

# CONNECTICUT SENTENCING COMMISSION

Pretrial Working Group

Friday, December 5, 2025

1:30 PM - 2:30 PM

## Minutes

1. Daniel Karpowitz Convenes.
  - Motion to approve prior meeting minutes – Debra DelPrete-Sullivan moves to correct typo in section 3-A. - approved on voice vote.
2. Introduction – Keep the chart in mind – continuity involved regarding Pretrial Situation.
  - Researchers have shown relative flatness in Pretrial population despite 2017 reforms.
  - We have discussed possible factors.
3. An Overview of Current Misdemeanor-Only Pretrial Detainees and Discussion, Michael Hines, Director, JB-CSSD Pretrial Services
  - Why holding pretrial individuals?
  - 383 Misdemeanor only “clients” held on 10-16-2025
  - 111 of those had companion felony charge picked up after D.O.C. admission.
  - 40 are Family Violence clients\
  - 29 held on detainers, mostly out-of-state.
  - 42 refused pretrial interviews, cannot make recommendations.
  - 161 “true” Misdemeanor only clients remaining.
  - a. Looking at 144 of those clients Admitted between 3-10-2023 and 10-14-2025
    - Risk scores ranged from +6 to -21 (least to highest risk)
    - Scores ranging from 0 to positives usually no financial releases.
    - 6 Clients fell between 0 and +6, 3 disposed of in court.
    - Average risk of 144 was -10.5.
  - b. Why Held?
    - Multiple FTA’s on underlying case – 3, 4, 5, as many as 6.
    - Some (17) recommended nonfinancial, but court overruled.
    - Multiple case pending.
    - Significant criminal history (risk scores -15 to -21), 4 with multiple FTA
    - Underlying serious mental health issues, many homeless.
    - Clients with out-of-state residency and no CT ties.
    - Clients previously released on promise to appear but violate terms.
  - c. Walker Project
    - Clients had prior experience incarcerated.

- Told researchers using pretrial detention as part of final disposition of case.
- Ability to dictate location and retain proximity to family.

d. Discussion

- Renee LaMark-Muir- Pretrial impacted by judicial discretion. This presentation clarifies that and the factors considered. Need to speed up the process for low-level misdemeanors. Is there way to better utilize beds?
- Anna Van Cleave – 144 admissions? Is that entire universe and the breakdown of the six buckets?
- Mike Hines – Prior FTAs probably the largest bucket. 3-10-23 was earliest admit date, rest were in 2024 and later. It is snapshot date for Oct. 2025 and these were the admission dates.
- Daniel Karpowitz – Using snapshot data is what we have, we need better data going forward.
- Renee LaMark-Muir – Is community cost going up or are community programs as successful? Program has to match populations needs.
- Mike Hines – For mentally ill, Sierra Program in New Haven has only 14 beds and is a 6-month program.
- Kyle Baudoin – Note on the Walker Report – Target study sample was those with significant criminal history. Know what the system is like, know the programs, riding out continuances until their time served will match their sentence. They know the calculus.
- John DelBarba – We need another Sierra Center. 14 beds for entire state is not enough. Have clients waiting months. It's a very good program.
- Andrew Clark – Lydia Wileden in chat asked if the one-third of those with felonies can be reclassified?
  - a. Mike Hines – We are discussing trying to clean that up.
  - b. Bryan Sperry – Per person, one “row” on our system makes it a challenge. Also a challenge for DOC to look at population and see most serious charge.
  - c. Daniel Karpowitz – One finding of the group is there are significant benefits from past reform. Findings could be pretrial is misleading and showing a problem that may not be there. We don't want to keep churning policy-wise, need to clean up the systems.
  - d. Kevin Neary – Regarding data – challenge with DOC mainframe and storage shows need for different data system and more robust replacement. Regarding misdemeanors and multi-misdemeanors, at time of sentence, are individuals sentenced at same time or do some case continue? Does that time align?
  - e. Mike Hines – Many times, courts try to combine cases. But if different courts, there might be different dates.

- f. John DelBarba – Goal is to try and move all cases at same time.
- g. Judge Pavia – Plea in one court can lead to issue in another court, but courts are aware and try to work so not losing time.

- Matt Hono – Besides wait for programs and desire to serve time pre-disposition rather than post, any other reason for variation in length of stay?
- Anna Van Cleave – Try to maximize jail credit with multiple case?
- Joe Greelish – Problem is trying to match data up between the systems. Can't always match up. Misdemeanors don't always fingerprint so can't always match to other offenses. Snapshot of one day is easier, but to do over time is much harder with thousands of cases.
- Debra DelPrete – Sullivan – Global disposition people might not get credit on pending cases. Hope we can look.
- Andrew Clark – Regarding the 414 – Imagine people with similar risk numbers who bonded out? What are those numbers? Also, those who stay in and don't get into Sierra Center, do not get services inside?
  - a. Mike Hines – Only looked at those inside. Accurate that pretrial holds have limited or no access to programs.

4. Discussion: What data from CISS do stakeholders need to adequately evaluate pretrial procedures? Why does CISS matter to the Connecticut Sentencing Commission? (~15 minutes or if time permits)

- Daniel Karpowitz – Next session – Mike Aiello presentation on “resources” over time. Need to align the data. CIS had promising meeting. What does the Sentencing Commission want from the Criminal Justice System data wise?
- Matt Hono – Across data systems, a list of fields essential to monitor. It is important to try and collect links and aggregate. Maybe expand the list to include some items discussed today.
- Daniel Karpowitz – This will make our analysis and work easier in the future.

5. Adjourn 2:28.