



**City of St. Louis Criminal Justice Coordinating Council  
Office of the Mayor | St. Louis City Hall  
1200 Market Street | St. Louis Missouri 63103**

**Circuit Court Judge Michael K. Mullen | Chairperson  
Debbie J. Allen, Interim Executive Director | Executive Adviser to the Mayor**

February 19, 2021

Corrections Task Force Committee:

Per your request, I am sending you this summary of the work that the City's Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (CJCC) has conducted related to the initial pretrial phase of the criminal justice system for the City of St. Louis. My remarks will mainly focus on the steps involved from booking, bond determination, detention. Any questions about pretrial court proceedings should be directed to Presiding Judge Michael Stelzer.

The CJCC began its work on the matter in the winter of 2018 and continues this day through the three CJCC's standing Committees—Alternatives to Incarceration, Information Sharing Governance and Public Health.

A "16B" Working Group was formed in the spring of 2019 to offer the Circuit Court input from the various criminal justice agencies and community-based stakeholders regarding the implementation of Missouri Supreme Court rule changes effective July 1, 2019 including Rule 33 (Misdemeanors or Felonies—Right to Release—Conditions and related rules). This working group was chaired by Judge Michael K. Mullen and informally co-chaired by Judge Rex Burlison, the presiding judge at the time.

All the jurisdiction's state and local criminal justice agencies served on the working group including: Circuit Court and its Municipal Division, Circuit Court's Bond Office, Sheriff's Office, Circuit Attorney's Office, City Corrections Division, City Police Division, and Missouri State Probation and Parole - Eastern District. The Missouri State Highway Patrol – CJIS Division was an asset to us, too. Judge Mullen, Nathan Graves, in his capacity as the Chair of the CJCC's Information Sharing Governance Committee, and I also met with Special Agent In Charge Richard Quinn of the FBI's St. Louis Division eliciting feedback on what he perceived as needing improvement regarding the sharing of information between federal, state and local agencies.

In addition to this core "criminal justice agency" group, the District Public Defender also participated. Additionally, and when appropriate, community-based behavioral health organizations were also invited to participate in discussions involving the assessments and/or services provided to detainees as part of bond determination.

This work became more than just implementing Rule 33; attention was also needed related to booking and detention. The composition of the work brought to light the need for new or better governance, coordinated data systems, agreements, and the need to reestablish trust and harmony among agencies, their staff and leadership. We all recognized that this work was a critical path to improving operational efficiencies within and between the agencies thereby improving the local criminal justice system itself. Therefore, we intentionally dug deep into the issues then and continue to do so today.

It's important to understand that the City's Justice Center is not just the "jail", it is the epicenter of a host of functions and agencies that are involved in bookings, bond determination, and detention. It involves the Sheriff's Office, City Corrections Division, City Police Division, and the Circuit Court's Bond Office. The Police Division is responsible for booking, the Sheriff's Office is responsible for transporting detainees, and the City Corrections Division is responsible for housing detainees and inmates. And the Bond Office is responsible for conducting a bond interview, and the information gathered, is considered by a judge during the initial appearance for bond determination. The prosecutor and defense attorney also provide information to the judge for consideration.

The complexity of this initial phase has resulted in the development and use of multiple separate data systems to manage individuals through this process. The police have a booking system to handle fingerprinting and the creation of the criminal history record; corrections use a system called “preadmit” that was developed to manage the transfer of custody of detainees between the police, sheriff, and corrections during the bond determination phase. Bond officers use the court’s case management system and other systems to do their job; sheriff deputies rely on all these separate systems to do their job. Should the detainee be ordered to jail without bond (inmate) after the initial appearance hearing, corrections staff enter data about the detainee from the “preadmit” system into their jail management system. Because of the many different entities involved in this process, no one system contains all information relevant to the detainee or inmate.

The "criminal justice agency" core group began their work by touring each criminal justice agency and literally walking through the steps of the existing pretrial process. The group observed agency operations, reviewed existing policies, and asked questions of the agency heads and "boots on the ground" staff to learn about the roles/responsibilities and legal liabilities each agency has in this process. The group also reviewed data system outputs and compared those outputs between the different systems to see how the data was being represented as it moved between the systems.

Balancing this work with all criminal justice related federal and state regulations, policies and procedures that govern the work of criminal justice agencies, the core group began to consider what existing workflows needed to change or to be created to follow Rule 33. And, how to improve the pretrial process more broadly.

Because no one data system contains all the information relevant to the detainee or inmate, an effort is currently underway to combine data from various systems in an anonymized way for official use by the CJCC to understand how the local criminal justice system is utilized.

Throughout COVID, we have leveraged this working group to implement new workflows and technologies needed to support COVID-related protocols.

Then and now, we continue to educate key stakeholders and the broader community to the regulations, policies and procedures that govern the work of criminal justice agencies and the authority assigned to criminal justice agency heads. This is particularly true regarding the FBI’s CJIS policies. The essential premise of these policies is to provide controls to protect the full lifecycle of criminal justice information including the creation, viewing, modification, transmission, dissemination, storage, and destruction. This Policy applies to every individual—contractor, private entity, noncriminal justice agency representative, or member of a criminal justice entity—with access to, or who operate in support of, criminal justice services and information.

We also continue to act and promote the importance of working together as a team. No one agency or person can affect change, and yet, the action of one can upset the apple cart. Adoption of new or changes to existing regulations, policies, procedures, programming, or data systems should not occur in an echo chamber and without assessing the impact on the other parts of the local criminal justice system. This is profoundly true for the City of St. Louis since so many different agencies are involved. Uncoordinated changes do have consequences.

Sincerely,



Debbie J. Allen  
Interim Executive Director  
Executive Advisor to the Mayor