

Washington State Criminal Sentencing Task Force
DRAFT Meeting Summary: September 2, 2021
Virtual Meeting via ZOOM – [Link to recording via TVW](#)

ATTENDEES:

- **Task Force Members and Alternates Attendees:** see [Appendix A](#).
- **Members of the Public:** Megan Allen, Michael Althaus, James Chambers, Bruce Glant, Carolyn Gray, Davina Kerrelola, Erik Kiffe, Sunshine Harper, Corey Patton, Matt Tremble, David Trieweiler, Michelle Mason, Gideon Newmark, Joanne Smieja, Shawnte Holmes-Davenport
- **Facilitation Team:** Amanda Murphy, Chris Page, Molly Stenovec, Maggie Counihan – William D. Ruckelshaus Center
- **Research/Technical Support:** Lauren Knoth (Washington State Institute for Public Policy, or WSIPP)

MEETING GOALS:

- Task Force introductions and updates
- Sentencing Alternatives Workgroup update
- Sentencing Grid Subgroup presentation and next offer of potential recommendations for Task Force Input

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, REVIEW AGENDA and GROUNDRULES

Amanda Murphy welcomed attendees and introduced herself and the rest of the facilitation team before reviewing the agenda and meeting goals.

CO-CHAIR UPDATES

Representative Goodman gave an update from the co-chairs, summarizing a discussion on the progress of the Task Force and the need to be as deliberate as possible to have a high-quality product. Given that the upcoming session is a short session and that it is an election year, it will be difficult to move forward large-scale sentencing reform. Have also received feedback from members that the pace of the work is moving very quickly and is not allowing for the time necessary to work through all issues and hear from all perspectives. Therefore, we are proposing to move back to one meeting per month, through June 2022. This will also give the working groups more time to work through proposals and be more prepared to present those proposals at Task Force meetings. To ensure the Task Force has the time it needs, it may even make sense for the Legislature to extend the Task Force timeline through the end of 2022.

FACILITATION TEAM UPDATES

The facilitation team will talk with Task Force members about extending the Task Force and to hear opinions about timelines. A member asked if a stipend could be provided for individuals volunteering their time. Rep. Goodman said that the constitutional prohibition of gifting might not make that

possible but that he and his Legislative colleagues can look into options and what a potential fiscal note would be.

SENTENCING ALTERNATIVES SUBGROUP UPDATE

Chris Page provided an overview of the Sentencing Alternative Subgroup's recent meeting. They have met four times and most recently reviewed the Special Sex Offender Sentencing Alternatives and will look at other alternatives in the upcoming weeks. All completed sets of past meeting notes are accessible on the [website](#).

PRESENTATION – Sentencing Grid Subgroup Presentation & Discussion: Potential Recommendations, Tradeoffs, and Considerations

Amanda provided a brief recap of the material discussed at the last meeting, which focused on Offense Serious Levels (OSL) 1-5. She then reviewed the agenda for today's meeting, which will focus on the upper portion of the grid, OSL 10 and above. She explained that the Grid Subgroup has not coalesced around any of the potential recommendations. These are ideas that the group has only begun to discuss but feels it is important to get all ideas in front of the Task Force for input so to help the Subgroup better understand where they may or may not be issues or areas of strong or weak support and to help give direction for further proposals.

Lauren Knoth and Keri-Anne Jetzer provided an overview of the potential recommendations emerging from the Grid Subgroup. Amanda asked Subgroup members to add context around the tradeoffs and considerations of each before asking for input from the Task Force. The following section lists those emerging potential recommendations followed by bulleted questions and comments from the Task Force (with responses where relevant).

The PowerPoint with additional information and grid visuals can be found here: [CSTF 9.2.21 PowerPoint](#)

POTENTIAL RECOMMENDATION #9: *Eliminate the mandatory minimum for Murder 1.*

Lauren shared what the grid group has discussed noting there are differing perspectives in the group. Murder 1 is at offense seriousness level (OSL) 15 and has a statutory minimum of 20 years.

Grid Group Discussion Points/Considerations:

- Little difference between Murder 1 and Murder 2
- Mandatory minimum gives more leverage/power/discretion to prosecutors particularly in plea bargaining process
- Potential racial disproportionality in who gets charged with Murder 1 or Murder 2

Task Force Input:

- Wouldn't you have disparate sentencing without a minimum to ensure consistency?
- Do all Murder 1 convictions come with a firearm enhancement? **R:** Clela will try to find out.
- Due to the way pre-meditation in statute is defined, there is little difference between Murder 1 and Murder 2.
- While could not support eliminating the mandatory minimum, would be willing to discuss what to replace it with.

- Important to look at the conduct of this crime and the impact it has on the victim and their families. 20 years is not completely out of line given the conduct we are talking about here and the forever loss and impact the victims and families face.
- Some families are shocked that it is only 20 years.
- Does anyone know how it came to be that we have mandatory minimums? Or what the minimum and max sentence length for murder 1 is in other state?

ACTION ITEM:

- Clela Steelhammer will see if there is information available on the number of Murder 1 convictions that have firearm enhancements [ACTION ITEM COMPLETE. [See Appendix B](#)]
- The Grid Subgroup will look into what the minimum and maximum sentences are for crimes similar to murder 1 in other states.

POTENTIAL RECOMMENDATION #10: *For aggravated murder 1 change the language from: “Life sentence without parole/death penalty for individuals at or over the age of eighteen. For individuals under the age of eighteen, a term of twenty-five years to life.”*

To

“Life sentence without parole/death penalty for individuals at or over the age of twenty-five. For individuals under the age of twenty-five, a term of twenty-five years to life.”

Grid Group Discussion Points/Considerations:

- Recent Supreme Court decision recognize the emerging brain science and the Washington Legislature has made other policy changes recognizing continued brain development between ages of 18 and 25.

Task Force Input:

- Since it pertains to individuals under 21, this statute as written is unconstitutional due to a recent [WA Supreme Court Case decision](#) *Monschke and Bartholomew*. This our approach should be to at least catch up to what the Supreme Court has decided. But with the current brain science being around 25 and the Supreme Court likely heading there, we can be future focused now and make it 25, instead of having to catch up later.
- If young people do not have the capacity to think about the future consequences of an action, can they really be guilty of premeditated murder?
- If the Supreme Court says its 21, then think should at least address to be 21. But for 25, have a lot of concern, especially given how criminal organizations recruit and groom individuals under 18 to commit crime. So concerned that now they would be having more room to do this for longer if it is up to 25.
- Concern about raising the age to 25, especially given that in all other aspects of society, 25 is considered an adult. We give a lot of mixed messages to our youth about when it is that you are an adult. For example, can vote and join the military at 18, drink at 21, many people are married and have kids by age 25. We need to come to some consensus at a greater scope of what is that age in which one is considered an adult.
- The science associated with juvenile development is soundly in place. We can use that science to come up with interventions for young people. The last place that matures in the brain is the frontal lobe, which is where judgement occurs, and this happens around age 25. The criminal

gangs are going to do what they do and find any opening they can. But we as a community need to say this is the science and we aren't going to pick and choose when we use it. If we do we allow for greater disparity. And this isn't recent science, it is 20 years old and we need to start incorporating it into our criminal sentencing system.

- There is a continual stream of Supreme Court decisions on youthfulness and have been having conversations for years on how to legislate. The issue of culpability, which is different from guilt. Guilt is defined by the court process, but culpability is about an individual's ability to access the consequences of their own actions, so that's where youthfulness comes into consideration. And remember, there is still a mandatory minimum of 25 years so it's not like there isn't accountability.
- The difference is whether their sentence is a life without parole sentence or a minimum of 25 years to life. So it is still about accountability, just whether those under 25 should get life without the possibility of parole. Changing the age to 25 and under, they would still be getting a minimum of 25 years to life. The U.S. is out of sync with the rest of the world in our criminal justice system, and other countries are getting better results. We should catch up with other countries, who do use recent brain science to guide their approaches.

POTENTIAL RECOMMENDATION #11: *For all sentences longer than 20 years, require a second chance review at 20 years of incarceration with the presumption of release.*

Grid Group Discussion Points/Considerations:

- Similar to current statutes for individuals convicted of offenses committed before age 18.
- Recognizes that extremely long sentences may not be beneficial/useful.
- Acknowledges potential for rehabilitation and redeemability.

Task Force Input:

- This recommendation would be similar to the statute 9.94(a).730, which refers to individuals convicted before the age of 18 and has a presumption of release, unless it is more likely than not that they will commit new law violations. Has been in place for six or seven years now and the last data seen did not show a high rate of return to prison. Not sure if this recommendation is meant to replicate for anyone once they reach 20 years, but if so, it has been successful and worth considering to expanding for all individuals.
- Senator Dhingra had a bill that passed the Senate and is sitting on the House floor currently, which is related to this recommendation to allow for a second chance review.
- Would suggest having it be 25 years for certain classes of offenses, such as aggravated murder. Also, whether it is a presumption of release or if it should have some other qualities, such as rehabilitation should also be considered.

Potential Recommendations 12, 12a, and 12b

Before explaining potential recommendation #12 and #12a, Lauren reviewed the upper portion of the grid-OSL 10 and above- and the statutes that apply to it. *See slides 15-21: [CSTF 9.2.21 PowerPoint](#)*

- Potential modifications to OSLs 10 and above
- Focus is on violent offenses (*see slide 19 for list of offenses [CSTF 9.2.21 PowerPoint](#)*)

- Focus is on implementation of the consistent/formulaic approach to setting guideline ranges while considering unique characteristics of offenses in the upper range.

Grid Group Discussion Points/Considerations:

- Formula provides an answer to “why this range”.
- Creates logical consistency in how sentence lengths change as OSL increases and as CHS increases.
- Long term durability of changes.
- Focus is on creating the structure of the grid. Individual offenses may need to be recalibrated on the new grid to account for the ad-hoc decisions in the past.

POTENTIAL RECOMMENDATION #12: *Increase the number of seriousness levels from 16 to 18 whereby:*

- *OSL 18 is Aggravated Murder with a range of 25 to life regardless of Criminal History Score (as it currently is in SL 16)*
- *OSL 17 is Murder 1 and Homicide by Abuse with current ranges for Murder 1*
- *OSL 16 is Murder 2 with current maximums, but minimums made consistent at 50% of the maximum.*
- *OSL 15 to 10 are as classified currently except for the offenses pulled out above. The formula is used starting at OSL 16.*

Formula is same as OSL 1-5 (see [PowerPoint 8.19.21](#))

- Anchor is the maximum for OSL 16.
- Maximum for CHS 9+ in each row established by creating equal intervals in the maximum for each row.
- Maximum for CHS 0 is calculated as 35% of the CHS 9+ maximum.
- Maximum for each CHS after CHS 0 is 110% of the maximum for the previous CHS.
- Minimum is 75% of the maximum.

Grid Group Discussion Points/Considerations:

- Maintains the ability to use a systematic/formulaic approach.
- Other offenses in OSL 15 and OSL 14 aren't tied to the mandatory minimum statutes for Murder 1 and Murder 2 but are affected by them as a function of their seriousness level on the grid.
- Reduces sentences for the majority of offenses, but keeps Aggravated Murder, Murder 1, and Murder 2 the same.
- Sentencing trends commonly at or below the midpoint for these offenses.
- Judges/prosecutors can still seek aggravated sentences for particularly egregious offenses.
- Sentences in these rows often greater than what appears on the grid due to sentencing enhancements, consecutive sentencing, and aggravating factors.

Task Force Input:

- The sentence lengths in the original SRA did not have data supporting them and may be arbitrary numbers. How do we know that these sentences are achieving what we intend them to do? How are they reducing recidivism? How do we know that with these sentences, and

individual is ready to transition back into society? We do know that after a point, people mature out of their criminogenic behaviors. What's the data that supports the sentence numbers? Our goal should be to come up with some logic to grid and these sentences. Keeping people too long in prison can actual be a detriment to public safety because people are so long removed from their communities, their families become disengaged, and this all has generational effects.

- No one recommendation that we as a task Force make will necessarily meet all three of the policy goals this group has been tasked with by the Legislature. It is each in the aggregate, and last year we did spend a lot of time discussing public safety and data and saw that there is a diminishing rate of return that incarceration will reduce crime – that at a point you are doing extra incarceration. Now there is a retribution side of justice that is not just about reducing crime but is to also punish, but on the flipside of this, why not instead use that money that would have been spent on extra incarceration and put it towards housing, education, job training, alternatives to incarceration such as treatment, and other community supports that would help to reduce crime. Agree that just letting people out is probably not going to improve public safety but if can reduce the sentence length and reinvest that money into services that support those being released, this will promote public safety. Our charge is to improve public safety overall, and reinvesting cost savings from reduced incarceration is a way to achieve this.
- 95% of people sentenced in this portion of the grid will eventually be released. The research shows that it's about the quality of time spent incarcerated, not the quantity of time served. Reducing some of the lengths and reinvesting those resources into programs will support public safety.
- The reduction of the numbers in each cell is significant, in this portion of the grid where these offenses are significant. There is an increase in violent crime across the county. Support having a systematic grid but do think we need to discuss the numbers and what level of reduction. The higher the OSL and the farther from the southwest corner we get, the rehabilitation approach becomes more difficult to envision. While a reduction may make sense for those that can rehabilitate, need to recognize that some cannot rehabilitate and in this portion of the grid, with this level of reduction is a concern.

POTENTIAL RECOMMENDATION #12A: *Move Trafficking 1 to OSL 15 with Malicious Explosion of a Substance 1. Move all other offenses up one OSL.*

Grid Group Discussion Points/Considerations:

- If the grid is expanded to 18 rows, there are two OSLs that would have only one offense (OSL 15 with Malicious Explosion of a Substance 1 and OSL 14 with Trafficking 1).
- Increasing the OSL by 1 would moderate the reduction in sentences that result from applying the formula to OSL 10 and above.
- This leaves OSL 10 empty, creating room to recalibrate offenses below OSL 10

Task Force Input:

- **Q:** Are these numbers we are taking about days served in prison or are we also talking about supervision or other additional time? Because some offenses have mandatory supervision and other do not. Keeping in mind that some of these do have supervision after the length of stay so is all that still on the table? **R:** What we are discussing here is just length of stay. However, with how these potential recommendations for the vertical axis lay out, there are these zones that have

formed. This is the benefit of using a systematic approach for the grid. The Task Force could recommend creating a zone for OSL 10 and above, as with the recommendation, this area would only include class A felonies. This zone could have certain requirements or stipulations attached that cover supervision, victim impact statements, and/or other conditions. Other requirements could then be developed for OSL 6-9 as a zone, and OSL 1-5 as a zone.

- **Q:** The numbers in these cells are a range - the minimum and the maximum, but they are not the actual specific sentence number ordered. What are the actual sentences that the courts are ordering now? Can we look at what the average sentence is that the courts are actually ordering now and can we see if they fall within the ranges of this simulated grid? While looking at the simulation, it looks like massive reductions, it may be that in reality and practice it would not be such a reduction based on how courts are currently sentencing. **R:** These comparisons can be made. The Adult Sentencing Statistical Sentencing Summaries produced by the Caseload Forecast Council has this information and we do see that judges sentence at or below the midpoint of the range (See [Table 12: Statistical Summary of Adult Felony Sentencing FY 2020](#)). For example, for Assault 1 is on average is
- Support for looking at this holistically and systematically. When we talk about recidivism in violent crime, the types of crimes we are looking at in this portion of the grid, its is difficult to talk about recidivism because it means a real victim of a serious violent crime—if we get it wrong in reducing sentences significantly, it’s hard to think of a person out there getting victimized that wouldn’t have if the person was still incarcerated.
- **Q:** Seeing all these changes that are all reductions is concerning, such as the reduction for Murder 2. Thinking of how to make this more palatable, is it possible to build in an aggravator, or change the conditions for the rapid recidivism aggravator to make it broader so it can be added to the charge and give the judge discretion for those who recidivate from serious violent offenses? **R:** When the group starts talking about criminal history score, could look at examples of what other states to to address this, such as having a category for Repeat Violent convictions, which could be a separate column on the grid.

REFLECTION/FEEDBACK and NEXT STEPS:

Amanda thanked Task Force members for their time, talent, and dedication to the work of the Task Force and thanked Lauren Knoth, Clela Steelhammer, and Keri-Ann Jetzer for their additional support. Amanda then opened the meeting for public questions and comments.

PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS:

The Following are Verbatim Public Comments and Questions Submitted via Zoom Chat Function and asked verbally.

Q: If the age is changed to 25, would the change mean a 19-year-old sentenced to 50 years would change even if it wasn’t for murder? **R:** The changing of the age was just for aggravated murder. (Shawnte Holmes-Davenport)

Comment: The brain development between 18 - 25 is where the military generally gathers it's recruits due to the, especially in males, they are physically at optimal performance levels, and in that age range the frontal lobe of the brain is not yet fully developed and therefore is easier to reestablish to think in the way that the "organization" chooses to direct their way of viewing everyday situations. This of course can sway towards a good intention or a non-good intention. (Michelle Mason)

In that age range one might perform an act that if not being guided by the thinking of the "elders" in the organization. Their own personal upbringing may give them pause but when they are involved with "the group" thinking that may override their "childhood" way of thinking. The positive to this is that this way of thinking and viewing things in the world is not so "hardwired" that with the proper teaching and guidance a human can self-educate themselves to mature into a more positive way of living their life. (Michelle Mason)

Q: Why is assault 1 so high on OSL when it doesn't actually require injury? The biggest difference between assault 1 and assault 2 is the use of a firearm (example a drive by shooting will almost always have an attached assault 1 even if no injury occurred because of the use of a firearm. Which will also add an enhancement and result in consecutive sentences not concurrent). **R:** Can't answer the legislative question to why it was placed there, but assault 1 is fairly serious. (Shawnte Holmes-Davenport)

Q: What are we going to do about crimes that have no victims that have tremendous consequences that are often longer than crimes against children. I'm curious, you sent out a list for fiscal year 2019 that had the number of crimes that were sentenced for 2019, how many were victimless crimes that have fictitious children? I'd be curious to see what that number is. **R:** No data from CFC, the courts might keep that information. Don't know of a lot of data that tracks victim information. WASPC collects incidents, but not arrests or convictions. Not sure if you could get that information, or if it is made public. You might want to look at the cities where those operations occur and then look at convictions from that individual county. (Bruce Glant)

Comment: The people in prison with long sentences those people tend to engage in positive programming more often than those with less time. (Waldo Waldron-Ramsey)

Q: Are there any stats on people who are minimum security and don't have options for programming?
R: Actually, people with longer time are barred from a lot of programming until they reach a certain time. **R:** There is a need to have more programming and be able to do it sooner. (Michelle Mason)

Comment: It was stated that rehabilitation becomes less possible for more seriousness level crimes, in reality the opposite is true. The recidivism rate for violent crimes is lower than for non-violent crimes. It is even lower still for sex crimes and it's incredibly low for murder. So it's not correct that as you go up the grid in seriousness level that rehabilitation becomes less likely or possible. (David Trieweller)

Comment: To add to my previous comments. I do realize that there will be cases that we just cause will remand an individual to long term or life within the institution in the interest of public safety. Thus I hope that those that are in control of positive programming do not discard these individuals from programming that "may" allow them to gain a positive role within the institution in educating incarcerated young adults as to the long term consequences of an impulsive action no matter what their circumstances were at the time of the charged event. Empathy can be a learned behavior even for an incarcerated individual whom may be serving decades and or life within the system. (Michelle Mason)

I am not able to stay on but a question I would like posed is how will the good time recommendations of 30-50% impact this also? Victims often find the system to be disingenuous when they claim the range is one thing and then in actuality that is not the sentence. This undermines victims and the public's trust in the system as a whole. Good time is not currently tied to any real incentive and so its essentially just guaranteed. There should be an additional grid that shows what this would look in

reality -- as reduction of the sentences and then added potentially 30-50% -- will produce a much different outcome which this committee should be transparent about. If good time is to be increased the goal should be tied to actual rehabilitation and engagement in programming and treatment in prison. Currently only 20-30% of offenders in prison for sex offenses are able to access treatment. This increases risk of re-offense and undermines victims trust in the legitimacy of the system as a whole. (Megan Allen)

Much better tools are available now to assess and help with rehabilitation resulting in a safer community. Much has been learned since the 70's (Bruce Glant)

An example would be Gary Ridgeway. He came from an abusive home as do many within the system. Although my personal belief is that his hardwiring, age and intelligence make him a true risk to the public safety of all. With positive education he may be able to gain empathy and with empathy gained in turn he may release information to the remaining families who have loved ones remains yet to be retrieved. Along with that may be able to come to terms due to hindsight as to where his turning point that directed his behavior was and may be able to educate others within the system as to possible solutions that may be used to end a long-term family history of detrimental behavior that is a risk to public safety to all. As we are doing here today. Gridlines and sentencing guidelines change so positive programs and mandating that they are actually being implemented within the institutions is of the utmost importance to serving the public and the safety of all in the future. (Michelle Mason)

ADJOURN

Upcoming Meetings:

Sept. 16, 9 am – 12:30pm

October 7, 1 pm – 4:30 pm

November 4, 1 pm – 4:30 pm

December 2, 1 pm – 4:30 pm

October 21, 9 am – 12:30pm

November 18, 9 am – 12:30pm

December 16, 9 am – 12:30pm

Appendix A:		
CSTF Members & Designated Alternates	Affiliation/Perspective Represented	Attendance:
Jon Tunheim	Washington Association of Prosecuting Attorneys	
Russell Brown (alternate)		✓
Lydia Flora Barlow	Statewide Reentry Council	✓
(Christopher Poulos)		✓
Rep. Roger Goodman	Washington State House of Representatives	✓
Sen. Chris Gildon	Washington State Senate	✓
Sen. Manka Dhingra	Washington State Senate	✓
Rep. Carolyn Eslick	Washington State House of Representatives	✓
Sonja Hallum	Washington State Office of the Governor	✓
Elaine Deschamps	Washington State Caseload Forecast Council	
(Clela Steelhammer)		✓
Julie Martin	Washington State Department of Corrections	✓
(Mac Pevey)		✓
Judge Wesley Saint Clair	Washington State Sentencing Guidelines Commission	✓
(Keri-Anne Jetzer)		✓
Suzanne Cook	Statewide Family Council	✓
(Melody Simle)		
Judge Josephine Wiggs-Martin	Superior Court Judges' Association	
Gregory Link	Washington Association of Criminal Defense Attorneys; Washington Defender Association	✓
(Kim Gordon)		
Chief Gregory Cobb	Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs	✓
(Chief Brian Smith)		✓
Councilmember Derek Young	Washington State Association of Counties	✓

Judge Veronica Alicea-Galván (Frank Thomas)	Washington State Minority and Justice Commission	
Chief James Schrimpsheer	Fraternal Order of Police, Labor Organization Representing Active Law Enforcement Officers in Washington State	✓
Nick Allen (Nick Straley)	Columbia Legal Services, Representing Interests of Incarcerated Persons	✓
Waldo Waldron-Ramsey (Ginny Parham)	Washington Community Action Network, Representing Interests of Incarcerated Persons	✓ ✓
Vacant	Representing Interests of Crime Victims	
Riddhi Mukhopadhyay (Tiffany Attrill)	Sexual Violence Law Center, Representing Interests of Crime Victims	✓ ✓

Appendix B:

**Table 7. Sentences with a Deadly Weapon Finding
Fiscal Year 2020**

The table below lists deadly weapon enhancements, by offense and type of weapon, for those sentences that received a deadly weapon enhancement. Deadly weapon enhancements for offenses committed prior to July 24, 1995 do not distinguish firearms from other deadly weapons. Initiative I-159 ("Hard Time for Armed Crime") provides deadly weapon enhancements for any felony offense committed after July 23, 1995. I-159 enhancements are greater for firearms than for other deadly weapons (see RCW 9.94A.533).

OFFENSE	FIREARMS	NON-FIREARMS	TOTAL
AGGRAVATED MURDER 1 (POST 7/24/99) [Life]	2	1	3
AGGRAVATED MURDER 1 (PRE 7/1/90) [Life]	1	0	1
ASSAULT 1 (POST 7/1/90)	14	7	21
ASSAULT 1 (POST 7/1/90) [Life]	0	1	1
ASSAULT 2 (POST 7/1/88)	19	52	71
ASSAULT 3 (POST 7/1/88)	1	4	5
BURGLARY 1	8	2	10
BURGLARY 1 [Life]	1	0	1
DEL POS W/I METH - 1ST OFFENSE (POST 6/30/98)	5	0	5
DEL POS W/I METH - 2ND OFFENSE (POST 6/30/98)	2	0	2
DEL POS W/I METH - SCHOOL ZONE (POST 6/30/98)	2	0	2
HATE CRIME (since 07/28/2019, previously MALICIOUS HARASSMENT)	0	1	1
KIDNAPPING 1	0	1	1
MAINTAIN PLACE FOR DRUGS - 1ST OFFENSE (POST 7/24/99)	1	0	1
MANSLAUGHTER 1 (POST 7/26/97)	3	1	4
MANSLAUGHTER 2 (POST 7/26/97)	4	0	4
MFG DEL POS W/I HER (POST 6/30/02) (L7)	2	0	2
MFG DEL POS W/I HER (POST 6/30/02) (L7) [Life]	1	0	1
MFG DEL POS W/I HER COC - SCHOOL ZONE (POST 6/30/02) (L7)	1	0	1
MFG DEL POS W/I SCH W/I NARC OR FLUNT SUBSEQ	1	0	1
MFG DEL POS W/I SCH W/I NARC OR FLUNT-1ST OFF	6	1	7
MURDER 1 (7/1/90-7/24/99) [Attempt]	1	0	1
MURDER 1 (POST 7/24/99)	21	10	31
MURDER 1 (POST 7/24/99) [Attempt]	2	0	2
MURDER 1 (POST 7/24/99) [Life]	1	0	1
MURDER 1 (POST 7/24/99) [Life] [Attempt]	1	0	1
MURDER 2 (POST 7/24/99)	10	8	18
MURDER 2 (POST 7/24/99) [Attempt]	2	0	2
MURDER 2 (7/1/90-7/24/99)	1	0	1
POSS OF CONTROL SUBSTANCE - OTHER, EXCEPT PCP/FLUNIT	1	0	1
POSS OF CONTROL SUBSTANCE - SCHEDULE W/II OR FLUNIT	0	1	1
RAPE 1 (POST 8/31/01) (.712)	1	1	2
RAPE 2 (POST 8/31/01) (.712) [Life] [Attempt]	0	1	1
RAPE 3	0	1	1
RESIDENTIAL BURGLARY (POST 7/90)	0	1	1
ROBBERY 1	10	3	13
ROBBERY 2	0	4	4
ROBBERY 2 [Attempt]	0	1	1
THEFT 1	1	0	1
TOTAL	126	102	228