



PUBLIC SERVICE AND TRUST COMMISSION

Committee on Alternatives to Court Appearances

Cost/Benefit Assessment Subcommittee

Meeting Minutes
March 19, 2009

Those in attendance:

Mr. David Iaccarino, Chair
Ms. Linda Cimino
Chief Probation Officer Natalie Latulippe
Mr. O'Donovan Murphy

Atty. Jennifer Robinson
Ms. Pamela Sarno
Hon. Elliot Solomon

Not Present:

Mr. Richard Miele
Mr. Brian Coco

The Cost/Benefit Assessment Subcommittee on Alternatives to Court Appearances met on March 19, 2009 at 9:30 am at 90 Washington Street, Hartford, in the 4th floor conference room.

The meeting was called to order by David Iaccarino at 9:54 am. The minutes for the February 10th meeting were unanimously approved.

The subcommittee discussed three different habeas flow diagrams each from the perspective of the Clerk, Judicial Marshal, and Department of Correction (DOC). Each diagram shows two different paths. One path shows the steps taken to process habeas traditionally and the other path shows the steps if video conferencing (VC) was utilized.

For the Clerk diagram, the use of VC appears to have a minimal impact on the number of tasks involved than if VC was not used.

The Judicial Marshal diagram clearly shows that the use of VC would greatly reduce the number of steps, with the majority of those steps being in the transportation and security checks of the inmates. Don Murphy also indicated that this diagram represented general steps to the process and does not take into account off-shoots from each step that cannot all be captured. The diagram does not account for special transports from Connecticut Valley Hospital (CVH), segregated inmates, youthful offenders, protective custody and female inmates. In addition, Don Murphy indicated that the steps taken to prepare inmates for transport on all matters including habeas start the night before in which they categorize and sort inmates.

The DOC habeas flowchart is similar to that of the Judicial Marshals in that the use of VC greatly reduces the number of steps to transport inmates on habeas matters. The subcommittee discussed the need to have all three flow charts be consistent with each other in the terms used describing similar processes.

The subcommittee discussed that the flow chart diagrams will not be published to subcommittee's website as an addendum to the minutes due to security concerns.

Via telephone, Rich Miele provided subcommittee members the staffing cost for the transports of inmates out of two correctional facilities. Northern Correctional facility averages 100 round trips a month at \$400 a round trip. Garner Correctional Facility averages 15 round trips a month at \$400 a round trip. It is important to note that these are staff costs only, and does not include administrative costs.

Don Murphy discussed the inmate-to-officer ratio for Judicial Marshal and DOC transports. He describes that Judicial has 3 different van sizes that can accommodate 10, 12, or 22 inmates based on total weight. The number of Marshals does not vary by inmate level. When Judicial transports from 2 to 22 inmates, there will be two Judicial Marshals. DOC transports by levels and would vary the number of officers depending on the risk level.

The subcommittee discussed juvenile transports. David Iaccarino contacted Karl Alston from Court Support Services Division (CSSD) and he indicated that they transport 400 individuals a month in 300 trips. The transports are not exclusive to traveling to court but to any facility. Detention utilizes car transports rather than multi-passenger vans like DOC and Marshals.

The subcommittee discussed the recommendations from the Purposes Subcommittee. Using the cost breakdown of VC equipment from the Technology Subcommittee's February 11th meeting minutes the subcommittee began to categorize the recommendations.

The four categories are as follows:

1. VC Courtroom setup (high-end unit) costing \$18,000 to \$25,000.
2. Sony PCS Unit (mid-range) costing \$5500
3. Laptop with integrated webcam costing \$1500
4. Portable Polycom VC Unit V700 costing \$3500 (including case)

The subcommittee also discussed the cost of a "bridge" for \$12,000 which is an electronic device that would provide the means to connect multiple VC users at the same time.

For the recommendations for *Criminal matters* the subcommittee categorized them as follows:

- Callbacks – #3
- 2nd Stage extradition – #1
- Sentence Review – #1, 2, or 4
- Motions that do not require testimony – #1
- Post arraignments where the defendant will not be seen by a judge – #3

For the recommendations for *CSSD* the subcommittee categorized them as follows: #3's for pre-sentence interviews, jail re-interviews and level service inventory interviews.

For the recommendations for *Juvenile, Family* and *Civil* matters the subcommittee categorized them as follows: #2 or #4 for court proceedings and a #3 if not a court proceeding.

The subcommittee discussed that for each VC recommendation there would be an analysis regarding the number of individuals in a scenario, the type of facility needed, and the cost of the equipment.

The meeting adjourned at 12:34 p.m. The subcommittee did not schedule a future meeting.