

CONNECTICUT SENTENCING COMMISSION

Pretrial Working Group

Friday, November 7, 2025

1:30 PM - 2:30 PM

Minutes

- I. Introduction
 - a. Undersecretary Karpowitz
 - i. We are not here to make policy; we are here to advise the Sentencing Commission and/or the Governor's Office.
 - ii. We need consensus regarding good data.
 - iii. Goal focused on improving public apparatus for knowledge and visibility.

- II. Presentation on DOC open data
 - a. Matt Hono presented a snapshot of one day (November 4, 2025) of those detained in DOC custody, examining length of stay by bond amount range and length of stay by type and class of the "controlling offense," along with counts of individuals in pretrial lockup by age, race and ethnicity, and gender.
 - b. Hono noted some data quality issues related to the type/class of controlling offense charge and that the DOC does not report the secondary charges of the individual in this open source data.
 - i. Bryan Sperry noted that the controlling offense associated with pretrial stay may not reflect the highest charge.
 - ii. Sachin Pandya noted that there is also no current way to classify the severity of a charge within type and class in terms of collateral consequences and maximum sentence length within each type and class.
 - iii. Tammi Harris suggested the team reach out to Joe Greelish at Court Ops and that he can help with the Judicial Branch statute file that includes more robust information on type and class of offenses.
 - c. Renee Lamark Muir questioned why we are still using open-source data? Why not CISS/CJIS?
 1. Bail study from 2003 shows demographics and trends have not changed. Should they have by now?
 2. If who is in pretrial has not changed, are the right people being held (i.e. do we have a systematic problem, a policy problem or a data problem).

- d. Jessica Wagoneer raised the idea that the data should also be presented with those held in a mental health hospital or facility.
 - e. Lydia Wileden noted that although most pretrial detainees are males, many of those detained at York (the women's DOC facility), around 40%, are pretrial.
- III. Presented Summary Document
- a. Matt Hono presented the summary document that collects various questions raised through discussion, provides initial findings related to those questions raised, outlines potential explanations, and highlights remaining unknowns.
 - i. Undersecretary Karpowitz highlighted that this was still a working document that he views as one of the major deliverables of the group. He also suggested workshopping the title of the document.
 - b. See also Thematic Questions Document
- IV. Follow-up on Sachin Pandya's proposals
- a. Create a tripwire to detect those who are on low bonds for long periods. Use DOC data sources. We may also need to look at case files. Need to DEFINE:
 - i. What counts as a low bond?
 - ii. What counts as long detention?
 - iii. Who wants to work on this?
 - b. Bryan Sperry:
 - i. "Is this a tactical means of raising visibility on these cases to practitioners in the hopes of addressing individual cases, or is this a research effort to better understand the factors that lead to low-bond detainees held for long periods of time?"
- V. Discussion of a methodology to look into case-level details
- a. The group discussed if CSSD, Court Operations, or any public entity tracks bail modification hearings
 - b. Anna Van Cleave noted that she also wants to start to look into this at the case level but still needs to go through IRB process.
 - c. John Delbarba noted that often the bail commissioner is present at bail modification hearings.