

# CONNECTICUT SENTENCING COMMISSION

## Pretrial Working Group

January 30, 2026

## Meeting Minutes

### I. INTRODUCTION

#### a. Daniel Karpowitz

- i. Minutes from 1-23-26 Meeting approved were approved by a voice vote.
- ii. Two major items on agenda but will first talk regarding tempo. One perspective is that we meet too often and meetings too short, other is we don't meet enough or for long enough.

### II. MEETING SCHEDULING AND TEMPO

- a. Rich Sparaco – First suggestion – continue same cycle, second suggestion, meet for 90 minutes every other week. Thought is we get good discussion going and then we run out of time.
- b. Renee Lamark-Muir – Where is end zone? Haven't come to any recommendations. I have talked to committee chairs regarding community beds.
- c. Daniel Karpowitz – Some end goals are pointed to session, some beyond. Create a consensus about where we stand.
  - i. Renee Lamark-Muir – Not looking to create bail reform.
- d. Daniel Karpowitz – You can ask Commission to do certain things as a legislator this session. Things from Matt's data, or anything. You have the minutes, provisional findings, our data. You make request, we will work to accommodate you.
- e. Judge Gold – Did speak with Daniel regarding tempo. I thought sometime when getting into substantive talks, we look to clock and we find that we are in the few last minutes. With Matt's data, I think a longer meeting would be productive. I would support longer meeting.
- f. Rich Sparaco – Is there motion for that? To try for three months to take us to the end of session and see how it works? Is anyone opposed? I think we have consensus.

### III. FTA CONTINUED: SUMMARY FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

- a. Matt Hono – FTA warrants are more common than VOP warrants. With ~5,000 issued per quarter, ~3,500 served per quarter, and 38,000 active FTA warrants as of 12/31/2025.
- b. Those with a history of FTA are detained at higher rate than those without a history.
- c. Ongoing question: How many unique persons have an active FTA?

- i. Response from PRAWN: It's based on docket, need to develop a system to identify individuals across dockets – look to CISS.
- d. Judge Gold – What does an active warrant mean?
  - i. Mike Hines – I think it means unserved, pending warrants.
- e. Judge Gold – so if we issue more warrants than those served, the number would always be increasing.
  - i. Mike Hines – Tough to say. It could be the number of warrants, so serving one person could clear multiple.
  - ii. Matt Hono – Serving is not the only way to clear a warrant. Can be vacated. Trying to get data from PRAWN on numbers vacated each quarter.
- f. Daniel Karpowitz – Era where data reflects function of the state rather than the experience of its citizens has to end. Can tell how much DOC spends on job training, can't tell how many get jobs. We don't have the capacity yet but need to be more person centered, not government centered. Ideas of scale of FTA warrants and impact on detention. How much is people with addiction problems failing to appear?
- g. Renee LaMark-Muir- Sounds like a system problem. What do the 38,000 look like. People can cycle through again and again. System hands out FTAs like chits. How can law address situation? If come up with legislation, how does system react or do as always done? What needs to be done to help system work better?
  - i. Daniel Karpowitz – If legislative action, hope people involved here are involved in implementation. Possible 2017 reform were addressing the wrong questions.
    - 1. Renee LaMark-Muir – Not necessarily. What questions are pending? How can we help system work in that manner?
- h. Matt Hono – Other ongoing issues and discussion from last week
  - i. How many active FTAs have been pending for more than five years. A process to deactivate older FTAs? It appears to be a state attorney led process. Per PRAWN, there's no effort on their end to clear old warrants.
  - ii. Tough to match individual persons across multiple dockets.
  - iii. Texts reminders might not be enough.
    - 1. Fears of sanctions associated with substance use issues.
- i. Gary Roberge – Comment regarding report 13% non-financial release FTA rate
  - i. The 13% does not include those who post bonds or full cash payments.
- j. Matt Hono – There are several potential policy interventions. How to encourage people to appear? How to make it easier for appearance? How to make reduce the number of in-person appearances?

- k. Renee Lamark-Muir – Why do people FTA? We can make assumptions. Brings us back to the problems with data. Why longstanding problems with court data? It's a stumbling block. Need resources, expertise. Hinders ability on policy level.
  - l. Rich Sparaco – Are FTAs fed through CISS? CISS works on matching dockets with individuals.
    - i. Tammi Harris – We do use info from PRAWN, using active warrants at docket level. We can try to get all matching data on individual level. Attempt to match and merge into one central record. CISS is as good as the data we can get. Working currently on master database for analytical capacity. Maybe able to work parallel as work of this group progresses.
  - m. Kevin Neary – Ability to go from dockets to people, different bar for matching if we are not looking for absolute precision, fuzzy matching and imprecision we could live with going forward. Must decide going from cases to individuals, FTAs won't be evenly spread with some individuals having a dozen and others having one. Need to subset those with higher numbers and by FTA type. Distinguishing between those intentionally fleeing the state and those who do not.
  - n. Joe Greelish – We often try perfection in data, but we can often make decision on “good enough” data. Judges don't want to know criminal histories unless comes in as evidence unless pertinent to case at hand, where to draw line. Can look at FTAs, but it won't be exact until person get specific identifier.
    - i. John DelBarba – I know judges are interested in histories especially FTAs at arraignments.
    - ii. Matt Hono – Better data is always good but shouldn't deter us from discussing how to improve systems operation at this current juncture.
  - o. Daniel Karpowitz – Very productive conversation here.
- IV. HOW MANY INDIVIDUALS DETAINED PRETRIAL NEVER GO ON TO SERVE A TERM OF IMPRISONMENT?, Matt Hono, IMRP
- a. Matt Hono
    - i. Using nightly sentenced count and pretrial count, we can track by unique inmate number
    - ii. From 2016 to present, count of unique identifies in the pretrial data was 62,000
    - iii. Count sentenced was 44,000, ~18,000 less people experience sentenced imprisonment than pretrial detention.
  - b. Mike Hines – Regarding the Walker Project, talked about people doing their sentence in pretrial detention. Does this include pretrial detainees that get time served?
    - i. Matt Hono – No, I make no effort to estimate how many pretrial detainees receive time served.

- c. Judge Gold – Tough to accurately assess. If one has served 60 days pretrial and agree the sentence should be 60 days. Can return to DOC and they are released, or can sentence to suspended or time served, especially if they can go right into a program. If they are going to lose that spot with even one more night in jail. It appears that person does not get a sentence. So this comparison is fraught with peril and might be misleading.
  - i. John DelBarba – I agree. There are a couple more variants, and it's complicated stuff.
  - ii. Renee LaMark-Muir – I think this slide should be taken from the records. Invites simplistic comparisons that invites problems and raises red flags.
  - iii. Kevin Neary – Limitations on data, but useful to show long person in DOC to measure physical time spent. Not paths out or why.
  - iv. Daniel Karpowitz – Fine with siloing slide based on concerns. Findings of Judge Gold and echoed by John, sounds like good courtroom and legal practice.

V. ADJOURNMENT AT 2:31 PM