

U.S. Department of Justice  
Office of Justice Programs



NCJRS

JUN 22 1995

ACQUISITIONS

# Pretrial Services Program

Bureau of  
Justice  
Assistance

**PROGRAM BRIEF**

# Pretrial Services Programs

---

## Program Brief

---

155178

U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this ~~copyrighted~~ material has been  
granted by  
Public Domain/OJP/BJA

---

U.S. Department of Justice

---

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the ~~copyright~~ owner.

**Bureau of  
Justice  
Assistance**

---

September 1990

**U.S. Department of Justice**  
**Office of Justice Programs**  
*Bureau of Justice Assistance*

**U.S. Department of Justice**

Dick Thornburgh ..... Attorney General

**Office of Justice Programs**

Richard B. Abell ..... Assistant Attorney General

**Bureau of Justice Assistance**

Gerald (Jerry) P. Regier ..... Acting Director

James C. Swain ..... Director, Policy Development  
and Management Division

Curtis H. Straub II ..... Director, State and Local  
Assistance Division

Eugene H. Dzikiewicz ..... Director, Discretionary  
Grant Programs Division

William F. Powers ..... Director, Special Programs  
Division

This document was prepared by the Pretrial Services Resource Center, under cooperative agreement number 88-DD-CX-K007, provided by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, U.S. Department of Justice.

The points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

**Bureau of Justice Assistance**  
**633 Indiana Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20531**  
**(202) 272-6838**

The Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs, coordinates the activities of the following program Offices and Bureaus: Bureau of Justice Assistance, National Institute of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and Office for Victims of Crime.



U.S. Department of Justice  
Office of Justice Programs  
*Bureau of Justice Assistance*

Office of the Director

*Washington, D.C. 20531*

Criminal caseloads are escalating in many jurisdictions, in part due to enhanced law enforcement and prosecution efforts directed at those persons engaged in drug-related crime. Pretrial services programs can help court systems manage these increasing caseloads efficiently. A good pretrial program includes an effective drug testing program and also is helpful in guiding the court to effective treatment for drug-using offenders.

The pretrial services concepts presented here are based on experiences with operational programs developed over the past 15 years. The brief summarizes key elements of such programs, optional services which they can provide, and performance measures which they can utilize to determine continuing program effectiveness.

We encourage state and local agencies to consider use of block grant funds from the Anti-drug Abuse Act of 1988 to establish new pretrial services programs. The benefits to the public, the offender and the criminal justice system can be substantial.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jerry Regier".

Gerald (Jerry) P. Regier  
Acting Director

---

# Table of Contents

---

	Page
<b>Introduction</b> .....	1
<b>Program Goals and Benefits</b> .....	3
Benefits of Achieving Program Goals .....	3
Background .....	3
<b>Critical Elements of a Pretrial Services Program</b> .....	5
Pre-Initial Appearance Procedures .....	5
Post-Initial Appearance Procedures .....	6
Program Management .....	6
Optional Elements .....	7
<b>Implementation and Operational Agenda</b> .....	9
Initiating a Pretrial Program .....	9
Performance Indicators .....	9
<b>Sources of Further Information and Assistance</b> .....	11
Bureau of Justice Assistance Sources .....	11
<b>Appendix</b> .....	13
Applicable Pretrial Services Standards .....	13

---

# Introduction

---

Recently, many jurisdictions have been faced with significant increases in criminal cases. The alarming increase in the use of drugs such as "crack" cocaine has produced a corresponding increase in drug-related criminal activity. Police have responded with an unprecedented number of arrests for drug sale and possession which in turn have added to already overburdened court and jail systems. Against this backdrop, the criminal justice system is still charged with the responsibility of determining which individuals can be safely released pending trial and which should be placed in jail. In many jurisdictions, the release/detention decision is made in a hurried fashion. Frequently there is little information available to the court about the arrestee that might help in assessing the risks to community safety or the likelihood of the arrestee failing to appear.

Pretrial services programs in many jurisdictions provide such information to help the judicial officer make more informed release/detention decisions. Program staff interview arrestees, contact references, conduct criminal history checks, and summarize this information for the court. Many programs also offer release recommendations, administer drug testing programs, and supervise conditions of release imposed by the court.

But many jurisdictions are still forced to make release/detention decisions without the benefit of verified information or release alternatives. Furthermore, many jurisdictions do not monitor defendants after release or collect data for measuring the effectiveness of their pretrial release policies. This Bureau of Justice Assistance Program Brief is intended to help jurisdictions seeking to start a pretrial services program or those seeking to improve the performance level of existing programs.

---

# Program Goals and Benefits

---

Pretrial services programs aspire to accomplish the following goals:

- o Improve the release/detention decision process in criminal courts by providing complete, accurate, non-adversarial information to judicial officers;
- o Identify those for whom alternative forms of supervision may be more appropriate than incarceration; and
- o Monitor released pretrial arrestees to ensure compliance with conditions of release imposed by the judicial officer for the benefit of public safety.

## Benefits of Achieving Program Goals

Effective pretrial release practices benefit the criminal justice system in a number of ways. The information the pretrial program provides helps judicial officers to decide better who may be released safely on his own recognizance pending adjudication and under what conditions, and who should be detained to maintain the safety of the community and the integrity of the criminal court process. By making release recommendations, the pretrial service program helps ensure consistency in the treatment of arrestees who pose little threat to the community if released. By providing release alternatives such as supervised release, the pretrial program can expand the number of release options available to the court.

Monitoring released pretrial arrestees promotes the greater likelihood of compliance with the conditions of release. Tracking released defendants enables the jurisdiction to measure the effectiveness of its release/detention policies and can create a data base for the system to use in policy formulation and decision-making. Identifying those for whom alternative forms of supervision may be more appropriate than incarceration can result in more efficient use of limited jail space.

## Background

Following practices in English Common Law dating back to medieval times, the American system of law adopted in the eighth amendment the prohibition against "excessive bail." In 1797, Congress provided

for the absolute right to bail in all Federal cases except capital offenses.

Until the early 1960's, the criminal justice system relied on financed surety bonds as the principal form of pretrial release. This often resulted in defendants with the financial means to post bail securing pretrial release while indigent defendants remained in custody. In 1961, the Manhattan Bail Project was established in New York City to test whether nonfinancial methods of pretrial release were as effective as money bail to assure court appearance. The results of this project, which showed that most pretrial defendants with ties to the community could be safely released without bail, helped create national interest in bail reform. Soon, other jurisdictions replicated the New York program or adopted similar approaches to create nonfinancial pretrial release options.

By 1964, when the first National Conference on Bail and Criminal Justice took place, more than 100 jurisdictions had implemented some type of pretrial services program. The bail reform effort was further strengthened by the passage of the Federal Bail Reform Act of 1966. The Act created a presumption in favor of personal recognizance release, authorized 10 percent deposit bail with the court, introduced the concept of conditional release, and stressed the philosophy that release should be under the least restrictive method necessary to ensure court appearance. Although the legislation only applied to Federal courts and the District of Columbia, at least 18 States emulated the Federal law in creating a presumption in favor of release on own recognizance. In 1968, the American Bar Association (ABA) published the first standards on pretrial release.

In the late 1960's and early 1970's, the pretrial movement was challenged by public concerns over reported increases in crime. These concerns were reflected in the passage of the District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970. This law amended the Bail Reform Act of 1966 as it applied to Washington, D.C., and directed judges to consider community safety in addition to the risk of flight in arriving at an appropriate release decision. The law also provided for the "preventive detention" of defendants who were considered to pose a substantial threat to the community if released.

New national standards were established in the 1970's. The National District Attorneys Association (1977), the National Association of Pretrial Services Agencies (1978), and the revised ABA standards (1978), all had common elements formalizing many of the reform movement's goals such as the presumption of release on own recognizance. However, these standards also provided procedures for using preventive detention in the release/detention decision. The use of such detention to address community safety concerns was institutionalized when Congress substituted the Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1984 for the Bail Reform Act of 1966. Drawing on the procedures already in use in the District of Columbia, the 1984 Act required that community safety as well as risk of flight be considered in the release/detention decision in Federal court. In 1987, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the use of preventive detention as defined in the Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1984 in U.S. vs. Salerno, 481 U.S. 739, 107 S. Ct. 2095 (1987).

Pretrial programs confronted two additional problems in the 1980's, jail crowding and increased drug-related arrests. As jail crowding reached dangerous

proportions, pretrial release administrators began to play a larger role in jail population management through efforts to reduce the number of pretrial detainees.

The increase in drug-related arrests placed additional demands on pretrial programs. One response was the implementation of drug use screening as part of the initial defendant evaluation. The objectives of the drug screening projects were (1) to provide information regarding links between drug use and crime, and (2) to assess the effectiveness of urinalysis surveillance on pretrial drug use, crime, and court appearances. Research is now underway to determine if these objectives have been met.

Pretrial release programs have become proven, effective ways to assist the courts in selecting and monitoring defendants who pose little danger to the community if released. The need to identify these defendants correctly has become more crucial as jail populations increase and the problem of drugs and crime continue to drain scarce justice system resources.



# Critical Elements of a Pretrial Services Program

An examination of both national criminal justice standards and the practices currently used by many pretrial programs reveals certain elements fundamental to the operation of an effective pretrial program. These elements can be grouped into the following categories:

- o Procedures used before and during the defendant's initial court appearance;
- o Procedures used following the initial court appearance to monitor defendants and aid them in making their court appearances; and
- o Management and data collection procedures that permit a program to examine the effectiveness of its practices.

## Pre-Initial Appearance Procedures

Targeting the Population. The pretrial program must systematically identify categories of defendants for program consideration. For example, some programs do not consider persons booked on misdemeanor offenses because they are released from custody within hours of booking. Others exclude persons who have parole holds. The decision about which defendants to consider will often be influenced by public policy considerations, available resources, and existing release procedures.

Defendant Information Gathering. Information about the defendant usually comes from several sources, including law enforcement records, court records, jail booking information, and a structured, personal interview of the defendant.

The interview should be voluntary. Before the interview, the defendant must be advised of the uses to which the information may be put, who may have access to it, and who will be contacted during the verification process. The interview should be designed to collect information of a non-adversarial nature for the court. It should exclude questions concerning details of the current offense (other than to determine if the defendant lives with the complaining witness). The interview should be structured to obtain as much of the following information as possible:

- o Personal identifiers, including name and any aliases, date of birth, and any system-generated numbers used to identify the defendant in the criminal justice system;
- o Defendant's residence history, including length of time in the local area, current address, and how long the defendant has lived there;
- o The address where the defendant intends to reside if released from custody;
- o A telephone number where the defendant can be contacted after release;
- o The defendant's current place of employment (or school if the defendant is a student), work (or educational) history, or means of legitimate support;
- o The frequency of contact the defendant has with local family members;
- o Information about prior criminal history; and
- o The names, addresses, and telephone numbers of persons who can verify the information obtained in the interview.

Criminal History Records. Any records of the defendant's adult criminal history need to be checked. These may include records of local law enforcement agencies, statewide criminal information systems, and the court clerk's office.

Other Information. The program should identify and gather any other information related to court appearance, such as history of appearances during prior court proceedings.

Information Verification. The program should attempt to verify the information obtained from the defendant by contacting references immediately following the interview. Of primary concern is verifying an address where the defendant may be contacted if released. If the program is initially unable to contact references or if conflicts arise, verification attempts should continue, especially if the defendant remains in custody.

**Defendant Assessment.** If a program makes recommendations to the court, the recommendation scheme should be primarily objective and measurable, and should be applied uniformly. An example of an objective scheme is one that uses preassigned points or weights for certain information to determine a defendant's eligibility for release. The scheme should be based on factors that local research has shown to relate to court appearance and/or rearrest.

If the program assessment scheme includes conditions of release, the recommended conditions should be the least restrictive necessary to address the identified risk. In no instance should the program recommend conditions of release where it lacks the capacity to monitor the conditions imposed. The number and range of conditions the program might recommend will be determined by the identified risk factors, program resources, and the availability of third party programs to supervise defendants.

**Information Distribution.** A written report summarizing the information gathered about the defendant should be submitted to the judicial officer. Some jurisdictions have procedures for submitting the information to judicial officers by telephone. This may be due to the remote location of holding facilities or a policy that allows judges to make release/detention decisions during nonbusiness hours to expedite the process. In these situations, the report should be read to the judge over the telephone.

The report's contents should also be made available to the prosecutor and defense counsel. However, the report should be used for release/detention decision purposes only. Any further use of the information contained in the report should be determined by the local jurisdiction. When contemplating further uses of the information, the program should take into account applicable statutes limiting dissemination of confidential information and the possibility of unanticipated uses of the information.

## **Post-Initial Appearance Procedures**

**Case Monitoring/Court Notification System.** The pretrial program should establish a system to follow the court dates of released defendants as a way of tracking those who fail to make court appearances. Defendants should be provided with written and/or telephonic notice of all pending court dates; if this is not already done by another agency such as the court clerk's office, the pretrial program should establish procedures to perform this function.

If conditions of release are ordered, the program should monitor released defendants for compliance.

The program should also establish procedures, approved by the local judiciary, for responding to non-compliance with the release conditions.

**Social Service Referrals.** Many defendants need some type of social services such as alcohol or drug abuse treatment, psychiatric or family counseling, housing, medical aid, etc. The pretrial program should maintain a list of referral agencies and establish contacts with those agencies to facilitate the placement of defendant's in need of social services.

## **Program Management**

**Management Information System.** A pretrial program should maintain a management information system that permits continued monitoring of its effectiveness. At a minimum, the information system should be able to provide the following data:

- o The number of defendants interviewed;
- o The number of defendants excluded from the interview process and the reason for their exclusion;
- o The number of reports prepared for the court;
- o The appearance rate of released defendants; and
- o The subsequent arrest rate of released defendants.

If the reports include release recommendations, the program should also collect data on the concurrence rates of the judicial officers' release decisions with the recommendations of the pretrial program.

Finally, the program should prepare an annual report derived from the accumulated data described above.

**Program Administration.** To enable the pretrial program to perform effectively in the criminal justice system, a number of administrative procedures should be adopted.

- o Regular formal meetings should be held with the governing or supervising body of the program.
- o A training program should be established to ensure that all personnel (both new and experienced) are sufficiently trained to perform program procedures competently.
- o The program should have written procedures to aid in the training of new employees and to serve as a staff reference tool.

- o The program should comply with all fiscal requirements established by the funding source of the agency.
- o Written staff evaluations should be performed at least annually.

Interagency Contacts. The pretrial program needs to exchange information systematically with other criminal justice agencies. For example, a pretrial program may need booking and prior record information from law enforcement, information from the court about pending cases and case status information from the probation office. Program management should maintain regular contact with supervisors of these criminal justice system agencies to facilitate the flow of information.

Program representatives should communicate regularly with the judicial officers responsible for pretrial release decisions. Such regular meetings allow the program to respond quickly to any procedural concerns or inquiries the court may have.

### Optional Elements

The following program components, while not essential, can enhance the effectiveness of a pretrial program and provide solutions to particular jurisdictional needs:

- o Staff in Court. Many programs have a staff member available at the initial appearance to respond to inquiries about defendant reports.
- o Drug Use Testing. An increasing number of pretrial programs have undertaken the screening of pre-initial appearance arrestees for possible drug use using urinalysis. Such testing, even if only done randomly for certain type of arrestees (e.g. felony-level), allows these programs to provide the court with additional pertinent information and can become the basis of supervised release and/or treatment options ordered by the court.

- o Supervised Release. By having staff available to supervise release conditions, a program can increase the release options available to the court, thus increasing the number of pretrial defendants released from custody. The program can suggest ways of addressing a particular problem that precludes release of the defendant without supervision. Programs should develop conditions for supervised release that address those problems, while insuring that the arrestee's primary accountability to the court is maintained.
- o Failure to Appear Follow-up. Many pretrial programs have adopted procedures to locate defendants who fail to appear and assist them in returning to court voluntarily. By bringing the defendant quickly back into the court system, the unnecessary costs of having to rearrest, book, and house the defendant are eliminated.
- o Pretrial Custody Population Screening. Pretrial programs can review the cases of defendants detained after the initial appearance. Often there are changes in the defendant's status that should be brought to the attention of the appropriate judicial officer. Procedures for carefully screening the pretrial custody population can often expedite the release or transfer of these detainees, thus making more efficient use of detention dollars while, at the same time, insuring that the integrity of the court process and safety of the community is maintained.
- o Automated Information System. An automated information system enables a pretrial program to efficiently manage data collected on defendants. It can also give the program the ability to perform sophisticated statistical analyses of recommendation and screening procedures that are difficult and time-consuming to perform with a manual system.

---

# Implementation and Operational Agenda

---

## Initiating A Pretrial Program

Review of Statutory Requirements. Release statutes define the parameters and often provide the framework for a pretrial release program. Before starting a pretrial program, planners should review applicable statutes and incorporate them into the program implementation plan. In many jurisdictions, statutes define what information is confidential, who may use it, and how it may be used. Statutes also specify criteria the judicial officer must consider in the release/detention decision, and when (or if) the release authority can be delegated. In some jurisdictions, the location of the program and how it is to be funded are covered by statutory authority.

Advisory Committee. Establishing a program implementation advisory committee may prove useful when starting a pretrial program. The committee should be comprised of members from all agencies involved in the criminal justice system, including the judiciary, the prosecutor's office, the defense bar, and the custodial agency. Since the ability to achieve program goals is directly related to the actions of the judiciary, it is crucial that the courts be involved from the beginning. The committee members should have the authority to effect changes needed to implement the pretrial program. The committee would be involved in setting the goals of the pretrial services program and developing the procedures to achieve those goals.

Initial Program Tasks. Once the decision to create a pretrial program has been reached, a number of tasks need to be undertaken.

- o The target population needs to be identified. A survey of pretrial jail bookings may be helpful in deciding the best way to allocate program resources.
- o The location of the program in the criminal justice system and the staffing levels needed for it to operate effectively must be determined. Pretrial programs are located in courts, probation departments, county corrections, or outside the county government as independent nonprofit organizations. The best location for the program will vary by jurisdiction.

- o Formal procedures for exchanging information between the program and other criminal justice agencies must be established. The program needs to receive information from the custodial agency, the department responsible for criminal records, the court clerk's office, and the probation department.
- o Procedures must be developed for conducting defendant interviews, acquiring criminal histories, interview verification, case assessment, and presenting information to the court. A useful guide for developing these procedures is to calculate one hour of staff time per defendant to complete the interview process and verify and present the information to the court. Post-release procedures also need to be developed for the actual release of defendants, explanation of release conditions, and monitoring and court date notification of released defendants.
- o The design and implementation of an information management system needs to be completed for the program to monitor released defendants and produce the data necessary for program measurement.

## Performance Indicators

Following implementation, the pretrial program should be evaluated to measure the effectiveness of procedures and the impact of the program on the criminal justice system. These indicators should be examined fairly frequently, possibly on a quarterly basis. Programs should use the following elements to help assess program performance:

- o Population Targeting. The program should review the categories of defendants interviewed and, more importantly, the groups of pretrial defendants excluded from the interview process by its screening procedures. The program could survey arrestees excluded from the interview process to determine what alternative methods of supervision could be imposed while facilitating release that is both safe and successful.
- o Information Gathering. The amount of time the program takes to complete the information

gathering process should be reviewed. Are delays being caused by internal procedures or by delays in obtaining information from other agencies, or both? What is the impact of these delays? Can procedural changes be made to reduce the delays? Are program resources being used to gather unnecessary information?

- o Verification Process. The amount of time the verification process takes should be examined. Is judicial review of cases being delayed because of verification problems? What percentage of cases undergo judicial review without verified information? What is happening to these cases? Finally, can changes be made in the interview or verification process to reduce these delays?
- o Defendant Assessment Procedures. Commonly used measures of the program assessment schemes are the number of defendants released, the appearance rate of those defendants, and, in some jurisdictions, the subsequent arrest rate of released defendants. These rates should be reviewed in conjunction with the population targeting assessment to determine the overall effectiveness of program procedures.
- o Information Distribution. To evaluate the distribution of information, parties receiving the information should be contacted to determine if the information presented or the format in which it is presented can be improved. The amount of time the information distribution process takes should be examined for unnecessary delays.
- o Case Monitoring/Court Date Notification. Is the program updating the defendant's court dates in a timely manner? What is the impact of any delays? The program's notification system can be examined to compare the appearance rate of defendants contacted to that of defendants the program was unable to contact. This measures the effectiveness of the notification system and allows the agency to determine if procedural changes are needed to improve the contact.

- o Management Information System. A management information system should provide the data the agency needs in a timely manner. Can the system respond to special inquiries in a timely and efficient manner? The amount of staff time needed to provide the data should be examined to determine if more efficient procedures are possible. If not automated, the agency should determine if an automated system would increase staff efficiency and improve the accuracy of the data collection process.
- o Administrative Effectiveness. There are several measures of administrative effectiveness. For example, have there been regular meetings with the supervising body of the agency? Are there written program procedures? Has a structured training program been implemented? Have written staff evaluations been completed annually? Has there been regular contact with other criminal justice agency supervisors? Have there been regular meetings with judicial officers? Does the program trace the "flow" of confidential documents such as rapsheets to ensure the program is in compliance with regulations governing the handling of such documents? Has the program complied with the fiscal requirements of the funding source?
- o Statistical Validation of the Assessment Scheme. If the agency makes release determinations or recommendations, attempts should be made to validate those procedures statistically. A thorough evaluation of the program assessment scheme should be made only after sufficient data have been generated. This can be fairly complex and may require technical assistance from outside the agency. The results of such an evaluation can help management measure program effectiveness and "fine tune" procedures to better achieve program goals.

---

# Sources of Further Information and Assistance

---

## Bureau of Justice Assistance Sources

Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) support is available to jurisdictions seeking to start or enhance pretrial programs. The assistance comes in two forms, block grants and technical assistance.

Formula Grant Support. Jurisdictions wishing to implement pretrial release programs are eligible for BJA formula grant support, and by virtue of this Program Brief, BJA is placing emphasis on using its resources to achieve this objective. For further information, including the State agency responsible for administering the Formula Grant Program, and to obtain other Program Briefs, contact:

State and Local Assistance Division  
Bureau of Justice Assistance  
U.S. Department of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue NW.  
Washington, DC 20531  
202/514-6638

Technical Assistance. The Pretrial Services Resource Center has been providing technical assistance to pretrial programs since 1977, most recently through the BJA-funded Enhanced Pretrial Services Delivery Program. Under this program, persons from jurisdictions wishing to implement a pretrial release program or upgrade an existing one are eligible for hosted visits to observe effective pretrial practices. For further information, contact:

The Pretrial Services Resource Center  
1325 G Street, Suite 620, NW.  
Washington, DC 20005  
202/638-3080

Additional assistance, including short-term on-site services, may also become available. For further information, contact:

Courts Branch  
The Bureau of Justice Assistance  
633 Indiana Ave., N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
202/514-5943

# Appendix

## Applicable Pretrial Services Standards

The American Bar Association (ABA Standards for Criminal Justice, Chapter 10 revised, 1985), the National Association of Pretrial Services Agencies (NAPSA Release Standards, 1978), and the National District Attorneys Association (NDAA National Prosecution Standards, Chapter 10, 1977) have taken similar positions on several issues.

A Presumption in Favor of Pretrial Release. Each standard notes the constitutional, ethical, and practical reasons for the presumption in favor of pretrial release. As NDAA standard 10.1 states, "detention should not be resorted to except in very special circumstances as it imposes extreme hardship upon the defendant, the defendant's family, the community, and the jail system."

Prompt First Appearance. The three standards propose that every arrested person be taken before a judicial officer without needless delay. The ABA and NAPSA standards specify that the first appearance be held within 6 hours of arrest except (a) when a judicial officer is unavailable (NAPSA) or (b) at night (ABA).

Pretrial Release Inquiry. The three standards specify that, either prior to or contemporaneous with the first appearance, an inquiry be conducted into facts relevant to the pretrial release decision unless the prosecution advises that it does not oppose release on own recognizance.

The NDAA standards state that the inquiry should be undertaken by an independent agency or an arm of the court; the ABA and NAPSA standards suggest that the inquiry be conducted by a pretrial services agency.

The standards also specify the types of information to be gathered. Each recommends inquiry into current and past residence history, extent of family and community ties, employment history, current financial condition, prior criminal record, appearance at prior court proceedings, and identity of persons who can assist the defendant in making future court appearances. Finally, all agree that the inquiry of the defendant should exclude questions concerning details of the current charge.

The standards differ concerning some areas of information to be collected. Both the ABA and NDAA

standards recommend inquiry into any facts pertaining to the likelihood that the defendant will commit violations of law if released without restrictions. They also endorse inquiry into the defendant's character and reputation. Additionally, the ABA standards advise inquiry into (1) treatment or programs which may render the defendant an appropriate subject of conditional release, (2) acts or circumstances warranting imposition of preventive detention, and (3) appropriateness of diversion.

Both the NAPSA and ABA standards propose that programs formulate guidelines for use in making release recommendations. The NDAA standards simply state, "where appropriate, the inquiring agency should make recommendations to the judicial officer concerning the conditions, if any, which should be imposed on the defendant's release."

A Presumption in Favor of Release on Own Recognizance (ROR) for Arrestees. The three standards endorse the presumption that the defendant is entitled to be released on own recognizance. However, all provide ways for overcoming the presumption. In the NDAA standards, the presumption is overcome by a substantial risk of non-appearance. In determining if the release presumption has been overcome, the judicial officer should consider the following factors: defendant's length of residence in the community, employment status and history, extent of family and community ties, mental condition, prior criminal record, prior court appearance record, the nature and circumstances of the offense charged, and the likelihood of conviction as they relate to risk of flight. The ABA and NAPSA standards recommend the use of risk to the community as an additional factor for consideration in overcoming the presumption in favor of release.

Provisions for the Imposition of Conditions of Release. The three standards suggest that if release on own recognizance is unwarranted, the judicial officer should impose the least restrictive conditions of release necessary to reasonably assure the defendant's appearance in court and should include in the record the basis for this decision.

The ABA and NDAA standards contain a provision cautioning the judicial officer to "exercise care not to give inordinate weight to the nature of the present charge."

## The Bureau of Justice Assistance

# BJA *Announces its New Clearinghouse*

To fulfill its mission under the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988, the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) provides funds and technical assistance to State and local governments to control crime and drug abuse and to improve the criminal justice system.

In support of these activities, BJA has created the Bureau of Justice Assistance Clearinghouse, a component of the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS). The Clearinghouse informs State and local criminal justice practitioners about BJA products and programs.

The following BJA publications, now available from the Clearinghouse, provide a wealth of useful information on some of the most critical issues affecting criminal justice and will be valuable additions to your professional library.

**An Invitation to Project DARE: Drug Abuse Resistance Education, Program Brief.** NCJ 114802. Free.

**Building Integrity and Reducing Drug Corruption in Police Departments, Monograph.** NCJ 120652. Free.

**Drug Recognition Program, Monograph.** NCJ 117432. Free.

**Electronic Monitoring in Intensive Probation and Parole Programs, Monograph.** NCJ 116319. Free.

**Estimating the Costs of Drug Testing in Pretrial Services Programs, Monograph.** NCJ 118317. Free.

**FY 1988 Report on Drug Control, Executive Summary.** NCJ 118277. Free.

**FY 1988 Report on Drug Control, Full Report.** NCJ 117435. \$6.50. Call for ordering information.

**Prosecution Management Support System, Program Brief.** NCJ 117093. Free.

**Reducing Crime by Reducing Drug Abuse: A Manual for Police Chiefs and Sheriffs, Manual.** NCJ 113110. Free.

**Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC): Participant's Manual, Training Manual.** NCJ 116322. Free.

**Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC), Program Brief.** NCJ 116321. Free.

**Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC) Resource Catalog, Resource Guide.** NCJ 119847. Free.

**Urinalysis as Part of a Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC) Program, Monograph.** NCJ 115416. Free.

**Wisconsin Drug Abuse Treatment Unit, Monograph.** NCJ 120655. Free.

---

*Write or call right away—limited quantities of these valuable resource documents are available.*

**Bureau of Justice Assistance Clearinghouse • Call toll-free 800-688-4 BJA(252)**  
or write: BJA Clearinghouse/NCJRS, Box 6000, Rockville, MD 20850