

# Criminal Justice Coordinating Council

## INFORMATION SHARING FORUM



## SUMMARY



MAY 16 **2025**

**Partnership for Public Service\***  
600 14th Street NW  
Suite 600  
Washington, DC 20005

\*event not affiliated with PPS



[cjcc.dc.gov](http://cjcc.dc.gov)

# ABOUT JUSTIS

The Justice Information System, or JUSTIS, is the District of Columbia's Integrated Justice Information System (IJIS). JUSTIS launched in 2002 and serves as the hub where District and federal agencies exchange and share criminal and juvenile justice information in near-real time. CJCC actualizes its core function of facilitating automated information sharing via JUSTIS. JUSTIS serves as a cost-effective mechanism for interagency communication, replacing manual information sharing with automatic functions that minimize response times and enhance the overall administration of justice in the District of Columbia.

JUSTIS has two modules. The JUSTIS Information Portal makes criminal history information from multiple agencies available on one interface. The JUSTIS Exchange facilitates the exchange of data from one agency's records management system to another. JUSTIS has 3,700 users across 33 District and federal agencies. JUSTIS has over 5 million records and, in FY24, averaged 760 logins and 4,200 searches per day.



# SYPNOSIS

After a six-year hiatus, the CJCC reconvened the Information Sharing Forum (ISF). The ISF provided an opportunity for adult criminal justice, juvenile justice, judicial, and public safety stakeholders to identify their information sharing needs and challenges, and to propose solutions to address these gaps. This year's ISF focused on JUSTIS, to include an overview of the current system, a discussion among agencies about how JUSTIS supports their operations, and a presentation on JUSTIS modernization. The ISF included breakout sessions that helped the CJCC understand the participants' information needs. The event concluded with a panel presentation on clean slate laws in different jurisdictions.

This document summarizes key takeaways from each session of the forum.

---

## Overview of JUSTIS

*Speaker: Marc Irlandez, Chief Information Officer, CJCC*

Marc Irlandez, CJCC's CIO, opened the ISF with a comprehensive overview of JUSTIS, offering participants a deeper understanding of the system, including a description of the agencies participating in JUSTIS; the type of data and information in JUSTIS and who has access to it; how CJCC transmits information through the JUSTIS Information Portal and JUSTIS Exchange; and notable (and perhaps less known) features of JUSTIS, such as custom notifications and reports.

CIO Irlandez's presentation described JUSTIS' adherence to and compliance with key federal security requirements, such as the Federal Information Security Modernization Act (FISMA) and the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), Security and Privacy (SP) 500-53 Rev. 5. It also described CJCC's plan to modernize JUSTIS, including the project description, the vendor, Ernst & Young (EY), and their experience in migrating similar systems to the cloud.

---

## JUSTIS User Panel Discussion

*Moderator: Colleen Moses, IT Project Manager, CJCC*

Colleen Moses moderated a panel of agency representatives from the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency (CSOSA), the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD), the Public Defender Service (PDS), the Pretrial Services Agency (PSA), and the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia (USAO-DC). These agency partners comprise the bulk of

JUSTIS users. The panelists discussed how JUSTIS supports their respective agency decision-making and operations, the value of special features and reports in JUSTIS, and identified opportunities to enhance criminal justice information sharing via JUSTIS, as well as through other mechanisms.

Specifically, CSOSA shared that JUSTIS helps the agency with monitoring supervised individuals, preparing pre-sentence investigation reports, and obtaining information needed for sex offender registry data. MPD relies on JUSTIS to locate individuals and verify known addresses for serving search warrants, as well as vehicle and license status when investigating shooting and firearms violations. PDS assigns cases based on court information received through the JUSTIS Exchange. PSA obtains information to support development of the Pretrial Services Report, which is used by judges to inform release decisions, and to verify defendants' demographic information and criminal history. Lastly, USAO-DC uses the system to access information needed to make papering decisions and access court orders, such as Order to Show Cause. JUSTIS is also convenient because attorneys can access court case information from JUSTIS within the courtroom.

*The panelists highlighted how critical JUSTIS is to their agencies, stating they cannot envision fulfilling their respective agencies' missions without JUSTIS as an information sharing tool*

*Following the ISF, CJCC obtained and compiled information from each of the 30+ agencies that use JUSTIS to understand how JUSTIS supports their agencies' operations and decision-making. Below is a summary of the agencies' responses.*

| <i>Viewing Agency</i> | <i>Agency Type</i> | <i>Total Queries</i> | <i>Examples of How Agency Use JUSTIS</i>   |
|-----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--|
| <b>ATF</b>            | Federal            | 1,889                | No information at this time  |
| <b>CFSA</b>           | District           | 11,699               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Obtain court-ordered drug test results for parents in neglect cases</li> <li>Locate current address</li> <li>Determine whether parent is incarcerated</li> <li>Determine whether parent is involved in another case</li> </ul>  |
| <b>CSOSA</b>          | Federal            | 241,526              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Determine workflow and case assignments</li> <li>Obtain documents needed to generate pre-sentence investigation reports</li> <li>View regional arrests in MD, PA, and DE</li> <li>Receive notifications of new DC arrests</li> <li>Obtain information needed for sex offender registry</li> </ul> |



| <i>Viewing Agency</i>          | <i>Agency Type</i> | <i>Total Queries</i> | <i>Examples of How Agency Use JUSTIS</i>  |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|---|
| <b>DBH</b>                     | District           | 42,393               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use court data to develop forensic reports</li> <li>• Verify personal identifying information</li> <li>• Review case history</li> <li>• Obtain charge information for the competency process for those ordered to St. Elizabeth's</li> </ul>   |
| <b>DC Clemency Board</b>       | District           | 214                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determine whether individuals seeking clemency are eligible</li> <li>• Determine whether all administrative and judicial relief has been sought</li> <li>• Obtain case history and documents needed for application</li> </ul>   |
| <b>DC Superior Court</b>       | Judicial           | 29,279               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Part of COOP plan, where JUSTIS is back-up to court's case management system</li> <li>• Obtain broader case history on defendants beyond what is in the court's system (e.g., arrest, supervision, and incarceration history)</li> <li>• View regional arrest history in MD, PA, DE</li> <li>• Serves as the court's data quality assurance (DQA) mechanism</li> </ul>   |
| <b>DOC</b>                     | District           | 55,390               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepare reports and obtain documents for inmate release</li> <li>• View regional arrest history in MD, PA, DE</li> </ul>   |
| <b>DYRS</b>                    | District           | 13,225               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Obtain charge information and prior court involvement to complete risk assessments</li> <li>• Confirm upcoming court hearings</li> <li>• Determine adult court involvement for youth and their parents/guardians</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Federal Public Defender</b> | Federal            | 1,069                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pull DCSC case history to calculate sentencing guidelines</li> <li>• Find attorneys of record for clients and witnesses</li> <li>• Receive alerts for new arrests and charges of clients</li> <li>• Identify any conflicts of interest for attorneys</li> </ul>  |
| <b>HIDTA</b>                   | Regional           | 112                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analytical case support for law enforcement groups/initiatives by providing the case information to the investigators</li> </ul>   |
| <b>MPD</b>                     | District           | 259,932              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides access to information, whether in the office or the field, to allow for efficient and informed decision-making</li> <li>• View regional arrests in MD, PA, and DE</li> <li>• Verify whether individuals must register as gun offenders</li> <li>• Verify addresses for search warrants</li> <li>• Receive alerts for individuals with active bench warrants</li> <li>• Obtain criminal history to conduct investigations</li> <li>• Verify stay away orders and release conditions</li> </ul> |
| <b>Metro Transit Police</b>    | Regional           | 15                   | No information at this time   |

| <i>Viewing Agency</i>          | <i>Agency Type</i> | <i>Total Queries</i> | <i>Examples of How Agency Use JUSTIS</i>  |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|---|
| <b>OAG</b>                     | District           | 31,944               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Search DMV license status</li> <li>• Search for information on adult co-defendants</li> <li>• Obtain daily court schedule to inform case handling</li> </ul>   |
| <b>OIG</b>                     | District           | 152                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Obtain criminal history and photographs</li> <li>• Corroborate information from other sources</li> <li>• Obtain DMV license and insurance information</li> </ul>   |
| <b>PDS</b>                     | District           | 156,575              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inform case assignments for attorneys (i.e., ensure client has same attorney for multiple cases)</li> <li>• Verify criminal history of clients</li> <li>• Check for open warrants and stay away orders</li> <li>• Obtain mugshots</li> </ul>   |
| <b>PSA</b>                     | Federal            | 237,901              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Obtain information needed to generate Pretrial Service Report, which judge uses to make informed release decisions</li> <li>• Verify and update information on defendant's current status and criminal history (e.g., dispositions, sentencing, release status, court order conditions, arrests, warrants, attorney information, etc.)</li> <li>• View regional arrests in MD, PA, and DE</li> <li>• Support case management and planning for defendant supervision</li> </ul> |
| <b>Sentencing Commission</b>   | District           | 8,719                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Receive court case information and arrest information to fulfill statutory reporting responsibilities</li> </ul>   |
| <b>USAO</b>                    | Federal            | 285,955              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Receive necessary information to make papering decisions</li> <li>• Communicate papering decisions to relevant parties</li> <li>• Access court case information</li> <li>• Receive notification of rearrest of defendants</li> <li>• Determine custody status of defendants</li> <li>• Obtain juvenile drug test results, when relevant</li> <li>• View regional arrests in MD, PA, and DE</li> </ul>  |
| <b>US Supreme Court Police</b> | Federal            | 499                  | No information at this time   |
| <b>US Capitol Police</b>       | Federal            | 12,930               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access critical documents (i.e., judgment and commitment order, stay away order, Gerstein, etc.)</li> </ul>  |
| <b>US Marshals Service</b>     | Federal            | 66,687               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• View regional arrests in MD, PA, and DE</li> </ul>   |
| <b>US Parole Commission</b>    | Federal            | 9,380                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access critical documents (i.e., judgment and commitment order, supervised release order, stay away order, Gerstein, etc.)</li> <li>• Obtain case information for hearings and case reviews</li> </ul>   |



| Viewing Agency                          | Agency Type | Total Queries | Examples of How Agency Use JUSTIS   |
|---|-------------|---------------|---|
| US Postal Inspection Service            | Federal     | 298           | No information at this time   |
| US Probation Office (DC)                | Federal     | 8,930         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>View regional arrests in MD, PA, and DE</li> </ul> |
| US Park Police                          | Federal     | 358           | No information at this time   |
| US Probation and Pretrial Services (MD) | Federal     | 3,318         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>View regional arrests in MD, PA, and DE</li> </ul> |
| US Secret Service                       | Federal     | 13,327        | No information at this time   |

*Note: The following agencies are authorized to access the JUSTIS information portal, however, they did not have any active users during FY24, largely due to turnover and change in responsibilities for staff. CJCC is working with these agencies to reinstate their staffs' access to JUSTIS: DCHA, DMV, FEMS, FBI (WFO), HSEMA, US District Court.*

---

## JUSTIS Modernization Presentation

*Speaker: Subhankar Sarkar, Managing Director, Technology Consulting, Ernst & Young, LLP*

In March 2025, CJCC engaged in a contract with Ernst & Young, LLP (EY) to modernize JUSTIS. JUSTIS has not had a significant upgrade since 2006. The software used to run the JUSTIS Exchange reaches end-of-life in January 2027. As a result, CJCC is rebuilding and modernizing JUSTIS to meet the pressing operational needs of our partners.

Subhankar Sarkar discussed the JUSTIS modernization effort, as well as lessons learned from modernizing similar systems in other jurisdictions. Mr. Sarkar described common issues in justice systems (such as disparate repositories), issues specific to the District and CJCC (such as the interconnection between local and federal data), and the outlook based on the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) adoption for JUSTIS for data standardization and interoperability.

Attendees also enjoyed a demonstration of JUSTIS 2.0, the new look and feel, the platform's key features and benefits, and program phases and objectives, which garnered praise and excitement from attendees.

---

## The National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) Presentation

*Speaker: Paul Wormeli, Innovation Strategist, Paul Wormeli Consulting, LLP*

Paul Wormeli described NIEM and its enhancement of criminal justice information sharing nationwide. NIEM is a common vocabulary that enables efficient information exchange across diverse organizations. The NIEM model defines terms and relationships for data exchange. NIEM is valuable because it does not require agencies to adopt standard terms in their own records management systems. It is a tool that determines when different terms have the same meaning (e.g., last name, surname, family name) and communicates such common meanings across systems.

Mr. Wormeli described how information sharing is at the heart of the criminal justice enterprise: from arrest, intake, prosecution, and adjudication—all via criminal justice databases. He described how the development of disparate and segmented data systems within and across levels of government has resulted in obstacles to sharing information, such as matching data, charge code standardization, and incompatible databases. He explained that systems such as JUSTIS, and in particular the modernized version of JUSTIS being developed, would help remedy such information sharing challenges. Mr. Wormeli also described the next generation of data integration for information sharing, including artificial intelligence, and data operability.

---

## Breakout Discussions and Debrief

CJCC staff moderated the breakout sessions, where attendees joined different groups based on their role in the criminal or juvenile justice system, including non-criminal justice partners, to discuss how they use JUSTIS, their information sharing protocols, needs, and challenges, and to offer feedback on improving JUSTIS in furtherance of leveraging information sharing to include a wider audience.

The ISF breakout sessions included Law Enforcement, Prosecutors, Judicial and Defense, Corrections and Community Supervision, and Non-Criminal Justice partners. After the respective sessions culminated, attendees gathered to share their feedback with the other groups. During the debrief, participants shared their perspectives on issues impacting their ability to share and receive information through JUSTIS.

---

## Challenges with Existing Information in JUSTIS

**Juvenile Data and Information:** The current restrictions on juvenile data and information are a major hindrance to users. While adult criminal history is available, limited access to juvenile records (e.g., court dates, past charges) inhibits the ability to hold offenders accountable.

The juvenile portal in JUSTIS does not meet the needs of the DC Office of the Attorney General (OAG). This forces them to use a separate system (i.e., DCSC CourtView), which impedes their ability to manage juvenile cases.

**Lack of Proactive Notifications and Systemic Automation:** JUSTIS is reactive; users must run a query to get information. They have no way of knowing about important events or changes unless they actively search for them. There are no automatic notifications for several critical events.

**Information Silos and Lack of Interagency Sharing:** Information in JUSTIS is often siloed, incomplete, or difficult to access, leading to a fragmented understanding of an individual's criminal history. JUSTIS is person-based, and users see the need for an incident-based search to better understand the full scope of a crime.

**Integrated Automated Data Flows:** The flow of information in JUSTIS from the agency/to the feed is not seamless. The current system requires additional manual calls and requests. For example, the DC Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency (CSOSA) must call the DC Department of Corrections (DOC)'s case managers to obtain pre-release information. This is a prime example of a broken loop that needs to be automated.

**Inefficient Communication and Processes:** OAG relies on weekly emails from the US Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia (USAO-DC) for critical case information, and even then, they don't know the specific charges USAO-DC is keeping. This creates a significant delay in making mixed case charging decisions.

The DC Public Defender Service (PDS) must manually search for warrant information.

**Static Feeds and Unreliable Data:** Documents from the DC Pretrial Services Agency (PSA), such as drug test results, are static in the feed. This forces agencies like the USAO-DC to email someone at Pretrial Services to get real-time information for a detention hearing.

**-Incomplete Data:** The information available in JUSTIS is not comprehensive.

**DC Department of Motor Vehicle (DMV) Information:** DMV addresses are often unreliable (e.g., shelters, etc.), which poses a challenge for investigators because it does not verify this information.

**Papering Decisions:** The DC Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) would like access to the reasoning behind "no papered" decisions on warrants to write better warrants and improve the process/training. There's a recognized need for a better feedback loop on what happens to cases that are "no-papered" or transferred to federal agencies. Having this information in JUSTIS would improve internal processes and training.

**DC Department of Corrections (DOC) Release Information:** Proactive notification in JUSTIS of an individual's release from DOC would provide information to law enforcement such as updated release date reports that account for jail credits.

**Civil Protection Orders (CPOs), Stay Away Orders (SAO), and Alleged Violation Reports (AVRs):** There is no proactive measure in JUSTIS to know what addresses are associated with these orders without running a query in another.

**Usability and Usability and Functionality Gaps:** JUSTIS has some limitations in functionality and user experience.

- JUSTIS is not mobile friendly.
- There is no way to track multiple CCNs (Criminal Case Numbers) in JUSTIS at once.

**Single Sign-On:** JUSTIS needs a single sign-on or Login.gov to simplify access.

- JUSTIS users expressed concerns with the current timeout period for staying logged into JUSTIS when not actively used. (Note: In response to this concern, in July 2025, CJCC increased the timeout length from 20 to 30 minutes so that JUSTIS users can remain in their session for longer without having to log back in.)

**Standardized Identifiers:** MPD does not issue PDIDs (Police Department Identification) for everyone, which is a challenge. Attendees suggest a "national biometric" identifier as the standard.

---

## Areas for Improvement- Additional Information Partners would like to have in JUSTIS

**Juvenile Case Data:** Attendees from CSOSA, DC Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services (DYRS), DC Child and Family Services Agency (CFSA), the DC Superior Court (DCSC), and Court Social Services Division (CSSD) noted they would like to have access to juvenile information, especially for those who transition into the adult system, to understand their full history (e.g., weapon or violence charges) and assess potential risks.

- **Juvenile and Adult System Disconnect:** There's a need for a mechanism to see both adult and juvenile information simultaneously, something only specific agencies like CJCC and DYRS currently have.

- Notifications of duplicate juvenile records are needed in JUSTIS when a youthful offender gets re-arrested.

*Case Status (Appeals/Evidence):* An alert or notification system is needed in JUSTIS to inform arresting officers when a case is up for appeal. This would help manage evidence (e.g., prevent destruction of guns that are still evidentiary).

- *Evidence Control:* An automated sign-off process is needed in JUSTIS to know when appeals are exhausted, so evidence can be disposed of.

*Data on Cases Prosecuted Federally:* A significant gap exists in the feedback loop when a case (e.g., carjacking) goes from DC Superior Court to a federal agency. Users do not know what happens to the case, preventing them from understanding the outcome.

*Criminal History Flags:* The ability to flag important information like gun registry, sex offense status, and other critical criminal history details would be a "useful function" in JUSTIS to avoid having to sift through so many documents.

*Vital Records Data (including out of state/country information):* JUSTIS should flag deceased individuals to prevent warrants from being issued on dead people and help with evidence management. Matching social security numbers from JUSTIS with vital records could be a solution.

*Sex Offender and Gun Registry Mapping:* There is a need for access to this information in JUSTIS for various agencies, such as the DC Housing Authority (DCHA), especially for background checks.

*Gun Violence Data:* Users would like to access detailed gun violence data directly from JUSTIS.

*Relative/Relationship Mapping:* The ability to map relationships among individuals (e.g., people who have lived at the same address, relatives who commit the same crime, or links between victims and defendants) would be highly beneficial.

- *Identical Twin Indicators:* The ability to identify twins or other relatives will be a useful function to have in JUSTIS, as PDID matches could be incorrect, and it's a helpful data point for investigations.

*Public Housing and Public Assistance Information:* MPD needs access to DCHA's database to know where public housing locations, cameras, and residents on public assistance will reside post-release.

- Attendees suggested that agencies enter into Memorandum of Understandings (MOUs) with CJCC about data sharing and privacy rules for users to access public assistance data in JUSTIS.

*Electronic/GPS Monitoring:* Attendees would like information on who is on electronic monitoring or when a tracker disconnects. CSOSA has this data, but it's not being shared with other agencies through JUSTIS.

*Other Databases:* Users would like access to specific external databases to integrate in JUSTIS for a more complete picture, such as:

- Vinelink or a similar system.
- Resources for immigration matters.
- PACER for District Court information.
- PRISM for a more comprehensive view of out-of-state convictions.
- CLEAR (though its cost and limited licenses are a challenge).

*Printing Large Case Files:* Users would like the ability to print large files directly from JUSTIS.

*Data-sharing agreements with non-criminal justice partners:* Non-Criminal Justice groups, like the DC Office of Neighborhood Safety and Engagement (ONSE), the DC Office of Victims Services and Justice Grants (OVSJG), and the DC Department of Behavioral Health (DBH) are locked out of crucial data needed to inform their decision-making and provide timely interventions.

- Attendees recommended creating different levels of access to ensure that agencies like DBH and ONSE can get the specific, identifiable data they need without compromising sensitive information.

*Streamlined Procedures for Accounts and Training:* Attendees recommended CJCC offer outreach about training and how non-criminal justice agencies can obtain access to JUSTIS.

- The process for adding new users is a significant problem. It is not online (automated); applicants are often rejected without instantaneous feedback, and this creates delays in getting new team members up and running.
- Create an online user application form that provides instantaneous decisions and feedback, streamlining the onboarding process for new staff.
- Develop and provide training on underutilized features like reports.

---

## Expanded Access to Information Currently in JUSTIS

*MARIS Arrest Information (including DC, DE, MD, PA, and VA):* Users would like to have access to arrest data from mid-Atlantic states, including data from Virginia.

*Proactive Notifications and Alerts:*

- Protection/Stay Away/Stalking Orders (CPOs): A proactive notification system in JUSTIS would be "very useful" to be aware of what addresses are associated with

these orders without having to run a query or receive notifications by an upset person.

*Juvenile Data:* Users would like the ability to search archived juvenile records by date range, and access case documents.

*Warrants:* Users want a warrant notification feature, possibly a "warrant report," to be alerted when a warrant gets issued.

*Tracker/GPS Monitoring:* Notifications in JUSTIS are needed when a person disconnects a tracker or when someone on electronic monitoring is living in a particular building.

*Mapping Data:* A mapping feature in JUSTIS that represents different agencies' data with different colors and allows for ranking addresses by most recent entry would be useful.

*Set Aside/Sealed Cases:* A more robust process is needed to ensure that sealed and set-aside cases are no longer visible in JUSTIS, as well as a notification system for those who need to be informed.

*Stay-Away Orders (SAOs):* SAOs from the US Parole Commission (USPC) are not being shared, hindering the ability of agencies like MPD's Real-Time Crime Center to act proactively.

*DMV Data:* Users would like the specific reasons for license suspensions or revocations, which is currently not available in JUSTIS.

*US Federal Bureau of Prisons (FBOP) Data:* CSOSA users would like to have FBOP release information.

---

### Clean Slate Panel Presentation

*Speakers: Destiny Garcia, Executive Director, Clean Slate Utah*

*Katrina Garrett, Manager, Criminal History Section, Criminal Justice Information Center (CJIC), Michigan State Police*

*Katie Svoboda-Kindle, Implementation Director, The Clean Slate Initiative*

*Corporal Brad Timbrell, Bureau of Records and Identification, Pennsylvania State Police*

*Moderator: Noella Sudbury, Founder & CEO, RASA*

Noella Sudbury moderated the last panel at the ISF, where panelists discussed how they implemented clean slate laws in their respective jurisdictions. The District of Columbia enacted the Second Chance Amendment Act in 2022, which expanded eligibility for records to be sealed or expunged; simplified the records sealing and expungement process; and allowed for automatic expungement for certain offenses. The "by motion" provisions of the Act took effect in March 2025, and the "automatic" provisions will take effect in October 2027.

Representatives from Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Utah described their respective approaches to implementing the “by motion” and “automatic” sealing and expungement provisions, the factors that contributed to their success, and lessons learned. Most importantly, the representatives discussed the return on investment for their efforts and the millions who have benefited from clean slate laws legislation. The Clean Slate Initiative’s implementation director, Katie Svoboda-Kindle, described the organization’s role in supporting jurisdictions’ implementation efforts, its technical offerings and partners, and provided insights into the positive impacts of these reforms.

MI, PA, and UT’s representatives shared when and how their clean slate laws passed; timeframes to implement the automatic process; who led and facilitated implementation (i.e., the courts, versus the state police, versus corrections, etc.); the key stakeholders involved (such as government and non-government organizations); the process for identifying eligible cases, challenges (i.e., data discrepancies and backlogs), and the role technology played towards success (including developing algorithms for data processing).

---

### *Michigan Implementation Highlights*

Michigan’s Clean Slate Law, enacted in 2020, expanded the expungement process by introducing automatic expungement for certain convictions, effective April 2021, and later updated to August 2023, to allow for sufficient time to make technology updates to facilitate implementation. The courts and the Michigan State Police (MSP) automatically process eligible cases (set-aside), thus eliminating the need for individuals to apply.

MSP developed an automated process in its Criminal History Record (CHR) database to identify and set aside eligible convictions. They also configured the CHR database to generate a daily file of all eligible convictions and transmit the file to relevant courts in the state via secure transfer. MSP also developed the Internet Criminal History Access Tool (iChat), which allows individuals to view their public criminal records.

Challenges included: decentralized and incomplete data, lack of public awareness about expungement eligibility, and potential employer access to unofficial records. Solutions involved modernizing data systems, public awareness campaigns, and addressing the unregulated nature of private background screening services.

Integrating technology and addressing data management challenges were key to the effective implementation in Michigan. Automatic expungement addresses backlogs of applications that

previously caused delays in the expungement process, and aims to improve employment, housing, and educational opportunities for formerly justice-involved persons. If a conviction doesn't qualify for automatic expungement, individuals can still apply to have their record cleared through a petition-based process.

---

### *Pennsylvania Implementation Highlights*

Pennsylvania's Clean Slate Law, enacted in 2018, was the first in the nation to automatically seal eligible low-level criminal records, starting in 2019. In 2023, Clean Slate 3.0 expanded eligibility to include certain non-violent felonies and reduced waiting periods for sealing misdemeanors to 7 years, and summary convictions to 5 years. The law also introduced automatic pardon-based expungement. The expanded provisions took effect in February 2024, with automated sealing starting in June 2024.

Key highlights included the automated process, eligibility criteria based on offense type and conviction-free periods, and the accessibility of sealed records to law enforcement but not the public. PA had a longer time to implement the process with two to three years to test and one year for backlog. PA also had an in-house vendor to build and maintain the Computerized Criminal History (CCH) repository thus it did not have to build a new system to implement the clean slate legislation.

Pennsylvania's Clean Slate Law uses technology to automate the sealing of eligible criminal records after individuals complete their sentences and remain crime-free, shifting the burden from individuals to the state. The system includes digitized and centralized records for efficiency and accuracy, computer algorithms to identify eligible records, and online screening tools for checking eligibility. There is also potential for artificial intelligence to assist in tasks like identifying eligible individuals and drafting expungement petitions. Overall, technology is essential for automating the process, ensuring accuracy, and making record clearance more accessible.

*Pennsylvania automatically sealed about 35 million records within its first year after implementation, while Michigan automatically sealed over 1.4 million convictions*



Challenges included lack of public awareness and technical issues, which required improved outreach and record-keeping systems. For Pennsylvania, having good communication in place with the state's court system, which includes receiving electronic dispositions since 1980, was critical. The court would send the information to seal or expunge a

case to the Pennsylvania State Police (PSP), who would validate it on its end and automatically seal or expunge it and then notify the court once it is complete. PSP did not have any conflict with different agencies because they only had to work with the Court. The law has provided a fresh start for many, becoming a model for other states' "second chance" initiatives.

---

### *Utah Implementation Highlights*

Utah's Clean Slate Law, enacted in 2019, automates the expungement of certain minor criminal records, aiding individuals in overcoming barriers to employment, housing, and education. Key highlights included automatic record clearance without petitions, eligibility for acquittals, dismissed cases, and most misdemeanor offenses, with exclusions for felonies and certain misdemeanors.

Key technological components included algorithms by Code for America for automated eligibility determination, data aggregation and processing, electronic communication and record updates with the Utah Bureau of Criminal Identification, online platforms like RASA Legal's application for checking eligibility, and electronic case management systems such as MyCase. This technology enables scalable record clearing, increases access to expungement by reducing complexity and cost, and decreases the burden on court systems.

The law aims to provide a more accessible and efficient expungement process, helping individuals to move forward positively. Currently, new expungement cases are suspended until January 2026, to address backlogs, with a workgroup formed to suggest improvements.



## **Criminal Justice Coordinating Council for the District of Columbia**

441 4<sup>th</sup> Street NW, Suite 715N

Washington, DC 20001-2714

(202) 442-9283

[www.cjcc.dc.gov](http://www.cjcc.dc.gov)

