WES MOORE
Governor

ARUNA MILLER
Lieutenant Governor

Maryland
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF CRIME PREVENTION AND POLICY

DOROTHY LENNIG
Executive Director

Local Government Justice Reinvestment Commission Agenda
Monday, July 28, 2025 · 11:00 am – 12:00 pm

Google Meet joining info
Video call link: https://meet.google.com/czg-iarw-cxx
Or dial: (US) +1 385-404-0724 PIN: 885 401 977#
More phone numbers: https://tel.meet/czg-iarw-cxx?pin=5918288202450

Attendance

- ~~Allegany, Captain Daniel Lasher~~
- ~~Anne Arundel, Administrator John Kelson~~
- ~~Baltimore City, VACANT~~
- Baltimore, Director Walt Pesterfield
- Calvert, Captain Timothy Fridman
- Caroline, Warden Charles Scott
- Carroll, Major Dennis Harmon
- Cecil, Lieutenant William Jolly
- ~~Charles, Director Ryan Ross~~
- ~~Dorchester, Don Satterfield, Interim Director~~
- ~~Frederick, Assistant Director Randy Martin~~
- ~~Garrett County, Captain Joe Wise~~
- ~~Harford, VACANT~~
- Howard, Director Margaret Chippendale
- ~~Kent, VACANT~~
- ~~Montgomery, Director Ben Stevenson~~
- Prince George's, Director Terence K. Clark
- Queen Anne's, Warden LaMonte Cooke
- Somerset, Sheriff Ronnie Howard
- St. Mary's, Warden Mary Ann Thompson, Chair
- ~~Talbot, Deputy Director Joseph Hughes~~
- ~~Washington, Maylon Campher~~
- ~~Wicomico, Director Stephanie King~~
- ~~Worcester, VACANT~~

Minutes

- **Welcome and Opening Remarks - Warden Mary Ann Thompson, Chair, Local Government Commission**

- **Roll Call - Lindsey McCullough, Justice Reinvestment Coordinator, Governor's Office of Crime Prevention and Policy (GOCPP)**

- **Local Government Commission Responsibilities and Reminders - Chair Thompson**
    - Reviews the Commission's responsibilities, as stated in §9–3211.
    - Responsibilities include advising the Oversight Board on matters related to legislation, regulations, rules, budgetary changes, etc. pertaining to JRA implementation; making recommendations to the Board regarding PIGF awards to local governments; and creating performance measures to assess grant efficacy.
    - Also mentions the JRA survey the Commission filled out earlier this year to analyze impacts of the JRA, as well as the GOCPP legislative report the Commission contributes to every year.
    - Aiming to have more from PIGF subrecipients at future meetings to get a better idea of where grant money is going and how it is being utilized.
    - In order to have the most effective meetings and increase engagement, Commission members should be attending *at least* 2 of the 4 meetings per year.

- **GOCPP Updates - Lindsey McCullough**
    - **FY26 PIGF Awards**
        - Received 100 applications and over $23 million in requested funds, with only about $10.5 million in available funds.
        - It was an extremely competitive grant cycle. After a rigorous scoring and review process, 58 awards were granted and started on time on July 1st.
        - 14 Local Government Entities were awarded through this year's funding. This count includes detention centers, sheriff's offices, health departments, state's attorneys offices, problem-solving courts, other local bodies, and collaborative partnerships between 2 or more of these types of entities.
            - 4 of these awards went specifically toward a detention center's project.
            - 2 more of these went toward a health department in collaboration with the detention center.
    - **Pretrial Project Interviews**
        - A current GOCPP priority is bolstering pretrial services in Maryland. To best understand how pretrial is working currently, the JRA team embarked on a project that consisted of interviews with each county to gain insight regarding the characteristics and efficacy of their pretrial services.
        - These interviews allowed us to establish a baseline and collect valuable data to best target these pretrial efforts going forward.

        - Conducted semi-structured virtual interviews with all 24 jurisdictions in the State, from June to July 2025. Each interview took about 45 minutes.
        - Asked a wide variety of questions pertaining to what the county's pretrial program entails, any risk assessment tools utilized, the various levels of supervision, whether they utilize electronic monitoring and any costs associated with that, violations and revocations, and the types of data collected on the program.
        - From the information we gathered, we were able to identify similarities, differences, and areas for improvement.
        - The report we generated will be shared to the Justice Reinvestment Oversight Board later today. The Board will use this information to guide their work for the next year or so, creating recommendations to improve pretrial functions across the State and ensure alignment with best practices.

- **JRA Budgetary Requirements on Local Detention Centers Survey Analysis - Dean Atanasoff, JRA Data Analyst, GOCPP**
    - *See infographic in the slides for more detailed information.*
    - Reviews results of the JRA survey completed by Commission members earlier this year. This survey is a follow-up to a 2016 report, released by GOCPP prior to the JRA's implementation. Goals of this survey include:
        - Analyze if and how certain JRI provisions presently affect local detention centers.
        - Determine the extent of any gaps or needs in programming and services.
        - Assist the Commission in determining recommendations and next steps.
    - 17 jurisdictions provided some type of response to the survey.
    - Findings cover 6 provisions, based on the original report.
        1. Reduction in controlled dangerous substances (CDS) offenses.
            a. Given the revisions to the maximum sentences for CDS charges as a result of the JRA passing, there may be presently fewer persons at any given time sentenced on those charges compared to the 2016 report. However, there has also been an overall decrease in the sentenced population during that time period.
        2. Increase in theft thresholds and reduction in sentences.
            a. Not enough data to accurately identify the impact. Data is difficult to compare, especially because of how much these charges have changed since the last report.
        3. Revocation caps for technical violations of parole or probation (TVOP).
            a. Likely a decrease in those sentenced, decreased impact on facilities. Specific details on VOPs not provided in the data.

4. Mandatory withholding of 25% of an incarcerated individual's earnings if there is a restitution order.
    a. Of responding jurisdictions, 41.2% (7 facilities) collect/disburse restitution.
    b. A top reason for not doing so is the facility does not have an active work release program, which at least previously was the main conduit of collecting and dispersing restitution. Also, some jurisdictions collect and disperse through courts/SAO. Some facilities do not have anyone in their program, even if it is active.
    c. Indeterminate impact on facilities, as with the previous report.
5. Increase from 5 to 10 days good conduct credits for nonviolent offenders.
    a. Should decrease impact on facilities, as these individuals would be staying for a shorter period of time.
6. State reimbursement of $45 for local jails providing prerelease services for DOC incarcerated individuals.
    a. 3 facilities say they do utilize this program. Reasons stated for not implementing include lacking an MOU, lacking administrative support, and limitations in cost, space, and staffing.

- Will send this report out to the Commission following this meeting.
- Chair Thompson mentions that for local detention centers, most of the time the work release programs are sheriff-run. So, the judge can court authorize individuals to that program. Especially during Covid, they found it was easier and lower cost to supervise these individuals on work release in the community than in the detention center.
- She asks what other programs facilities are using besides work release. Atanasoff clarifies that one facility stated using a day reporting center and pre-trial supervision. Other respondents did not provide this information.
- Chair Thompson voices concerns regarding the MOUs and Provision 6. This was a key initiative when the JRA was passed, but the local detention centers lack the ability to provide that level of programming. She asks if the Oversight Board or this Commission should recommend more successful alternatives.
- Brandi Cahn agrees that this has been a consistent problem over the years and is not aware of many locals taking sentenced individuals back into their facilities. She suggests inviting the DOC to be a part of these conversations, as making sure these individuals are connected to resources in their community will definitely promote a more successful reentry.
- Chair Thompson asks how it was determined that 14 local government entities received PIGF funding. McCullough clarifies that this number was based on the implementing agencies listed on the application and award. Additional

organizations may partner with and/or provide services to local detention centers or other entities.
    - Chair Thompson asks how to move forward with recommendations based upon this report. Cahn suggests bringing this information to the Oversight Board. She will create a standing agenda item in those meetings so Thompson can report out on what the Commission is working on. This will foster coordination and collaboration between the two groups.
    - Thompson requests moving the Commission meeting to occur prior to the Oversight Board, with enough time to develop the report before the deadline.

- **Open Discussion**

- **Next Steps and Closing Remarks - Chair Thompson**
    - McCullough will move the next meeting (currently scheduled for October 27th) to a Monday in September, and will notify the members of this change later today. Will also send out the infographic/report presented by Atanasoff.
    - Plan for next meeting is to have a PIGF grantee present on their funded project.