

**ATTORNEY GENERAL
STATE OF MONTANA**

**Tim Fox
Attorney General**



**Joseph P. Mazurek Building
215 North Sanders
P.O. Box 201401
Helena, MT 59620-1401**

Montana Attorney General's Office

**FINAL QUARTERLY
REPORT**

For Period Ending January 31, 2016

Re: MOU/Agreement Requirements between the Montana
Attorney General, the US Department of Justice and the Missoula
County Attorney's Office.

Montana Attorney General's Office
FINAL REPORT
February 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

▪	Introduction from MT Attorney General Tim Fox.....	p. 3
▪	Outline of Work Conducted Pursuant to the MOUs in the Reporting Period.....	p. 5
▪	Outline of Compliance Updates.....	p. 5
▪	Technical Advisor Recommendation Updates.....	p. 9
▪	Outline of Aggregate Data Analysis.....	p. 15
▪	Conclusion.....	p. 23
▪	Attached Exhibits 1-3:	
○	Exhibit 1, Victim Witness Coordinator Survey	
○	Exhibit 2, Spreadsheet of Cases Referred to MCAO for Prosecution, June 2014-Jan. 31, 2016	
○	Exhibit 3, Spreadsheet of Cases Referred to MCAO for Review Only, June 2014-Jan. 31, 2016	

ATTORNEY GENERAL STATE OF MONTANA

Tim Fox
Attorney General



Joseph P. Mazurek Building
215 North Sanders
P.O. Box 201401
Helena, MT 59620-1401

AN INTRODUCTION FROM TIM FOX, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MONTANA

On June 10, 2014, I signed a memorandum of understanding (MOU)¹ with Missoula County, the Missoula County Attorney's Office (MCAO), and the United States Department of Justice (USDOJ) resolving USDOJ's investigation of the MCAO's handling of sex assault prosecutions. This MOU outlined a cooperative agreement between the Montana Attorney General's Office (MT AGO) and the MCAO to ensure the success of the MCAO's efforts to improve its response to sexual assault. My office provided the first report to the USDOJ in December 2014 and we have since published four quarterly reports for the periods ending in January, March, June and September of 2015. These reports are available here: <https://dojmt.gov/agooffice/missoula-county-agreement>

This document represents the final Quarterly report that will be prepared by our office pursuant to the agreements, but work on these agreements will continue through June, 2016. The MCAO will continue to collect and provide data to the MT AGO through June 2016 as set forth in Section G(2)(e) of the MOU between US DOJ, MT AGO, and MCAO. The parties have also agreed to begin working with the MCAO, the USDOJ and our Technical Advisor, Anne Munch to provide

¹ This and the other MOUs are attached to the First Quarterly Report, available here at <https://dojmt.gov/wp-content/uploads/Quarterly-Report-January-2015.pdf>.


the public with a final reflection on this extraordinary effort, to be published after June, 2016, when all obligations under the agreements are scheduled to be complete.

For now we should take a moment to celebrate the accomplishments that the MCAO has achieved through cooperation with all the parties to the agreements. The MCAO has made dramatic improvements in their pace of prosecution, services to victims, and administrative structure in handling these cases. The MCAO, along with their colleagues in the Missoula Community are truly a model we can all look to in how to better bring justice to victims of this terrible crime.

While we celebrate these accomplishments, we also must not forget that there is always more that can be done. It remains true that most victims of sexual assault never come forward and even those who do, many do not want to participate in prosecutions. I see the work done under these agreements not as a finish line, but as a starting point for further improvements in handling of sex assault cases all around our great state. This is why my office is currently working with stakeholders from Missoula and all around Montana on a number of initiatives, including proposed legislative improvements to our statutory definitions of “consent” and a pilot training to be held in Helena, MT on May 24 through 25 to provide best practices to attendees and a strategic plan to improve sex assault prosecutions within the Helena community.

With these and many other efforts to follow, we look forward to continuing to work tirelessly to bring justice to all victims of sexual violence.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Tim Fox', with a stylized, cursive script.

Tim Fox

**WORK CONDUCTED PURSUANT TO THE MOU'S IN THE REPORTING
PERIOD – September 9, 2015 through January 31, 2016**

On September 17 and 18, 2015, Ole Olson of the MT AGO's Prosecution Services Bureau (PSB) and Technical Advisor Anne Munch (TA) visited the Missoula County Attorney's Office. Over the two-day period they conducted on site reviews and in person interviews with attorneys with regard to the declined cases and other cases requested to be reviewed during the prior reporting period. They also facilitated the formation of the Montana Multi-Disciplinary Training Team on Sex Assault, and attended the weekly Special Victims Unit meeting. Additionally, Anne Munch and local Missoula Police Detective Brad Waln conducted a two-hour training with the Missoula County Sheriff's Detectives on best practices for conducting sex assault investigations.

On February 1, 2016, the MCAO provided the MT AGO with the data described in the Monitoring and Compliance Plan, including a list of training and the updated Sexual Assault Case Data Forms. Having reviewed these materials, the MT AGO, TA and MCAO discussed the reporting points outlined in the Monitoring and Compliance plan. The MT AGO followed up with specific queries on several particular cases. Additionally, the MT AGO followed up on specific points that the TA had raised in her letter which accompanied the June 2015 Quarterly Report.

MOU COMPLIANCE UPDATES

The following is a summary of the updates provided by the MCAO to the MT AGO in order of the subject topics provided in the Monitoring and Compliance Plan.

I. Changes, if any, to policies and guidelines for handling sexual assault cases:

- No changes in this reporting period.

II. A list and description of any Sexual Assault related trainings conducted or attended by MCAO attorneys and supervisors, including victim advocates, the MPD or MSO since the last Quarterly Report:

- 9/17/15 Anne Munch facilitated a sexual assault meeting with our Special Victims Unit to review cases, strategize and identify any remaining gaps;

- 10/6/15 Cathy Dorle and Brian Lowney attended training by expert Gael Strack, entitled *Saving Lives: Assessing, Investigating and Prosecuting Strangulation Cases*;
- 10/7 & 8/15 Cathy Dorle attended the Montana Board of Crime Control's MONTANA CRIME PREVENTION CONFERENCE at the University of Montana;
- 10/16/15 Investigator Mike Dominick attended *Profiling Abusers and Killers: Common Traits and Differences* in Hamilton, Montana;
- 11/9 & 10/15 Not in Our State Summit – *Sexual Assault in Montana: Fact, Fiction, and Future* – Kirsten Pabst was a panelist; all members of the Special Victim's Unit attended the conference;
- 12/10/15 Jordan Kilby, Suzy Boylan and the Missoula County Sheriff's detectives participated in a webinar entitled *Raped or "Seduced"? How Language Helps Shape Our Response to Sexual Violence*;
- 1/20-22/16 Jordan Kilby attended the *Montana Children's Justice Conference*, in Big Sky, Montana; and
- Jordan Kilby will be attending the EVAWI annual conference March 22-24, 2016.

III. A list of the designated sex assault prosecutors, supervisors, and in-house victim advocate: (* Indicates there has been a change since the last Quarterly Report.)

- SVU Supervisor: Jason Marks;
- SVU Attorneys: Jen Clark, Suzy Boylan, Jordan Kilby, & Brian Lowney;
- Investigative Specialist: Jordan Kilby;
- MCAO Investigator: Mike Dominick.
- Victim Witness Coordinator: Cathy Dorle.

IV. Changes, if any, to MOU's between MCAO and MPD and MCSO since the last Quarterly Report:

- None.

V. Current Sex Assault Case Data Forms on all sex assault cases referred to MCAO for charging or review. Data forms show new referrals and/or changes in status of previous referrals since the last Quarterly Report:

- The MCAO forwarded all current Sex Assault Case Data Forms to the AG.

VI. Updates as to participation and/or results of Missoula's sex assault safety and accountability audit and the victim and advocate survey through the University of Montana and MPD.

- Since the last report the MCAO has conducted one additional victim survey in a case that has been resolved. As with the previous surveys, this survey was conducted by the victim witness coordinator by telephone with the victim. The feedback was once again positive. The victim responded that the prosecutor “made sentencing so much more comforting than I ever could have imagined.” She also stated “I have nothing but great things to say about the Missoula County Attorney’s Office and am so grateful that Jen Clark stayed by my side the whole way.” The complete survey is attached as Exhibit 1.

VII. Status update on the Special Victims Unit process at the MPD:

- Jordan Kilby continues to be co-located at MPD in the Special Victims Unit to assist in ongoing investigations and facilitate more rapid case review and charging decisions. MPD has expressed that her presence in their SVU has continued to be tremendously valuable in assisting detectives in their investigations and in preparing cases for charging.
- On January 8, 2016, Missoula Police Chief Mike Brady sent County Attorney Kirsten Pabst a letter praising the County Attorney’s Office in general and Jordan Kilby, Jason Marks and Kirsten Pabst in particular for their recent work with the police department on major cases. Chief Brady wrote,

“We would also like to emphasize the importance of having Ms. Kilby’s presence within our Detective Division. . . [H]er presence cannot be overstated [because of] the good work and assistance she provides to our investigators.” He continued, “Thank you to your and your office for their assistance. We look forward to maintaining the great working relationships we have established.”

VIII. Status update on MCAO involvement with law enforcement and community partners and update on community education efforts:

- Suzy Boylan has been actively participating in statewide efforts to re-write the statutes pertaining to sexual intercourse without consent and sexual assault.
- The MCAO’s individual outreach efforts this last quarter include:
 - 9/14/15 University Council on Student Assault meeting UM Boardroom, attended by Kirsten Pabst;
 - 9/17/15 Multi-Disciplinary Team Steering Meeting UM Boardroom, with AG’s Office, Anne Munch, Jason Marks, Jennifer Clark, Suzy Boylan, Brian Lowney, Jordan Kilby, Cathy Dorle and Kirsten Pabst;
 - 9/18/15 Kirsten Pabst met with Anne Munch to discuss progress to date and identify remaining gaps and ideas for continued outreach;

- 9/28/15, 10/19/15, 11/2/15 Montana MDT Training Team on Sex Assault conference, with Kirsten Pabst, Cathy Dorle, Jordan Kilby, Jennifer Clark and Suzy Boylan;
- 9/29/15 Kirsten Pabst and Cathy Dorle met with the CVA staff for our quarterly meeting/sharing;
- 10/8/15 Kirsten Pabst was the guest lecturer at UM Criminal Adjudication class on changes in how sexual assault cases are handled in Missoula and in particular on the benefits of the integrated SVU unit;
- 10/14/15 Kirsten Pabst was the guest speaker at the Sunrise Rotary Club, discussing changes in the office and the building of our SVU;
- 10/28/15 Jennifer Clark presented at the Citizen's Law School in part on how sexual assault cases are handled in Missoula;
- 11/9 & 10/15 Not in Our State Summit – Sexual Assault in Montana: Fact, Fiction, and Future – Kirsten Pabst was a panelist; all of the Special Victim's Unit attended the conference;
- 11/19/15 Jennifer Clark presented a CLE at the law school on prosecuting sexual assault and domestic violence cases;
- 11/30/15 Suzy Boylan and Jennifer Clark participated in the Montana MDT Training Team on Sex Assault, Helena meeting; and
- 12/9/15 First Step Advisory Board Meeting– Jason Marks and Suzy Boylan participated.

IX. *Status of the \$10,000 Expert Witness fees fund:*

- The fund has been used to pay the following experts in sexual assault cases tried this past Quarter: No cases tried in this period.

X. *Review of all MCAO files for all declined sexual assault cases since the prior Quarterly report, if any, as well as any other cases requested to be reviewed by the TA and MT AGO:*

There were no declined sexual assault cases between September 8, 2015 and January 31, 2016.

- The TA and MT AGO have completed the case review process for LE case number 2015-4283 which was charged and then dismissed prior to September 8, 2015, pursuant to the victim's request. The MT AGO and the TA reviewed the case file and conducted an in person meeting with the prosecuting attorney and SVU supervisor Jason Marks. This case was an example of the struggle in balancing respect for a victim's wishes with the need to hold offenders accountable. Ultimately, MT AGO and the TA suggested to the MCAO that this was a case where the MT AGO and TA

believed that more could have been done to hold the offender accountable. The MCAO maintains that it would not have been appropriate to continue prosecution of a sexual assault against the wishes of the victim. This case remains unfilled. The MT AGO is not recommending that the MCAO reverse course after the fact on this case as victim's request to dismiss has already been granted and reversing course at this point would not be just to either the victim or the defendant. As a result of this review, however, the MCAO and MT AGO agree that on future cases the MCAO will specifically look for what more can be done to engage or re-engage victims on cases where the victim is reluctant to prosecute. The MCAO will at least consider proceeding on cases against the victim's wishes where the sexual assault case dynamics of the case are more informed by domestic violence case as opposed to a sexual assault case.

- The TA and MT AGO also conducted formal case review on LE case numbers 2015-1951; 2015-27095; 2015-29653; and 2015-15509. These cases were all referred to the MCAO by MPD for review. All four cases involved homeless victims and were placed inactive by MPD after victim discontinuation. These cases highlighted the difficulty faced by law enforcement in completing investigations of sexual violence against this vulnerable population. The MT AGO and the TA reviewed the case files and conducted a telephone conference with the prosecuting attorney who reviewed the cases and SVU supervisor Jason Marks.
- As a result of issues identified and discussions arising out of this case review process MCAO has identified a number of opportunities to try and improve outcomes on cases where the victim does not wish to participate or is reluctant. The MCAO has engaged a trainer from the Montana Native Women's coalition to help the MCAO engage with Native Victims of sexual assault. The MCAO has also communicated with the MPD to ensure that the MPD will contact the "on-call" SVU attorney when an "off hours" rape case is reported so that appropriate guidance can be ensured at the outset of a case.

TECHNICAL ADVISOR RECOMENDATION UPDATES

Anne Munch made a number of recommendations in her letter dated June 23, 2015. Some of these updates were addressed in the Quarterly Report for Period ending September 8, 2015. For continuity, the prior updates are included here along with the updates that occurred in the current reporting period.

I. Development of Policies and Guidelines for Sexual Assault Cases:

- *Ms. Munch recommended that the MCAO continue to utilize the Condensed Policy and Guidelines for Handling Sexual Assault cases:*

- A review of the Sex Assault Data Sheets indicates this is the case.

II. Training for County Attorney Supervisors and prosecutors in response to sexual assault:

- *Ms. Munch recommended continued training for MCAO prosecutors in the areas listed in the MOU as well as on additional topics such as prosecuting cases involving Native American Victims and Drug and Alcohol Facilitated Assault:*

- The MCAO continues to look for training opportunities and will schedule and attend trainings on these topics. The MT AGO and the MCAO have scheduled a training session on working with Native American Victims for the second week in March of 2016.

- *Ms. Munch recommended that she spend additional time with the MCAO developing training blocks for use in the larger Montana community:*

- Ms. Munch provided sample curriculum for sexual assault and domestic violence training at the inaugural meeting of the Montana Multi-Disciplinary Training Team on sex assault held in September, 2015. Development of a training program utilizing community partners is ongoing in conjunction with the MT AGO. The members of this team include the Prosecution Services Bureau out of the MT AGO, the MCAO, the MPD, Just Response, the UM PD, the crime victim's advocacy center, the Title IX office of the University of Montana, and many others. The team's mission statement is as follows:

The mission of the Montana Multidisciplinary Training Team on Sexual Assault is to provide trauma-informed training and technical assistance to communities across Montana by enhancing a coordinated, competent, professional and consistent response by criminal justice professionals with the goal of creating improved outcomes for victims, increasing offender accountability, and creating safer communities.

The training team is currently preparing to present a statewide training and workshop in Helena, Montana to take place on May 24 and 25 of 2016. This training will provide best practices in law enforcement and community response to sex assault, as well as a facilitated goal setting session for improving response to sex assault in the Helena Community.

III. Assurances to on-going practices within the Missoula County Attorney's Office

- *Ms. Munch recommended that the MCAO utilize the victim advocate and SVU to reduce the time period between the charging decision and the first meeting with the victim:*
 - Under the administration of Missoula County Attorney Kirsten Pabst, the time between charging decision and first meeting with the victim has improved dramatically. For example, in the first report, the average time between referral of a case and contact with victim was 35 days. In this final reporting period, the average time between referral and contact with the victim was less than one day. This improvement is due in large part to not only a focus on this metric, but also the availability of a dedicated victim advocate within the MCAO to ensure immediate contact with victims.
- *Ms. Munch recommended that the MCAO continue to collect and evaluate data with regard to communication with victims and advocates in order to ensure long term changes:*
 - The parties to the MOUs have all agreed MCAO will continue to collect and provide data to the MT AGO through June 2016 as set forth in Section G(2)(e) of the MOU between US DOJ, MT AGO, and MCAO.
- *Ms. Munch recommended that the MCAO solicit and consider feedback of victims and community based advocates in order to ensure that her role and the introduction of these services to victims in the community are maximally effective and the services are not unnecessarily duplicated:*
 - On June 29, 2015, the MCAO implemented a victim survey that is conducted on each closed sex assault case. These surveys are conducted either in person or over the phone by the MCAO's victim advocate on every closed sex assault case.

As of this report a total of four surveys have been completed and all indicate positive experiences by the victims. Additionally, Kirsten Pabst and Cathy Dorle have been meeting with the Crime Victim Advocates on a quarterly basis, to discuss on-going positive relationships between the offices, identify gaps in services and reduce duplication of efforts.

MCAO reports that duplication of services has been identified and addressed primarily through regular communication between the Ms. Dorle, the community advocates, and the victims in order to identify the needs of each victim, given that each case/victim is different.

MCAO reports that gaps in services were identified primarily in the area of post-conviction services. Accordingly, the MCAO has directed Ms. Dorle to provide post-conviction services to victims. This has proven to be a very valuable and appreciated service to victims in the community. The victim advocate works to track down victims to notify them of their offender's parole hearings, and assist them as needed to testify and prepare written statements. Ms. Dorle has personally spoken to the Parole Board on their behalf. Following parole hearings, Ms. Dorle notifies victims of the outcome, and provides follow up information such as explaining the Dept. of Corrections programs to them, and keeping them informed of the inmate's movements within the DOC, referring them to the VINE system, and other helpful/informational resources.

- *Ms. Munch recommended that the SVU participate in some strategic planning with the SVU partners to identify the best methods for utilizing and growing prosecutorial and investigative expertise in the SVU:*
 - The MCAO is an active member of Just Response and Just Response as a whole is working toward the long term goal of a Family Justice Center in Missoula. There are also ongoing efforts within Just Response to identify gaps in services and areas for improvement. Finally, the MPD is heading up the efforts of the SVU around policies and practices and by all reports operations are going well.

- *Ms. Munch recommended the SVU identify and implement a process to help SVU prosecutors evaluate stress levels and effectiveness on a routinely scheduled basis:*
 - MCAO supervisors are monitoring stress levels with the understanding that SVU attorneys are at a high risk for burnout. Of particular concern is the high caseload being handled by the SVU attorneys. Current staffing in the MCAO does not allow for either a reduction in caseload or rotation of attorneys out of the SVU. This issue will be addressed in the next budget cycle with a request for an additional attorney as well as an enhancement to pay for professional debriefing with a local expert on vicarious trauma associated with these cases.
- *Ms. Munch recommended that the SVU review MOU's between MCAO and the law enforcement partners to ensure they are being implemented and followed and whether they need revision:*
 - The MCAO reports that the MOU's between the MCAO and the MCSO, and the MCAO and the MPD are in compliance by all partners. The MCAO and the MT AGO would prefer for the MCSO to assign a specific SVU detective to handle sex assault cases, however, those items are not covered in the MOU's and it is clear at this point that the MCSO will not accept such a term.
- *Ms. Munch recommended that a member of the MCSO who will be handling sex assault cases be identified and join the SVU as quickly as possible:*
 - The MCSO has specifically declined to designate an investigator to handle sex assault cases and join the SVU. The MCSO chose to have sex assault cases as part of the general detective rotation out of a concern for investigator burnout. There is no plan to change this in the foreseeable future.
- *Ms. Munch recommended that supervisor review continue over a longer period of time in order to guarantee forward progress and watch trends over time:*
 - The MCAO intends to have sex assault cases reviewed by the SVU supervisor on a permanent basis.

IV. Improved communication with law enforcement and community partners:

- *Ms. Munch recommended that the SVU participate in an on-site visit to other SVU's operating in similar communities:*
 - The SVU conducted a site visit to an SVU in Boise, Idaho in August, 2015. The SVU has also been in phone contact with other similar units around the country.
- *Ms. Munch recommended that members of the SVU identify specific areas where additional training for all SVU members would be helpful to improve the quality of the cases:*
 - While not directly related to the quality of any of the current cases being prosecuted by the MCAO, as noted above, MT AGO has already discussed with the MCAO SVU plans for a training on working with Native American Victims which is planned for March. Ms. Munch and the SVU supervisor have also had significant conversations about the best way of dealing with a victim's wish to decline a case and those conversations have served to inform the supervisor's review of cases being handled by the SVU. Specifically, the supervisor reviews focus on what efforts have been made to engage or re-engage victims in a particular case. If possible the supervisor also likes to meet with the victim and the attorney handling the case. We have also discussed the possibility that a particular case may need to be treated as a domestic violence case where we prosecute even if the victim does not wish to proceed.
- *Ms. Munch recommended that the MCAO consider being a partner in the formation of a multi-disciplinary training team that could provide training in other parts of Montana:*
 - On September 17, 2015, Kirsten Pabst and all the MCAO SVU attorneys attended the facilitation meeting for the creation of the Montana Multi-Disciplinary Training Team on Sex Assault. Over twenty members of the professional community attended and brainstormed ideas for the structure, funding and mission of the team. The team has applied for various grant funds and is currently planning a pilot statewide training and workshop to take place in Helena, MT on May 25 and 26, 2016. The plan is for additional trainings to take place in other parts of the state under this initiative. MCAO staff are involved in planning and executing the multi-disciplinary training.

V. Public Outreach and Education:

- *Ms. Munch recommended that the MCAO create a strategy for how to continue outreaching to and educating the public about the improvements they are making in their office in an effort to better educate and receive feedback from the public from whom they serve:*
 - Kirsten Pabst has been a regular guest on TalkBack radio program, discussing the SVU, the role of the Victim Witness Coordinator, the new investigator's role and Jordan Kilby's specialization at the MPD's SVU. Members of the MCAO are also involved in the formation of the new Montana Multi-Disciplinary Training Team on Sex Assault and are contributing time and expertise to its development. Specific outreach efforts are described in detail above.

VI. Assessment of this Agreement and Review of Cases by the Montana Attorney General

- *Ms. Munch recommend that case reviews continue and that a more formal case review process be identified and implemented by the MCAO and MT AGO in order to create a more consistent method for case reviews:*
 - The MT AGO and TA have completed their final formal case review of MCAO sex assault cases. However, the MT AGO will continue to review case data provided for the remainder of the term of the agreements and MCAO will continue its formal internal supervisor review of all sex assault cases for the foreseeable future.

AGGREGATE DATA ANALYSIS

The MOU between the MT AGO and MCAO² contemplates that the MT AGO will provide in this quarterly report “an analysis of collected data from the MCAO and a report on all measurable improvements in the response to allegations of sex assault.” For purposes of this report, the Data analyzed will include those items listed on page 3 of the MOU between the MCAO, MT AGO and USDOJ, which includes the Aggregate Data on Sex Assault cases from June 2014 through January 31, 2016, specifically including:

² All the MOUs referenced in this report are attached as Exhibit to the First Quarterly Report, available here at <https://dojmt.gov/wp-content/uploads/Quarterly-Report-January-2015.pdf>.

- The number of sexual assault cases referred for review by local law enforcement to MCAO;
- The number of sexual assault cases charged by MCAO;
- The disposition of charged sexual assault cases;
- The number of sexual assault cases in which additional investigation was requested of local law enforcement;
- The number of victims of sexual assault who have utilized the services of the in-house victim witness coordinator.

As a pre-requisite to gathering this Aggregate Data and as a way to monitor compliance in particular cases, the MCAO also is providing the MT AGO with the following case specific data as outlined in the Monitoring and Compliance Plan (*See* March 2015 report, Exhibit 2):

- Copies of all Current Sex Assault Case Data Forms on all cases referred to MCAO for charging or review since the last Quarterly Report.
- Copy of the complete files for all declined sex assault cases, if any, since prior Quarterly report.
- Data on sexual assault cases, organized by Defendant name and Case Number, which includes:
 - Referral type: review or charging.
 - Decision made
 - Disposition
 - Sentence
 - The following dates and time spans: Date of referral, Date of any request for further investigation; Date of prosecution decision; Date of meeting with victim; Date of meeting with advocate; Date of plea offer; Date of Disposition.

The Aggregate Data provided by the MCAO is presented in attached Exhibits 2 and 3. Exhibit 2 represents cases referred for a charging decision from June 2014 through January 31, 2016. Cases referred for a charging decision are cases where law enforcement feels it has completed investigation and that there is probable cause to charge the case.

Exhibit 3 represents cases referred from June 2014 through January 31, 2016 for “review only.” Cases referred for “review” are cases “where, in the eyes of the MPD detective, the investigation has not developed probable cause necessary for arrest and prosecution.”³ The assigned prosecutor reviews that investigation and either agrees with the law enforcement decision to make the case inactive or refers the case back for further investigation.

³ Memorandum of Understanding Between Office of the Missoula County Attorney’s Office and the City of Missoula Police Department (Dec. 13, 2013), at p.2.

We note that the sub-categories of “cases referred for review,” which includes cases where victims declined to participate, should not be read to imply that the MPD or the MCAO or the MT AGO considers a victim’s decision to cooperate with the case as a pre-requisite for probable cause to arrest or sufficient evidence to charge. Regardless of the way that these cases are referred to the MCAO, all the cases are subjected to the same substantive review by a prosecutor to determine whether the case should be charged, declined, or referred for further investigation. The victim’s decision to participate is only one of the many factors that play into the prosecutor’s decision, and does not necessarily foreclose the possibility of charging the case.

I. Comparative Analysis of Cases Referred for Charging Decisions:

An analysis of the aggregate data for cases referred for a charging decision is provided below in Tables 1 and 2. Table 1 is based on data compiled in the first quarterly report (June 2014 through November 2014). Data gathered for the second quarterly report (November, 2014 through March 1, 2015) indicates that no cases were referred for charging in the reporting period ending March 1, 2015. Table 2 is based on the Data compiled during the reporting period of March 2, 2015 through June 4, 2015. Table 3 is based on the Data compiled during the current reporting period of June 5, 2015 and September 8, 2015. Table 4 is the current quarter, based on Data compiled during the reporting period of September 9, 2015, through January 31, 2016.

According to the MCAO Sex Assault Manual there is no specific deadline for making a charging decision on cases referred for prosecution or meeting with the victim. The manual states at pages 19 to 20 that the prosecution should make contact with the investigator within two weeks of referral and emphasizes that communications with victims is of paramount importance.

The six cases reported during this period were all charged. The data on these cases illustrates a trend of improvement in the pace of prosecution since the June 2015 Quarterly report. The average time between referral and charging has improved from 27 days in the June 2015, to 9 days in the September, to less than one day in the current reporting period. The time between the referral and contact with the victim has improved from 28 days in June to 7 days in September and now less than one day in the current reporting period.

**Table 1: Analysis of Sex Assault Cases Referred for a Charging Decision
June 2014 and November 25, 2014 (Exhibit 2).**

SA Cases Referred to MCAO for Charging by MPD and MCSO	10
SA Cases Charged by MCAO	8
SA Cases Referred for Further Investigation by MCAO	1
SA Cases Declined by MCAO	1
SA Cases in Which Prosecutor Made Contact with Victim	8 ⁴
Average Time Between Referral and First Contact with Victim	35 days
Longest Time Between Referral and First Contact with Victim.	147 days
Shortest Time Between Referral and First Contact with Victim	0 days
Average Time Between Referral and Charging Decision	21.4 days
Longest Time Between Referral and Charging Decision	70 days
Shortest Time Between Referral and Charging Decision	0 days

**Table 2: Analysis of Sex Assault Cases Referred for a Charging Decision
March 2, 2015 through June 4, 2015 (Exhibit 2)**

SA Cases Referred to MCAO for Charging by MPD and MCSO	3
SA Cases Charged by MCAO	0
SA Cases Referred for Further Investigation by MCAO	1
SA Cases Declined by MCAO	1
SA Cases in Which Prosecutor Made Contact with Victim	3
Average Time Between Referral and First Contact with Victim	28 days
Longest Time Between Referral and First Contact with Victim.	55 days

⁴ Regarding the two cases in which the victim was not contacted, one victim was unable to be reached despite attempts by the Detective and Crime Victim Advocate. The other victim had not been contacted at the time of this report.

Shortest Time Between Referral and First Contact with Victim	9 days
Average Time Between Referral and Charging Decision	27 days
Longest Time Between Referral and Charging Decision	38 days
Shortest Time Between Referral and Charging Decision	16 days

**Table 3: Analysis of Sex Assault Cases Referred for a Charging Decision
June 5, 2015 through September 8, 2015 (Exhibit 2)**

SA Cases Referred to MCAO for Charging by MPD and MCSO	2
SA Cases Charged by MCAO	1
SA Cases Referred for Further Investigation by MCAO	1
SA Cases Declined or Dismissed by MCAO	2
SA Cases in Which Prosecutor Made Contact with Victim	2
Average Time Between Referral and First Contact with Victim	7 days
Longest Time Between Referral and First Contact with Victim.	13 days
Shortest Time Between Referral and First Contact with Victim	1 days
Average Time Between Referral and Charging Decision	9 days
Longest Time Between Referral and Charging Decision	12 days
Shortest Time Between Referral and Charging Decision	7 days

**Table 4: Analysis of Sex Assault Cases Referred for a Charging Decision
September 9, 2015 through January 31, 2016 (Exhibit 2)**

SA Cases Referred to MCAO for Charging by MPD and MCSO	6
SA Cases Charged by MCAO	6

SA Cases Referred for Further Investigation by MCAO	0
SA Cases Declined or Dismissed by MCAO	0
SA Cases in Which Prosecutor Made Contact with Victim	6
Average Time Between Referral and First Contact with Victim	0.5 days
Longest Time Between Referral and First Contact with Victim.	3 days
Shortest Time Between Referral and First Contact with Victim	0 days
Average Time Between Referral and Charging Decision	0 days
Longest Time Between Referral and Charging Decision	0 days
Shortest Time Between Referral and Charging Decision	0 days

II. Comparative Analysis of Cases Referred for “review only”:

An analysis of the aggregate data for cases referred for “review only” is provided below in Tables 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8.

- Table 4 includes data collected from June 2014 through November 2014 for the first quarterly report.
- Table 5 includes all data collected from November 2014 through March 1, 2015 for the second quarterly report.
- Table 6 includes all data collected from March 2, 2015 through June 4, 2015 for the third quarterly report.
- Table 7 includes all data collected from June 5, 2015 through September 8, 2015 for the fourth quarterly report.
- Table 8 includes all data collected from September 9, 2015 through January 31, 2016 for the final quarterly report.

The Sex Assault Policy and Procedure Manual, at page 19 through 21, provides that cases referred to MCAO for “review only” should be reviewed by a prosecutor within one month of referral. The Current report shows a continued decline in the review time taken on these cases by the MCAO. In the previous reporting period the average time to review a case was 5 days. In

the current reporting period the average time was 4 days. The MCAO now has been consistently within the one month standard on all cases referred for review since March of 2015.

**Table 5: Analysis of Sex Assault cases Referred for “Review Only”
June 2014 through November 25, 2014 (Exhibit 3)**

		Average Time Between Referral and Decision (Days)	Cases in Which CA Agreed with Investigator	Cases in Which CA Referred Back for Further Investigation	Cases in Which the CA’s Review is Pending
Total SA Cases Referred for Review	16	40	12	4	0
SA Cases Referred for No PC	9	41	7	2	1
SA Cases Referred Where Victim Declined to Participate	8	40	5	3 ⁵	0

**Table 6: Analysis of Sex Assault cases Referred for “Review Only”
November 26, 2014 through March 1, 2015 (Exhibit 3)**

		Average Time Between Referral and Decision (Days)	Cases in Which CA Agreed with Investigator	Cases in Which CA Referred Back for Further investigation	Cases in Which the CA’s Review is Pending
Total SA Cases Referred for Review	13	16	2	7	4
SA Cases Referred for No PC	5	19	1	2	2
SA Cases Referred Where Victim Declined to Participate	4	4	1	3	0

⁵ The reasons for referring a case back for further investigations are varied. In one case the CA made contact with the victim and the victim decided to participate. Even where the victim has declined to participate, the CA will sometimes want to insure the timely collection of ephemeral evidence in the event the victim decides to later participate.

**Table 7: Analysis of Sex Assault cases Referred for “Review Only”
March 2, 2015 through June 4, 2015 (Exhibit 3)**

		Average Time Between Referral and Decision (Days)	Cases in Which CA Agreed with Investigator	Cases in Which CA Referred Back for Further investigation	Cases in Which the CA’s Review is Pending
Total SA Cases Referred for Review	6	19	4	2	0
SA Cases Referred for No PC	3	25	1	2	0
SA Cases Referred Where Victim Declined to Participate	4	15.25	3	1	0

**Table 7: Analysis of Sex Assault cases Referred for “Review Only”
June 5, 2015 through September 8, 2015 (Exhibit 3)**

		Average Time Between Referral and Decision (Days)	Cases in Which CA Agreed with Investigator	Cases in Which CA Referred Back for Further investigation	Cases in Which the CA’s Review is Pending
Total SA Cases Referred for Review	9	5	8	1	0
SA Cases Referred for No PC	3	13	2	1	0
SA Cases Referred Where Victim Declined to Participate	6	7	6	0	0

**Table 8: Analysis of Sex Assault cases Referred for “Review Only”
September 9, 2015 through January 31, 2016 (Exhibit 3)**

		Average Time Between Referral and Decision (Days)	Cases in Which CA Agreed with Investigator	Cases in Which CA Referred Back for Further investigation	Cases in Which the CA’s Review is Pending
Total SA Cases Referred for Review	15	4	13	2	0
SA Cases Referred for No PC	5	4	3 Did Gregory Bray fall in this category? No, when the investigator lost contact with the victim it went into the category below	2	0
SA Cases Referred Where Victim Declined to Participate	10	4	10	0	0

CONCLUSION

The data from this report shows that the MCAO has sustained the great improvement in the pace of its sex assault prosecutions, both in reaching decisions and communicating with the victim. This is likely due to the focus on these metrics by the SVU supervisor, the addition of more specialized prosecutors, the placement of an Investigative Specialist in the MPD and the work of the Victim Witness Coordinator. The data also shows that challenges remain in these cases in encouraging victims to come forward and participate in the prosecutions. It can be equally challenging for prosecutors to balance the wishes of the victims with the need to hold offenders accountable. A complete analysis of overall the successes, challenges, and further opportunities for improvement will be reserved for a final reflection after June 2016. For now, it suffices to say that the MCAO is in a drastically better position to meet the challenges that these cases pose and to make further strides bringing justice to victims.

The improvements seen in this final report are a credit to Missoula County Attorney Kirsten Pabst who brought to office a spirit of cooperation and a new focus on the pace of sexual assault prosecutions and specialized training as part of a broader goal of improving the experience victims of sexual assault have with the criminal justice system in Missoula. Her leadership, her placement of an Investigative Specialist in the MPD, and her hiring of an in-house investigator have helped make the Missoula County Attorney's Office SVU a model program for the state. Most importantly, credit for the improvements seen in this report goes to the prosecutors in the Missoula County Attorney's Office who have shown tremendous dedication to their work, their community, and to continually evaluating themselves to find ways to improve the work they do

Thank you for agreeing to answer a few brief questions. I would like to talk with you about your experience with the Missoula County Attorney's Office. I appreciate any information that you are willing to provide. It is important to recognize that your participation is voluntary. You may skip any question(s) that you do not feel comfortable answering. Your responses to the survey questions will be kept strictly confidential. At no point will your name and/or identity be connected with this survey and the answers that you provide. In other words, prosecutors will not know who has taken the survey or who has provided a particular answer. The information that your answers provide is important to us, and we ask that you answer candidly. Your answers will be used to identify key issues and will provide a basis for informing future efforts to, where needed, reform and improve the responses of prosecutors to victimization reports.

1. Did a prosecutor from the Missoula County Attorney's Office meet or offer to meet with you to discuss whether or not charges would be filed in your case?

☐ No

☒ Yes ----- If yes, please answer Question 1a before answering Question 2.

- 1a. If yes, did the prosecutor give a good explanation as to why the Missoula County Attorney's Office decided to file or not file charges?

☐ No

☒ Yes

Comments:

Jen Clark did a great job of not only explaining the charges filed but kept me posted on them every step of the way.

2. Did the Missoula County Attorney's Office file any charges in your case?

☐ No ----- If no, skip ahead to question 12.

☒ Yes ----- If yes, continue with the rest of the survey.

3. If the case was charged, did you meet with the prosecutor in person?

☐ No

☒ Yes-----If yes, answer questions 3a and 3b before answering question 4.

3a. If yes, how many times did you meet in person with the prosecutor?

☐ 1 or 2

☐ 5 or 6

☐ 3 or 4

☒ more than 6

3b. Did you meet in person with the prosecutor before the case was charged?

☐ No

☐ Unsure

☒ Yes (Multiple times)

4. At what stage(s) of the case did you meet with the prosecutor in person?

Before + During Ten always offered me
to come to her office to fill me in on
new information of the case.

5. Did you meet or speak with an advocate or the Victim/Witness Coordinator before the case was charged?

☐ No

☒ Yes

6. Did you meet or speak with the prosecutor and/or Victim/Witness Coordinator by phone while the case was pending?

☐ No

☒ Yes ----- If yes, answer Question 6a.

6a. How many times did you meet or speak with the prosecutor and/or Victim/Witness Coordinator by phone while the case was still pending?

☐ 1 or 2

☐ 5 or 6

☐ 3 or 4

☒ more than 6

7. Did you have to go to court for a pre-trial hearing, trial or sentencing hearing?

☒ Yes

☐ No

☐ Unsure

8. Did the prosecutor prepare you for court?

☒ Yes

☐ No

☐ Unsure

Comments:

Jen made sentencing so much more comforting than I ever could have imagined. She let me know how sentencing would be & even took me to the courtroom it would be in before sentencing just for my own comfort/ease.

9. Did the prosecutor describe the prosecution process to you?

☒ Yes

☐ No

☐ Unsure

Comments:

Jen Clark let me know what the prosecution process was and when I was confused, explained in detail what would be next to help me understand :)

10. Did the prosecutor inform you of your rights as a victim in the following stages of the case?

a. Investigative

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Unsure
- ☐ N/A

b. Pretrial

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Unsure
- ☐ N/A

c. Trial

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Unsure
- ☐ N/A

d. After Trial/Sentencing

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Unsure
- ☐ N/A

Comments:

Jen never left me in the dark about
any stages of the prosecution.

11. If the case was charged by the Missoula County Attorney's Office, what was the result?

- ☒ Plea agreement for the charged offense
- ☐ Plea agreement for a reduced charge
- ☐ Convicted at trial
- ☐ Acquitted at trial
- ☐ Hung jury
- ☐ Dismissed
- ☐ Other
- ☐ Unsure
- ☐ Case is still pending

12. Do you have any final comments about your interactions with the Missoula County Attorney's Office?

Comments:

I have nothing but great things to say
about Missoula County Attorneys Office and am
so grateful that Jen Clark stayed by my
side the whole way. Her compassion for
the victim (Me) went Above And Beyond and
I can't thank her enough ♥"

LE Case Number	Pre-referral Consult	Date Referred	Referred back before charging decision	Decision - 1)charged, 2) declined, 3)referred for investigation	Date of Decision	Time Between Referral/ rereceipt and Decision	Date of first contact with Victim or CVA	Time between referral and first contact with victim or CVA	LE Case Number	Initial Plea Offer	Date of Initial Plea Offer	Time between charging/meeting and plea offer	Case Disposition	Sentence	Time between initial offer and disposition	Time between referral and disposition	Time between charging and disposition	Victim Witness Corrdinator involved
2014-12873	Yes	9/23/2014	No	Charged - DC-14-527	9/24/2014	1 day	10/23/2014	30 days	2014-12873	30 MSP w/ 15 susp (waiting for victim approval before sending)	2/11/2015	Charging: 4 mo. 18 days, Contact: 3 mo. 17 ays	Trial: 3/16/16					No
2014-1661	Yes	6/11/2014	Yes	Charged CR-2014-12687-C1	10/20/2014	3 mo 9 days	7/25/14.	40 days	2014-1661	40 years MSP	1/28/2014	Charging: 3 mo. 19 days, Contact: 6 mo. 3 days	Pleaded Guilty via Alford	Sentencing 4/7/2016				Yes
2014-4203	Yes	6/12/2014	No	Declined - Victim would not respond to correspondence from detective and CVA	6/17/2014	4 days	Detective and advocate unable to contact victim. Call to victim advocate 6/24/2014	12 days	2014-4203	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No
2014-20800	Yes	8/8/2014	No	Charged - DC-14-436	8/8/2014	0 days	10/21/2014	2 months 13 days	2014-20800	25 with 15 suspended MSP	10/29/2014	Charging: 2 months 21 days; Contact: 8 days	Pleaded Guilty- 12 years all suspended subject to exception to man min.	Sentencing: 12 years with 10 suspended				No
2014-29367	No	9/29/2014	No	Charged - DC-14-530	9/29/2014	0 days	CVA - 9/29/2014 VICTIM - 9/29/2014	CVA - 0 DAYS VICTIM - 0 DAYS	2014-29367	Met with victim 2.25.15 to discuss possible plea offers came up with offer: 20 years MSP, 12 suspended	2/27/2015	charging: 151 days; first meeting: 151 days	defendant pleaded guilty; PSE being completed; SENT set for 9/3/2015	1/25/2015 Agg Assault: 20 years MSP with 12 suspended, parole restriction: 4 years; SIWOC: 20 years MSP with 12 suspended, parole restriction 4 years concurrent	11 months 2 days	14 months	14 months	No
2014-35246	No	11/5/2014	Ongoing	Charged - DC-14-598	11/6/2014	1 day	11.7.15 - Victim did not show up for meeting, called her and spoke with her over the phone, she did not want to come in at that time. Met with her finally on 3.4.2015 when her father brought her in	2 days	2014-35246	Defendant has been clear he will not plead to SIWOC, no offer			Trial 4/13/2016					Yes

2015-4283	Yes	3/5/2015		Charged after extensions granted	3/19/15: extension granted to because of difficulties contacting victim. Subsequent extensions granted to allow attempt to reach plea agreement before charging. Charged 7/21/2015	4 months 16 days	3/25/2015	20 days	2015-4283	offer to settle for misdemeanors pre-charge.	voicemail left for defense attorney on 6/8/2015	Initial meeting and plea offer: 2 months 14 days	Dismissed at victims request					Yes
2015-8782		4/10/2015	Yes	Referred for investigation	4/27/15: charging deadline extended to 5/8/2015 to be reviewed with Anne Munch 5/18/2015: referred back to law enforcement	1 month 8 days	Multiple unsuccessful attempts to contact victim. Finally able to contact her through a relative on 6/15/15.	1 month 25 days	2015-8782				10/1/2016 Declined Prosecution	n/a	n/a	6 months 9 days	n/a	Yes
2015-5207	Yes	4/6/2015	No	2) Declined - victim discontinuation	4/22/2015	16 days	4/15/2015	9 days	2015-5207	n/a								Yes
2014-37431	Yes	6/18/2015	Yes (from prior referral for review)	2) Declined	6/25/2015	7 days	6/19/2015	1 day	2014-37431	n/a								No
2015-8886	No	6/19/2015 then re-referred 8/14/2015	Referred for further investigation on 6/30/2015	3) Referred for more investigation then 1) decision to charge 8/26/2015	6/30/2015 then 8/26/2015	First: 11 days Second: 12 days	9/2/2015	13 days	2015-8886	No offer			Litigating Motions					Yes
2015-22922	Yes	9/30/2015	No	1) Charged	9/30/2015	same day	9/30/2015	same day	2015-22922	Waiting on victim response to offer			Trial 03/28/2016					Yes
2015-39359	Yes	10/21/2015	No	1) Charged	10/21/2015	same day	10/21/2015	same day	2015-39359	No offer			Trial 6/08/2016					Yes
2015-44365	Yes	10/21/2015	No	1) Charged	10/22/2015	same day	10/21/2015	same day	2015-44365	No offer			Trial 04/13/2016					Yes
2015-18565	Yes	10/26/2015	No	1) Charged	10/26/2015	same day	10/29/2015	3 days	2015-18565	No offer			Omnibus hearing 2/17/2016					Yes
2015-18072	Yes	11/5/2015	No	1) Charged	11/6/2015	same day	11/5/2015	same day	2015-18072	No offer			Trial 4/29/2016					Yes
2015-44525	Yes	1/19/2016	No	1) Charged	1/19/2016	same day	1/19/2016	same day	2015-44525	N/A			Warrant active					Yes

The cases below were referred to the Missoula County Attorney's Office by law enforcement for review only. Cases referred for review only are cases in which the investigator has determined that probable cause for a charge does not exist, no suspect has been identified and all leads have been exhausted, or the victim has requested that the investigation be discontinued. The assigned prosecutor reviews that investigation and either agrees with the law enforcement decision to make the case inactive or refers the case back for further investigation.

LE Case Number	Pre-referral consult	Date Referred for review	Reason for review only	Decision - 1)review complete - agree with assessment or 2) review complete - referred for further investigation	Date of Decision	Time Between Referral and Decision	
2014-854	yes	7/8/2014	No PC for charges	review complete - agree	9/8/2014	2 months	
2014-11348	yes	7/9/2014	Victim discontinuation	review complete - agree	7/29/2014	20 days	
2014-5100	no	7/25/2014	No PC for charges	review complete - agree	9/16/2014	1 month 22 days	
P131012-010	no	6/18/2014	No PC for charges; victim discontinuation	review complete - referred for further investigation - Review -complete agree	8/21/2014	2 months 4 days	
2014-2526	yes	6/20/2014	Victim discontinuation	review complete - agree	8/12/2014	1 month 22 days	
2014-3559	?	6/23/2014	No PC for charges	review complete - agree	8/12/2014	1 month 19 days	
2014-6195	yes	7/15/2014	Victim discontinuation	review complete - referred for further investigation Review complete - agree	11/13/2014	4 months 11 days	
2014-18539	yes	8/5/2014	Unable to contact victim	review complete - agree	8/15/2014	10 days	
2014-8880	yes	8/5/2014	No suspect identified	review complete - agree	8/12/2014	7 days	

2014-1341	yes	9/18/2014	No PC for charges	review complete - agree	10/20/2014	32 days	
2014-26666	no	9/25/2014	No suspect identified; victim discontinuation	review complete - agree	11/14/2014	1 month 19 days	
2014-14419	no	9/29/2014	No PC for charges	review complete - agree	11/14/2014	1 month 14 days	
2014-14419	no	9/29/2014	No PC for charges	review complete - agree	11/14/2014	1 month 14 days	
2014-27553	yes	10/30/2014	No PC for charges; victim discontinuation	review complete - agree	10/31/2014	1 day	
2014-2209/2014-2310	no	8/26/2014	No PC for charges	reviewed - referred for more investigation; Received report 2.26.15 - review pending - review complete - agree	9/19/2014	24 days	
S121126-013	no	8/29/2014	Victim discontinuation	reviewed - referred for more investigation	9/4/2014	5 days	
2014-37431	Yes	12/23/2014	Victim discontinuation	reviewed - referred back because victim now wishes to proceed - see referred for charges list	1/2/2015	10 days	
2014-33668	yes	12/19/2014	No PC for charges	reviewed and met with victim on 2/3/15, referred for more investigation	2/9/2015	1 mo. 20 days	
2014-12205/ UM: 1406-00221	no	12/23/2015	MPD wanted review while DNA being processed.	reviewed - referred for more investigation	1/28/2015	1 month 5 days	

2014-12205/ UM: 1406-00221	no	12/23/2015	MPD wanted review while DNA being processed.	reviewed - referred for more investigation	1/28/2015	1 month 5 days	
2014-31728	yes	1/2/2015	No PC for charges	reviewed - referred for more investigation	1/6/2015	4 days	
2014-41168	no	1/5/2015	No suspect identified; victim discontinuation	review complete - agree	1/6/2015	1 day	
2014-37104	yes	1/29/2015	Victim discontinuation	reviewed and referred for more investigation. then, review complete - agree	referred back: 1/30/2015, complete: 2/26/2015	1 day and 28 days	
2015-1242	yes	2/2/2015	No PC for charges; No suspect identified	review complete - agree	2/5/2015	3 days	
2015-1519	no	2/10/2015	No suspect identified	review complete - agree	3/20/2015	1 month 8 days	
2014-39542	no	2/11/2015	Initially: Victim discontinuation rereferred for review: No PC	reviewed - referred for more investigation - review complete - agree	initially: 2/17/2015 referred back: 5/11/2015 after meeting with Anne Munch	6 days	
2014-13070	yes	2/11/2015	No PC for charges	review complete - agree	2/27/2015	16 days	

2015-4946, 2015-4985	yes	2/20/2015	No PC for charges/unable to locate victim	review complete - agree	reviewed 2/25/2015, but waited on finding victim and review complete 3/20/2015	5-30 days	
2015-2668	no	2/23/2015	No suspect identified	review complete - agree	4/1/2015	37 days	
2014-12354	no	3/6/2015	No PC for charges, victim did not wish to pursue charges/recanted	reviewed and referred for more investiagion on 3/31/2015 - review complete - agree	3/31/2015	25 days	Referred back to MCAO after further investigation on 5/1/2015 and 2nd review complete 6/1/2015
2015-5041	Yes	3/24/2015	No PC for charges	review complete/referred for further investigation	4/21/2015	27 days	Staffed with Anne Munch on 5/8/2015 and referred back for investigation on 5/22/2015
2015-9405	Yes	3/26/2015	Victim discontinuation	review complete - agree	4/13/2015	18 days	
2015-8222	Yes	4/1/2015	Victim discontinuation	review complete - agree	4/6/2015	5 days	
2014-37546	Yes	4/14/2015	Victim discontinuation	review complete - agree	4/27/2015	13 days	
2015-14905	no	5/11/2015	No suspect identified	review complete - agree	6/4/2015	24 days	
2015-15509	Yes	6/17/2015	Victim discontinuation	review complete - agree	6/18/2015	1 day	

2015-17707	Yes	6/24/2015	No PC for charges	Review complete - agree	7/16/2015	22 days	
2015-8575	Yes	7/23/2015	Victim discontinuation	Review complete - agree	7/23/2015	same day	
2015-27095	Yes	7/22/2015	No suspect	Review complete - agree	7/22/2015	same day	
2015-79	No	8/17/2015	No PC for charges	Review complete - waiting for victim contact	9/2/2015	16 days	
2015-25311	Yes	8/27/2015	Victim discontinuation	Review complete - agree	8/28/2015	1 day	
2015-29096	Yes	8/28/2015	Victim discontinuation	Review complete - agree	9/2/2015	5 days	
2015-28669	Yes	9/8/2015	Victim discontinuation	Review complete - agree	9/8/2015	same day	
2015-29653	Yes	9/8/2015	Victim discontinuation	Review complete - agree	9/8/2015	same day	
2015-30199	Yes	9/11/2015	Victim Discontinuation	Review complete - agree	9/11/2015	same day	
2015-41339	No	10/2/2015	Victim discontinuation	Review complete - agree	10/5/2015	3 days	
2015-17134	No	10/14/2015	Victim discontinuation	Review complete - agree	10/29/2015	15 days	
2015-33341	Yes	10/26/2015	No PC	Review complete - agree	10/26/2015	same day	
2015-35453	Yes	10/20/2015	No PC	Review complete - agree	10/21/2015	1 day	
2015-18763	No	11/6/2015	No PC	Review Complete - referred for more investigation	11/11/2015	5 days	
2015-16532	Yes	11/20/2015	Victim discontinuation	Review Complete - agree	12/1/2015	11 days	
2015-46206	Yes	20-Nov	Victim discontinuation	Review Complete - agree	11/20/2015	same day	

2015-28866	Yes	12/4/2015	Victim discontinuation	Review Complete - agree	12/4/2015	same day	
2015-17891	Yes	12/9/2015	Victim discontinuation	Review Complete - agree	12/17/2015	8 days	
2015-37030	Yes	12/15/2015	Victim discontinuation	Review Complete - agree	12/17/2015	2 days	
2015-46454	Yes	12/15/2015	Victim discontinuation	Review Complete - agree	12/17/2015	2 days	
2015-40197	Yes	12/29/2015	Victim discontinuation	Review Complete - agree	12/31/2015	2 days	
2015-21478	No	1/4/2016	No PC	Review complete - agree	1/15/2016	11 days	
2015-41553	Yes	1/13/2016	No PC- waiting on DNA	Review Complete - referred for more investigation: waiting on DNA	1/18/2016	5 days	