	77
		Column %	.4%	.6%	.6%	1.2%	1.0%	.8%
	Total	Count	2,438	2,000	2,045	2,259	1,464	10,206
		Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

## 2. DAYS TO FIRST PAYMENT Property Cases

% of Cases With Pymt in 90 Days:  
2000- 18.6%  
2001- 26.2%

