

**MINUTES**  
**PUBLIC SAFETY COORDINATING COUNCIL**

**July 11, 2019**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Wayne Spath, Bail Bonds Industry, Chair  
Brett Gibson on behalf David Scharf, Broward Sheriff's Office  
Jack Feinberg, BARC  
Brenda Forman, Clerk of Court  
Adam Goldberg, Public Defender's Office  
Michael Horowitz on behalf of Jeff Marcus, State Attorney's Office  
Lieutenant Colonel Angela Neely, Broward Sheriff's Office  
Greg M. Lauer, Broward County Bar Association  
Kathleen Pugh, Court Administrator  
Steve Ronick, Henderson Mental Health  
Greg Salters on behalf of Chief Rick Maglione, Police Chief's Association  
Andrew Siegel, Circuit Court Administrative Judge on behalf of Chief Judge Tuter  
Darren Sieger, Broward Sheriff's Office  
Michael Udine, Broward County Commissioner

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Lori Alhadeff, Broward School Board  
Raul Fernandez, Florida DOC, Probation.  
Alan Levy, Broward Workshop

**ALSO PRESENT:** Keoki Baron, Assistant County Attorney  
Larry Barszewski, Sun Sentinel  
Alfreda Coward, Citizen (Telephonic)  
Bethany Frankel, Citizen  
Alphonso Jefferson, Assistant County Administrator  
Jean Russo, Broward County Real Time Reporter

A meeting of the Public Safety Coordinating Council (PSCC) was held on Thursday, July 11, 2019, at 3:00 p.m., in the Broward County Courthouse, 201 SE 6<sup>th</sup> Street, Public Defender's Conference Room, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, North Wing, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301.

(The following in a near-verbatim transcript of the meeting.)

MR. SPATH: I'm going to call the meeting to order. A moment of silence, please. Thank you. Self-introductions. I'm going to start with Darren right here.

MR. SIEGER: Good afternoon, everybody. Darren Sieger, Broward Sheriff's Office. Assistant Director.

MS. RUSSO: Jean Russo, Broward County Real Time Reporter.

MR. GIBSON: Brett Gibson, Broward Sheriff's Office. Department of Community -- (inaudible) --

MR. HOROWITZ: Michael Horowitz, State Attorney's Office.

MR. RONIK: Steve Ronik, Henderson Mental Health.

INAUDIBLE SPEAKER: Public Defender's Office.

MS. PUGH: Kathy Pugh, Trial Court Administrator.

JUDGE SIEGEL: Andrew Siegel, Circuit Court Criminal Administrative Judge.

COMMISSIONER UDINE: Michael Udine, Board of County Commissioners, Broward County.

MR. LAUER: Greg Lauer, Broward County Criminal Defense Lawyers Association.

MS. FORMAN: Brenda Forman, Broward County Clerk of Courts.

MR. FEINBERG: Jack Feinberg, Broward County, BARC.

MR. JEFFERSON: Alphonso Jefferson, County Administration.

MS. FRANKEL: Bethany Frankel. I'm here for the citizen position.

MR. BARON: Keoki Baron, Broward County Attorney's Office.

MR. BARSZEWSKI: Larry Barszewski, Sun Sentinel.

INAUDIBLE SPEAKER: -- Sinclair. (Phonetic.)

MR. JEFFERSON: We have Alfreda Coward on the phone. By phone.

MR. SPATH: Okay. Nominations. We have two people nominated for community representative. You've got their resumes. Has everybody had chance to look at their resumes? Everybody agree we're going to proceed? Okay.

Bethany, you're sitting here first. Why don't you speak?

MS. FRANKEL: Sure. Would you like me to stand?

MR. SPATH: You can stand. Whatever is best for you.

MS. FRANKEL: Okay. I'll stand. Good afternoon. I'm Bethany. So I'm here again. I was here last time. I was invited to this meeting by Greg Lauer. And I was interested, because I understand that the mission here is to reduce the jail population in Broward County, and I believe in what you're up to here. I have seven years experience as a law enforcement officer, and the same amount of time as a social worker, and victim advocate. And I would look forward to collaborating and contributing any of my skills, and talents, and abilities, to create something new with you guys, and make the changes that you're trying to make. I would be happy to answer any questions that anybody has about myself, my experience.

MR. SPATH: Questions? Thank you, Bethany.

MS. FRANKEL: Thank you so much.

MR. JEFFERSON: Ms. Coward, are you there?

MS. COWARD: Yes, I'm here. Can you hear me?

MR. JEFFERSON: Yes. I didn't expect it to be that loud. Would you like to say some words?

MS. COWARD: Sure. I couldn't hear anything that was said before, I could only hear your voice to mine. First of all, I would like to thank you for giving me this

opportunity. I understand the consideration was provided to me previously as well. (Inaudible.) I had a scheduling conflict that put me out of the state, and over here with all this rain and hurricane weather. But anyway, that's the issue at hand. I do want to tell you that I'm extremely qualified for this position. And I hope that you had opportunity to view my resume, and agree with the qualifications. But for those that may not know me already -- I know some of the members do -- (inaudible) -- I am a private attorney and have been so for the past 24 years, but more -- (inaudible) -- I have been in community service, spend all of my time and my talents to serving the community and multiple populations. I do that locally. I bring a statewide perspective, having served on many statewide Boards, and I am also involved nationally with the similar populations to talk about and explore trends that we may be able to consider through the American Bar Association. I'm excited about the possibility of being able to bring what I have to the table, and to be able to collaborate with others who I deem to be experts in this subject, to see how we can best serve our community. So that's just something brief about who I am, and what I do. And I'm a little bit out of breath, because I had to run down the hall to take this call. But again, thank you, thank you, for all of your consideration. And I'm sure whoever you select will do a great job.

MS. FORMAN: I have a question for you. This is Brenda Forman. You said that you're involved in the community; could you let us know what you're involved in, and what community outreach groups that you're involved with, and how long you been with that?

MS. COWARD: What was the last part? What community outreach was the last part that you asked me about?

MS. FORMAN: And how long you've been involving yourself with that particular -- or with these particular communities?

MS. COWARD: Okay. So it depends on the capacities. I moved to Broward County in the year 2000. (Inaudible) -- when I first moved here, I served on Boards -- (inaudible) -- Juvenile Justice Council. I did anything that related to kids. Throughout my career -- (inaudible) -- for 24 years as well. I provided all kinds of services to the community, including -- (inaudible) -- so the general population in general. (Inaudible) -- I've done outreach inside the prison. As you know, I am a criminal defense lawyer, so I have first-hand knowledge with -- (inaudible) -- I represented families, I represented grandparents, I represented all the different needs and holistic needs. So I have experience on these different organizations. But looking at a person collectively, not just one factor in their life; that would be put -- (inaudible) -- incarcerated, but what we can do as a community to make sure our residents are served with those things. And I do -- not to give you a specific thing, -- (inaudible) -- resume. So I'm just trying to give you an example of some of the things I've done. But this is a commitment. Not a new commitment for me, this is something I've been doing as long as since college, since I've been out. Undergraduate since 1988. So this is a commitment I brought to the table. I am trying to think of something, some of these organizations, other organizations that I served, but I served on a whole bunch of different Boards. The Learning Coalition Board -- (inaudible) -- Advisory Board. And the American Bar Association. I'm in leadership -- (inaudible) -- population in that capacity as well.

MS. FORMAN: Thank you.

MR. SPATH: Thank you. I think what we should do is take it to a vote, if it's okay with the Committee here. Have Bethany step outside -- anybody wants to

discuss anything, and we'll have a vote on it. You have two good candidates. That's the only thing we can sit back and do. Has everybody read their resumes?

(Ms. Frankel left the room.)

MS. FORMAN: I read it from the last time.

MR. SPATH: I did too. Does anybody have any questions? Things like this are hard, because you've got really, two people that care.

MS. FORMAN: Can we get two people to do it?

MR. SPATH: I wish we could, you know, Brenda. I wish we could. You got two people that really care, that want to do something.

COMMISSIONER UDINE: Can we make one an alternate in case one can't make it?

MR. SPATH: I don't know. Can we do that?

MR. JEFFERSON: I don't think you can, but --

MR. SPATH: But we do it here with Darren, right?

MR. JEFFERSON: That's BSO. All seriousness, that's BSO. So -- and they have a representative --

MR. SPATH: Mike, can you -- what do you do with the Commission?

COMMISSIONER UDINE: I don't think so. I think I'm the appointee.

MR. SPATH: No. But I mean, so you can't -- if you're not here, can anybody else come?

COMMISSIONER UDINE: I don't think so. But I'm happy to let somebody else come.

MR. SPATH: Oh, I thought you like it here.

COMMISSIONER UDINE: No. I do like it.

MR. SPATH: Does anybody want to call the question? Okay. I'm going to call the question. All those in favor of we'll say, Bethany Frankel, raise their hands.

JUDGE SIEGEL: Can I have a vote on behalf of Judge Tuter? No? Okay.

(Vote taken.)

MR. JEFFERSON: What's that? Five?

MR. SPATH: Five? Okay. All those in favor of Alfreda Coward, raise their hand. Four?

(Vote taken.)

MR. JEFFERSON: Did you vote?

MR. SPATH: I only vote if there's a tie.

MS. FORMAN: It's a tie. Five. It's five. You had three over there, and these two over here.

MR. SPATH: Who's the three?

MR. JEFFERSON: For who?

MR. SPATH: Coward.

MS. FORMAN: Alfreda.

MR. SPATH: One, two --

MS. FORMAN: Besides you.

MR. SPATH: -- three --

MS. FORMAN: Four, five.

MR. SPATH: Okay. Well, this was a tough one, you know. It's a real tough one. But I think I'm going to sit and support -- I just -- at the qualifications on the

District Court, Southern Middle District, Public Defender -- you got really, two good candidates in there. I'll support Alfreda Coward. Just because I think they're really good, but I think that -- I mean, I feel bad she's not here to go and vote for that, but if she's busy like she is, we'll see what happens. That's my vote.

MR. JEFFERSON: So a motion.

MR. SPATH: Yeah. Chair will take a motion. Do I have a motion?

MR. JEFFERSON: I can't make a motion.

MS. FORMAN: Motion. Motion to accept Alfreda Coward.

MR. FEINBERG: Second.

MR. SPATH: All those in favor signify by saying, aye.

(Vote taken.)

MR. SPATH: Ayes have it. Tell her to come back in, and tell her, look, it was a tough decision. We still want her to get involved in it, and please be here. I'm sure there's going to be a way to come in here.

(Ms. Frankel entered the room.)

MR. SPATH: Bethany, it was really a close, close thing. Alfreda got it, but we want you to still be involved in it. Because down the line, there's things you can do. I really do. I just think there's a lot of people here that really like you, and a lot of people like her -- but nice things about you.

MS. FRANKEL: Thank you.

MR. SPATH: So please come back.

MS. FRANKEL: Of course.

MR. SPATH: You're welcome to stay here now. Okay. Did everybody read the Minutes?

COMMISSIONER UDINE: Motion to approve.

MS. FORMAN: Second.

MR. SPATH: Now, you guys read them now, right? If I gave you a test, you'd know all about it. You'd know about Dave Scharf with the Work Release Program. You'd know about all the stuff that you talked about. Okay. You'll talk about it later. Okay. The Chair will entertain a motion to approve as read. Do I have a motion?

COMMISSIONER UDINE: So moved.

MS. FORMAN: Second.

(Mr. Salters entered the room.)

MR. SPATH: Who came in?

MR. SALTERS: Major Salters representing Chief Maglione.

MR. SPATH: You got to say that slower. I missed that. Chief of where?

MR. SALTERS: I'm Major Greg Salters. I am representing Chief Rick Maglione. Fort Lauderdale Police.

MR. SPATH: Fort Lauderdale Police. Okay. We just had a vote and we recommended to the County Commission, we recommended Alfreda Coward, and she's going to be Community Representative right now. Okay. Let's look at Approval of Minutes, we got that. We got -- let's vote on that. All in favor signify saying, aye.

(Vote taken.)

MR. SPATH: Ayes have it. Status update. 750-Day Report, Darren.

MR. SIEGER: Good afternoon, everybody. I'll be very brief. This month there were 252 individuals on the list. If you look at the graph -- I apologize -- the date is wrong. The graph is based on June 30th. The graph is based on June 30th. So

we had a decrease of seven inmates off the list from last month. The list is attached. You know, we basically delineate the most serious offense that the individual's in custody on, and the last hearing date, and the next court date, and the assigned judge, and the -- that we researched the information. I'm happy to answer any questions about the list. Thank you.

MR. SPATH: Are there any questions, please? Okay. Civil Citation.

MR. JEFFERSON: Tamica is not here today. But just very quickly, I sent to you, all the information associated with Juvenile Predisposition, and also the Juvenile Civil Citation Program. My understanding that the team that works on the Adult Civil Citation Program -- hopefully within the next time we meet, they can have an update on that particular program, on where it is, and where it stands, and what's moving forward. But Tamica is not here today. She wasn't in the office today, so she couldn't make the meeting today.

MR. SPATH: The Civil Citation is in here, right? I want to see how many there were here. Let me see that. Anybody see that? Civil Citation, okay. Everybody have a copy of that?

MR. SIEGER: Yes.

MR. SPATH: Looks like it's since October 2018. It's been 265. Female 312. And then it looks like -- I see successful completions. Somebody has to explain it, I think, if you really want to get into it. Judiciary.

JUDGE SIEGEL: What do you want to know?

MR. SPATH: Whatever you want to tell us.

JUDGE SIEGEL: I can tell you we're restructuring things a little bit different. So we set up, at the beginning of this year, a third degree division, in order to

try to alleviate some of the easier resolvable cases. We took a number of extremely old cases, and moved them into that particular division. I have the Clerk's Office funding that division with two -- I think it is -- it's two new "third degrees" that are filed for every "one third" that goes into a regular division. I'm going to increase that to four, for every one, so that the "thirds" we'll just be able to get done, which will alleviate the time that needs to be done on those. That will give us more time to do what we need to related to the 750-day cases.

MS. FORMAN: Okay.

JUDGE SIEGEL: I set up a system where individuals -- and I don't know if this was ever brought up. We took cases where individuals were going directly over to the magistrate courtroom; we moved them directly to the main -- to our courtroom; so we alleviated basically five to seven-day individuals sitting in custody, so cases could be resolved early on.

I know that I had conversation with Darren about that particular set of circumstances that we're dealing with. We restructured.

I restructured -- I set up two trial units that's responsibility is to address the older cases, and specifically cases that are in custody, i.e., the 750-day cases. We have Judge Bailey doing a trial division, and we have Judge Murphy doing a trial division. I transferred into Judge Murphy's division -- I don't remember how many initially, I transferred, maybe -- you can look at that. All 750-day -- let's say compare it to the 750-day list from last month or two months ago, and see how the judges changed to where it reflects Judge Murphy's responsibilities to address those, and Judge Bailey's responsibility to address those. I transferred in, I want to say, 30 more, of the 750-day

cases into Judge Murphy's division, so that he'd be able to try those cases in an effort to designate one judge to try the cases.

Basically the whole focus has been to try to address some of these older cases the best that they can be addressed before one judge. And everybody's been trying as many cases as they can possibly try in order to be able to get done as much as could get done. Recognize there's only 18 specific judges that try cases in the criminal division. Every division has at least 600 cases in it. That is the lowest, 500 and something. The most being 900 in a particular division. I've taken from the 900 division. I'm in the process of taking some of those older cases, and moving those into Judge Casey's division, so that he could get rid of those. So it's basically been, you know, management.

MR. SIEGER: If I could say one thing in support of the -- the judiciary in concept, there's a lot of folks here that are involved in a lot of the process. It's not just one issue. The average length of stay for an inmate is now down five days. Not to say that we can't do better. But that's -- translates to about 500 inmates. So if we have the same average length of stay, our population would be up 500, if it wasn't for the actions of helping, moving processes more efficiently and quicker. So all of these First Appearance -- a lot of these First Appearance division initiatives that Judge Siegel has mentioned, has a lot to do with reducing the average length of stay. So I want to thank you for your support, and everybody who's involved in that process.

JUDGE SIEGEL: And the State Attorney and P.D., we sat down and discussed various changes, and various things to be done, and they've been onboard with regard to everything, my suggestions; nobody said no, nobody fought, nobody said any -- I think they're working from the standpoint of the State getting cases processed

faster, and the P.D., and getting individuals out of custody faster, as well as the defense lawyers.

MR. SPATH: From me. I'm going to say one thing on that. I think we can all agree on one thing. The length of stay really comes into play after the first week. It's really the back end of the jail. Because every study that I've read -- I seen the James Austin Study. It says after a week, it goes up to about 90 days. Is that right, Brett?

MR. GIBSON: That's right.

MR. SPATH: It gets up there pretty good. So that's what we have to concentrate -- the biggest problem I've seen here has been somebody is charged with a felony and a misdemeanor; they drop the felony, and all the guys caught in the cracks -- and he's there 60, 70, 80 days on a \$250.00 bond, I've seen. So if we watch our population unit, you can get that population down lower. Thank you, judge. Clerk of the Court.

MS. FORMAN: Nothing to report.

MR. SPATH: Nothing to report. State Attorney. Nothing. Public Defender.

MR. GOLDBERG: There is one question that I have. I don't know if it comes from -- I had a question for BSO, for Darren. You know, we are doing all these great things to help reduce our jail population, but we know that the law has changed on July 1st regarding immigration detainers. And I don't know how much the Committee knows about that law. Has there been any discussion or evaluation about how the change in law is going to affect our jail population?

MR. SIEGER: Sure. So I don't remember the name of the State Bill, but the governor signed a law that changes the requirements in which Sheriff's Offices

place a detainer -- what's required to place a detainer on an individual for an immigration hold. In short, what it says is, prior to, we needed a signed court order by an immigration judge to place a detainer on a person, which means, keeps a person in custody. Now there's other means. It doesn't just require a judge's order. So there's other means to place a detainer. And the back end of that is, when a person is completed with all their charges in Broward County, and we're basically done with the individual, we notify immigration, and they have 48 hours to pick up an individual. So after that, we would release them. So you do have a short time window in which for an individual to get -- to be picked up. But it is easier now to place a detainer on somebody. So I'll give you an example. In 20 -- from June 1, 2018, -- no -- from July 1, 2018 to June 30th, we had about 140 people with detainers placed on them. And from July 1st, when this law went into effect, until the 9th, we had 19. So in a little over a week -- again, it's not measuring how long they stay, because they are also here on other charges, okay. So we'll have to see how that evolves. It's going to have some impact. But because it's a short period of time, that 48 hours, I don't think it's going to be significant. But then again, if you have a lot of people with holds, and you're holding a lot of people for short periods of time, it could have an affect. I don't think it's going to be significant where -- but it's going to have a negative affect no matter how you slice it.

MR. GOLDBERG: First Appearance, since the law changed -- a number of folks coming through -- I think every day we're getting upwards of really ten-plus people that are coming through. And like you say, they're not just being held on the detainer, they're -- come up for Count 4 and 5 -- (inaudible) -- pending criminal matters. And now they have an additional detainer. The problem is unlike the other charges, which is -- are bondable offenses in most cases, these are on hold. Even if

somebody later would have been able to come up with a means to post monetary bond or comply with pretrial release, the courts would no longer hold -- they would be compelled to be detained.

MR. SIEGER: Once we see like somewhat of a leveling off of what the average would be, how many people are we holding for that 48 hour period; at any given time we can measure the impact on ADB.

MR. GOLDBERG: The hold that is in place is only in place for 48 hours.

MR. SIEGER: Well, what that means is we -- we'll keep them in custody after other charges are resolved, for up to 48 hours, to allow immigration to come pick them up. So it's that time period where you're done with everything, where normally you might, you know, time served, and you go out the door. You have to wait 48 hours. So that's the difference.

MR. SPATH: Anything else?

MR. GOLDBERG: No.

MR. SPATH: BSO Detention.

MR. SIEGER: I'll pass the baton to my fearless leader.

MR. SPATH: Anything to report?

LT. COLONEL NEELY: Nothing to report at this time.

MR. SPATH: BSO Department of --

MR. SIEGER: Can I say one --

MR. SPATH: Sure.

MR. SIEGER: For you folks that don't know; Eric Vail, you know, he was taken into custody late yesterday afternoon in Georgia. Combination of being SWAT

Fugitive Task Force, along with the U.S. Marshals Regional Task Force. So it's a good thing. Taken into custody without incident.

MR. SPATH: That's great.

MR. SIEGER: Thank you.

MR. SPATH: Brett.

MR. GIBSON: Broward Sheriff's Office. On behalf of Director Scharf, he extends his apologies. He's in the Attorney General's Office in Tallahassee. And nothing to report.

MR. SPATH: Thank you, Brett. There's nothing to report from the Bond Industry. BARC?

MR. FEINBERG: I put in front of everybody a report that just purely details the amount of court involved individuals that were referred to us, that showed up for an evaluation, and those that we recommended for treatment, and those who are admitted into treatment services. Please bear in mind that detox does not count as treatment service. So as you can see from this, the numbers are pretty dynamic, but the admission stays pretty static, and I dug into that this morning; and the reason is that we're almost always at capacity. So the amount that are coming in each month is going to be very similar from month to month, even if the amount referred goes up and down. So I just wanted to keep you abreast that we are serving a lot of the population, and doing our best to keep public safety at our forefront.

In addition, last meeting, we talked about the BSO grant, that that pays for peer mentors from BARC to help take nonfatal emergencies in emergency rooms from overdose, and link them up with services; often medication assisted treatment, and I'm happy to report that of those four positions -- we had hired four, but one decided not to

pursue it after hire -- but three of the four have actually started, has been through training and orientation, and are now beginning to actually do the job. So we're real excited. It was a very quick turnaround to get those onboard once we had everybody signed and approved.

MS. FORMAN: I have a question for you. At the South Broward Bar Association Luncheon today, they were speaking about opiates. What does a lot of your patients fit in? Is there a lot that comes in with that -- I'm going to call it a disease?

MR. FEINBERG: Ma'am, there is a tremendous a lot. The opioid disorder is our predominant thing that we treat. We still see a lot of people using alcohol, and we see people using cocaine, and meth, and everything you can imagine, but the opioid epidemic has really changed the face of substance use disorder treatment in America, and it's no different here in Broward County.

MR. SPATH: Let me ask one question. I'll just look at October. You got court involved referral service. It was 120. You recommended 109. 79 for treatment. What happened to those other people?

MR. FEINBERG: Our new facility -- oh, why was that number higher or what happened?

MR. SPATH: No. But what happened that you don't do anything for?

MR. FEINBERG: Well, either they don't meet criteria for --

MR. SPATH: What is the criteria?

MR. FEINBERG: It would depend on the level of care. So if somebody comes in and is evaluated, they could meet criteria from everything to let's say, detox, to residential treatment, to intensive outpatient treatment, to outpatient treatment, or no treatment at all. Maybe somebody has more of a predominate mental health issue than

they do with substance use disorder. There's a lot of reasons. And there's also the reason that they're not admitted, might have been we were at capacity, and we referred them somewhere else.

MR. SPATH: Okay. Anything else? Broward County Police Chief's Association? Broward Workshop?

MR. JEFFERSON: Not here.

MR. SPATH: Broward County Bar Association.

MR. LAUER: I think that's what I count as.

MR. SPATH: Do you want to do it at the end or do you want to do it now?

MR. LAUER: Whenever you want.

MR. SPATH: Just go ahead.

MR. LAUER: Okay. I did some digging into the 750-day list, because I kind of wanted to understand a bit more about these cases. And I sent you all a summary that I'm getting ready to go through. But I went through the court files online of the ten individuals who have been in custody the longest in our jail awaiting trial. And what I found was -- I'm going to just go through them one by one.

We got Mr. Lumsdon. All right. He has been in there almost 12 years. This was a double murder. He allegedly -- I'm just going to say, all these individuals did it, even though I know they're all presumed innocent -- went into a convenience store and murdered two people working there. Sounds like it was execution style, shot them in the head. Some type of robbery. I don't know how much he got, but when left, there were bloody shoe prints all over the floor. As he exited the store, an individual sort of from the neighborhood, sounds like, you know, almost a homeless person who knew him, and had

known him for years, saw him. And Mr. Lumsdon told this man, "hey unc, you know who the fuck I am, you better forget what you saw here, get out of here." That guy basically took off. However, another witness saw that man as he was riding his bike, freaking out, and later told the police about it. The police ended up getting a Crime Stoppers tip. They go to Mr. Lumsdon's house, they find the shoe that has the victim's DNA from her blood on the bottom of it, the shoe print matches the shoe prints on the blood on the floor of the store, and Mr. Lumsdon's DNA is inside of the shoe, because it's his shoe.

In 2009, December 17th of 2009 -- I have the letter in front of me. It's to Judge Paul Backman, and it is from Judge Holmes. And it says, "I've been asked to bring to your attention November 30, 2009, the above referenced case has been placed on the Broward Sheriff's Office 150-day in Custody List. As you know, these cases must receive the highest priority for resolution." Accordingly, per Judge Holmes's request this case has been set for a status conference in January. So that was 2009. Almost a decade ago this got on the 750-day List.

This is a capital case. And there has been no appeal, and there are no mental health issues. He's never been declared incompetent. There's no legitimate reason why this case should take 12 years to get to trial. I went through the docket. This one I'm more disgusted by than really anything I'd seen. I had no idea this case existed. But this is absolutely inexcusable. I'm not sure what excuses or the reasons may be for this, but I'm not willing to, you know, just sit idly by and say this isn't a problem.

We now have a Constitutional Amendment for Victims' Rights. And it says a victim shall have the following specific rights upon request; and one of them is, the right to proceedings free from unreasonable delay, and to a prompt and final conclusion of the case, and any related post judgment proceedings. I didn't vote for this

Constitutional Amendment, but 60 -- over 60 percent of the people in Florida did. And it's now part of our Constitution. This doesn't comply with it. And on this list if you go through it, and you highlight the charges on here, you have 112 murder cases that have been in custody for more than two years. I don't think a single one of those complies with this new Victims' Rights Constitutional Amendment. Two years for a murder case. To get through 112 murder cases, I can't even imagine how long that that's going to take, if it's even possible. And what ends up happening, is all of these victims -- well, not all of the victims -- but all these witnesses; they disappear, they forget. I think on this case we had -- was it Detective Shotwell (phonetic) -- was one of the individuals who was working this case. I don't know if you know, but he ended up getting shot several times himself. This is what happens when you wait 12 years to try a case. You end up having to give this guy time served, who committed a double murder.

Next case we have on here is Ms. Ritchie.

JUDGE SIEGEL: Hold on. Let's address each case --

MR. LAUER: Yeah. I want to talk about this one first.

JUDGE SIEGEL: Let's address each case. First of all, I take personal affront with your attitude towards dealing with the individual cases, because you are not the attorney assigned in a particular case; and I assure you that if you were -- if you want each one of these cases, you would be assigned in these cases if you think they can get done as fast as --

MR. LAUER: I can try this case in a week.

JUDGE SIEGEL: -- number one. Number two, is this case did go to trial, and the attorney had a stroke in the middle the trial.

MR. LAUER: What year was that?

JUDGE SIEGEL: That was two years ago. The attorney had a stroke in the middle of the trial --

MR. LAUER: So after it was --

JUDGE SIEGEL: Well, hold on a second. So somebody has to rehab from that stroke in order to be able to do -- whatever the situation is, the situation is with regard to the case.

MR. LAUER: Twelve years is indefensible for a double murder --

JUDGE SIEGEL: Hold on. Hold on. You had your piece. You had your piece. It's not as easy as -- and you're a defense lawyer, and you're a friend of mine; it's not as easy as okay, well, it's a double murder, and this guy is guilty. Because I'll tell you, from the P.D.s' Office there are defenses to particular cases. Okay? So whatever the situation was, it was, and it's in the process of being tried at this moment -- well, not at this moment -- but it's set for trial. And that's where it sits.

MR. HOROWITZ: If I could respond. I know you sent a list to our office, State Attorney's Office, late yesterday. And so as best we could, on short notice that you had this list -- try and look into these cases and see what's going on with them. And I agree with the judge. Each case is individual. And you gave a little synopsis and we listened. No one wants to get the cases to trial faster than the State Attorney --

MR. LAUER: I agree. It's in your best interest.

MR. HOROWITZ: -- and the faster we can get them to trial, we want to do that. But there is also a process, and the Public Defender can tell you. And as a defense attorney, you know there is certain due process rights that need to be watched out for, for everybody. And so our interest is to get it to trial.

I looked at your list, and as best I could tell on short notice of the cases, there was 81 defense continuances, three State continuances -- joint continuances is often times -- status conferences. This particular case, the little bit we could find out -- again, each case is individualized. So there's on this case; 20 defense continuances -- (inaudible) -- and two joint continuances. The case was originally set for trial three different times; the first time there came up an issue of a Frye Goldberg issue. That was heard in front of Judge Holmes. At the end of the hearing, the defense requested a continuance to hire a DNA expert. Judge Holmes gave him 90 days to get an expert. Obviously you know the issue is if there's DNA issues and the defense isn't allowed to get an expert, that's not going to do anybody any favors, because you know that case --

MR. LAUER: I tried putting DNA cases --

MR. HOROWITZ: -- so it got started again for trial, at which time the defense attorney had -- (inaudible) -- medical conditions, and was hospitalized on the fifth day of jury selection. So that caused a delay. Then it's -- was set in front of Judge Bailey for trial again, as recently as February, but Judge Bailey was in a trial. Scheduling conflict there. So it was reset. Again, the trial got started; during jury selection, the defense, again, wanted to retain an expert witness on blood spatter. The State objected and continued back and forth. The judge realized that you needed to go ahead and grant them the continuance to get their expert. And the case is now set for trial. So it's currently set.

MR. LAUER: September.

MR. HOROWITZ: -- there is a status that's set for trial now in September 16th. What I'm saying is, you know --

MR. LAUER: Yeah. I just picked the top ten.

MR. HOROWITZ: -- when you paint a "broad brush," and you just kind of throw it around there -- these are each -- and you know that, you can't simply say every defendant is guilty. Each case is unique in its own set of facts and circumstances.

MR. LAUER: And this is incredibly unique. Twelve years. There are two individual families who lost loved ones in this store.

MR. HOROWITZ: You're preaching to the choir.

MR. LAUER: I know --

MR. HOROWITZ: I'm not the one that -- but there are delays. And we're trying to get it -- them to trial. As I said, the majority was defense continuances, as you know, the defense took the majority of continuances. We want to get them to trial as quick as we can. But let's look at them individually.

MR. LAUER: No. I'm going to go through them individually. I mean, the police solved this case. When I say, "solved," they brought it to you all within like 48 hours.

MR. SPATH: Alphonso, what?

MR. JEFFERSON: Can I just make a suggestion? The Public Safety Coordinating Council, your role is to make recommendations, things of that nature, to reduce jail population.

MR. LAUER: No. Actually, I have a purpose.

MR. JEFFERSON: Let me finish. From the standpoint of, you can always create a little small Committee to deal -- to go deeper into these items to figure out how you want to solve those, and bring back an overall solution to the Public Safety Coordinating Council on what you want to --

MR. SPATH: Alphonso, listen. I agree with you. But let Greg go over it. And listen, here's how I look at it; as long as we could come with a solution. When we leave this room here, let me tell you, I've been on this Public Safety Council for nine years, right? I only missed one meeting when my daughter was in an accident in Costa Rica. And that comes up every time. Now I read the Minutes last time. I looked at what Judge Tuter said. There's a lot of things. I understand what the State Attorney says. I understand the Public Defender's going to do anything you can do to delay this thing and delay it.

JUDGE SIEGEL: That's not true. That's not true. That's not true. Each individual is entitled to due process. No. Part of the situation is science changes over time. And you have a lawyer who's representing a particular defendant, and all of a sudden -- and I'll give you another case -- whatever it may be -- with regard to this boxing case, just went to trial; there's some new issues with regard to brain structure and the way the brain is evaluated. And one of the things the defense decided to do was -- because they believed this guy had some kind of brain anomaly based upon some medical records that were reviewed -- hired another expert related to the defense, related to that. Well, fine, you're a judge, you're sitting here, and it's going to take another six months in order for them to be able to do it, for that expert to be able to review it. If you say no, that case gets tried, and guess what happens, the Appellate Court decides, that hey, no, you should have given him six months to be able to do it, so it's come back, it's going back for retrial. Okay. So you're going back for retrial. Now you have the State Attorney's Office that's got to figure out what to tell their particular victims as to why the judge reversed it because of that particular brain injury.

It's a breathing, living thing; a criminal case. Circumstances change during the course of the case. And yes, you can point to 11 years on Lumsdon, you can point to the 750-day on other cases, but I assure you that everybody is doing what they need to do in order to be able to get this case to trial and have it resolved finally, to where to the best of anybody's ability, it is not going to go back up on appeal, and be reversed on appeal, so that everything starts over again, and the individual sits in custody again. There are anomalies, and you can point to the top ten as anomalies.

I could give you one of the top ten. Because it really bugs me. I could give you one of the top ten, Devonte Martin; number eight. Devonte Martin is in my division. I want you to go into my division and I want you to sit there when Devonte Martin is brought in, and I want you to see what Devonte Martin does every single time, in order for him to be able to delay whatever trial he has.

MR. LAUER: I'll come watch it. He's been ordered to be gagged. I saw it.

JUDGE SIEGEL: Exactly. Because it's on the record, for the record, and you get a 30-minute diatribe as to why he's a sovereign citizen, and why he's not subject to the jurisdiction of this particular state, and this particular country. And he will go on and on, and he can not be shut up, other than to either gag him or send him downstairs. And every time I send him downstairs, what will happen is somebody, maybe up above, when they actually go to trial, will say, judge, you should have never sent him downstairs, because that was a substantive situation that he needed to be present for. And he could go on the record, for the record, for six years, that's fine. Okay. He's going to be tried, he's tried in October. He is now being managed, only because a way was figured out for him to be able to avoid on the record, for the record, and I want to represent

myself. So individually the State, the defense, everybody is working towards getting these things done. And I could tell you, Devonte Martin -- I mean, that's -- I got another one where I've got John Brown; who was tried and convicted of murder. He's like 15 or 17 on your list. He's got a PDP case. Well, the State wishes to pursue the PDP case. The truth is, he was offered time served because he's been in custody so long. He refuses to take time served, so he wants his case tried. I brought him into court three times to try his cases; he just fired his lawyer, and said I want a -- excuse me -- he wants a Public Defender's Office -- no -- SPD. He's on SPD at this point, because he started out with the Public Defender's Office, and he continued with the Public Defender's Office until through their discovery, they found out that they had a conflict with regard to a particular witness. So they needed to be off the case. Regional Counsel is on the case. Regional Counsel is on the case for a long period of time. Then Mr. Brown decides he is in love with his lawyer, and he can't have a relationship with this lawyer because he is physically in love with this lawyer, and every time he sees him, he can not keep it together to be able to work with his lawyer to pursue his case. So then he decides that he's going to represent himself. So he's representing himself for a while, and then he decides he's going to file the demand for a speedy trial; he files the demand for a speedy trial, then on the day of speedy trial, he decides he wants a lawyer to represent him. So a lawyer's appointed to represent him. And then that lawyer files a demand for speedy trial. So the criticism is just wrong.

MR. LAUER: Okay. I got nine more I'm going to go through.

MR. SPATH: Let me say one thing. I understand what you're saying. I'll stand corrected. I see a picture where if you don't let them have their -- to get these

tested -- it's grounds for an appeal, it's going to start all over again. That's basically what you're saying. They're going to get their day in court.

JUDGE SIEGEL: No. I'm saying exactly what Mr. Horowitz is saying. Every case is unique. Mr. Goldberg will back it. Every case is unique. Nobody is doing anything other than trying to get the cases to trial. Period.

MR. GOLDBERG: The goal from our perspective -- and I know in the case that we're discussing, it's not our case. It's not delay. It's due process. All of us are tasked with making sure --

MR. SPATH: I got it. I think I answered that wrong. But in order to get -- if we're going to go through the same thing here with what we're doing there, do you want to put a Committee together?

MR. LAUER: No. I'd rather just go through. I can do it quickly. And one of the things I think we're supposed to be doing, when I read our Mission Statement, our purpose; number five is to provide an efficient and timely criminal justice system in Broward County. So it's not just jail population. Maybe I've got the wrong, you know, website I was looking at.

Let me go into number two. We got Ms. -- Mr. Ritchie. Convicted --

MR. HOROWITZ: I don't want to interrupt you, but that case is over.

MR. LAUER: That's right.

MR. HOROWITZ: -- he's been --

MR. LAUER: -- it was a decade before the case was over, which was the reason he was on my list. Just you know, another individual. It's a murder case. From what I read in the Sun Sentinel, it sounded like the victim was stabbed 87 times,

and yet a decade later for the case to be resolved. And while it was pending, the father of the victim lost another child in a violent crime.

MR. SPATH: All right. Greg, let's go through --

MR. LAUER: All right. Jermaine Osborn. This one, when I went through the docket, it looks like this guy should be time served. He's only being held on a third degree felony. Okay. He was sentenced in 2011 for some child molestation cases, they were run concurrently, back to back, he's supposed to be doing five years in Florida State Prison; however, he's in our jail on a \$10,000 bond. I can't figure out why he hasn't been sent to prison. I mean, I guess the State is still going forward on a third degree felony. But I couldn't see paperwork designating him as an H.O.Q, meaning Habitual Offender Qualified, where he could possibly get 10 years. It looks like this man already served any possible sentence. He's number three on our list. Okay.

MR. HOROWITZ: The short of the whole little information --

MR. LAUER: Yeah --

MR. HOROWITZ: -- that I could find out, that doesn't tell the whole story --

MR. LAUER: Okay.

MR. HOROWITZ: -- and so you put out there that this is what's going on with these cases and it makes a nice headline --

MR. LAUER: Is there -- what's going on with them?

MR. SPATH: Listen, let's get focused now. Let's let the State talk, and let's go through this. I don't want to spend all day.

MR. LAUDER: Okay.

MR. HOROWITZ: You put this out there very quickly, and want to get on your soapbox. Like I said, we want to get these tried, but what you put in here is not always accurate.

MR. LAUER: Okay. So tell me; is he being held for a \$10,000 bond, and that's it?

MR. HOROWITZ: Let me go through it.

MR. LAUER: Okay. Thank you.

MR. HOROWITZ: First of all, you had the sentence wrong. Okay. In the 0911851; lewd and lascivious battery, aggravated assault, tampering of a witness. He had a motion to reduce bond in 2009 --

MR. LAUER: No, no. But he was sentenced to five years in 2011, right?

MR. HOROWITZ: Hold on.

MR. SPATH: Greg, let him finish.

MR. HOROWITZ: I let you --

MR. LAUER: All right.

MR. HOROWITZ: Did I interrupt you?

MR. LAUER: I apologize. No, you didn't.

MR. HOROWITZ: So I let you finish, and you said your piece. You put it in writing. I want to be able to respond.

MR. LAUER: Okay.

MR. HOROWITZ: Okay. He had a motion to reduce bond. He bonded out at one point. He pled to all of his charges. He was given 16 years, Florida State Prison, followed by five years Sex Offender Probation. So he's still under sentence. His sentence isn't completed yet. Okay. Same with the other count. It ran concurrent.

Requests for continuances, he had attorney withdrawal. Okay. He was transferred to Mental Health Court. He was declared incompetent in 2012.

MR. LAUER: Yep. I wrote that.

MR. HOROWITZ: He was incompetent until December 6th of 2018. Okay. He was transferred back to the regular division back in December of 2018. The defense took a continuance on March 7, 2019. There is a motion to set bond. A trial was set for 7/8/19. The State asked for a continuance in order to get in touch with the victim about a possible plea offer. Okay. We couldn't reach the victim right away, so we took a continuance. One State continuance. All right. His offer is 31.65 months, the bottom of the guidelines, okay, to run concurrent. He's still under sentence. He's been incompetent since 2012. Okay. And he wants his day in court. So we'll get him his day in court. But he's been incompetent until -- just of December of this year. So now it's up, we made a plea offer, a concurrent, less than the bottom of the guidelines, to run concurrent, he doesn't want to accept it. (Inaudible) -- it will get resolved. There's nothing you can do. He's incompetent. You know that.

MR. LAUER: Yeah. But he was State sentenced.

MR. HOROWITZ: He's incompetent for -- since 2012. You can't do anything without --

MR. LAUER: But we held an incompetent individual who already had a prison sentence since 2001 in our jail, and paid for him for 2011 until right now. Just because he's incompetent, doesn't mean he can't be released, ROR, the State can drop the case, he can go to prison; do his 16 years.

MR. HOROWITZ: The victim seemed startled with burglary --

MR. LAUDER: Well, I know, but --

MR. HOROWITZ: -- now you want to go back to Victims' Rights, we're going to drop your case, because --

MR. LAUER: Or you can ROR him, and then try him when he comes back. I'm just saying --

MR. HOROWITZ: (Inaudible) -- he has to do his prison time anyway, so he's not getting out.

MR. LAUER: I know he's not. But we're paying for him on \$140 a day on a case when he walked into somebody's --

MR. SPATH: Let's go to the next one.

MR. LAUDER: All right. Let's go onto the next one.

MR. SPATH: I'm not going to spend all day on this.

MR. LAUER: All right. So we have James Moncur. This is a homicide, where he had a codefendant. David Fletcher; he's been in there for 7.1 years.

All right. David Weintraub. He has a codefendant as well. He's number six. And there's codefendants --

MR. HOROWITZ: Let's go through them.

MR. LAUER: Okay.

MR. HOROWITZ: -- Fletcher -- codefendants, right?

MR. LAUER: Uh-huh.

MR. HOROWITZ: That started out -- it's now turned into a nine-count indictment. There's three codefendants. Two of them are charged with racketing -- racketeering, conspiracy for racketeering. There's 12 separate incidents, which included robbery, possession of counterfeit bills, felony, murder, cannabis. He's

been -- different attorneys. There's been 19 defense continuances. Now the case is set in front of John -- (inaudible) -- it's set for trial on September 18th.

MR. LAUER: My point is that seven years isn't reasonable for a case.

Next we have six and seven, which is David Weintraub and Mr. Desir. This is a body found in a canal in Davie. They end up arresting this guy, from what I read in the police reports. Sounds like he was at the victim's home, driving the victim's car, he confessed to it, his codefendant confessed to it. They got their cell phones that are pinging off of each other, and they got one of the guy's video at an ATM. So he's been in jail for seven years on a case, that to me, doesn't sound overly complicated, and I don't think should be taking seven years for, you know, the Court, or the State Attorney's Office to resolve. I just picked the top ten.

MR. HOROWITZ: You're looking at me, and like I said, we want to try these cases quickly. All these cases are in front of a judge, with the defense attorney and the judge, and there's reason why they're asking for continuances, they're needing more time. The Court is reviewing things that are reasonable. If the Court doesn't think there's a reasonable reason, then I'm sure it will set for trial.

In this case, it's been assigned some different judges. Death Penalty case where I think they're flipping one of the codefendants. Ed Hoeg who happened to be on the --

MR. LAUER: Nope.

MR. HOROWITZ: -- significant health problems. Mitch Filet (phonetic) was on the penalty phase, and Mitch Filet was in the Temper (phonetic) trial, which went on for the police officer killing -- went on for over a year, and then the trail settled with

multiple codefendants. So it's set for a date certain on August 12th, and there's been multiple defense continuances. Okay?

MR. LAUER: Yep. Next one. We have Martin Devonte. This is the individual who --

JUDGE SIEGEL: Devonte Martin.

MR. LAUER: Devonte Martin -- I'm sorry, I reversed them -- murdered Mr. Conway (phonetic). Mr. Conway was --

JUDGE SIEGEL: That's the one I just talked to you about --

MR. LAUER: Yep. I know. But the facts are he's walking through -- Mr. Conway, the victim, is walking with his girlfriend through a lot. This individual comes up to him with his friend, shoots him, kills him. They have a video of him running away with his friend. The girl identifies him, she identifies the codefendant he was with, they find the murder weapon at his house. And since he's been in custody, he's assaulted a BSO deputy, corrections deputy, so he's charged with a felony for that. They found a shank, meaning a weapon, taped underneath his desk where he writes letters.

You know, I understand that there's differences, and every case is a unique breathing animal, but he's been in jail seven years for a murder, and I don't think it should have taken this long.

Number nine, Mr. Conway. Mr. Conway pled out already. There is an open plea. And they're waiting for him to testify against one of his codefendants. I read the entire deposition that he gave to Tom Coleman; who's now Judge Coleman. He admits to everything. He implicates the other individual. And they planned on murdering this kid who lived up the street from them, and they carried it out. And so far we've had him sitting in jail for almost seven years.

And Mr. Harold Escalante; trafficking, and he took a plea on this specifically --

MR. HOROWITZ: (Inaudible) -- the defense has Frye (phonetic) defense witnesses, defense experts, and there's continuances -- (inaudible) -- there's also issues between Frye and -- (inaudible) -- and changes in the law, and all that needs to be addressed. And there's willful experts involved in that case.

Again, you know, sentence over. Late last night trying to find as much as I can, so everybody knows what's going on, not just --

MR. LAUER: Yeah. No. I'll try to get them out earlier from now on. I sent them originally to try to have them passed out ahead of time, but I'll take care of it, and get them to you earlier from now on.

MR. JEFFERSON: Just be very careful of the Sunshine Laws.

MR. LAUER: Yeah. Harold Escalante. So this individual was arrested for trafficking. He took a plea specifically to testify against Jose Morales. He's been sitting in our jail after he's already taken a plea, just awaiting sentence since 2015. He's number 74 on our list, and he is testifying against five other individuals that were arrested as part of an uncover operation that the Hollywood Police Department did, called -- what is it -- Heroin Valley.

Now, it's racketeering, there's multiple defendants. I understand that it might be complicated. But at this point, these individuals, together, on a drug case, have been in our jail for 18.2 years. When you add up all the time, and all the money that it costs us, and not dispose of their case in a more expeditious fashion -- so when I added it up, meaning all the individuals on this list, as well as the codefendants, that would be worked out once they testified, and once all their cases are over, we came to 88 years.

That's three -- 32,000 days. And according to Judge Tuter, it costs approximately \$140.00 per day to house an individual. I heard it might even be more than 140 when we're talking health care and other things. So that's \$4.5 million that we spent.

Obviously they would have needed to be held for some period of time, but in my opinion, and it's my humble opinion, I don't think that the time periods that it's taken to take care of cases is appropriate. I don't think it's reasonable. And I would like to, whether we need a Working Group, whether we need something else to come up with some methods to try to get through the 112 murder cases that have been in custody for more than two years at this point. It's not fair to the victims' families. If this were my family, I can't even tell you what I would be doing if the case went on for two years without a resolution. And it might just be, because they're you know, voiceless. Maybe they don't cause any ruckus. Maybe no one cares. But I think we can do a better job.

MR. HOROWITZ: Hold on. Just so you know, our office, we have a Victims Advocate Office. They're in the court with us, we're in touch with our victims from the point of the investigations, to the time the case is charged, through the bond hearings, status conferences; we update them all the time. And there is frustration with them. The whole criminal justice system is frustrating for everyone. But each one of those victims, we're in touch with, and they know what's going on, and they understand the process. Sometimes they're frustrated with it, but we as prosecutors, sit down and explain it to them. They don't necessarily agree. It is a frustrating system, and sometimes they don't understand. But we keep them informed. We have Victim Advocates. So to say that they're voiceless, they're out there in the fog, nobody knows what's going on -- again, another one of your -- you know, I don't know if it's a political statement, or your soapbox, or whatever your agenda --

MR. LAUER: No. It personally bothers me.

MR. HOROWITZ: -- when you say stuff like that, the victims don't know what's going on --

MR. LAUER: I didn't -- that's not what I said.

MR. HOROWITZ: -- kept in the dark. Their voiceless.

MR. LAUER: No. I said, maybe they're not raising a ruckus, because they're not politically connected and wealthy, and they can't do anything about it. I'm not sure what the problem is, but to me, this isn't okay.

MR. SPATH: Greg, we're going to move on.

MR. LAUER: All right.

MR. SPATH: All right. We discussed it. I'm sure when I was looking at the Minutes, the last Minutes, Judge Tuter is going to address it. I think everybody here --

JUDGE SIEGEL: I addressed it on behalf of the -- (inaudible) -- and Judge Tuter. I mean, it's you know, I take personal affront to the fact that we're being accused, the State and the defense lawyers are being accused of not pursuing their responsibilities, and not doing their job. Because in every single one of the individual cases, if you sat there for every one of the individual hearings, as opposed to reading a particular pleading, you would see exactly what went on, and resulted in the case being whatever age it is. It's not that nobody is not doing anything. It's that everybody is doing what they need to do, so that when there is finality, and it is final -- and it's not a situation where it's coming back -- and everything is completely done.

MR. HOROWITZ: I don't disagree with the cases. We need to move quicker, and everyone is for that. That's why we're here. But I just kind of took exception.

MR. LAUER: Okay. Would it be possible to have a Working Group, and maybe we can put together, and expedite these things; especially now that it looks like the State Attorney is tasked with -- you know, the State Attorney may file a good faith demand for speedy trial? I mean, I think this could be a very useful tool for the State Attorney's Office to maybe move some of these cases in a more appropriate fashion, and we could have a resolution on the merits. I'd be more than happy to work with anybody. I have plenty of time, and I have lots of energy. So anybody who's interested; would you be interested? How do we set it up, Mr. Spath?

MR. HOROWITZ: Anything we can do to move forward.

MR. SPATH: We'll just put a Committee together, Greg. Anybody wants to volunteer. What I want to do -- I should have listened to Alphonso when he said put the Committee together. But listen, we got it out here, right? We vetted it here. So we know what we're going to do. We're not going to have this discussion again in here. It will go back to a Committee.

So Greg, you can get with the State, you can get with me, anybody that wants to get on the Committee, we'll put a Committee together. We'll meet and understand it. I understand more today. The first thing I said -- the defense, until it got corrected by my friend here. But it's okay. I understand it. Everybody is trying to do their job. Everything comes up all of a sudden. Things happen. It's not cut and dried like you read. It's altogether different. I learned a lot from the State Attorney today. Let's move on. Mental Health Treatment.

DR. RONIK: Good afternoon, everybody. Update on the centralized receiving system, which is now -- (inaudible) -- a couple of years in operation. To remind you, this is open 24 hours a day, seven days a week. This gives law enforcement an

opportunity to help somebody you bump against to somehow get -- (inaudible) -- but what they really need to do is resolve their mental health crisis. So a whole system is funded around that, and having started out slow, now we saw over 800 people on -- (inaudible) -- now we should average about 10,000 people a year. So it's a very busy, intense, service now. And a huge percentage of folks would be caught up in the criminal justice system if there was not this service. So just wanted to give you an update. If any one of you want to see this centralized receiving center, that's in Lauderdale Lakes, get in touch with me, and we'll give you a tour, and you can see what goes on there.

MR. SPATH: Florida DOC, Probation.

MR. JEFFERSON: They're not here.

MR. SPATH; County Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER UDINE: Good afternoon. Just briefly. When we had our budget meeting, the Sheriff was there, and members of law enforcement. They're going to be looking to try and ramp up the civil citation as far as getting that out to more different departments throughout the County. I know that there was -- when we met last time, I don't remember the exact numbers, but the numbers seem awfully small as to what we were hearing. They were going to try and get that a little more out, push that out into the community. So I guess when we have the next few updates over the next few months, we'll get a better handle of that.

MR. SPATH: Thank you. Open forum. Any public comments? Future meeting dates; September 5, 2019, November 7th, 2019. The Chair will take a motion to adjourn. Do I have a motion?

MS. FORMAN: Motion.

MR. SIEGER: Second.

(Vote taken.)

(This day's meeting adjourned at 4:03 p.m.)