

**Washington State Criminal Sentencing Task Force**  
**Sentencing Alternatives Workgroup**  
**Meeting Notes: May 17<sup>th</sup>, 2022**  
**Meeting via Zoom**

**ATTENDEES**

**Task Force Members/Alternates:**

- Tiffany Attrill, *Interests of Crime Victims*
- Mac Pevey, *Department of Corrections (DOC)*
- Judge Saint Clair, *Sentencing Guidelines Commission*
- Jon Tunheim, *WA Association of Prosecuting Attorneys*
- Waldo Waldron-Ramsey, *Interests of Incarcerated Persons*

**Guests:** Bruce Glant

**Ruckelshaus Center:** Molly Stenovec, Amanda Murphy, Maggie Counihan,

**Research:** Dr. Lauren Knoth-Peterson, Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP)

**Meeting Purpose:** continue discussion on intermediate sanctions and how such a program could overlay on the sentencing grid

**Presentation: Intermediate Sanctions, proposal DRAFT of 5.13.22**

Amanda welcomed Task Force members and alternates before providing context for the purpose of today's meeting. At the May 3<sup>rd</sup> Sentencing Alternatives Workgroup meeting, the group reviewed CSTF potential recommendations relevant to the discussion on intermediate sanctions. While sentencing ranges on the current grid have a clear delineation between potential prison (longer than 12 months and a day) and jail sentences (shorter than or equal to 12 months), adopting a systematic, mathematically formulaic approach to the ranges would create "straddle cells," with sentencing options in a range that could be a prison OR a jail sentence. The group has discussed eliminating those straddle cells (Potential Recommendation 8) or keeping the straddle cells AND creating intermediate sentencing options for that zone (Potential Recommendation 9).

The Alternatives Workgroup expressed interest in more fully developing what intermediate sanctions could look like, e.g., exploring potential funding models and looking at sample approaches used in other states. As per an action item from that last meeting: the facilitation team and Dr. Lauren Knoth-Peterson have developed a draft proposal for an intermediate sanctions zone that includes potential components and a proposed funding model. (That document also includes some other potential recommendations discussed by this group during discussions on statutory eligibility criteria for current sentencing alternatives.)

Lauren reviewed a potential framework for a community intermediate sanctions zone overlaid on the sentencing grid (full draft proposal is attached). A visual of the simulated grid (which reflects all potential recommendations that have been presented to the Task Force) and key takeaways are below.

		Simulated Grid																					
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9+		Agg Departure Cap	Repeat SV/Violent									
Zone 4: State Prison	18	Life Sentence without parole/death penalty for defendants at or over the age of 18. For defendants under the age of 18, a term of 25 years to Life																					
	17	240	320	252	336	264	352	277	370	291	388	308	408	321	428	337	450	354	472	372	496	48 mos	60 mos
	16	104	138	134	152	128	188	138	184	152	203	167	223	184	246	203	270	223	297	257	337	48 mos	48 mos
	15	93	124	102	137	113	150	124	165	136	182	150	200	165	220	182	242	200	267	237	306	36 mos	48 mos
	14	82	110	90	121	100	133	110	145	121	161	133	177	146	195	161	214	177	236	206	275	36 mos	48 mos
	13	71	95	79	105	87	116	95	127	105	140	115	154	127	169	140	186	154	205	175	224	24 mos	36 mos
	12	61	81	67	89	74	98	81	108	89	119	98	131	108	144	119	158	131	174	154	203	24 mos	36 mos
	11	50	67	55	73	60	81	67	89	73	98	81	108	89	119	98	130	108	144	144	192	24 mos	24 mos
	10	39	52	43	58	47	63	52	70	58	77	63	85	70	93	77	102	84	113	113	151	24 mos	24 mos
	Zone 3: CIS/SIS, DOSA, FOSA, State Prison	9	16	21	19	25	23	31	27	37	33	44	40	53	48	64	58	77	69	92	81	108	12 mos
8		14	19	17	22	20	27	24	32	29	39	35	47	42	56	51	68	61	81	71	95	12 mos	12 mos
Zone 2: CIS/SIS, DOSA, FOSA ≤12 Jail; >12 Prison	7	12	16	14	19	17	23	21	28	25	34	30	40	36	48	44	58	52	70	61	82	12 mos	12 mos
	6	10	13	12	16	14	19	17	23	21	28	25	34	30	41	37	49	44	59	51	69	12 mos	12 mos
Zone 1: CIS, RDOSA, Jail	5	3	10	3	12	4	15	5	18	6	22	8	28	9	32	11	38	13	48	16	54	6 mos	6 mos
	4	2	9	3	10	3	12	4	15	5	18	6	22	8	28	9	32	11	38	13	45	6 mos	6 mos
	3	2	7	2	8	3	10	3	12	4	14	5	17	6	21	7	25	9	30	10	38	6 mos	6 mos
	2	0	3	1	6	2	7	2	8	3	10	3	12	4	14	5	17	6	21	8	27	6 mos	6 mos
	1	0	2	0	3	1	5	1	6	2	7	2	8	3	10	3	12	4	14	5	18	6 mos	6 mos
Zone 0: Unranked	Unr	0-365 days																					

- **CIS:** County Intermediate Sanctions. Sentences less than 2 years may be served in a county intermediate sanctions program administered by the local court.
- **SIS:** State Intermediate Sanctions. For sentences more than 2 years, up to 50% of the individuals sentence may be served in a community-based intermediate sanctions program administered by DOC.
- **RDOSA:** Residential DOSA, for eligible individuals based on offense type and criminal history
- **PDOSA:** Prison DOSA, for eligible individuals based on offense type and criminal history
- **FOSA:** Parenting Sentencing Alternative, for eligible individuals
- Cells in the hatched zone may be eligible for the FTOW sentencing alternative.

Key points:

- Depending on changes to the grid, there could be logical “zones” overall grid:
  - Zone 1: jail only or sentencing alternative
  - Zone 2: encompasses all the “straddle cells” – sentences could be prison OR jail OR sentencing alternative
  - Zone 3: remaining nonviolent offenses (with available potential sentencing alternatives listed on the grid, per Task Force members’ suggestion)
  - Zone 4: violent and serious violent offenses
- Intermediate sanctions: would provide increased sentencing options for individuals in situations where the current sentencing alternatives don’t apply (i.e., not a parent). Examples include:
  - Intensive supervision probation
  - Day reporting centers

- House arrest
- Electronic home monitoring
- Community service
- Intermittent confinement, such as work release or weekenders
- Mandatory treatment conditions
- Residential community corrections, such as halfway houses
- Potential framework/elements for intermediate sanctions:
  - All sentences for individuals in Zone 2 are paid for by the state
  - Presumptive sentences in Zone 2 are a sentencing alternative that is served locally
  - County would operate their intermediate sanctions programs and the state would oversee to ensure that programs meet a minimum level of care. For example, the state could set parameters around revocation, set guidelines and requirements for individuals sentenced in different zones.
  - For sentences in Zone 2, sentences greater than 12 months could have an option for state intermediate sanctions. State intermediate sanctions could also be an option for Zone 3. Elements of state intermediate sanctions: could include partial confinement, would provide continuous DOC oversight of the sentence and case management.
  - Funding for sentences in Zone 2 would be provided by the state to counties through a block grant based on a formula, modeled on the Juvenile Court Block Grant Program

Lauren then posed some outstanding questions for the group to consider during their discussion:

- How should requirements for intermediate sanction be determined? For example, by judge or by local intermediate sanctions program supervisor?
- What level of quality assurance and oversight would the state provide?
- Should the grant funding include funds for ongoing research/evaluation?

**Member/Alternate discussion:**

- What about disparities—geographic and racial? How could those disparities be addressed?
  - The current proposal states that intermediate sanction is the presumptive sentence.
  - Elements or components of will need to be individualized through the lens of “What services, programs, and opportunities could be provided to maintain pro-social bonds?”
- Alternatives usually come with supervision and reporting conditions already; would this program be duplicative?
  - Community intermediate sanctions intended to provide non-confinement sentencing options for individuals who are not eligible for current sentencing alternatives, i.e., don’t have an underlying substance use disorder
- A member expressed concern about the framing of “sanctions,” since the public may expect something more than just “sanctions as a form of accountability.” The member encouraged group to consider the need to identify the particular type of treatment/services or intervention.
- How would implementation of the intermediate sanctions fit with the Department of Corrections (DOC) work to develop and implement its iCOACH supervision model?
  - iCOACH supervision will be more individualized, emphasize the mentoring and resources needed that an individual may need, rather than oversight and monitoring.

- If this were a county-based, locally implemented program, the staffing/programming and oversight would occur at the local level. Existing therapeutic programs and supports could be expanded or new, local programs created.
- Much of the juvenile program success is attributed to immediate contact with a case manager, who starts connecting an individual with resources/programs right away.
- Counties could build on existing county-level probation programs and offices since this new framework would create locally “owned” and operated program. Counties would use state funds to help address the superior court case loads.
- State Intermediate Sanctions: the full sentence could be overseen by the state and could be similar to the prison Drug Offender Sentencing Alternative (pDOSAs): the individual would serve some time in DOC prison, then transfer to community supervision.
- Several members discussed county supervision programs and approaches. Comments included:
  - Most county supervision programs are not informed by iCOACH principles, rather based on compliance of terms set by the court, i.e., is the individual paying fines? Attending classes/programs?
  - Currently individuals could be reporting to multiple supervision authorities: county, state, and local. A member expressed concern about adding more to that oversight and compliance burden and encouraged the group to develop a recommendation where sanctions could be overseen by an entity that is already “overseeing” an individual.
- Counties currently have statutory authority to create probation programs and county reentry programs; however, many counties lack the resources to do so.
- Several members discussed the need for liability (tort) reform or creating liability limitations.
- How would this recommendation relate to the current “under 12 months” / “12 months and a day” demarcation between jail/prison?
  - Guidelines cells that “straddle” that demarcation form Zone 2, which would be funded by the state. Clela and Lauren will be able to conduct simulations for the potential grid and develop fiscal note information based on FY19 data.
  - With potential grid modifications and changes in sentence length, there is potential for cost savings, especially long-term, and reinvestment in programs and victims’ services.
- COVID has created a backlog of felony cases—as counties begin to move forward on those cases, the number of individuals in DOC custody could dramatically increase. A member suggested the group to consider this when thinking about resources and forecasting.

Amanda asked the group, “What else is missing from the draft proposal? What needs to be done prior to presenting this to the full Task Force at its June meeting?”

- A member suggested to focus on community intermediate sanctions in Zone 2 “straddle cells” for the June meeting. The workgroup will further discuss and present a proposal on state alternative sanctions at a later meeting.
- Is there anything from the victims’ perspective that should be included in county requirements?
  - Victims need accountability and transparency to make sure individuals participate fully in programs and meet the requirements of their sanction.

- If we think of intermediate sanctions as enhanced reintegrative service and reentry support, how could victims' perspectives and needs (such as no-contact orders) be explicitly considered?
- Several members discussed restitution:
  - Members shared examples of restitution awards to victims occurring at the time of sentencing, noting that they have seen nonprofits pay restitution to a victim and then the defendant makes smaller payments to the nonprofit.
  - WSIPP is conducting an evaluation of legal financial obligations (LFOs), which will include information about payment and collections. That report will be available fall 2022.
  - Action item: facilitation team will review resources reviewed during previous discussion on LFOs for relevant reports.
- A member expressed support for funding for victim services, suggesting resources could come from a justice reinvestment fund.

**Next meeting** – May 31<sup>st</sup> at 1:30pm

Action Items:

- Facilitation team will work with Dr. Knoth-Peterson to incorporate input from today's discussion into the proposal for the intermediate sanctions framework.
- Workgroup will present the Zone 2 / Community Intermediate Sanctions proposal at the full Task Force meeting in June.

---

**APPENDIX A: COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY PUBLIC VIA ZOOM CHAT**

*Due to limited time, the public may submit questions or comments via the zoom chat (or email) and the Facilitation Team includes with the meeting notes. The following questions and comments were sent during this meeting:*

**Bruce Glant:** How about community and social integration?

**ATTACHMENT – POTENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS:  
CREATING A STATE-FUNDED COMMUNITY INTERMEDIATE SANCTIONS PROGRAM &  
POLICY CHANGES TO CURRENT SENTENCING ALTERNATIVES**

*DRAFT as of 5.20.22*

**SECTION 1. STATE-FUNDED COMMUNITY INTERMEDIATE SANCTIONS PROGRAM**

The Sentencing Alternatives Workgroup has been looking various options for integrating sentencing alternatives onto the sentencing guidelines grid. At the May 3, 2022 Sentencing Alternatives Work Group meeting, members expressed interest in further exploring Potential Recommendation 9 which would keep straddle cells and create a state-funded community intermediate sanction program. Provided below is background on potential recommendations 7-9. Beginning on page 3 is a draft proposal for a State-Funded Intermediate sanctions Program.

**A. Background and Context**

**Potential Recommendation 7:** *If the maximum sentence based on the formula is 12 months or less, the minimum is automatically reduced to zero.*

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9+										
V	3	10	3	12	4	15	5	18	6	22	8	26	9	32	11	38	13	46	16	54
IV	2	9	3	10	3	12	4	15	5	18	6	22	8	26	9	32	11	38	13	45
III	2	7	2	8	3	10	3	12	4	14	5	17	6	21	7	25	9	30	10	36
II	0	3	1	6	2	7	2	8	3	10	3	12	4	14	5	17	6	21	8	27
I	0	2	0	3	1	5	1	6	2	7	2	8	3	10	3	12	4	14	5	18
Unr	0 - 365 days																			

  

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9+										
V	0	10	0	12	4	15	5	18	6	22	8	26	9	32	11	38	13	46	16	54
IV	0	9	0	10	0	12	4	15	5	18	6	22	8	26	9	32	11	38	13	45
III	0	7	0	8	0	10	0	12	4	14	5	17	6	21	7	25	9	30	10	36
II	0	3	0	6	0	7	0	8	0	10	0	12	4	14	5	17	6	21	8	27
I	0	2	0	3	0	5	0	6	0	7	0	8	0	10	0	12	4	14	5	18
Unr	0 - 365 days																			

Affects minimums that are 3 months or less.

Under this potential recommendation, the number of cells in which there is an option for 0 months of incarceration would be expanded. However, the actual impact on incarceration will vary because of pre-trial confinement. Under the current system, some individuals sentenced in the southwest corner are sentenced to time served, therefore they do not receive additional incarceration after sentencing. This potential recommendation expands ranges in the southwest corner where WSIPP found frequent disproportionality in sentencing. However, this change could lead to geographic differences due to differences in varying philosophies of punishment in combination with wide ranges, and judges may be unlikely to sentence to 0 months incarceration without some other alternative (e.g., probation). **In addition, a major effect of this potential recommendation is it will create straddle cells – such that sentences may be jail or prison confinement.**

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9+										
V	3	10	9	12	4	15	5	18	6	22	8	26	9	32	11	38	13	46	16	54
IV	2	9	3	10	3	12	4	15	5	18	6	22	8	26	9	32	11	38	13	45
III	2	7	2	8	3	10	3	12	4	14	5	17	6	21	7	25	9	30	10	36
II	0	3	1	6	2	7	2	8	3	10	3	12	4	14	5	17	6	21	8	27
I	0	2	0	3	1	5	1	6	2	7	2	8	3	10	3	12	4	14	5	18
Unr	0 - 365 days																			

**Yellow cells** were previously presumptive prison sentences, but are “straddle” cells with the formula, such that sentences may be jail or prison confinement.

Two options to address straddle cells have been put forward:

**Potential Recommendation 8 Eliminate straddle cells:** *If the maximum based on the formula is more than 12 months, the minimum must be at least 12 months and a day.*

One effect of this potential recommendation would be to create variability in the width of the sentence ranges, such that some ranges will be very small (for example, sentence range 12-14 months). Not having straddle cells (as is current law) creates more predictability in caseloads for local and state facilities and clarity/predictability about whether a defendant will face a jail or prison sentence. It also prevents an increase in local resources (jail sentences).

The second option is **Potential Recommendation 9: Keep Straddle Cells and Create an Intermediate Sanction Zone.**

Under this potential recommendation, for the sentences in this zone of the grid the presumptive sentence is a sentencing alternative served locally. Sentences for individuals in straddle cells are paid for by the state. For sentences in this zone, sentences that are DOC sentences (more than 12 months) could have an option for state Intermediate Sanctions. These cells will have a lower mid-point, likely facilitating a small decrease in sentence lengths. A state-funded intermediate sanctions program would provide support for counties while still allowing state oversight to ensure that community services meet certain standards. Such a state-funded program would support rehabilitative and non-incarcerative alternatives without increasing financial burden on counties. It could help support expansions of community services and resources that local counties could then use for other individuals under local sanctions (e.g., SW corner of the grid). It would also shift the focus from retribution/confinement to rehabilitation and community reintegration, thus reducing collateral consequences of incarceration.

At the May 3, 2022 Sentencing Alternatives Work Group meeting, members expressed interest in further exploring Potential Recommendation 9 and putting together a more detail proposal for a creating a Community Intermediate Sanctions Program.

## B. Draft Proposal for a State-Funded Community Intermediate Sanction Zone

		Simulated Grid																					
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9+	Agg Departure Cap	Repeat SV/Violent										
		Life Sentence without parole/death penalty for defendants at or over the age of 18. For defendants under the age of 18, a term of 25 years to Life																					
Zone 4: State Prison	18	240	320	252	336	264	352	277	370	291	388	306	408	321	428	337	450	354	472	372	496	48 mos	60 mos
	17	104	138	114	152	126	168	138	184	152	203	167	223	184	246	203	270	223	297	297	397	48 mos	48 mos
	16	93	124	102	137	113	150	124	165	136	182	150	200	165	220	182	242	200	267	267	356	36 mos	48 mos
	15	82	110	90	121	100	133	110	146	121	161	133	177	146	195	161	214	177	236	236	315	36 mos	48 mos
	14	71	95	79	105	87	116	95	127	105	140	115	154	127	169	140	186	154	205	205	274	24 mos	36 mos
	13	61	81	67	89	74	98	81	108	89	119	98	131	108	144	119	158	131	174	174	233	24 mos	36 mos
	12	50	67	55	73	60	81	67	89	73	98	81	108	89	119	98	130	108	144	144	192	24 mos	24 mos
	11	39	52	43	58	47	63	52	70	58	77	63	85	70	93	77	102	84	113	113	151	24 mos	24 mos
	10	16	21	19	25	23	31	27	37	33	44	40	53	48	64	58	77	69	92	81	108	12 mos	12 mos
Zone 3: CIS/SIS, DOSA, FOSA, State Prison	9	14	19	17	22	20	27	24	32	29	39	35	47	42	56	51	68	61	81	71	95	12 mos	12 mos
	8	12	16	14	19	17	23	21	28	25	34	30	40	36	48	44	58	52	70	61	82	12 mos	12 mos
Zone 2: CIS/SIS, DOSA, FOSA <=12 Jail; >12 Prison	7	10	13	12	16	14	19	17	23	21	28	25	34	30	41	37	49	44	59	51	69	12 mos	12 mos
	6	3	10	3	12	4	15	5	18	6	22	8	26	9	32	11	38	13	46	16	54	6 mos	6 mos
Zone 1: CIS, RDOSA, Jail	5	2	9	3	10	3	12	4	15	5	18	6	22	8	26	9	32	11	38	13	45	6 mos	6 mos
	4	2	7	2	8	3	10	3	12	4	14	5	17	6	21	7	25	9	30	10	36	6 mos	6 mos
	3	0	3	1	6	2	7	2	8	3	10	3	12	4	14	5	17	6	21	8	27	6 mos	6 mos
	2	0	2	0	3	1	5	1	6	2	7	2	8	3	10	3	12	4	14	5	18	6 mos	6 mos
1	0 - 365 days																						
Zone 0: Unranked	Unr																						

- **CIS:** County Intermediate Sanctions. Sentences less than 2 years may be served in a county intermediate sanctions program administered by the local court.
- **SIS:** State Intermediate Sanctions. For sentences more than 2 years, up to 50% of the individual's sentence may be served in a community-based intermediate sanctions program administered by DOC.
- **RDOSA:** Residential DOSA, for eligible individuals based on offense type and criminal history
- **PDOSA:** Prison DOSA, for eligible individuals based on offense type and criminal history
- **FOSA:** Parenting Sentencing Alternative, for eligible individuals
- Cells in the hatched zone may be eligible for the FTOW sentencing alternative.

### Stipulate that those sentences for individuals in straddle cells are paid for by the state.

- Justification: if they are not prison sentences, it is saving DOC funding by reducing DOC caseloads, so that funding could be diverted to the local courts to support non-incarcerative alternatives.

### For sentences in this zone, presumptive sentence is a sentencing alternative served locally.

- Could be operated by local courts but funded by the state

- Reduces prison sentences/beds/costs, so cost savings can be used to fund the county intermediate sanctions programs.

The State would oversee all county Intermediate Sanction (IS) programs to ensure they meet minimum standards of care.

- Counties would operate there IS programs, but each program must receive state approval every XX years to ensure all the programs are meeting a minimum standard. The state can set requirements for any/all programs that must be reviewed annually or biannually (i.e., approvals for each 2-year budget cycle).
- The state can also set requirements for the type of data that must be collected and reported to the state on an annual basis.
- The state may establish certain minimum levels of care for the general intermediate sanctions program, but also for specific populations of individuals. For example, the state may require that individuals receiving an IS sentence for an offense at a certain seriousness level or for an individual with a certain level of criminal history must have a higher level of supervision such as electronic home monitoring or day reporting centers. Similarly, the state may require that all individuals sentenced to the IS program receive some type of needs assessment to inform treatment.
- The state may also create consistent standards for what types of behaviors would require a revocation of the IS sentence and a return to local incarceration.

**For sentences in this zone, sentences that are DOC sentences (more than 12 months) could have an option for state Intermediate Sanctions. Alternatively, state Intermediate Sanctions could be reserved for individuals sentenced in Zone 3.**

- Partial confinement – could be similar to prison DOSA, where individuals serve ½ of the midpoint or something similar.
- The portion of the sentence served in the community may require higher levels of restriction/supervision (e.g., electronic home monitoring, day reporting centers, etc.)
- Allows DOC to assume the financial/resource responsibility for community supervision portion of the sentence and to provide continuous case management from the incarceration portion of the sentence through the community supervision portion of the sentence.
- Includes an emphasis on rehabilitation and programming.
- In many ways, this may look similar to DOC’s Graduated Reentry (GRE)0 program.

**Funding would be provided by the State to counties through a block grant based on a formula, modeled on the Juvenile Court Block Grant Program.**

Juvenile Court Block Grant: In accordance with RCW13.06.020, the state appropriates approximately \$38 million to local county juvenile courts each two-year budget cycle. In order to reduce reliance on state-operated institutions, this funding provides community-based responses for youth who commit crimes. The funding also assists with the application of disposition (sentencing) programs. The Department of Children, Youth, and Families’ DCYF’s Juvenile Rehabilitation program administers these dollars across the 33 county juvenile court jurisdictions.

A similar grant system could be created for county IS programs. Funds would be allocated based on county size, caseloads, use of the IS program, etc. There should be a minimum base level of funding to cover the staffing and capital costs of running an IS program.

The funds from the block grant can support staffing and capital costs that may also allow counties to expand the types of services offered to individuals in jail or individuals sentenced in district court. Thus, this program could have beneficial spillover effects for an even larger population of individuals involved in the criminal legal system.

### **Intermediate Sanctions**

Sentencing options that fall between probation and incarceration. Examples include:

- Intensive supervision probation
- Day reporting centers
- House arrest
- Electronic home monitoring (EHM)
- Community service
- Intermittent confinement (e.g., work release or weekenders)
- Mandatory treatment conditions
- Residential community corrections (e.g., halfway houses)

Some remaining questions:

- How should requirements for an IS sentence be determined? Would the terms (e.g., EHM vs. day reporting center) be determined by the judge ordering the alternative or by the local IS program supervisor?
- What level of quality assurance and oversight would the state provide? For Juvenile evidence-based programs, the state operates quality assurance protocols and standards for the local court programs. The proposed IS structure is intended to provide more flexibility to the local courts, so there may not be an exhaustive list of specific programs offered in the courts.
- Should the grant funding include funds for ongoing research/evaluation?

## **SECTION 2. POLICY CHANGES TO CURRENT SENTENCING ALTERNATIVES**

The Sentencing Alternatives Workgroup has also reviewed and discussed the state's current Sentencing Alternatives, looking specifically at eligibility criteria. Below are potential recommendations the group has proposed to date, along with a link to the notes from the meeting in which the workgroup discussed the potential recommendation.

**Potential recommendation:** Eliminate eligibility exclusions related to prior convictions for a violent offense from prison and residential drug offense sentencing alternatives. [2.22.22 Sentencing Alternatives Work Group meeting](#)

**Potential Recommendation:** Eliminate eligibility exclusions related to prior convictions for a violent offense from Sentencing Alternatives. [2.8.22 Sentencing Alternatives Work Group meeting](#)

**Potential recommendation:** eliminate cap on the number of DOSA sentences that an individual can receive in a 10-year period. [1.25.22 Sentencing Alternatives Work Group meeting](#)

**Potential recommendation:** eliminate cap on the number of DOSA sentences that an individual can receive in a 10-year period and instead let judges have discretion/flexibility. [1.25.22 Sentencing Alternatives Work Group meeting](#)