



MINUTES
NORTH CAROLINA SENTENCING AND POLICY ADVISORY COMMISSION MEETING
June 6, 2025

The North Carolina Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission met on Friday, June 6, 2025, at the North Carolina Judicial Center in Raleigh, North Carolina.

Members Present: Chairman Charlie Brown, Natalia Botella, Lindsey Granados, Judge Greg Horne, Joe Houchin, Honorable Tracey Johnson, Honorable Jim Mixson, Judge Fred Morrison, Judge Scott Ussery, Honorable Michael Waters, Elizabeth Watson, Patrick Weede, and Chief A.Z. Williams.

Guests: Emily Mehta (AOC RPP), Meagan Pittman (AOC RPP), Amber Barwick (NCCDA), Kim Quintus (DPS JJDPD), William Crozier (DPS DJJDP), Ethan Gardner (DPS DJJDP), Cortney Goodwin (NCSA), Marie Evitt (NCSA), and Beth Hopkins Thomas (NCPLS).

Staff: Michelle Hall, John Madler, Ginny Hevener, Tamara Flinchum, John King, Meghan Boyd Ward, Julio Cazares, Sierra Satterfield, Dylan Saunders, and Shelley Kirk.

INTRODUCTIONS

Chairman Brown called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. and then asked members and guests to introduce themselves. He presented the minutes from the March 7, 2025, meeting and called for a motion. Tracey Johnson moved to adopt the minutes as written; Patrick Weede seconded the motion and it carried.

Chairman Brown informed Commissioners of the remaining 2025 meeting dates: September 12 and December 12. He then reviewed the agenda.

SESSION UPDATE AND LEGISLATIVE REVIEW

Chairman Brown began by explaining that the Legislative Review Subcommittee met on April 14 and reviewed bills that had been introduced or amended since the March 7 Sentencing Commission meeting. He presented the Legislative Review Report #2 which contained the findings from that meeting and called for a motion. Jim Mixson moved to adopt the findings in the Legislative Review Report #2; Michael Waters seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Chairman Brown recognized John Madler, staff, to provide an update on the 2025 Session and to explain the legislative review. Beginning with the Legislative Review, Mr. Madler informed the Commissioners that the bill filing deadlines and Crossover Day had passed so they would be reviewing bills that were still eligible for consideration and that had been amended. He reviewed the duty the General Assembly assigned to the Sentencing Commission to review proposed legislation that either created a new offense,

reclassified an existing offense, or changed a punishment (*see Handout*). He then reviewed the Offense Classification Criteria that the Commission used to perform this duty, and the policies the Commission established for guidance.

Meghan Boyd Ward, staff, began the review by presenting bills and provisions that were identical (or substantially similar) to bills the Commission reviewed in this or previous sessions (*see Handout*). Lindsay Granados moved to adopt the previous findings. Mr. Mixson seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Ms. Boyd Ward then presented bills introduced in the House of Representatives for review (*see Handout*). She omitted the provisions that were identical (or substantially similar) to provisions the Commission reviewed in this or previous sessions.

HB 251 – Disaster Response Funding/Nondiscrimination [Ed. 4]

(G.S. 14-288.6(b)(1)) Joe Houchin moved to find the proposed Class F felony consistent with the Offense Classification Criteria. Ms. Granados seconded the motion and the motion carried.

HB 535 – Title Fraud Prevention Act [Ed. 2]

(G.S. 14-122(b)) Judge Greg Horne moved to find the proposed Class H felony consistent with the Offense Classification Criteria. Ms. Granados seconded the motion and the motion carried.

(G.S. 14-209) Mr. Mixson moved to find the proposed Class F felony consistent with the Offense Classification Criteria. Judge Scott Ussery seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Julio Cazares, staff, presented bills introduced in the Senate for review (*see Handout*). He omitted the provisions that were identical (or substantially similar) to provisions the Commission reviewed in this or previous sessions.

SB 375 – Harrison’s Law [Ed. 3]

(G.S. 14-35(b)) Mr. Weede moved to find the proposed Class I felony consistent with the Offense Classification Criteria. Judge Fred Morrison seconded the motion. The motion failed by a vote of 4 to 7 with one abstention. Ms. Granados moved to find the proposed offense inconsistent with the Offense Classification Criteria with a note that it would be consistent with a Class 1 misdemeanor. The Judge Ussery seconded the motion and the motion carried.

SB 429 – 2025 Public Safety Act [Ed. 2]

(G.S. 14-202.3(a) and (c)(1)) Ms. Granados moved to find the proposed Class G felony inconsistent with the Offense Classification Criteria with a note that it would be consistent with the Offense Classification Criteria for a Class F felony. Mr. Weede seconded the motion and the motion carried.

(G.S. 14-202.3(a) and (c)(1)) Ms. Granados moved to find the proposed Class E felony for a second or subsequent offense inconsistent with the Offense Classification Criteria because the Structured Sentencing punishment chart takes a defendant’s prior record into account through the Prior Record Level. Judge Horne seconded the motion and the motion carried.

(G.S. 14-202.3(a) and (c)(2)) – Ms. Granados moved to find the proposed Class D felony inconsistent with the Offense Classification Criteria with a note that it would be consistent with the Offense Classification Criteria for a Class E felony. Judge Horne seconded the motion and the motion carried.

(G.S. 14-202(e1)) Ms. Granados moved to find the proposed Class I felony consistent with the Offense Classification Criteria. Judge Ussery seconded the motion and the motion carried.

(G.S. 90-95(b)(1b)) Judge Ussery moved to find the Offense Classification Criteria were not applicable because the Offense Classification Criteria were not used in the classification of drug offenses. He noted

that it could be consistent with the Offense Classification Criteria for a Class F felony if the Offense Classification Criteria were applied to drug offenses as the offense can result in significant personal injury or serious societal injury. Mr. Weede seconded the motion and the motion carried.

(G.S. 90-95(d)(2)) Mr. Houchin moved to find the Offense Classification Criteria were not applicable because the Offense Classification Criteria were not used in the classification of drug offenses. Mr. Weede seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Ms. Granados asked if the Commission considered developing offense classification criteria for drug offenses. Michalle Hall, staff, responded that the Commission formed a subcommittee a number of years ago to develop criteria for homicide offenses and drug offenses; the subcommittee developed the Homicide Offense Classification Criteria but was not able to develop criteria for drug offenses. Mr. Madler added that instead the Commission adopted the last review policy, "The Offense Classification Criteria were not used to classify drug offenses. However, the Commission will review proposed controlled substance offense classifications on an ad hoc basis, by comparison to existing offenses." Ms. Granados stated it would be beneficial for the Sentencing Commission to have a framework to work within when classifying drug offenses as new substances continue to be added to the statutes. Ms. Granados moved to form a subcommittee to develop Offense Classification Criteria for drug offenses. Mr. Weede seconded the motion and the motion carried.

(G.S. 90-95(h)(4c)a) Judge Horne moved to find the Offense Classification Criteria were not applicable to the proposed Class E felony because the Offense Classification Criteria were not used in the classification of drug offenses and trafficking offenses carry mandatory minimum sentences. Judge Morrison seconded the motion and the motion carried.

(G.S. 90-95(h)(4c)b) Judge Horne moved to find the Offense Classification Criteria were not applicable to the proposed Class D felony because the Offense Classification Criteria were not used in the classification of drug offenses and trafficking offenses carry mandatory minimum sentences. Ms. Granados seconded the motion and the motion carried.

(G.S. 90-95(h)(4c)c) Judge Horne moved to find the Offense Classification Criteria were not applicable to the proposed Class C felony because the Offense Classification Criteria were not used in the classification of drug offenses and trafficking offenses carry mandatory minimum sentences. Ms. Granados seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Mr. Madler provided an update on the 2025 Session (see Presentation and Handout). He reviewed the budget proposals from the Governor, the House of Representatives, and the Senate, to show potential resource changes. He focused on the agencies that make up the Justice and Public Safety section of the budget and the provisions that will affect criminal justice and sentencing.

Under the budget proposals affecting the Judicial Branch, Chairman Brown asked about the reaction to the Senate's proposal to eliminate the North Carolina Innocence Inquiry Commission. Mr. Madler replied that the House kept the Commission in their version of the budget but changed the name to the Postconviction Review Commission.

Chairman Brown asked if there were any details available about the House proposal to create a pilot program to assess indigency status. Mr. Madler responded that the budget documents did not provide any more information but that staff would check into it.

Under the budget proposals affecting the Department of Adult Correction (DAC), Chairman Brown asked if the House proposal to eliminate approximately 400 vacant correctional officer positions was in addition

to their proposal to ask the agencies to eliminate approximately 20% of their overall vacancies. Mr. Madler replied that it was in addition. The members discussed the agencies getting some of that money back in their Labor Market Adjustment Reserve (LMAR) fund, positions that are not eligible for increases through the LMAR fund, and the need for positions versus pay raises. Chief A.Z. Williams explained that police departments have been using that procedure for several years, eliminating vacant positions to give pay raises to the existing officers.

Mr. Madler concluded by highlighting special provisions relating to increasing the reimbursement to local jails for offenders awaiting transfer to prison and for Statewide Misdemeanor Confinement Program (SMCP) inmates. Chairman Brown asked how many counties participate in the SMCP roadway cleanup program. Cortney Goodwin, N.C. Sheriffs' Association, reported that 6 to 7 counties participated each month since the beginning of the year and that interest increases as the weather warms up.

FY 2024 FELONY CONVICTIONS

Chairman Brown recognized John King, staff, to present the highlights from the FY 2024 Felony Conviction data (*see* Presentation). Mr. King pointed out that *Quick Facts* for the FY 2024 felony and misdemeanor convictions were in their packet (*see* Handouts) and that the *FY 2024 Structured Sentencing Statistical Report* would be sent once it's printed.

Mr. King stated the purpose of the Statistical Report is to monitor convictions and sentences under Structured Sentencing. In addition, the report can inform potential recommendations for modifications to Structured Sentencing. The unit of analysis in the report is based on offenders' most serious conviction on a given day in court. Mr. King pointed out the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) is continuing its transition from their long-time data management system, the Automated Criminal Infraction System (ACIS), to Odyssey. The FY 2024 data includes convictions from 27 counties using Odyssey, up from 4 in FY 2023. The FY 2025 data is expected to have Odyssey data from 73 counties.

During FY 2024, there were 27,088 felony convictions, a 3% increase over FY 2023. Mr. King noted that, despite this increase, felony convictions were still down compared to pre-pandemic levels (28,526 in FY 2019). The median time to sentencing for FY 2024 felony convictions was 10 months and decreased as the seriousness of the offense class decreased.

Discussion ensued about the time to sentencing measure with several commissioners observing that the reported median lengths seemed too low. Some observations included whether the amount of time to dispose of cases included the time added to a case when defendants change attorneys, the availability of defense counsel, and the increased amount of digital discovery that needs to be reviewed. Ginny Hevener, staff, commented that staff can look at time to sentencing more closely and might add additional analyses to the Statistical Report.

Next, Mr. King presented information on the personal characteristics (e.g., sex, race/ethnicity, and age) of offenders with felony convictions last year. He also explained that Class H and Class I felonies comprised the largest numbers of convictions; property and non-trafficking drug convictions were the largest categories of convictions. Mr. King then highlighted the changes in the top five offenses between FY 2015 and FY 2024.

Mr. King stated that, over the past 10 years, the distribution of prior record level (PRL) has shifted toward the more serious levels. For example, in FY 2015, 58% of offenders were in PRL I and II, but this decreased

to 49% in FY 2024. He mentioned that 40% of felony convictions resulted in active punishment and that 66% of those sentences were sentenced in the presumptive range. He shared additional information on active sentences, including active rates by offense class, PRL, and crime type. Shifting to nonactive (e.g., probation) sentences, Mr. King compared the average length of probation to the average length of suspended sentences and noted that, as offense class decreased, so did the lengths of both probation and the suspended sentence.

Mr. King concluded with information contained in the Special Issues of the report (*see Handout*). He noted that life without parole sentences (n=86) and drug trafficking convictions (n=638) were the highest in recent years. In addition, habitual felon convictions have increased since FY 2021 but were still below pre-pandemic levels. Mr. King then shared some overall key points regarding FY 2024 felony convictions, pointing out how the Felony Punishment Chart has contributed to stability over time and the shift over time in the PRL distribution to more serious levels.

FY 2025–FY 2034 PRISON POPULATION PROJECTIONS

Chairman Brown again recognized Mr. King to review the current prison population projections (*see Presentation and Handout*). Mr. King stated that producing prison projections is part of the Commission's original mandate to develop a tool to be used for accurate long-term correctional resource planning. The projections are prepared annually in conjunction with the DAC and are used for multiple purposes including determining whether existing capacity is adequate for the current and future population, assisting with the determination of future staffing needs and inmate housing needs, and allowing for consideration of correctional policies within the context of available resources.

Mr. King noted that FY 2024 felony convictions and sentences imposed provide the foundation for the projections and are used to project new admissions across the projection period. The projections also take into account the release of the prison population at the beginning of the projection period. The projections include all offenders in prison and those awaiting transfer from local jails (i.e., jail backlog).

Mr. King next reviewed the prison projections and capacity, indicating that the prison population is projected to increase from 31,708 to 36,597 (15%) across the ten-year projection period. He noted the current projection is similar to the previous projection (within 1% per year) and that a 10% increase in Class A-D felony convictions contributed to a higher projection than last year in the projection's later years. Standard Operating Capacity (SOC) is projected to be 28,986 and Expanded Operating Capacity (EOC) is projected to be 34,341. The prison population is projected to be above SOC for all ten years and below EOC until FY 2031.

Mr. King shared historical information on the prison population before noting that the prison population has increased 9% since its lowest point during the pandemic in July 2021 (29,033) and December 2024 (31,639). Nevertheless, the monthly average prison population is still below pre-pandemic levels (35,106 in March 2020). He also reminded the Commission that, as reviewed at the September 2024 meeting, the previous projection was within the historical accuracy range of 2% for the first year.

Mr. King then summarized the key assumptions used to develop the projections. He noted that the accuracy of the projections largely depends on how well FY 2024 data on felony convictions, prison admissions, and prison releases represent future years.

Mr. King concluded with a discussion of how the prioritization of resources for violent and repeat offenders under Structured Sentencing is reflected in the prison population. Class A-D convictions account for the smallest proportion of convictions per year but comprise over half of the projected population as a result of their mandatory active sentences and long sentence lengths. Most low-level felons (Class H-I) who receive active sentences are repeat offenders and impact the prison population through their high volume; however, they comprise only 18% of the prison population due to their shorter sentence lengths.

2025 JUSTICE REINVESTMENT IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION REPORT

Chairman Brown informed the Commission that he was departing early for a family emergency and that Judge Horne would chair the remainder of the meeting.

Judge Horne recognized Sierra Satterfield, staff, to review key findings from the 2025 Justice Reinvestment Implementation Evaluation Report (*see Presentation and Handout*). She reminded the Commission the Justice Reinvestment Act (JRA) took effect in 2011; 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 past two calendar years, habitual felon prison admissions were evenly or nearly evenly split between Class C and Class E. She noted that habitual felons continue to account for the largest proportion of the prison population, according to the DAC's broad categorization of offenses. She noted there were 69 entries to prison for habitual breaking and entering and 148 ASR sentences in CY 2024. Ms. Satterfield shared county level data for both habitual breaking and entering and ASR sentences. Lindsey Granados suggested ASR is used so infrequently because of a lack of knowledge by attorneys. Judge Horne, Judge Ussery, and Ms. Granados discussed their experiences with ASR.

Ms. Satterfield next reviewed outcome measures. Treatment for Effective Community Supervision (TECS) entries and completion rates remained similar from CY 2023 to CY 2024. Ms. Satterfield stated 41% of Confinement in Response to Violation (CRV) dispositions in CY 2023 resulted in a subsequent violation. Ms. Satterfield noted 82% of the quick dips imposed in CY 2023 resulted in a subsequent violation. For both CRV dispositions and quick dips, as supervision level became less restrictive, the percent of subsequent violations decreased.

Ms. Satterfield next reviewed changes to incarceration and reentry under the JRA. She noted most SMCP entries are for misdemeanors under the Structured Sentencing Act. 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 it is not back to pre-pandemic levels. Ms. Satterfield stated the PRS population is important to monitor because it can have an impact on the prison population.

Ms. Satterfield concluded with trend information. Overall, the community supervision population declined 29% from December 2011 to December 2024, with much of the decline attributable to the decline in the misdemeanor population. Ms. Granados asked if the misdemeanor decline was due to the Driving while License Revoked reclassification. Ms. Hall responded that only the supervised population is shown here (*see Presentation*) and that there were declines in misdemeanor convictions even before 2011. Emily Metha (AOC) shared that misdemeanor filings have also been down. Chief Williams shared that police departments do not focus on low level marijuana possession anymore. Ms. Satterfield moved to discuss changes in prison entries. 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 2024. Ms. Satterfield briefly discussed the prison population trends. Ms. Satterfield noted 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.

2025 JUVENILE RECIDIVISM REPORT

Judge Horne recognized Ms. Satterfield to present the Juvenile Recidivism Study, FY 2022 Juvenile Sample (see Presentation and Handout). Ms. Satterfield informed the Commission that this report is one of their legislatively mandated biennial reports on juvenile recidivism. She described the three groups of juveniles in the sample: diversion, probation, and commitment. Their inclusion in the study was based on their exit from the juvenile justice system during FY 2022. She discussed the two recidivism time periods analyzed (i.e., during their juvenile justice involvement and a two-year follow-up) and shared the new information in this cycle's report: Youth Assessment and Screening Instrument (YASI) data, Juvenile Crime Prevention Council (JCPC) program participation, gang involvement, and multivariate analysis).

Ms. Satterfield presented information on the sample profile, including personal characteristics, delinquency history levels, charged offense (juvenile complaint), results from YASI, JCPC program participation, and length of time in the juvenile justice system. She then provided the recidivism rates for the juvenile sample. The probation group had the highest recidivism rates during juvenile justice involvement. The low recidivism rates during juvenile justice involvement for the commitment group are due to their confinement in a juvenile detention center. Juveniles released from a Youth Development Center (YDC) had the highest recidivism rates during the two-year follow-up, while the probation group had higher recidivism rates compared to the diversion group. She shared recidivism rates for juveniles with and without prior complaints as well as recidivism rates by risk level. Ms. Satterfield highlighted the findings from multivariate analysis; recidivism during juvenile justice involvement was the strongest predictor of recidivism during the two-year follow-up period.

Key findings for the diverted juveniles by successful and unsuccessful diversion and adjudicated juveniles by Levels 1, 2, and 3 dispositions were discussed separately as well. The unsuccessful diversion group had a higher percentage of juveniles with a prior complaint and were assessed as higher risk and with lower strengths compared to the successful group; the unsuccessful group had higher recidivism rates than the successful group. Multivariate analysis revealed the strongest predictor of recidivism during the two-year follow-up period for diverted juveniles was unsuccessful diversion. The adjudicated juveniles had key differences in their profile – as disposition level increased (from Probation Level 1 to Probation Level 2 to Level 3 [commitment]), the percentage of prior complaints, percentage assessed as high risk, percentage of high needs, percentage of low strengths, and the percentage of having a felony as the most serious adjudicated offense also increased. The Level 3 commitment group had the highest recidivism rate during the two-year follow-up. Multivariate analysis revealed the two strongest probabilities of recidivism were juveniles who were nonwhite and had recidivism during juvenile justice involvement.

Ms. Satterfield next summarized the key findings from the report and the potential policy considerations. She discussed the decrease in the sample size, the increase in the percentage of diverted juveniles, the increase in the percentage of 16- and 17-year-olds, the decrease in misdemeanor charged offenses, and the decrease in school-based offenses. Ms. Satterfield suggested the change in charged offense type and school-based offenses may reflect a shift in the prioritization of resources towards more serious offenses, as well as strategies that are directed toward less serious offenses, such as School Justice Partnerships

and diversion. Ms. Satterfield then shared recidivism trend data. She noted that recidivism rates did not increase beyond previous sample years even with the new population of Raise the Age (RtA) juveniles. Ms. Satterfield also noted a consistent finding of this report – recidivism rates increased as the level of involvement increased. Judge Ussery asked why the commitment group has the highest rates. Ms. Hall responded that juveniles in YDCs tend to be the highest risk and highest need and often have already had a lot of contact with the system. Ms. Satterfield continued to discuss the decrease in the number of recidivist juveniles and the decrease in the total number of recidivist events.

Ms. Satterfield concluded with five main takeaways from the study – 1) decrease in sample size and a change in the composition of the sample, 2) RtA added a new population and 16- and 17-year-olds and recidivism did not increase beyond previous samples, 3) decrease in misdemeanor and school-based offenses indicate the system may be prioritizing more serious offenses, 4) the higher the risk, the higher the recidivism, and 5) this report has had a consistent finding that the lowest recidivism rates corresponded to the lowest levels of system intervention which suggests the most efficient investment of sufficient resources is at the community level at the front end of the Juvenile Justice System.

2025 JCPC EFFECTIVENESS REPORT

Judge Horne thanked Ms. Satterfield for her presentations and next turned to Mr. King again for presenting the key findings of the Juvenile Crime Prevention Council (JCPC) Program Effectiveness Report (see Presentation and Handout). Mr. King began by briefly describing JCPCs and, specifically, JCPC-funded programs. He explained the study sample, which included all juveniles who exited from a JCPC Program in FY 2022 and pointed out that the JCPC recidivism study used a similar methodology to the Juvenile Recidivism report. The number of juveniles in the FY 2022 sample increased 2% (from 11,070 to 11,337) from the previous FY 2020 report. At-risk juveniles comprised 59% of the sample and most juveniles exited from programs in two categories: restorative and structured. Mr. King shared some key differences found between juveniles classified as at-risk and court-involved before noting that recidivism rates were lower for the at-risk juveniles. He explained that having a prior delinquent complaint was associated with having a higher recidivism rate regardless of legal status. Further, he pointed out that as risk level and the number of prior behaviors increased, recidivism increased for both groups.

Next, Mr. King moved to profiling the different types of programs that sample juveniles participated in. He noted that the report was revamped with a chapter dedicated to each of the four program categories. He said that each program category has been subdivided into program types, which provides a new level of detail previously unexplored in this report.

Mr. King shared the characteristics of programs within each of the four program categories: clinical treatment, residential services, restorative programs, and structured programs. He noted that program types with the highest percentages of high risk juveniles and juveniles with 5 or more problem behaviors were invariably the program types with the highest recidivism rates. He pointed out other notable differences among program categories, such as the high rates of completion for juveniles in restorative programs and high numbers of direct service hours for juveniles in structured programs.

Mr. King presented information comparing the FY 2022 sample to the FY 2016, FY 2018, and FY 2022 samples. He noted recidivism rates for the FY 2022 sample increased compared to the FY 2020 sample and that this sample's recidivism rates were almost identical to those in FY 2016. He noted that the FY 2022 increase in recidivism rates compared to FY 2020 wasn't surprising given how the pandemic impacted the FY 2020 sample. He also said that comparisons between FY 2022 and pre-RtA samples are

difficult because the compositions of the samples have changed (e.g., 50% of the court-involved juveniles in FY 2022 were 16 years or older compared to 33% of the FY 2016 sample). He also noted that the percentage of at-risk juveniles in the samples has increased to almost 60% of the sample (up from 55% in FY 2016).

Mr. King concluded by summarizing a few key points from the study. First, that sample compositions appear to be changing and that might necessitate changes in the types of programs JCPCs offer. Next, that JCPC program types have different profiles and these differences between programs have an effect on recidivism rates. He pointed out that deeper involvement in the juvenile system was strongly associated with recidivism, which suggests that the lowest possible intervention should be used. Finally, Mr. King noted that program completion yielded positive results in reducing recidivism and efforts to ensure program completion should continue.

SENTENCING PRACTICES SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATE

Judge Horne recognized Michelle Hall, staff, to provide an update from the Sentencing Practices Subcommittee. Ms. Hall noted the primary update was related to the staff pursuit on behalf of the Subcommittee for criminal history data. She noted some positive progress, working with partners at AOC on securing data from the Government Data Analytics Center (GDAC). At this stage, a data-sharing agreement was being worked out, with support from both AOC and GDAC. She indicated that staff would keep the Commission and the Subcommittee informed, but the outlook for creating a Prior Record Level database seemed promising.

INSTRUCTIONS TO STAFF AND OTHER BUSINESS

Judge Horne thanked staff for their presentations and guests for attending and reminded the members of upcoming meeting dates: September 12 and December 12.

ADJOURNMENT

Judge Horne adjourned the meeting at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Shelley Kirk
Administrative Secretary