

ADULT COURT SERVICES 2018 ANNUAL REPORT

(Amended 08/12/19)



ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANTS

AMY BRITT
KELLY CLEVELAND RUHLMAN

COURT SERVICES OFFICERS

JENNIFER CLINKINBEARD
KAY CROUSE
LADONYA HILL
SULLONGE TURNER
DIANA WINN

COURT SERVICES SUPERVISOR

BRANDON WALKER

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	1
HISTORY OF ADULT COURT SERVICES	2
OBJECTIVES OF ADULT COURT SERVICES	4
FORWARD.....	5
2018 STATISTICAL OVERVIEW	6
BOND INVESTIGATIONS	8
BOND SUPERVISION	11
HOME DETENTION/ELECTRONIC MONITORING PROGRAM.....	15
ACS SUPERVISED PROBATION.....	21
FINES & RELATED COSTS PROGRAM.....	23
ACS SUPERVISED JUDICIAL PAROLE	25
WORK SEARCH / WORK RELEASE.....	25
WORK & EDUCATION PROGRAM	25
COMMUNITY SERVICE WORK.....	26
VICTIM IMPACT PANEL	26
VIDEO CONFERENCING	27
MONETARY SAVINGS ESTIMATES	30
DISCONTINUED PROGRAMS, POLICIES AND PRACTICES	31

HISTORY OF ADULT COURT SERVICES

In 1961 the first formal pretrial release program in the United States was instituted in New York City. Known as the Manhattan Bail Project, its success generated national interest, and by 1965 multiple jurisdictions reported operating programs modeled after it, including the city of St. Louis.¹ On July 1, 1968, state Probation and Parole assumed the operations and functions of the St. Louis City Adult Probation Department, which included the city's pretrial release program.²

In 1972 the circuit judges of the 13th Judicial Circuit established the Director of Court Services position, which would later become known as the Court Administrator. The primary focus was the administration of juvenile court programs, but the position also had other responsibilities and objectives related to the criminal court, one of which was a mandate to explore and implement a pretrial release program.³ In 1973 the Director of Court Services conducted a feasibility study of pretrial release,⁴ but no formal program was established at that time.

In 1975 state Probation and Parole formally acknowledged an intent and willingness to provide pretrial investigation and supervision services to all of Missouri's trial courts,⁵ however, the final decision to do so appears to have been made on a district by district basis. Anecdotal evidence suggests Boone County began receiving these services in the mid to late 1970s.

In 1981 state Probation and Parole eliminated pretrial investigations and supervision services for Boone County, citing a lack of funding.⁶ At the same time a Jail Study Task Force was established to study the Boone County Jail overcrowding problem and make recommendations concerning alternatives to incarceration. Recognizing the importance of pretrial release services, and upon recommendations of the Jail Study Task Force, Boone County provided funds to the Circuit Court to establish the Adult Court Services (ACS) office and employ a full time Court Services Officer (CSO) to conduct Bond Investigations and Bond Supervision. In early 1982 the position was filled, and later that year a second CSO position was added to assist the first and implement the Community Service Work program. With this addition the first CSO began assuming administrative and supervisory duties.

In 1983 state Probation and Parole eliminated certain supervision services to misdemeanants. The Fines, Costs and Restitution program was created in the ACS office to provide collection services for some cases previously collected by state Probation and Parole.

In 1988 a federal court limited inmate census at the Boone County Jail, which required excess jail inmates to be housed at other jails. To negate the cost of housing defendants in other facilities, an electronically monitored Home Detention program was established to provide an additional alternative to jail incarceration. A new CSO position was added to administer this program. With this addition, ACS staff consisted of the supervisor, two CSOs and an administrative assistant.

¹ Schnacke, T.R., Jones, M.R., Brooker, C.M.B. The History of Bail and Pretrial Release. *Pretrial Justice Institute*, p. 10, 12

² *Missouri Blue Book*, 1969-1970, p. 402

³ Court Services Director Emphasizes Involvement. (1972, November 18). *Columbia Missourian*, p. 3

⁴ Jury Report Overlooks Jail Renovation Factors. (1973, July 8). *Columbia Missourian*, p. 27

⁵ *Missouri Blue Book*, 1975-1976, p. 1014.

⁶ County to Ask City for Input on Investigator. (1981, November 25). *Columbia Missourian*, p. 6B

In 1990 the Fines, Costs and Restitution program was expanded after policy changes resulted in more types of cases being supervised. The Home Detention program also saw a significant increase. A third CSO was added to assist with these growing programs.

In 1992 the Victim Impact Panel (VIP) was implemented in Boone County to help alcohol and traffic offenders understand the consequences of their actions. ACS was given responsibility to track and assist this program.

In 1997 the jail administered Work and Education program commenced, with ACS providing reports to assist the court in determining participation. The court also approved the implementation of a dedicated video link between the courthouse and jail to be used in certain associate circuit court proceedings. ACS began using this video system to interview jail inmates for investigation purposes and assumed responsibility for collecting and reporting statistical data on its use.

The beginning of the 21st century was a period of growth and change for the office. In 2001 ACS began providing reports to the court to assist in determining participation in the Reality House administered Work Search/Work Release program. With passage of the Law Enforcement Sales Tax in 2002, the Boone County Commission funded a fourth and fifth CSO in 2003 and 2004 to work with an expanded Home Detention/Electronic Monitoring program, which included the new technologies of alcohol monitoring (adopted in 2002), and GPS (adopted in 2004), as well as the ACS supervised Probation and ACS supervised judicial Parole programs, created in 2003 and 2004, respectively.

Since 2004, ACS has experienced level staffing with five CSOs, two administrative assistants and the supervisor.

OBJECTIVES OF ADULT COURT SERVICES

The establishment of ACS was the result of a jail overcrowding problem. The development of ACS is the result of changing needs of the court.

ACS administers alternatives to incarceration. The objectives of ACS are:

1. Recommend pretrial release for defendants who cannot post initial bond, who pose little or no danger to themselves or to the community, and who are likely to appear in court.
2. Supervise defendants who are released from jail under ACS supervision as a condition of bond.
3. Provide an electronically monitored home detention program for intensive supervision of defendants. Participants include pretrial, pre-sentence, and sentenced defendants.
4. Supervise defendants who are placed under ACS supervision as a condition of probation.
5. Supervise defendants who are placed under ACS supervision as a condition of judicial parole.
6. Provide supervision, monitoring, and collection efforts for defendants placed under ACS supervision who owe fines and related costs.
7. Provide information to defendants on programs required as a condition of probation, such as the Victim Impact Panel (VIP), Stealing Offenders Program (STOP), Batterer Intervention Programs (BIP) and Substance Abuse Traffic Offender Program (SATOP).
8. Evaluate incarcerated defendants for the jail administered Work and Education program, which can include participation in Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous meetings, religious services, education, and trustee work. Successful participants receive a reduced sentence and prepare for release from jail.
9. Evaluate current and future Boone County Jail inmates for participation in the Reality House administered Work Search/Work Release program. Successful participants obtain and maintain employment, pay their confinement costs and earn income which could be used for court costs, fines, restitution, child support and other debts.
10. Supervise defendants ordered to perform community service work under ACS supervision.
11. Maintain and report statistical data on video use. Provide support and assistance to court administration staff who plan and schedule videoconference hearings for defendants housed in the Department of Corrections or other facilities.


FORWARD

2018 was the highest bond supervision caseload in office history as measured by the daily average, the continuation of a five year rising trend. Also, bond investigations submitted approached historic highs, a three year trend. Home detention/electronic monitoring and fines/costs collections figures remain similar to recent years, while probation supervision levels and home detention reports for commit sentences submitted continue an overall trend of decline since 2013. Judicial parole had no participation in 2018.

Although the court cannot calculate the impact, it should be noted that starting in October, 2017, the Boone Public Defender's Office began placing out of custody defendants on a waitlist for services. As of January, 2019, there were more than 640 of these cases. Public defenders have entered their appearance in waitlist cases, however, the waitlist continues to grow.


STATISTICAL OVERVIEW

Investigations By Type




In 2018, ACS initiated reports in 2,900 cases, a 5% decrease from 2017. Of these, 2,163 (75%) were bond investigations; 127 (4%) were home detention/sentencing reports; 323 (11%) were violation reports; 169 (6%) were informational reports and 94 (3%) were completion reports. The remaining 24 (1%) consisted of 11 work and education reports, 8 work search/ work release reports and 5 parole investigations.

For comparison, in 2017 ACS initiated reports in 3,059 cases. Of these, 2,120 (69%) were bond investigations; 129 (4%) were home detention/sentencing reports; 389 (13%) were violation reports; 202 (7%) were informational reports and 173 (6%) were completion reports. The remaining 46 (1%) consisted of 25 work and education reports, 11 work search/ work release reports and 10 parole investigations.



Investigations: Types of Charges or Convictions




Thirty-three percent of the charges or convictions referenced in 2018's investigations were for crimes against persons, 32% for crimes against property, 19% for drug-related offenses, 8% for alcohol related offenses, and 8% for traffic-related offenses (such as driving while suspended or revoked).

BOND INVESTIGATIONS

The court orders a bond investigation for defendants at the Boone County Jail who cannot post the initial bond set. ACS officers provide a thorough criminal history check and the defendant is interviewed about ties to the community, employment history, and other factors. Information is also obtained from third parties. The completed report presents the facts and recommends a course of action based on the subject's suitability for release from custody.


Recommendations regarding bond can include no reduction, home detention/electronic monitoring, reduction in bond, posting a percentage of the bond in cash or release on own recognizance ("ROR").




In 2018, ACS initiated bond investigations in 2,163 cases and completed or closed bond investigations in 2,159 cases. This compares to 2017's 2,120 and 2,125 respective figures. Of the 2,159 completed cases, 1,957 were initial or complete bond investigations representing 1,093 defendants. The remaining 202 were supplementary or subsequent bond investigations representing 124 defendants.

In 2018, 205 of the initiated bond investigation cases resulted in bond being posted or the matter being resolved prior to the completion of the bond investigation report. An additional 195 cases included defendants who did not qualify for a bond investigation. Reasons for this could include being under a detainer from the Department of Corrections or federal authorities, currently serving a commit jail sentence, or a refusal to be interviewed for the bond investigation. Of the remaining cases, ACS recommended no reduction in 63%, ROR in 19%, a reduced bond/percentage of bond in 13%, home detention/electronic monitoring in 3% and deferral to the court in 2%. This compares with 2017 recommendation rates of no reduction in 68%, ROR in 18%, a reduced bond/percentage of bond in 10%, home detention/electronic monitoring in 3% and deferral to the court in 1%.

ACS Bond Investigation Recommendations by Case




Court Response To ACS Bond Investigation Recommendations by Case



Of the bond investigations reviewed by the court in 2018, an order for no reduction was entered in 78% of the cases, ROR in 13%, reduced bond/percentage of bond in 7% and home detention/electronic monitoring in 2%. This compares with 2017 disposition rates of no reduction in 81% of the cases, ROR in 11%, reduced bond/ percentage of bond in 6% and home detention/electronic monitoring in 2%.

Bond Investigations: Percentage Completed In Three Days




The court orders bond investigations upon initial appearance, which is typically the next business day following an arrest and detention. Bond investigations can also be ordered at other times. ACS strives to submit these reports in a timely manner, with a goal of submitting at least 80% within three business days of the order. In 2018 ACS submitted 89% within three business days, equaling 2017's figure.

BOND SUPERVISION

Defendants released from custody pursuant to a bond investigation are typically subject to ACS supervision until disposition of the case. These defendants typically report at least once per week to ACS and provide updated information regarding employment, contact information (telephone number and address), attorney status, activities, and next court appearance date. Conditions may be applied to a defendant's release such as participating in treatment or counseling programs, restriction from visiting certain places, and having no contact with alleged victims or co-defendants. Defendants who do not report as directed or who are found to be in violation of their bond conditions are reported by ACS to the court and are subject to revocation.


For administrative purposes, the bond supervision population does not include pre-disposition defendants who are electronically monitored by ACS. Those defendants are included in the home detention/electronic monitoring population.

Bond Supervision: Charge Types




Thirty-five percent of 2018 bond supervision charge types were for crimes against persons, 32% for crimes against property, 17% for drug-related offenses, 8% for alcohol related offenses and 8% for traffic-related offenses (such as driving while suspended or revoked).

Bond Supervision: Participant Outcomes



There were 314 defendants removed from bond supervision in 2018. Of those removed, 58% were successful with the remaining 42% revoked by the court due to a violation of conditions. Of those revoked, 13% failed to appear, 10% absconded, 16% committed a new offense and 3% committed a technical violation. The most common technical violation was testing positive for drug or alcohol use.

Bond Supervision Daily Averages




Prior to 2015, ACS counted bond supervision days only after a defendant had first reported as directed. Since 2015, ACS gathers data by both the defendant's first check in date and their Boone County Jail release date. Defendants do not always report immediately upon release from jail. Reasons for delay can include a release time outside of regular business hours, the existence of outstanding warrants or holds that transfer the defendant directly to the custody of another


jurisdiction, immediate placement in a residential treatment program or transfer to a hospital for medical treatment.

The optimal daily inmate housing capacity for the Boone County Jail is 210. In 2018, the jail averaged 211 inmates in house with an additional 21 housed in other facilities, for a total daily inmate housing average of approximately 232. The 2018 cost estimates for inmates housed at other facilities are approximately \$37, which does not include transport costs. This report will base estimates for monetary savings on the \$37 figure.

The pre-disposition bond supervision program totaled 45,770 days of supervision in 2018, equating to an average of 125.4 participants per day (see chart on previous page). At a daily cost of \$37 for housing in other facilities, the 2018 figures could represent a savings of \$1,693,490.



During 2018 the pre-disposition bond supervision program had 414 participants, a 7% decrease from 2017's total of 446. These individuals were represented by 508 cases, a 4% decrease from the 530 cases in 2017.




In 2015 the court began requiring some defendants charged with certain DWI offenses to obtain an ignition interlock device and be placed in bond supervision. These conditions were required regardless of whether or not the defendant had already posted a surety bond. Fourteen (3%) of the 2018 participants and 1,733 (4%) of the 45,770 supervision days in 2018 can be attributed to this policy.

HOME DETENTION / ELECTRONIC MONITORING PROGRAM


ACS supervised home detention is an intensive supervision program that utilizes electronic monitoring equipment to assist in ensuring compliance. Defendants can participate in lieu of serving a jail sentence or as a condition of bond. ACS determines the defendant's eligibility for the program and makes a recommendation to the court through a bond investigation if in pretrial status, or through a home detention/electronic monitoring report if the defendant is serving a commit jail sentence. Public safety and program integrity are reflected in the screening, selection, and supervision of program participants.

All participants serving commit sentences, and many pretrial participants, are electronically monitored 24 hours a day and follow a pre-set schedule. ACS utilizes a variety of monitoring equipment and selects the most appropriate type for the situation. Depending on the equipment used, participants can be monitored when they enter and leave their residence, if they enter or leave specific locations or areas, and if they consume alcohol. At least one CSO is on call at all times to monitor and respond to alerts and issues that require immediate action.

In 2018, ACS completed reports in 126 cases to consider home detention/electronic monitoring program eligibility for defendants serving commit jail sentences, a minor decrease from the 129 cases in 2017. For those 2018 cases in which the court rendered a decision, 61% were granted placement in the ACS supervised home detention/electronic monitoring program, 27% were granted placement in a comparable program administered by a third party, and 12% were denied. In 2017, 70% were granted placement in the ACS supervised home detention/electronic monitoring program, 14% were granted placement in a comparable program administered by a third party and 16% were denied.




Home Detention/Electronic Monitoring: Types of Charges or Convictions



Twenty percent of 2018's home detention/electronic monitoring charges or convictions were for crimes against persons, 12% for crimes against property, 4% for drug-related offenses, 44% for alcohol related offenses and 20% for traffic-related offenses (such as driving while suspended or revoked).


Home Detention/Electronic Monitoring: Total Participant Outcomes




In 2018, 139 participants were removed from home detention/electronic monitoring with 124 (89%) successful and 15 (11%) revoked. Three participants committed a new offense, 4 absconded and the remaining 8 were for technical violations. These technical violations included testing positive for drug or alcohol use (6), failing to abide by program rules such as not reporting as directed, not abiding by the set curfew or engaging in unapproved or disallowed activity (1), and failing to appear for court (1).

Seventy-five of the removed participants were serving a commit jail sentence and the remaining 64 were pretrial. Of the revoked participants, 3 were serving a commit jail sentence and 12 were pretrial.


Home Detention/Electronic Monitoring: Commit Participant Outcomes



Home Detention/Electronic Monitoring: Pretrial Participant Outcomes




Home Detention / Electronic Monitoring Total Days of Supervision



The ACS supervised home detention/electronic monitoring program averaged 41.7 participants per day with a total of 15,238 days for the year in 2018. At \$37 per day this could represent a savings of \$563,806.

Home Detention / Electronic Monitoring: Pretrial vs Commit Supervision Days




Of the 15,238 days ACS monitored in 2018, 12,976 days (85%) of the total, were pretrial, and 2,262 days (15%) were for a commit sentence. Pretrial participants averaged approximately 109 days of supervision compared to commit participant's 30 day approximate average. The preceding

chart illustrates the estimated historical percentage of the daily representation of these two participant types.

In 2018, ACS supervised home detention/electronic monitoring for 194 participants in 224 cases. 119 (61%) of participants were in pretrial status and 75 (39%) were serving commit sentences. The case numbers were 141 (63%) in pretrial status and 83 (37%) serving commit.

In 2015, the court began requiring defendants charged with felony level DWI offenses to be electronically monitored for alcohol consumption. This condition was required regardless of whether or not the defendant had already posted a surety bond. In 2018, 78 (40%) of ACS supervised participants and 7,902 (52%) of 2018's supervision days can be attributed to this policy. If compared only to the pretrial participants and days, the respective figures are 66% of participants and 61% of supervision days.



ACS supervised home detention/electronic monitoring defendants can be required to pay fees to offset the cost of the program. Per Administrative Order 03-10, the standard daily cost is the greatest of the following: the state or federal minimum wage, the defendant's hourly salary, or the cost of the equipment to Boone County. In 2018 defendants paid the court \$137,749 to participate in the program. The court paid \$120,840 to its equipment vendor. The \$16,909 difference helped offset personnel and administrative costs of the program and helped to fund equipment for defendants who were truly unable to pay.

Per policy, ACS does not directly supervise home detention/electronic monitoring participants who reside outside of Boone County. However, individuals with out of county residences are still eligible for consideration. For those with commit sentences, ACS submits a report to the court assessing eligibility and providing a recommendation. For those candidates granted or ordered participation by the court, ACS verifies placement into and completion of a comparable program administered by an approved third party. In 2018, 23 defendants served 1,090 days in lieu of


commit sentences via third party electronic monitoring programs. At a cost of \$37 per day this could represent a savings of \$40,330.

As previously noted, in 2015 the court began requiring some defendants to be electronically monitored for alcohol consumption as a condition of pretrial release. In 2018, 16 defendants served 1,978 days in alcohol monitoring programs administered by third party entities due to a pretrial release condition. Pretrial defendants required to submit to electronic monitoring by a third party are also placed in the bond supervision program with standard conditions, including a condition to report to ACS regularly, and for administrative and statistical purposes they are included in the bond supervision population.


ADULT COURT SERVICES SUPERVISED PROBATION

The ACS supervised probation program began in 2003 in response to statutory changes removing certain class A misdemeanors from state Probation and Parole supervision. Program eligibility is determined by Administrative Order 18-17. Defendants who meet specific probation conditions are removed from active supervision and their cases are converted to unsupervised probation.

Adult Court Services Supervised Probation Cases Assigned vs. Closed



During 2018, 93 individuals in 107 cases were assigned to ACS supervised probation, which was in addition to the 140 individuals and 152 cases still active from 2017. The 107 assigned cases in 2018 reflect a 31% decrease from the 154 assigned cases in 2017. Throughout 2018 there were 118 cases released from probation. Of those released cases, 90 (76%) were successful completions, meaning specific conditions were met and the supervision status was amended to unsupervised. Twenty-eight (24%) were unsuccessful, meaning probation was revoked or removed from ACS supervision without having met the required specific probation conditions.




In 2018 Boone County defendants served 47,848 days in ACS supervised probation cases, a 6% decrease from the 50,969 days in 2017.

FINES & RELATED COSTS PROGRAM

ACS supervises defendants not under the supervision of state Probation and Parole who have been assessed a fine and related costs and cannot pay in full on the day of sentencing. Under the formal administrative plan for collection of court debt, these defendants have 90 days in which to pay. Defendants unable to pay within 90 days are given the opportunity to negotiate a formal payment plan which is submitted to the court for approval. These plans are formulated with the goal of achieving a positive outcome and can include the option of performing community service work in lieu of paying the fine. Once approved by the court, ACS monitors payments, recommends extension requests for defendants who genuinely attempt to meet their financial obligations, sends overdue notices, and submits warrant requests for those who do not pay or perform community service work as directed.


In cases in which ACS does not have collection responsibility, costs are collected through other programs including collections by the circuit clerk's office, the tax intercept program, and the judiciary's third-party debt collection agency.

Payment Monitoring: Number of Annual Cases Ordered



ACS was ordered to monitor payment compliance in 897 cases in 2018, a 7% decrease from 2017.

ACS Supervised Payments Ordered and Collected



Court-ordered amounts in 2018 totaled \$288,521, a 14% decrease from 2017. Collections totaled \$220,337 in 2018, a 9% decrease from 2017. Collections in 2018 were 76% of case totals, an increase from 72% in 2017.

Due to the time between sentencing and the 90 day due date, as well as extended due dates formulated by payment plans, and specific statutory and policy changes in 2013 and 2014, amounts ordered and collected are not entirely comparable to one another or prior years.

ADULT COURT SERVICES SUPERVISED JUDICIAL PAROLE

The ACS judicial parole program was established to provide a program of structured, supervised release as an alternative to Boone County Jail incarceration. Jail inmates who meet certain criteria set forth in Administrative Order 01-06 are eligible for consideration. The court may grant parole without a report, but typical practice is for ACS to submit a report prior to consideration. Each day served on judicial parole counts as a jail day served in determining a defendant's release date.

In 2018, ACS completed judicial parole reports in 5 cases, a decrease from the 10 cases in 2017. The court did not grant parole for any of these cases. For comparison, 2 cases were granted in 2017.

No defendants participated in the ACS supervised judicial parole program in 2018. In 2017, participation was 4 defendants represented by 5 cases, which totaled 123 days of supervision.

WORK SEARCH / WORK RELEASE

Work search/work release is a Reality House, Inc., administered program that provides Boone County Jail inmates the opportunity to obtain or maintain employment while serving a sentence. Jail inmates may petition the court to participate in this program. If ordered, ACS provides the court with a report and recommendation for or against participation.

In 2018, ACS completed work search/work release reports in 8 cases, a decrease from the 13 cases in 2017. The court granted 1 of the 2018 case petitions, a decrease from 2017's 10 cases.

WORK & EDUCATION

"Work and Education" is a Boone County Jail administered program that provides inmates with experience, training and an opportunity for service. Eligibility is determined by the criteria set forth in Administrative Order 06-18. Inmates receive a one-day (24 hour) reduction in their sentence for every 8 hours of approved program participation. With sheriff approval, inmates can petition the court to participate in this program. In response to this petition, ACS provides the court with a report and recommendation for or against participation.

In 2018, ACS completed work and education reports in 11 cases, a decrease from the 25 cases in 2017. The court granted 5 of the 2018 case petitions, an increase from 2017's 8 cases.

COMMUNITY SERVICE WORK

Community Service Work (CSW) recompenses the community for the harm caused to it by criminal acts. ACS supervises two types of CSW: (1) CSW ordered as a condition of ACS supervised probation, and (2) CSW allowed by the court upon ACS's recommendation in lieu of paying a fine.

CSW may only be performed at a qualified, not-for-profit, tax exempt agency. Tax exempt means the agency has either an IRS tax exemption letter or a Missouri sales tax exemption letter. This and all other CSW policies are explained at the outset to each program participant. ACS's goal is to maximize successful outcomes.

In 2018, 54 defendants representing 58 cases successfully completed 881 hours of CSW under ACS supervision. At the standardized \$10 per hour rate used by the court to value CSW hours, this represents an \$8,810 return to the community through participating not-for-profit agencies.

VICTIM IMPACT PANEL

Certain traffic offenders are ordered by the court to attend the Victim Impact Panel (VIP) as a condition of probation. During this program, panelists share their experiences with serious traffic accidents in a non-judgmental way. The VIP program gives names and faces to victims and increases awareness of how events impact real people.

In 2018, 373 defendants attended the VIP program at the Boone County Courthouse. Defendants are required to pay a fee to attend the program, a portion of which is provided to the court. Revenue from this program totaled \$1,865.

Defendants who live a distance from the Boone County Courthouse, or who cannot attend this program on the first Monday of each month, can request approval from the court to attend a more convenient program, provided it offers the same teaching format and substantive content.


VIDEO CONFERENCING

Since 1997, defendants arrested and held in the Boone County Jail who cannot post bond have been interviewed by a CSO using video conference equipment. These interviews enable the CSO to obtain material information from the defendant to better evaluate the potential for pretrial release and to answer any questions the defendant might have. In 2018, ACS completed bond investigations in 2,159 cases assigned to 1,217 Boone County Jail inmates, which could represent an average of 5 video interviews each business day.


Defendants incarcerated at the jail with active cases in the court may attend hearings by video conference between the jail and the court. Cases eligible to be heard by video conference in Boone County include, but are not limited to, initial arraignments, bond reduction hearings, counsel status hearings, first appearance on warrants issued for probation violation hearings, and returns on warrants issued for failure to appear.

In 2018, the associate circuit court dockets utilized video conferencing with the jail in 2,863 case proceedings, a 10% decrease from 2017. The 2,863 video proceedings conducted in 2018 represent an average of 11.7 such proceedings per business day.


The higher video conferencing numbers since 2016 can be attributed in part to a deliberate effort on behalf of the associate court to increase its use.



In August 2014, jail video conferencing was expanded to include certain circuit court proceedings. In 2018 the circuit court heard 1,627 cases representing 1,250 jail incarcerated defendants, a 64% and 60% increase, respectively, from 2017's totals.



In July 2013, the court implemented policies and procedures to create a weekly circuit video conferencing docket with inmates housed in the Department of Corrections (“DOC”). ACS had primary responsibility for supporting this program by planning, scheduling and preparing video writs until August, 2018, when this role was transferred to support staff in court administration. ACS is still responsible for reporting related statistical data and providing general assistance when needed.



In 2018, 334 cases representing 256 DOC incarcerated defendants were heard in circuit court via video dockets. At a vehicle transportation cost estimate of 54.5 cents per mile and accompanying personnel cost estimate of \$17.47 per hour, 2018 DOC video use represents an estimated savings of \$18,272 in transport costs, \$10,206 in personnel costs, and 456 days of jail avoided which, at \$37 per day, is \$16,872. These figures combine for a total of \$43,350 in savings to Boone County.

MONETARY SAVINGS ESTIMATES

The list below represents a cumulative view of estimated minimum savings related to the work of ACS. These numbers are based on the information provided in this report, and correspond to estimates of potential transport costs, fees collected and days defendants would otherwise have been at the jail or housed out of county.

JAIL DAYS SAVED

Bond supervision:	45,770
ACS supervised home detention/electronic monitoring:	15,238
3 rd Party home detention/electronic monitoring:	1,090
ACS supervised judicial parole:	0

Total:	62,098 @ \$37/day=	\$2,297,626
--------	--------------------	-------------

FEES COLLECTED

ACS supervised home detention/electronic monitoring:	\$16,909
VIP:	\$1,865

DOC VIDEO SAVINGS	\$43,350
-------------------	----------

TOTAL ESTIMATED SAVINGS	\$2,359,750
-------------------------	-------------

DISCONTINUED PROGRAMS, POLICIES AND PRACTICES

Homebound Release

The Homebound Release program ran from May to October, 1985. It allowed certain defendants with misdemeanor jail sentences to serve those sentences at their residence. Participants were required to remain in their home except for work or other court approved activities. ACS provided screening, recommendations and supervision, which included requiring weekly meetings with a CSO and daily compliance checks at the defendant's residence. An additional part time staff position was established to conduct the daily checks.

The program ended by agreement with the court and county commission. The population was much smaller than anticipated and the savings did not justify the costs. There was also significant resistance from the prosecutor's office. Although unsuccessful, the Homebound Release program developed basic concepts and practices that were later incorporated into the electronically monitored Home Detention program.

Community Service Work Orientation Meetings

From July, 1999 to July, 2003, all defendants under ACS supervision for CSW, who were also Boone County residents, were required to attend a CSW orientation meeting. These meetings were held monthly at the courthouse, after regular business hours, and were conducted by a CSO. Defendants received two hours of CSW credit for participating. This practice ended in anticipation of major policy and procedural changes to the CSW program.

Saturday Bond Investigations

From March to September, 2003, ACS implemented a rotating work schedule allowing for one CSO to work on Saturdays. The primary purpose was to initiate bond investigations on defendants who had been arrested and detained Saturday morning or the previous Friday evening. These bond investigations would be submitted to the court the following Monday with the goal of providing them prior to initial appearance. This practice ended when it became clear that much of the work performed on Saturdays was ultimately unproductive, primarily due to the subjects of the reports posting bond prior to report submission. In addition, the rotating work schedule negatively impacted office efficiency by creating a cyclical staffing shortage.

Adopt A Highway

The Adopt A Highway program began in November 1988. Portions of I-70 and, later, 63 highways were adopted by the court for litter removal on a monthly basis. Defendants owing CSW were required to participate with exceptions granted for non-Boone County residents and documented medical excuses. One CSO and one deputy court marshal were responsible for supervision. The program ended in October 2003, due to safety concerns and policy changes.

Callaway County Court Services

The 13th Circuit consists of Boone and Callaway Counties. In 1983 Callaway County Court Services (CCCS) was established with goals and objectives similar to ACS. It was suspended in 1994, reinstated in 1995, and suspended and reinstated in 1997. ACS maintained a degree of administrative support and oversight until about 2004. ACS also reported annual statistical information for CCCS in 1991, 1992 and 1996-2004. In 1999 all functions of the office were assigned to court marshal staff. After 2004 all administrative responsibility was assumed by the court marshal's office.

Security Responsibilities

In the 1980s a radio base station was established in the ACS office to facilitate and assist security related communications in the courthouse. In the 1990s the office began housing video monitoring and recording equipment, linked to courthouse security cameras. During certain periods in the 1990s ACS staff were required to provide security screening at the main entrance to the courthouse, which included the operation of metal detectors and the physical search of persons. In 1994 manual duress alarms were installed in various courthouse locations with the associated monitoring equipment placed in the ACS office. ACS staff began providing monitoring and notification of these alarms to security personnel. In 2006 the alarm system was further expanded, resulting in a corresponding increase in ACS' responsibility. In September 2008, in conjunction with a major courthouse renovation and addition, the radio, video and alarm monitoring equipment were removed from the ACS office and all security responsibilities ended.

Drug Court

In January 1998, the first drug court was held in Boone County. At that time staff consisted of one part-time employee, the Drug Court Coordinator, who was located in the ACS office. In May 1999, this position was amended to full time and placed under the authority of the ACS supervisor. In 2000 the ACS supervisor became a more active part of the program, receiving the additional designation of Drug Court Administrator in July of that year. In December 2001, an administrative decision was made to remove Drug Court from ACS and place it in its own division, with the Drug Court Coordinator assuming the Drug Court Administrator position. ACS continued to provide a degree of administrative support, primarily in the form of accepting and maintaining fee remittances. That role ended in July 2009, when the circuit clerk's office assumed the responsibility.

ACS Probation Intake Meetings

From early 2004 until April 2011, defendants placed on ACS supervised probation, who were also Boone County residents, were required to attend a probation intake meeting. These meetings were held monthly at the courthouse, after regular business hours, and were conducted by a CSO. Defendants were spoken to both as group and individually. The primary purpose was to explain general and specific probation conditions and ensure each defendant understood their probation

requirements. ACS stopped conducting these meetings after changes to internal procedures rendered them redundant.

Community Service Work Supervision

The CSW program began in July 1982. At its inception ACS assumed supervision responsibility for all state court ordered CSW, including probation cases under the supervision of state Probation and Parole. Program size reached a high in 2001 with 1,630 defendants ordered to complete 57,762 hours. In October 2003, the policy changed to require ACS supervision only in ACS supervised probation cases and in cases in which ACS supervises CSW performance in lieu of fines. This new approach was specifically intended to reduce the size of the CSW program which would allow ACS to focus on other objectives. In 2004, the year following this change, 288 defendants were ordered to complete 9,196 hours under ACS supervision. In 2011 statutory changes to certain driving offenses further reduced the amount of CSW ACS supervises.

Fines, Costs and Restitution Collection

In December 1983, ACS began supervising the collection of fines, costs and restitution balances in certain case types not supervised by state Probation and Parole. In 1990 this responsibility expanded to include all cases not under the supervision of state Probation and Parole, including traffic offenses. In 1993 statutory changes allowed for driver's license suspension for nonpayment of traffic fines, and ACS ceased collection activity for traffic cases. That same year a part time aide position was created to focus solely on collections. This position was later converted to a full time administrative assistant position but with a continued collections focus.

In July 2003, the court began requiring all balances to be due "forthwith" upon sentencing, and the collections program was completely reorganized. Defendants unable to pay in full were allowed to enter a court approved payment plan formulated and administered by ACS, but only with a substantial monetary down payment. Defendants who informed ACS they could not comply were immediately returned to the sentencing judge. One CSO was designated with responsibility for the program, but due to the workload increase all CSOs and the supervisor were required to provide regular, ongoing assistance.

In 2006 ACS ceased collection of cases assessed with costs only. In this and subsequent years additional changes were made regarding the down payment deadline for payment plans, the down payment amount requirements, the amount and types of forms utilized, paperwork flow and other policies and practices with intent to increase efficiency and reduce workload. In December 2011, the program was further restructured with the court adopting a new formal administrative plan for the collection of court debt based on Supreme Court Operating Rule 21.

In August 2013, statutory changes placed the responsibility of restitution collection with the prosecutor's office. The court modified the collection plan to accommodate this change and enacted several other revisions, including allowing defendants 90 days to pay fines and removing all costs collection responsibility from ACS. In July 2014, the court returned costs collections to ACS but only for those cases in which ACS is responsible for fines collection.

Alcoholics Anonymous/Narcotics Anonymous Informational Meetings

In January 1999, as directed by the court administrator and upon consultation with the Court en Banc, ACS initiated a policy to recommend certain defendants on bond supervision be required to attend an Alcoholics Anonymous or Narcotics Anonymous informational meeting as a condition of bond. In February 1999, these informational meetings commenced. They were held at the courthouse, on a monthly basis, after regular business hours, and were led by volunteers affiliated with one or both associations. In November 2015, with consultation and direction from the Court en Banc and court administrator, these practices ended.

Associate Circuit Court Attendance

Historically, CSOs attended associate circuit court for initial appearances and hearings involving recently incarcerated defendants. The primary purpose of this was to immediately receive notice of orders for bond investigations. Other reasons included the ability to obtain and review charging documents, police reports and other pertinent information obtained from prosecutor staff, afford an opportunity for timely communication with the court, and provide support for the video system. With the advent of electronic filing and the regular attendance of other court staff who could support the video system and facilitate communication, it became evident that continued CSO attendance was not necessary. In April 2017, in consultation with associate circuit judges and the court administrator, CSOs ceased attending these hearings on a regular basis.