From: Lizabeth Belli <bellifranco@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 5:05 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge. For evidence, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice2Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those

who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone will be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including probation, risk assessments, and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative this Commission ensures that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly reduce any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Lizabeth Belli

Lizabeth Belli (she/her)
bellifranco@gmail.com
(310) 948-3221
#CareFirst
#CareNotCops

From: Lucas O'Connor <lucas.c.oconnor@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 5:10 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge. For evidence, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice2Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those

who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone will be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including probation, risk assessments, and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensures that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly reduce any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Lucas O'Connor

From: Sarah Bowers <sarah.a.bowers@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 5:32 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members:

Like many who are writing and submitting public comment, I'm writing to explain my concerns about Agenda Item 4. I was very relieved about the state's Supreme Court decision that ruled the money bail system unconstitutional. As someone who is working on my master's degree and has studied the unconstitutionality and harmful effects of monetary bail, I feel very glad it has been deemed unconstitutional.

However, the way that the system is now filling the void of monetary bail is just as problematic and perpetuates some of the most harmful aspects of monetary bail. Your Board must guard against increased probation, risk assessment tools, and e-monitoring.

Probation is a problem for many reasons:

- Data shows that inclusion of probation still serves to cycle people back into incarceration
- Probation can be and will be unfairly applied to already marginalized and discriminated-against groups of people - because that's what is already happening and you haven't stopped it from happening
- Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers.
- Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.
- If you use probation employees as primary experts when considering how to change these punitive systems, of course they will opt and choose to make changes that aren't really changes, just dressed up versions of the same punitive measures.

E-Monitoring is also a problem:

- It still limits people's access to employment, caregiving, parenting, legal resources, and income. Why do people think e-monitoring is somehow better?
- Data shows it increases risk of domestic abuse, perpetuates racial disparities, and develops more burdens for those under surveillance
- EM hasn't improved court appearance.
- It seems the only benefit EM has is for the Probation Department
- It isn't a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention

The harms of including probation, risk assessments, and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Signed,
Sarah Bowers

From: Ashley Locke <ashleylocke1206@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 5:47 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Ashley Locke

--
Ashley Locke
Pronouns: She/her
562 - 508 - 1828

From: Melissa Butts <mbutts0321@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 5:51 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Submitting Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money

bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Melissa Butts

From: Kelly Young <klly.a.young@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 5:58 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Kelly Young

--

Kelly Young
Owner/Designer of Deconstructed Design

From: Selina Ho <sho9223@scrippscollege.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 6:04 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Selina

From: Court Val <courtvalsocial@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 6:08 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Courtney Valentine

From: Jeshow Yang <jeshowy@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 6:12 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

--
Sincerely,

Jeshow Yang

From: Grant Carey <gcarey8@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 6:21 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Charles Carey

From: Catherine Weld Mayer <cmayer3446@scrippscollege.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 6:26 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Catherine Mayer
90066

From: Bri Price <briprice7@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:02 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
--
Bri Price

From: Social Modo LA <social@modoyogala.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:04 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Best,
--
Caroline Lacy (she/hers)
Social Media Manager
Student, Teacher
Modo Yoga LA
Venice | La Brea | Echo Park
1-888-MODO-LA3
www.modoyogala.com

MODO YOGA LA

From: Lani Engstrom <laniengstrom@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:05 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Lani Engstrom

From: John Bradley <mapgallo@icloud.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:05 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
MaryAnn Gallo

From: Dawy Rkasnuam <dawy.rk@protonmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:05 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized

by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Dawy Rkasnuam

From: Karen Garcia <karenlissettgarcia@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:06 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring. I believe implementation of any of the items mentioned would worsen the incarceration cycle.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Karen

--
Karen Garcia
University of Southern California, 2018
B.A. Creative Writing
University of Southern California, 2019
M.A. Literary Editing and Publishing
Dornsife College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences
karenlissettgarcia@gmail.com

From: Samantha Abbott <sam21abbott@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:06 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment,

mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Samantha Abbott

--
Samantha Abbott
Pronouns: she/her/hers
sam21abbott@gmail.com

From: Lynne Moses <lynnemoses08@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:08 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Lynne Lueders
Studio City, CA

From: Sarah Eggers <eggers.sh@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:08 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Sarah Eggers

--

Sarah Eggers, LMFT, ATR, MFA
pronouns she/her/hers
450 S. Marengo Ave. Pasadena, CA 91101
(626)720-4335
LMFT#100220

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The contents of this email message and any attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged information and may be legally protected from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, or if this message has been addressed to you in error, please immediately alert the sender by reply email and then delete this message and any attachments. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, copying, or storage of this message or its attachments is strictly prohibited.

From: Michelle King <king.michellej@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:08 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and

would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

In community,

Michelle King

From: Danielle Achiro <danielleachiro9@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:09 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Danielle Achiro

From: Grace Persico <gepersico@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:09 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,

Grace

From: Laura Adery <laura.adery@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:11 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

As a mental health professional and fellow Angeleno, I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Respectfully,
Laura Adery, Ph.D.

From: Bri Maranga <brimaranga@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:14 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Best,
Bri Maranga

From: Nannah N. <neddiedavid@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:15 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Hannah Nitecki

From: alix@kalaher.net <alixkalaher@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:16 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Alix Kalaher

From: Amelie Cherlin <ameliecherlin@protonmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:17 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Amelie Cherlin
Los Angeles

From: Cody Cushing <CodyCushing@live.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:18 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Cody Cushing

From: Alex Fierro-Clarke <alexfierro.film@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:18 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

-How EM use has changed over time -- specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
-Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.

-What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
-What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
-How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
-Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

-What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
-What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

-Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
-Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

-Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
-Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Alexander Fierro-Clarke
Los Angeles resident

From: Jack MacCarthy <jackmaccarthywrites@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:23 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Jack MacCarthy

From: Milla Bell-Hart <milla.bell.hart@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:23 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,

--
Milla
she/her
207.841.9220

From: richard.gagliano@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:25 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.What decision-

making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento. Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,

Richard Gagliano

From: Elizabeth Frame <eaw1088@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:25 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

Why would we ever expect a system already proven to be malignant to solve any problems?

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

It is time to fix these problems, not just give them a new look.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these

outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Frame, MD

From: romane thomas <tozmastozmas@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:28 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Romane Thomas

From: Sophia Rome <sophrome@umich.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:28 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Sophia Rome

--
Sophia Rome
University of Michigan Class of 2018
BA Spanish, BA Political Science

From: Tobin <tobin.lisamarie@me.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:34 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
LisaMarie Tobin

From: Lieah Maxfield <lieahzavrid@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:35 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment for Probation Oversight Commission Meeting 5/13/2021

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Oversight Commission Members,

Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

1) How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now. Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
2) What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
3) What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
4) How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
5) Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

1) What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
2) What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

1) Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
2) Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

Thank you for your time,

Lieah Maxfield, MS, ATC
lieahmaxfield@gmail.com
(619) 701-4256

"You have to accept whatever comes and the only important thing is that you meet it with courage and with the best that you have to give."

-Eleanor Roosevelt

From: Joe Parker <Joe_Parker@pitzer.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:35 PM
To: info-POC
Cc: Joe Parker
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,

joe parker
Altadena

From: Ruby Condon <rubyjanecondon1@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:35 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Ruby Condon

From: Jaclynn Lauwerys <jaclynnc21@icloud.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:36 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: PublicComment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely yours
Jacqueline Combs Name]

5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Live Public Comment Talking Points

---

Sent from my iPhone

From: Anna Hossnieh <annahossnieh@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:37 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Anna Hossnieh

From: Conrad Moore <conradtmoore@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:39 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,

Conrad Moore
He/Him/His

From: Mallory Westfall <mallory.westfall@icloud.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:40 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Mallory Westfall

From: Shira Mendelsohn <shiramen@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:42 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,

Shira Mendelsohn

From: Kendall Sherwood <kasherwood@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:43 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,

Kendall Sherwood
Los Angeles, CA 90042

From: Sandra So Hee Chi Kim <sandy.chi@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:43 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Sandra Kim

From: Averill Healey <healey.averill@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:43 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely
Averill Healey

From: Samantha Miller <samanthamiller3@me.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:44 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Sam Miller (she/her)

From: Jacob Roberts <roberts.jacob@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:45 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Commission Members:

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Thank you.

From: Chris Riddle <chris.riddle@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:48 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,

Chris Riddle
Second AD
828.231.2153
chris.riddle@gmail.com
www.imdb.me/chrisriddle

From: becca.v.b@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:52 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Becca

From: gillian mammone <gillianmammone@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:53 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Gillian Mammone

From: Lyndsey Nolan <lqnolan@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:53 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Lyndsey Nolan
90017
--

Lyndsey Q. Nolan, MPH
She/Her
P: 310.709.5518
L: linkedin.com/in/lyndseyqnolan

From: Ashley Gibbons <agibb13@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:55 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,
I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.
Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.
Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.
For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.
And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.
EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.
We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.
For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,

Ashley Gibbons

From: Herley Jim Bowling <herleyjim@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:55 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring. This is why I worked to defeat Prop 25 on the November 2020 ballot.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm. As we can see from experience with Family Case Management and community-support alternatives to immigrant detention EM is not necessary.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM

capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it’s important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly eliminate the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Herley Jim Bowling

From: Grace Rosanova <grace.rosanova@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:56 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved

ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Grace Rosanova

Sent from my iPhone

From: CJ Bourque <rinkrat33@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 7:57 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment,

mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
CJ Bourque

From: Emma Persico <persicoemmalauren@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 8:04 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other

types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,

Emma Persico

From: Jessica Renick <jessicarenick@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 8:10 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,

From: Vicki Friesen <vmfriesen1998@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 8:12 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment,

mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Vicki Friesen

From: Jemma Lorenat <Jemma_Lorenat@pitzer.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 8:12 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should prioritize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Jemma Lorenat

From: ashley brim <ashleypaigebrim@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 8:13 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Ashley Brim

--
Ashley Paige Brim // she/her/hers
Co-Producer / HOMELAND
Director / *An Act of Terror*
Fox Directing Lab 2018-19
HALF Initiative Directing Fellow 2017
YES on J!
C: +1 704-968-6209
ashleypaigebrim@gmail.com
ashleypaigebrim.com

From: Lucy Rimalower <larimalower@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 8:13 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,

--

Lucy Rimalower, L.M.F.T.

From: Autumn Kessler <hello.autumnrae@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 8:19 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.

- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,

Autumn Kessler

From: Kayla Imhoff <kaylabriavel@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 8:21 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Kayla Imhoff
91607

From: Riley Francisco <rileynfrancisco@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 8:28 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Riley Francisco

From: Alison Agnew <alison.agnew1@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 8:33 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,
I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.
Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.
Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.
For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.
And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.
EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.
We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.
For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Alison Agnew

From: Dan Monick <danmonick@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 8:35 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely

Dan Monick

From: Reid Uhrich <reid.uhrich@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 8:35 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,

Reid Uhrich

From: Rebecca Himmelstein <rlhimmel@umich.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 8:36 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Rebecca

Rebecca Himmelstein
(914) 715- 9341
rlhimmel@umich.edu
pronouns: she/her/hers

From: Nikki Osborne <osbornena@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 8:42 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Nikki Osborne

From: Sharon Lord Greenspan <sharonlordvox@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 8:42 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Sharon Lord Greenspan

From: Jan Mae <jannmaee11@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 8:42 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,

Jan Mae

From: Henry A. Wiencek <hwiencek@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 8:49 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Henry Wiencek

-
Henry Alexander Wiencek
Los Angeles, CA
(202) 527-2972

From: Mikael Taylor <azusatheater.mikael@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 8:49 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Mikael Taylor

From: Danielle Carne <danielle.carne@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 8:52 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Danielle Carne

From: KR Rose <krose21@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 9:17 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Kay Rose

From: Sean Lacson <lacson.sean@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 9:28 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Sean Lacson

From: Ellen Giesy <giesygirl4@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 9:32 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Ellen Giesy

From: Maria Ahverdyan <mahverdyan@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 9:34 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Maria Ahverdyan

From: Kevin King <kwking766@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 9:36 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and

would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Thank you from a concerned citizen
Kevin King

From: Dani Kaiserman <dani.kaiserman@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 9:48 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,
I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.
Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.
Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.
For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.
And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.
EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.
We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.
For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,

Dani Kaiserman

From: David Greenspan <sweetredbeancake@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 9:48 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and

would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
David Greenspan

From: Alexa Spiegel <anspiegel@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 9:58 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Alexa Spiegel

From: Samantha Lappin <shlappin16@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 10:04 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Sammi

Sammi Lappin
Communicator & Educator
she/her

From: Stephanie Cupp <scfcupp@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 10:06 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Stephanie Cupp--
Best Regards,
Stephanie Cupp (she/her)

From: Chloe Green <chloe@we3greens.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 10:15 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Chloe Green

From: Celia Johnson <csjohnson1842@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 10:20 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives, I am concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment,

mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (ex. failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Celia Johnson

From: Stephen Flowers <stephenrusl@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 10:25 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Stephen Flowers

From: Judy Branfman <branfman@ucla.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 10:41 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I'm writing you to voice my support for and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I am glad for the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is definitely not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

1) How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
2) Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
3) What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
4) What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
5) How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
6) Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

1) What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.

2) What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

1) Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
2) Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

1) Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.

2) Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance.

The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,

Judy Branfman

Santa Monica, CA

From: Sara L. <sara@ssmade.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 11:25 PM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,

Sara Lowry

From: Julie Alley <juliesbooks@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2021 12:16 AM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Julie D Alley

From: Logan Guntzelman <loganguntzelman@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2021 1:18 AM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Logan Guntzelman

From: B Zedan <b.zedan@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2021 12:15 AM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Thank you,
- B.Zedan

From: Chris Rafter <christopherrafter@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2021 5:37 AM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM

capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,

Christopher Rafter

From: Theo Zucker <theodora.zucker@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2021 6:50 AM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,

Theo Zucker
(she/her or they/them)
Cell: (248) 494-0922
theodora.zucker@gmail.com

From: Devon Fleury <devon.fleury@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2021 7:49 AM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
-
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
-
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,

Devon Fleury

From: Sarah Willson <rowdymouse@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2021 8:00 AM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Sarah Willson

From: Juliane Crump <ujulisnr@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2021 8:05 AM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Juliane Crump

From: dahlia ferlito <dahlia.ferlito@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2021 8:07 AM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
--
Dahlia Ferlito, MPH

From: Joan Harper <joanharper818@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2021 8:08 AM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money

bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Joan Harper

From: Shifra Teitelbaum <shif66@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2021 8:24 AM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money

bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Shifra Teitelbaum, EdD

From: Taylor Owens <taylorsowens18@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2021 8:26 AM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Taylor Owens

From: Kathy Yamamoto <kathyamamoto@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2021 9:20 AM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

My name is Kathy Yamamoto. I am a lifelong resident of Southern California, an WOC and a concerned voter. Particuarly, I am concerned with the dysfunctional incarceral system in our country and I think we can dismantle is starting with our county. Which is what brings me to you today. I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and

would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Kathy Yamamoto

From: Christina Hang <chrstnahng@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2021 9:33 AM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Christina Hang

From: Geoffrey Golden <geoffrey.golden@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2021 9:44 AM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through

police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are

racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,

Geoffrey Golden

From: Rebecca Brown <rebecca@nlg-la.org>
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2021 10:05 AM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Rebecca Brown

--

Rebecca Brown
Legal Fellow
National Lawyers Guild of Los Angeles
Phone: (860) 944-5111
She/Her/Hers
NLG-LA.org|Facebook|Twitter

From: Lexie Beer <lexiebeer@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2021 10:41 AM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Lexie Beer

From: Cody Sloan <csloan90@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2021 10:43 AM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,

Cody Sloan
--
Cody Sloan
pronouns: he/him/his (what's this?)
MFA in Acting: UCSD '21
www.codydsloan.com
(603) 667-1222

From: Joe Bobman <joebobman@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2021 10:56 AM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Voters came out around this issue this past election cycle, and I believe that there's a clear call to make sure that we are supporting pretrial justice.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM

capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these

outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Joseph

From: Jessica Ardon <ardonjessica@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2021 10:59 AM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in

pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,
Jessica Ardon

From: Lauren Worsham <lauren.worsham@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2021 11:06 AM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,

Lauren worsham

——————————

www.laurenworsham.com
www.skyponyband.com

From: M W <mwpoint@outlook.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2021 11:06 AM
To: info-POC
Subject: Public Comment: 5/13 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to you today to voice my support of and concerns around Agenda Item 4, regarding the implementation of the California Supreme Court's decision in the Humphrey case. While I applaud the termination of California's unconstitutional money bail system and the consideration of non-monetary alternatives to detention, I am deeply concerned about any potential incorporation of probation, risk assessment tools, or electronic monitoring.

Years of data have already shown us that the inclusion of probation in Humphrey implementation—or in any pretrial model, for that matter—will only serve to cycle people back into incarceration. Further, we know that it will be unfairly applied to already vulnerable communities because we're seeing it already in existing probation practices. Under the recent reductions of money bail and increases in pretrial release, there has been an expansion of Probation supervision and electronic monitoring, which has proven arduous for our community members and costly for the county.

Additionally, because it falls under the purview of law enforcement, probation also exacerbates many of the problems that the elimination of money bail ought to solve. Granting probation officers complete decision-making power over those on probation or under supervision leaves people who are trying to move forward with their lives unable to advocate in their own best interest and without recourse for abuse by these same officers. This harmful dynamic undermines the very intention of Humphrey. We've seen before how probation is as complicit as the Sheriff in furthering incarceration, whether it's behind bars or through probation supervision and e-carceration. Probation is an anchor of the punitive state, and any attempts to reform this punitive state cannot allow its actors to lead the charge.

For evidence of this truth, we need only look to the findings of Sacramento's Justice Jobs Coalition, whose work has revealed tremendous flaws with the involvement of probation in pretrial models. Sacramento County has tended to treat existing correctional programs as fixed baselines upon which to build, thereby sustaining the harm caused by those traditional systems and structures. By relying on personnel who are part of the existing legal systems as primary experts when considering how to change these entrenched systems, Sacramento has only succeeded in maintaining current ineffective and unjust outcomes.

And as extensions of law enforcement supervision, electronic monitoring (EM) is also no solution. In denying people access to employment and income, denying them access to legal resources and due process, and limiting their ability to participate in caregiving and parenting, EM programs amount to digital prisons. They increase the risk of domestic violence, heighten racial disparities, and create unwieldy burdens for the loved ones of those under surveillance. EM has not improved court appearance rates and has no beneficial effects to anyone other than the Probation Department in the expansion of their capacity to inflict harm.

EM is also not a cheaper alternative to pretrial detention. According to L.A. County's pretrial pilot application form, the cost of implementation is $18.5 million over two years, all to expand Probation's supervision and EM capabilities. This is a huge amount of money to spend on probation and surveillance that target our most vulnerable community members.

We have an opportunity to do better. Instead of relying on racist risk assessments and electronic monitoring through police-led probation, we must look for genuine solutions to problems by providing housing, treatment, mental health supports and the other types of services that lead to radical improvements in the lives of those who are criminalized by the legal system. Electronic monitoring is not a service, it is a punishment. It is a particularly harmful extension of pretrial incarceration, not an alternative to it.

For all of these reasons, the POC should obtain detailed reporting from the L.A. County Probation Department on the following:

- How EM use has changed over time—specifically before the pandemic, during the last year—and what use looks like now.
- Copies of all contracts Probation has relating to EM.
- What, if any, policies Probation has regarding supervision of people on EM.
- What decision-making framework, if any, Probation uses regarding when EM is applied.
- How violations will be reported to the Court and on what grounds someone can be returned to jail.
- Specific line-item budget information for EM, disaggregated by pilot and non-pilot populations under EM supervision.

The POC should request that Probation produce and make publicly available weekly or monthly data on the implementation of the current judicial council pretrial pilot.

This data must include outcomes (like failures to appear), different types of monitoring, length of time people are spending on electronic monitoring, demographic information (ex. race and gender), breakdown of number of people on electronic monitoring by region, and charge level.

Additionally, it's important to receive reporting that compares the data of the pilot against the non-pilot/probation populations, and that the POC get clarity on what Probation's engagement with the courts on Humphrey implementation has looked like.

The POC should inquire on the following:

- What Probation has been planning, and what they have been discussing with the courts. The County has been left out of those conversations, despite having oversight authority over the department.
- What the court is proposing in terms of collaboration with Probation on Humphrey implementation, what funding streams are associated with any plans, and whether Probation is formalizing any plans.

The POC should agendize the following for upcoming meetings:

- Presentation from other jurisdictions with alternative pretrial models, specifically David Mauroff from San Francisco Pretrial, Silicon Valley DeBug from Santa Clara County, and The Public Defender's Office in Sacramento.
- Presentation on the efficacy and effectiveness of EM as it relates to pretrial public safety and appearance rates by experts in the field, like James Kilgore.

And the POC should take the following official positions:

- Recommend to the Board that Probation should not be a part of the pretrial space.
- Request that the Board explicitly limit or restrict the use of EM.

The harms of including risk assessments and electronic monitoring in pretrial models cannot be overstated—which is why it is imperative that this Commission ensure that the implementation of Humphrey does not lead to an expansion of Probation Department capacity, e-carceration, or surveillance. The inclusion of these outmoded, ineffective, and harmful systems in L.A. County's implementation of the Humphrey ruling on money bail would only put further burden on already vulnerable Black, Brown, and low-income communities, and would significantly lessen any cost savings from reduced incarceration. Such programs should have no role in pretrial models or services, as the tools they utilize are racist, classist and only serve to exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration.

Sincerely,

Michele Wetteland
pronouns: she/her