



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

770 L Street, Suite 1240 • Sacramento, California 95814-3368
Telephone 916-323-3121 • Fax 916-323-4347 • TDD 415-865-4272

TANI G. CANTIL-SAKAUYE
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council

MARTIN HOSHINO
Administrative Director

CORY T. JASPERSON
Director, Governmental Affairs

June 30, 2017

Hon. Reginald B. Jones-Sawyer, Sr., Chair
Assembly Public Safety Committee
State Capitol, Room 2117
Sacramento, California 95814

Subject: Senate Bill 10 (Hertzberg), as amended March 27, 2017 – Letter of Concern
Hearing: Assembly Public Safety Committee – July 11, 2017

Dear Assembly Member Jones-Sawyer:

The Judicial Council has a number of significant concerns about SB 10, as amended March 27, 2017. SB 10 would enact major bail/pretrial release reform. While there are some areas of conceptual agreement the Judicial Council continues to have substantial concerns about many elements of the bill including the impact on judicial discretion and independence; the creation of unrealistic or unspecified timelines; the imposition of unrealistic responsibilities and expectations on the pretrial services agencies that courts would rely on for information in making decisions, and the creation of an overly burdensome and complicated system. While expressing these concerns about SB 10, the Judicial Council acknowledges that SB 10 is a work in progress. We have been in communication with the author's office and the sponsors and we understand that the author is considering amendments.

Areas of Conceptual Agreement

While the Judicial Council has a substantial number of very significant concerns about SB 10 in its current form, in concept, the council agrees with the following:

- Providing for pretrial release, with or without conditions as appropriate, for all eligible defendants, and providing for preventive detention for defendants who pose a high risk to public safety or of fleeing the jurisdiction.
- Exploring the implications of moving from a pretrial release and detention system that is implemented primarily through the setting of money bail to a system that focuses on evidence-based risk assessment that considers the risk to public safety and victims with the risk of fleeing the jurisdiction and failure to appear, and is implemented through setting conditions of release, and preventive detention for cases in which no combination of conditions of release will be sufficient to address the risk.
- Providing pretrial services in a manner that: 1) closely coordinates with the courts; 2) delivers risk assessment information, criminal history, and other data relevant to judges' determinations of conditions of release for defendants; 3) includes monitoring and supervision of defendants released pretrial, where appropriate; and 4) is funded at a level to adequately and properly address the costs of such services.
- Use of a validated risk assessment instrument that does not give undue weight to factors that correlate with race, ethnicity, and class to obtain a risk level or score.
- Respect for the constitutional principle of judicial discretion and responsibility for pretrial release and detention decisions, and with aiding judges in their decision-making responsibility by providing risk assessment and other relevant information gathered by pretrial services.
- Improving upon the current system of pretrial detention/release to enable judges to make appropriate decisions as quickly as possible when there is adequate information on which to base such a decision, and so long as there are new and sufficient resources for the system.

Areas of Concern

Judicial discretion and independence

The Judicial Council is concerned that SB 10 would infringe on judicial discretion and independence for the following reasons:

- ***Balance of system interests:*** The council is concerned that SB 10 does not establish a reasonable or realistic balance between the interest in releasing all defendants who can be safely released pretrial, and a concern for public safety (including safety of victims) and the administration of justice (fleeing jurisdiction/failure to appear). Judges have

constitutional and statutory responsibility for implementing the law in ways that ensure appropriate consideration for protecting the rights of the accused, protecting the public and victim(s), and providing for the fair and efficient administration of justice. In that regard, the council is concerned that SB 10 would require the pre-arraignment release *by the pretrial services agency* of any person charged with a misdemeanor (unless the defendant is already on pretrial release), without providing an opportunity for a judge to determine whether the defendant (who may be charged with a serious misdemeanor, including domestic violence) is a risk to public safety or the safety of the victim(s), or is likely to flee. SB 10 also does not account for those defendants who fail to appear and are cited and released rather than booked.

- *Matters appropriate for Rules of Court:* The bill has a number of detailed requirements for judicial decision-making that are more appropriately addressed in Rules of Court rather than statutes, so they can be more easily revised and updated. For example, the council believes that it is more appropriate for Rules of Court to address certain factors courts must consider in making their determination, such as what the court must consider in making a release decision, what constitutes "substantial hardship" in determining ability to pay, and factors for determining whether the defendant's release would result in great bodily harm to others.
- *Information provided to the court:* The bill appears to significantly limit information provided to the judge at pre-arraignment as a basis for the release determination. As currently drafted the bill would only require information about the current offense, the law enforcement list of charges, and a risk assessment result. The bill, however, does not allow other important information to be provided to the judge such as criminal history, probable cause documentation or other background related to the risk assessment.
- *Balance between judicial authority and pretrial services authority:* Substantial burdens are imposed on judges to justify any departure from recommendations of the pretrial services agency, including requiring courts, if the release decision is inconsistent with the recommendations of the pretrial services agency, to include a statement of reasons. The bill also requires the court to annually report the rate of judicial concurrence with recommended conditions of release without requiring the provision of additional data regarding the decisions made, the conditions actually imposed initially and through the course of the case, etc. Reporting solely the rate of concurrence implies that judges are discouraged from exercising any discretion that departs from the pretrial services recommendations.
- *Judicial determination of risk:* SB 10 would allow the court to impose preventive detention only for those defendants who are charged with a violent or serious crime. The

council is concerned that this makes the bill ineffective and unfair because the determination is charge-based rather than risk-based and appears to not allow the judge to take criminal history or other factors into account. Further, the council believes that courts should have the option of imposing preventive detention for those defendants who, whatever their current charge, score in the highest risk levels and for whom no condition or combination of conditions can provide for safe pretrial release.

- *Release on bail:* The bill provides for release on bail in a manner that places judges in the untenable position of being required to release on bail defendants who are at high risk of failure to appear (FTA) or of danger to public safety. This structure undermines the legislation's goal of judicious use of preventive detention to protect public safety while releasing defendants who are appropriate for pretrial release. For example, the proposed bill would prohibit release on bail *except* when no condition or combination of conditions can assure safe pretrial release. It requires the court to set monetary bail at the least restrictive level necessary and to consider ability to pay without substantial hardship. This arrangement affords "high risk" defendants the opportunity to be released on bail *despite* their risk level, unless they have been charged with a violent or serious offense. Further, the bill appears to limit the court's ability to consider the appropriateness of preventive detention in cases where the defendant has a history of violent offenses but has a current offense for which preventive detention is not statutorily permitted.
- *Violations of release:* The proposed approach for addressing violations of pretrial release is unrealistic and impinges on judicial discretion because the sole option for addressing violations of pretrial release is through contempt of court proceedings, which is not an adequate solution. Contempt is a complex and extended process for courts to impose and implicates Penal Code section 1382 rights. Penal Code section 1382 requires the court, unless good cause is shown to the contrary, to order an action dismissed in specified cases.

Timelines/Resources

The Judicial Council is concerned that the bill would impose unrealistic (and unspecified) timelines on courts. The bill would require informed decision-making on timelines that are unrealistic for courts and criminal justice partners. For example, the bill would: (a) require pretrial services agencies to gather and courts to process a significant amount of information regarding a defendant on very tight timelines; (b) require judges to issue findings of fact and a statement of the reasons for imposing each condition that are specific to the person in each case where conditions are imposed; and (c) require up to five pre-arraignment hearings on very tight timelines. Currently, many of the timelines in SB 10 are yet undefined, to be filled in through later amendments. The council is also concerned that the limitations on hearings are unclear, so it seems they could be as extensive (and time consuming) as a preliminary hearing with

presentation of witnesses, cross-examination, and submission of other evidence. Because the proposed system is so complex, it is unclear whether there is a need for these multiple hearings in order to accomplish the legislation's stated purposes.

Pretrial Services agencies: unrealistic responsibilities and expectations

The Judicial Council is concerned that the bill would impose unrealistic responsibilities and expectations on the pretrial services agencies that courts would rely on for information when making decisions, as follows:

- **Courts' interest in effective pretrial services agencies:** The proposed system requires pretrial services agencies to undertake a variety of tasks that are integral to efficient and effective decision-making by courts. Courts have a vested interest in the effectiveness of agencies with such significant responsibilities that are intertwined with those of the court. In many counties, such agencies either do not currently exist or are relatively small. For a pretrial release and detention system to function, courts must have confidence that pretrial services agencies—whether a separate agency or a unit of an existing agency—are right-sized and well-run so that courts can rely on the agencies' assessments, recommendations, and ability to monitor and supervise defendants granted pretrial release.
- **Risk assessment instrument:** Portions of the bill that define the use of a risk assessment tool by pretrial services raise questions regarding validity, reliability and access. More specifically, the bill would mandate certain criteria for the tool and prohibit other criteria. This approach would undermine the fundamental requirement that the factors in an evidence-based tool, and the algorithm used to weight the factors, have been validated to be predictive of risk for a particular population. Further, the council is concerned that *only* the PSA-Court instrument developed by the Laura & John Arnold Foundation currently appears to meet the requirements of SB 10.

Burdensome and complicated system

Finally, the Judicial Council is concerned that SB 10 would create a non-linear and highly complex system. More specifically, the council is concerned that the operational impact on courts would be profound and, without adequate funding, unachievable. The council is also concerned that SB 10 would attempt to graft at least four different release and detention elements onto the current statutory structure for the bail system: risk-based release; unsecured bonds; ability-to-pay determinations; and preventive detention. Further, in many counties, a significant portion of the pretrial population is ineligible for release due to probation or parole holds, immigration (ICE) holds, holds for multiple failures to appear, or other legal circumstances that prevent their release. The council believes that it would be inefficient to use resources to assess defendants, process paperwork, hold hearings, etc. for defendants who will not be eligible for

Hon. Reginald B. Jones-Sawyer, Sr.

June 30, 2017

Page 6

release due to circumstances that arise from legal issues unrelated to the current charge. Finally, the council believes that any significant revision to the current pretrial detention and release system should be phased-in with at least a two year “sunrise” so that courts and justice system partners are able to put the necessary structures, processes and training into place, and help to ensure that the revised system will be functional and a genuine improvement.

In closing, the Judicial Council has several substantial concerns about SB 10 in its current form and looks forward to working with the author’s office and your committee to address these concerns.

Should you have any questions or require additional information, please contact Sharon Reilly at 916-323-3121.

Sincerely,

Sent by mail on June 30, 2017

Cory T. Jasperson
Director, Governmental Affairs

CTJ/SR/yc-s

cc: Members, Assembly Public Safety Committee
Hon. Bob Hertzberg, Member of the Senate
Hon. Travis Allen, Member of the Senate
Hon. Joel Anderson, Member of the Senate
Hon. Toni G. Atkins, Member of the Senate
Hon. Jim Beall, Member of the Senate
Hon. Steven Bradford, Member of the Senate
Hon. Ricardo Lara, Member of the Senate
Hon. Holly J. Mitchell, Member of the Senate
Hon. William W. Monning, Member of the Senate
Hon. Bob Wieckowski, Member of the Senate
Hon. Scott D. Wiener, Member of the Senate
Hon. Rob Bonta, Principal coauthor, Member of the Assembly
Ms. Mica Doctoroff, Legislative Advocate, American Civil Liberties Union of California
Ms. Sandy Uribe, Counsel, Assembly Public Safety Committee
Mr. Gary Olson, Consultant, Assembly Republican Office of Policy
Mr. Daniel Seeman, Deputy Legislative Affairs Secretary, Office of the Governor
Mr. Martin Hoshino, Administrative Director, Judicial Council of California