## Office of the State Court Administrator



TO:

House and Senate Judiciary Committees

Colorado General Assembly

FROM:

Gerald A. Marroney

State Court Administrator

RE:

HB 14-1336

Concerning Pretrial Service Program Requirements

Gerald A. Marroney State Court Administrator

Mindy Masias Chief of Staff

**Terri Morrison** *Judicial Legal Counsel* 

## DIRECTORS

Sherry Stwalley Court Services & Legislative Relations

David Kribs, CFO Financial Services

Eric D. Brown
Human Resources

Chad Cornelius, CIO Information Technology Services

Eric Philp
Probation Services

DATE: November 1, 2014

In accordance with HB 14-1336 and Section 16-4-105 (3) (e) and (3) (F), C.R.S., each pretrial service program is required to provide an annual report to the State Judicial Department no later than November 1 of each year for inclusion in a combined annual report to be presented to the House and Senate Judiciary Committees.

The combined report is to include the following information:

- (1) The total number of pretrial assessments performed by the program and submitted to the Court;
- (2) The total number of closed cases by the program in which the defendant was released from custody and supervised by the program;
- (3) The total number of closed cases in which the defendant was released from custody, was supervised by the program, and, while under supervision, appeared for all scheduled court appearances on the case;
- (4) The total number of closed cases in which the defendant was released from custody, was supervised by the program, and was not charged with a new criminal offense that was alleged to have occurred while under supervision and that carried the possibility of a sentence to jail or imprisonment:
- (5) The total number of closed cases in which the defendant was released from custody and was supervised by the program, and the defendant's bond was not revoked by the court due to a violation of any other terms and conditions of supervision.

The accompanying table represents the combined information provided by pretrial service programs in Adams, Alamosa, Arapahoe, Boulder, Denver, Douglas, Jefferson, LaPlata, Larimer, Mesa, Montezuma, Pueblo and Weld Counties. As can be seen, the different pretrial service programs use varying language to describe recommendations they make to the courts and/or bond status.

This report is an effort to compile information in compliance with HB 14-1336; however the Judicial Department has no administrative authority regarding pretrial programs.

Should you have additional questions, please contact Kris Nash, Probation Analyst, Evaluation Unit, Division of Probation Services, (720) 625-5762 or <a href="mailto:kris.nash@judicial.state.co.us">kris.nash@judicial.state.co.us</a>.

## FY2014 CRS 16-4-105 Pretrial Services Program Reporting Annual Reporting to State Judicial Department

County	Number of Pretrial Assessments	Number of Pretrial Supervision Cases Closed	Number of These Cases with No FTA	Court Appearance Rate	Number of These Cases with No New Filing	Public Safety Rate	Number of These Cases Not Revoked for Technical Violation	Technical	Number of These Cases Posted via Commercial Surety Bond (Bail Bonding Agent)	Percent of These Cases Posted via Commercial Surety Bond	Number of These Cases Posted via All Cash Bonds	Number of These Cases Posted via Property Bond	Total Number of All Cash and Property Bonds		Number of These Cases Posted via Personal Recognizance/S elf Bond	Number of These Cases Posted via Personal Recognizance/S urety Bond	Total Number of All Personal Recognizance Bonds	Percent of These Cases Posted via All Personal Recognizance Bonds
Adams	11,771	871	740	85.0%	819	94.0%	685	78.6%	468	53.7%	0	0	0	0.0%	403	0	403	46.3%
Alamosa >																		
Arapahoe <sup>1</sup>	4,400	1,256	1,003	79.9%	1,096	87.3%	1,220	97.1%	577	45.9%	85	0	85	6.8%	430	0	430	34.2%
Boulder <sup>2</sup>	3,759	1,837	1,748	95.2%	1,632	88.8%	1,613	87.8%	620	33.8%	924	6	930	50.6%	287	0	287	15.6%
Denver <sup>3</sup>	9,017	5,524	4,780	86.5%	4,948	89.6%	5,464	98.9%	3,565	64.5%	546	26	572	10.4%	1,053	0	1,053	19.1%
Douglas	2,805	1,654	1,592	96.3%	1,610	97.3%	1,593	96.3%	1,246	75.3%	0	0	0	0.0%	293	0	293	17.7%
El Paso >																		
Jefferson	5,283	3,184	2,950	92.7%	3,015	94.7%	2,898	91.0%	831	26.1%	1,259	0	1,259	39.5%	755	120	875	27.5%
LaPlata	825	368	254	69.0%	0	0.0%	114	31.0%	154	41.8%	1	0	1	0.3%	212	0	212	57.6%
Larimer	5,174	4,737	4,097	86.5%	4,393	92.7%	4,418	93.3%	857	18.1%	518	1,120	1	34.6%	1,488	752	2,240	47.3%
Mesa	2,393	2,218	1,957	88.2%	1,742	78.5%	1,722	77.6%	763	34.4%	164	3	167	7.5%	1,174	113	1,287	58.0%
Montezuma <sup>4</sup>	861	328	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	179	54.6%	8	0	8	2.4%	140	0	140	42.7%
Pueblo	3,374	838	762	90.9%	419	50.0%	47	5.6%	433	51.7%	0	0	0	0.0%	406	0	406	48.4%
Weld <sup>5</sup>	1,686	2,636	2,291	86.9%	2,437	92.5%	2,541	96.4%	1,879	71.3%	6	3	9	0.3%	461	16	477	18.1%

<sup>1</sup>Approximately 11% of the defendants we supervise are on summons.

<sup>2</sup>CJS Pretrial Services instituted a business practice change on cases opened after July 1, 2013 to distinguish whether cash bonds were posted via a commercial surety agent. For cases in the reporting period opened before July 1, 2013, our system does not distinguish what type of cash bond was posted. As a result, numbers reported in columns L, N, and P are estimates based on the proportional distribution of bond types among the 884 cases that opened and closed after July 1, 2013.

<sup>3</sup>6% of the terminated cases in our dataset were missing the bond type ( professional suret, PR, cash, property) code, however, there is no reason to believe that this missing data would change the distribution percentage of the various bond types during the reporting period.

## Notes:

Some data are currently unavailable. Montezuma County has recently updated their data base to capture all elements of this report. Information wil lbe reported in full next year.

SUMMONS CASES: In addition to supervising the above noted bond types, Weld County also supervises Summons cases. We felt it important to inform that in July 2013 - June 2014, one hundred eighty seven (187) Summons cases were ordered to Pretrial Services supervision. While the above table does not include a specific designation for Summons cases, Summons data is reflected in columns 3 through 9.

>No information available at the time of the writing of this report.