Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice

Pretrial Release Task Force

Minutes

October 9th, 2018 12:00PM-5:00PM
710 Kipling, 3rd floor conference room

ATTENDEES:

TASK FORCE CHAIR

Stan Hilkey, Dept. of Public Safety

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Bo Zeerip, District Attorney 21st Judicial District
Bill Kilpatrick, Golden Police Department
Monica Rotner, Boulder County Community Justice Services
Greg Mauro, Denver Community Corrections
Glenn Tapia, Judicial, Probation Services
Jennifer Bradford, Metro State University of Denver
Judge Shawn Day, Aurora Municipal Court
Mindy Masias, State Court Administrator's Offices
Maureen Cain, Criminal Defense Attorney
Valarie Finks, Victim Services, 18th Judicial District
Kirk Taylor, Pueblo County Sheriff
Judge Chris Bachmeyer, 1st Judicial District
Steve Chin, Mesa County Pretrial Services
Tim Lane for Tom Raynes, CDAC

STAFF

Richard Stroker/CCJJ consultant
Kim English/Division of Criminal Justice
Laurence Lucero, Division of Criminal Justice
Germaine Miera/Division of Criminal Justice

ABSENT

Clifford Riedel, Larimer County District Attorney
Lucienne Ohanian, Public Defender's Office
Rick Kornfeld, Defense Attorney
Joe Salazar, Representative, House District 31
Lang Sias, Representative, House District 27

ADDITIONAL ATTENDEES

Terry Scanlon, Legislative Liaison
Judge Margie Enquist
Joe Thome, Division of Criminal Justice
Courtney Kramer, Boulder County
Chad Dilworth, Boulder County

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
Welcome and Introductions	Chair Stan Hilkey welcomed task force members and apologized for the delayed start to the meeting. He explained that he, Richard Stroker and the task force members scheduled to present today were working out some last minute changes to the agenda. Before reviewing the agenda Stan asked meeting attendees to introduce themselves and asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Kirk Taylor moved to approve the minutes and Shawn Day seconded the motion. The minutes were approved and Stan outlined the changes to the agenda. Stan reminded task force members that the original plan for today's meeting was for Bo Zeerip to present the most recent version of the recommendation from the Pretrial Release Detention Working Group, and then to consider proposed amendments from the defense representatives of the working group. However, Stan added that between last month's meeting and today there has been a lot of movement around this recommendation from multiple stakeholders – and that to create an opportunity of fairness, the presentation of amendments from all stakeholders will be postponed until the November meeting. The revised plan is for Bo to present the recommendation including the suggested revisions from the September meeting. After that, Maureen will present the full set of recommendations from the Implementation of the 2013 Statute Working Group. Amendments to the recommendation from Bo's working group will be heard at the November meeting. Stan emphasized the importance of the work and that it is critical to approach the process in the spirit of fairness and collaboration, and with as much engagement from all stakeholders as possible. Mindy Masias stated that in order to be a good government partner in this process, it will be helpful for Judicial to have the opportunity to speak to the procedural pieces of the recommendation - both in its current state and in terms of possible amendments. Mindy noted she will try to pull together a group of judges to respond to proposed revisions or possible fiscal notes before the next meeting. Bo replied that he doesn't believe the amendments will have much impact on fiscally and that Judicial can go ahead and use the proposal in its current state to determine any fiscal impact on the Judicial Department. He noted the one big difference would be that the defense wants to require a witness at the detention hearing and the DA's do not – which would affect how long a hearing would take. Tim added that another issue for DA's is around the procedural aspect of transportation. Kirk Taylor said that at the end of the day sheriffs will be left responsible for transports. A discussion was held about a prior task force recommendation that was presented in August but was tabled by the group (FY19 – PR#04 *Ensure Proxy Services are available to provide pretrial functions in jurisdictions lacking a pretrial program*). Glenn Tapia explained that he has an idea about how the recommendation could work – he and Greg Mauro agreed to meet and discuss possible revisions and bring it back to the November meeting for reconsideration.

	Bill Kilpatrick noted that the group might be getting a little too into the weeds about the details of the recommendation from the Pretrial Release Detention group and that if this task force agrees on the constitutional recommendation piece, and that concept is recommended and eventually approved by voters, all the details will then be worked out one way or another. The group discussed details around timelines and procedures for a constitutional amendment to be placed on a ballot, considered by voters and then implemented if passed.

Issue/Topic:	**Discussion:**
Report Out: Bail Blue Ribbon Commission	Mindy Masias offered an update on the work of the Bail Blue Ribbon Commission. To date the Commission has met with various stakeholder groups including CDAC, the Public Defender's Office, victims, county commissioners, county sheriffs, directors of pretrial services and others to hear different perspectives on proposed reforms. The Commission is currently in the midst of going through all the data collected to determine what official position to take on different perspectives and legislative changes that may be coming in the next year or so. The Commission will be focusing much of its efforts on education of the entire branch, including judges and justices. Mindy explained that the Commission will likely be asking more groups to testify in preparation for the legislative session and that November will be a very busy month. The Blue Ribbon Commission is paying close attention to recommendations coming forward from the CCJJ. Analyzing the CCJJ's work is helpful for judicial in terms of determining procedurally how to carry out proposed recommendations. Mindy pointed out that Terry Scanlon is the sole legislative liaison and due to the significance of the proposal he will need to track and gather as much information as possible. She summarized that the Bail Blue Ribbon Commission is very much on board with wanting to make significant changes and that the main concern currently is around fiscal ramifications. It's also not the court's role to get too deep into the weeds around involvement with statutory and constitutional changes, so they'll want to create some boundaries around those issues and not get too specific on recommendations.

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
Working Groups - Report Out Recommendation Presentation Assessment and Pretrial Services Working Group	Richard Stroker offered background information regarding the Assessment Tools/CPAT/Decision making/ Bond schedules/Conditions/Behavioral Health – AND – Pretrial Services/Supervision/Resources Working Group. Richard explained that one of the issues discussed early on in the Task Force was the value associated with notification and the subsequent impact on appearance rates and the evidence-based support around notification practices. The group agreed on the importance of notification but never formally acted on it. Greg Mauro and Steve Chin's

Action:	combined work group has given the issue some more thought and has some suggestions today with a proposal for the group to consider. **<u>Assessment and Pretrial Services Working Group</u>** Greg Mauro explained that reminder notifications are the most researched intervention in Pretrial Services. He added that Recommendation FY19 – PR #02 (approved by the task force in August) calls for the SCAO to establish standards for pretrial programs and includes that, at a minimum, a court reminder system/program needs to be in place for every jurisdiction in the state. With that in mind the working group wants to highlight the importance of this intervention and returns to the task force today with a recommendation specific to the creation of a statewide court reminder system. **FY19-PR #10. Create a statewide court reminder system for criminal defendants in state court.** *DISCUSSION* The recommendation requires that on or before July 1, 2020, the State Court Administrator shall develop and manage a program that is responsible for reminding criminal defendants to appear for their scheduled court hearings in the county (Denver County and Municipal Courts may be excluded from this requirement) and district courts of the state. This recommendation feeds slightly off legislation that was introduced last year but ended up not passing. Greg reviewed the entire recommendation and pointed out that the statutory language on page 2 is intentionally fairly broad and generic. That's because this might not even need to be a statutory recommendation but could perhaps move forward as a policy recommendation. Additionally, it will be important to work with Judicial on all the details necessary to carry out this level of change. Greg explained that it's his hope the task force agrees to advance this notion as a good idea, support it, and then let CCJJ decide whether it should be a statutory or a policy recommendation. It was noted that Denver County is exempt from this as they are not part of the state court system and it would be unfair for Judicial to operate a program they can't mandate. It's important that this is administered by the state because that's where the most up-to-date information resides. Greg pointed out that Denver County is already working on a similar court reminder system likely to come forward soon. Representative Lee sponsored similar legislation last year that failed due to the fiscal note. It was noted that Rep. Lee will likely be in support of this attempt at legislation. After further discussion by the group Stan asked task force members if they would be willing to waive the 30-day period to wait on a vote, so this recommendation could be voted on today. This would also allow it to be included in the packet of recommendations being presented to the CCJJ this Friday. A motion was made by Kirk Taylor and seconded by Mindy to waive the 30-day recommendation waiting period.

	The motion was unanimously approved by the task force. A motion was then made again by Kirk and seconded by Mindy to approve Recommendation FY19 – PR #10. A vote was held and all members voted in favor.

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
Working Groups - Report Out Recommendation Presentation Pretrial Release Detention **Action:** All amendments to the proposal to be submitted by COB October 29th	Bo Zeerip began his presentation by following up on Recommendation FY19 – PR #10, and asked task force members if they would be in support of proposing that there be audio/visual technology available statewide. This was also a bill during the last legislative session that had broad support but failed. He explained that this group hasn't talked about the issue yet, but that his working group's proposal assumes that's in place. He asked if this is a component that might be an 'easy lift'. Maureen replied that there was a bill last year but that the Public Defender's Office insisted on full and fair opportunity to talk to the client before holding a hearing – and any statutory change would have to include the judge providing sufficient time prior to the hearing to gather information and perform an interview. Currently certain jails won't allow the defense to talk to a client. A change to individualized hearings would have to be coupled with language that the court provide sufficient time to prepare. Stan asked Maureen to work on this before the next meeting and include it in the amendment discussion in November. Bo replied that he doesn't believe this piece fits with the proposal, but that the proposal assumes audio/visual capacity is in place. Kirk replied that even though the court can mandate access and audio/visual requirements, and defense and DA's may agree – jails often don't have the capacity to comply, which leaves jails holding the bag. Terry Scanlon noted that Judicial already has audio/visual set up in 41 counties, and 70+ courtrooms. He added this might be less about legislation and more about funding. Stan explained that it may just be a fiscal note attachment. Bo reiterated the detention proposal assume A/V capacity is available everywhere. **<u>Pretrial Release Detention Working Group</u>** Bo mentioned that he met with the DA's last week and is very encouraged by their reaction to the proposal. Even though they are concerned about certain details and statutory language, they appear to support the recommendation in general and are at the table and want to be involved in the discussion. *DISCUSSION* Bo directed task force members to a handout in their packets and explained that in this most recent version of the proposal there are a few small wording changes in black and underlined, or with strikethroughs. There are also more substantial changes that are noted in red. Bo reviewed the changes page-by-page. Discussion highlights follow: 1. **Constitutional provisions** (page 2) On this page Bo added the verbiage "arrested for or" in front of the words "charged with a detention eligible crime". He also changed the words "may" to

"shall", and changed the words "and" to "or" where appropriate.

2. **Summons and arrest provisions (Replaces 16-5-206 and 16-5-207)** (page 3)
   Paragraph (3) on page 3 verbiage is changed from "Local jurisdictions to develop policies and procedures…", to "Law enforcement agencies in consultation with the prosecuting authority may develop…".

   Bo struck verbiage on conditions of release because he felt it didn't need to be in the summons section.

3. **Legislative declaration and Scope of Article 4 (page 5)**
   There are a few underlined words that have been added to this page. Maureen is opposed to the verbiage "and effectively" in paragraph 2 of page 5.

   Judge Bachmeyer asked if DUI's are detention eligible. Bo replied that Felony DUI are detention eligible and 3rd DUI's would be reclassified as M1's and be detention eligible.

4. **Initial hearing** (page 7-9)
   Bo explained that the first substantial language change, in red, can be found on page 7. The language is in response to a concern request by the task force at the last meeting to re-address what to do with people when they are not in the jurisdiction where they will be prosecuted. An in-depth conversation was held about this change and the 48-hour requirement for the initial hearing.
   The following points were made:
   -Bo explained another option would be "2 business days" which would dramatically affect the fiscal note
   -The 48-hour rule would require weekend court
   -Most jurisdictions have judges available 24/7
   -This is really important to the defense and the ACLU
   -The recommendation (FY19 – PR #03) that calls for the availability of pretrial services everywhere may help address this issue
   -HB 17-1338 addressed similar issues, but for municipal court
   -Maureen noted that this will be less of an issue if her proposal (FY19-PR#07) passes

   Richard summarized that the language in red was in response to a request by the task force at the last meeting. He asked for proposed amendments to the language to be presented at the November meeting.

5. **Pretrial detention hearing** (page 15-17)
   -Bo pointed out the inclusion of verbiage that reads "for good cause shown" in the first paragraph of this page.

-Language was crossed out in the second paragraph that reads "both before and at the time of the detention hearing".
-Language was stricken on page 16, paragraph (6) that reads "if a witness with personal knowledge of the facts or the investigation is called to present sworn testimony". Maureen added that the defense will be proposing amendments in this section in November.
-A discussion was held about the timeframe by which charges should be filed. Options of 48 hours, 72 hours and 7 days were deliberated.
-An in-depth discussion was held about whether witnesses will or won't be called as to probable cause issues.
-Language was added to paragraph (8) on page 17. Bo noted that the DA's brought up a point about cases where a grand jury issues an indictment. The added language reads "At the conclusion of the detention hearing the court shall order the detention of a defendant if there is probable cause that the defendant committed a detention eligible crime, or a grand jury has issued an indictment for a detention eligible crime; and ".

The group agreed to keep the language as-is and to entertain amendments at the November meeting.

6. **Definition of detention eligible crimes** (page 18)
   Under 16-4-107 an addition was made to the list of detention eligible crimes. "Fugitive from Justice as specified in 16-19-103" was added.

7. **Review and modification of release conditions, and revocation of release** (page 19)

   Greg Mauro noted paragraph (1) allows parties to modify conditions of release. He wondered if it shouldn't mirror paragraph (3) where pretrial services can also bring forth a modification. Greg explained that Denver has gone to a system where Pretrial can bring a request straight to the court and proposed adding the language "Either party or a pretrial service program". The group unanimously agreed to this addition. Maureen noted she may have an amendment to this next month.

8. **Review and modification of release conditions, and revocation of release / Court decision at review and modification hearing** (page 21)
   Bo explained that these are the findings necessary to detain somebody after they've been initially released. He reviewed the new verbiage (in red) that the task force asked him to craft at the last meeting. The goal was to capture situations where there was a violation of a release condition that was really important to the safety of a person.

   The group discussed the wording "attempt to obstruct" and whether it should

	simply be "obstruct". The group also discussed the meaning of "obstruct". 9. **Speedy trial and priority scheduling for detained defendants 16-4-109** (page 22) Bo reviewed the new verbiage (in red) that the task force asked him to add at the last meeting to address jurisdictions where the county court handles felony preliminary hearings. He noted the other option is to simply remove this entire section and let the current speedy trial and preliminary hearing statues and rules govern. A discussion was held about whether to leave the verbiage in or remove it – the task force agreed to remove the new language. The group also agreed to add language to the original wording along the lines of "subject to the other statutes". 10. **Expedited appellate review of pre-conviction release and detention orders** (page 23) Bo reviewed the new verbiage (in red) that cites a current expedited review/appeal process as specified in Rule 4.1 for Interlocutory Appeals. The task force held a discussion about whether to keep the revised language. Richard summarized that it sounds like there's no harm in keeping the language, it just won't be very speedy. Richard asked people to bring any amendments regarding this issue to the November meeting. 11. **Release and detention after conviction** (page 25) Bo described the language he added to this part of the proposal. There were no objections from the group about the addition. At the conclusion of the discussion Stan reminded task force members that all amendments to the proposal will be considered during the November meeting.

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
Working Groups - Report Out Recommendation Presentation Implementation of 2013 Statute **Action:**	Maureen explained that her working group will be presenting four preliminary recommendations to the task force today. Those recommendations are FY19 – PR #06, #07, #08 and #09. **<u>Implementation of 2013 Statute</u>** Maureen directed task force members to copies of four recommendations in their handouts and reminded them that two of these recommendations (PR #06 and #07) were presented at the last meeting. At that time Cliff Riedel asked Maureen to describe her proposed statutory changes in detail – which she has outlined in a

separate PowerPoint that accompanies the recommendations. Maureen directed the group to that PowerPoint and explained that it shows where current law would be preserved and where it would be changed. She explained proposed changes are in blue, current law is in black, and strikethroughs show the areas of proposed removal of language. Discussion points follow and the PowerPoint can be found here.

DISCUSSION

16-4-101. Bailable offenses – definitions. Maureen began by stating 16-4-101 lists crimes currently in the constitution that are eligible for detention without bail. She explained this would remain the same and there are no proposed changes to 101. Bo pointed out that sex offenses are not currently in the constitution and neither is possession of a weapon by a previous offender.

16-4-102. Right to bail – before conviction.
Maureen reviewed the proposed changes in this statute. Those changes can be found in the attached document. Maureen summarized the basic change is that if someone is not released on a pre-release mechanism, they come in within 48 hours.

16-4-103. Setting and selection type of bond – criteria (proposed change: Setting and selection type of bond – Development of criteria by each judicial district and implementation of an assessment and release program).
Maureen reviewed the proposed changes in this statute. She explained that the changes contained here are the meat of recommendation FY19 – PR #06. The working group proposes removing all current language in this statute and replacing it with new language. Maureen explained that this is basically the pre-screening process and if the numbers hold out as expected it's not unrealistic to assume that approximately 50% of the people that are arrested could potentially be released under this proposal.

Bo asked about subsection (2)(b) and (c) and why there are two subsections for presumption of release and presumption of PR summons, and what is the difference. Maureen replied that in lower level crimes there's a little difference between present danger and substantial risk of danger.

16-4-104. Types of bond set by the court (proposed change: Initial hearing – types of bond set by the court – factors for setting of monetary conditions of bond – right to counsel).
Maureen reviewed the proposed changes in this statute.

Bo noted that he would have a difficult time supporting the language change under (1)(b) that refers to clear and convincing evidence. He added that it's a big change that has nothing to do with early release. He asked Maureen which of her four recommendations this verbiage would fall under. This pointed out that this rewrite in statute is not in any of Maureen's recommendations. Richard asked Maureen to be

sure to put the statutory changes directly into the recommendations to which they pertain.

16-4-105. Conditions of release on bond.
Maureen reviewed the proposed changes in this statute.

16-4-106. Pretrial Services Programs.
Maureen reviewed the proposed changes in this statute.

16-4-107. Hearing after setting of monetary conditions of bond (proposed change: Time Frames for Commencement of Action).
Maureen reviewed the proposed changes in this statute.

16-4-109. Reduction or increase of monetary conditions of bond – change in type of bond or conditions of bond – definitions (proposed change: Hearing after setting of a monetary condition of bond – reduction or increase of monetary conditions of bond – change in type of bond or conditions of bond – definition of bonding and release commissioner).
Maureen reviewed the proposed changes in this statute.

16-4-113. Type of bond in certain misdemeanor.
The working group proposes putting this statute in Section 104.

At the conclusion of her PowerPoint presentation Stan asked Maureen to rework her four recommendations (below) and incorporate the statutory changes from her PowerPoint into the recommendations to which they pertain. At this point in the meeting Maureen began a review of the four recommendations.

FY19-PR #06. Establish a more Effective Pretrial Release Front End Process
DISCUSSION
This recommendation calls for each Judicial District to develop, by December 1, 2019, a screening process to assess a person upon arrival at the county jail for consideration of immediate release without financial conditions (on a PR bond or on a summons), without appearing before the court, pursuant to release criteria developed within the judicial district. The goal of this change is for the release of persons who will be recommended for release at a court hearing anyway.

Greg pointed out that the recommendation says “within 8 hours of arrest” but should read “within 8 hours of booking”. Steve expressed that the 8-hour timeframe is going to be difficult for many jurisdictions. Maureen replied that California mandates release within 12 hours. Greg wondered if the timeframes might be better established in the standards coming from SCAO and Mindy agreed. This timeframe is easily doable in

some jails, but not all. Greg emphasized that to make this work pretrial needs to be established 24/7. The group discussed various timeframes and agreed on language that reads "as soon as possible but not more than 24 hours". Jen Bradford explained that another reason for the 8-hour timeframe is to discourage someone from getting all the way into housing or even dressed out. This recommendation is really about assess and release and keeping people from going into housing.

Bo asked about pretrial service professionals making these decisions and if they will now be entering into judgements about the nature and severity of the offense, risk posed, willful failure to appear, etc. He said it seems these are judicial determinations. Maureen replied that those things are promulgated by the chief judge and that those factors can be factored into the written criteria. The intent was to have a broad base for what a chief judge could consider in written criteria and that written criteria should be developed with this kind of legal description in mind. The group held an in-depth discussion about who should make the decision on release and how that decision should be made. Tim suggested that language could be included stating that the decision be based on objective rather than subjective criteria.

Richard summarized that the sentiment is not to have the pretrial specialist take the place of the judge, but to carry out the order of the judge.

Terry pointed out the importance of stakeholders and noted that there should be clarification around how many stakeholders and who makes the final decision. The group continued to discuss criteria and process, and the fact that criteria guides the process. The administrative authority is the order but a jurisdiction determines their own criteria.

Richard asked, if when talking about the screening process, conditions should be mentioned in this recommendation. Greg noted that the real challenge is how to not over-condition pretrial release.

Tim asked Maureen to ensure that on page 1 of the recommendation there is the word "or" between the first three reasons someone can be placed on bond.

FY19-PR #07. Regarding Judicial Decision Making, Time Frames and Reconsideration of Monetary Conditions of Bond

DISCUSSION

This recommendation is based on current law and calls for an arrested person to be brought before a judicial officer for an initial court appearance, as soon as practicable, but not later than 48 hours after the person's booking into a detention facility. For jurisdictions that don't have a weekend court this would require that one be instituted. This recommendation was not discussed in detail due to time constraints.

FY19-PR #08. Require Best Practices Bail Training

DISCUSSION

Jen Bradford presented this recommendation and explained that one of the things that was clear during the working group's discussions about the 2013 changes is that the information and directives in the legislation somehow never trickled down into all the places it needed to be, with ongoing confusion about the concept and ideology.

The recommendation summary reads: *Require Pretrial Services, Colorado District Attorneys' Council, State Court Administrator, the State Public Defender, and law enforcement to provide new hire and regular training on the best practices of bail and the bail process*. The idea is to provide best practices, basic training at the big, five agencies. Jen explained that some entities really took hold of the 2013 changes and others just aren't getting it done. This recommendation will hopefully help provide that gap in training throughout these entities. Jen walked task force members through the full recommendation.

Richard asked Jen to emphasize in the recommendation that the first step is requiring the SCA to establish/identify an appropriate curriculum, which is one piece. The second piece is about who will be expected to participate in this training and the training requirements. The third piece would be about expecting the SCA to maintain some information about the oversite and implementation of whether it's actually being done. He asked Jen to speak to those three elements specifically in the first part of the recommendation. A question was raised about whether the training would look different for each of the 5 agencies or if it would be standardized. Jen answered that it would be one standardized training with individualized, localized tweaks. Richard noted that if there was one core curriculum about bail best practices, there could be a caveat that it could be altered to match the needs of different localities.

Mindy added that she is very much in favor of a two-part training with the first part focused on basic training because so many people don't understand bail and pretrial in general. Secondly, in looking to the future it would be great to create something that can continue to grow beyond those of us in the system now. It might make sense to create a convening conference which brings different stakeholders together from around the state. Stakeholders could synergize around a subject and continue to refine best practices including pretrial, law enforcement, judges, SCAO, etc. This would offer an opportunity to continue to progress in this area and to not be back here three years from now. She added that her agency can monitor judicial branch employee attendance, but if a judge decides they don't want to do something there's no enforcement power. Glenn added that all judges may not have a criminal docket either. Tim noted that the curriculum could possibly be included in the training for new district attorneys.

FY19-PR #09. Regarding Public Defender Involvement.

This recommendation calls for clarification of the public defender's involvement in the initial bail setting hearing. It reads: *Clarify in statute that a person is entitled to counsel*

	at the initial bail setting hearing. Clarify that counsel shall have adequate time to prepare for an individualized hearing on bail. This recommendation was not discussed in detail due to time constraints. *OTHER DISCUSSION POINTS* Bill asked Maureen about money on arrest warrants and noted that in the past a judge would ask a police officer "How much bond do you want?", and the officer would throw out an amount and that's what the judge would go with. Maureen replied that under this system she doesn't see money being part of the warrant at all anymore. When someone comes in on the warrant they would get assessed for risk and assessed for release. Bill pointed out that this should be included in the recommendation. Bo replied that under his proposal the judge would issue either a PR warrant or a no bond warrant. He added that with FTA's the judge wouldn't issue a money bond, but would issue a warrant for failure to appear. Monica added this is a big issue with the current proposal because one of the most irritating things that happens now is that someone violates a bond condition, then a new warrant is issued with more money, then before the person is even picked up they check in at a clerk's window, pays their warrant, and nothing happens at pretrial supervision. There's a problem with the whole concept of having warrants issued that can't be changed by anybody – and they are issued with money attached to them. Greg added that with preventive detention there would be no more money bond on arrest warrants. Maureen explained that under her proposal, in the interim, arrest warrants – whether issued by the court or by law enforcement – are no-bond warrants, that don't have money attached.

Issue/Topic:	**Discussion:**
Next Steps and Adjourn **Action:**	Richard closed the meeting and summarized the next steps as follows: • Maureen and Tim/Bo agreed to meet and bunch their amendments so that the DA and PD amendments can be seen together. Amendments will be submitted by COB, Monday, October 29th. Germaine will send all amendments to task force members electronically by COB November, 1st. • Maureen agreed to fold her proposed statutory changes under the recommendations to which they pertain. • Greg and Glenn will convene to revisit recommendation FY19 – PR #04 and return to the group with revisions (probably in December since both will be out during the November meeting). • Richard asked the task force members to come prepared to vote on amendments to the Pretrial Release Detention Working Group recommendation at the November meeting. The task force will then vote on

	the recommendation as a whole. • The Implementation of the 2013 Statute Working group will continue to present/discuss their recommendations at the November meeting. • The November meeting will be expanded and will be held from 10:30am – 4:30pm with lunch included.

Next Meeting

November 6, 2018 10:30am – 4:30pm 710 Kipling, 3rd floor conference room