

WES MOORE
Governor

ARUNA MILLER
Lieutenant Governor



DOROTHY LENNIG
Executive Director

Justice Reinvestment Oversight Board

Monday, July 28 · 1:00 – 3:00pm

Google Meet joining info

Video call link: <https://meet.google.com/rmb-ehqx-qcp>

Or dial: (US) +1 432-756-5043 PIN: 430 799 924#

Board Attendees

- Judge Kathleen Cox, Board Chair
- Delegate Charlotte Crutchfield, Montgomery County
- Dorothy J. Lennig, Esq., Executive Director, Governor's Office of Crime Prevention and Policy
- Secretary Carolyn Scruggs, Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services
- Robyn Lyles, Maryland Parole Commission (designee)
- Carrie Williams, Deputy Attorney General
- Sonia Chessen, Senior Advisor for Systems Reform, Maryland Department of Health
- Mary Ann Thompson, Warden, St. Mary's County Detention and Rehabilitation Center
- Chief Judge John Morrissey, District Court of Maryland
- Judge Brett R. Wilson, Administrative Judge of the Circuit Court for Washington County
- Erin Roth, Department of Labor, Licensing & Regulation
- Scott Shellenberger, Baltimore County State's Attorney
- Walt J. Pesterfield, Director, Baltimore County Department of Corrections
- William Henry, The Law Offices of William H. Henry
- Prendi Garcia, Commander, Maryland State Police
- Rebecca Jones, Health Officer, Worcester County
- Danielle Cox, Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services

Agenda

I. Welcome and Opening Remarks - Judge Kathleen Cox, Justice Reinvestment Oversight Board, Chair

A. Call to Order

1. Chair Cox introduces herself to members of the Board, as this is her first meeting since being appointed Chair. She briefly reviews her qualifications and experience.

B. Roll Call

C. Approval of the Minutes

1. Minutes are approved.
2. In the future, minutes will be circulated and approved electronically prior to the next meeting.

100 Community Pl. · Crownsville, MD 21032

Tel: 410-697-9338 · Fax: 410-558-6697 · Toll Free: 1-877-687-9004 · TTY Users: Call via Maryland Relay

<http://goccp.maryland.gov/>

II. GOCPP Updates - Brandi Cahn, Assistant Director of Justice Reinvestment

A. Oversight Board responsibilities

1. Since there are multiple new members and a new Board Chair, Cahn discusses the roles and responsibilities of the Oversight Board as defined in statute.
2. *See slides for more detail.*
3. The Board is tasked with monitoring and evaluating implementation of the Justice Reinvestment Act and the recommendations made by the Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council.
4. It is also required to work closely with the Local Government Commission, which is tasked with creating performance measures for the reinvestment funding and making recommendations on PIGF priorities.
5. The board advises on future legislative and budget proposals grounded in data and fiscal soundness. It also acts as a vehicle for stakeholder engagement.
6. Additionally, the Board is responsible for Financial Oversight and Data Collection related to JRA implementation.

B. PIGF update

1. For FY26, GOCPP awarded 58 programs with approximately \$10.5 million in grant funding. It was the most competitive year to date. The majority of funds went to reentry programs, and about a quarter supported behavioral health programming.

III. Department Reports - It is noted that departmental updates will now be received in written form a week prior to the meeting, so less meeting time needs to be dedicated to reviewing them. *See slides for more detail.*

A. Department of Public Safety and Correctional Service, Secretary Scruggs

1. Secretary Scruggs shares that DPSCS surveyed over 2,400 incarcerated individuals on their needs and experiences. They received a lot of valuable data to identify how needs vary between gender and age group.
2. Also highlighted a new program that started last month called Seeds of Light. It is a motivational speaker series for youth charged as adults, where lived experiences and new perspectives on successful reentry are shared.
3. DPSCS Reentry Simulation will be held on Thursday, July 31st, at War Memorial Plaza in Baltimore City.

B. Maryland Department of Health, Sonia Chessen

1. For period of January 2025 to June 2025
 - a) # of 8-505 evaluations completed: 282

- (1) Cycle Time: 13.1 days
 - b) # of 8-507 defendants placed into treatment: 255
 - (1) Cycle Time: 13.2 days
 - 2. Evaluator vacancy in the process of being filled.
- C. Local Detention Centers, Director Ryan Ross**
 - 1. Cahn notifies Board of a change in MCAA leadership, as Director Christopher Klein (Anne Arundel County) is the new president.
- D. Administrative Office of the Courts, Chief Judge Morrissey**
 - 1. Presents technical violations chart included in the slides.
 - 2. It has remained very consistent from the beginning, hovering around 80% compliance. The majority of those that are non-compliant are the result of multiple charges.
- E. Pretrial Detainee Data - Jeffrey Zuback, Director of Research, Analysis, and Evaluation, GOCPP**
 - 1. Zuback reviews the legislation that outlines the pretrial detainee data each county and DPDS are required to report to the Board each year.
 - 2. Data Elements include 1) a January 1st snapshot each year, utilizing unique intake ID numbers, and 2) a count of total intakes and pre-trial releases from January 1st to 31st.
 - 3. They have yet to do an in-depth analysis, they are just required to track it. However, now that GOCPP has multiple years of data to work with, this analysis could be done if the Board requests it.

IV. Pretrial Improvements

A. Pretrial overview

- 1. Chair Cox notes that pretrial release issues, particularly the use of private home monitoring services, has recently become an area of focus in the media and public discourse. Looking into the pretrial population is a natural outgrowth of this Board's work, as effective pretrial services can positively impact detention facilities and sentence lengths for those convicted.
- 2. Chief Judge Morrissey explains pretrial processes from the court side and identifies deficiencies he sees in the current systems in place.
 - a) Majority of pretrial cases start in the district court. Commissioners are responsible for initial bail reviews, and anyone detained is seen by a district court judge the next day.
 - b) About 50% of individuals are released by Commissioner on ROR or unsecured personal bond.
 - c) Rule changes have led to more serious cases coming before the Commissioner.
 - d) Cash bail has largely been eliminated, replaced by no bond.
 - e) Serious deficiencies with the private home detention monitoring system include lag time between violation and the

mechanisms for getting that to court/having court take action.

- f) However, if the court places an individual on “no bond” but has authorized release to a warden-based pretrial system, the warden has the right to pick up the individual after violation. They do not have to ask the court to issue a bench warrant, eliminating issues for violations that occur after hours.
 - g) Overall, pretrial systems and eligibility differ greatly between jurisdictions and policies do not align with evidence-base. Suggests standardization and encouraging shift away from private monitoring through grant funds. Issues with detainers also highlight a need to improve inter-county communication and transportation options/alternatives (perhaps all proceedings except trial being done remotely).
3. Executive Director Dorothy Lennig emphasizes the importance of releasing individuals into the community pretrial but also ensuring individuals are being effectively monitored so that violations are addressed and consequences are implemented.
 4. Secretary Scruggs notes that if the Board decides to discontinue private home detention through statute, it needs to first ensure that the State and other areas have access to the proper resources and alternatives. Many areas would need to expand their capabilities to make this shift effective.
 5. Warden Thompson describes the process with detainers in St. Mary’s County, voicing agreement that it would be beneficial to do these proceedings remotely. She also suggests remote status hearings.
 - a) Judge Cox notes that this may need to be approached differently for cases that involve interplay between district and circuit courts.
 6. Carrie Williams voices concerns that there are differences by jurisdiction in whether the individuals must pay for supervision.
 7. Secretary Scruggs notes that Baltimore City is unique, as they have a warrant unit. However, they are experiencing an issue with detainers, as older warrants read that the individual can only be seen in the county in which the charge originates, not the arrest. Judge Morrissey references policies implemented during Covid to minimize these transportation issues.
 8. Judge Wilson asks that everyone remain sensitive to the financial aspect of these programs and any proposed changes. The legislature is placing a lot of financial responsibility on the counties, so it has to be viewed from a holistic perspective.
 9. Judge Diana Smith asks, regarding private home detention, if a full medical evaluation is still required before a detainee can be monitored. Secretary Scruggs said that this evaluation is performed to

determine their mental/medical status and whether they are safe for the community. They are also given the first 30-day supply of medications they need.

10. Judge Smith also notes that there is sometimes a delay with caseload and the medical evaluation, and she suggests the Board look into ways to speed up the process to keep public safety at the forefront. Secretary Scruggs says individuals should be receiving the evaluation in 7 to 10 days, and asks that Judge Smith follow up with examples so she can look into it.
11. Delegate Crutchfield asks if there is data that indicates a lag in the process of the private home detention providers in notifying the authorities when violations occur. She wonders if civil penalties are being enforced for the companies, but Secretary Scruggs says they are not getting information from the local law enforcement in a timely manner, causing delays in being able to audit the company.
12. Judge Morrissey raises the question of what constitutes a violation. These discrepancies can lead to varying response levels. Lennig emphasizes the need to get everyone on the same page and to learn from each other.
13. Judge Wilson notes that laws in Washington County prohibit individuals from pretrial if they have ever been convicted of a violent crime. This restriction inhibits Washington's ability to effectively carry out pretrial services, but the legislature needs to approve.

B. Survey results

1. Cahn provides a high-level overview of interview data collected by GOCCP's JRA team.
2. *See report on slides for more detail.*

C. Workgroups

1. The Board will split into the following workgroups, coinciding with information presented in the report and the discussion had:
 - a) Standardization of terms and levels of supervision
 - b) Legislation and local rules
 - c) Detainers and information sharing
 - d) Private home detention and electronic monitoring
 - e) Risk assessments and validation
 - f) Data collection - added after suggested by Warden Thompson, because current pretrial data reported by the counties does not sufficiently break down population into type of release/supervision (in community vs. in detention center, on electronic monitoring, on home detention, etc.)
2. Judge Morrissey and Secretary Scruggs will work on getting the appropriate subject matter experts involved in these workgroups.
3. Judge Cox notes the importance of making sure these groups are

geographically diverse, because pretrial differs so greatly from place to place.

4. Delegate Crutchfield mentions that any legislative goals the Board has for the next session, those need to be completed no later than mid-December.
5. Brandi Cahn will send out information on the workgroups so that members can volunteer.

V. Next Steps - Judge Cox and Brandi Cahn

A. October meeting

1. The next meeting is Monday, October 20th, 2025.

VI. Good of the Order and Adjournment - Judge Cox