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Executive Summary

On December 5, 2016, Assemblymember Rob Bonta, partnering with California State Senator Bob Hertzberg, introduced the California Money Bail Reform Act of 2017, which aims to reform the current commercial surety bail system. Our project will assist our client in evaluating policy alternatives to the commercial surety bail system.

In California, defendants who are assigned bail may contract with a bail bonds agency and pay a ten percent nonrefundable fee to be released from jail custody. This system is referred to as commercial surety bail. Because this system uses a financial condition in order to release defendants from jail, a majority of defendants incarcerated pretrial are incarcerated only because they cannot afford bail. According to the Executive Director of Equal Justice Under Law, Phil Telfeyan, “The problem we see with money bail is that it puts a price tag on freedom. Those who are rich get to pay their way out and those who aren’t get to languish in jail.” This system, which prioritizes a financial condition over a defendant’s potential risk to be rearrested or to fail to appear at court, does not ensure public safety.

Beginning in the 1960s, a nationwide bail reform trend began, resulting in many states either abolishing or reforming this system. In an attempt to investigate how bail reform efforts would impact the state of California, we conducted policy analysis to compare the commercial surety bail system in California to an alternative system.

The alternative system we compare to commercial surety bail involves several important elements. The first element is risk assessment tools, which are predictive algorithms that assess the risk of a defendant failing to appear for a court date and of being rearrested. The second is non-bail release methods, which can include release on one’s own recognizance, supervised release, and unsecured bonds.

We conducted this analysis in two stages. First, we compared the screening process used in commercial surety bail to the screening process used with non-bail release. Under the commercial surety bail system, judges use bail schedules to screen defendants and assign bail amounts. Under non-bail release, judges use risk assessment tools to screen defendants and inform their release decisions. We analyzed how the bail schedule compares to risk assessment tools on two criteria: predictive accuracy and race neutrality. We found that risk assessment tools scored higher on both criteria. Based on this analysis, we recommend the adoption of a risk assessment tool to inform judicial decision-making.

The second stage of our analysis compares the commercial surety bail release method to non-bail release methods based on five criteria: effectiveness, economic bias, fiscal impact, social cost, and political feasibility. We employed a variety of methods in our analysis. We operationalized predictive accuracy, race neutrality, economic bias, and effectiveness by undertaking an intensive literature review. We used high-level cost calculations and estimations to analyze fiscal impact and social cost. Finally, we conducted interviews to operationalize political feasibility. We found that non-bail release methods scored higher than commercial surety bail on four out of the five criteria (all except for political feasibility). Therefore, based on this analysis, we recommend that non-bail release replaces the commercial surety bail system.
Risk assessment tools received higher scores than bail schedules in the first stage of analysis for both predictive accuracy and race neutrality. Non-bail release scored higher than bail release in the second stage of analysis for economic bias, effectiveness, fiscal impact, and social cost; it scored lower on political feasibility. Therefore, we recommend that the use of risk assessment tools paired with non-bail release replace the commercial surety bail system in California.
Glossary

**Arraignment:** “The initial step in a criminal prosecution whereby the defendant is brought before the court to hear the charges and to enter a plea.”¹

**Bail:** “The temporary release of a prisoner in exchange for security given for the prisoner's appearance at a later hearing.”²

**Bail bondsman (bail agency):** “One who guarantees a defendant’s appearance for court by promising to pay a financial condition of bond if the defendant does not appear for court. Bail bondsmen are typically licensed by the state and have an appointment from an insurance company to act as such. For their services, bail bondsmen charge defendants a non-refundable fee, and usually require the defendant (or his or her friends or family) to collateralize the full amount of the financial condition with cash or property.”³

**Bail hearing:** “A judge or magistrate will decide whether an arrested person may be released while his or her criminal case is pending. The initial hearing can have different names, but they all derive from the common-law practice of setting bail—traditionally an amount of money pledged by a surety—to ensure the defendant’s appearance at future proceedings.”⁴

**Bail schedule:** “A written listing of amounts of money to be used in bail setting based on the offense charged, regardless of the characteristics of any individual defendant.”⁵

**Bond:** A portion of the bail amount, paid for by an outside agent that acts as surety.⁶

**Bond forfeiture:** “When a defendant released on cash bail fails to appear in court, or otherwise violates a condition of their bail, the court can declare the bail bond forfeited.”⁷

**Commercial surety bail:** A system in which defendants have the option to contract with a bail bonds agency, paying a percentage (eight to ten percent in California) of their bail amount to a bail bonds agency to secure their pretrial release from jail.⁸

---

**Failure to appear:** “The phrase typically used when a defendant or witness under subpoena does not show up for a scheduled court appearance.”

**Pretrial services agency/program:** “Any organization created ideally to perform the three primary pretrial agency or program functions of: (1) collecting and analyzing defendant information for use by the court in assessing risk; (2) making recommendations to the court concerning bail bond conditions of release to address risk; and (3) monitoring and supervising defendants who are released from secure custody during the pretrial phase of their cases in order to manage their risk.”

**Release on own recognizance:** “The pretrial release of an arrested person who promises, usually in writing but without supplying a surety or posting bond, to appear for trial at a later date.”

**Risk assessment tool:** A tool that enters variables proven to be statistically significant in predicting risk of rearrest and failure to appear into a scientifically predictive algorithm which computes a risk score.

**Supervised release:** “If a defendant is not qualified for release on own recognizance, imposition of conditions of release should be considered. Any pretrial services agency or program that provides supervised release services should recommend the least restrictive release conditions necessary to assure the defendant’s appearance in court, to protect the safety of the community, and to safeguard the integrity of the judicial process.” Supervised release methods can include: imposing restrictions on activities, requiring check-ins with the pretrial services agency, or requiring substance abuse treatment and testing.

**Unsecured bond:** A type of bond in which “The defendant pays no money to the court but is liable for the full amount of [bond] upon failure to appear in court.”

**Validated risk assessment tool:** A risk assessment tool that has been tested for the “predictive power of its assessment instrument” on the population on which it is to be used.

---


Introduction

On December 5, 2016, Assemblymember Rob Bonta (Figure 1), in partnership with California State Senator Bob Hertzberg, introduced the California Money Bail Reform Act of 2017 (Assembly Bill 42 and Senate Bill 10). As an ally to communities of color, Bonta was driven to address the disparities created by the bail system. The legislation aims to better serve Californians by reforming the commercial surety bail system. The objective of our project is to assist our client in evaluating policy alternatives to the commercial surety bail system, which could significantly impact California’s criminal justice system.

![Figure 1: Assemblymember Rob Bonta speaks at the Press Conference For the Introduction of Bail Reform Legislation on December 5, 2016.](image)

California uses a system of commercial surety bail to regulate pretrial release for defendants. California has established the right to bail in the California Constitution. All defendants are guaranteed the right to bail, except for defendants charged with capital crimes and violent or sexual felonies when “there is a substantial likelihood the person’s release would result in great bodily harm to others.”

To streamline the bail process, the California Penal Codes require the creation of bail schedules, which match criminal charges with money bail amounts. Every county in California has its own

---

21 Cal. Penal Code § 1269b(c) (West 2017).
bail schedule. Judges are required to develop bail schedules annually. When creating bail schedules, judges must “consider the seriousness of the offense charged.” Judges can also consider “aggravating or enhancing factor[s],” such as gang affiliation.

Consider a hypothetical defendant charged with felony assault with a firearm. The bail system starts after arrest when the defendant is booked into county jail. Booking agents use the bail schedule to assign bail to the defendant. Then the defendant has three options:

1. The defendant can pay the full bail amount, as dictated by the bail schedule.
2. The defendant can contract with a bail agency.
3. The defendant can remain in custody at the county jail, waiting for his or her first court appearance.

Under the first option, the defendant pays the entire bail amount to the court. For the hypothetical defendant charged with felony assault with a firearm, the defendant would be required to pay $50,000 in Los Angeles County, $125,000 in San Francisco County, or $60,000 in Butte County to be released from jail, promising to appear at the next court hearing. Additionally, enhancements could increase the bail amount. For example, gang affiliation in Los Angeles County adds $40,000 to the base bail amount. As long as the defendant appears at all court dates, the bail payment is ultimately refunded, regardless of case outcome.

Defendants who cannot afford the full bail amount can instead contract with a bail bonds agency. This agency acts as an insurer, guaranteeing that defendants will appear at future court dates. Defendants contract with a bail bonds agency and agree to pay a fee, generally ten percent of the bail amount. Continuing with the example above, the hypothetical defendant would be required to pay $5,000 in Los Angeles County, $12,500 in San Francisco County, or $6,000 in Butte County to the

23 Cal. Penal Code § 1269b(c) (West 2017).
24 Ibid.
27 Cal. Penal Code § 1269b(a) - (b) (West 2017).
29 Ibid.
32 “What Should I Know if I Am Arrested?” (Public Pamphlet, the State Bar of California, 2016), http://www.calbar.ca.gov/Public/Pamphlets/Arrested.aspx.
bail bonds agency. This fee is nonrefundable, regardless of case outcome. Even if the charges against the defendant are dropped, the defendant is still responsible to pay the ten percent fee to the bail bonds agency.

If the defendant cannot afford either of the previous options, the defendant will remain in custody at the jail. The defendant should have his or her first court appearance within 48 hours of arrest. However, these 48 hours do not include weekends or holidays. For instance, if a defendant is arrested on a Thursday before a holiday weekend, the defendant could remain in custody awaiting arraignment for up to six days. While defendants await trial in jail custody, they are unable to attend to their obligations, such as working, going to school, paying rent, or caring for family members.

This is the status quo system Assemblymember Bonta, Senator Hertzberg, and their co-sponsors intend to reform with Assembly Bill 42 and Senate Bill 10.

---


42 Alex Emslie, “Class Action Suit Against San Francisco Seeks to End Use of Cash Bail System,” KQED News (Northern California, CA), October 29, 2015.


44 Ibid.


Policy Problem & Significance

“California’s bail system punishes poor people simply for being poor. In many cases, if you have enough money to pay your bail, you can get out of jail regardless of whether you are a danger to the public or a flight risk. But if you’re poor and are not a flight risk or a danger to the public, you are forced to stay in jail even when the charge is a misdemeanor. That’s not justice.”

–Assemblymember Bonta

Throughout this section, we detail the problems with commercial surety bail. Comparing the cases of Sandra Bland and Robert Durst clearly illustrates the injustices of the commercial surety bail system. Sandra Bland (Figure 2) was a young, Black woman who was initially stopped in Texas in July 2015 for failing to use a turn signal. The situation with the Texas State Trooper escalated quickly, and Bland was arrested for assault on a public servant. Bland spent three days in jail because she was unable to pay her $500 bond. Bland’s story ended tragically when she committed suicide, allegedly because of her inability to afford bond.

Figure 2: Sandra Bland

48 Gavin Newsom, (Speech, Bail Reform Press Conference, Sacramento, CA, December 5, 2016).
50 Ibid.
In contrast, Robert Durst (Figure 3) was arrested in October 2001 for “dismember[ing] and behead[ing] his elderly neighbor.”\(^{53}\) Durst posted $250,000 in bail, was released from jail, and then fled.\(^{54}\) Durst, a 58-year old white man, didn’t mind losing the $250,000 he paid to the court because “he certainly didn’t need a quarter of a million dollars back.”\(^{55}\) At the time, Durst was a suspect in the disappearance of his wife and the murder of his friend in Los Angeles.\(^ {56}\) Comparing these two cases demonstrates that the commercial surety bail system releases defendants based solely on their ability to pay, without regard for their public safety risk or probability of appearing at future court dates. Under this system, low-risk and low-income defendants like Bland will continue to lose their freedom solely based on their economic status, while defendants like Durst, who pose a high public safety risk, will be allowed to “purchase their freedom.”\(^ {57}\)

![Figure 3: Robert Durst\(^ {58}\)](image)

Injustices like these play out every day across California. The state operates 123 jails with a combined average daily population of over 72,500 inmates.\(^ {59}\) Between 60 and 70 percent of these inmates are unsentenced, including pretrial defendants, people in jail because of parole and probation violations, and people awaiting sentencing.\(^ {60}\) Under this system, taxpayer dollars fund jail beds for thousands of unconvicted defendants.\(^ {61}\)

---


\(^{54}\) Ibid.


Furthermore, median bail amounts in California are more than five times greater than in the rest of the country ($50,000 in California; less than $10,000 elsewhere).62 Across the country, approximately ninety percent of defendants who are detained pretrial remain in jail because they cannot afford bail.63 This means that of the approximately 630,000 people in jails nationwide, about 340,000 are behind bars because of limited finances.64

Further, people of color are disproportionately represented among the pretrial population.65 Between 2005 and 2013, African Americans made up six percent of the California population but 17 percent of arrests.66 Similarly, during this time, Latinxs accounted for 37 percent of California’s population but 42 percent of arrests.67 The commercial surety bail system may perpetuate these disparities because judges, who determine pretrial custody status, may have implicit or explicit biases against people of color.68

Fifty-nine percent of arrestees in California are detained pretrial, compared to just 32 percent in the rest of the country.69 Despite detaining a greater percentage of pretrial defendants than other states, California has higher rates of felony rearrest than the rest of the country (12.4 percent versus 10.1 percent) and higher failure to appear rates than other states (6.6 percent versus 2.9 percent).70

It is clear that California’s current pretrial release system does not more effectively maintain public safety. If the state continues to operate under this ineffective and unjust system, Californians will suffer. Society is more at risk under a system that detains only those who are unable to pay, rather than those who threaten public safety.71

Under the current system, low-income people and people of color suffer a loss of freedom and other social costs associated with being jailed pretrial.72 Assemblymember Bonta is committed to protecting poor communities and communities of color and therefore feels called to reform this unjust system.73

---

62 Ibid.
66 Ibid.
67 Ibid.
70 Ibid.
Lastly, some jurisdictions have begun to challenge commercial surety bail on the basis of constitutionality, arguing that money-based systems detain defendants solely based on their inability to afford bail.\(^{74}\) Organizations such as Equal Justice Under Law have filed lawsuits alleging that commercial surety bail violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.\(^{75}\) Currently, there are two such lawsuits pending in Sacramento and San Francisco.\(^{76}\)

Normally a national leader for progressive policy, California should consider following the example of other states to reform the commercial surety bail system.

### Bail Reform

Bail reform in the United States began in earnest in the 1960’s with the Manhattan Bail Project, which encouraged the use of non-financial pretrial release.\(^{77}\) More recently, an increasing number of states are abandoning money-based systems and adopting risk-based systems. Many counties and states have pretrial services agencies that use risk assessment tools to screen defendants for risk before making pretrial release decisions.\(^{78}\) Additionally, almost every state has implemented some form of non-financial release which is used in conjunction with bail.\(^{79}\) A few states have abolished commercial surety bail altogether: Kentucky, Wisconsin, Illinois, and Oregon.\(^{80}\)

Many states implemented bail reform without increasing crime rates or failure to appear rates. For example, Kentucky releases around 70 percent of pretrial defendants and, of those, 90 percent are

---


\(^{80}\) Ibid.
not rearrested. Similarly, Washington, D.C. releases 90 percent of defendants. While D.C. did not abolish commercial surety bail, reforms prevent pretrial defendants from being held in jail because of an inability to pay bail. D.C.’s pretrial agency reports that about 90 percent of those released pretrial were not arrested within five years.

New Jersey also passed reform legislation. This legislation is relevant because California’s reform bills are modeled after New Jersey’s bill. In 2014, New Jersey passed legislation encouraging non-financial release, which went into effect statewide in January 2017. The bill mandates the use of a scientific risk assessment tool to screen defendants for their probability of being rearrested or failing to appear at their next court appearance. While commercial surety bail was not abolished, the bill requires that “release, where appropriate, will be ordered in lieu of money bail.” Since this law went into effect, the jail population has decreased by 27 percent compared to last year, and less than ten percent of defendants are detained pretrial.

This is the type of reform that California intends to implement. California’s bill will encourage the use of non-financial release methods without explicitly abolishing commercial surety bail. It is important to know that while there has been no statewide bail reform legislation passed in California, 46 of 58 counties have a pretrial services agency, and every county uses some form of non-financial release in conjunction with bail. Some counties also use risk assessment tools. The goal of Assemblymember Bonta’s bill is to expand pretrial services to every county in California, to mandate the use of a risk assessment tool, and to explicitly encourage the use of non-financial release in lieu of commercial surety bail. To assist our client in comparing this reform to the current system, we will examine the following policy question.

83 Ibid.
84 Ibid.
85 Margaret Dooley-Sammuli (Criminal Justice and Drug Policy Director for ACLU of California) in discussion with the authors, February 2017. See Appendix F for interview questions.
87 Ibid.
88 Ibid, 2.
90 There is an individual right to “bail by sufficient sureties” in the California Constitution. The current reforms will not amend the state constitution. Therefore, commercial surety bail will not be abolished. Cal. Const. art. 1, § 12.
92 Ibid.
Policy Question

How does the use of risk assessment tools and non-bail release compare to the current commercial surety bail system in California?

Policy Alternatives & Scoring

Nationally, federal and state governments are eliminating or minimizing commercial surety bail systems and creating pretrial services agencies.93 A primary function of these agencies is to screen defendants to determine their risk of failing to appear or being rearrested.94 Pretrial services agencies conduct these screenings with the help of risk assessment tools.95 After screening defendants, pretrial services agents prepare reports that aid judges in making decisions about pretrial custody status.96 Depending on the release options available to the judge, pretrial services agencies may also supervise defendants who are released pretrial.97

To analyze the status quo and policy alternative, we separated our analysis into two stages. The first stage analyzes the screening process whereby judges make decisions about defendants’ pretrial custody status. The status quo for the first stage is judicial decision-making informed by bail schedules. The policy alternative is judicial decision-making informed by risk assessment tools. The second stage analyzes release methods. Under the status quo release method, bail agencies contract with and supervise defendants released pretrial. Our policy alternative includes non-bail forms of release, such as release on own recognizance, supervision, and unsecured bonds. These policy alternatives will be explained in greater detail below. We chose our policy alternatives based on these factors: client preference, availability of research, national trends, and whether or not the alternative is widely used.

96 Ibid.
97 Ibid.
Stage One: Screening Processes

“Screening process” refers to judicial decision-making about the pretrial custody status of defendants. The purpose of screening processes is to assess a defendant’s risk of being rearrested or failing to appear at their next court date. We compare the impact of bail schedules and risk assessment tools on judicial decision-making about pretrial custody status.

Bail Schedule

A bail schedule is a list of criminal charges and aggravating factors associated with a bail amount. The judges in each county create bail schedules annually, so there are 58 bail schedules in California. “Judges [must] consider the seriousness of the offense charged” when setting bail amounts. All defendants are eligible for bail except for defendants charged with specific offenses outlined in the California Constitution. These specified offenses include: capital crimes, violent felonies, felony sexual assault, and criminal threats that may be carried out during pretrial release. The Penal Code outlines that judges are entitled to consider ability to pay, “the seriousness of the offense charged, the previous criminal record of the defendant, [the] probability of his or her appearing at the trial or hearing of the case,” and public safety. However, judges primarily rely on bail schedules, which only “consider the seriousness of the offense charged.” An excerpt from the Los Angeles County Superior Court bail schedule is included below in Figure 4.

---

100 Cal. Penal Code § 1269b(c) (West 2017).
102 Cal. Const. art. 1 § 12.
103 Cal. Const. art. 1 § 12.
105 Cal. Penal Code § 1269b(c) (West 2017).
The bail amount is initially set when the defendant is booked into jail. After the bail amount is set, the defendant has three options. First, the defendant can pay the full bail amount, which is refundable after trial, to the court. Second, the defendant can pay ten percent of the bail amount, plus fees, to a bail agency annually. Third, if the defendant is unable to afford the first two options, the defendant will remain in custody pretrial at the county jail. Our status quo policy for stage one of our analysis focuses on judicial decision-making about the bail amount using a bail schedule.

**Risk Assessment Tools**

Risk assessment tools are used to “identify the likelihood of failure to appear in court and the danger to the community posed by a defendant pending trial.” These tools input variables proven to be

---

108 Cal. Penal Code § 1269b(g) (West 2017).
110 “What Should I Know if I Am Arrested?” (Public Pamphlet, the State Bar of California, 2016), http://www.calbar.ca.gov/Public/Pamphlets/Arrested.aspx.
statistically significant in predicting the probability of being rearrested and failing to appear into a predictive algorithm that computes a risk score.\textsuperscript{112}

The variables considered by risk assessment tools vary.\textsuperscript{113} Common variables include: history of drug abuse, current charge, criminal history, age at first arrest, employment status, and residential stability. Pretrial services agencies gather information about defendants on relevant variables through criminal history records and/or interviews with the defendant.\textsuperscript{114} The information is then entered into the tool’s predictive algorithm, which computes a risk score. \textit{Table 1} below includes four risk assessment tools we will refer to throughout the analysis, the number of factors they consider, and how they categorize risk levels. \textit{Figure 5} shows an example of how a risk assessment tool classifies and scores defendants.

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|}
\hline
Risk Assessment Tool & Number of Factors & Risk Categorization \\
\hline
Ohio Risk Assessment System & 11 & Low, Medium, High \\
\hline
Community Risk Assessment System & 9 & Low, Medium, High \\
\hline
ARMS Risk Assessment System & 10 & Low, Medium, High \\
\hline
Risk Score & 5 & Low, Medium, High \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Four risk assessment tools.}
\end{table}


\textsuperscript{113} Risk assessment tool factors in \textit{Appendix A}.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Assessment Tools</th>
<th>Created by</th>
<th>Number of risk factors</th>
<th>Risk categories and corresponding scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Pretrial Assessment Instrument (VPRAI)(^{115})</td>
<td>Luminosity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Low (0-1), Below Average (2), Average (3), Above Average (4), High (5-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Risk Assessment System (ORAS)(^{116})</td>
<td>University of Cincinnati, Center for Criminal Justice</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Low (0-3), Moderate (4-6), High (7-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretrial Risk Assessment (PTRA)(^{117})</td>
<td>Luminosity</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Risk Level 1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretrial Risk Assessment (PSA)(^{118})</td>
<td>Laura and John Arnold Foundation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Risk Level 1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Offender Manager Profiling for Alternative Sanctions(^{119})</td>
<td>Northpointe</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Low (1-4), Moderate (5-7), High (8-10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


After the defendant is placed in a risk category, the pretrial services agency uses this information to compile a pretrial risk assessment report and recommendation for release. This information is given to the judge, who has the ultimate authority to make a release decision. Risk assessments tools, therefore, complement judicial authority instead of replacing it.

---


Stage Two: Release Methods

In stage two, we compare the conditions of release that defendants face under commercial surety bail to the conditions that would be used under a non-bail release system.

Commercial Surety Bail

Defendants have two release options under the commercial surety bail system. In the second stage analysis, we will focus only on the option where defendants contract with bail bonds agencies and pay ten percent of their bail amount.

For defendants who contract with bail bonds agencies, the agencies act as insurers, guaranteeing that defendants will appear for court dates. This can take many forms, such as requiring defendants to check-in by phone or in-person, or requiring that defendants wear electronic monitoring devices. We interviewed six bail agents from different counties throughout California. In these interviews, multiple bail agents indicated that they do not supervise defendants. One agent mentioned that he does not like to “baby-sit,” and another said that his work is “on the front end,” attempting to ensure that the defendants he contracts with will be reliable and attend court dates. If a defendant who has contracted with a bail bonds agency misses a court date and is never located, the bail bonds agency must “pay the full amount of the [defendant’s] bail to the court.”

Non-bail Release

Non-bail release methods do not require that defendants pay to secure their release from jail. These methods include supervised release, release on own recognizance, unsecured bonds, or a combination of these. Because many non-bail release methods are used in combination, we do not score them as individual alternatives. Instead, we combine the three alternative release methods to create an aggregated score for non-bail release.

Supervised release means that defendants are assigned supervision conditions based on risk level. In states using supervised release, conditions can include regular check-ins, electronic monitoring,
drug testing, and more. Judges may release low- and moderate-risk defendants with conditions that allow them to maintain employment and avoid other social costs. Thirty-eight counties in California currently offer supervised release.

Release on own recognizance is a release method that does not impose any conditions on defendants. Defendants are released on their promise to appear at the next court hearing. According to California Penal Code § 1270, anyone who is arrested for a non-capital offense is legally entitled to be considered for release on own recognizance and may be released by a judge. Judges usually consider the defendant’s public safety threat and risk score, as determined by a risk assessment tool, when making this determination.

The final form of non-bail release we consider is unsecured bonds, which require no upfront payment. With unsecured bonds, defendants are released with the promise to pay the full amount of their bond if they fail to appear for a court date. The bond amount is usually smaller than the amounts in bail schedules under the commercial surety bail system. Unsecured bonds are used in 38 states.

**Scoring**

To recommend a policy, we will evaluate the status quo and policy alternatives described above using seven criteria, two criteria for stage one and five criteria for stage two. The status quo and policy alternatives will receive a score for each criterion. This score is on an ordinal scale; alternatives will be ranked comparatively and relative to one another. A score of “1” will be given to the worse alternative, while a score of “2” will be given to the better alternative. This scoring system is applicable to all seven criteria. Within each stage of analysis (screening and release), the scores will be weighted. The weighting system is based on the recommendations of our client. The weights will be discussed in greater detail within each stage. After weighting the scores in each stage, the scores will be summed. This will reveal a policy recommendation for each stage: a recommended screening policy and a recommended release policy.

---


132 Example of OR Form from Riverside. “Agreement for Own Recognizance Release” (Superior Court of California, County of Riverside), http://www.riverside.courts.ca.gov/localfrms/ri-cr013.pdf.


First Stage of Analysis: Screening Processes

The first stage of analysis is based on two criteria: predictive accuracy and race neutrality. Judicial decision-making informed by bail schedules will be compared to judicial decision-making informed by risk assessment tools.

**Predictive Accuracy**

Predictive accuracy is the degree to which an alternative correctly predicts a defendant’s risk of being rearrested or failing to appear while released pretrial. Predictive accuracy is significant because judges are tasked by the California Constitution with accurately predicting the defendant’s risk of rearrest and failing to appear while released. The California Constitution states: “In setting, reducing, or denying bail, the judge or magistrate shall take into consideration the protection of the public, the safety of the victim... and the probability of his or her appearing at the trial or hearing of the case. Public safety and the safety of the victim shall be the primary considerations.”138 Judges may use bail schedules or risk assessment tools to inform this decision-making.

To evaluate the predictive accuracy of judicial decision-making using a bail schedule, we analyzed ethnographic “Bail Watch” data collected by the ACLU in the fall of 2016 at California Superior Courts.139 Additionally, after a comprehensive review of research on the accuracy of judges’ decision-making using a bail schedule, we found only one experimental study on this topic, which we included in our analysis. To evaluate risk assessment tools, we found three validation studies that published results on the tools’ predictive accuracy, and two case studies that address how risk assessment tools can improve judicial decision-making (Appendix B).

**Bail Schedule**

Under the commercial surety bail system, judges screen defendants using a bail schedule, which connects the current charge to a bail amount.140 The National Association of Pretrial Services Agencies’ (NAPSA) Standard indicates:

“[A] bail amount may be set by a judicial officer exercising unbridled discretion, without procedural safeguards for the defendant, without a full evidentiary hearing, and without giving the defendant any real opportunity to challenge the grounds for setting the bail at an amount virtually certain to result in detention.”141

Judges in California have the discretion to consider only “the seriousness of the offense charged, the previous criminal record of the defendant, and the probability of his or her appearing at the trial or
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139 Data from Los Angeles, Santa Clara, Alameda, Contra Costa and San Diego counties. ACLU Bail Watch Data, on file with the ACLU at Destiny Lopez, dlopez@aclusandiego.org.
hearing of the case." 142 Despite being allowed the discretion to consider the probability that a defendant will appear at trial, judges are not provided with any objective information that would lead them to infer how likely a defendant is to fail to appear. 143 The bail schedule itself only considers current charge. 144 So the judge is left with two options: use the bail schedule and make a pretrial decision based only on current charge, or make a decision based on their best guess at a defendant’s probability to reappear.

We found one study that evaluated the predictive accuracy of judicial decision-making using bail schedules. This experimental study showed that judges’ pretrial bail decisions were fairly predictive of the defendants’ risk of failure to appear and rearrest. 145 The author researched a natural experiment in Philadelphia comparing defendants who were originally released by a judge (“initial release”) with defendants who were initially detained by a judge but who were later released because of emergency jail overcrowding (“emergency release”). 146 Comparing the two defendant populations, “initial release” and “emergency release,” the study found that the “emergency release” population failed to appear 3.5 times more than the “initial release” population and were rearrested 2.3 times more than the “initial release” population. 147 This experiment demonstrates that judicial decision-making accurately predicted that the “emergency release” population was more at-risk for failure to appear and rearrest than the “initial release” population.

Despite the potential for accurate prediction, judges do not incorporate the careful consideration required to accurately predict the risk level of defendants beyond using the bail schedule. The “Bail Watch” data collected by the ACLU showed that less than 1.5 percent of defendants were “asked about their ability to pay” bail, and the most common factor considered by judges was the current charge. 148 Bail hearings lasted from under one minute to ten minutes, with a median of only two minutes. 149 It is reasonable to assume that two minutes is inadequate for judges to consider anything more than the bail schedule and their immediate biases. 150

Furthermore, bail schedules in California are set independently by Superior Court Judges in each county, based on an evaluation of the “seriousness of the offense charged.” 151 This results in the arbitrary assignment of bail amounts that vary widely across the state. For example, for “misdemeanor battery on a peace officer, fireman, or other specified public servant,” the bail amounts range from $500 in Merced County to $50,000 in San Joaquin County. 152 Bail schedules vary based solely on the county of arrest.

142 Cal. Const. art. 1, § 12.
143 Cal. Penal Code § 1269b(e) (West 2017).
147 Ibid. 1575.
148 ACLU Bail Watch Data, on file with the ACLU at Destiny Lopez, dlopez@aclussanandiego.org.
149 Ibid.
150 Ibid.
152 Range of bail amounts was the result of an analysis of all misdemeanor bail schedules for the years 2014-2017 in California, depending on availability. Total counties: 48. The remaining counties did not have a publicly accessible misdemeanor bail schedules. Superior Court of California, County of Merced, “Misdemeanor Bail Schedule,” (July 2014):
Because the status quo alternative does not provide judges with objective information to predict failure to appear, judges are only officially considering one risk factor—current charge. To compensate for this lack of information, judges use more discretion, which may include implicit biases, to attempt to predict failure to appear. Furthermore, the bail schedule itself is an unscientific tool that randomly assigns money bail amounts. Basing release decisions on a subjective and random instrument will significantly limit the predictive accuracy of the screening process.

Risk Assessment Tools

Alternatively, risk assessment tools can inform judicial decision-making. These tools are designed to objectively and scientifically predict rearrest and failure to appear. They generate risk scores, which are included in a risk assessment report created by pretrial services agencies. The reports are distributed to judges to help them determine whether to release defendants and the conditions of their release. Three validation studies of risk assessment tools demonstrate that all variables in the tools are statistically significant in predicting failure to appear and rearrest.153

The validation study of the Virginia Pretrial Risk Assessment Instrument (VPRAI) showed that the tool “is statistically significant in predicting pretrial outcomes,” with a p-value of 0.000.154 This tool goes beyond what is considered in the bail schedule (only current charge) to include additional factors (see Appendix A for risk assessment tool variables).155 The study also demonstrates that each factor is statistically significantly correlated with rearrest and failure to appear. The validation study of the Federal Pretrial Risk Assessment Instrument (PTRA) shows similar results. The PTRA includes “nine statistically significant and policy relevant predictors of pretrial failure.”156 The validation study of the Ohio Risk Assessment System—Pretrial Assessment Tool shows that “each
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risk level is associated with progressively higher rates of recidivism,” with an $R^2$ value of 0.22 and a
$p$-value of 0.00.  

Two case studies found that risk assessment tools help judges make more accurate decisions than
bail schedules about pretrial release. These studies conducted in Lucas County, Ohio, and Santa
Clara County, California showed that risk assessment tools help judges release more defendants
while reducing or keeping constant failure to appear and rearrest rates.

Unlike judges using bail schedules, pretrial services agencies are tasked with providing reliable
information to the court. Additionally, NAPSA Standards advocate for an objective process that
limits judicial discretion through the use of a risk assessment tool. If pretrial release is not
recommended, judges “should include in the [court] record a statement, written or oral, of the
reasons for this decision.” The record of the judicial decision about pretrial release allows for later
appeal of this discretion.

The use of risk assessment tools by pretrial services agencies and judges creates a reliable system
backed by systematically gathered information entered into a scientifically validated tool.

**Predictive Accuracy Scoring**

Our policy alternatives will be scored relatively. The better alternative will receive a score of “2”
while the worse alternative will receive a score of “1.”

Because the validation studies demonstrate that risk assessment tools use statistically significant
variables in a scientifically validated algorithm to predict failure to appear and rearrest, risk
assessment tools receive a score of “2.” Because bail schedules are unscientific, random instruments,
they receive a score of “1.” The scoring matrix for predictive accuracy can be viewed below in
*Table 2.*
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157 Latessa et al., “Creation and Validation of the Ohio Risk Assessment System Final Report,” *University of Cincinnati*
158 Laura and John Arnold Foundation, “New data: Pretrial risk assessment tool works to reduce crime, increase court
crime-increase-court-appearances/.
159 County of Santa Clara Bail and Release Work Group, “Consensus Report on Optimal Pretrial Justice,” (Santa Clara
County Government).
how judges document their decisions to override the score from a RAT for future appeal, see: Kristy Pierce-
Danford and Meghan Guevara, “Creating an Effective Pretrial Program,” *Crime and Justice Institute* (June 2013): 7,
### Table 2: Predictive Accuracy Scoring Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Definition: A screening process that uses...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>multiple variables that are designed to predict failure to appear and rearrest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>only one variable or random variables, which do not consider failure to appear and rearrest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Race Neutrality

A race neutral screening process transparently measures and minimizes racial bias.\(^{163}\) Racial bias occurs when groups face differential outcomes based on race. This criterion is significant because our client is dedicated to reducing racial injustices in California.\(^{164}\) In addition to our client’s preferences, all defendants have the right to be treated equally without regard to race.

We evaluated the prevalence of racial bias perpetuated by judges’ screening decisions by analyzing four studies that published results on the differential treatment of white defendants as compared to nonwhite defendants by judges. Because less research has been conducted on racial bias perpetuated by risk assessment tools, we analyzed this alternative based on three studies that published conclusions on how two risk assessment tools currently perpetuate racial bias, and how they can be corrected to reduce racial bias (Appendix C).

### Bail Schedules

Every study found some degree of racial bias in judicial decision-making. For example, four studies showed that defendants of color “were less likely to be released pretrial than white defendants.”\(^ {165}\) One of these studies found that being black increased the probability of staying in jail pretrial by 25 percent.\(^ {166}\) Another study used logistic regression which controlled for relevant factors, such as criminal history, and found that Hispanic defendants’ probability of release was 55 percent, in contrast to white defendants, whose probability of release was 68 percent.\(^ {167}\) Two studies similarly


find that Black and Hispanic defendants have a higher probability of being held pretrial.\textsuperscript{168} One of these studies used nonparametric methods to construct a simple model of bail setting in order to prove a causal relationship between judges’ decisions and the race of the defendant, and another used multivariate regression analysis to control for any relevant variables to prove that race alone had a significant effect on the probability of release.\textsuperscript{169}

Race can also play a role in bail determinations. One study showed that bail amounts for black defendants are systematically higher than white defendants, and another study showed that average bail amounts for Black and Hispanic males are 35 percent and 19 percent higher—a statistically significant difference.\textsuperscript{170}

As discussed in the previous section on predictive accuracy, judges only officially consider the bail schedules when making pretrial release decisions. But because the status quo screening process does not provide judges with objective information on the risk of rearrest and failure to appear for defendants, they are likely to fill in this information gap with their own assumptions and biases. While only one bail schedule is applied to all defendants within a county, we conclude that racial disparities perpetuated by pretrial detention decisions must be a result of these implicit biases.

It is well-known that judges exhibit implicit biases.\textsuperscript{171} One study surveyed judges about these biases. They found that “[ninety-seven percent (35 out of 36) of the judges placed themselves in the top half and 50 percent (18 out of 36) placed themselves in the top quartile]”\textsuperscript{172} when asked about “their ability to ‘avoid racial prejudice in decision-making’ relative to other judges who were attending the same conference.”\textsuperscript{173} This is “mathematically impossible.”\textsuperscript{174} Additionally, if judges believe that they make objective decisions, this could increase their bias.\textsuperscript{175} Operating in a system with unchecked


\textsuperscript{169} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{173} Ibid.


discretion to set bail using bail schedules, judges are likely influenced by implicit biases, which results in disparate outcomes for defendants based on race.

When combined with broad discretion and the implicit biases of judges, judicial decision-making informed by bail schedules is not race neutral.

**Risk Assessment Tools**

There is a lack of research on racial bias in risk assessment tools. Although risk assessment tools must be validated to prove predictive accuracy, an extensive review of pre-existing studies on risk assessment tools found that only two tools have been independently studied for racial bias.

One of these is the VPRAI, which was validated for race and gender neutrality in Virginia in 2016.\(^ {176} \)

According to this validation study, race- and gender-neutral tools are free from predictive bias. The author defines predictive bias as when a given risk score is associated with different failure rates between racial groups. An example of predictive bias is if a Black defendant receives a risk score of four, and that score is associated with a different predicted failure to appear and rearrest rate than a similarly scored white defendant.\(^ {177} \) This results in one group being over- or under-classified as high risk, and therefore receiving different treatment. To address and correct for predictive bias, the VPRAI researchers tested whether or not each factor statistically significantly predicted failure to appear and rearrest rates for both white defendants and defendants of color.\(^ {178} \) When they found a discrepancy in the predictive accuracy of a variable between racial groups, they amended or excluded that factor.\(^ {179} \) Their final conclusion stated that each factor, as well as the tool as a whole, accurately predicted failure to appear and rearrest for both white and nonwhite defendants.\(^ {180} \) They therefore concluded that the VPRAI is race- and gender-neutral.\(^ {181} \)

However, two ProPublica studies tell a different story.\(^ {182} \) The studies, backed by researchers at Google, the University of Chicago, and Carnegie Mellon University,\(^ {183} \) analyzed racial bias perpetuated by the COMPAS risk assessment tool. They found that Black defendants were two


\(^{180}\) Ibid.

\(^{181}\) Ibid.


times more likely to be misclassified as high risk (45 percent) than white defendants (23 percent). The tool also misclassified white defendants as being less risky than they actually were. They argue that racial bias includes more than just the narrow definition of predictive bias outlined above. Because the COMPAS tool accurately predicts rearrest and failure to appear equally for both Black and white defendants, as does the VPRAI, Black defendants receive more “false positives” than white defendants, meaning they are more frequently incorrectly labeled high-risk when they are actually low-risk. For the same reason that you wouldn’t consider a medical test accurate if it correctly identified the number of patients with cancer but gave out false positives to hundreds of patients who did not have cancer, these researchers argue that this system is not equitable for both Black and white defendants. Therefore, these researchers conclude that COMPAS is not race-neutral, and it perpetuates racial bias.

There is disagreement within the academic community about how to achieve race neutrality in risk assessment tools. However, researchers agree that it is possible. The VPRAI researchers claim that race neutrality in risk assessment tools can be achieved through improved predictive accuracy alone. Alternatively, the ProPublica studies quote researchers who believe in a different approach. Carnegie Mellon Professor Alexandra Chouldechova is currently studying how the risk assessment algorithm can be adjusted for a wider definition of race neutrality. Furthermore, racial bias can be explicitly measured in every risk assessment tool, and therefore the tools have potential for progress. Even though there is no consensus that a pre-existing tool effectively reduces racial bias, its ability to at least measure bias has potential.

While there is some evidence that risk assessment tools perpetuate racial biases, there is also evidence that they can be corrected and can achieve race neutrality. Risk assessment tools will limit judicial discretion by providing an official recommendation for judges. As discussed in our predictive accuracy section, judicial decision-making used in conjunction with risk assessment tools limits judicial discretion. One report shows that when judges are presented with risk assessment tool recommendations, they follow the recommendation 75 percent of the time. Based on this evidence, we believe that judges using risk assessment tools are better equipped to achieve race neutrality than judges using bail schedules.

**Race Neutrality Scoring**

The policy alternatives of bail schedules and risk assessment tools will be scored relatively. The better alternative will receive a score of “2” while the worse alternative will receive a score of “1.”
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3. Ibid.
Because it is difficult to measure judges’ implicit biases, judges using bail schedules receive a “1.” Because of the potential to measurably improve risk assessment tools, judges using risk assessment tools receive a score of “2.” The scoring matrix for race neutrality can be viewed below in Table 3.

**Table 3: Race Neutrality Scoring Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Definition: A screening process that...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judges with Risk Assessment Tools</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges with Bail Schedules</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**First Stage of Analysis: Recommendation**

Bail schedules received a score of “1” for predictive accuracy and racial neutrality, respectively. Risk assessment tools received a score of “2” for predictive accuracy and racial neutrality, respectively. Risk assessment tools scored higher than bail schedules on both criteria in the first stage of analysis.

These scores will be weighted based on the preferences of our client. Our client maintains that predictive accuracy is the most important factor to consider when evaluating screening processes, followed closely by race neutrality. Therefore, predictive accuracy will be weighted more (0.6) than race neutrality (0.4). The weighted and unweighted scores can be viewed in Table 4. After weighing the scores, bail schedules received a total weighted score of “1,” and risk assessment tools received a total weighted score of “2.” Thus, we recommend using a risk assessment tool to inform and improve judicial decision-making when screening defendants.

**Table 4: First Stage of Analysis Scoring Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Judges with Bail Schedules</th>
<th>Judges with Risk Assessment Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preliminary score</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictive accuracy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race neutrality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Second Stage of Analysis: Release Methods

For the second stage of analysis, we will compare the release methods of commercial surety bail to non-bail using five criteria: effectiveness, economic bias, fiscal impact, social cost, and political feasibility.

**Effectiveness**

An effective release method results in a released pretrial defendant avoiding rearrest within two years of initial arrest, and appearing at all mandated court appointments.

We compare the status quo of commercial surety bail to non-bail release methods, including release on supervision, unsecured bonds, and release on own recognizance. Many studies evaluate the effects of multiple non-bail release methods simultaneously, so we cannot make recommendations based on specific types of non-bail release. Our final analysis is based on ten studies that discuss failure to appear rates, rearrest rates, or both, in the context of at least one of the non-bail release methods (Appendix D).

A study in Colorado proved that unsecured bonds were as effective as surety bail in reducing failure to appear and rearrest. The study showed a 15 percent rearrest rate for unsecured bonds, compared to a 24 percent rearrest rate for commercial surety bonds. The same study also showed a 12 percent failure to appear rate for unsecured bonds, compared to a 19 percent failure to appear rate for commercial surety bail.

A case study in Kentucky examined the use of a validated risk assessment tool and non-bail release methods. The release methods included a mix of unsecured bonds, release on own recognizance, and supervision, which resulted in an increased release rate of five percent. Despite releasing more defendants pretrial, Kentucky saw decreases in its failure to appear rate (11 percent to ten percent) and its rearrest rate (nine percent to eight percent).

Another study from Virginia showed that defendants released on supervision “were 1.3 times less likely to fail to appear” or be rearrested. A case study from Iowa showed that using supervised
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release led to a 16 percent increase in release rate, as well as a decreased failure to appear rate (5.3 percent to 2.3 percent) and a decreased rearrest rate (4.4 percent to 2.3 percent).  

Two studies in Philadelphia and Kentucky showed that supervision decreases pretrial success for low-risk defendants, but increases pretrial success for medium- and high-risk defendants. 196 In Kentucky, “low-risk defendants who were [detained] for two to three days were 40 percent more likely” to be rearrested than low-risk defendants held 24 hours. 197 These studies show that detention increases rearrest rates for low-risk defendants, and that release without conditions is more effective in reducing rearrest.

Of these ten studies, four are experimental or quasi-experimental, which allow for causal conclusions. The first experimental study, in Manhattan, demonstrated that defendants who are released on their own recognizance had lower failure to appear rates (1.6 percent) than defendants released on commercial surety bail (three percent). 198 In the second experimental study, in Philadelphia, rates of rearrest and failure to appear for medium-risk defendants decreased for groups on supervised release, and rates of failure to appear decreased for high-risk defendants on supervised release. 199

A third quasi-experimental study from Colorado shows a 21 percent rearrest rate for unsecured bonds, as compared to a 23 percent rearrest rate for commercial surety bonds, and a ten percent failure to appear rate for unsecured bonds, compared to a 15 percent failure to appear rate for commercial surety bonds. 200 This study did not show a statistically significant difference in the rearrest or failure to appear rates between the two types of bonds, leading the researchers to conclude that rearrest and failure to appear remain constant under unsecured bonds and commercial surety bonds. 201 The final study, a meta-analysis of multiple experimental studies, showed that reminder calls to defendants (a form of supervision) reduced failure to appear rates from 23 percent
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to 11 percent in Colorado and from 25.4 percent to 12.9 percent in Arizona. However, the study did not show a correlation between drug testing (another form of supervision) and a reduction in the failure to appear rate in any county.

Lastly, one study concluded that failure to appear rates were lower for defendants under the commercial surety system. This study was done using the State Court Processing Statistics (SCPS) data, a statistical series by the Bureau of Justice Statistics. The Bureau of Justice Statistics released a data advisory against the SCPS data warning that it should not be used to explain causal associations. The study also only uses data from ten counties but labels the study as a national study. Four of the ten counties are from Texas, which makes the study geographically biased. Collectively, these studies show that non-bail release methods in general have lower failure to appear and rearrest rates compared to the commercial surety system.

**Effectiveness Scoring**

The policy alternatives of commercial surety bail and non-bail release will be scored relatively. The better alternative will receive a score of “2” while the worse alternative will receive a score of “1.”

Because some studies conclude that non-bail release methods reduce failure to appear and rearrest rates, but other studies find that the rates remain constant as compared to commercial surety bail, non-bail release is assigned a score of “2.” Because most studies conclude that commercial surety bail results in either higher or constant failure to appear and rearrest rates as compared to non-bail release, commercial surety bail receives a score of “1.” The scoring matrix for effectiveness can be viewed below in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Definition: Most studies conclude that this release method results in...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>lower rates of failure to appear and rearrest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>higher rates of failure to appear and rearrest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Economic Bias

An economically biased release method imposes a financial condition on defendants, resulting in unequal outcomes between high-income and low-income defendants.

Economic bias is a leading instigator of the legal arguments for bail reform. For example, the United States Department of Justice, in a brief for the plaintiff-appellee in *Walker v. City of Calhoun, Georgia* stated, “[A] bail scheme that imposes financial conditions, without individualized consideration of ability to pay and whether such conditions are necessary to assure appearance at trial, violates the Fourteenth Amendment.” This sentiment is further emphasized by our client, who maintains the perspective that an economically biased pretrial release system is not only unconstitutional, but unethical. Therefore, economic bias is a crucial criterion to consider when evaluating pretrial release methods.

We evaluate the prevalence of economic bias in each alternative by first examining the definition of each proposed policy. Definitions that include a financial condition will result in a lower score for economic bias. We supplement this evidence of economic bias with eight studies that point to whether defendants received differential treatment based on income under each alternative.

**Commercial Surety Bail**

Under the commercial surety bail system, defendants can either pay the full bail amount determined by a judge at their bail hearing, or they can contract with a bail bonds agency that assumes responsibility for their bail amount, “in exchange for a non-refundable fee” of ten percent annually. If they cannot afford either of these options, they will remain incarcerated pretrial. Bail bond agencies are commercial, private businesses and are therefore motivated primarily by profits. Their goal is to bail out defendants who can pay the nonrefundable fee. This non-refundable fee can have drastic financial consequences for low-income and indigent defendants. It is not waived or returned even if the defendant is found innocent or if the charges are dismissed. Many defendants cannot afford to pay their way out of jail pretrial, and instead remain incarcerated, despite the fact that they have not been convicted of any crime. Nationally, almost ninety percent of unsentenced defendants are in jail because they cannot afford to pay bail.
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Furthermore, defendants who cannot afford the full bail amount and must contract with bail agencies are often charged twice. First, they pay a non-refundable fee to compensate the bail agencies that are assuming the risk that the defendant will fail to appear and the bail agency will have to forfeit the full bail amount to the court. Many bail agencies also have defendants and their families sign contracts stating that the agencies will legally seize their assets if they fail to appear. Therefore, defendants pay both the nonrefundable fee, as well as assume the risk that their assets will be seized.

Economic bias occurs when a low-income defendant who is unable to pay faces a different outcome than a high-income defendant who is able to pay. With commercial surety bail, this is the case. Low-income defendants who cannot afford to either pay bail or contract with a bond agency remain incarcerated. Additionally, low-income defendants who do contract with a bail agency will have to pay a ten percent nonrefundable fee even if they appear at all court dates and/or are acquitted or their charges are dropped.

**Non-bail Release Methods**

To evaluate non-bail release methods, we will assess the economic bias of three such methods: release on own recognizance, supervised release, and unsecured bonds. Because pretrial services agencies often use these methods in combination, we will aggregate the results from each method to generate a total score for this alternative.

One non-bail release method that we will consider is release on own recognizance. The technical definition of release on own recognizance is “the release of a defendant in a criminal case in which the court takes the defendant’s word that he or she will appear for a scheduled matter or when told to appear; this type of release dispenses with the necessity of the defendant’s posting money or having a surety sign a bond with the court.” Because this alternative does not impose any financial condition on defendants, it is not economically biased.

Another non-bail release method is supervised release. The California Association of Pretrial Services (CAPS) defines release on supervision as the use of least restrictive terms to ensure that the defendant will not fail to appear or be rearrested. These supervision methods can include required substance abuse testing, limiting the activities or residence of a defendant, or requiring in-person check-ins with a pretrial services agency. Furthermore, CAPS states that supervised release can include “imposing financial conditions only when no other conditions of release will provide reasonable assurance that the defendant will appear in court.” Therefore, according to the pretrial standards set by CAPS, supervision should be included as a non-financial alternative to pretrial incarceration, and should not include financial conditions, except under extenuating circumstances.
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214 The Board of Directors of the California Association of Pretrial Services, “Release Standards and Recommended Procedures”, (California Association of Pretrial Services, California, 2007), 12.
However, in some counties defendants do have to pay a supervision fee. For example, defendants in Broward County, Florida must pay a $5 daily fee for their supervision.\footnote{Evan A. Lukic, “Evaluation of the Pretrial Services Program Administered by the Broward Sheriff’s Office,” (auditor’s report, Broward County, 2009), 12, \url{https://www.broward.org/Auditor/Documents/pretrial_final060909.pdf}.} However, according to the Pretrial Justice Institute, it is possible that defendants who are indigent and unable to pay these fees could undergo an ability-to-pay hearing and be exempt.\footnote{VanNostrand et al., “State of the Science Pretrial Recommendations and Supervision,” (Report, Pretrial Justice Institute, June 2011), 12.} In Broward County, this is the case; indigent defendants are not required to pay the $5 fee. There is no national or state-wide data that outlines how many pretrial services agencies charge defendants for their own supervision. However, because the standards set by CAPS do not recommend a fee and consider supervision to be a non-financial alternative, we can reasonably assume that if California adopts supervision as a non-bail release method, it will only sparingly include financial conditions. Therefore, this alternative is not considered to contain significant economic bias.

Unsecured bonds are another alternative to commercial surety bail. An unsecured bond is defined as “a bond where money is promised to be paid if the defendant fails to appear for court, but money does not have to be paid to gain release from custody. This type of bond may or may not have a co-signer who promises to pay the court the full monetary bond amount if the defendant fails to appear.”\footnote{Schnacke et al., “The Jefferson County Bail Project: Lessons Learned from a Process of Pretrial Change at the Local Level,” (Report, Pretrial Justice Institute, June 2014).} Unsecured bonds have the potential to be economically biased because they impose a financial condition if the defendant does not appear at court. In this case, low-income defendants who fail to appear could suffer an unequal burden as compared to high-income defendants because a set financial condition is a harsher penalty for a low-income defendant. However, there is no requirement of an upfront nonrefundable fee to be released from jail. Therefore, unsecured bonds may or may not perpetuate economic bias.

\section*{Economic Bias Scoring}

The policy alternatives of commercial surety bail and non-bail release will be scored relatively. The better alternative will receive a score of “2” while the worse alternative will receive a score of “1.”

Commercial surety bail always imposes an upfront financial condition, which creates different outcomes for low- and high-income defendants. Therefore, commercial surety bail is scored as “1.” Non-bail release methods vary in whether or not they impose a financial condition. Release on own recognizance imposes no financial condition on defendants. Supervision primarily does not impose a financial condition, and unsecured bonds have the potential to impose a financial condition as a sanction for failing to appear. However, none of these non-bail release methods impose a financial condition prior to release from jail. Therefore, this alternative receives a score of “2.” The scoring matrix for economic bias can be viewed below in \textit{Table 6}. 

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
Policy Alternative & Score \\
\hline
Commercial Surety Bail & 1 \\
Release on Own Recognizance & 2 \\
Supervision & 2 \\
Unsecured Bonds & 2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Economic Bias Scoring Matrix}
\end{table}
**Table 6: Economic Bias Scoring Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Definition: A release method which imposes...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-bail Release</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>no financial condition prior to release.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Surety Bail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a financial condition prior to release.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fiscal Impact**

The fiscal impact of a policy alternative is the degree to which it financially burdens taxpayers.\(^{218}\) This criteria is one of the most important to our client because constituents and policymakers are concerned about how taxpayer dollars are spent. Pretrial detention currently costs the state almost 30 billion dollars each year.\(^{219}\) However, reform will require investment to expand pretrial services to all 58 counties, properly staff all pretrial services agencies, and continue operating agencies into the future.\(^{220}\) The fiscal impacts of commercial surety bail release and non-bail release methods are critical to our understanding of reform.

We analyzed the fiscal impact of commercial surety bail and non-bail release methods on three dimensions: Average yearly cost of incarceration for the total jail population, pretrial services agencies wages and benefits, and pretrial services agencies supplies and supervision costs. See Table 7 for a summary of the fiscal impact of each dimension.

---


\(^{219}\) See Table 7.

## Table 7: Fiscal Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Impact of Status Quo Release Method (Commercial Surety Bail) (60% detained)</th>
<th>Fiscal Impact of Non-Bail Release Methods (40% detained)</th>
<th>Fiscal Impact of Non-Bail Release Methods (10% detained)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of pretrial defendants detained in jail per year</strong></td>
<td>675,614</td>
<td>450,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average yearly cost of incarceration for total jail population</strong></td>
<td>($113.87/per inmate * 675,614) * 365 = $28,080,240,656/yr</td>
<td>($113.87/per inmate * 450,409) * 365 = $18,720,146,583/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pretrial Services Staff Salary and Benefits</strong></td>
<td>46 counties: $29,923,310/yr</td>
<td>58 counties: $152,373,288/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pretrial Services Agencies Supplies and Supervision Costs</strong></td>
<td>46 counties: $18,222,656/yr</td>
<td>58 counties: $28,740,620/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$28,128,386,622</td>
<td>$18,901,260,491</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below we describe our calculations. First, we calculated the number of defendants detained under the status quo and under two non-bail release methods scenarios. In California in 2014, there were 1,126,022 felony and misdemeanor arrests of adults. The average number of defendants in custody in California per year is 675,614. We then conducted a sensitivity analysis, comparing the 60 percent detainment rate of the status quo to two hypothetical detainment rates that could be achieved using non-bail release methods: 40 percent (450,409 detained) and ten percent (112,603 detained).

---

221 All Figures are in 2014 Dollars.
222 2014 is the most recent year for which complete California adult arrest data is available from the California Attorney General.
Next, we determined the average yearly cost of incarceration for the total jail population. We multiplied the number of detained defendants by the average daily cost of a jail bed in California, which is $113.87, and then multiplied that product by 365 days. Under the status quo, with the 60 percent detainment rate, this totals more than $28 billion. With a 40 percent detainment rate, the total is $18.7 billion. With a ten percent detainment rate, the total is $4.7 billion.

Although California currently relies on a commercial surety bail system, pretrial services offices have already been established in 46 of 58 counties. However, many of these offices are currently understaffed and under-resourced. These 46 counties continue to rely on bail in addition to non-bail release methods to varying degrees. If non-bail release methods are adopted to replace or supplement commercial surety bail statewide, pretrial services agencies would need to be strengthened in the 46 counties with existing pretrial services and expanded to the 12 counties without pretrial services. Currently, the cost of incarceration and pretrial services is borne by the counties. However, if the alternative is adopted, the costs might be centralized under the state, making it look more expensive than it actually is.

The total cost of expanding pretrial services agencies statewide includes the cost of expanding pretrial services staff salaries and benefits to all 58 counties. We modeled our statewide estimates from Santa Clara County’s FY 2015 budget because Santa Clara has the most comprehensive pretrial services agency in the state. Therefore, it is a good example of best practices and represents a good estimate of the fiscal impact of pretrial services. In Santa Clara, 38,379 adults were arrested in 2014. In FY 2015, Santa Clara had 41 full-time equivalent (FTE) staff working in pretrial services. Using these numbers, there were 936 arrests per staff member. In California, 1,126,022 adults were arrested in 2014. Dividing total arrests by arrests per staff member equals 1,203 total required FTE staff in California (including the 236.25 FTE staff currently working in pretrial services statewide). The total salary and benefits for pretrial services in Santa Clara was $5,193,040 in FY 2015. Dividing that by 41 FTE staff members equals an average of $126,659.51 in salary and benefits per employee. Multiplying this by the total FTEs in the state (1,203) equals $152,373,287.65, which is the cost of pretrial services staff salaries and benefits statewide.

To calculate the cost of the existing pretrial services staff salaries and benefits in 46 counties, we use data from Californians for Safety and Justice. Currently, there are 236.25 FTE staff working in
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225 Gary Wion, “Average Daily Cost to House Inmates In Type II and III Local Detention Facilities,” (memorandum to Sheriffs, Local Department of Corrections Directors, and Type II and III Jail Managers, 2012), 2.
229 Gary Graves, “Fiscal Year 2016-2017 Recommended Budget,” (Budget, County of Santa Clara, 2016).
232 Arrest data from California Criminal Justice Statistics Center, which can be accessed here: https://oag.ca.gov/crime/cjsc/stats/arrests.
233 Gary Graves, “Fiscal Year 2016-2017 Recommended Budget,” (Budget, County of Santa Clara, 2016), 352.
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pretrial services in 46 counties. We multiplied 236.25 FTE staff by the salary and benefits per employee, $126,659.51, and found that the state currently spends $29,923,309.80 on salary and benefits for existing pretrial programs.

Finally, we calculated the cost of pretrial services supplies and supervision under the three release scenarios. Santa Clara County spent $653,093 on services and supplies in FY 2015. This amounts to $42.54 for services and supplies per released defendant in Santa Clara County. To calculate the cost of services and supplies under the status quo, we multiplied this number by 40 percent of arrests in the 46 counties that currently have established pretrial services programs (0.40*428,365), and we estimate that current, statewide spending on pretrial services supplies and supervision is $18,222,656. Similarly, under the 60 percent release scenario, we multiplied the cost of services and supplies per released defendant ($42.54) by 60 percent of the total arrests in California (675,614), resulting in $28,740,619 for services and supplies. Finally, under the 90 percent release scenario, we multiplied the cost of services and supplies per released defendant by 90 percent of the total arrests in California (1,013,421), resulting in $43,110,929. As more defendants are released and supervised, the cost of services and supplies expectedly increases.

Another fiscal impact factor is bail bond forfeitures, which is the amount that bail companies owe the state if a defendant fails to appear. If the state adopts non-bail release methods, it will, theoretically, be impacted by revenue loss from fewer bond forfeitures. However, evidence suggests that weak enforcement because of powerful bail industry lobbying groups leads bail companies to delay or avoid paying these forfeitures to the state. There are no state records showing the total amount bail companies owe the state in forfeitures, but records from Los Angeles County show that the county was owed $9.1 million in uncollected forfeitures between 2001 and 2003. Courts do not have the infrastructure to follow-up and file lawsuits, and because the bail industry is a for-profit industry, they do not pay expenditures they are not forced to pay. Counties are required to essentially sue the bail companies to receive forfeitures; this court process is lengthy and costly to taxpayers.

If a defendant flees and is recovered by law enforcement, bond companies are no longer required to pay the forfeiture amount. This scenario occurs frequently. Because of the lack of precise data on how much money bail companies owe the state in bond forfeitures, we are unable to include this factor in our quantitative analysis but this is still relevant to our scoring of fiscal impact.

236 Gary Graves, “Fiscal Year 2016-2017 Recommended Budget,” (Budget, County of Santa Clara, 2016).
239 https://crimlawandpolicy.wordpress.com/2016/03/30/forfeited-bail-how-much-is-forfeited-per-year/.
243 Ibid.
The total fiscal impact of the status quo system of commercial surety bail, combining the average yearly cost of incarceration for the total jail population, the costs of pretrial services staff salary and benefits, and the costs of pretrial services agencies supplies and services while 60 percent of arrestees are detained, is $28.1 billion. With a 40 percent detainment rate, the total would be $18.9 billion. With a ten percent detainment rate, the total would $4.9 billion.

**Fiscal Impact Scoring**

The policy alternatives of commercial surety bail and non-bail release will be scored relatively. The better alternative will receive a score of “2,” while the worse alternative will receive a score of “1.”

Based on our analysis of the costs associated with the policy alternatives (over $28 billion for the status quo versus $4.9-18.9 billion for non-bail release), commercial surety bail receives a score of “1,” and non-bail release receives a score of “2.” The scoring matrix for fiscal impact can be viewed in *Table 8*.

*Table 8: Fiscal Impact Scoring Matrix*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Definition: A release method that is...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Non-bail Release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Commercial Surety Bail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social Cost**

The social cost of a policy alternative is the degree to which it reduces the welfare of people affected directly and indirectly by the policy. Social costs are important because, like negative externalities, they do not appear in government budgets. Calculating social costs can be challenging because they are often difficult or impossible to monetize. Examining social costs enriches our analysis by providing a more complete understanding of how release methods affect defendants, their families, communities, and society.

We will analyze the monetizable social costs of commercial surety bail and non-bail release methods on three dimensions: lost wages of the jail population, the cost of sexual assaults among the jail population, and the cost of suicides among the jail population. We will also consider other social costs including the increase in recidivism for low-risk defendants who are incarcerated pretrial, the greater likelihood of being convicted and receiving a harsher sentence due to pretrial incarceration, and jobs lost if the bail industry is abolished.

To ascertain the social costs of lost wages, sexual assaults, and suicides among the jail population, we used a study published in October 2016 by the Institute for Advancing Justice Research and
Innovation at Washington University in St. Louis’s George Warren Brown School of Social Work.  

We used this study because the data is recent (all costs are in 2014 dollars), it is based on national cost data, and it is published by a reputable source.

We focus on lost wages, the cost of sexual assaults, and the cost of suicides among the jail population because these social costs are monetizable and impose significant burdens on incarcerated people, their families and communities, and society. See Table 9 below for a summary of these social costs.

Table 9: Social Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Costs of Status Quo (60% of defendants detained)</th>
<th>Social Costs of Non-Bail Release Methods (40% of defendants detained)</th>
<th>Social Costs of Non-Bail Release Methods (10% of defendants detained)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of pretrial defendants detained in jail per year</strong></td>
<td><strong>675,614</strong></td>
<td><strong>450,409</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lost wages of jail population</strong></td>
<td><em><em>$33,066 (average wages lost per defendant per year)</em> 675,614 = $22,339,852,524/yr</em>*</td>
<td><strong>$14,893,223,994/yr</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of sexual assaults for jail population</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,620 (3.2%) jail inmates sexually assaulted per year * $324,690 for the cost of one rape = $7,019,797,800/yr</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,414 sexual assaults</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost of suicide for jail population</strong></td>
<td><strong>112 (0.0165%) jailed inmates commit suicide per year * $8.66 million cost of human life = $2,338,200,000/yr</strong></td>
<td><strong>75 suicides</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$31,697,850,324/yr</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,216,570,384/yr</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


245 All Figures are in 2014 Dollars.

First, we calculated the number of defendants detained under the three scenarios. From the fiscal impact section, we find that 675,614 defendants are detained under the status quo, 450,409 are detained under the 40 percent detainment scenario, and 112,603 are detained under the ten percent detainment scenario.

Next, we determined lost wages for the jail population. This calculation consists of multiplying the average wages lost per defendant per year, which is $33,066,247 by the number of defendants held under each detainment scenario. We calculated lost wages of $22.3 billion per year under the status quo, $14.9 billion per year under the 40 percent detainment scenario, and $3.7 billion per year under the ten percent detainment scenario.

Next, we determined the cost of sexual assaults among the jail population. The number of jail detainees who are sexually assaulted each year (3.2 percent)248 was multiplied by the estimated cost of a sexual assault ($324,690).249 This calculation reveals that currently, the jail population experiences 21,620 sexual assaults per year with a social cost of more than $7 billion. Under the 40 percent detainment scenario, 7,206 sexual assaults would be avoided compared to the status quo, which results in $2.3 billion saved. Under a ten percent detainment scenario, 18,016 sexual assaults would be avoided, saving $5.8 billion compared to the status quo.

Finally, we determined the cost of suicides among the jail population. This calculation consists of multiplying the number of jail detainees who commit suicide in jail each year (0.0165 percent)250 by the estimated cost of a human life ($8.66 million).251 We find that currently, 112 jail inmates commit suicide each year with a social cost of $2.3 billion. Under the 40 percent detainment scenario, 37 suicides would be avoided and $1.7 billion would be saved compared to the status quo. Under a ten percent detainment scenario, 93 suicides would be avoided and $2.2 billion would be saved compared to the status quo.

Some social costs cannot be monetized. For example, it is difficult to monetize the increase in recidivism among low-risk defendants. Low-risk defendants held in jail “for two to three days [are] 40 percent more likely to commit [a] crime” than defendants who are held for 24 hours or less.252 Within 18 months of the bail hearing, jail “detention is associated with a 30 percent increase in felonies and a 20 percent increase in misdemeanors.”253

Another significant but non-monetizable social cost of pretrial incarceration is the greater likelihood of being convicted and receiving a harsher sentence. Research indicates that defendants who are
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248 Ibid., 10.
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250 Ibid.
251 Ibid.
incarcerated pretrial are between 13 and 25 percent more likely to be convicted, and 25 percent more likely to plead guilty. Another study conducted on 238,474 defendants in Philadelphia and Miami-Dade, Florida found that defendants incarcerated pretrial are 15.6 percentage points more likely to be found guilty, and 12 percentage points more likely to plead guilty. Additionally, defendants who are incarcerated pretrial are 43 percent more likely to be sentenced to incarceration. Those who are detained pretrial and then convicted receive sentences that are, on average, two times longer than defendants who were not detained pretrial. It is hypothesized that pretrial incarceration causes adverse case outcomes because detained defendants are in a worse bargaining position than released defendants and because detained defendants are stigmatized during court hearings by virtue of being incarcerated.

Pretrial incarceration is also linked to worse labor market outcomes for defendants incarcerated pretrial. Detained defendants “are 5.1 percentage points [less] likely to be employed within two years of the bail hearing.” Pretrial detention also negatively impacts tax filings and the receipt of government benefits. Defendants who are released pretrial are “9.5 percentage points more likely to file a tax return one to two years post-bail.” Within one to two years, defendants incarcerated pretrial received approximately $185 less in Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC). Over three to four years, defendants who were incarcerated pretrial receive approximately $343 less in Unemployment Insurance and $239 less in EITC. The negative labor market outcomes associated with pretrial incarceration may be impacted by the fact that defendants are unable to work while in jail, lose their jobs while in jail, and because of the “stigma of a criminal conviction” or arrest on job applications.

Pretrial incarceration also significantly impacts the children of defendants. Unfortunately, data about the number of children who enter the foster care system because of a parent being incarcerated pretrial are not available. However, in the year 2000 approximately 97,000 California children had at least one parent in jail. These children are being raised by grandparents, other family members and friends, and in foster care. They are profoundly affected by the incarceration of a parent, from psychological problems and mental health problems to poor school performance and a greater
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263 This is statistically significant at the 10% level. Ibid, 23.
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266 Charlene Wear Simmons, “Children of Incarcerated Parents” (report for California Research Bureau, Sacramento, 2000), 3.
likelihood of future incarceration.\textsuperscript{267}

While adopting non-bail release methods would clearly impose fewer social costs on defendants and much of society, it is also important to consider those who will be negatively impacted by the adoption of non-bail release methods: bail bonds agents. Approximately 3,240 bail bonds agents in California could lose their jobs if non-bail release methods are adopted.\textsuperscript{268} Because there is no reliable estimate the average salary of bail agents’ in California, this factor was not monetized.

We calculated the social costs under the status quo and our two hypothetical release scenarios (40 and ten percent detainment rates) and found significant cost savings under the hypothesized release conditions. We found decreases in lost wages, sexual assaults, and suicide under alternative release totaling between $11.5-26.6 billion yearly. Additionally, there are non-monetizable factors that could be improved under higher release scenarios. For example, as more defendants are released pretrial, we found evidence that the recidivism rate will decrease, case outcomes will become more equitable, and there will be better labor market and child welfare outcomes. The only negative impact that could result from non-bail release and higher release rates is the labor market impact on the bail industry, but we do not expect this cost to outweigh the savings. Overall, non-bail release methods provide substantial savings for social costs of incarceration and supervision.

\textit{Social Cost Scoring}

The policy alternatives of commercial surety bail and non-bail release will be scored relatively. The better alternative will receive a score of “2,” while the worse alternative will receive a score of “1.”

Our analysis found that non-bail release will produce cost savings of approximately $11.5-26.6 billion yearly, as compared to commercial surety bail. Additionally, the non-bail release alternative will yield savings on a majority of the non-monetizable costs considered in this analysis. Because of the savings generated under the non-bail release alternative, non-bail release is scored as “2,” and commercial surety bail is scored as “1.” The scoring matrix for social cost can be viewed below in \textit{Table 10}.

\textit{Table 10: Social Cost Scoring Matrix}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Definition: A release method which incarcerates...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Bail Release</td>
<td>2 fewer defendants and results in lower social costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Surety Bail</td>
<td>1 more defendants and results in higher social costs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{267} Ibid, 4.
\textsuperscript{268} Kendra Zoller, “AB 2449 by Assembly Member Eggman” (California Department of Insurance fact sheet, 2016).
Political Feasibility

Political feasibility is the likelihood that a policy alternative will be adopted based on the political environment and support of the public and elected officials.

To evaluate the political feasibility of the status quo and non-bail release methods, we interviewed Justin Rausa, Principal Field Representative for Assemblymember Bonta, and Margaret Dooley-Sammuli, Criminal Justice and Drug Policy Director of the ACLU of California. Rausa's insight and opinions on this matter represent our client's. Additionally, he is well-informed about the politics of the California Legislature. Dooley-Sammuli is knowledgeable about the political feasibility of bail reform in California because she is heading the ACLU’s Bail Reform Campaign Research Committee.

Support for non-bail release methods within the legislature is strong because the legislation was introduced by a Democrat and there is currently a Democratic supermajority in the California Legislature. The fact that bail reform has been achieved via bipartisan legislation in other states, like New Jersey, leads our client to believe that the bill will receive bipartisan support.269 Within the legislature, the bill will first move through the Public Safety Committee, which has staff with institutional knowledge on how to create legislation that will pass.270 Because people of color now make up a majority of the California electorate,271 and this legislation aims to reform a system that has historically discriminated against people of color, Rausa believes the bill will receive strong public support.272 This is substantiated by the passage of Proposition 47 in 2014 and Proposition 57 in 2016, both of which were progressive ballot measures that worked towards reforming the criminal justice system.273 Our client also believes that the recent surge in liberal political activism due to the new federal administration will work in favor of reform because the general population is paying attention to progressive policy reforms.274

Although the Democrats have a supermajority in the legislature, there are varying degrees of support for progressive issues within the party. In the legislature, there is a caucus of moderate Democrats,
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270 Justin Rausa (Principal Field Representative for Assemblymember Rob Bonta) in discussion with the authors, February 2017. See Appendix F for interview questions.
272 Justin Rausa (Principal Field Representative for Assemblymember Rob Bonta) in discussion with the authors, February 2017. See Appendix F for interview questions.
known as the “Mod Caucus,” which includes around 24 lawmakers who are pro-business and might support the bail industry.

Dooley-Sammuli echoed several of Rausa’s thoughts, highlighting the bill’s support from universities, criminal justice reform groups, anti-poverty groups, mental health groups, immigration groups, ethnic groups, faith communities, and politicians including Lieutenant Governor of California Gavin Newsom. The ACLU is undertaking public education efforts and is sharing the stories of families that are affected by the commercial surety bail system. Dooley-Sammuli explained that innocent family members of defendants (often mothers, grandmothers, wives, and girlfriends) are the ones who pay the price imposed by the bail industry by bearing greater family and financial burdens to make up for absent defendants.

Dooley-Sammuli also indicated concern about the bail industry’s powerful lobbying potential and “access to unlimited resources to buy political support.” The bail industry donated over $700,000 to lawmakers in California between 2002 and 2011. In contrast, Rausa is not concerned about campaign donations because on a per legislator basis, the donation amount is insignificant. Records from the donations made to State Senators and Assemblymembers from the past 12 years show that only a small portion of the legislators’ total donation (less than 1 percent for all current state legislators) comes from the bail industry. Therefore, although campaign donations are a consideration, they do not seem to pose a threat to the passage of the bill.

Adopting non-bail release methods is challenging because it requires investment in pretrial services agencies, which might not be possible in the current federal climate. Rausa expressed concern that California might not be willing to spend money on pretrial services if, for example, the Affordable Care Act (ACA) is repealed without replacement. Dooley-Sammuli also mentioned that if ACA is repealed, there will be a significant hole in California’s budget. In that scenario, the state would have to allocate funding for healthcare, and bail reform would not be a priority.

---


[280] Margaret Dooley-Sammuli (Criminal Justice and Drug Policy Director for ACLU of California) in discussion with the authors, February 2017. See Appendix F for interview questions.

[281] Ibid.


Dooley-Sammuli also discussed the challenges posed by critics of risk assessment tools, which are criticized for being racially biased. She said, “It’s a concern we all share, but we have to try to move something politically. It’s OK for people to critique risk assessment tools, which does not inherently go against the campaign.” She acknowledges that the legislation is a starting point, and improving the tools will be an ongoing process.

Another factor to consider when discussing political feasibility is the lawsuits that have been filed by Equal Justice Under Law in Sacramento and San Francisco counties. These lawsuits challenge the constitutionality of bail in California and could positively impact the passage of the bill if the plaintiffs win. Dooley-Sammuli stated that if these lawsuits result in wins for the plaintiffs, it could help raise the profile of the broken bail system in California. However, if they lose, it could present a challenge because they would garner negative press for the reform effort.

Assemblymember Bonta’s staff surveyed approximately 100 constituents, and found that, in general, people are unaware of problems with commercial surety bail. However, the same survey showed that people were very supportive of reform after learning of the existing problems. This illustrates that legislators and lobbyists must focus their efforts on public education about the problems inherent in the commercial surety bail system.

Maintaining the status quo is almost always more politically feasible than adopting reform because it requires no action. Reform efforts would clearly require considerable public education efforts. However, California is in a very good position to pass progressive reforms based on the political factors outlined above.

**Political Feasibility Scoring**

The policy alternatives of commercial surety bail and non-bail release will be scored relatively. The better alternative will receive a score of “2,” while the worse alternative will receive a score of “1.”

As the status quo, commercial surety bail requires no action to continue operating. Thus, bail release is more politically feasible than non-bail release, which requires legislative reform. For this reason, we score status quo as “2” and non-bail release as “1.” The scoring matrix for political feasibility can be viewed below in Table 11.
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286 Margaret Dooley-Sammuli (Criminal Justice and Drug Policy Director for ACLU of California) in discussion with the authors, February 2017. See Appendix F for interview questions.
288 Justin Rausa (Principal Field Representative for Assemblymember Rob Bonta) in discussion with the authors, February 2017. See Appendix F for interview questions.
Table 11: Political Feasibility Scoring Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Definition: A release method with...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Surety Bail</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>fewer challenges to adoption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-bail Release</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>more challenges to adoption.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Final Recommendation

The first stage of our analysis compares screening processes (judges and bail schedules vs. judges and risk assessment tools) on two criteria: predictive accuracy and race neutrality. The second stage compares release methods (commercial surety bail vs. non-bail release) on five criteria: effectiveness, economic bias, fiscal impact, social cost, and political feasibility. The mix of quantitative and qualitative criteria necessitate a variety of methodologies. We employed a review of existing studies and literature, high-level cost calculations and estimations, and interviews with experts to operationalize all of our criteria. Alternatives are always scored relative to one another, on a scale of 1 (worse) to 2 (better). After analyzing both alternatives according to each criterion, we scored the alternatives using weights developed in consultation with our client.

In the first stage of analysis, judges using risk assessment tools scored higher than judges using bail schedules because risk assessment tools are better at predicting risk. Additionally, risk assessment tools have the potential to measure and minimize racial bias more effectively than judges using bail schedules. In the second stage of the analysis, non-bail release methods score higher than bail release for effectiveness, economic bias, fiscal impact, and social cost, but not for political feasibility. After completing both stages of analysis, we compiled the final scores. Table 12 and Table 13, below, are the final criteria alternative matrices for our recommendations.
Table 12: First Stage of Analysis: Scoring Matrix for Screening Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Preliminary Score</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Final Score</th>
<th>Preliminary Score</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Final Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predictive accuracy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race neutrality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Second Stage of Analysis: Scoring Matrix for Release Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Preliminary Score</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Final Score</th>
<th>Preliminary Score</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Final Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Bias</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Impact</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Cost</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Feasibility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1.25</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1.75</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the section entitled “First Stage of Analysis: Recommendations,” judges and risk assessment tools received a higher weighted score (2) than judges and bail schedules (1). This led us to recommend that judges utilize a risk assessment tool when screening defendants to assess probability of rearrest and failure to appear.

Regarding the two criteria in the first stage of analysis, our client decided that predictive accuracy should be weighted slightly more heavily (0.6) than race neutrality (0.4). The unweighted and weighted scores for each criteria are in Table 12.
In the second stage of our analysis, we compared commercial surety bail to non-bail release methods: release on own recognizance, supervision, and unsecured bonds. Commercial surety bail received a score of “1” for effectiveness, economic bias, fiscal impact, and social cost. It received a score of “2” for political feasibility. Non-bail release received a “2” for effectiveness, economic bias, fiscal impact, and social cost. It received a “1” for political feasibility.

The scores for the second stage of analysis are also weighted based on the preferences of our client. Our client emphasizes effectiveness, fiscal impact, and political feasibility (0.25 each) more than economic bias and social cost (0.125 each). The weighted and unweighted scores can be viewed in Table 13.

After weighting the preliminary scores for the alternatives in the “Second Stage of Analysis,” commercial surety bail scored “1” while non-bail release scored “1.75.” Therefore, we recommend replacing commercial surety bail with different forms of non-bail release to increase the fairness and success of pretrial release.

Our overall policy recommendation is to combine the use of a validated risk assessment tool with non-bail release, such as release on own recognizance, supervision, or unsecured bonds. We do not recommend the continued use of bail schedules, judicial decision-making in isolation, or commercial surety bail.

**Limitations**

Throughout our analysis, we encountered various limitations. Overall, we discovered that there is a scarcity of research on the commercial surety bail system, risk assessment tools, and non-bail release. More specifically, we noted that the three validation studies used to evaluate the predictive accuracy of risk assessment tools were completed by the tool creators themselves, and therefore have the potential to incorporate bias. Furthermore, we found only one study that evaluates the predictive accuracy of judges using bail schedules. Additionally, we noted a lack of research on racial bias in risk assessment tools. Only one tool, COMPAS, has been studied by an independent unbiased researcher, and another tool, VPRAI, was analyzed for racial bias, but the analysis was conducted by the tool creator and therefore has the potential to be biased.

In addition to a lack of research, we also faced challenges when attempting to estimate fiscal impact and social costs. We found it impossible to monetize some social costs, such as the impact of the pretrial custody status of defendants on the foster care system. We based our fiscal impact estimates for non-bail release on Santa Clara’s fiscal year 2015 budget. We used this budget because the ACLU and California Forward consider Santa Clara to be a good example of a functioning pretrial

---


While the Santa Clara County Office of Pretrial Services’ budget is a good example, it could be problematic to assume that all counties in California will operationalize their pretrial services agencies budgets in the same way. It is more likely that costs will vary across counties if risk assessment tools and non-bail release are implemented in California; therefore, our fiscal impact numbers are a rough estimate. Furthermore, we could not find data on all costs that may influence the fiscal impact criteria, such as bail bond forfeitures owed to the state.

The limitations we encountered lead us to believe that more research should be done on the commercial surety bail system and its outcomes, as well as on risk assessment tools and non-bail release. This research should be done by neutral third parties—not by entities with connections to the bail bonds industry or to the companies that create risk assessment tools. In particular, more research on racial bias in risk assessment tools will also inform the debate about replacing the commercial surety bail system with a system based on predictive algorithms.

Despite these limitations, all assumptions were made with careful considerations, and the best available research was used when evaluating both of these policy alternatives. Therefore, our recommendations are based on data-driven objective policy analysis, and we do not hesitate in recommending the use of risk assessment tools and non-bail release. After our careful analysis, we support the passage of Assembly Bill 42 and Senate Bill 10.

---

292 Sharon Aungst, “Pretrial Detention and Community Supervision,” (Report, California Forward, September 2012), 14. https://caforward.3cdn.net/7a60c47c7329a4ab6d7_2am6iyh9s.pdf.


294 Examples include: ACLU, Luminosity, private consultants like Cathy O’Neil, ProPublica, California Forward, Californians for Safety and Justice, etc.

### Appendix A: Risk Assessment Tool Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Risk Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Virginia Pretrial Assessment Instrument (VPRAI)\(^{296}\) | ● “Current Charge(s)”  
● Pending Charges at Time of Arrest  
● History of Criminal Arrests and Convictions  
● Active Community Supervision at Time of Arrest (e.g. Pretrial, Probation, Parole)  
● History of Failure to Appear  
● History of Violence  
● Residence Stability  
● Employment Stability  
● Community Ties  
● Substance Abuse” |
| Ohio Risk Assessment System (ORAS)\(^{297}\)          | ● “Age at first arrest”  
● “Number of Failure-to-Appear Warrants Past 24 Months”  
● “Three or more Prior Jail Incarcerations”  
● “Employed at the Time of Arrest”  
● “Residential Stability”  
● “Illegal Drug Use during Past Six Month”  
● “Severe Drug Use Problem” |

| Federal Pretrial Risk Assessment (PTRA)\(^{298}\) | ● “Number of felony convictions  
● Prior failure to appear  
● Pending felonies or misdemeanors  
● Current offense type  
● Offense class  
● Age at interview  
● Highest education  
● Employment status  
● Residence  
● Current Drug Problems  
● Citizenship status  
● Foreign ties” |
| --- | --- |
| Arnold Foundation Public Safety Assessment (PSA)\(^{299}\) | ● “Age at current arrest  
● Current violent offense  
  ○ Current violent offense & 20 years old or younger  
● Pending charge at the time of the offense  
● Prior misdemeanor conviction  
● Prior felony conviction  
  ○ Prior conviction (misdemeanor or felony)  
● Prior violent convictions  
● Prior failure to appear in the past 2 years  
● Prior failure to appear older than two years  
● Prior sentence to incarceration” |


Correctional Offender Manager Profiling for Alternative Sanctions (COMPAS)

- **“Criminal Involvement**
  - Criminal involvement
  - History of non-compliance
  - History of violence
  - Current violence

- **Relationships/Lifestyle**
  - Criminal associations/peers
  - Criminal opportunity
  - Leisure and recreation
  - Substance abuse

- **Personality/Attitudes**
  - Criminal personality
  - Criminal thinking self-report
  - Anger
  - Cognitive behavioral

- **Family**
  - Socialization failure

- **Social exclusion**
  - Vocational/education
  - Residential instability
  - Social adjustment problems”

---

## Appendix B: Predictive Accuracy Table of Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating and Validation of the Ohio Risk Assessment System</td>
<td>Edward Latessa, Paula Smith, Richard Lemke,</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>University of Cincinnati School of Criminal Justice Center</td>
<td>1,837</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Validation study, correlational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Lemke, Matthew Makarios, Christopher</td>
<td></td>
<td>for Criminal Justice Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lowenkamp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New data: Pretrial risk assessment tool works to reduce crime, increase court appearances</td>
<td>Laura and John Arnold Foundation</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Laura and John Arnold Foundation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Lucas County, Ohio</td>
<td>Correlational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretrial Risk Assessment in the Federal Court</td>
<td>Marie VanNostrand</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Luminosity, Inc.</td>
<td>565,178</td>
<td>94 federal judicial districts, including at least one district in each</td>
<td>Validation study, correlational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Title</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Journal/Publication</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk-Based Pretrial Release Recommendation and Supervision Guidelines</td>
<td>Mona J.E. Danner, Marie VanNostrand, Lisa M. Spruance,</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Luminosity, Inc.</td>
<td>14,382</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Validation study, correlational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C: Race Neutrality Table of Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Market Test for Race Discrimination in Bail Setting</td>
<td>Ian Ayres and Joel Waldfogel;</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Yale Law School</td>
<td>1,366</td>
<td>New Haven, Connecticut</td>
<td>Correlational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias in Criminal Risk Scores is Mathematically Inevitable, Researchers Say</td>
<td>Julia Angwin, Jeff Larson</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>ProPublica</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Correlational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give Us Free': Addressing Racial Disparities in Bail Determinations</td>
<td>Cynthia E. Jones;</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>American University Washington College of Law</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Meta-analysis, correlational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine Bias</td>
<td>Julia Angwin, Jeff Larson, Surya Mattu and Lauren Kirchner</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>ProPublica</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>Broward County, Florida</td>
<td>Correlational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretrial Release of Felony Defendants in State Courts</td>
<td>Thomas H. Cohen &amp; Brian Reaves</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>DOJ Bureau of Justice Statistics</td>
<td>~40,000</td>
<td>“40 of the nation’s 75 most populous counties” (2, n. 3)</td>
<td>Correlational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix D: Effectiveness Table of Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Give Us Free’: Addressing Racial Disparities in Bail Determinations</td>
<td>Cynthia E. Jones</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>American University Washington College of Law</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Saint Louis County, Minnesota</td>
<td>Correlational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives to Pretrial Detention: Southern District of Iowa</td>
<td>Marie VanNostrand</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Luminosity, Inc.</td>
<td>3,521</td>
<td>Southern District of Iowa</td>
<td>Comparative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretrial Release of Felony Defendants in State Courts</td>
<td>Thomas H. Cohen &amp; Brian Reaves</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>Sample of 40 of the nation’s 75 most populous counties</td>
<td>Correlational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Title</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk-Based Pretrial Release Recommendation and Supervision Guidelines</td>
<td>Marie VanNostrand, Lisa Spruance, and Mona Danner</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Luminosity, Inc.</td>
<td>14,382</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Correlational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsecured Bonds: The As Effective and Most Efficient Pretrial Release Option</td>
<td>Michael R. Jones</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Pretrial Justice Institute</td>
<td>~1,900</td>
<td>10 Colorado counties (where 80% of the state’s population lives)</td>
<td>Correlational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vera Institute of Justice: Manhattan Bail Project</td>
<td>Scott Kohler</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>~3,505</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Causal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: Campaign Donation Data for Current State Assemblymembers and Senators, Since 2006

Between 2006 and 2018, eight senators accepted $23,800 in campaign donations: five Democrats and three Republicans. The most donations were received by Kevin de Leon, who is currently the Senate President Pro Tempore, at $9,700.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assemblymember Name</th>
<th>Donations from Bail Agencies and Agents</th>
<th>Total Donations from All Sources</th>
<th>Percent of Total Donations that Come from Bail Agencies and Agents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kevin de Leon</td>
<td>$9,700</td>
<td>$8,576,594.43</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Nielsen</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>$3,068,266.27</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Stone</td>
<td>$3,900</td>
<td>$1,926,770.27</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathleen Galgiani</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$10,204,201.98</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike McGuire</td>
<td>$725</td>
<td>$618,258.59</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Hernandez</td>
<td>$375</td>
<td>$5,117,148.02</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Nguyen</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$4,408,738.11</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Beall</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$4,085,806.18</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Between 2006 and 2016, 13 Assemblymembers received campaign donations from bail agencies and agents. They received $15,950 in campaign donations. Donations were received by nine Democrats and four Republicans. The Speaker of the Assembly, Anthony Rendon, has received the most donations at $3,125.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senator Name</th>
<th>Donations from Bail Agencies and Agents</th>
<th>Total Donations from All Sources</th>
<th>Percent of Total Donations that Come from Bail Agencies and Agents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Rendon</td>
<td>$3,125</td>
<td>$4,659,999.39</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Cooper</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,044,436.74</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher Gonzalez</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$1,278,298.77</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joaquin Arambula</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$1,820,201.39</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan Cunningham</td>
<td>$1,225</td>
<td>$1,267,550.51</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Caballero</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$4,852,268.32</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Calderon</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$3,000,277.44</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Waldron</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,614,725.67</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Mullin</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$2,151,522.47</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Brough</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$708,172.98</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Choi</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$888,668.14</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin McCarty</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$1453154.03</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudy Salas, Jr.</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$4,741,372.09</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: Interview Questions for Political Feasibility Criterion

Interview Questions for Justin Rausa on February 13, 2017:

1. What are some of the challenges with abolishing the commercial bail system?
2. What kind of support do you have inside and outside of the legislature? Where does the support come from?
3. Are you worried about opposition from legislators who have received donations from the bail industry?
4. What are you doing to gain public support for this legislation?
5. Why has this reform not happened in California before now? Why do you think now is a good time?
6. Can you talk about what political conditions lead to bail reform in other states?
7. Do you expect pushback because of the research that shows risk assessment tools contain racial bias?
8. What kind of effect does the current federal administration and political climate have on the passage of the bill?
9. What do you think is more politically feasible: keeping commercial surety bail or adopting risk assessment?
10. What do you think is more politically feasible: release on own recognizance, supervision matrix, or unsecured bonds, or a combination of these?

Interview Questions for Margaret Dooley-Sammuli on February 23, 2017:

1. What are some of the challenges with abolishing the commercial bail system? Do you think it will be possible to totally abolish bail with the introduction of this legislation? (If yes/no: why?)
2. What kind of institutional support does the ACLU have on this issue? Where does the support come from? (other organizations, non-profits etc.)
3. Are you worried about opposition from the bail industry? What, in particular, are you worried about?
4. What are other barriers to bail reform that you think the campaign will face?
5. How big of a barrier to full bail reform (elimination of money bail) does the California Constitution pose?
6. What impact do you think the lawsuits in Sacramento and San Francisco will have on the bail reform campaign, if any?
7. What are you doing to gain public support for this legislation?
8. Why has this reform not happened in California before now?
9. Why do you think now is a good time for reform? Can you talk about what political conditions led to bail reform in other states?
10. Another person that we interviewed mentioned that there have been a lot of successes on criminal justice reform legislation, and that these successes have created momentum of support of bail reform. However, we saw an LA Times article about the killing of the police officer in Whittier and how they are blaming the killing on criminal justice reform and are asking Jeff Sessions to look into the criminal justice reform in California. Do you think this will have an impact on bail reform in California?
11. Do you expect pushback because of the research that shows risk assessment tools contain racial bias?
12. What do you think is more politically feasible: keeping the commercial surety bail or adopting risk assessment tools?
13. What do you think is more politically feasible: release on own recognizance, supervision matrix, or unsecured bonds, or a combination of these?
14. Do you think that this will end up being a two-year bill?
Appendix G: Interview Questions for Bail Agents

Introduction questions:

1. How did you get into this type of work?
2. How long have you been working at your current position?
3. What is your official title?

Understanding the system:

1. Walk me through your day today.
   a. Is this a typical day?
2. How do you get business?
3. Do you go to court? What do you do at court?
4. Do you work with attorneys? How do you work with them?
5. How do you decide who to bail out?
6. Describe the ideal defendant for bailing out.
7. Describe a defendant that you would not bail out.
8. How do you make decisions about co-signers?
9. How do you monitor the defendants? How do you ensure that they will return to court?
10. What happens if they don’t appear at court?
11. How often do you worry about flight-risk being an issue for defendants? Are they mostly compliant?

Understanding the agents’ self-image:

1. When you see depictions of bail agents in popular culture, what is your reaction?
2. What qualities do you possess that make you good at your job?
3. How do you incorporate ethics into your position? (For example, man in Riverside bailed out and murdered his partner.)
4. I’ve heard bail describe their work as a service. What services do you provide for families of defendants? What about defendants? For society as a whole?
5. What are some challenges you run into trying to do your job?
6. What are some information or tools you wish you had to make your job easier?