## **SENATE BILL 614**

E28lr2333 SB 744/04 - JPR By: Senator Raskin Senators Raskin, Frosh, Gladden, Mooney, and Muse Introduced and read first time: February 1, 2008 Assigned to: Judicial Proceedings Committee Report: Favorable with amendments Senate action: Adopted Read second time: March 21, 2008 CHAPTER \_\_\_\_ AN ACT concerning Death Penalty - Maryland Commission on Capital Punishment FOR the purpose of establishing a Maryland Commission on Capital Punishment; providing for the membership of the Commission; providing for the chair of the Commission; authorizing the Commission to hold public hearings; providing for the staffing of the Commission; requiring certain entities to cooperate with the Commission; providing for the funding of the Commission; providing that a member of the Commission may not receive compensation but is entitled to certain reimbursement; establishing the duties of the Commission; requiring the Commission to make a certain report by a certain date; defining a certain term; providing for the construction of this Act; providing for the termination of this Act; and generally relating to the death penalty. BY adding to Article - Correctional Services Section 3–910 Annotated Code of Maryland (1999 Volume and 2007 Supplement) SECTION 1. BE IT ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF MARYLAND, That the Laws of Maryland read as follows:

21 3-910.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

## EXPLANATION: CAPITALS INDICATE MATTER ADDED TO EXISTING LAW.

[Brackets] indicate matter deleted from existing law.

Underlining indicates amendments to bill.

Strike out indicates matter stricken from the bill by amendment or deleted from the law by amendment.

**Article - Correctional Services** 



29

1 2	(A) IN THIS SECTION, "COMMISSION" MEANS THE MARYLAND COMMISSION ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.
3	(B) THERE IS A MARYLAND COMMISSION ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.
4	(C) THE COMMISSION CONSISTS OF THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS:
5 6 7	(1) TWO MEMBERS OF THE SENATE OF MARYLAND, APPOINTED BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND REFLECTING THE BROAD DIVERSITY OF VIEWS ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT;
8 9 10	(2) TWO MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES, APPOINTED BY THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE AND REFLECTING THE BROAD DIVERSITY OF VIEWS ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT;
11	(3) THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, OR THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S DESIGNEE;
l3 l4	(4) ONE MEMBER OF THE JUDICIARY, APPOINTED BY THE CHIEF JUDGE OF THE COURT OF APPEALS;
l5 l6	(5) THE SECRETARY OF PUBLIC SAFETY AND CORRECTIONAL SERVICES, OR THE SECRETARY'S DESIGNEE;
17 18	(6) THE STATE PUBLIC DEFENDER, OR THE STATE PUBLIC DEFENDER'S DESIGNEE;
19 20 21 22	(7) A STATE'S ATTORNEY, RECOMMENDED DESIGNATED BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE MARYLAND STATE'S ATTORNEYS' ASSOCIATION AND WHO SUPPORTS THE DEATH PENALTY AND HAS PROSECUTED A DEATH PENALTY CASE; AND
23 24	(8) THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS, APPOINTED BY THE GOVERNOR AND REFLECTING THE BROAD DIVERSITY OF VIEWS ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT:
25 26	(I) A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE MARYLAND CHIEFS OF POLICE ASSOCIATION;
27 28	(II) A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE MARYLAND STATE LODGE FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE;

(H) (III) A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION 30 OF STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES WHO IS ALSO EMPLOYED AS A 31 CORRECTIONAL OFFICER IN A STATE PRISON;

1 2	(HH) (IV) A FORMER STATE PRISONER WHO HAS BEEN EXONERATED OF THE CRIME FOR WHICH THE INDIVIDUAL WAS INCARCERATED;
3 4	$\overline{\text{(IV)}}$ $\overline{\text{(V)}}$ ONE REPRESENTATIVE THREE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY; AND
5 6	$\frac{(V)}{(VI)}$ THREE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE GENERAL PUBLIC, TO INCLUDE AT LEAST ONE FAMILY MEMBER OF A MURDER VICTIM.
7	(D) THE GOVERNOR SHALL APPOINT THE CHAIR OF THE COMMISSION.
8	(E) THE COMMISSION SHALL HOLD PUBLIC HEARINGS.
9 10 11	(F) (1) THE MARYLAND JUSTICE ANALYSIS CENTER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINOLOGY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND IN THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF CRIME CONTROL AND PREVENTION SHALL PROVIDE STAFF FOR THE COMMISSION.
13 14 15	(2) ALL STATE, COUNTY, AND MUNICIPAL AGENCIES, DEPARTMENTS, BOARDS, BUREAUS, AND COMMISSIONS SHALL COOPERATE FULLY WITH THE COMMISSION.
16 17	(G) FUNDS NECESSARY FOR THE FUNCTIONING OF THE COMMISSION SHALL BE AS PROVIDED IN THE STATE BUDGET.
18	(H) A MEMBER OF THE COMMISSION:
L9 20	(1) MAY NOT RECEIVE COMPENSATION AS A MEMBER OF THE COMMISSION; BUT
21 22 23	(2) IS ENTITLED TO REIMBURSEMENT FOR EXPENSES UNDER THE STANDARD STATE TRAVEL REGULATIONS, AS PROVIDED IN THE STATE BUDGET.
24	(I) (1) THE COMMISSION SHALL STUDY\$
25 26	(1) ALL ASPECTS OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT AS CURRENTLY AND HISTORICALLY ADMINISTERED IN THE STATE; .
27 28 29	(II) WHETHER THE DEATH PENALTY RATIONALLY SERVES A LEGITIMATE PENOLOGICAL INTENT, INCLUDING DETERRENCE WITHIN THE PRISON SYSTEM AS IT RELATES TO THE SAFETY OF CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS;

1 (III) WHAT DIFFERENCE EXISTS BETWEEN THE COST OF 1 DEATH PENALTY FROM INDICTMENT TO EXECUTION AND THE COST OF LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT PAROLE, FACTORING IN THE COST OF ALL CAPITAL OFFENSE TRIALS THAT HAVE RESULTED IN LIFE SENTENCES AS WELL AS THE DEATH SENTENCES REVERSED ON APPEAL;  (IV) WHETHER THE DEATH PENALTY IS CONSISTENT WITH EVOLVING STANDARDS OF DECENCY;  (V) WHETHER THE SELECTION OF CASES IN THE STATE FOR CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IS ARBITRARY, UNFAIR, OR DISCRIMINATORY;  (VI) WHETHER THERE IS ARBITRARY, UNFAIR, OR DISCRIMINATORY VARIABILITY AT ANY STACE IN THE PROCESS FOR A CAPITAL CASE;  (VII) WHETHER THERE IS A DIFFERENCE IN THE CRIMES OR CIRCUMSTANCES OF THOSE SENTENCED TO DEATH AND THOSE SENTENCED TO HATTON AND THOSE SENTENCED TO HATTON AND THOSE SENTENCED TO HATTON AND ADMINISTRATION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN THE STATE AND THE PUBLIC SAFETY AND ADDRESS OTHER LECTIMATE SOCIAL AND PENOLOGICAL INTERESTS, INCLUDING THE INTERESTS OF THE FAMILIES OF VICTIMS.  (2) (I) THE COMMISSION SHALL MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO CHARANTEE THAT CONCERNING THE APPLICATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN THE STATE AND THE PUBLIC POLICY OF THE STATE REGARDING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT SO THAT THEY ARE FREE FROM BIAS AND ERROR AND DESIGNED TO GUARANTEE ACHIEVE FAIRNESS AND ACCURACY.  (II) THE RECOMMENDATIONS SHALL ADDRESS:  1. RACIAL DISPARITIES;  2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES;  3. SOCIO-ECONOMIC DISPARITIES;  4. THE RISK OF INNOCENT PEOPLE BEING EXECUTED;  3. EVOLVING STANDARDS OF PROPRIETY RECARDING STATE EXECUTIONS; AND A COMPARISON OF THE EFFECTS OF	1	()
THE COST OF LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT PAROLE, FACTORING IN THE COST OF ALL CAPITAL OFFENSE TRIALS THAT HAVE RESULTED IN LIFE SENTENCES AS WELL AS THE DEATH SENTENCES REVERSED ON APPEAL;  (W) WHETHER THE DEATH PENALTY IS CONSISTENT WITH EVOLVING STANDARDS OF DECENCY;  (V) WHETHER THE SELECTION OF CASES IN THE STATE FOR CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IS ARBITRARY, UNFAIR, OR DISCRIMINATORY, UNFAIR, OR DISCRIMINATORY VARIABILITY AT ANY STAGE IN THE PROCESS FOR A CAPITAL CASE;  (VII) WHETHER THERE IS A DIFFERENCE IN THE CRIMES OR CIRCUMSTANCES OF THOSE SENTENCED TO DEATH AND THOSE SENTENCED TO LIFE IN PRISON; AND  (VII) WHETHER ALTERNATIVES TO THE DEATH PENALTY EXIST THAT WOULD SUFFICIENTLY ENSURE PUBLIC SAFETY AND ADDRESS OTHER LEGITIMATE SOCIAL AND PENOLOGICAL INTERESTS, INCLUDING THE INTERESTS OF THE FAMILIES OF VICTIMS.  (2) (I) THE COMMISSION SHALL MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO GUARANTEE THAT CONCERNING THE APPLICATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN THE STATE AND THE PUBLIC POLICY OF THE STATE REGARDING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT SO THAT THEY ARE FREE FROM BIAS AND ERROR AND DESIGNED TO GUARANTEE ACHIEVE FARNESS AND ACCURACY.  (II) THE RECOMMENDATIONS SHALL ADDRESS:  1. RACIAL DISPARITIES;  2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES;  2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES;  3. SOCIO-ECONOMIC DISPARITIES;  4. THE RISK OF INNOCENT PEOPLE BEING EXECUTED;		
OF ALL CAPITAL OFFENSE TRIALS THAT HAVE RESULTED IN LIFE SENTENCES AS  WELL AS THE DEATH SENTENCES REVERSED ON APPEAL;  (IV) WHETHER THE DEATH PENALTY IS CONSISTENT WITH  EVOLVING STANDARDS OF DECENCY;  (V) WHETHER THE SELECTION OF CASES IN THE STATE FOR  CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IS ARBITRARY, UNFAIR, OR DISCRIMINATORY,  (VI) WHETHER THERE IS ARBITRARY, UNFAIR, OR DISCRIMINATORY VARIABILITY AT ANY STAGE IN THE PROCESS FOR A CAPITAL CASE;  (VII) WHETHER THERE IS A DIFFERENCE IN THE CRIMES OR CIRCUMSTANCES OF THOSE SENTENCED TO DEATH AND THOSE SENTENCED TO LIFE IN PRISON; AND  (VII) WHETHER ALTERNATIVES TO THE DEATH PENALTY EXIST THAT WOULD SUFFICIENTLY ENSURE PUBLIC SAFETY AND ADDRESS OTHER LEGITIMATE SOCIAL AND PENOLOGICAL INTERESTS, INCLUDING THE INTERESTS OF THE FAMILIES OF VICTIMS.  (2) (1) THE COMMISSION SHALL MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN THE STATE AND THE PUBLIC POLICY OF THE STATE REGARDING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT SO THAT THEY ARE FIREE FROM BIAS AND ERROR AND DESIGNED TO GUARANTEE ACHIEVE FAIRNESS AND ACCURACY.  (II) THE RECOMMENDATIONS SHALL ADDRESS:  1. RACIAL DISPARITIES;  2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES;  2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES;  3. SOCIO-ECONOMIC DISPARITIES;  4. THE RISK OF INNOCENT PEOPLE BEING EXECUTED;		
WELL AS THE DEATH SENTENCES REVERSED ON APPEAL;  (IV) WHETHER THE DEATH PENALTY IS CONSISTENT WITH EVOLVING STANDARDS OF DECENCY;  (V) WHETHER THE SELECTION OF CASES IN THE STATE FOR CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IS ARBITRARY, UNFAIR, OR DISCRIMINATORY, UNFAIR, OR DISCRIMINATORY VARIABILITY AT ANY STAGE IN THE PROCESS FOR A CAPITAL CASE;  (VII) WHETHER THERE IS A DIFFERENCE IN THE CRIMES OR CIRCUMSTANCES OF THOSE SENTENCED TO DEATH AND THOSE SENTENCED TO LIFE IN PRISON; AND  (VIII) WHETHER ALTERNATIVES TO THE DEATH PENALTY EXIST THAT WOULD SUFFICIENTLY ENSURE PUBLIC SAFETY AND ADDRESS OTHER LEGITIMATE SOCIAL AND PENOLOGICAL INTERESTS, INCLUDING THE INTERESTS OF THE FAMILIES OF VICTIMS.  (2) (I) THE COMMISSION SHALL MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO GUARANTEE THAT CONCERNING THE APPLICATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT SO THAT THEY ARE FREE FROM BIAS AND ERROR AND DESIGNED TO GUARANTEE ACHIEVE FAIRNESS AND ACCURACY.  (II) THE RECOMMENDATIONS SHALL ADDRESS:  1. RACIAL DISPARITIES;  2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES;  3. SOCIO-ECONOMIC DISPARITIES;  4. THE RISK OF INNOCENT PEOPLE BEING EXECUTED;		THE COST OF LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT PAROLE, FACTORING IN THE COST
6 (IV) WHETHER THE DEATH PENALTY IS CONSISTENT WITH 7 EVOLVING STANDARDS OF DECENCY; 8 (Y) WHETHER THE SELECTION OF CASES IN THE STATE FOR 9 CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IS ARBITRARY, UNFAIR, OR DISCRIMINATORY; 10 (VI) WHETHER THERE IS ARBITRARY, UNFAIR, OR 11 DISCRIMINATORY VARIABILITY AT ANY STAGE IN THE PROCESS FOR A CAPITAL 12 CASE; 13 (VII) WHETHER THERE IS A DIFFERENCE IN THE CRIMES OR 14 CIRCUMSTANCES OF THOSE SENTENCED TO DEATH AND THOSE SENTENCED TO 15 LIFE IN PRISON; AND 16 (VIII) WHETHER ALTERNATIVES TO THE DEATH PENALTY 17 EXIST THAT WOULD SUFFICIENTLY ENSURE PUBLIC SAFETY AND ADDRESS 18 OTHER LEGITIMATE SOCIAL AND PENOLOGICAL INTERESTS, INCLUDING THE 18 INTERESTS OF THE FAMILES OF VICTIMS. 20 (2) (I) THE COMMISSION SHALL MAKE RECOMMENDATION STO 21 CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN THE STATE AND THE PUBLIC POLICY OF THE STATE 22 REGARDING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT SO THAT THEY ARE FREE FROM BIAS AND 14 ERROR AND DESIGNED TO GUARANTEE ACHIEVE FAIRNESS AND ACCURACY. 15 (II) THE RECOMMENDATIONS SHALL ADDRESS: 16 RACIAL DISPARITIES; 17 2 JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES; 28 3. SOCIO-ECONOMIC DISPARITIES; 29 4. THE RISK OF INNOCENT PEOPLE BEING 30 EXECUTED; 31		OF ALL CAPITAL OFFENSE TRIALS THAT HAVE RESULTED IN LIFE SENTENCES AS
CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IS ARBITRARY, UNFAIR, OR DISCRIMINATORY;  (VI) WHETHER THERE IS ARBITRARY, UNFAIR, OR DISCRIMINATORY VARIABILITY AT ANY STAGE IN THE PROCESS FOR A CAPITAL CASE;  (VII) WHETHER THERE IS A DIFFERENCE IN THE CRIMES OR CIRCUMSTANCES OF THOSE SENTENCED TO DEATH AND THOSE SENTENCED TO LIFE IN PRISON; AND  (VIII) WHETHER ALTERNATIVES TO THE DEATH PENALTY EXIST THAT WOULD SUFFICIENTLY ENSURE PUBLIC SAFETY AND ADDRESS OTHER LEGITMATE SOCIAL AND PENOLOGICAL INTERESTS, INCLUDING THE INTERESTS OF THE FAMILIES OF VICTIMS.  (2) (1) THE COMMISSION SHALL MAKE RECOMMENDATION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN THE STATE AND THE PUBLIC POLICY OF THE STATE REGARDING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT SO THAT THEY ARE FREE FROM BIAS AND ERROR AND DESIGNED TO GUARANTEE ACHIEVE FAIRNESS AND ACCURACY.  (II) THE RECOMMENDATIONS SHALL ADDRESS:  1. RACIAL DISPARITIES;  2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES;  2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES;  3. SOCIO-ECONOMIC DISPARITIES;  4. THE RISK OF INNOCENT PEOPLE BEING EXECUTED;	5	WELL AS THE DEATH SENTENCES REVERSED ON APPEAL;
(VI) WHETHER THE SELECTION OF CASES IN THE STATE FOR CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IS ARBITRARY, UNFAIR, OR DISCRIMINATORY, UNFAIR, OR DISCRIMINATORY VARIABILITY AT ANY STAGE IN THE PROCESS FOR A CAPITAL CASE;  (VII) WHETHER THERE IS A DIFFERENCE IN THE CRIMES OR CIRCUMSTANCES OF THOSE SENTENCED TO DEATH AND THOSE SENTENCED TO LIFE IN PRISON; AND  (VIII) WHETHER ALTERNATIVES TO THE DEATH PENALTY EXIST THAT WOULD SUFFICIENTLY ENSURE PUBLIC SAFETY AND ADDRESS OTHER LEGITIMATE SOCIAL AND PENOLOGICAL INTERESTS, INCLUDING THE INTERESTS OF THE FAMILIES OF VICTIMS.  (2) (I) THE COMMISSION SHALL MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN THE STATE AND THE PUBLIC POLICY OF THE STATE REGARDING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT SO THAT THEY ARE FREE FROM BIAS AND ERROR AND DESIGNED TO GUARANTEE ACHIEVE FAIRNESS AND ACCURACY.  (II) THE RECOMMENDATIONS SHALL ADDRESS:  1. RACIAL DISPARITIES;  2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES;  2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES;  4. THE RISK OF INNOCENT PEOPLE BEING EXECUTED;	6	(IV) WHETHER THE DEATH PENALTY IS CONSISTENT WITH
CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IS ARBITRARY, UNFAIR, OR DISCRIMINATORY  (VI) WHETHER THERE IS ARBITRARY, UNFAIR, OR DISCRIMINATORY VARIABILITY AT ANY STAGE IN THE PROCESS FOR A CAPITAL CASE;  (VII) WHETHER THERE IS A DIFFERENCE IN THE CRIMES OR CIRCUMSTANCES OF THOSE SENTENCED TO DEATH AND THOSE SENTENCED TO LIFE IN PRISON; AND  (VIII) WHETHER ALTERNATIVES TO THE DEATH PENALTY EXIST THAT WOULD SUFFICIENTLY ENSURE PUBLIC SAFETY AND ADDRESS OTHER LEGITIMATE SOCIAL AND PENOLOGICAL INTERESTS, INCLUDING THE INTERESTS OF THE FAMILIES OF VICTIMS.  (2) (1) THE COMMISSION SHALL MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN THE STATE AND THE PUBLIC POLICY OF THE STATE REGARDING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT SO THAT THEY ARE FREE FROM BIAS AND ERROR AND DESIGNED TO GUARANTEE ACHIEVE FAIRNESS AND ACCURACY.  (II) THE RECOMMENDATIONS SHALL ADDRESS:  1. RACIAL DISPARITIES; 2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES; 2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES; 2. THE RISK OF INNOCENT PEOPLE BEING EXECUTED; 3. SOCIO-ECONOMIC DISPARITIES; 4. THE RISK OF INNOCENT PEOPLE BEING EXECUTED;	7	EVOLVING STANDARDS OF DECENCY;
CAPITAL PUNISIMENT IS ARBITRARY, UNFAIR, OR DISCRIMINATORY,  (VI) WHETHER THERE IS ARBITRARY, UNFAIR, OR DISCRIMINATORY VARIABILITY AT ANY STACE IN THE PROCESS FOR A CAPITAL CASE;  (VII) WHETHER THERE IS A DIFFERENCE IN THE CRIMES OR CIRCUMSTANCES OF THOSE SENTENCED TO DEATH AND THOSE SENTENCED TO LIFE IN PRISON; AND  (VIII) WHETHER ALTERNATIVES TO THE DEATH PENALTY EXIST THAT WOULD SUFFICIENTLY ENSURE PUBLIC SAFETY AND ADDRESS OTHER LEGITIMATE SOCIAL AND PENOLOGICAL INTERESTS, INCLUDING THE INTERESTS OF THE FAMILIES OF VICTIMS.  (2) (1) THE COMMISSION SHALL MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO CAPITAL PUNISIMENT IN THE STATE AND THE PUBLIC POLICY OF THE STATE REGARDING CAPITAL PUNISIMENT SO THAT THEY ARE FREE FROM BIAS AND ERROR AND DESIGNED TO GUARANTEE ACHIEVE FAIRNESS AND ACCURACY.  (II) THE RECOMMENDATIONS SHALL ADDRESS:  1. RACIAL DISPARITIES;  2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES;  2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES;  2. THE RISK OF INNOCENT PEOPLE BEING EXECUTED;  3. SOCIO-ECONOMIC DISPARITIES;	8	(V) WHETHER THE SELECTION OF CASES IN THE STATE FOR
DISCRIMINATORY VARIABILITY AT ANY STAGE IN THE PROCESS FOR A CAPITAL CASE;  (VII) WHETHER THERE IS A DIFFERENCE IN THE CRIMES OR CIRCUMSTANCES OF THOSE SENTENCED TO DEATH AND THOSE SENTENCED TO LIFE IN PRISON; AND  (VIII) WHETHER ALTERNATIVES TO THE DEATH PENALTY EXIST THAT WOULD SUFFICIENTLY ENSURE PUBLIC SAFETY AND ADDRESS OTHER LEGITIME SOCIAL AND PENOLOGICAL INTERESTS, INCLUDING THE INTERESTS OF THE FAMILIES OF VICTIMS.  (2) (I) THE COMMISSION SHALL MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN THE STATE AND THE PUBLIC POLICY OF THE STATE REGARDING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT SO THAT THEY ARE FREE FROM BIAS AND ERROR AND DESIGNED TO GUARANTEE ACHIEVE FAIRNESS AND ACCURACY.  (II) THE RECOMMENDATIONS SHALL ADDRESS:  1. RACIAL DISPARITIES;  2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES;  2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES;  2. THE RISK OF INNOCENT PEOPLE BEING EXECUTED;  3. SOCIO-ECONOMIC DISPARITIES;	9	
12 CASE;  13 (VII) WHETHER THERE IS A DIFFERENCE IN THE CRIMES OR 14 CIRCUMSTANCES OF THOSE SENTENCED TO DEATH AND THOSE SENTENCED TO 15 LIFE IN PRISON; AND  16 (VIII) WHETHER ALTERNATIVES TO THE DEATH PENALTY 17 EXIST THAT WOULD SUFFICIENTLY ENSURE PUBLIC SAFETY AND ADDRESS 18 OTHER LEGITIMATE SOCIAL AND PENOLOGICAL INTERESTS, INCLUDING THE 19 INTERESTS OF THE FAMILIES OF VICTIMS.  20 (2) (I) THE COMMISSION SHALL MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO 21 CUARANTEE THAT CONCERNING THE APPLICATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF 22 CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN THE STATE AND THE PUBLIC POLICY OF THE STATE 18 RECARDING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT SO THAT THEY ARE FREE FROM BIAS AND 19 ERROR AND DESIGNED TO GUARANTEE ACHIEVE FAIRNESS AND ACCURACY.  25 (II) THE RECOMMENDATIONS SHALL ADDRESS: 26 1. RACIAL DISPARITIES; 27 2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES; 28 3. SOCIO-ECONOMIC DISPARITIES; 29 4. THE RISK OF INNOCENT PEOPLE BEING 30 EXECUTED; 31 5. EVOLVING STANDARDS OF PROPRIETY	10	(VI) WHETHER THERE IS ARBITRARY, UNFAIR, OR
(VII) WHETHER THERE IS A DIFFERENCE IN THE CRIMES OR CIRCUMSTANCES OF THOSE SENTENCED TO DEATH AND THOSE SENTENCED TO LIFE IN PRISON; AND  (VIII) WHETHER ALTERNATIVES TO THE DEATH PENALTY EXIST THAT WOULD SUFFICIENTLY ENSURE PUBLIC SAFETY AND ADDRESS OTHER LEGITIMATE SOCIAL AND PENOLOGICAL INTERESTS, INCLUDING THE INTERESTS OF THE FAMILIES OF VICTIMS.  (2) (I) THE COMMISSION SHALL MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO GUARANTEE THAT CONCERNING THE APPLICATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN THE STATE AND THE PUBLIC POLICY OF THE STATE REGARDING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT SO THAT THEY ARE FREE FROM BIAS AND ERROR AND DESIGNED TO GUARANTEE ACHIEVE FAIRNESS AND ACCURACY.  (II) THE RECOMMENDATIONS SHALL ADDRESS:  1. RACIAL DISPARITIES; 2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES; 2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES; 3. SOCIO-ECONOMIC DISPARITIES; 4. THE RISK OF INNOCENT PEOPLE BEING EXECUTED; 31  5. EVOLVING STANDARDS OF PROPRIETY	11	DISCRIMINATORY VARIABILITY AT ANY STAGE IN THE PROCESS FOR A CAPITAL
14 CIRCUMSTANCES OF THOSE SENTENCED TO DEATH AND THOSE SENTENCED TO 15 LIFE IN PRISON; AND  16 (VIII) WHETHER ALTERNATIVES TO THE DEATH PENALTY 17 EXIST THAT WOULD SUFFICIENTLY ENSURE PUBLIC SAFETY AND ADDRESS 18 OTHER LEGITIMATE SOCIAL AND PENOLOGICAL INTERESTS, INCLUDING THE 19 INTERESTS OF THE FAMILIES OF VICTIMS.  20 (2) (I) THE COMMISSION SHALL MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO 21 GUARANTEE THAT CONCERNING THE APPLICATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF 22 CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN THE STATE AND THE PUBLIC POLICY OF THE STATE 18 REGARDING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT SO THAT THEY ARE FREE FROM BIAS AND 19 ERROR AND DESIGNED TO GUARANTEE ACHIEVE FAIRNESS AND ACCURACY.  25 (II) THE RECOMMENDATIONS SHALL ADDRESS: 26 1. RACIAL DISPARITIES; 27 2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES; 28 3. SOCIO-ECONOMIC DISPARITIES; 29 4. THE RISK OF INNOCENT PEOPLE BEING 30 EXECUTED; 31 5. EVOLVING STANDARDS OF PROPRIETY	12	<del>CASE;</del>
15 LIFE IN PRISON; AND  16 (VIII) WHETHER ALTERNATIVES TO THE DEATH PENALTY 17 EXIST THAT WOULD SUFFICIENTLY ENSURE PUBLIC SAFETY AND ADDRESS 18 OTHER LEGITIMATE SOCIAL AND PENOLOGICAL INTERESTS, INCLUDING THE 19 INTERESTS OF THE FAMILIES OF VICTIMS.  20 (2) (I) THE COMMISSION SHALL MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO 21 GUARANTEE THAT CONCERNING THE APPLICATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF 22 CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN THE STATE AND THE PUBLIC POLICY OF THE STATE 23 REGARDING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT SO THAT THEY ARE FREE FROM BIAS AND 24 ERROR AND DESIGNED TO GUARANTEE ACHIEVE FAIRNESS AND ACCURACY.  25 (II) THE RECOMMENDATIONS SHALL ADDRESS: 26 1. RACIAL DISPARITIES; 27 2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES; 28 3. SOCIO-ECONOMIC DISPARITIES; 29 4. THE RISK OF INNOCENT PEOPLE BEING 30 EXECUTED; 31 5. EVOLVING STANDARDS OF PROPRIETY	13	(VII) WHETHER THERE IS A DIFFERENCE IN THE CRIMES OR
16 17 18 18 18 19 19 10 10 10 11 11 12 12 13 18 18 19 19 10 10 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	14	CIRCUMSTANCES OF THOSE SENTENCED TO DEATH AND THOSE SENTENCED TO
20 (2) (I) THE COMMISSION SHALL MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS #0  CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN THE STATE AND THE PUBLIC POLICY OF THE STATE  REGARDING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT SO THAT THEY ARE FREE FROM BIAS AND ERROR AND DESIGNED TO GUARANTEE ACHIEVE FAIRNESS AND ACCURACY.  (II) THE RECOMMENDATIONS SHALL ADDRESS:  1. RACIAL DISPARITIES;  2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES;  2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES;  3. SOCIO-ECONOMIC DISPARITIES;  4. THE RISK OF INNOCENT PEOPLE BEING EXECUTED;  31  5. EVOLVING STANDARDS OF PROPRIETY	15	LIFE IN PRISON; AND
17 EXIST THAT WOULD SUFFICIENTLY ENSURE PUBLIC SAFETY AND ADDRESS 18 OTHER LEGITIMATE SOCIAL AND PENOLOGICAL INTERESTS, INCLUDING THE 19 INTERESTS OF THE FAMILIES OF VICTIMS.  20 (2) (I) THE COMMISSION SHALL MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO CAPITAL PURISHMENT IN THE APPLICATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF CAPITAL PURISHMENT IN THE STATE AND THE PUBLIC POLICY OF THE STATE REGARDING CAPITAL PURISHMENT SO THAT THEY ARE FREE FROM BIAS AND ERROR AND DESIGNED TO GUARANTEE ACHIEVE FAIRNESS AND ACCURACY.  25 (II) THE RECOMMENDATIONS SHALL ADDRESS: 26 1. RACIAL DISPARITIES; 27 2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES; 28 3. SOCIO-ECONOMIC DISPARITIES; 29 4. THE RISK OF INNOCENT PEOPLE BEING EXECUTED; 31 5. EVOLVING STANDARDS OF PROPRIETY		
20 (2) (I) THE COMMISSION SHALL MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO GUARANTEE THAT CONCERNING THE APPLICATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN THE STATE AND THE PUBLIC POLICY OF THE STATE REGARDING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT SO THAT THEY ARE FREE FROM BIAS AND ERROR AND DESIGNED TO GUARANTEE ACHIEVE FAIRNESS AND ACCURACY.  (II) THE RECOMMENDATIONS SHALL ADDRESS:  1. RACIAL DISPARITIES;  2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES;  2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES;  3. SOCIO-ECONOMIC DISPARITIES;  4. THE RISK OF INNOCENT PEOPLE BEING EXECUTED;  31  5. EVOLVING STANDARDS OF PROPRIETY	16	(VIII) WHETHER ALTERNATIVES TO THE DEATH PENALTY
19 (2) (1) THE COMMISSION SHALL MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS #0 21 GUARANTEE THAT CONCERNING THE APPLICATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF 22 CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN THE STATE AND THE PUBLIC POLICY OF THE STATE 23 REGARDING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT SO THAT THEY ARE FREE FROM BIAS AND 24 ERROR AND DESIGNED TO GUARANTEE ACHIEVE FAIRNESS AND ACCURACY. 25 (II) THE RECOMMENDATIONS SHALL ADDRESS: 26 1. RACIAL DISPARITIES; 27 2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES; 28 3. SOCIO-ECONOMIC DISPARITIES; 29 4. THE RISK OF INNOCENT PEOPLE BEING 30 EXECUTED; 31 5. EVOLVING STANDARDS OF PROPRIETY	17	
20 (2) (I) THE COMMISSION SHALL MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO 21 GUARANTEE THAT CONCERNING THE APPLICATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF 22 CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN THE STATE AND THE PUBLIC POLICY OF THE STATE 23 REGARDING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT SO THAT THEY ARE FREE FROM BIAS AND 24 ERROR AND DESIGNED TO GUARANTEE ACHIEVE FAIRNESS AND ACCURACY. 25 (II) THE RECOMMENDATIONS SHALL ADDRESS: 26 1. RACIAL DISPARITIES; 27 2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES; 28 3. SOCIO-ECONOMIC DISPARITIES; 29 4. THE RISK OF INNOCENT PEOPLE BEING 30 EXECUTED; 31 5. EVOLVING STANDARDS OF PROPRIETY	18	OTHER LEGITIMATE SOCIAL AND PENOLOGICAL INTERESTS, INCLUDING THE
21 GUARANTEE THAT CONCERNING THE APPLICATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF 22 CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN THE STATE AND THE PUBLIC POLICY OF THE STATE 23 REGARDING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT SO THAT THEY ARE FREE FROM BIAS AND 24 ERROR AND DESIGNED TO GUARANTEE ACHIEVE FAIRNESS AND ACCURACY. 25 (II) THE RECOMMENDATIONS SHALL ADDRESS: 26 1. RACIAL DISPARITIES; 27 2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES; 28 3. SOCIO-ECONOMIC DISPARITIES; 29 4. THE RISK OF INNOCENT PEOPLE BEING 30 EXECUTED; 31 5. EVOLVING STANDARDS OF PROPRIETY	19	INTERESTS OF THE FAMILIES OF VICTIMS.
21 GUARANTEE THAT CONCERNING THE APPLICATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF 22 CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN THE STATE AND THE PUBLIC POLICY OF THE STATE 23 REGARDING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT SO THAT THEY ARE FREE FROM BIAS AND 24 ERROR AND DESIGNED TO GUARANTEE ACHIEVE FAIRNESS AND ACCURACY. 25 (II) THE RECOMMENDATIONS SHALL ADDRESS: 26 1. RACIAL DISPARITIES; 27 2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES; 28 3. SOCIO-ECONOMIC DISPARITIES; 29 4. THE RISK OF INNOCENT PEOPLE BEING 30 EXECUTED; 31 5. EVOLVING STANDARDS OF PROPRIETY		
CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN THE STATE AND THE PUBLIC POLICY OF THE STATE REGARDING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT SO THAT THEY ARE FREE FROM BIAS AND ERROR AND DESIGNED TO GUARANTEE ACHIEVE FAIRNESS AND ACCURACY.  (II) THE RECOMMENDATIONS SHALL ADDRESS:  1. RACIAL DISPARITIES;  2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES;  2. SOCIO-ECONOMIC DISPARITIES;  4. THE RISK OF INNOCENT PEOPLE BEING EXECUTED;  5. EVOLVING STANDARDS OF PROPRIETY	20	(2) (I) THE COMMISSION SHALL MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS <del>TO</del>
22 CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN THE STATE AND THE PUBLIC POLICY OF THE STATE 23 REGARDING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT SO THAT THEY ARE FREE FROM BIAS AND 24 ERROR AND DESIGNED TO GUARANTEE ACHIEVE FAIRNESS AND ACCURACY.  25 (II) THE RECOMMENDATIONS SHALL ADDRESS: 26 1. RACIAL DISPARITIES; 27 2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES; 28 3. SOCIO-ECONOMIC DISPARITIES; 29 4. THE RISK OF INNOCENT PEOPLE BEING 30 EXECUTED; 31 5. EVOLVING STANDARDS OF PROPRIETY	21	GUARANTEE THAT CONCERNING THE APPLICATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF
24 ERROR AND DESIGNED TO GUARANTEE ACHIEVE FAIRNESS AND ACCURACY.  25 (II) THE RECOMMENDATIONS SHALL ADDRESS:  26 1. RACIAL DISPARITIES;  27 2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES;  28 3. SOCIO-ECONOMIC DISPARITIES;  29 4. THE RISK OF INNOCENT PEOPLE BEING  30 EXECUTED;  31 5. EVOLVING STANDARDS OF PROPRIETY	22	CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN THE STATE AND THE PUBLIC POLICY OF THE STATE
24 ERROR AND DESIGNED TO GUARANTEE ACHIEVE FAIRNESS AND ACCURACY.  25 (II) THE RECOMMENDATIONS SHALL ADDRESS:  26 1. RACIAL DISPARITIES;  27 2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES;  28 3. SOCIO-ECONOMIC DISPARITIES;  29 4. THE RISK OF INNOCENT PEOPLE BEING  30 EXECUTED;  31 5. EVOLVING STANDARDS OF PROPRIETY	23	REGARDING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT SO THAT THEY ARE FREE FROM BIAS AND
26 1. RACIAL DISPARITIES; 27 2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES; 28 3. SOCIO-ECONOMIC DISPARITIES; 29 30 EXECUTED; 31 5. EVOLVING STANDARDS OF PROPRIETY	24	
2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES;  28  3. SOCIO-ECONOMIC DISPARITIES;  29  30 EXECUTED;  31  5. EVOLVING STANDARDS OF PROPRIETY	25	(II) THE RECOMMENDATIONS SHALL ADDRESS:
3. SOCIO-ECONOMIC DISPARITIES;  29	26	1. RACIAL DISPARITIES;
29 30 EXECUTED;  4. THE RISK OF INNOCENT PEOPLE BEING  5. EVOLVING STANDARDS OF PROPRIETY	27	2. JURISDICTIONAL DISPARITIES;
30 <b>EXECUTED;</b> 31 <b>5. EVOLVING STANDARDS OF PROPRIETY</b>	28	3. SOCIO-ECONOMIC DISPARITIES;
30 <b>EXECUTED;</b> 31 <b>5. EVOLVING STANDARDS OF PROPRIETY</b>	29	4. THE RISK OF INNOCENT PEOPLE REING
31 <b>5.</b> EVOLVING STANDARDS OF PROPRIETY		
		Limbo Ilb,
	31	5. EVOLVING STANDARDS OF PROPRIETY

1	PROLONGED COURT CASES INVOLVING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT AND THOSE
2	INVOLVING LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE;
3 4 5	6. A COMPARISON OF THE COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH DEATH SENTENCES AND THE COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH SENTENCES OF LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE ; AND
6	7. THE IMPACT OF DNA EVIDENCE IN ASSURING
7	FAIRNESS AND ACCURACY IN CAPITAL CASES.
8 9 10 11	(J) THE COMMISSION SHALL MAKE A FINAL REPORT, AND IF APPLICABLE, A MINORITY REPORT, ON ITS FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, IN ACCORDANCE WITH § 2–1246 OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT ARTICLE, TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON OR BEFORE DECEMBER 15, 2008.
12 13 14 15	SECTION 2. AND BE IT FURTHER ENACTED, That this Act may not be construed to affect in any way the law concerning the death penalty, including the procedures and time frames for notifications, determinations, and judicial review of death penalty decisions.
16 17 18 19	SECTION 3. AND BE IT FURTHER ENACTED, That this Act shall take effect July 1, 2008. It shall remain effective for a period of 6 months and, at the end of December 31, 2008, with no further action required by the General Assembly, this Act shall be abrogated and of no further force and effect.
	Approved:
	Governor.
	President of the Senate.
	Speaker of the House of Delegates.