

Chair Wm. Weston J. Newton

*First Vice-Chair:
Joseph H. Jefferson, Jr.*

Legislative Oversight Committee

*Kambrell H. Garvin
Rosalyn D. Henderson-Myers
Max T. Hyde, Jr.
Kimberly O. Johnson
John R. McCravy, III
Travis A. Moore
Melissa Lackey Oremus
Marvin R. Pendarvis
John Taliaferro (Jay) West, IV*



South Carolina House of Representatives

*Gil Gatch
William M. "Bill" Hixon
Jeffrey E. "Jeff" Johnson
Josiah M. Attorney General
Timothy A. "Tim" McGinnis
Adam M. Morgan
Russell L. Ott
Michael F. Rivers, Sr.
Chris Wooten*

*Jennifer L. Dobson
Research Director*

*Cathy A. Greer
Administration Coordinator*

**Post Office Box 11867
Columbia, South Carolina 29211
Telephone: (803) 212-6810 • Fax: (803) 212-6811
Room 228 Blatt Building**

*Charles L. Appleby, IV
Legal Counsel*

*Lewis Carter
Research Analyst/Auditor*

*Riley E. McCullough
Research Analyst*

July 11, 2022

VIA EMAIL

Lisa Catalanotto, Director
South Carolina Commission on Prosecution Coordination
Post Office Box 11561
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

Dear Director Catalanotto:

The House Legislative Oversight Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Subcommittee is currently performing an oversight study of the Attorney General's Office. The purpose of legislative oversight is to determine if agency laws and programs are being implemented and carried out in accordance with the intent of the General Assembly and whether they should be continued, curtailed, or even eliminated. Any House Member may file legislation to implement the Committee's recommendations.

The purpose of this letter is to seek input from your office about the questions attached. If your office would like to provide input, which would be appreciated, please do so before Friday, July 29, 2022. Additionally, the subcommittee welcomes any other input or feedback your office would like to provide.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Chris Wooten", is written over a light blue grid background.

Representative Chris Wooten
Subcommittee Chair

cc: The Honorable Wm. Weston J. Newton
Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Subcommittee

Questions to Prosecution Coordination Commission

Members of Commission

1. What reasons, if any, support the Attorney General not serving as a member of the Prosecution Coordination Commission since the State Constitution makes the Attorney General the Chief Prosecutor for the State and the Commission was created “to coordinate all activities involving the prosecution of criminal cases in this State”? (See S.C. Code Section 1-7-910)

Post-Conviction Relief (PCR)

2. What are the pros and cons of Solicitors handling post-conviction relief matters within their own judicial circuits instead of the Attorney General’s Office?

Case Management Systems

3. What, if anything, will the Commission do, before releasing funds to each solicitor’s office for purchase of their individual case management systems, to ensure systems purchased are capable of integration with the South Carolina judicial branch, all state and local law enforcement departments, and other offices of circuit solicitor? (e.g., will there be certain data fields each solicitor’s office is required to have in their case management systems before receiving funding for their individual system? If so, how will those fields be determined? If determination does not include collaboration with other state agencies that transfer information back and forth with Solicitor’s offices (e.g., Attorney General’s Office, Sexually Violent Predator Multidisciplinary Team, etc.), is the agency willing to consider this?)
4. Please list the systems at the judicial branch and law enforcement departments with which the Commission understands solicitors’ systems must be capable of “integration.”
5. Please list examples of information that will be available for transfer between systems as part of the “integration.”
6. Please list the entities the Commission believes fall within “state and local law enforcement departments.”
7. Please provide examples of how each circuit solicitor will “detail the capabilities” for their individual case management system.
8. Is the Commission willing to work with the entities below to reach a consensus among prosecutors, courts, and public defenders on (1) how cases will be counted (e.g., defendant, warrant, indictment) and (2) certain data fields/formats that will exist across all entities, so agency and other data applications provide consistent information on caseloads and applicable information can be efficiently shared between the entities?
 - a. Solicitors’ Offices (recently received \$9M for upgrade of case management systems; share information with the courts; send case information to other Solicitors and the Attorney General’s Office when transferring cases)
 - b. Court Administration (e.g., Judges, Clerks of Court, etc.) (received \$22M for upgrade of case management system)
 - c. Commission on Indigent Defense (utilizes a single case management system for all public defenders and appellate work)
 - d. Attorney General’s Office (in process of researching case management systems to purchase; receives files from solicitor’s office to handle appeals; receives and sends files from multiple entities as part of Sexually Violent Predator Proceedings)
 - e. Other agencies the Attorney General’s Office has authorized to prosecute (e.g., Department of Insurance, Department of Employment and Workforce, etc.)