

## PUBLIC SERVICE AND TRUST COMMISSION

**Committee on Alternatives to Court Appearances** 

Meeting Minutes March 5, 2009

Those in attendance:

Hon. Elliot Solomon, Chair Family Support Magistrate John Colella Hon. Emmet Cosgrove Atty. Joseph Del Ciampo Atty. Joseph Garrison Ms. Marilou Giovannucci Atty. Eric Groody Mr. David Iaccarino Hon. Christine Keller Mr. Ronald Macchio Atty. Adele Patterson Atty. Maureen Platt

## Not Present

Atty. David Belt Hon. Thomas Bishop Hon. David Borden Hon. Patrick Carroll III Ms. Linda Cimino Hon. Patrick Clifford Atty. Susan Quinn Cobb Atty. Lucio DeLuca Atty. Scott Hartley Atty. Nancy Porter Hon. O. James Purnell Mr. Gary Roberge Atty. Norman Roberts II Atty. Jennifer Robinson Mr. Scott Rosengrant Ms. Betsy Rosser Ms. Pamela Sarno Atty. Robin Smith Hon. Hillary Strackbein Atty. Elisa Villa

Hon. Arthur Hiller Dr. Thomas Kirk Mr. Richard Miele Hon. Lynda Munro Mr. O'Donovan Murphy Atty. Mark Ostrowski Atty. Norman Pattis Hon. David Tobin

The Committee on Alternatives to Court Appearances met on March 5, 2009 at 2 pm at 225 Spring Street, Wethersfield in the 4<sup>th</sup> floor conference room 4B.

The meeting was called to order by Judge Solomon at 2:07 pm. He made preliminary remarks about the committee's progress and discussed the April 30<sup>th</sup> Report deadline. The committee unanimously approved the minutes of the January 22, 2009 meeting.

The committee discussed the progress of each subcommittee and the tentative recommendations from the Purposes subcommittee. Judge Strackbein began the discussion of the recommendations beginning with criminal matters. It was discussed that video conferencing (VC) for arraignments should be tabled and practical research should be conducted with further site visits to other jurisdictions that hold VC arraignments. Also, VC for both Connecticut Valley Hospital (CVH) competency hearings and sentence reviews require legal research.

There were disagreements amongst committee members as to whether the recommendations from the Purposes subcommittee regarding callbacks by VC, sentence review by VC, and post arraignment proceedings where the defendant will not be seen by a judge, be by consent of all parties or at the discretion of the judge. There were various opinions on this matter and Judge Solomon wants the Purposes subcommittee to meet to resolve these issues. He also indicated that regardless of these unresolved matters, the other subcommittees have enough information to complete their own recommendations.

The committee discussed changes to the proposed recommendations for criminal matters. These include VC arraignment for transfers from Part B to Part A after the defendant signs a waiver in Part B. Also for post arraignments where a defendant will not be seen by a judge, communication between counsel and inmate would be available by VC.

In the areas of Juvenile, Family, and Civil there was committee support but none of the recommendations were voted on. In Juvenile matters the committee discussed the prioritization of uses for teleconferencing (TC). Marilou Giovannucci will make the necessary changes and submit them to the chair. In addition, to implement any of these recommendations will require a rules change. In Family matters the committee discussed adding VC to be used for in-state self-represented inmates at the discretion of the judge. These recommendations will require a rules change. In Civil matters the committee discussed expanding the use of VC from self-represented inmate name change to self-represented inmate proceedings. The committee also discussed a provision for inmates that bring civil suits against the warden to be conducted by VC.

David laccarino reported out on the progress of the Costs and Benefits Subcommittee. He indicated that the last meeting was done by VC and the reaction was overall positive. There were some issues with the audio quality at one location, but that can be addressed. He also spoke about the overall number and cost of inmate transports by Judicial. A request was made to investigate the number and cost of detention transports in juvenile. Mr. laccarino also discussed the habeas flowchart. One track outlines the steps to transport inmates to and from court and another track outlines the steps if VC is used. Also discussed was the use of VC for Court Support Services Division (CSSD) in pre-sentence investigations, level service inventories and jail re-interviews.

Scott Rosengrant reported out on the progress of the Technology Subcommittee. He indicated there was a practical session for subcommittee member where they could familiarize themselves with the various VC units available within the branch. The subcommittee members had a positive reaction to the quality of the VC and it was concluded that the next Full Committee meeting should be given the same demonstration. The subcommittee also worked on refining their scope document. They also identified all necessary infrastructure upgrades that would be needed for VC and TC. Judge Solomon indicated the need to clearly define a quality standard for different

purposes, a time frame of immediate use, and a broad scale of costs for technology for all courts or a select number of courts.

Judge Cosgrove reported out on the progress of the Statutes and Rules Subcommittee. He indicated that they have researched and identified all the constitutional issues for VC and needed the Purposes recommendations to proceed further.

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, April 9<sup>th</sup> at 1pm at 99 East River Drive, East Hartford. The meeting adjourned at 4:32 pm.