

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

400 McAllister Street, Room 205
San Francisco, CA 94102-4512
Phone: 415-551-5737
FAX: 415-551-5701



BRANDON E. RILEY
COURT EXECUTIVE OFFICER

June 9, 2026

Response to San Francisco Pretrials' (SF Pretrial) Outcome Data

Context

The San Francisco Superior Court (SFSC) seeks to understand how the outcome data from SF Pretrial is collected and calculated. To further this effort, the Court reached out to SF Pretrial in April 2026 for information on its business rules and methodologies along with a client records request for data validation. A client records request was deemed necessary as the Court's Case Management System, C-Track, does not track SF Pretrial's individual service cessation dates. This time specificity is required to accurately calculate the measures that SF Pretrial is presenting.

While SF Pretrial has been responsive, the Court has not received the requested data as of June 9th, 2026. To validate SF Pretrial's findings, the Court has conducted preliminary analyses using available data in C-Track.

In addition to conducting preliminary analyses, the Court has also reviewed the Budget and Legislative Analyst Report from May 27th, 2026, and is attaching its response below.

Preliminary Analysis

Scope and Caveat

The scope of the analysis is restricted to cases that:

- 1) had entered services with SF Pretrial on or before December 31st, 2025, and
- 2) had at least one hearing within CY 2025.

Due to the limitations discussed above, the analysis assumes that all SF Pretrial clients remain active until the conclusion of their case.

Appearance Rate

According to the data from San Francisco Sheriff's Office, SF Pretrial clients had an average appearance rate of 84% in CY 2025 (defined as the percentage of clients who attended their court dates).

The court’s preliminary finding suggests that 80.0% court dates were attended in CY 2025 by SF Pretrial clients after entering services with SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial Client Court Hearings in CY2025	
Number of Hearings Where Defendant is Present	39,958
Number of Hearings Where Defendant is Not Present	9,979
Total Number of Hearings	49,937
Percentage of Court Dates Attended	80.0%

Safety Rate

According to the data from San Francisco Sheriff’s Office, SF Pretrial had an average safety rate of 94% in CY 2025 (defined as the percentage of clients who are not arraigned on a new misdemeanor or felony charge, or a probation or parole violation). Due to system limitations, SFSC opted to calculate the percentage of clients not arrested on a new charge.

The court’s preliminary finding suggests that 69.5% of SF Pretrial clients had no new arrest charges in CY 2025.

Re-Arrests for SF Pretrial Clients in CY 2025	
Count of Cases with Re-Arrests (after entering services with SF Pretrial)	2,425
Count of Cases with No Re-Arrests (after entering services with SF Pretrial)	5,521
Count of Cases That Entered services with SF Pretrial On or Before 12/31/2025	7,946
Safety Rate	69.5%

Response to Budget and Legislative Analyst Report

Small Sample Size in PSA and Progress Report Reviews

In the May 27th, 2026 Budget and Legislative Analyst Report (Report), the San Francisco Sheriff’s Office (SFSO) reviewed 22 Public Safety Assessments (PSAs) and eight progress reports for four clients:

Performance Monitoring

Following our recommendation to do so, in 2025 the Sheriff's Office began formally evaluating the Pretrial contract. Previously, the Sheriff's Office monitored performance through a monthly review of incoming data from Pretrial, but the review was not formally documented. In FY 2025-26, the Sheriff's Office conducted a site visit to review

Pretrial's organizational changes, programmatic policies and procedures including ADA compliances, client grievances, and job descriptions. Sheriff staff noted that Pretrial provided requested materials without delay.

In addition, Sheriff staff reviewed a sample of 22 public safety assessments and determined that they are 98 percent accurate, which exceeded the goal of 85 percent. Sheriff staff also reviewed eight sample progress reports in 2026 for four clients. The Sheriff's review did not quantify the accuracy of the progress reports but found that they "clearly list all court requirements in contrast with client actions to determine compliance" and that one of the eight reports did not list all group attendance.

The Court makes the following observation:

Public Safety Assessments

- This is a sample size of 0.27%, as SF Pretrial conducted 8,134 PSAs in 2025.^[1]
- With a sample of 0.27%, the margin of error is extremely high (20 – 21%, assuming a standard 95% confidence level). These results lack precision.^[2]
- For populations in the thousands, typical statistical targets are between 300 and 400 respondents to achieve a 95% confidence level with a 5% margin of error.^[3]

Progress Reports

- With a daily average of 1,700 active participants, a sample size of eight progress reports is 0.47% – less than half of one percent – of possible progress reports.
- With the reports reviewed limited to four participants of SF Pretrial's daily average of 1,700 individuals, 0.24% (less than one quarter of one percent) of clients were reviewed.
- The 1,700 figure is a *daily* average, not an annual total. With a sample size this small, the court is not confident that the data reported is an accurate representation of clients served.

Safety Rate Comparison with Other Counties

The comparison of Safety Rates between SF Pretrial (96%) and the Judicial Council of California's Pretrial Pilot Program (61-73%) is misleading.

- SF Pretrial calculates Safety Rate based on arraigned charges whereas the JCC Pretrial Pilot Study specifically examined any new arrests. Since not all new bookings lead to filed charges or arraignments, the derived Safety Rate using JCC's broader definition of recidivism would appear lower than that of SF Pretrial.
 - SFSC's preliminary analysis on Safety Rate using re-arrests - which aligns with the JCC Pretrial Pilot Study - received a result of **69.5%** (compared to SF Pretrial's

reported 94%). This means **69.5% of SF Pretrial cases that had at least one hearing in 2025 had no new arrests within CY 2025. The re-arrest rate for CY 2025 would be 30.5%, rather than the 4% rate being reported by SF Pretrial.**

The periods being compared by SF Pretrial and the JCC Pretrial Pilot Study are not aligned, and there is a significant time gap. SF Pretrial has data from CY 2025, whereas the data from the JCC Pretrial Pilot Study is from January 2019 through December 2021. Below is what SF Pretrial is referencing from their self-comparison:

Table 5. FTAs and New Arrests by Supervision Level

Monitor Level	Total	FTA		New Crime	
		Percent	Count	Percent	Count
Lowest Levels	1,744	25%	435	27%	478
Medium Levels	2,381	33%	786	35%	836
Highest Levels	2,308	32%	749	39%	893
All Levels	6,433	31%	1,970	34%	2,207

Source: Pretrial pilot program multi-agency county-linked data and California Department of Justice. View date: 05/05/2023

As stated in the Court's June 8, 2026 letter to Supervisor Connie Chan, the Superior Court of California, San Francisco operates under a foundational principle that public institutions must avoid not only actual impropriety, but also the appearance of impropriety. Accordingly, transparency, accountability, and verifiable performance measures are essential components of any Court-funded program.

The metrics and data methodologies utilized by SF Pretrial, together with the statistically limited sample sizes relied upon in the Budget and Legislative Analyst's report, underscore the Court's longstanding challenges in obtaining the transparency, accountability, and outcome measurement standards required under Assembly Bill 102.

Assembly Bill 102 requires organizations providing pretrial services under contract to adhere to the same transparency, accountability, reporting, and outcome measurement standards applicable to county probation departments. Despite repeated requests for data methodologies, performance metrics, outcome measures, and fiscal documentation, the Court has been unable to obtain sufficient information from SF Pretrial to independently verify performance outcomes, assess compliance with statutory requirements, or evaluate the effectiveness of publicly funded services with the level of confidence expected of a governmental institution.

The Court's responsibility is not only to ensure that pretrial services are delivered effectively, but also that they are administered with a level of transparency, fiscal accountability, and measurable outcomes that can withstand public scrutiny. After years of attempting to obtain the information necessary to fulfill these obligations, the Court has concluded that it can no longer maintain confidence in the existing contractual relationship with SF Pretrial.

In contrast, the San Francisco Adult Probation Department is subject to established governmental oversight, standardized reporting requirements, independent audits, public accountability mechanisms, and the performance measurement standards contemplated by Assembly Bill 102. The Court believes that transitioning pretrial services to Adult Probation will better ensure transparency, accountability, and reliable outcome measurement while strengthening public confidence in the administration of pretrial services.

For these reasons, the Court has determined that partnering with the Adult Probation Department is the most appropriate path forward to meet its statutory obligations and uphold the principles of transparency, accountability, and public trust that are fundamental to the administration of justice.

Respectfully,

Brandon E. Riley
Court Executive Office
Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco

[1](#) SF Pretrial Q4 Report

[2](#) DataForce Research

[3](#) Omni Calculator