Fulton County Familiar Faces Project
Snapshot of APD Data on Contacts with the 100 Familiar Faces
Applied Research Services, Inc.
June 2021

Project Background

The Fulton County Justice and Mental Health Taskforce was inaugurated in 2016 when the county signed onto the Stepping Up Initiative (Stepping Up Initiative (stepuptogether.org), aiming to reduce the number of people with mental illness in jail as well as increase their connections to services and care. In October 2016, Fulton County Superior Court received a planning grant to conduct an end-to-end analysis of criminal justice and behavioral health systems. This planning grant resulted in a *Task Force Prioritized Recommendations Report* and business cases related to the Task Force's implementation teams. In 2019, Fulton County Superior Court received a Bureau of Justice Assistance, Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Program (JMHCP) grant focused on the highest utilizers of the local criminal justice system and, more specifically, the jail.

The 100 Familiar Faces – Who Are They?

These 100 persons referred to as familiar faces comprise the group of 100 individuals with the most bookings at the **Fulton County Jail** between January 1, 2017, and December 31, 2019. Together these 100 individuals were booked a total of 1,146 times over these three years, for an average number of 11.5 bookings per person. The average length of stay for these persons was 27.2 days, with the total number of jail beds occupied by this cohort during the same three-year period being 31,165 jail bed days.

Furthermore, booking data at **Atlanta City Detention Center (ACDC)** was analyzed to assess this group's involvement at the city jail. This cohort was booked 855 times at ACDC and accounted for 7,656 jail bed days during this same time period.

These individuals are indeed familiar faces.

Demographics

The average age of the group of 100 persons is 43 years (SD = 11), with a median of 41.5 years and a range from 23 to 66 years of age. Slightly more than three-quarters (78%) are male, with the remaining 22% being female. More than nine in ten (93%) are Black, with the remaining 7% being White.

Offense Characteristics

The majority of charges given to this population consist of relatively low-level non-violent offenses. At Fulton County Jail, the top three most common booking charges were Criminal Trespass (23.2%), Possession and Use of Drugs (9.6%), and Theft by Shoplifting (5%). Combining Criminal Trespass, Possession and Use of Drugs, Possession of Marijuana, and Drug Court Sanctions accounts for nearly two out of every five bookings (38.62%).

At the Atlanta City Detention Center (ACDC), 37.1% of bookings for this population of 100 people were for quality-of-life offenses. These include but are not limited to pedestrian offenses, disorderly conduct, public indecency, and drinking in public. One in ten (10.3%) of these bookings were for Theft by Shoplifting alone.

Close to three-quarters (71.2%) of bookings for Familiar Faces at ACDC can be characterized as a "crime of interest." Crimes of interest include Criminal Trespass, Theft by Shoplifting, Possession and Use of Drugs, Quality of Life Offenses, and a combination category. This combination category was created to classify individuals with multiple charges that all fall into crimes of interest categories. In the three years from 2017 to 2019, these crimes of interest made up 8-10% of the total annual bookings at Fulton County Jail and 30-35% of the total annual bookings at Atlanta City Detention Center.

Atlanta Police Department (APD) Contacts

Individual identifiers for the 100 familiar faces were submitted to APD after they agreed to pull data for this project. A determinate match was made for 87 of the 100 individuals using their first and last names as well as the date of birth. APD provided data tables from their old and new management information systems. Their new system began in the fall of 2020.

These data tables consisted of substantial amounts of data on contacts between APD officers and the 87 familiar faces for whom there was a definite match. Field and arrest contacts together accounted for 95% of all contacts between APD and this cohort of 87 familiar faces. A much smaller number of contacts (223) were indicated as either Involved Party (N = 140) or Suspect (N = 83) contacts. As a result, with few exceptions, this report will focus on field and arrest contacts.

Individual-level APD contact data for the 87 members of the Familiar Faces Cohort shows that **this group of 87 persons had 3,603 arrest or field contacts with APD officers between 2009 and 2020**, for an average of 41 of these types of contacts each. Six members of this cohort had only one contact with APD officers, while six had 100 or more contacts. One person had a total of 217 of these contacts with the APD. Table 1 below breaks these numbers down into ranges.

Table 1. Number of Contacts between APD and Cohort Members.

Number of APD Contacts	Number of Individuals
1 - 10	21
11 - 20	11
21 - 30	12
31 - 40	7
41 - 50	8
51 - 60	8
61 - 100	15
101 - 150	4
over 150	1
Total	**87**

Data on APD field contacts were available for 77 members of the Familiar Faces Cohort. The counts of those field contacts across cohort members are displayed as number ranges in Table 2, below.

Table 2. Number of Field Contacts between APD and Cohort Members.

Number of APD Contacts	Number of Individuals
1 - 10	47
11 - 30	21
31 - 49	9
Total	**77**

Data on APD arrest contacts were available for 85 members of the Familiar Faces Cohort. The counts of those arrest contacts across cohort members are displayed as number ranges in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Number of Arrest Contacts between APD and Cohort Members.

Number of APD Contacts	Number of Individuals
1 - 10	28
11 - 20	15
21 - 30	10
31 - 60	20
61 - 100	10
Over 100	2
Total	**85**

These contacts between the Familiar Faces Cohort and APD have occurred over many years, as shown in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Contacts with APD Over the Years.

Years	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	10	11.5	11.5
2	1	1.1	12.6
3	4	4.6	17.2
4	9	10.3	27.6
5	8	9.2	36.8
6	4	4.6	41.4
7	8	9.2	50.6
8	9	10.3	60.9
9	6	6.9	67.8
10	13	14.9	82.8
11	9	10.3	93.1
12	6	6.9	100
Total	**87**	**100**	

The table above indicates that while ten members of the cohort only had contacts with APD officers over the past year (2020), approximately half of these 87 individuals had contacts with APD dating back seven or more years.

Given the large number of contacts with APD over many years, it stands to reason that these individuals had contact with many different officers. Count ranges of these data can be found in Table 5.

Table 5. Number of Contacts with Different APD Officers.

Number of APD Officers	Number of Individuals
1 - 10	22
11 - 20	14
21 - 30	16
31 - 40	8
41 - 50	11
51 – 60	8
61 - 100	7
Over 100	1
Total	**87**

The types of these contacts were indicated in the data with the results appearing in Table 6 below.

Table 6. Type of Contact.

Contact Interaction Type	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Arrest	2,545	70.6	100
Suspicious Person	377	10.5	10.7
Criminal Trespass Warning	270	7.5	24.8
Other	211	5.9	17
Suspect	81	2.2	28.9
Victim	65	1.8	26.7
Witness	16	0.4	29.4
Larceny	14	0.4	11.1
Banishment	13	0.4	17.3
Narcotics-Related	3	0.1	0.1
Urban Camper	3	0.1	0.2
Sex Crimes	2	0.1	0.2
SIS Intelligence	1	0	0.2
Alarm-Business	1	0	17.3
Pre-Arrest Diversion (PAD)	1	0	24.9
Total	**3,603**	**100**	**100**

Considering that PAD was initiated in 2017 and these data extend through most of December 2020, it is an unexpected finding that only one PAD contact was noted. It is known from working with PAD that considerably

more officer-initiated referrals were made to PAD over this period, so it seems those are not being coded as such or at all.

Aforementioned, APD data linked to the Familiar Faces Cohort covered 12 years (2009 through 2020). Table 7 provides the contact data broken down by year.

Table 7. Year of Contact.

Year	Number	Percent
2009	165	4.6
2010	236	6.6
2011	228	6.3
2012	222	6.2
2013	252	7.0
2014	232	6.4
2015	270	7.5
2016	318	8.8
2017	544	15.1
2018	518	14.4
2019	365	10.1
2020	253	7.0
Total	**3603**	**100**

As shown in Table 7, the data suggest a continual increase from 2009 through 2018. During 2019 and 2020, there were sizable declines in the number of contacts comparatively. While 2020 can be explained in large part due to the impacts of COVID-19 and the civil demonstrations that summer, the reasons for the decline from 2018 to 2019 are not known at this time.

While the above findings have focused almost exclusively on field and arrest contacts, the next set of data is presented by APD Zone for all contacts to provide the most complete picture possible regarding the location of these contacts. Table 8 below displays the number of contacts in each of the seven APD zones.

Table 8. Contacts by APD Zone.

APD Zone	Frequency	Percent
1	478	10.7
2	227	5.1
3	370	8.2
4	597	13.3
5	2,184	48.7
6	610	13.6
7	20	0.4
Total	**4486**	**100.0**

As is evident in the above table, Zone 5 has the most contacts with members of the Familiar Faces Cohort, distantly followed by zones 6, 4, and 1, respectively. Table 9, on the next page, provides this same data ordered by the number of contacts in decreasing frequency.

Table 9. Contacts by APD Zone, in Order of Decreasing Frequency.

APD Zone	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
5	2184	48.7	48.7
6	610	13.6	62.3
4	597	13.3	75.6
1	478	10.7	86.3
3	370	8.2	94.5
2	227	5.1	99.6
7	20	0.4	100
Total	**4486**	**100.0**	

As indicated in the Cumulative Percent column in Table 9, together zones 5, 6, 4, and 1 account for just under nine-in-ten (86.3%) contacts between APD officers and members of this cohort of familiar faces.

Summary and Conclusions

An examination of 12 years of APD data spanning the years 2009 through 2020 finds that 87 of the total cohort of 100 familiar faces could be matched to APD contact data. Together these 87 persons had 3,603 arrest or field contacts during these dozen years, for an average of 41 of those types of contacts each. While six members of this cohort had only one contact with APD, an equal number had 100 or more contacts, with one person accumulating 217 contacts. As would be expected given the large number of contacts over a span of one dozen years, members of this group had contact with many different officers. Specifically, 40% of familiar faces had contact with at least 31 individual APD officers. While the data indicate a fairly steady increase in the number of contacts from one year to the next, sizable decreases in the frequency of contacts were observed both the last two years, 2019 and 2020.

Reviewing the data by APD zone, Zone 5 contacts were significantly more frequent than those in the other zones, representing nearly half (48.7%) of all contacts. Zones 6, 4, and 1 followed in decreasing order, with these four zones accounting for 86% APD and cohort contacts.

Given the proliferation of contacts between APD officers and members of the Familiar Faces Cohort, as well as the fact that 70% of contacts involved an arrest, it is not surprising that these familiar faces also account for a substantial number of jail admissions and bed days that are far out of proportion to the number of people that comprise this cohort. With 1,146 admissions over three years totaling 31,165 bed days at the Fulton County Jail, and 855 bookings and 7,656 bed days at ACDC, this group of persons has an outsized impact on law enforcement and corrections budgets for the City of Atlanta and Fulton County.

Next Steps

The grant-funded research team is currently working on a detailed Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) to provide as full an accounting as possible of the expenditures associated with the 100 Familiar Faces Cohort. The team is also designing and implementing a secure communication system by which agency partners can share relevant data that will take advantage of the collaborative efforts to provide more coordinated care and follow-up to these individuals. Synergistically combining the resources, knowledge base, and expertise of the collaborative,

combined with a state-of-the art secure Internet-based data sharing platform will hopefully result in meaningful reductions in arrests, jail admissions, and the related expenditures among these and other familiar faces.