

## Notes from SEARCH Meetings

July 12 and 13, 1999

### Attendees:

Ruth Castor	MVD
Linda Christophel	Maricopa Sheriff's Office
Janet Cornell	Maricopa CIO's Office
Joyce Dehnert	DPS
Debbie Giles	MVD
Mike Goss	Maricopa Adult Probation
Jerry Hardt	ACJC
Maureen Haggerty	AOC
Mark Hendershot	Maricopa Adult Probation
Joe Hindman	Phoenix Police Department
John Kelly	GITA
Amir Holmes	SEARCH
Nancy LaPlaca	ACJC
Tim Lawler	AOC
Linda Meissner	GITA
Jim Meyer	Pima Adult Probation
Mike O'Hara	Maricopa Superior Court - IT
Terri Oliveira	MVD
Georgene Ramming	DPS
Marcus Reinkensmeyer	Maricopa Superior Court Administration
John Reynolds	Maricopa Superior Court Administration
Dave Roberts	SEARCH
Clifton Sells	Maricopa Superior Court
Sarah Shew	Maricopa Superior Court - SE
Will Tagart	Maricopa Clerk of Court
Dave Usury	SEARCH

## Minutes

Presentation by Dave Roberts, Dave Usury and Amir Holmes from SEARCH. Dave Usury was the CIO for the integrated justice plan for the state of Colorado.

Latest version of integration bill from U.S. Senate will allocate \$350 million for integration projects. Planning process will happen sooner or later. Once the Governor gets involved, the group will more clearly define scope, business processes etc., the project will move forward more efficiently. The Governor will be forming a criminal justice integration task force in the Fall.

Critical documents are 1. Work flow; and 2. Operational requirements.

Group discussed work flow in Maricopa and Pima counties. Marcus Rienkensmeyer said that Maricopa county has diagramed out information flows by defendant, and case process. (Nancy will get from Marcus.)

Joe Hindman reported that Phoenix Police Department has obtained about \$400,000 from the

## Notes from SEARCH Meetings

July 12 and 13, 1999

City of Phoenix budget to fund COPLINK. COPLINK is a joint project between the MIS Department of the University of Arizona and the Tucson Police Department. COPLINK is a database fed by a number of disparate databases, and allows complex queries through huge amounts of information very quickly. Eventually Phoenix Police Department's (PPD) COPLINK project will hook up to other police departments.

Dave Roberts commented that although integration will make systems more efficient, it won't reduce jail populations.

Need committee to review data flows. Need to know decision points. Data flow charts that Nancy LaPlaca diagramed don't identify transaction points. Need to talk about organizational structure of group. John Kelly brought up the fact that the Governor will be forming a policy group in the Fall. That's when the Governor's office will look at this project and make some decisions about funding. The existing Integration group, currently chaired by Karl Heckart, needs to be formalized.

Linda Meissner asked which states have been successful? What are models we should follow?

Dave Usery replied that there are no cookie cutter solutions. Colorado went through the same process in determining what to do. Figuring out the data flow can take a lot of time. State statutes determine much of the flow due to time requirements (for example, having an initial appearance within 24 hours.)

Dave also commented that there are many levels to this discussion. There's the high level overview with little detail, and the view that takes into account all the detail. Variations also occur between jurisdictions, different courts, etc. We shouldn't worry about the exceptions to the rule right now. Go with the 80/20 rule; if it's the rule 80% of the time, go with that process.

Dave commented that the flow charts Nancy LaPlaca provided mix concepts, and include *defendants*, *processes* and *decision points*. The flow charts need to be re-done to reflect these 3 viewpoints of the criminal justice process.

Where are we going? Dave Usery commented that Colorado wrestled a lot with this issue also. All agencies have their own needs and view. Local needs are different than state needs.

Joe Hindman suggested that we look at the charts moving the data and start with the flow from the initial criminal act to arraignment. The case report needs to get to the prosecutor.

Joe Hindman commented that we need to start working more effectively together. Information about the defendant needs to get to the jail and into the Jail Management System (JMS). Police Department personnel key in information, then jail re-keys. PPD then updates the prosecutors with supplements to the case report.

## Notes from SEARCH Meetings

July 12 and 13, 1999

Linda Meissner suggested that the group needs leadership. Colorado had a mandate - we have no such animal.

Mark Hendershot suggested that each shop bring its own flow chart to the table.

John Kelly, who is responsible for selling this project to the Governor's office, sees the horizontal flow as the most important component that will "sell the case" for integration to the Governor's office and thus be granted state funding. Thus far, integration projects have been funded only by the federal government or by individual agencies, or jurisdictions such as cities.

Dave Roberts commented that the group needs to figure out its organizing principles, and determine the role of the Ad Hoc group that exists now. Operational requirements need to be determined. Then, when the statewide task force looks at these issues in the Fall, a reasonable foundation will have already been established. This preliminary work will facilitate the work of the task force.

An Ad Hoc committee on Integrated Justice Systems would include the following state agencies: the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission (ACJC), the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), the Department of Public Safety (DPS), the Government Information Technology Agency (GITA), and the Department of Corrections (DOC). Other agencies that would be included at some point in time would be the state Motor Vehicle Division (MVD), Juvenile Corrections, and the Department of Economic Security.

John Kelly also suggested that we include one or two legislators from the appropriate legislative subcommittee(s), and a staff person from the Governor's office.

What is integration? Needs to be *within* agency; *between* agencies, and *between* jurisdictions. Agencies need the ability to access and share critical information at key points.

### **System needs to be able to:**

**Query:** local, state, regional and national databases  
**Push:** information to another agency  
**Pull:** information from other systems to incorporate into recipient agency  
**Publish:** information regarding people, cases, events and agency actions  
**Subscribe:** to notification service

Data needs to be captured at origination point, and re-used many times. An integrated system would be driven by the operational needs of participating agencies.

Need to translate vision into goals and objectives, such as "obtain criminal history data within X minutes, with a status currency of 24 hours."

John Kelly commented that the Governor's office is waiting for input. John confirmed that the Governor has no problem with the current ad hoc group looking at integration issues.

## Notes from SEARCH Meetings

July 12 and 13, 1999

Next step: what will the group produce? What are outcomes? Joe Hindman wants the group to address data sharing within the criminal justice community. The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) will *not* be funding projects that don't *share* data. The feds will no longer fund 8 different laptop projects for 8 different police departments within Maricopa County. If we don't plan more effectively, we will not obtain federal funding.

### Plan for Data Sharing

- # Recommendation for group governance structure
- # Security issues
- # Establish what plan is.
- # Define operational requirements.
- # Identify benefits and quantity.
- # Define scope of project.
- # Identify stakeholders.

Will Tagart brought up the fact that we each agency's grant funding needs should comport with larger plan.

Need to break down tasks into smaller chunks. Need to make sure we have agreement on tasks as they occur. Need to determine who will be on subcommittees.

### Committee Products:

- # plan for data sharing
- # recommendation for governance
- # determine data ownership
- # privacy, security and access issues
- # vision
- # subcommittees
- # operational requirements
- # Identify and quantify benefits
- # Define scope
- # Identify stakeholders
- # Define planning process

Sara Shew: what is our planned agenda for today and tomorrow? Does it tie into production of these documents?

Jerry Hardt discussed the Integrated Justice Information Systems Plan he drafted this year.

If we're going to send a letter to agencies asking them to participate in ad hoc group, should this document be sent with the letter? Does this document reflect the views of the group?

The group reviewed Jerry Hardt's document. The first three pages are background. The bottom of page three is where the mission and vision begin. ACJC has spent about \$8 million

## Notes from SEARCH Meetings July 12 and 13, 1999

on case management systems for county attorneys, sheriff's offices, courts, etc.

### **Mission Statement**

*To establish a statewide integrated criminal justice information system with accurate, complete and timely data on individuals and events. The system will support the effective administration of criminal justice, public and officer safety and public policy management in a cost effective manner. The integrated system will facilitate criminal case tracking, without unnecessary duplication of data entry and storage, while providing appropriate privacy and security protection.*

*Proposed July 12, 1999.*

### **Objectives**

The rest of the meeting will focus on:

- # solidifying objectives
- # governance structure
- # operational requirements.

Joe Hindman talked about what kinds of transactions or operational requirements the project. Dave Usury suggested we talk about the operational requirements, and *then* determine the objectives.

The group decided to discuss the operational requirements. Joe wants to be able to go into the system, and get all the current status information about the person. Wants to be able to see all events for person; gang affiliation information; where person lives, what kind of automobile the person has; basically person-based current status report. Need single point of interface.

Linda Meissner talked about looking at 2 different views: case-based and person-based. The major stakeholders are prosecution, law enforcement and courts. What about organizing it around events? Sara asked what have other states done?

Tim Lawler wants the ability to e-file complaints. Joe wants system to have remote access.

### **Operational Requirements**

- # Ability to pull up current status
  - \*supervision
  - \*location
  - \*gang affiliation
- # Single point of interface
- # Share case report
- # View electronic case file

## Notes from SEARCH Meetings

July 12 and 13, 1999

- # Be able to e-file criminal complaints
- # Remote access
- # Positive identification (fingerprint-based)
- # Access issues (restricted records such as juvenile)
- # Abuse, neglect, adoption cases where information is restricted
- # Generate statistical reports/GIS

Georgene Ramming brought up the fact that records must be correctly linked by PCN and SID (SID for the individual, Process Control Number for the event). Will brought up the fact that if we can do the above, we can generate the types of statistical reports we need. Joe Hindman commented that COPLINK will allow Phoenix PD to generate more usable reports.

Cliff Sells from Pretrial Services talked about the fact that he needs information very quickly, and as accurate as possible. Pretrial needs to make release decisions, and requires criminal history, current charges, probation and parole information, and failure to appear information. If a person is released erroneously, Pretrial can make a decision that puts public at risk. Cliff's agency just shut down LEJIS; and now is getting information from Maricopa Superior Court's CMS (Case Management System). He doesn't want to have to query a number of different databases to get the information he needs, and he needs the information when the person is booked. Right now, Cliff's agency relies heavily on information from the County Attorney's Office. Phoenix Police Department can't get information from the County Attorney's office. The only way to get information right now is to physically call the agency to determine status.

Phoenix City Court wants to be able to get information about *felony* cases, and get real detail about persons prior to trial.

DuPage County (Chicago suburb) IL has *all* traffic tickets etc keyed in via automation.

### Design Features

#### Queries (Person-based)

Positive ID  
Wants/Warrants  
Criminal History  
Driver Record  
Future event  
Pending Charges  
Location  
Case Information  
Arrest Information  
Demographics (physical descriptors)

#### Push/Pull (Event-based)

Booking  
Charge Filing  
Events/event dates  
Dispositions  
Wants and Warrants  
Sex Offender Registries

### Next Steps

- ◆ Scope

## Notes from SEARCH Meetings

July 12 and 13, 1999

- ◆ Re-draft Jerry's paper, incorporating changes from these meetings.
- ◆ Bring this committee back together and OK final document to be sent out.
- ◆ Draft letter to accompany Jerry's document.
- ◆ Who will letter be coming from?
- ◆ Bring full Ad Hoc Committee together.
- ◆ Begin information flow.
- ◆ Draft agenda for next meeting.
- ◆ *4 subcommittees suggested:*
  - ◆ Benefits/business case
  - ◆ Standards/technical architecture
  - ◆ Funding
  - ◆ Information Exchange/Flow

Who will be paying for next steps of process? When we have a meeting of the large group that includes all stakeholders, we'll have expenses. Will need to identify and quantify benefits as part of a subcommittee's task. We also haven't defined the scope yet.

*Defining the Scope:* includes courts, corrections, law enforcement and prosecution. The criminal justice work flow that we're working on does not include non-criminal justice cases, which constitutes 80% of the court's work. We recognize that other case types and non-criminal justice agencies have a role to play, but at this point we'll just include criminal justice agencies. There are a number of other groups that are contemplating standards, such as NCIC, Sex Offender Registries, etc. For right now, we are working on criminal justice enterprise, with an eye toward folding in other agencies such as MVD further down the line.

In reviewing Jerry Hardt's Criminal Justice Integration proposal, we've looked at the Mission Statement and Objectives. Let's look next at Operational Requirements statement.

Joe Hindman asked whether anyone could address the level of involvement by the Governor. Linda Meissner answered that the Governor is aware that the statewide integration initiative is in the beginning stages. GITA has met with George Weiss, the Governor's staff person for criminal justice issues. John Kelly has been communicating with the Governor about this project, and as part of the Governor's cabinet, has her ear.

Coconino county model will affect all of our work. We need to look at Coconino project to determine whether we are being effective. Maureen Haggerty explained that the biggest bang for the buck is occurring at the local level.

Business rules for Colorado are on the Colorado web page. Look for business process button to click. Click on paragraph title and will have before and after business process rules, and includes flow charts and data entities. Each subcommittee in Colorado wrote up its own rules, then they were combined. Rules were used by the vendor.

***Following are notes from the SEARCH meeting with Maricopa County personnel on***

**Notes from SEARCH Meetings**  
*July 12 and 13, 1999*

***Tuesday morning, July 13. Thanks to Janet Cornell for the briefing.***

The group reviewed:

- # Maricopa county's proposed governance policy and agreement
- # the job description for an integrated systems Program Manager, and the job responsibilities
- # how to advertise for the position.
- # the impact of the statewide integration project on Maricopa's effort.
- # the importance of continuing dialogue between the two groups, and the county's role in statewide integration.