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LETTER FROM THE CO-CHAIRS

SUSTAINING EFFECTIVE PARTNERSHIPS TO PROMOTE JUSTICE AND ENSURE SAFETY

Greetings to all Stakeholders and Citizens:

Throughout 2009 the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council and its stakeholders have steadily pursued the District of Columbia’s policy objectives of ensuring crime prevention and public safety.

Programmatic and project successes were achieved through interagency collaboration and commitment among federal and local CJCC partners. In 2009 partners focused on strengthening substance abuse/mental health services, rehabilitation of released offenders, detention alternatives for juvenile offenders, secure residential treatment, data and information sharing, improving court processing, central booking and papering reform. These achievements are part of an overall policy direction which stresses equity, accessibility, efficiency and accountability in the criminal justice system.

Innovations such as the Mental Health Diversion Court, which saw the successful completion of 142 defendants, papering reform which streamlined administrative processes by establishing efficient dissemination of arrest and prosecution reports across the criminal justice system, making it possible for 13,770 cases to be filed electronically; GunStat which helped track repeat gun offenders; and the Secure Residential Treatment Program (SRTP), which provides an alternate and mental health counseling placement for eligible DC Code offenders on parole or supervised release, were all implemented in 2009. As a result, the city has seen great improvements in the criminal justice system.

Each year, CJCC stakeholders continue to enhance collaboration to ensure the attainment of numerous goals and accomplishments within the framework of concerted plans, vision and mission. The contributions, achievements, efforts and the support of multi-agency stakeholders in this Annual Report bear testimony to the relentless pursuit of excellence by CJCC and these agencies in the administration of justice.

Sincerely,

[Signatures]
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2009 ACCOMPLISHMENTS TO REDUCE VIOLENT CRIME THROUGH INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION & PLANNING

For the past seven years, CJCC has worked consistently to improve public safety in Washington, D.C. We are pleased to present this latest edition of CJCC’s annual report.

With a focus on reducing violent crime, CJCC began 2009 with two goals: (1) improve data-driven services by increasing effective interagency collaboration and planning, and (2) improve criminal justice system operations requiring interagency cooperation and information sharing. These goals were necessary to effect crime reduction.

Through the cooperation and creative initiatives of our stakeholders, these goals have been realized. The District has reduced crime and increased public safety and security. This is best exemplified by the reduction in the homicide rate, which went down 23% from last year. Initiatives contributing to the overall success of these goals will be highlighted in this annual report. A short summary of the following initiatives is presented below:

- GunStat
- The Justice Information System (JUSTIS)
- Diversion and treatment programs
- The Secure Residential Treatment Program
- Continuity of operations planning
- Reentry

GunStat

As a District-wide initiative, GunStat has evolved. Its objectives include (a) identifying the most dangerous repeat gun offenders in the District, (b) focusing our collective efforts and the resources of law enforcement stakeholders on these offenders, and (c) examining trends and snapshots of gun cases as they progress through the criminal justice system. GunStat has become a collective, multi-agency approach aimed at ensuring the highest levels of public safety and security in the District.

Monthly sessions of GunStat produced important data and reports that became a framework for interagency collaboration. In addition, the GunStat sessions, which included all stakeholders, became a forum for exchange of ideas which helped in identifying legislative solutions, forging clearer protocols, and sharing critical information to solve gun-related crimes.

Overall, GunStat improved violent crime reduction through effective interagency collaboration. It can also be credited with:

- A reduction in gun and violent crimes committed by candidates.
- Prompt removal of violent, repeat offenders from communities.
- Enhanced pretrial and post-release supervision of candidates.
- Successful prosecution of candidates with pending cases.
- An overall decrease in gun and violent crime in the District of Columbia.

Through GunStat, dividends have been realized in the year 2009 that will benefit the District in coming years.

Justice Information System (JUSTIS)

Currently in its fourth phase of development, the Justice Information System or JUSTIS now has a total of 5,136 registered users. JUSTIS allows users to view criminal justice information from multiple agencies at the same time. Agency stakeholders contributed time and data to enhance the reputation of JUSTIS as a reliable database. The database includes contributions from law enforcement, prosecution, probation, parole, pretrial services, court supervision, corrections and the courts.

In 2009, neighboring jurisdictions in Maryland began utilizing JUSTIS as it has now become a regional information-sharing tool. Users from the U.S. Pretrial and Probation Office (USPPO-MD) in Baltimore, the Metro Transit Police of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Association (WMATA) and the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) of Washington, D.C. have been trained on JUSTIS. The diversity of information and the easy access in JUSTIS have contributed to its fundamental objective: making timely information available to the criminal justice community. CJCC continues to engage all stakeholders and agencies in improving JUSTIS as a reliable public safety and security tool.

Diversionary and Treatment Programs

Diversion of offenders has been an ongoing CJCC objective. Through its Substance Abuse/Mental Health Services Integration and Pretrial Diversion initiatives, CJCC stakeholders have increased alternative opportunities for offenders. The Mental Health Clinic at the D.C. Superior Court and the numerous diversion programs have positively impacted the criminal justice system, individuals, families and communities. This report will explore the impact of these efforts on:

- Increased cost savings to the District and families due to diversion.
- Decreased recidivism for defendants who successfully complete treatment programs.
- Improved capacity for transition of mentally-ill defendants from the criminal justice system to appropriate treatment options.
- Enhanced referrals to mental health services and substance abuse treatment for inmates while incarcerated.
- Improved aftercare opportunities for District residents with mental-health or co-occurring mental health and substance abuse disorders.

These programs have provided insights into alternatives that have been mutually beneficial to the District and communities.

Secure Residential Treatment Program

The Secure Residential Treatment Program (SRTP) is aimed at establishing a unit for substance abuse and behavioral intervention at the Correctional Treatment Facility (CTF). It serves as an alternative placement for eligible D.C. Code offenders on parole or supervised release who face possible revocation of parole on technical grounds including substance abuse or other criminal violations. The SRTP is a partnership among Court Services & Offender Supervision Agency (CSOSA), the Department of Corrections (DOC), the Corrections Corporation of America, Incorporated (CCA), the United States Parole Commission (USPC) and the Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP). The program is fully subscribed with 32 participants. Its expansion is expected to provide 96-bed capacity in the coming years. As an alternative treatment program, the SRTP is part of a long-term plan to continue post-release out-patient substance abuse services.

Continuity of Operations Planning

The Criminal Justice Interagency Continuity of Operations Planning (CJ COOP) workgroup was established to assist the criminal and juvenile justice agencies in developing, implementing and maintaining plans for emergency preparedness. Because the District’s public safety is managed by federal, local and independent agencies, this planning process is unique in its approach to a citywide response. CJ COOP is a comprehensive interagency effort to ensure that individual organizations and agencies design plans to ensure system wide recovery and continuity of essential and normal public safety operation in the event of natural and manmade emergencies. COOP plans promote a rapid return to normal operations as soon as practicable and also safeguard vital documents, records and equipment. CJ COOP continues to:

- Identify specific agency plans.
b. Review relevant agency planning considerations.
c. Draft interagency plans.
d. Conduct training exercises.
e. Update interagency emergency contact list.

The workgroup conducts regular meetings and plans are underway to ensure interagency preparedness.

**Reentry**

D.C.’s Reentry initiatives continue the District’s commitment to enhance the preparation and transition of former offenders from incarceration to community by:

CJCC’s Reentry Steering Committee serves as a collaborative forum of stakeholders. In 2009, the committee focused on pre-release and discharge planning, supporting non-custodial parents leaving incarceration to provide for their families financially and emotionally, housing, education, training, employment, health, substance abuse and community support to assist in preventing and reducing post-incarceration crimes and enhancing public safety.

**CJCC WORKPLAN SUMMARY**

The following is a summary of the CJCC 2009 Strategic Workplan. The outcomes of this workplan will be fully described throughout the remainder of this annual report, which represents the efforts of CJCC members and their staff in 2009.

**OVERARCHING GOAL:** Reduce Violent Crime Through Interagency Collaboration

**GOAL ONE:** Improve Data-Driven Services By Increasing Effective Interagency Collaboration And Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>INITIATIVE</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRETRIAL DIVERSION</td>
<td>Increase pretrial diversion opportunities.</td>
<td>• System cost savings due to diversion. • Increase in recidivism of defendants who successfully complete treatment-based diversion programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBSTANCE ABUSE/MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES INTEGRATION</td>
<td>Develop a means to share information on mental health and substance abuse with criminal justice agencies and ensure treatment rather than incarceration when appropriate.</td>
<td>• Increased opportunities and improved capacity for diversion of mentally ill defendants from the criminal justice system. • Enhanced connection to mental health services and substance abuse treatment for inmates upon release from incarceration. • Improvement of aftercare opportunities for District residents with a mental health co-occurring mental health and substance abuse disorder. • Decrease in recidivism by individuals who successfully complete treatment programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REENTRY</td>
<td>Develop a comprehensive prisoner reentry strategy with focus on high-risk offenders.</td>
<td>• Reduced recidivism for high-risk offenders. • System cost savings due to reduced recidivism (e.g., policing, confinement, judicial [to include prosecuting, legal defense], etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUNSTAT</td>
<td>Reduce gun crime by focusing law enforcement, supervision and prosecutorial resources on repeat, violent offenders and by collecting and analyzing data on gun cases as they progress through the criminal justice system.</td>
<td>• Prompt removal of violent, repeat offenders from the community. • Reduction in gun and violent crimes committed by candidates. • Pretrial detention of candidates who have pending gun and violent crime cases and pose a danger to the community. • Enhanced pretrial/post-release supervision of candidates. • Successful prosecution of candidates with pending cases (all charges). • Decrease in gun and violent crime in the District of Columbia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUVENILE GUNSTAT</td>
<td>Reduce juvenile gun crime by providing, collecting and analyzing data on gun cases as they progress through the juvenile justice system.</td>
<td>• Reduced recidivism for high-risk juveniles. • Systems saving by reduced recidivism. • New and/or enhanced services for this population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUVENILE DETENTION ALTERNATIVES INITIATIVE</td>
<td>Create appropriate detention alternatives for juveniles.</td>
<td>• Expedited case processing. • Reduction in number of juveniles securely detained unnecessarily. • Increased number of quality community-based detention alternatives. • Data-driven management of JDAI. • Interagency DMR plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECURE RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT PROGRAM</td>
<td>Develop a parole/supervise release violation treatment plan.</td>
<td>Design an outcome study to support long-term implementation of the SRTP and define a comparison group of similar offenders who did not enter or complete the SRTP. Outcome measures will include: • Reduction in the frequency of substance abuse. • Reduction in supervision violations, particularly substance-abuse related violations. • Increase in successful supervision completions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OVERARCHING GOAL: Reduce Violent Crime Through Interagency Collaboration

GOAL TWO: Improve Criminal Justice System Operations Requiring Interagency Cooperation & Information Sharing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>INITIATIVE</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUSTIS (Justice Information System) Enhancements</td>
<td>Enhance JUSTIS use and application by revising protocols and addressing participating agencies’ needs.</td>
<td>• Timely exchange of quality information. • Enhanced public safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL BOOKING</td>
<td>Establish central booking capability, including a central cellblock and processing of arrestees at 300 Indiana Avenue, N.W.</td>
<td>• Increased police officer time on patrol. • Cost savings due to reduced time to transfer arrestees to court. • More efficient processing of arrestees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT PROCESSING</td>
<td>Increase accuracy and timeliness of court processing by DCSC, USMS and DOC— including transferring inmates between jail and courts, managing inmate movement through the courts and documenting court appearances and outcomes.</td>
<td>• Reduction in erroneous releases. • Improved defendant tracking and processing. • More timely defendant tracking and processing. • Reduced overdetention. • Implement court releases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAPERING REFORM</td>
<td>Eliminate in-person papering in most cases and stream-line records-sharing and administrative processes by establishing electronic collection and dissemination of arrest and prosecution reports across the criminal justice system.</td>
<td>• Enhanced public safety. • Reduced use of overtime by police officers. • Maintain quality prosecution decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARRANTS</td>
<td>Develop a clear business process for warrants across agencies and reduce the number of outstanding warrants.</td>
<td>• Improved multi-agency capacity to execute warrants. • Reduced crime. • Reduced outstanding warrants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS PLANNING</td>
<td>Develop and maintain an interagency Continuity of Operations Planning framework.</td>
<td>• Enhanced decision making, coordination and communication among local, federal and judicial criminal justice stakeholders in the event of a catastrophic emergency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GOAL ONE: IMPROVE DATA-DRIVEN SERVICES BY INCREASING EFFECTIVE INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION & PLANNING

PRETRIAL DIVERSION

Chair: Susan Shaffer Co-Chair: Ann O’Regan Keary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIATIVE</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase pretrial diversion opportunities.</td>
<td>1. Develop and implement pretrial diversion opportunities for misdemeanants in support of specialty courts (e.g., Community Courts, Drug Court, and Mental Health Diversion Court), GPS, domestic violence. • System cost savings due to diversion. • Decrease in recidivism of defendants who successfully complete treatment-based diversion programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES:</td>
<td>DCSC, OAG, USAO, MPD, PSA, EOM, DOC, DMH, PDS &amp; CJCC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Broaden eligibility for existing diversion programs to appropriate populations on other Superior Court calendars.</td>
<td>3. Identify city agency to provide coordination and oversight for expanded community service opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

The Pretrial Systems and Community Options Committee (PSCOC) was created to identify, develop, and implement pretrial release alternatives and diversion programs, where appropriate, as well as approaches that foster more effective pretrial system operations among stakeholder agencies. In 2009, the PSCOC undertook the tasks of broadening, and/or creating, pretrial diversion options best suited for specific populations of misdemeanor defendants in support of specialty courts within the D.C. Superior Court (DCSC).

Accomplishments

The Superior Court’s D.C. Misdemeanor and Traffic Community Court (DCMTCC) and East of the River Community Court (ERCC) were launched January 2002 and September 2002 respectively. The community courts’ aim is to enhance public safety by addressing low-level crime and disorder.

DCMTCC’s mission is to reduce low-level and quality-of-life offenses in the District of Columbia by utilizing a collaborative, problem-solving approach to crime to protect rights and liberties, to hold defendants and offenders accountable, and to increase the public’s confidence in the court system. ERCC’s mission is to reduce misdemeanor and low-level felony offenses in east of the Anacostia River neighborhoods by utilizing a collaborative, problem-solving approach to crime to protect rights and liberties, to hold defendants and offenders accountable, and to increase the public’s confidence in the court system. In furtherance of the missions, the community courts partner with government agencies, social service providers, community and faith-based organizations, businesses and residents.

In 2009, the DCMTCC reached a significant milestone. The number of defendants who completed Next Day Community Service, since its inception in July 2006, reached over 1000 people. Next Day Community Service may be offered to defendants...
charged with committing “quality of life offenses” or “minor criminal traffic offenses” and eligible to perform community service with the Downtown Business Improvement District (BID). In 2009, over 6120 hours of community service work were completed by defendants/offenders in the DCMTCC. In 2009, over 3669 hours of community service work were completed by defendants/offenders in the ERCC. The community courts yielded a total of $80,759 worth of labor based upon the District of Columbia minimum wage.

The DCMTCC and ERCC also hosted visitors including elected officials, judges, prosecutors, business persons, criminal justice administrators, social services administrators, and public information officers from a diverse array of jurisdictions, including Portland, San Francisco, London, Tokyo and the Ukraine.

The CJCC Reentry Steering Committee is comprised of federal and local stakeholders engaged in activities related to reentry in the District. In 2009, the committee’s primary areas of focus included: pre-release/discharge planning, housing, education/training, employment, health/substance abuse and community supports. The CJCC Reentry Steering Committee was co-chaired by Cedric Hendricks, Acting Deputy Director, CSOSA and Theodore Sweet, Interim Director, OEOA.

The District’s multi-pronged reentry initiatives continue to strive to enhance the preparation and transition of offenders from incarceration to the community. Successful reentry is a key factor in improving public safety. To this end, everyone has an interest in successful reentry. Offenders who do not have adequate skills and preparation for life post-incarceration or community supervision are more likely to commit new crimes.

### Reentry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIATIVE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a comprehensive prisoner reentry strategy with focus on high-risk offenders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES: |
| CSOSA, OEOA, DOC, EOM, OCA, DCSC, DMH, OSEH, USAO, OAG, UDC, UPO, UPC, DHCD, DOES, BOP & CJCC. |

| ACTIVITIES: |
| 1. Facilitate Reentry Steering Committee. |
| 2. Update reentry strategic plan. |
| 3. Conduct service needs assessment for ex-offenders. |
| 4. Identify reentry continuum of services, responsible agencies, and resource commitments. |
| 5. Develop MOUs between service agencies and CSOSA defining extent of available services over a defined period. |
| 6. Produce benchmark data on re-entry and recidivism. |
| 7. Support the Second Chance Strategic Planning Subcommittee for discharge planning, transition to the community, and supervision/services for every returning offender, especially high risk. |
| 8. Collaborate with the Reentry Commission. |

| OUTCOMES: |
| • Reduced recidivism for high risk offenders. |
| • System cost savings due to reduced recidivism (e.g., policing, confinement, judicial [to include prosecuting, legal defense], etc.). |
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In 2009, the Office of Ex-Offender Affairs (OEOA) continued to enhance constituency outreach through community meetings, workshops, and an informative website. A total of 1,388 returning residents visited the office this year as compared to 2,200 in 2008. OEOA reports that 27% of visits were made by homeless returning residents seeking housing assistance as compared to 25% in 2008. Another 72% sought some other form of housing assistance as compared to 75% in 2008. OEOA also reported that 88% of the returning residents visiting the office sought employment assistance as compared to 85% in 2008.

Accomplishments

Below are examples of reentry initiatives that are aligned with the Reentry Steering Committee’s identified priority areas that occurred in 2009:

Community Resource Days

Community Resource Days (CRD), hosted by CSOSA and Rivers Correctional Institute, were held on January 12-13 (on-site), April 7 (video conference), July 14 (video conference), and October 27. The CRDs enabled D.C. government and community-based housing, healthcare, employment, and education providers to present information to soon-to-be released offenders. Additionally, over 130 CRD DVD/CD Packets in English and Spanish were mailed to the Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP) institutions across the country with instructions to the wardens to make them available to D.C. inmates preparing to return home.

The Risk Needs Symposium

The Risk Needs Symposium coordinated by CJCC, CSOSA and Urban Institute, held on June 18, 2009, brought together federal and local criminal justice partners, as well as national experts, to discuss criminal justice interventions based on risk assessment tools, and how these tools can help inform and improve pre-release and discharge planning decisions. The symposium provided an opportunity for dialogue between agencies within the District and national experts on how measures of risk could be used to inform decisions on incarceration, release, and supervision, as well as to help manage growing prison populations.

Approximately 60 representatives from D.C.’s criminal justice agencies attended the symposium. Nancy Ware, Executive Director, CJCC welcomed the audience and introduced the panelists. Terry Dunworth, Ph.D., Director, Justice Policy Center, Urban Institute moderated the panel. The national experts on risk assessment included James Austin, Ph.D., JFA Institute, Avi Bhati, Ph.D., Urban Institute, Edward Latessa, Ph.D., University of Cincinnati, and Doug McDonald, Ph.D. Abt Associates. They were joined by a second panel of criminal justice principals from District agencies that included Devon Brown, Director of the Department of Corrections, Isaac Fulwood Jr., Chairman of the U.S. Parole Commission, Honorable Ann O’Regan Kearny, Presiding Judge of the Criminal Division of the Superior Court of D.C., Peter Newsham, Assistant Chief of the Metropolitan Police Department, Adrienne Poteat, Interim Director of the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency, and Susan Shaffer, Director of the Pretrial Services Agency.

Hospitality Training Program

CSOSA, BOP, Office of the State Superintendent for Education (OSSE), University of the District of Columbia (UDC), Hotel Associates (HA) and Department of Employment Services (DOES), have partnered to launch a Hospitality training program which began September 28, 2009. The 20-week program is designed to provide 60 students with the requisite skills for the hospitality industry. The target population includes incarcerated individuals assigned to RRCs Hope Village (halfway house for men) and Fairview (halfway house for women).

In addition to 8 weeks of free classroom training, followed by a 12-week internship in an area hotel, eligible students will receive a stipend during the training period. Graduates will receive a nationally recognized certification upon successful course completion. There are 8 students (7 men, 1 woman) in the first class. Classes will continue in 2010.

Education and Training Unit

DOC and OSSE have teamed up to dedicate a learning unit for education and training within the D.C. jail. OSSE has provided 10 computers and technical assistance support to improve adult education in the jail by providing a literacy coach.

Reentry Geographic Mapping

OEOA’s emerging geographical mapping tool was identified as a best practice by the United States Conference of Mayors in its 2009 Status of Reentry Efforts in Cities.

Challenges

Like the nation, the District is working to address high unemployment and homelessness. The unemployment rate in November 2009 was 11.8% (Bureau of Labor Statistics, December 18, 2009). And, while the District made significant strides in addressing homelessness through the Mayor’s Permanent Supportive Housing Program which provided housing for 400 men and women, the number of homeless persons from January 28, 2008 to January 2009 increased from 6,044 to 6,228 (3%), due in large part to families in emergency shelter and transitional housing (Community Partnership for the Prevention of Homelessness, TCP Fact Sheet 2009).

Given the citywide backdrop, the issues of employment and housing are chief among the challenges faced by returning residents. In December 2009, Project Empowerment reported a waiting list of 8,000. Approximately 80% of Project Empowerment’s clients are returning residents.

In an effort to reduce the waitlist and efficiently and effectively provide job readiness training and placement services, DOES is in the process of decentralizing the work of Project Empowerment to the various One Stop Centers in the District.
The GunStat program objectives are:
1. Identify the most dangerous repeat offenders in the District, and focus attention/resources on those offenders.
2. Evaluate the criminal justice system, and GunStat’s impact on the system by providing periodic trend analyses on CPWL charges.
3. Implement interagency strategies to reduce the likelihood of repeat gun offenses.
4. Examine the arrest, charge and conviction histories of specific candidates for the purpose of identifying lessons and initiating proactive investigations.

**Responsibilities:**
- DCSC, OAG, USAO, MPD, CSOSA, OCA, PSA, EOM, USPC, USPO, DOC & CICC.

**Background**
GunStat is a District-wide effort proposed by Mayor Adrian Fenty. The aim is to track gun cases as they progress through the criminal justice system for the purpose of identifying trends, strengths and weaknesses. This is accomplished through the compilation of a collaborative report (GunStat Report or “Report”) of gun-related statistics, as a tool to support the missions of criminal justice-related participating agencies, both District and Federal.

Stakeholder agencies meet once a month to discuss individuals of interest and develop appropriate strategies. Staff-level meetings are also held in advance of the general meetings.

**Goals**
The GunStat program objectives are:
- To identify the most dangerous repeat offenders in the District.
- To focus the collective efforts and resources of law enforcement and criminal justice partners on those offenders (supported by evidence and statutory requirements).
- To examine trends and snapshots of these gun cases as they progress through the criminal justice system.

**Challenges**
A key element in the success of the GunStat initiative has been the ability and willingness of agencies to engage in open constructive discussions. The openness exhibited has permitted participants to identify areas in the criminal justice process where greater collaboration is needed.

As new tools and processes are developed to improve efficiency and promote transparency, the continued willingness and openness among GunStat partner agencies is crucial for the continued success of the program.

**Accomplishments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GunStat 2009 Summary</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of GunStat sessions held</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of candidates considered</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Quarterly summaries prepared</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of action items addressed by participating agencies</td>
<td>50/65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the GunStat-related enhancements made to JUSTIS were:
1. Participating agencies started forwarding more detailed information on individuals they arrest, supervise or prosecute.
2. The automated GunStat Report was enhanced to include more information.
3. One new event notification was added.

**Juvenile GunStat**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIATIVE:</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES:</th>
<th>OUTCOMES:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce juvenile gun crime by providing, collecting and analyzing data on gun cases as they progress through the juvenile justice system so as to develop programs for youth.</td>
<td>1. Identify the most dangerous repeat juveniles in the District and focus attention/resources on those offenders.</td>
<td>• Reduced recidivism for high-risk juveniles. • Systems saving by reduced recidivism. • New and/or enhanced services for this population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Provide periodic trend analyses on CPWL charges to profile those cases, with updates as needed.</td>
<td>3. Improve interagency strategies to reduce the likelihood of repeat gun offenses and to encourage development of effective prevention programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identify Juvenile Offenders that reside in Focus Improvement Areas and link them to supportive services.</td>
<td>5. Enhance monthly JUSTIS Juvenile GunStat Reports.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responsibility Agencies:**
OCA, CFSA, CSS, DCSC, DYRS, MPD, OAG & CICC.

**Background**
In 2008, the District of Columbia initiated the Juvenile GunStat Initiative to monitor the juvenile gun offenders. CJCC was charged with examining juvenile gun offenders from November 2007 to February 2009. A Juvenile GunStat (JGS) committee was established to determine a strategy for addressing this subset of offenders. The committee consists of the Office of the Attorney General (OAG), the Office of the City Administrator, the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD), the Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services (DYRS), the D.C. Superior Court (DCSC), and the DCSC’s Court Social Services (CSS), the Child and Family Services Agency (CFSA), and the Public Defender Service (PDS).

The purpose of the committee is to:
1. Improve interagency strategies to reduce the likelihood of repeat gun offenses and to encourage development of effective prevention programs.
2. Identify the most dangerous repeat gun offenders who are juveniles in the District and focus attention/resources on those offenders.
3. Provide periodic trend analyses on gun-related charges to profile those cases, with updates as needed.
4. Identify juvenile offenders that reside in Focus Improvement Areas and link them up to supportive services.

The JGS committee developed the criteria for selecting the first group of juvenile gun offenders to study in the initial phase of JGS. This group of juveniles included any youth who were arrested for a gun-related offense in the given timeframe. These offenses included any offense that included the use of a real gun or BB gun during a crime incident.

**Accomplishments**
The JGS committee convened an inaugural meeting in the fall of 2009 to outline the goals and objectives for addressing juvenile gun violence in the District of Columbia. The JGS committee sought to identify trends of juvenile gun violence and characteristics of these offenders. The committee’s consensus was that the initiative should be prevention focused rather than concentrating on increasing punitive consequences for gun-related offenses.

The JGS offenders were juveniles with gun-related offenses selected by the OAG, which included cases from November 2007 to February 2009. The total number of cases during this period was 213 individual juvenile gun cases. This information was provided to CJCC to compile and disseminate to DYRS, DCSC, CSS, CFSA, and MPD. Each agency
populated as much information as possible for the juveniles identified by the OAG. CICC compiled and analyzed each agency’s information to provide an overview of the juvenile gun offenders for that period.

**Challenges**

- Limited citywide resources were available to focus on this unique group of juvenile offenders, which created a delay in furnishing services.
- There continues to be a need for a comprehensive citywide approach to providing appropriate prevention and intervention options in response to the needs of juvenile gun offenders.
- The initiative requires a shared vision for the Juvenile GunStat Stakeholders.
- Consistency in agency data collection and reporting will further strengthen the management of this initiative.

**Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIATIVE: Create appropriate detention alternatives for juveniles.</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Measure implementation of recommendations from the Case Processing Agreement (CPA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Initiate step-down process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Implement recommendations for faster case processing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identify gaps in programming and develop new non-secure alternatives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES: DCSC, DYRS, CSS, OAG, PDS, CFSA, DCPS, OSSE, MPD, DME, EOM, DMH, &amp; CICC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Add community representation to JDAI.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Generate and share monthly data reports to help manage the outcomes of JDAI.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Support DCSC Disproportionate Minority Representation efforts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTCOMES: Expedit Case processing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reduction in number of juveniles securely detained unnecessarily.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Increased number of quality community-based detention alternatives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Data-driven management of JDAI.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Interagency DMR plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background**

The Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) in the District of Columbia entered its 5th year in 2009. The District is one of over 100 sites that have participated in this progressive initiative to focus on the detained population. JDAI focuses on eliminating unnecessary and inappropriate detention of young people, by promoting the utilization of culturally relevant community-based programs to assist them during the particularly challenging pre-adjudication period, all while keeping public safety a priority.

The Annie E. Casey Foundation sponsors this Initiative through a grant and technical assistance to support the objectives of JDAI. JDAI is a process that empowers stakeholders to collaborate on common goals. The primary goals are as follows: reducing inappropriate and unnecessary detention of youth, reducing the number of young people who either fail to appear for court or re-offend pending adjudication, and reducing the disproportionate number of minorities in detention or in contact with the juvenile justice system.

The District of Columbia has committed to these worthy goals through the collaboration of the following juvenile justice stakeholders: the DCSC’s Family Court & CSS, DYRS, PDS, OAG, OSSE, DCPS, MPD, CFSA, and the community.

**Accomplishments**

In 2009, the District of Columbia’s juvenile justice system continued to attend to the many ongoing priorities of JDAI. The first JDAI newsletter was distributed in August, highlighting the work of DYRS, CSS and the leadership of JDAI.

A Quality Assurance Plan was approved by the Quality Assurance Committee chaired by the Honorable Zoe Bush, DCSC, Family Court Deputy Presiding Judge. This Committee developed an implementation plan beginning with training and several site visits for committee members to become familiar with the various Alternatives to Detention programs through the site visits. Other stakeholders will also be invited to tour these programs. The Quality Assurance Committee will develop a protocol of standards for these JDAI programs. Proposed standards are timely referrals from judge to program, consumer feedback through exit surveys, and uniform data collection across agencies.

Since JDAI began there has been a substantial decrease in the number of days that youth must wait in secure detention prior to being placed in a shelter home. Usually, young people placed in a shelter home are those who warrant a more rigid structure, but not to the extent of secure detention. Nevertheless, in years past, young people were waiting up to 36 days to be placed in a shelter home, as ordered by the judge. As can be seen by the figure below, this waiting time is sometimes zero, but usually does not exceed a few days.

**Average Length of Stay in Secure Detention Prior to Shelter Home Placement February 2006 - August 2009**

This table displays a graphical trend of the average time males and females spent waiting in secure detention for shelter placement. The average time is arrived at by averaging the number of days that youth who are released to shelter care, in a given month, have spent in secure detention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month and Year</th>
<th>Male Re-Entrants</th>
<th>Female Re-Entrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2006</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2006</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2006</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2006</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2006</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2006</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2006</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2006</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following is an account from a young lady who participated in the Leaders of Today in Solidarity (LOTS) Civil Rights Tour. LOTS is a detention alternative developed by CSS.

"We met at the building early and loaded the bus. They asked us questions and gave us money for it. Our ride was long but fun. I adapted to everyone there and communicated very well. We stopped to eat and played a lot of games. We visited the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Coretta Scott King memorial and took lots of pictures. We took tours led by different people such as Willie Ricks and others, and we learned a lot from those people that were actually there during each of the tragic events. We visited the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church and the Kelly Ingram Park. The Sixteenth Street Baptist Church was where four little girls died at during a random explosion, and the park Kelly Ingram was a dedication to the girls and it's named after a fire fighter that was drafted to the Navy and was killed. Every statue in the park meant something and it told stories as it went along. There is a tree behind the church that was planted there after the girls died and when it grew there were four branches in remembrance of the little girls, and to prepare us for that we watched movies and a lot of short films.

We travelled a lot from Atlanta, Georgia to Tuskegee, Alabama where we learned about Booker T Washington, W.E.B. Dubois and went to Ms. Robinson’s house. One of my favorite parts of the trip was sleeping and experiencing different hotels, and also adapting and exploring to other people’s environment. We went to a step show and cheered for different sororities. They honored the honorable President Barack Obama and the history of our African American culture and future heroes. We attended a festival and collaborated with others and they taught us different things ‘interfering with’ (about) our Black history.

Later we went to the University of Alabama where we took a tour of the university and the football stadium. It was so beautiful and huge. We also walked through the Student Union where students were participating in activities. We met at the building early and loaded the bus. They asked us questions and gave us money for it. Our ride was long but fun. I adapted to everyone there and communicated very well. We stopped to eat and played a lot of games. We visited the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Coretta Scott King memorial and took lots of pictures. We took tours led by different people such as Willie Ricks and others, and we learned a lot from those people that were actually there during each of the tragic events. We visited the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church and the Kelly Ingram Park. The Sixteenth Street Baptist Church was where four little girls died at during a random explosion, and the park Kelly Ingram was a dedication to the girls and it’s named after a fire fighter that was drafted to the Navy and was killed. Every statue in the park meant something and it told stories as it went along. There is a tree behind the church that was planted there after the girls died and when it grew there were four branches in remembrance of the little girls, and to prepare us for that we watched movies and a lot of short films.

The next day was the best day ever, the best day in history. We marched in the Bloody Sunday March. The Bloody Sunday March is a march when back then on a Sunday over hundreds of people marched from the project to the Edmund Pettus Bridge. The people were vandalized and abused and some were even killed by the police, to show that they weren’t allowed to cross this bridge. So every year people from all over the United States would come to Salem, Alabama and march and reunite and reminisce about the tragedy of that Sunday. When we crossed the bridge, they talked and prayed next to this stone that was left there in memory.

We travelled a lot from Atlanta, Georgia to Tuskegee, Alabama where we learned about Booker T Washington, W.E.B. Dubois and went to Ms. Robinson’s house. One of my favorite parts of the trip was sleeping and experiencing different hotels, and also adapting and exploring to other people’s environment. We went to a step show and cheered for different sororities. They honored the honorable President Barack Obama and the history of our African American culture and future heroes. We attended a festival and collaborated with others and they taught us different things ‘interfering with’ (about) our Black history.

The next day was the best day ever, the best day in history. We marched in the Bloody Sunday March. The Bloody Sunday March is a march when back then on a Sunday over hundreds of people marched from the project to the Edmund Pettus Bridge. The people were vandalized and abused and some were even killed by the police, to show that they weren’t allowed to cross this bridge. So every year people from all over the United States would come to Salem, Alabama and march and reunite and reminisce about the tragedy of that Sunday. When we crossed the bridge, they talked and prayed next to this stone that was left there in remembrance of all of their trials and tribulations..."
**Secure Residential Treatment Program**

**Initiatives:**

- Develop a parole/supervised release violation treatment plan.

**Responsible Agencies:**

- DOC, CSOSA, BOP, USPC, OCA, EOM, DCSC & CJCC.

**Activities:**

1. Establish a 32-bed, 180-day demonstration pilot project of the Secure Residential Treatment Program at DOC’s CTF that could serve as an alternative placement for D.C. Code offenders on parole, or supervised release, who face revocation for technical and/or minor new criminal violations.
2. Secure funding/resources to support a supervised release and parole treatment unit. Draft interagency agreements on management of unit.
3. During 2009-10, CSOSA will evaluate SRTP operations in order to:
   - Develop and refine profiles of participants for program suitability,
   - Monitor and refine the program content and schedule,
   - Monitor and refine operations for intake, classification, and commitment,
   - Monitor and refine operations for support service, security, case management, and discharge procedures.
4. CSOSA will summarize findings documented during the diagnostics stage.

**Outcomes:**

- During FY 09-10, CSOSA will design an outcome study to support long-term implementation of the SRTP and define a comparison group of similar offenders who did not enter or complete the SRTP. Outcome measures will include:
  - Reduction in the frequency of substance abuse.
  - Reduction in supervision violations, particularly substance-abuse related violations.
  - Increase in successful supervision completions.

**Background**

The Secure Residential Treatment Program (SRTP) is a partnership among the CSOSA, DOC, USPC, BOP, and the Corrections Corporation of America, Incorporated (CCA). The partnership’s purpose is to design and establish a secure residential substance abuse and behavioral intervention treatment program at DOC’s Correctional Treatment Facility (CTF). The SRTP will serve as an alternative placement for eligible D.C. Code offenders on parole or supervised release who face revocation for technical (including substance abuse) and, in some cases, new criminal violations.

**Accomplishments**

On September 21, 2009, CSOSA, DOC, CCA and USPC launched the SRTP pilot demonstration at DOC’s Correctional Treatment Facility. Thirty-two offenders are participating in the pilot. The USPC will reestablish an offender to parole or supervised release supervision without revocation once he successfully completes the program.

Additionally, CSOSA will provide post-release supervision and will continue to facilitate transitional housing, out-patient substance abuse treatment, and provide services to assist with job search and placement support.

**Next Steps**

The SRTP partners are engaged in planning the long-term direction of SRTP. This includes developing a detailed gender-specific program plan for female offenders with chronic substance abuse histories and non-compliance issues. Additionally, BOP is working on post-pilot plans to contract for a treatment provider to deliver intervention services in the CTF.

The long-term goal of SRTP is to expand the program’s capacity to 96 beds for male and female offenders. When the expansion occurs, female offenders will be transitioned from the RSAT program space to the SRTP. The partners aim to launch the full program in early 2011.

---

**Goal Two: Improve Criminal Justice System Operations requiring interagency collaboration & information sharing**

**Justice Information System Enhancements**

**Initiatives:**

- Enhance JUSTIS use and application by revising protocols and addressing participating agencies’ needs.

**Activities:**

1. Increase User Access and Training.
2. Enhance automatic report development.
3. Investigate and implement, if possible, case initiation through JUSTIS.
4. Pursue federal and grant funding for JUSTIS enhancements, including system-to-system information exchange between agencies, electronic exchange of papering documents, etc.
5. Facilitate system-to-system information exchange between agencies.
6. Provide access to JUSTIS by regional partners.
7. Streamline JUSTIS navigation to make information more readily available.

**Outcomes:**

- Timeless exchange of quality information.
- Enhanced public safety.

**Background**

JUSTIS (Justice Information System) is a web-based application, developed and administered by CJCC. It is a one-stop shop for information that allows registered users to view criminal justice-related information from multiple agency sources at the same time. A hallmark of the system is that it relies entirely upon the voluntary sharing of information from contributing public safety and criminal justice agencies.

The system has gone through four major releases, with each one designed to meet the ever-changing needs of the District’s criminal justice community. The first phase of JUSTIS development took the form of a functioning proof-of-concept (POC). Phase two initiated JUSTIS implementation beginning with testing the POC system by creating a production environment within The District. During phase three, the Superior Court Integrated Judicial Information System (JIIS) was integrated with JUSTIS including the juvenile data. In addition, design and implementation of the Data Quality Alliance and the Core Data Transfer were initiated.

JUSTIS is now in the fourth phase of development. The user base has increased by almost 400% over the past two years and now spans law enforcement, prosecution, probation, parole, pretrial services, court supervision, corrections and the judiciary. Agencies from neighboring jurisdictions are now also signing on for access to JUSTIS including USPPO in Maryland.

**Goals**

The fundamental objective of JUSTIS is to provide agency partners with timely access to critical information. CJCC continuously engages partner agencies to determine their information requirements:

1. CJCC works to identify exactly what information stakeholders need and then facilitates the process of making such data available within JUSTIS. Providing more information on the type of pretrial release (such as electronic monitoring) is one example.
2. CJCC also works to make key information available within JUSTIS so that it is easier to consume. Adding new event notifications via e-mail and developing new daily reports (such as most recent Stay Away Orders) are two such examples.
WHAT ARE JUSTIS USERS SAYING?
The following comments were received by actual JUSTIS users:

"JUSTIS allows me to quickly access arrest, court and incarceration records, including scanned materials in the criminal info. Assisted another outside agency with arrest information that they could not have obtained otherwise." - User 1

"JUSTIS gives real-time information for criminal info. Assisted another outside agency with arrest information that they could not have obtained otherwise." - User 2

"During a traffic stop, I arrested a subject who was arrested three times for the same offense in two different law enforcement agencies. JUSTIS helped." - User 3

"I run JUSTIS along side of mobile. This allows me to make sure the person I am running is the person on criminal's arrest when I see them on the street. This is a tool we shouldn't live without!" - User 4

The goal of making JUSTIS a regional tool was also realized this year with users being trained on JUSTIS for the first time from both the USPPO in Baltimore and the Metro Transit Police of the WMATA.

The entire Metropolitan Police Department also underwent JUSTIS training in their respective Districts and Police Service Areas. New recruits are now receiving JUSTIS training while they are at the Police Academy.

Accomplishments

Information Technology Advisory Committee

The Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC), under Chair Brook Hedge, Senior Judge of the D.C. Superior Court, serves as a forum for keeping CICC member agencies abreast of developments within the overlapping fields of criminal justice, public safety and homeland security.

1. Inter-Agency Workgroup: addresses business process related issues and how collaboration among CICC member agencies may be enhanced.

2. The Legal Workgroup: addresses any legal issues related to the exchange of information among contributing agencies.

3. The Security Workgroup: provides agency JUSTIS information technology security officers (ITSOs) with updates on any access and security-related procedures deemed necessary to safeguard the integrity of the information contained therein.

4. The Quality Assurance Workgroup: addresses any underlying data quality issues identified by the JUSTIS user community.

The Inter-Agency workgroup met continuously throughout the year and presented the two following recommendations to the ITAC in 2009:

Recommendation 1:
Develop a mechanism by which information (data and documents) can be exchanged electronically among participating agencies:
- In a phased manner
- To allow agencies to exchange information/data/documents within a JUSTIS framework
- To permit individual agencies to receive the same information (data and documents) for integration into their own in-house technology systems.

Recommendation 2:
Adopt the Police Department Identifier (PDID) as the Universal Person ID.

Both of these recommendations were approved by the ITAC. Recommendation 1 resulted in the launch of the Case Initiation project. Recommendation 2 addressed the issue of positive identification of individuals among the various technology systems of different agencies.

In the previous year, the ITAC had approved the adoption of the Universal Case ID. Taken together, the Universal Person ID and Universal Case ID shall comprise the Universal ID. As agencies phase out old technology systems and replace them with new ones, the Universal ID should facilitate the quick and accurate identification of an individual, thus decreasing errors.

The ITAC also oversaw the completion of a comparison between JUSTIS and CourtView (DCSC’s in-house technology system) to identify what Court information is currently unavailable in JUSTIS and what should be included in future DCSC data contribution updates. The results of this analysis shall also be incorporated into the case initiation project.

Individual agencies appointed representatives to this workgroup to serve as points of contact (POCs) for the overall purpose of resolving any information-related discrepancies or inaccuracies. Incomplete or inaccurate data has been a long-standing concern among criminal justice entities within the District of Columbia. The ITAC re-launched the Data Quality Group with individuals being designated by their respective agencies as Data Quality Assurance (DQA) Representatives. This Group provided CICC with the functional requirements of a just-completed DQA Module within JUSTIS.
Case Initiation Project

CJCC partner agencies, under the auspices of the ITAC, applied for and received a JGA grant to further enhance the electronic sharing of information. CJCC, DCSC, OAG, USAO and PSA are engaged in this year-long project (Oct. 1, 2009 – Sept. 30, 2010), which will automate the case initiation process. Arrest and prosecution information, required for case filing, shall be forwarded to DCSC and agency partners utilizing a new JUSTIS technology infrastructure being developed by CJCC as a part of this project. This same infrastructure shall permit JUSTIS to facilitate the future automated, electronic exchange of information among CJCC partners.

In addition, DCSC will be implementing a new electronic technology aimed at meeting the ever-changing needs of the District’s criminal justice community. This new technology aims to provide partner agencies more complete information in a timely manner. It will also provide the information identified in the JUSTIS and CourtView analysis.

JUSTIS System Improvements

JUSTIS underwent a major overhaul in terms of navigation and how information is presented or grouped. Two user-focus sessions were organized by CJCC and the results formed the foundation for this overhaul. Survey results reflect how these improvements were received by users.

JUSTIS Lite

MPD participated in the design and field testing of JUSTIS Lite, a handheld version of JUSTIS. This mobile device version of the system was specifically designed for field officers so that they may literally have the information they need at their fingertips. The Homicide Unit of MPD and the Metro Transit Police of WMATA are having JUSTIS Lite made available to their members on government-issued PDAs.

Focus on Data Quality

A new Data Quality Assurance (DQA) Module was developed within JUSTIS this year. This new module will permit partner agencies to report data quality issues and then have this information automatically disseminated by JUSTIS among all designated DQA Representatives.

Another key feature of this module is that it allows for the reporting and tracking of each data quality issue from initial reporting to final resolution.

JUSTIS Training

CJCC re-launched the JUSTIS Train-the-Trainer program last year whereby designated trainers from agencies were trained by CJCC and these individuals subsequently conducted JUSTIS training sessions within their own departments. The overall objective of this program has been to improve the availability of JUSTIS training to users.

The results of this program are reflected in the table below.

| Individuals trained by CJCC as JUSTIS trainers | 145 |
| Training sessions conducted by agency JUSTIS trainers | 127 |
| Users trained by agency JUSTIS trainers | 2227 |

Some of the JUSTIS-related enhancements made to JUSTIS were:

1. The automated GunStat Report was enhanced to include more information.
2. Participating agencies started forwarding more detailed information on individuals they arrest, supervise or prosecute.
3. One new event notification was added.

GunStat Program in JUSTIS

The GunStat program is a District-wide initiative with the following objectives:

1. To identify the most dangerous repeat offenders in the District.
2. To focus the collective efforts and resources of law enforcement partners on those offenders (supported by evidence and statutory requirements).
3. To examine trends and snapshots of these gun cases as they progress through the criminal justice system.

Some of the GunStat-related enhancements made to JUSTIS were:

1. The automated GunStat report was enhanced to include more information.
2. Participating agencies started forwarding more detailed information on individuals they arrest, supervise or prosecute.
3. One new event notification was added.

Challenges

The Case Initiation Project will be an opportunity for partner agencies to make substantive progress in the realm of information sharing.

For its part, CJCC will enhance JUSTIS by adding a new technical infrastructure. This addition will permit the system to facilitate the exchange of information (based upon business rules) among partner agencies.

Automating the Case Initiation process through electronic means will result in a more efficient and timely criminal case process flow for the District of Columbia. It will also uncover areas of improvement such as:

1. Accuracy/completeness of information being exchanged.
2. Realigning business processes, as required.

CJCC will need to continue to work as a cooperative body to come up with timely and effective solutions to these and other challenges.
Challenges
Stakeholders must review the recommendations from the report to determine the approach that should be followed. There will be a financial commitment that will be required to implement this initiative. Over the long term there will be cost savings but the initial output of resources will have to be considered.

Background
MDP spent 2009 working with CJCC stakeholders to build upon the innovative Papering Reform Initiative (PRI) that was established by Chief Lanier. Chief Lanier developed a Papering Elimination Project (PEP), which began on Nov. 7, 2007, with the primary objective of developing a system where an “arrest package” containing the arresting officers statement would be delivered to the Court Liaison Division. At that time an MDP representative would present the “package” without the need for the officer being present.

PEP evolved in 2008 and 2009 by standardizing the arrest form and expanding the protocol to all the MDP police districts. The new standardized form is now accessible via MDP’s intranet.

In 2009, MDP also worked towards refining the administrative process to facilitate better tracking of cases and improve on the time taken to move cases to the relevant prosecutors. MDP’s response from officers has been positive. MDP and CJCC stakeholders continue to monitor the successes of the PRI and PEP projects.

Goals
The primary goal is to eliminate in-person papering in most cases and streamline records-sharing and administrative processes by establishing electronic dissemination of arrest and prosecution reports across the criminal justice system.

Accomplishments
Since the inception of the MDP papering pilot program on Nov. 7, 2007, more than 36,000 cases have been presented where the arresting officers were not required to personally appear for papering. In 2009, over 13,770 cases have been presented without an arresting officer present.

During 2009, the Metropolitan Police Department continued to build upon the Papering Elimination Project by incorporating all units into the program and by adding standardized arrest forms and associated paperwork on the MDP intranet. The General Orders regarding Court appearances have been revised to include these changes.

Citation Release forms have been revised and translated into a variety of languages. These updated forms have also been placed on the MDP intranet site to afford Citation Release to more individuals.

Also during 2008, the requirement that an officer obtain driving records was eliminated. This action has streamlined the papering process in traffic related cases. Further changes have been made to address firearm related offenses. Through a revision of the Gerstein form, the need for the arresting officer to personally view the test fire of the weapon was eliminated.

In early 2009, Carrying a Pistol Without a License was added as an offense to be handled under papering elimination. This is a contributing factor towards the increase in the total number of cases processed in 2009.

### Court Processing

**Chair**: Lee F. Satterfield

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIATIVE:</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES:</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase accuracy and timeliness of court processing by DCSC, USMS and DOC— including transferring inmates between jail and courts, managing inmate movement through the courts and documenting court appearances and outcomes.</td>
<td>1. Enhance business process efficiencies across agencies and improve the interrelated automated systems. 2. Implement a fully paperless process. 3. Create and implement documented integrated Automated Prison Transfer Request (PTR) process. 4. Transition to a paperless system.</td>
<td>• Reduction in erroneous releases. • Improved defendant tracking and processing. • More timely defendant tracking and processing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES:**
CA, DCSC, OAG, USAO, MPD, DCSC, DOC & CJCC.

### Papering Reform

**Chairs**: Cathy L. Lanier, Channing D. Phillips

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIATIVE:</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES:</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate in-person papering in most cases and stream-line records-sharing and administrative processes by establishing electronic collection and dissemination of arrest and prosecution reports across the criminal justice system.</td>
<td>1. Review, streamline and automate the current business process across agencies to determine what can be automated. 2. Identify and implement technological needs of an electronic, paperless system. 3. Establish protocol for papering.</td>
<td>• Enhanced public safety. • Reduced overtime spending by MDP. • Maintain quality prosecution decisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES:**
MPD, DCSC, OAG, USAO, CSOSA, OCA, PSA, DCSC, DOC, EOM & CJCC.

The relevant staff were trained. Court cases onto the automated PTR was achieved. The primary goal is to eliminate in-person papering to DCSC, DOC, USMS, and DCSC have continued to work collaboratively to insure that the automated PTR is produced and disseminated in a manner that meets agency-specific requirements.

**Accomplishments**
This year, the goal of capturing the DCSC, Family Court cases onto the automated PTR was achieved. The relevant staff were trained.

**Background**
In 2009, the D.C. Superior Court, the Department of Corrections and U.S. Marshals Service have continued a concerted collaborative focus on enhancing the flow of information generated by the court. A focus of this priority area was the Prisoner Transfer Report (PTR), which identifies the inmates that are to be transported from the D.C. Jail or CTF to DCSC. DOC, USMS, and DCSC have continued to work collaboratively to ensure that the automated PTR is produced and disseminated in a manner that meets agency-specific requirements.

**Accomplishments**
This year, the goal of capturing the DCSC, Family Court cases onto the automated PTR was achieved. The relevant staff were trained.

**Background**
In 2009, the D.C. Superior Court, the Department of Corrections and U.S. Marshals Service have continued a concerted collaborative focus on enhancing the flow of information generated by the court. A focus of this priority area was the Prisoner Transfer Report (PTR), which identifies the inmates that are to be transported from the D.C. Jail or CTF to DCSC. DOC, USMS, and DCSC have continued to work collaboratively to ensure that the automated PTR is produced and disseminated in a manner that meets agency-specific requirements.

**Accomplishments**
This year, the goal of capturing the DCSC, Family Court cases onto the automated PTR was achieved. The relevant staff were trained.
SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT & MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES INTEGRATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIATIVE:</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES:</th>
<th>OUTCOMES:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a means to share information on mental health and substance abuse with criminal justice agencies and ensure treatment rather than incarceration when appropriate.</td>
<td>1. Enhance “Linkages to Mental Health Services and Substance Abuse Treatment” protocol.</td>
<td>• Increased opportunities and improved capacity for diversion of mentally ill defendants from the criminal justice system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Examine and abate where possible the legal impediments to the establishment of a Substance Abuse and Mental Health Electronic Interface for information sharing while ensuring individual protections.</td>
<td>• Enhanced connection to mental health services and substance abuse treatment for inmates upon release from incarceration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Continue to enhance linkages to mental health crisis and emergency services.</td>
<td>• Improvement of aftercare opportunities for District residents with mental health or co-occurring mental health and substance abuse disorders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Enhance mental health and substance abuse service coordination for defendants participating in the D.C. Mental Health Diversion Court.</td>
<td>• Decrease in recidivism by individuals who successfully complete treatment programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA, DMH, OAG, USAO, PDS, CSOSA, APRA, DOC, MPD, EOM, DCSC, PDS &amp; CJCC.</td>
<td>5. Incorporate the Case Conference Model of Discharge Planning into the current discharge planning initiative at the D.C. Jail for inmates in the Reentry and RSAT Units.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Produce a report for stakeholders’ review with recommendations for addressing any legal impediments for implementing an electronic interface.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Produce legislative amendments and standardized court order to facilitate sharing of mental health information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Finalize a universal consent form for consideration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

The Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) released a nationwide report of substance use and mental health treatment during 2005-2006. The study, the “2004 National Study on Drug Use and Health,” estimated that approximately 50,000 (11.23%) District of Columbia adult residents experienced “serious psychiatric distress” between 2005 and 2006, and an additional 36,000 (8.36%) experienced at least one major depressive episode. SAMHSA also reported that about 14.7% of the District’s mental health population had an arrest in 2008.

In an effort to bring further attention to the mental health needs on the national level, the U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) continues to highlight the issues surrounding mental health in the criminal justice system. In 2006, BJS reported that nearly half (48.7%) the national jail population had co-occurring mental health and substance use disorders. Additionally, 15.0% were diagnosed with only a mental illness, and 18.9% were diagnosed with only a substance use disorder.

In an attempt to better serve District of Columbia residents who have been connected with the criminal justice system and the mental health system, CJCC created the Substance Abuse Treatment and Mental Health Services Integration Taskforce (SATMHSIT). SATMHSIT was developed to improve the treatment options available to offenders, ex-offenders, and defendants with mental illness and/or co-occurring substance use disorders. In 2008, SATMHSIT finalized the 2009-2015 Strategic Plan for Persons with Serious and Persistent Health and Substance Use Disorders Involved in the Criminal Justice System in the District of Columbia.

Accomplishments

Mental Health-Related Amendments

The Taskforce co-chaired by Steve Baron, DMH Director, and Susan Shaffer, PSA Director, collaborated toward the development of legislative amendments to facilitate the sharing of mental health information in the criminal justice context. Research of statutes from jurisdictions nationwide revealed that the District of Columbia Mental Health Information Act (“MHIA”) as amended in 2001, was among the most restrictive identified in terms of information sharing. The statutory barriers to the exchange of mental health information were determined to have the following two negative consequences: (1) interference with seamless and non-duplicative delivery of mental health treatment; and (2) burdening or prohibiting effective collection and reporting of information concerning compliance with criminal justice release conditions.

After surveying statutes nationwide for possible models, the Taskforce convened a working group composed of staff from federal and District of Columbia criminal justice entities that were impacted by existing gaps in mental health information sharing. The result of the working group’s efforts was the inclusion of amendments to the MHIA in the Omnibus Public Safety and Justice Amendment Act (Bill 18-0151), the substance of which was enacted by the Council of the District of Columbia on an emergency basis on August 6, 2009. The permanent legislation became effective December 10, 2009.

Mental Health Diversion Court

In November 2007, DCSC opened the Mental Health Diversion Court which serves as an alternative calendar for defendants with mental health disorders who have committed low-level crimes. During the second year of the Mental Health Diversion Court (Nov. 1, 2008 to Oct. 31, 2009), 142 defendants have successfully completed the program.

MENTAL HEALTH DIVERSION COURT SUCCESS STORIES

1. A single mother of five young children was unable to enter inpatient drug treatment because she had no one to care for her children. She abused PCP. She was connected to outpatient drug treatment and mental health services. It was a long process to connect her to the right services. After seven months on the calendar, she completed the program. She was in the courtroom with one of her young children (around 3 months old). As the Assistant United States Attorney dismissed the criminal charges, she held the boy on her lap and she cried. The defendant stood when she was acknowledged for her success and eloquently thanked the Court for its help. She was jubilantly proud of her hard work.

2. One man had medical problems preventing him from entering an inpatient drug treatment program. After surgery, he successfully engaged with wrap-around services, addressing his medical, psychiatric and drug abuse issues. On the day that a defendant successfully completes the program, he or she is presented with a certificate, a medal and a rose. This defendant brought a dozen roses for the Judge (which were passed to the case manager) and his lawyer. He cried in appreciation.

3. One woman had slept over and was so concerned that she would miss Court and a bench warrant would be issued that she arrived in her bubble-gum pink flannel pajamas and slippers.

4. One chronically mentally ill older man had difficulty going to an outpatient clinic for a monthly injection. He agreed to visit the DMH’s Urgent Care Clinic (UC) located in the courthouse. He then transitioned to a community clinic. When he graduated from the program, he walked out of the courtroom arm in arm with a case manager from the UC and another from the community clinic.
In 2009, MPD trained 115 officers, with the assistance of DMH. MPD expects to train another 115 during 2010. In addition to these specially trained officers, every MPD officer will receive approximately 16 hours of mental health training to learn appropriate techniques to use when responding to calls-for-service involving mentally ill residents.

Challenges
There was some difficulty determining how best to address the barriers to the electronic sharing of mental health data, which was solved by adding an amendment to the Mental Health Information Act. DMH led the collaboration to provide new language for the Council of the District of Columbia regarding mental health information. The amendments are scheduled to be approved by the end of 2009.

Urgent Care Clinic
On June 23, 2008, the Court Urgent Care Clinic (CUCC) opened as a partnership of DCSC and the DMH. The collaboration was created to provide court-based services for defendants with mental health disorders. Initially, the CUCC was to provide mentally ill defendants of the D.C. Misdemeanor and Traffic Community Court with immediate access to mental health services and linkage to a DMH mental health provider. Since the first few months of the collaboration, the CUCC has grown to accept referrals from various courts in the DCSC.

Mobile Response Services
The Mobile Crisis Services (MCS) was established by DMH in November of 2008 as a mobile crisis unit that can respond to calls regarding consumers who are having an emergent or urgent mental health crisis. In its first year of service, the MCS made a total of 2,976 contacts with consumers who were experiencing a crisis. This involved 1,489 consumers, some of whom were contacted multiple times during the year.

Crisis Intervention Training
At the beginning of FY 2009, MPD entered into an agreement with DMH to undertake the Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) model of law enforcement intervention with mentally ill residents. Under the CIT model, a specialized unit of police officers receives 32 hours of CIT training from DMH training staff based on the Memphis-based model. These officers are provided training in specialized mental health crisis de-escalation techniques to utilize with District residents.

The CIT trained officers at MPD are available for deployment for calls-for-service involving District residents in mental health crisis. The unit works to safely de-escalate crises and to link mentally ill residents with DMH for services with community-based providers.

Next Steps
The taskforce continues to work diligently on supporting the many initiatives developed since its creation. For the second year of the strategic plan, the SATMH-SIT will address the following goals:

- Electronic data sharing
- Discharge planning
- Housing
- Improving connections to mental health and substance abuse aftercare services
- Exploring initiatives for specialized populations (i.e., juveniles, women and veterans).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIATIVE</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a clear business process for warrants across agencies and reduce the number of outstanding warrants.</td>
<td>1. Identify a comprehensive warrants business approach. 2. Review outstanding 1978-1998 misdemeanor warrants and proposed cases for the judges to consider clearing.</td>
<td>1. Improve agencies’ capacity to execute warrants. 2. Reduce crime.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background
The Warrants Subcommittee was tasked with developing a clear business process for warrants across agencies and engaging in initiatives that will reduce the number of outstanding warrants in the District of Columbia. The updated business process will allow partnering agencies to have a better understanding of their roles and responsibilities. As a result, it is expected that agencies will more effectively partner with participating agencies to execute outstanding warrants.

Goals
The goals are:
1. To identify a multiagency comprehensive warrants business approach.
2. Review outstanding 1978-1998 misdemeanor warrants and propose cases for the judges to consider clearing.
3. Transfer arrest warrants from DCSC to MPD.
Accomplishments

• The Warrants Subcommittee met with CJCC’s IT Department to explore the possibility of using JUSTIS to address the outstanding warrants. CICC’s IT department understood the committee’s concerns and is now in the process of developing an infrastructure for stakeholders to share and exchange warrants information.

• OAG and DCSC met to review a proposal for warrants information. The report will help all warrants stakeholders to understand their responsibility as it relates to the warrants business process.

• MPD and DCSC is working on a business process for MPD to consider regarding moving the responsibility of switching the arrest warrant from DCSC to MPD.

• DCSC has drafted a copy of the warrants business process. The report will help all warrants stakeholders to understand their responsibility as it relates to the warrants business process.

WARRANTS SUCCESS STORY

On Saturday, October 27, 2009 D.C. Superior Court Deputies were requested to assist in the arrest and transport of Youseif Lazar, an international fugitive, originally wanted by Maricopa County, Arizona. Lazar was wanted by Maricopa County for jumping a $500,000 bond in relation to an attempted murder of an Arizona Department of Public Safety investigator. This investigator was leading an investigation into Lazar and his role in an Iraqi criminal syndicate in the Phoenix, Arizona area. This group was responsible for drug trafficking and murder and eluded a corrupt Arizona Public Safety Highway Patrol Officer to assist in the criminal enterprise.

After posting bond Lazar fled the United States and the Phoenix Police Department came to the USMS for help in locating Lazar. The United States Marshals Service then retrieved a federal warrant for unlawful flight to avoid prosecution from the District of Arizona. After a federal warrant was issued the USMS Technical Operations Group investigated and found evidence that Lazar had fled to Iraq to be with his parents.

After confirming this with overseas authorities, efforts were made to get Lazar onto commercial flights from Iraq to Vienna, Austria, and on to Washington, D.C. Deputy U.S. Marshals from Arizona were on the flight from Austria to Dulles Airport but were ordered by the U.S. State Department not to arrest Lazar until the flight landed. Upon landing, U.S. Marshals from D.C. Superior Court along with Customs and Border Protection and Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority Police met the aircraft and made the physical arrest of Yousif Lazar upon exiting the aircraft.

Lazar was taken into custody without incident and transported to D.C. Jail to await presentment in front of D.C. District Court. After postbond Lazar was ordered to be returned to Arizona on October 26, 2009. On Monday Lazar was ordered to be returned to Arizona for an immediate flight back to Phoenix.

Continuity of Operations Planning

Background

Continuity of Operations Planning (COOP) is an effort within individual organizations to ensure that essential functions – those critical activities that must be continued throughout, or resumed rapidly after, a disruption of normal operations – are performed during a wide range of emergencies, natural and manmade, with and without warning. This effort consists of plans and procedures, under all readiness levels, that delineate essential functions. It specifies succession to office and emergency delegations of authority. It also provides for the safeguarding of vital records, the identification of a range of alternate facilities and work locations, and it provides for interoperable and redundant communications. Finally, it also addresses human capital considerations, specifies devolution of control and direction, provides for reconstitution of normal operations, and validates these capabilities through a regimented test, training, and exercise program.

Goal

The primary goal of the workgroup is to develop a comprehensive framework that allows Federal and District government agencies and independent organizations to work together to continue essential criminal justice functions during an emergency affecting normal operations in the District of Columbia.
Statistical Analysis Center

Background
As a unit under CJCC, the D.C. Statistical Analysis Center (SAC) is charged with the responsibility of carrying out independent statistical analysis, data collection and analysis, research (both quantitative and qualitative), program evaluation, policy review and facilitation of information exchange or dissemination. Additionally, the SAC provides technical and statistical support to CJCC membership and workgroups, and responds to requests for outputs (such as forecasts, reports and research studies) on various criminal and juvenile justice topics. Through its data and research responsibilities, the SAC identifies activities, programs and projects aimed at improving public safety policies and procedures in the District of Columbia.

Goals
The SAC focuses on incorporating research and statistics into the organizational and administrative culture of the District of Columbia by disseminating empirical data and research findings to policy and decision-making agencies and authorities. Activities of the SAC also include responding to requests for applications to provide funding for partner initiatives; as well as participating with national organizations and agencies in ongoing analyses and research discussions on crime and justice. The SAC has been approached by a few stakeholders to assist with grant writing for collaborative initiatives focused on public safety.

Accomplishments
In 2008-2009 some of the accomplishments of the SAC working collaboratively with agencies and stakeholders include:
• The Comprehensive Homicide Elimination Strategic TaskForce Report
• Juvenile Detention Alternatives Monthly Data Analyses and Reports
• Adult and Juvenile GunStat Monthly Reports
• Interim Report: 2008 Homicides in the District of Columbia

Currently, the SAC is developing an indexing technique to fully address crime indices in the District. This will go a long way towards better inter-temporal crime comparison in the District since its goal is to comprehensively index all serious and minor crime in the District. This will assist in the provision of recommendations for policies regarding public safety.

Next Steps
The SAC was the recipient of a 2009 grant from the Bureau of Justice Statistics. This grant will be utilized in support of the analysis of gun-related crimes in the District from the 1990s to the current year. The data collected will provide background information for determining policies on guns and firearms.

The SAC was also awarded a grant from the JGA for the Juvenile Justice Enhancement Program. This project includes a partnership between CJCC and MPD focused on the analysis and evaluation of MPD diversion programs for juveniles in the District. The results of this project will provide information on the efficacy of diversion options designed to steer youth away from crime and the juvenile justice system.

Compliance Monitoring

Background
The District has again achieved full compliance with the core requirements of the JJDP Act in 2009. This marks the third straight year of full compliance. The credit for this success is attributed to the District’s juvenile justice stakeholders including the Family Court, OAG, CSS, DYRS, USMS, DOC, and MPD. As a result of the annual OJJDP audit, stakeholders worked closely with the D.C. Compliance Monitor to implement the recommendations in the District. To assist agencies in achieving compliance, the monitor created an updated Compliance Monitoring Policies and Procedures Manual including revised forms for facility inspections. Several additional facilities that hold juveniles pursuant to public authority were indentified and incorporated into the monitoring universe. An annual certification form for the various types of facilities in the compliance monitoring universe was implemented and introduced to the facilities. The monitor paid particular attention to eliminating the use of prohibited locking mechanisms in non-secure facilities, specifically padlocks on rooms big enough to detain children or staff against their will.

Goals
To achieve full compliance the District had to meet each of the core requirements of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act.

Accomplishments

Full Compliance with Sight and Sound Separation
Alleged and adjudicated delinquents cannot be detained or confined in a secure institution (such as a jail, lockup, or secure correctional facility) in which they have sight or sound contact with adult offenders. There were no violations of sight and sound separation in 2009.

Under the separation core requirement, because all youths are processed at the juvenile detention center, there is no possibility of interaction with adult inmates. Processing youth at the juvenile detention center eliminates co-causing of youths and adults at local MPD lockups. Although there is no sight and sound separation requirement in an adult jail where youths charged as adults are held, the D.C. Department of Corrections has proactively implemented sight and sound separation for youths charged as adults. As a result, youths are placed in their own self-contained cell block eliminating most contact with the general population.

Full Compliance with Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders (DSO)
A status offender (a juvenile who has committed an act that would not be a crime if an adult committed it) or non-offender (such as a dependent or neglected child) cannot be held, with statutory exceptions, in secure juvenile detention or correctional facilities, nor can they be held in adult facilities for any length of time. The two primary status offender charges in the District are habitual truancy and habitual runaway. This population is very vulnerable and often the charges are symptoms of larger familial or socio economic issues.

The District has experienced tremendous success in complying with the DSO core requirement. This can be seen by reference to our historic rate of detention. Understanding that even with best practices in place, there are certain exceptional circumstances that may require securely holding a status offender, the federal law allows up to six youth to be detained in any year in order for the jurisdiction to still be in full compliance. In 2004, there were nine youth detained. In 2005, there were eight youth detained. In 2006, there were five youth detained. In 2007, there were five youth. In 2008, there were five youth. Our three consecutive years of full compliance are a testament to the collaboration of juvenile justice stakeholders: the Family Court, OAG, CSS, DYRS, and MPD.

36
Full Compliance with Removal of Juveniles from Adult Jails and Lockups

As a general rule, juveniles (individuals who may be subject to the original jurisdiction of a juvenile court based on age and offense limitations established by state law) cannot be securely detained or confined in adult jails and lockups. D.C. was not in violation of this requirement in 2009.

While the JJDP Act provides for a 6-hour removal exception, the District does not use this exception since the MPD only processes arrested juveniles at the Youth Processing Center which is located at the juvenile detention facility. MPD’s Juvenile Processing Unit is the sole place to process arrested juveniles in the District and all police departments (federal and local) transport youth to the Youth Services Center for processing. Because the juveniles are processed at the juvenile detention facility, the District does not have any jail removal violations. This is another example of a best practice employed in the District to eliminate potential violations of the jail removal core requirement.

Full Compliance with Disproportionate Minority Contact and Confinement

Section 223(a)(23) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, provides that states are required to develop and implement plans to reduce the disproportionate contact and confinement of youth of color within the juvenile justice system. There are substantial efforts in the District of Columbia to address DMC throughout the D.C. juvenile justice system. The D.C. Superior Court is taking the lead through the Family Court’s Model Court Collaborative on Disproportionate Representation of Minorities.

3. Examine and/or develop agency policies and set three goals to be accomplished to address the disparate treatment of minorities in the system. Develop an action plan to address the disproportionate representation of minorities within each agency.

Individually, agencies were also encouraged to establish SMART Goals (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, and Timely Goals). The 2007 SMART Goals to address the Disproportionate Representation of Minorities in Family Court were informed by input from participants in the 2007 October Interdisciplinary Conference sponsored by the Family Court and the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ). In September 2009, collaboratively working with the Family Court, NCJFCJ and CJCC, the Honorable Zoe Busch convened a day-long retreat for frontline juvenile justice workers. Frontline workers participated in a discussion about race and its effects on the justice system. In addition, retreat activities included interactive surveys, video screening, group discussions, and a strategic planning session. Feedback from the attendees encouraged a platform for cross-agency collaboration to assist in the District’s effort to decrease the prevalence of racial disparities in the justice system.

DISPROPORTIONATE MINORITY CONTACT SUCCESS STORY

Charnette Robinson, Commander of the Youth Investigations Branch of the Metropolitan Police Department was very involved with the Court’s DRM effort. She reported the number of diversions implemented in 2008 as part of the prevention approach to DRM. But the data was limited because while a lot of information was captured in the diversion log books, it was very time intensive to review the logs to determine: the number of youth diverted, the reasons for diversion, where the youth lived, where the youth were arrested, what school they attended, if they had previously been diverted, and other information that officers would need to determine eligibility for diversion. Commander Robinson immediately recognized the need for creating an electronic diversion database for the Juvenile Processing Center. MPD set out to create a diversion database that was searchable by officers at the juvenile processing center and capable of producing monthly reports that could aid policy-making decisions. CJCC staff assisted Commander Robinson in digitizing the juvenile diversion log books going back to 2005. A database was developed with search functions and input forms to reflect all the information previously only captured in the diversion log books. Officers are now able to search the database to see whether youth are eligible for diversion at the point of arrest. Commander Robinson is able to receive monthly reports on the youth diverted, including number of youth, arrest allegation, residence, arrest location, school attended, arresting police officer’s district, and type of diversion program they were referred to. The officers are also now able to capture and report accurately on the race, ethnicity and gender of the youth diverted. This has been a significant step toward implementing and measuring prevention strategies and their impact on disproportionate minority representation.
NOTES
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