



ABA Restoring the Presumption of Innocence Project

Updates on National Pretrial Reforms

Virginia

- Virginia enacted the Pretrial Services Act with a purpose of providing more effective protection of society by establishing pretrial services agencies to assist judicial officers in discharging their duties related to determining bail. From this they developed the Virginia Pretrial Risk Assessment Instrument (VPRAI). Which was then implemented and validated.
 - The VPRAI was created in 2002. It was implement in all pretrial service agencies between July 2003 and December 2004, using a phased in approach. By January 2005 all pretrial services agencies were using the VPRAI.
- VPRAI
 - Source of Date to complete VPRAI (within 7 days of arrest)
 - Personal interviews with defendant
 - Arrest warrants, criminal history records, and court records
 - References provided by defendant to verify information
 - Current and prior adult criminal justice supervision records
 - Eligibility Requirements for performing VPRAI
 - Adult (18 y/o or over)
 - Not incarcerated at time of arrest
 - Arrested for one or more jailable offense
 - Arrested for criminal offense
 - 8 factors for risk calculation
 - Primary charge type
 - Pending charge(s)
 - Criminal history
 - Two or more failures to appear
 - Two or more violent convictions
 - Length at current residence
 - Employed/primary caregiver
 - History of drug abuse
 - All are weighted as 1 point, except Two or more FTAs, which receives 2 points
 - Risk levels

Risk Level	Risk Score	Failure to Appear	New Arrest	Total Failure
Low	0 – 1	4%	6%	10%
Below Average	2	8%	11%	19%
Average	3	11%	16%	27%
Above Average	4	13%	27%	40%
High	5-10 (now 9 after removing 1 factor from VPRAI)	16%	37%	53%

- 8 options for bail recommendations:
 - Personal recognizance
 - Reduced bond
 - Same bond
 - Supervised release with PR bond
 - Supervised release with secure bond
 - Increased bond
 - No bond
 - No recommendation
- 7 common recommendations for conditions of release:
 - Refrain from excessive use of alcohol or use of drugs
 - Submit to testing for drugs and alcohol
 - Refrain from possessing a firearm, destructive device, or other dangerous weapon
 - No contact with victim or potential witness
 - Maintain or seek employment
 - Maintain or commence educational program
 - Comply with a curfew
- Resources:
 - “Pretrial Risk Assessment in Virginia” Sponsored by the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services in partnership with the Virginia Community Criminal Justice Association. Research by Marie VanNostrand and Kenneth J. Rose. May 1, 2009. (<http://www.pretrial.org/infostop/>)

Kentucky

- In 2011, Kentucky legislature passed House Bill 463 which revamped the state’s criminal laws and penal codes, including: defining a “pretrial risk assessment,” requiring the use of evidence-based decision practices, and requiring “low risk” defendants to be released on their recognizance or an unsecured bond.
- They’ve seen a 10% decrease in defendants arrested and a 5% increase in the overall release rate, which non-financial releases increasing from 50% to 66%.
- As part of the Bail Bond Reform Act in 1976, commercial bail bonding for profit was abolished and the Kentucky Pretrial Services was created. Pretrial Services is a statewide

agency housed under Kentucky's Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), which is the Court of Justice and the operation's aspect of Kentucky's judicial branches.

- Pretrial Services has 294 employees working in 49 local program districts. They operate in all 120 counties and provide services seven days a week, 24 hours a day. Per court rule mandates pretrial officers to conduct an interview and investigation of all persons arrested on bailable offenses within 24 hours of arrest. Many jurisdictions strive to provide their services within 12 hours of initial incarceration.
- Interviews are voluntary and confidential. Defendants are screened for alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health issues. In addition to interviewing defendants, officers verify information, conduct criminal history check, and use risk assessment to measure flight risk and anticipated criminal conduct. The officer then presents the findings and makes recommendations to the judge, who ultimately decides release decisions.
- In addition to pretrial screenings, the officers administer three formal, supervision programs: Monitored Conditional Release (MCR), Misdemeanor Diversion Program, and a Deferred Prosecution Program.
- Pretrial Services Risk Assessment
 - *Questions:*
 - Does the defendant have a verified local address and has the defendant lived in the area for the past twelve months? (2 points for no)
 - Does the defendant have verified sufficient means of support? (1 point for no)
 - Is the defendant's current charge a Class A, B, or C Felony? (1 point for yes)
 - Is the defendant charged with a new offense while there is a pending case? (7 points for yes)
 - Does the defendant have an active warrant(s) for Failure to Appear prior to disposition? If no, does the defendant have a prior FTA on his or her record for a misdemeanor or felony charge? (2 points for yes)
 - Does the defendant have a prior FTA on his or her record for a criminal or traffic violation? (1 point for yes)
 - Does the defendant have prior misdemeanor convictions? (2 points for yes)
 - Does the defendant have prior felony convictions? (1 point for yes)
 - Does the defendant have prior violent crime convictions? (1 point for yes)
 - Does the defendant have a history of drug/alcohol abuse? (2 points for yes)
 - Does the defendant have a prior conviction for felony escape? (3 points for yes)
 - Is the defendant currently on probation/parole from a felony conviction? (1 point for yes)
 - *Risk Levels*
 - Low (release per statute) – 0 to 5 points
 - Moderate (release per statute with Supervision) – 6 to 13 points
 - High (judicial discretion) – 14 and up
- Monitored Conditional Release (MCR)

- This program allows pretrial officers to supervise defendants and monitor compliance with release conditions during pretrial stage. This is an alternative to financial bail. The pretrial officers create a risk reduction plan and supervision strategy, which is recommended to the court as supervised release. Supervised release is targeted for defendants with moderate to high risk of pretrial failure, because giving supervision to low risk offenders increases their risk level.
- The pretrial officers uses a supervision matrix to match supervision level with level of risk and defendant needs. Restrictions depend on needs, location, and access to outside resources. It can include curfew, court notification, drug testing, or electronic monitoring. Pretrial officers respond to non-compliance with defined policies and procedures. Over 10,000 defendants were referred to MCR in 2012.
- Misdemeanor Diversion Program
 - Pretrial Services operates 52 misdemeanor diversion programs within the Court of Justice. These offer defendants an alternative to prosecution. The goal is to avoid criminal conviction by making positive changes, preventing future criminal behavior. Additionally, it can create a positive view of the judicial system for first-time offenders, instead of a negative experience.
 - The defendant must be a first-time offender, with no criminal record. Upon completion of the program, the criminal charges are dismissed. In 2012, 87% of participants successfully completed the program. Over 4,000 misdemeanor defendants went through diversion. Participants performed almost 25,000 hours of community service and paid victims over \$56,700 in restitution. Additionally, the program allows participation from the victim in the process.
 - Defendants are eligible either by court rules or through prosecutorial or judicial discretion. The program is completely voluntary. The pretrial officer collects background information and performs external and internal assessments. Then the pretrial officer creates an individually based service plan, which is written into a contract. The specific terms must be met to complete the program. Terms can include AODA treatment, mental health counseling, volunteer work, or trainings. The contract length can range from 2 months to 12 months. Upon successful completion, the charges are dismissed with prejudice. Pretrial officers make every attempt to assist clients with successful completion, however if client refuses to comply, the program is terminated and the case is referred back to court for prosecution.
- Deferred Prosecution
 - Created in 2011 by the legislature, this began in June 2012. It is similar to the misdemeanor diversion program. However, only defendants charge with first or second offenses of 1st Degree Possession of a Controlled Substance are eligible. The defendant must make a written request for the Commonwealth Attorney to approve. By statute, it is the preferred alternative for first offenses of these charges.
 - Upon completion, the charges are dismissed and the defendant's records are sealed. Because the defendant never enters a plea, the case remains in the pretrial stage of legal proceedings. The Commonwealth Attorney sets all the conditions and receives all violations. Conditions can include random drug testing, office visits, or counseling. The cases must not extend beyond two years.

- Pretrial Reform
 - Pretrial Services in Kentucky began in 1976 and was stagnant for nearly 30 years. In 2005, MCR was introduced. In 2006, Pretrial Services implemented a computer-based, case management system. Additionally, in 2006, Pretrial Services revamped the risk assessment it was using. In 2009, a study was performed on the instrument, 'PRIM' (Pretrial Release Information Management) and it was revamped into the 12-question appraisal that is now used. Additionally, from 2007 to 2009, Pretrial Services overhauled its organization structure, priorities and value, and training curriculum.
 - Began using the Public Safety Assessment – Court (PSA-Court) in 2013. Lead to decrease in crime by 15% among defendants on pretrial release (from 10% to 8.5%). Additionally the PSA-Court flags defendants who pose an increased risk of violence. These defendants are rearrested at a rate of 17 times that of those not flagged, giving stronger data assessment for judges to use.
- House Bill 463
 - In 2011, the General Assembly passed 463, which overhauled the criminal laws and penal codes for the first time in more than 30 years. HB 463 dictates presumptive, non-financial release for low and moderate risk defendants. The only exception is financial bonds; which are only allowed if the judge documents that the defendant is a flight risk or danger to the community. HB 463 requires that state-funded supervision and intervention programs gradually implement and utilize evidence-based practices. HB 463 requires low risk defendants to be released on recognizance or with an unsecured bond. Moderate risk defendants must be released on recognizance or with an unsecured bond with the court considering additional supervision.
 - HB 463 requires that state-funded supervision and intervention programs of pretrial defendants gradually implement evidence-based practices (EBP), and beginning July 1, 2016, at least 75% of all such programs use EBP.
 - HB 463 requires a defendant who, per the Pretrial risk assessment, is determined to be at a low risk level of failure to appear for court or being re-arrested during their pretrial phase be released on their recognizance (ROR) or with an unsecured bond (USB), unless the judge finds in his or her discretion that the defendant is a flight risk or danger to others.
 - Requires a defendant, who per the Pretrial risk assessment, is a moderate risk level to be released either ROR or USB with the court to consider additional supervision, such as referral to Pretrial Services' Monitored Conditional Release (MCR) program, GPS tracking, etc. unless the judge finds the defendant is a flight risk and/or a danger to others.

HB 463 Success

- HB 463 has led to a 10% decrease in number of defendants arrested. It has led to a 5% increase in release rates. Non-financial release rates have increased from 50% to 66%. Low and medium risk release rates have increased from 76% to 85% and 58% to 67% respectively. Appearance and safety rates have remained consistent, while pretrial jail populations have decreased by over 275 people.

- Since HB 463, recommendations to MCR by a pretrial officer increased by 73% and referrals to MCR by a judge increased by 18%, for a total 37% overall increase in new MCR clients.
- In the year following HB 463's creation of deferred prosecution process, Pretrial Services received 148 Deferred Prosecution cases to supervise in 25 different counties.
- Since HB 463, the overall pretrial release rate has seen a 5% increase, representing nearly 11,000 additionally released defendants compared to pre-HB 463.
- Non-financial pretrial releases increased from 51% to 66%, a total of 15% increase.
- Resources
 - "Pretrial Reform in Kentucky" Pretrial Services: Administrative Office of the Courts Kentucky Court of Justice. January 2013. (<http://www.pretrial.org/infostop/>)
 - "Implementing the Recommendations of the National Symposium on Pretrial Justice: The 2013 Progress Report" Released by the Pretrial Justice Institute. Washington D.C., 2014. (<http://www.pretrial.org/infostop/>)
 - "Implementing the Recommendations of the 2011 National Symposium on Pretrial Justice: A Progress Report" Released by the Pretrial Justice Institute. January 2013. (<http://www.pretrial.org/infostop/>)
 - "Results from the First Six Months of Public Safety Assessment – Court in Kentucky" Released by the Laura and John Arnold Foundation. July 2014. (<http://www.arnoldfoundation.org/sites/default/files/pdf/PSA-Court%20Kentucky%206-Month%20Report.pdf>)
 - "Report on Impact of House Bill 463: Outcomes, Challenges and Recommendations" Released by Pretrial Services. Report prepared by Tara Boh Klute and Mark Heyerly. June 2012. (<http://www.pretrial.org/download/law-policy/Kentucky%20Pre%20Post%20HB%20463%20First%20Year%20Pretrial%20Report.pdf>)

Colorado

- Mesa County
 - As part of the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) EBDM Initiative, they developed new guidelines that put more emphasis on risk of FTA and risk of re-arrest. The put less emphasis on ability to pay financial bond and the specific charge.
 - Avoided an estimated \$1.5 million in pretrial costs in 2012, with a forecasted \$2 million to be saved in 2013. The saved 95,630 jail beds in 2012.
 - Adopted an evidence-based decision making practice. In addition to the CPAT tool. Uses a range of release options including unsupervised release on personal recognizance, supervised release, and special conditions. Used the SMART Praxis and the Pretrial Services Response to Violation Guide (PSRVG) as tools.
- Administered the Colorado Pretrial Assessment Tool (CPAT) and conducted presentations and trainings sessions to all parties, allowing structure and

standardization of CPAT. Created new bail statute that de-emphasizes secured financial release commissions and promotes empirical risk assessment.

- The Colorado Improving Supervised Pretrial Release (CISPR) project is a 12-county initiative to develop research-based policies and practices for criminal justice professionals. The first step was creating and validating the CPAT.
- Colo. Rev. Stat. § 16-4-105 (1) (a) – (l) creates a list of factors the judge must consider when setting bail, however it does not provide any guidance on defining or weighing these factors in assessing risk to public safety or non-appearance in court.
- In early 2012, each of the 12 counties was using a different risk assessment instrument. Ten counties contributed data to the study. The pretrial services programs in these counties are administered under county administration (7), county commissioners (1), or the sheriff’s office (2).
- Data for assessment was collected by:
 - Face-to-face interviews with pretrial services staff and defendant
 - Arresting agencies’ charging documents
 - Criminal history records from national and state databases
 - Jail information systems
 - Pretrial services staffs’ case tracking systems
- The analyses created a tool that includes the following 12 factors and scoring ranges:
 - Having a home or cell phone 0-5 points
 - Owning or renting one’s residence 0-4 points
 - Contributing to residential payments 0-9 points
 - Past or current problems with alcohol 0-4 points
 - Past or current mental health treatment 0-4 points
 - Age at first arrest 0-15 points
 - Past jail sentence 0-4 points
 - Past prison sentence 0-10 points
 - Having active warrants 0-5 points
 - Having other pending cases 0-13 points
 - Currently on supervision 0-5 points
 - History of revoked bond or supervision 0-4 points
 - With the exception of “age at first arrest”, either all the points or none of the points are awarded. The amount of points correlates to the percentage of total risk that that factor contributes to.
- Scores range from low of “0” to high of “82.”

Revised Risk Category	Risk Score	Public Safety Rate	Court Appearance Rate	Overall Combined Success Rate
1	0 – 17	91%	95%	87%
2	18 – 37	80%	85%	71%
3	38 – 50	69%	77%	58%

4	51 – 82	58%	51%	33%
Average	30	78%	82%	68%

- The CPAT is designed to replace all existing and un-validated pretrial assessments currently in use in Colorado. Even counties not contributing data should be able to validly use the CPAT
- **LIMITATION – It does NOT indicate which bond types or bond conditions are most likely to mitigate an individual defendant’s pretrial risk**
- Jefferson County
 - implemented a phone contact program to assess improvements in successful appearances from forming FTAs. When successfully contacted, the court appearance rose from 79% to 88%. With those who were FTA, 50% arrived to court after being notified by phone of their warrant. These were initial numbers. The successful contacts have continued to rise every year. The FTA rate of the targeted population from 23% to 11%, a reduction of 52%, over a 6 month period. It avoided an estimated 425 FTA warrants.
- New bail statute de-emphasizes secured financial release conditions and charged-based bond schedules, and promotes empirical risk assessment
- Resources
 - Mahoney, B. and Smith W. (2005) *Pretrial Release and Detention in Harris County: Assessment and Recommendations*. Denver, CO: Justice Management Institute.
 - “Implementing the Recommendations of the National Symposium on Pretrial Justice: The 2013 Progress Report” Released by the Pretrial Justice Institute. Washington D.C., 2014.
(<http://www.pretrial.org/infostop/>)
 - “Increasing Court Appearance Rates and Other Benefits of Live-Caller Telephone Court Date Reminders: The Jefferson County, Colorado, FTA Pilot Project and Court Date Notification Program” by Timothy Schnacke, Michael R. Jones, and Dorian Wilderment. May, 18, 2011.
(<http://www.pretrial.org/infostop/>)
 - “Jefferson County, Colorado Court Date Notification Program FTA Pilot Project Summary” 11-09-2005 (<http://www.pretrial.org/infostop/>)
 - “Jefferson County, Colorado, Court Date Notification Program: Six Month Program Summary” Jefferson County Criminal Justice Planning 11-15-2006
 - “Mesa County Pretrial Justice County Profile” Released by the Pretrial Justice Institute and the National Association of Counties
 - “The Colorado Pretrial Assessment Tool (CPAT)” A Joint Partnership among Ten Colorado Counties, the Pretrial Justice Institute, and the JFA Institute. Revised Report 10-19-2012

California

- Napa County – After determining more than 80% of jail population were individuals awaiting trial, Napa built a “Community Corrections Service Center”

that serves to provide risk-assessments, supervision, services for those released pending trial, or on probation. Their pretrial detention rate has dropped below 65%.

- Santa Cruz County – Developed a supervision program and reporting rules for those released pretrial. They found that 92% did not re-offend, and 89% made all court appearances. This saved 90 beds per day and was a 25% reduction in daily population leading to a pretrial detention rate of 56%.
- Resources
 - “Public Safety Realignment: California at a Crossroads” reported by the ACLU of California. Written by Allen Hopper, Margaret Dooley-Sammuli, and Kelli Evans. March 2012. (www.aclunc.org/realignment and www.pretrial.org/infostop)

Connecticut

- “Decision Aid” Sites – Waterbury, New Britain, Hartford, New Haven
 - *Decision Aid* was a guide to conditional release recommendations developed in 2004.
 - Developed based on an analysis of best practices among pretrial personnel, review of existing criminogenic needs, and an examination of the use of conditions during pretrial release.
 - Structured on addressing three primary areas that conditions are intended to address: personal needs, compliance needs, safety needs.
 - Assist pretrial personnel in making conditional release recommendations by narrowing down the available options to smaller subset of conditions most appropriate for addressing clients’ needs.
 - Goal is to help pretrial personnel make more informed decisions, while maintaining much of discretion they have to use own best judgments.
 - Produced a significantly higher percentage of non-financial release recommendations. Generally lead to twofold increase in number of clients being recommended for release without financial bond compared to pre-*Decision Aid*.
 - Saw an increased percent of cases involving a conditional release recommendation compared to pre-*Decision Aid*.
 - Additionally, the average number of conditions per client was higher than compared to pre-*Decision Aid*.
 - Lead to significantly fewer cases (a combined 18% less across four counties) being held in pretrial detention compared to pre-*Decision Aid*.
 - Lead to fewer FTAs compared to pre-*Decision Aid* (a combined 5% less across four counties).
 - Resources:
 - “Expanded Validation of a Decision Aid for Pretrial Conditional Release” Jennifer Hedlund, Principal Investigator, April 10, 2007 (www.pretrial.org/infostop)

Delaware

- Requires the court to state in writing its reasons for overriding any risk assessment recommendations for juveniles’ pretrial release or other non-detention alternatives

- S.B. 226 mandates that DOC adopt proven practices for reducing the risk of re-offense. It requires risk needs assessments for supervised and incarcerated populations.
- Resources:
 - “Implementing the Recommendations of the National Symposium on Pretrial Justice: The 2013 Progress Report” Released by the Pretrial Justice Institute. Washington D.C., 2014. (<http://www.pretrial.org/infostop/>)

District of Columbia

- Pretrial Services Agency
 - Perhaps the best-known use of evidence-based risk assessment to reduce reliance on financial release conditions exists in the District of Columbia’s Pretrial Services Agency (PSA).
 - The DC Code provides that a judge may not impose a financial condition as a means of preventative detention.
 - PSA conducts a risk assessment (flight and danger) through the interview with the defendant within 24 hours of arrest that assess points on a 38-factor instrument, assigning a defendant into a category as high risk, medium risk, and low risk.
 - In 1965, only 11% of defendants were released without a money bond, but by 2008, 80% of all defendants were released without a money bond, 15% were held without bail, and 5% were held with financial bail (none on surety bond).
 - Additionally, 88% of released defendants made all court appearances.
 - 88% completed pretrial release without any new arrests.
 - Resources:
 - “2012-2013 Policy Paper Evidence-Based Pretrial Release” by Arthur W. Pepin Conference of State Court Administrators

Maryland

- Maryland Court of Appeals declared in *DeWolfe v. Richmond* that poor people’s constitutional right to representation commences when they appear before a judicial officer and their liberty is first at stake
 - This “attaches to any proceeding that may result in defendant’s incarceration.”
- A survey in Baltimore showed 96% of supervisees were not arrested on new charges, while 94% made all court appearances. The city spend \$2.50/day/person on monitoring the released supervisees versus the \$100/day/person to have them incarcerated while awaiting trial.
- Submitted 6 recommendations to the Governor’s Task on Laws and Policies Relating to the Representation of Indigent Criminal Defendants
 - Completely eliminate the use of secured financial conditions of pretrial release
 - Implement a statewide system that utilizes a standard pretrial screening tool at the initial hearing.
- Resources:
 - “Implementing the Recommendations of the National Symposium on Pretrial Justice: The 2013 Progress Report” Released by the Pretrial

Justice Institute. Washington D.C., 2014.
(<http://www.pretrial.org/infostop/>)

New York

- Queens County
 - New York City Criminal Justice Agency (CJA) introduced an experimental supervised pretrial release program in Queens County.
 - Released specific types of defendants to community supervision, rather than bail setting.
 - Types were limited to select non-violent felony charges
 - Either drug offenses or property offenses
 - 87.4% of participants were successful. Around 90% of all low and medium risk FTAs were successful.
 - When convicted on 10.2% of successful participants were sentenced to imprisonment. 72% of unsuccessful participants were sentenced to imprisonment.
- Resources
 - “CJA’s Queens County Supervised Release Program: Impact on Court Processing and Outcomes” Project Director Freda F. Solomon. June 2013. New York. (www.pretrial.org/infostop/)
 - “Implementing the Recommendations of the National Symposium on Pretrial Justice: The 2013 Progress Report” Released by the Pretrial Justice Institute. Washington D.C., 2014. (<http://www.pretrial.org/infostop/>)

Texas

- Harris County (Houston)
 - Began a “direct filing” system
 - As charges are being accepted and filed, the defendant is transferred to the central jail for intake.
 - At jail, the pretrial screening department interviews the client and collects data, which culminates in a risk classification identifying defendants who are appropriate for release on person recognizance bond.
 - This process continues through the appearance before a magistrate judge.
 - Harris County had an estimate of net savings and revenue for Fiscal Year 2010 of \$4,420,976 in avoided detention costs and pretrial services fees collected after deducting for the costs of pretrial services.
 - Resources
 - “2012-2013 Policy Paper Evidence-Based Pretrial Release” by Arthur W. Pepin Conference of State Court Administrators

West Virginia

- The state Supreme Court of Appeals is now empowered to use a standardized pretrial risk assessment as part of evidence-based pretrial decision-making
 - Resources:
 - “Implementing the Recommendations of the National Symposium on Pretrial Justice: The 2013 Progress Report” Released by the Pretrial Justice Institute. Washington D.C., 2014. (<http://www.pretrial.org/infostop/>)

Wisconsin

- Eau Claire

- Created a diversion program for low-risk offenders, all adult ordinances for possession of THC or paraphernalia.
 - Saw a 17.97% reduction in recidivism for those who participated
 - Non-participants were 140 percent more likely to reoffend during the next 12 months
- Was part of the National Institute of Correction (NIC) Evidence-Based Decision Making Initiative, Eau Claire coupled a citation release effort with a pretrial diversion effort. Law enforcement officers applied a proxy risk assessment to identify low risk persons who can be issued a citation in lieu of custodial arrest and referred directly to the pretrial diversion program for an eligibility determination rather than being given a court date. If they are accepted into the diversion program and successfully complete it, there is no public record of their involvement in the criminal justice system.
- Defeated a bill to reinstate commercial bail bond industry.
 - Also, a Wisconsin Court of Appeals issued a ruling in which it “caution(ed) circuit courts that a mandatory condition or release based solely on the nature of a charged crime without considering a defendant’s individual circumstances constitutes an erroneous exercise of discretion in setting bail conditions.”
 - This is in reference to a WI county imposing substance abuse treatment as a blanket condition to pre-trial release for all OWIs (second offense or higher).
- Resources:
 - “Implementing the Recommendations of the National Symposium on Pretrial Justice: The 2013 Progress Report” Released by the Pretrial Justice Institute. Washington D.C., 2014. (<http://www.pretrial.org/infostop/>)
 - “Implementing the Recommendations of the 2011 National Symposium on Pretrial Justice: A Progress Report” Released by the Pretrial Justice Institute. January 2013. (<http://www.pretrial.org/infostop/>)

General Information

- Muller, J. (2010) *Pretrial Services Program Implementation: A Starter Kit*. Washington, D.C.: Pretrial Justice Institute.
- Pretrial Justice Institute (2012). *Rational and Transparent Bail Decision Making: Moving from a Cash-Based to a Risk-Based Process*, p. 33. Washington, D.C.: Pretrial Justice Institute.
- “Promising Practices in Pretrial Diversion” by National Association of Pretrial Services Agencies (<http://www.pretrial.org/infostop/>)