



## MINUTES

### NORTH CAROLINA SENTENCING AND POLICY ADVISORY COMMISSION MEETING March 13, 2026

The North Carolina Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission met on Friday, March 13, 2026, at the North Carolina Judicial Center in Raleigh, North Carolina.

**Members Present:** Chairman Charlie Brown, Dr. Heidi Bonner, Lindsey Granados, Judge R. Greg Horne, Joe Houchin, Deputy Secretary William Lassiter, Sherri Lawrence, Honorable Jim Mixson, Luther Moore, Haley Phillips, Caitlin Poe, Honorable Jimmie Silver, Calvin Suber, Nicole Sullivan, Judge Scott Ussery, Honorable Michael Waters, Patrick Weede, Chief A.Z. Williams, and Judge Valerie Zachary.

**Guests:** Marie Evitt (NCSA), Cortney Goodman (NCSA), Meagan Pittman (AOC RPP), Amber Barwick (NCCDA), and Emily Mehta (AOC RPP)

**Staff:** Michelle Hall, Ginny Hevener, Tamara Flinchum, John King, Julio Cazares, Mel Lugo, Sierra Satterfield, Madison Sholar, Shelley Kirk, and Jack Stein (Intern).

## INTRODUCTIONS AND RECOGNITION OF NEW COMMISSIONER

Chairman Brown called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. and asked members and guests to introduce themselves. He introduced the newest Commissioner, Nicole Sullivan, appointed by the Governor. Chairman Brown next introduced SPAC's newest staff member, Madison Sholar, who joined the Policy team earlier in the month. Lastly, he reintroduced SPAC's Intern, Jack Smith, to the full Commission; Jack was previously introduced to the Drug Offense Classification Subcommittee in January.

Chairman Brown presented the minutes from the December 12, 2025, meeting and called for a motion. Luther Moore moved to adopt the minutes as written; Joe Houchin seconded the motion and it carried.

Chairman Brown reminded Commissioners of the remaining 2026 Sentencing Commission meeting dates of June 5, September 11, and December 11, and the Sentencing Practices Subcommittee meeting on May 15. He then reviewed the agenda.

## FY 2026–FY 2030 STATEWIDE MISDEMEANANT CONFINEMENT PROGRAM CAPACITY PROJECTION

Chairman Brown recognized Michelle Hall, staff, to present the FY 2026 – FY 2030 Statewide Misdemeanant Confinement Program (SMCP) Capacity Projections (see Handout and Presentation). Ms. Hall thanked the North Carolina Sheriffs' Association (NCSA) and staff, the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) Jails and Detention Unit, and the architectural firms that design jails for their

contributions to the capacity projections. She provided a brief history of the SMCP and an overview of the types of inmates that are housed in jails. She explained the purpose of the projection is to assess future capacity and to ensure that adequate bed space is available to house SMCP inmates. She reviewed the factors that are considered in the projection and noted that county participation in the SMCP is voluntary; receiving counties offer bedspace, while other counties only send inmates.

Ms. Hall reviewed the average daily population and capacity trends. For jails statewide, capacity as reported by DHHS has remained sufficient to meet average population demands. When examining SMCP capacity population trends, she noted that there was relative stability in SMCP capacity in the past fiscal year with an average monthly decrease of less than 1%. However, within the first half of the fiscal year, there was a significant decrease from 903 beds in July to 840 beds in December of 2025.

Ms. Hall discussed the SMCP capacity when compared to population as a percentage of available capacity as reported on June 30<sup>th</sup> for the past five years. She explained that, between 2021 and 2025, SMCP capacity and population have grown closer together, with the available capacity dipping to 20% in 2023 before increasing to 25% by 2025.

Ms. Hall continued by reviewing the key assumptions informing the projections and considerations for SMCP capacity projection for the next five years (see Handout). She noted that SMCP capacity projections assume there will be no change in local practices, particularly practices related to pre-trial release. Historically, staff have tracked local efforts related to pre-trial release that have reduced the pre-trial population. However, the recent passage of Iryna's Law (S.L. 2025-93) will limit the number of pre-trial releases. Staff will monitor how this may change those practices and limit SMCP bed availability. Another related pressure on local jails is the number of inmates waiting to be transferred to the state prison system, which reached 611 inmates at the end of December 2025. She noted backlogs have exceeded up to 800 inmates during portions of 2025.

Judge Scott Ussery asked if staff had seen the effects of Iryna's Law on the jail population and the SMCP. Ms. Hall stated staff has not yet examined the reported numbers because the law is in the early stages of implementation. Marie Evitt, Government Counsel for NCSA, informed the Commission that one portion of the law has gone into effect but another portion has not (i.e., involuntary commitment changes), and that NCSA has not heard from any sheriffs yet of changes to the SMCP population. She noted NCSA is monitoring the program and anticipated there would be some impact when the other portion goes into effect. Judge Ussery replied that there should be a noticeable impact already since magistrates are unable to provide pre-trial release for a greater number of inmates and district courts are also restricted during first appearances. Ms. Hall replied that the data staff receive from NCSA is specifically related to bed allocations for the SMCP, not daily jail populations. Data provided to staff and used in the SMCP capacity projections are received on an annual basis so the downstream impact of Iryna's law may not be immediately observable.

Mike Waters stated that magistrates are excluded from setting bonds for more offenders as a result of Iryna's Law and the State and victims are more involved in the bond hearing in district court as a result of Marsy's Law also and is hearing that jail population is increasing. Chairman Brown asked Ms. Evitt whether that was the case on a statewide basis. Ms. Evitt responded that NCSA would hear from their sheriffs if they were feeling pressure on a daily basis. She noted that some sheriffs have reported that they are reviewing the number of inmates they have the option to house (e.g., federal inmates). In addition, NCSA advocated for certain portions of Iryna's Law (e.g., mental health changes, which have not taken effect yet) and informed their members there would be certain changes that would require additional time to

work through. Many of them are trying to make it work. Chairman Brown asked Ms. Evitt how much the federal government pays sheriffs to house federal inmates and how that compares to the SMCP rate. Ms. Evitt replied that the SMCP rate was set in 2012 at \$40 a day. She explained that the NCSA is allowed to raise this rate but has not done so as they would prefer to have some form of legislative approval. Mr. Waters stated that the federal reimbursement rate is currently \$160 a day and Deputy Secretary Billy Lassiter noted the juvenile reimbursement rate is currently \$300 a day. Chairman Brown stated that the SMCP will likely face future capacity issues due to the optional populations and the inmates that sheriffs will be required to house due to Iryna's Law, even as some counties are already in the process of expanding their jails.

Judge Ussery questioned the assumption that local practices would not change based on the fact that local practices were changing in response to Iryna's Law. Ms. Hall replied that the first year of the SMCP Projection is FY 2026 and portions of Iryna's Law took effect in the middle of that year. Staff would continue to monitor the impact and adjust the projections in the coming years when they have empirical data to inform new assumptions.

Patrick Weede asked if other members had encountered situations where offenders charged with homicide are transferred a significant distance from the county they were originally charged in. Mr. Waters replied that he knew of one county where offenders were transferred from a facility that was facing potential administrative takeover from DHHS due to the facility's poor conditions. The county was forced to move some offenders out while making repairs.

Chairman Brown asked Mr. Weede if he knew of any other cases where offenders were moved significant distances across the state. Mr. Weede replied that he had another case where a client was moved to another part of the state while being held pretrial. Mr. Weede wondered if these transfers occur based on the needs of the SMCP. Ms. Evitt explained that when sheriffs have jail issues arise (e.g., structural issues), they may have to transfer inmates and NCSA helps facilitate the process. These transfers may send offenders to one county or to multiple counties depending on the number of inmates involved. She added that the SMCP Projection looks at capacity in the long term and these issues are usually shorter term. Sheriffs should be able to answer how long it will take before the inmate can be brought back.

Mr. Weede asked if offenders who are charged with more serious charges are given priority to stay in their original county due to time and costs involved in their cases. Ms. Evitt replied that she did not know what conversations were taking place but that transfer practices may be affected by what area of the jail is having the issue. It is something that NCSA could speak with sheriffs about to provide future clarification.

Dr. Heidi Bonner asked if staff had any information on the effect of staffing shortages on SMCP capacity. Ms. Hall replied that staff had anecdotal information but not empirical data because they are only receiving information about a portion of bed allocation within a jail. Staff receives information on bed allocations via a standardized SMCP allocation form, staff would not know if there was an issue unless it was noted on the allocation form by the jail itself. Ms. Hall further explained that jails may not include this information in their allocation form as changes often take place verbally with the NCSA. She added that staffing has been a major issue over the last few years.

Ms. Hall reviewed the key assumptions informing the projection, including the sending and receiving status of counties, new jail construction, and the growth rates. Ms. Hall presented the five-year projection and explained that there is relative stability projected overall between FY 2026 and FY 2030, with an overall decrease of 3%. She added that there has been a decrease in capacity over the last several years.

Judge Valerie Zachary asked if the projection considers the state's growing population or the age of the population. Ms. Hall replied that because it is not a population-based projection but a projection of the potential beds that may be available in the future, those factors are not as relevant. Chairman Brown asked if elections and other local factors are considered. Ms. Hall replied that individual and local efforts to address pretrial release issues are considered; however, other issues are not part of the considerations.

Ms. Hall concluded by discussing considerations from the SMCP capacity projection. She highlighted that participation is voluntary and that creates some uncertainty for future planning. As of January 2026, 48 counties are receiving counties, 27 counties are sending only counties, and 25 counties are designated as receiving counties but are currently not providing any beds to the program. That may be some indication of external factors limiting their ability to receive inmates. Lastly, she noted that SMCP capacity has consistently exceeded the population. NCSA has been able to find additional beds when needed but the projection provides an indication of the direction the capacity is heading.

## SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATES

Chairman Brown recognized Ms. Hall to provide updates on the work of the Drug Offense Classification Subcommittee and Sentencing Practices Subcommittee (*see Presentation*).

### *Drug Offense Classification Subcommittee*

Ms. Hall began by reviewing the principles of Structured Sentencing and explaining that the two subcommittees were focused on the principle of consistency in sentencing. Turning to the Drug Offense Classification Subcommittee, Ms. Hall reviewed the issue that led to the creation of the Subcommittee and the decisions the Subcommittee made at its first meeting to direct the study.

At the January 2026 meeting, the Subcommittee examined other states' practices for classifying drug offenses, the federal drug offense system, and how drugs are scheduled and currently structured, in North Carolina. Regarding classification methods in other states, Ms. Hall explained that the Subcommittee members observed that using the elements of the offenses is one way to get at the potential harm, looking at sentencing data to classify offenses is not possible, and comparing new offenses to existing offenses is hard when a new drug is singled out and there is no precedent to follow. Mr. Houchin stated that, after examining the other jurisdictions, he found that North Carolina's system is unique in that once an offense is classified, its sentencing options are set. Therefore, the legislative analysis and recommendations provided through the Legislative Review are an important part of establishing sentencing outcomes throughout the state.

Ms. Hall summarized the Subcommittee's examination of the federal sentencing guidelines, explaining that the federal approach would not be a feasible model to adopt because the process requires more resources than North Carolina has available; adding and subtracting factors to estimate the final level is less predictable, and the system in North Carolina is more streamlined, easier to explain and apply, which leads to more consistency.

Mr. Waters stated that having a probation officer complete a presentence investigation in every case, like in the federal system, would be resource intensive. Mr. Weede explained that the federal system has a lower volume of cases and focuses on the defendant at the pretrial phase so it can do that. Mr. Waters added that the probation officer in the federal system is an agent of the court whereas in North Carolina, the prosecutor has the burden of putting forth the prior record and sentencing factors.

Ms. Hall summarized the presentation on how North Carolina and the federal government schedule drugs. She explained that the Subcommittee members found scheduling to be broad but they could not think of a better approach (*see* Presentation). They agreed that the schedules should be instructive but not determinative for classifying offenses because they do not address all of the harms involved.

Mr. Waters stated that, given the recent discussions on marijuana within the state and the potential for legalization at a state level, there may also be a need to address the different kinds of marijuana and marijuana-derived products that a schedule-based system may be unable to account for fully. Chairman Brown agreed and pointed out that the presenter referred to changes that occur when new developments are made in medical and therapeutic uses for certain scheduled substances. They may fall into multiple schedules.

Judge Zachary asked if marijuana offenses can be separated and categorized based on the potency of the product. Chairman Brown replied that it is possible, but the usefulness may be limited if marijuana is found in every schedule.

Mr. Houchin stated that the schedules are broad but seem to be an attempt to schedule substances according to perceived harm. If offense classification criteria are meant to include some harm-based analysis, schedules would be a way of looking at those issues. Chairman Brown reiterated that the Subcommittee was concerned about the potential for certain drugs to be present in every schedule which would affect the consistency of future offense classifications.

Ms. Hall reviewed factors that were currently used to classify drug offenses: conduct, substance, quantity, and special circumstances like certain victims and locations. She presented four charts that showed the different combinations of factors that were used to classify the different types of drug offenses.

Ms. Hall concluded by explaining the next steps. Subcommittee members instructed staff to explore grid-based criteria options for them to consider and provide feedback. This iterative process would allow them to decide which options would work with the current structure and classification of drug offenses.

#### *Sentencing Practices Subcommittee*

Ms. Hall next presented an update on the Sentencing Practices Subcommittee (*see* Presentation). Ms. Hall began by reviewing the Sentencing Practices study, which addressed whether offenders with similar offenses were receiving similar punishments. The Commission established the Subcommittee to examine the study's findings more closely and make recommendations for changes if necessary. She reviewed the areas the Subcommittee had examined so far and their findings.

Ms. Hall stated that the next area for study is criminal history and its effect on sentencing. To address these issues, staff have been working with the Government Data Analytics Center (GDAC) since May 2025 to obtain criminal history data for every offender in the Study's sample. Ms. Hall explained that staff will use the GDAC data to match an offender's criminal history with current conviction data to determine the composition of each offender's offense history.

Ms. Hall concluded by informing the Commission that, as of the week of March 13, staff have developed a memorandum of agreement (MOA) with GDAC that is under final review. Once the MOA is signed by both parties and staff receives the data, they will be able to determine whether it will be feasible for the Subcommittee to meet in May.

## JUSTICE REINVESTMENT IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION: PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

Chairman Brown recognized Sierra Satterfield, staff, to present the preliminary findings from the 2026 Justice Reinvestment Implementation Evaluation Report (*see Presentation*). Ms. Satterfield commented that the final report is due April 15<sup>th</sup> and Commissioners will receive an electronic copy and a hard copy at the June meeting. She reminded Commissioners that the Justice Reinvestment Act (JRA) took effect in 2011 and its purpose was to reduce corrections spending by shifting resources away from prisons and reinvesting in community punishments. She reviewed the phases of evaluating the JRA and the major areas of the criminal justice system that were changed or created by the JRA (*see Presentation*).

Ms. Satterfield noted that in calendar years 2023 and 2024, habitual felon prison admissions were evenly or nearly evenly, split between Class C and E, but in calendar year 2025, most prison admissions were for Class E. She noted that habitual felons continue to account for one of the largest proportions of the prison population, according to the Department of Adult Correction's broad categorization of offenses. She noted there were 42 entries to prison for habitual breaking and entering and 129 advanced supervised release (ASR) sentences in CY 2025. Ms. Satterfield next reviewed supervision level. Chairman Brown asked if supervision level can change during an offender's supervision period, to which Ginny Hevener, staff, responded that they can change with reassessments. Ms. Satterfield then reviewed the number of Confinement in Response to Violation (CRV) dispositions and quick dips ordered. Haley Phillips asked if DWI offenders are eligible to serve their sentence in a CRV centers, which Ms. Satterfield responded, they are not. A discussion ensued about operational CRV centers and how most offenders serve their CRV in prison and not a CRV center.

Ms. Satterfield next reviewed outcome measures. Treatment for Effective Community Supervision entries had decreased from CY 2024, but the completion rate increased. She stated 43% of CRV dispositions in CY 2024 resulted in a subsequent violation and that 81% of the quick dips imposed in CY 2024 resulted in a subsequent violation.

Changes to incarceration and reentry under the JRA were reviewed, including the fact that for the first time, most SMCP entries were for DWI instead of Structured Sentencing misdemeanors. Under the JRA, all felony inmates who receive an active sentence must be released onto post-release supervision (PRS). The PRS population has been increasing since CY 2021 but is not back to pre-pandemic levels. Ms. Satterfield stated the PRS population is important to monitor because of its possible impact on the prison population.

Ms. Satterfield concluded with trend information. Overall, the community supervision population declined 21% from December 2011 to December 2025, with much attributable to the decline in the misdemeanor population. PRS revocations only represented 2% of prison entries in FY 2012 (pre-JRA) compared to PRS revocation representing almost a quarter of entries in FY 2025. Lindsey Granados asked if revocation rates could be explored further to determine how many revocations are related to absconding. Ginny Hevener, staff, responded that revocation is explored further in the prison projections. Ms. Satterfield concluded that while it is likely that North Carolina has already realized the major savings and reduced prison population as a result of the JRA changes, the population and its drivers, including any additional impact from the JRA, will continue to be monitored through this report.

## ADULT RECIDIVISM PREVIEW

Chairman Brown recognized Tamara Flinchum, staff, to present preliminary findings from the 2026 Adult Recidivism Study (see Presentation). Ms. Flinchum first shared some key definitions for the study, including the outcome measures of interest (fingerprinted arrests) and the time periods examined. She noted the breakdown of the sample, which included probationers who exited supervision (66%) and prisoners who exited prison (34%) in FY 2023. Next, she shared one of the findings so far from the study: continued declines in the sample size (-8%), following steep declines from the previous sample (-18%), is primarily attributable to the COVID-19 pandemic. She then provided information on the personal characteristics of the sample.

Ms. Flinchum reviewed the recidivist arrest rates for the FY 2023 sample. Recidivist arrest rates remained the same for the current sample compared to the pandemic sample. Recidivism rates slightly increased for probationers but continued to decline for prisoners. Staff had anticipated that the recidivism rates would return to pre-pandemic rates, similar to the post-pandemic sample in the Commission's 2025 Juvenile Recidivism Study. She solicited input from Commissioners to understand the puzzling recidivist arrest findings.

Ms. Sullivan mentioned that Justice Reinvestment was never truly realized with the closures of several CRV Centers as an example but continued that CRV Centers should be the model for minimum custody offenders. Ms. Grandos said that additional resources may be available now through the private/public partnerships with more reentry services. Ms. Sullivan added that the reentry programs had momentum, but that conversations have slowed. Ms. Granados mentioned that the 2021 legislation of the felony expunction expansion may have helped offenders obtain employment and better jobs, implying a reduction in offenders' recidivism. Mr. Waters countered that those reentry services are not necessarily available in rural areas. Judge Ussery offered that the increase in expunctions is a reasonable and logical explanation and reported that he is signing more expungement forms. He also mentioned that relaxed arrest components during the pandemic may be contributing to the decrease in recidivism. Judge Greg Horne reported that he is also seeing more expunctions and suggested that there are more employment opportunities for offenders post-pandemic. Dr. Bonner suggested that the recidivism rates may rebound with the FY 2025 sample. Chairman Brown commented that the certificates of relief for fines and fees may reduce recidivism rates with offenders receiving a valid driver license and relief from court fees. Ms. Granados countered that those certificates may not be as widely done by private attorneys due to limited funding. Ms. Flinchum shared that recidivist incarceration rates have returned to post-pandemic rates which may contribute to the decrease in recidivist arrests because of fewer offenders available to recidivate. Discussion ensued about more legal aid is needed with the slowing down of trials and case processing primarily due to a lack of attorneys.

Ms. Flinchum thanked the Commissioners for their contributions and continued with the presentation by summarizing the profile and criminal justice findings of the FY 2023 sample as follows:

- **Recidivism:** Prisoners fare worse (higher recidivism rates) compared to probationers for all three outcome measures.
- **Timing of Recidivism:** Most (62%) offenders recidivate within 12 months following release from prison or probation implying the timing of recidivism is key to targeting interventions.
- **Employment:** Probationers had lower employment rates during and following release compared to two years prior to their criminal justice contact. Prisoners had lower employment rates prior to prison

entry. Employment rates two years after release were similar for both groups, but lower than the state's employment rate.

- **Felony Punishment Chart:** For the internal grid cells, most offenders were in the cells with a less serious offense class and with a lower Prior Record Level (PRL), while offenders with higher PRLs had higher recidivism rates. There were no recidivism patterns by offense class; however, recidivism rates increased as PRL increased.

Ms. Flinchum concluded her presentation by sharing anticipated work left to complete on the report before its submission to the Legislature on April 15.

## IMPACT OF CHANGES TO JUVENILE JURISDICTION ON STATEWIDE JUVENILE DEFENSE REPRESENTATION

Chairman Brown recognized Eric Zogry, the State Juvenile Defender, to provide an update on the impact of changes to juvenile jurisdiction on statewide juvenile defense representation (*see Presentation*). Mr. Zogry began by explaining where the Office of the Juvenile Defender (Office) is located in terms of the Indigent Defense Services organizational structure and the Office's mission. He stated that the Office provides consultations, training, and resources for juvenile defenders as well as advocacy and policy guidance to the state. Mr. Zogry highlighted the creation of the Juvenile Delinquency Law Specialization with the North Carolina State Bar.

Mr. Zogry stated that juveniles are conclusively presumed to be indigent; therefore, each juvenile is automatically appointed an attorney. He explained juvenile defenders can be public defenders, privately assigned counsel, managed assigned counsel, members of a law clinic, or a combination of each. Mr. Zogry displayed a map showing the different types of juvenile representation across the state. Judge Zachary noted Yadkin had managed assigned counsel while the rest of the district did not. Mr. Zogry explained Yadkin was the only county in the district where private attorneys expressed interest in managed assigned counsel contracts. Mr. Waters added that the Office does a good job of reaching out to attorneys whose practice area may not be criminal law to recruit them to juvenile defense. Mr. Zogry noted it comes down to finding people who believe in the work and enjoy working with youth. Members discussed attorneys prioritizing juvenile work over their other obligations.

Regarding juvenile defense statewide, Mr. Zogry reported public defenders provide juvenile defense in 59 counties (22 of 27 public defenders offices provide some juvenile defense service), 50 managed assigned counsel contractors provide juvenile defense in 15 counties, and, according to recent data, 469 privately assigned attorneys provided juvenile defense in FY 2023.

Turning to the impact of the legislation to raise the age of juvenile jurisdiction, Mr. Zogry noted that prior to the legislation, adult criminal court had original jurisdiction over any person charged who was 16 years old or older, while juvenile delinquency court had original jurisdiction over any person between the ages of 6 to 15 years old. Any person charged with a felony between the ages of 13 to 15 years old could be transferred to adult criminal court after a probable cause and transfer hearing. Mr. Zogry explained that under the Raise the Age (RtA) legislation, juvenile delinquency court obtained original jurisdiction for most people under 18 years old and the minimum age was raised to 10 years old. Additionally, new procedures in the RtA legislation, such as indictment, the District Attorney's discretion not to transfer, remand, and removal, allow for more flexibility in handling juvenile cases.

Mr. Zogry stated that RtA legislation produced additional changes in the juvenile code. He highlighted some of the recent changes, including the timing of secured custody and probable cause hearings, “caretaker” being added as a responsible person for the purposes of custody and interrogation, a new capacity to proceed process, and probation and PRS being extended for the most serious offenses. These changes provide more flexibility for the system. The members discussed the purpose of extending the period of PRS and the impact on juveniles who turn 18. Mr. Zogry highlighted new challenges like determining where a juvenile is being held, lack of resources for older youth, continuity of counsel, and legal deserts.

Next, he highlighted the creation of the Juvenile First Degree Murder Roster as one of the Office’s key responses to the RtA legislation. He stated the importance of ensuring quality of representation and continuity of council to 13–17-year-olds charged with first degree murder and facing life without parole. The Roster is now being piloted in 27 counties. While public defenders were given the option to opt out of the system, the Office still helps them find attorneys if needed. Through an IOLTA grant, the Office was also able to create a mentorship program with attorneys who want to represent juveniles charged with first degree murder but have minimal jury trial experience and attorneys who have jury trial experience. The Office is also working with the Center for Death Penalty litigation to provide representation to those juveniles.

## INSTRUCTIONS TO STAFF AND ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Brown recognized Ms. Flinchum again to update the Commission on Quinlan, her 12<sup>th</sup> Guiding Eyes for the Blind (GEB) puppy. Ms. Flinchum reported that Quinlan graduated from GEB in January and now lives with his new owner Sophia in New York City, New York.

Chairman Brown thanked the Commissioners and guests for attending and reminded them of the 2026 meeting dates: June 5, September 11, and December 11, for the Sentencing Commission, and May 15 for the Sentencing Practices Subcommittee. Chairman Brown adjourned the meeting at 2:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Shelley Kirk  
Administrative Secretary