
Table of Contents - Volume 2

A.	Facilitated Sessions / Focus Groups	
1.	Mobile Voice and Data	A.1-1
2.	Users of AOC Information	A.2-1
3.	Users of DCI Information	A.3-1
4.	Users of DOC Information	A.4-1
5.	Users of DMV Information	A.5-1
6.	AOC / DCI Interface	A.6-1
7.	AOC / DOC Interface	A.7-1
8.	DOC / DCI Interface	A.8-1
9.	AOC / DMV Interface	A.9-1
10.	Local Integrated Criminal Justice Systems	A.10-1
11.	Law Enforcement User Vertical	A.11-1
12.	Court User Vertical	A.12-1
13.	Corrections User Vertical	A.13-1
14.	Individual Statewide Identifier	A.14-1
15.	Sheriff / Police Perspective	A.15-1
B.	Regional Public Hearings	
C.	National Survey	
	Methodology and Findings	C-2
	Best Practices Follow-up Survey for Maryland and Michigan	C-17
D.	State Survey	
E.	Stakeholder Interviews	

- F. Definition of Terms**
- G. Reference Materials Listing**
- H. Legislative Issues**
- I. Advanced Technologies**

Focus Groups and Facilitated Sessions

This section of the report contains the detailed minutes for the 15 of the 19 focus groups and facilitated sessions that were conducted during the three month project period.¹ These sessions examined the development of a criminal justice information network from a variety of perspectives and focused on specific segments of CJIN. The average focus group lasted from 4 to 6 hours and included 6 to 14 participants.

There were three focus groups that dealt specifically with the plan for a statewide integrated wireless communication system for law enforcement. Four "horizontal" focus groups examined the current and future information needs from the AOC, DOC, DCI, and DMV systems through the eyes of law enforcement, courts and correction users of all four state systems. Five "technical" focus groups reviewed the interfaces between the current criminal justice systems and developed alternatives for the CJIN network architecture.

Three "vertical" sessions focused on the current and future needs within federal, state, and local law enforcement, corrections and courts. There was a specific focus group to identify technical and business process solutions for implementation of a CJIN statewide personal identifier, and another focus group solicited information and ideas from six jurisdictions who have implemented all or part of an integrated criminal justice information system on the local level. One group examined the specific issues related to juvenile criminal justice, while another session met with sheriffs and police chiefs to better understand their perspective and needs.

Below is a listing of the specific sessions conducted and following this summary are the detailed minutes of each focus group. The information, thoughts, and opinions contained in the focus group minutes represent the views of the focus

¹ The focus group minutes from the two subsequent Mobile Voice and Data sessions, and from the Network Architecture focus group, are not included as these sessions were primarily used to validate project recommendations. The two juvenile sessions notes have been included in the Juvenile Automation Project description.

group attendees and are not necessarily those of Price Waterhouse. This information was then used as the basis for further follow-up and analysis of the criminal justice information system and needs statewide.

WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS	HORIZONTAL USER GROUPS	VERTICAL USER GROUPS
Mobile Voice and Data	Users of AOC Information	Correction
Mobile Voice	Users of DOC Information	Courts
Mobile Data	Users of DCI Information	Law Enforcement
	Users of DMV Information	

TECHNICAL GROUPS	SPECIFIC TOPICS
AOC/DCI Interface	Individual Statewide Identifier
AOC/DOC Interface	Local Integrated CJIS
DOC/DMV Interfaces	Juvenile Automation
AOC/DMV Interfaces	Sheriff/Police Chief Perspective
Network Architecture	

Focus Group 1: Wireless Voice and Data Communications

Friday, January 6, 1995

Department of Insurance

Participants

<u><i>Name</i></u>	<u><i>Title</i></u>	<u><i>Organization</i></u>
Ron D. Wiley	Major Accounts Manager	Ericsson Inc.
James Amos	Major Accounts Manager	Ericsson Inc.
Jerry Clark	Captain	Guilford County Sheriff's
Department		
Jim Neese	Chief of Security and Radio Services	Mecklenburg Co. Security & Radio
Al Linker	Telecommunications Manager	City of Salisbury
Edward Rankin	Communications Systems Coordinator	City of Durham, Dept. of Emer.
Serv.		
Ben Bailey	Sergeant	Union County Sheriff's Office
Marvin Heller	Consultant	Fred Griffin Telecommunications
Tommy Pope	Communications Systems Manager	City of Durham
Fred Davis	Lieutenant	NC State Highway Patrol
Harold Meacombs	Chief Radio Engineer	NC State Highway Patrol
Blair T. Tyndall	Assistant Emergency Services Coordinator	Wayne County Emergency Services
Albert R. Little	Director of Information Services	Dept. of Crime Cont. & Public Safety
Ken Wiseman	Lieutenant	Fayetteville Police Department
David Sessoms	Police Specialist	Fayetteville Police Department
Carl Van Cott	Assistant Chief of Engineering	NC Off. of Emergency Medical Ser.
Donnie Bunn	Telecommunications Equipment Technician	NC State Highway Patrol
Frank Johnson	Systems Programmer	State Bureau of Investigation / DCI
Woody Sandy	Sergeant	NC State Highway Patrol
Peggy Cox Bradley	Lieutenant	Duke University Public Safety

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Bill Carter	Special Agent	State Bureau of Investigation / Field
Jerry Reutlinger	Technology Architecture	Administrative Office of the Courts
Claude White	Assistant Administrator	Administrative Office of the Courts
Russ Eaker	Telecommunications Manager / MIS Dept.	Town of Cary
Holt Watts	Corporate Consultant	Motorola
Bruce Daws	Communications Manager	City of Fayetteville
Sly White	Assistant Communications Manager	City of Fayetteville
Max Hopper	Corporate Consultant	Motorola
George Papazickos	Systems Engineer	Motorola
Nick Barnet	Data Administrator	Office of State Controller / IRM
Curtis Baker	Eastern NC Sales Manager	Motorola
John C. LeMay, Jr.	Telecommunications	Duke University
Richard Little	Project Manager	Criminal Justice Info. Network Study
Donna Maynard	Executive Officer	NC Sheriff's Association
Dyke Hostettler	Telecommunications / Radio, Paging	State Telecommunications Services

General Topics of Discussion: *Wireless Voice and Data Communications*

- Trunking Technology
- Mobile Applications
- Mobile Data (MODAP Pilot Project)
- Current Requirements
- Future Technology
- Future Vision for North Carolina
- Implementation Alternatives
- Findings and Recommendation

I. Project Overview

Price Waterhouse Project Manager, Steve Holdridge, gave a brief overview of the Criminal Justice Information Network Study Committee and its goals and objectives. Mr. Holdridge also discussed the roles of the various “user” and “interface” focus groups, and how their input will help shape the development of the CJIN committee’s final plan.

II. Focus Group Highlights

Price Waterhouse Technical Team Leader, Mitchell Kemp, facilitated a four hour group discussion whereby critical issues were raised on the following topics:

A. Trunking Technologies

Fredrick Griffin, P.C., a subcontractor to Price Waterhouse, provided a basic overview on trunking technologies currently available, and on future technologies being developed. A presentation on conventional trunking systems and their current limitations regarding coverage, air traffic, mobile-to-mobile communication, and mutual aid compatibility followed. Other topics included comparisons of several technologies including digital-vocoder systems, vehicle repeater radio systems, conventional trunking systems, and combined trunking and cellular systems. In the development of an integrated statewide or regional communications systems, the trunking variations discussed included: all area same-band trunking, area multi-band trunking, independent / overlapping out of jurisdiction coverage, and mutual aid solutions, among others.

Further discussion involved the increased costs of the land based system that occurs with the utilization of the National Public Safety Planning Advisory Committee (NPSPAC) band system. In general, the NPSPAC band will increase the cost of the land based system by a factor of two to four times over the original band.

Other presentation topics included: propagation and frequencies, the impact of APCO 25, base station designs, and costs and benefits of various system options.

B. Mobile Applications

John Dewey, a subcontractor to Price Waterhouse, gave a brief presentation on mobile voice and data applications. The session included discussion on space restrictions for the placement of Mobile Display Terminals in vehicles, on cellular, packet cellular, commercial carrier communications, and private networks. Mr. Dewey stated that a clear delineation needs to be made between organizations' computing needs and voice communicating requirements and whether or not to run voice and data applications together.

A group discussion on the findings of the MODAP Project ensued. The pros and cons of changing from a smart net radio system to a smart zone radio system were also discussed. Compatibility, future technologies, and protocols, specifically Transmission Control Protocol / Internet Protocol (TCP / IP), were discussed in detail.

A focus group participant updated the audience on the North Carolina SUN (NCSUN) Project, whereby a group of local trunk system “owners” signed agreements to share technology and systems. Currently 15 owners are participating in this project with three more additions planned.

A driving force behind the need for shared communications is the need for multiple agencies (fire, police, highway patrol, department of emergency management, among others) to communicate with each other in the event of a disaster, or in other situations requiring multi-agency response.

C. Requirements

- Voice communication inside vehicle
- Voice communication with dispatch
- Voice communication outside vehicle
- The MODAP Pilot should be used as the minimum specification for data requirements
- Location / tracking abilities
- Interfaces for System Network Architecture (SNA) and TCP / IP networks should be integral
- Outside vehicle portability
- Wider ranges
- Inside building usage
- Communication with other state and local agencies
- Communication with own agency
- Communication with other states

- Compatibility amongst technologies
- Multiple channels for command and control for emergency response agencies
- Solutions for tactical command and control needs
- 24 hour-a-day, 7 day-a-week system operation

In addition, the focus group agreed that the ability to establish communications among select agencies during a discrete period of time, in a defined geographic area (for unscheduled events / disasters) would be ideal. This would include the ability to have “phone like” capabilities such as conferencing, and direct person-to-person communications.

D. General Points of Consensus Among Focus Group Participants

- Inclusion of all public safety and emergency response agencies, as well as public utilities, into a statewide communications network is desired.
- NCIC 2000 standards should be considered in the implementation of any new technologies or systems.
- Need consensus on all issues by local users. This may include intergovernmental understandings, and agreements between local and state governments.
- Statewide technology inventory and needs assessments must be conducted. Consideration of the different levels of technological sophistication across the state should be incorporated into the development of any new system.
- Management of the new system should have some form of user representation.
- Policies and procedures for unscheduled-events communications should be pre-established.

- Development of the new system should be designed with not only the front line users in mind, but also other users, such as dispatchers.
- High volume data transfer issues have to be considered, and the capacity for such, built into the new system.
- Voice and data should be separate systems.
- The use of public mobile network providers, such as RAM and Ardis, may be restricted by NCIC.

E. Organizational Issues Requiring Resolution

Other issues raised during the course of discussion that will require future resolution included:

- Adequate financing (budget) and personnel required to support a statewide communications network.
- Appropriate horizontal, as well as vertical communication linkages need to be defined.
- Adequate security and control of communications linkages need to be developed.
- Training for users needs to be included in the development of the new system.
- Ownership of this new integrated system was discussed and the possibilities raised by the focus group participants included Office of the State Controller - State Information Processing Services (SIPS), State Highway Patrol, a statewide umbrella organization, and / or an entirely new organization.

- Whether the start-up and on-going costs of an integrated statewide system should be borne by the users or should be receipt based, free, sliding-scale, or some other method.
- Whether or not the MODAP pilot project should be expanded and what the transmission architecture should be.
- Which costs should be shared, and who will bear the costs for local agencies that don't have adequate financial resources to "buy-in" to the new system.
- How to ensure security and integrity of the system (that only appropriate personnel are allowed access at various communications levels).
- Investigate possibility of specialized cellular for data.

F. Other Focus Group Suggestions

- One possible outcome could be a type of statewide common voice communicator or "talk around" system.
- Dedicated mutual aid channels in each radio band.
- A approach to the development of a statewide systems could include the utilization of existing technologies at both the state and local levels with a sharing of infrastructure. The new plan could focus on filling in the gaps across existing state and local systems.

- The idea of a mobile communications van for responding to emergency situations was not readily accepted. Rather, there was a strong preference for a planned, in place infrastructure.
- Follow-up focus groups were suggested on the individual topics of voice and data.

Focus Group 2: Users of AOC Information

Wednesday, January 18, 1995

Aspen Building Conference Room

Participants

Name

Randy Byrd
William C. Creel
Samuel W. Pledger
James H. Smith
Donald George
Nevelle O. Jones
Chase Boone Saunders

Title

Investigator
Director of Investigations
Investigator
Special Deputy Attorney General
Magistrate
Classification & Support Services
Senior Resident Superior Court Judge

Organization

Cary Police Department
Department of Insurance
Dare County Sheriff's Office
NC Department of Correction
Danbury, North Carolina
NC Department of Correction
Mecklenburg County

General Topics of Discussion: *Users of AOC Information*

- Overview of CJIN
- Current Information Environment
- Information Needs
- Key Points for Success

I. Project Overview

Price Waterhouse Project Manager, Steve Holdridge, gave a brief overview of the Criminal Justice Information Network Study Committee and its goals and objectives for the term of this project. Mr. Holdridge also discussed the roles of the various focus groups and how their input will help shape the development of the CJIN committee's final plan. Mr. Holdridge presented the schedule of public forums to be held throughout the state.

II. Focus Group Highlights

Price Waterhouse consultants, Dr. Deborah Cheesebro and Gilbert Skinner, facilitated the focus group which promoted discussion on the following topics:

A. Current Information Environment

Law Enforcement from AOC

- Forms - arrest, search, etc.
- Court calendar - defendant and witness information via check through DCI
- Local criminal history
- Bail bond information - Department of Insurance needs limits of individual bail bondsman for regulatory purposes

Law Enforcement to AOC

- Case file information - check digit number, ID number, offense, fingerprint card, etc.
- Traffic citations
- Arrest and detention release orders
- Served and expired warrants

AOC to Courts

- Criminal history (AOC) statewide terminal access required. Users are district attorneys, public defenders, some magistrates, and law enforcement agencies statewide
- Management reports - aging reports, case status, facility scheduling
- E-mail
- Hard copy forms provided
- Accounting (clerks)

Courts to AOC (through clerks)

- Warrants
- Pretrial release information
- Case dispositions
- Accounting

AOC to Corrections

- Commitments
- Orders
- Warrants
- Restitution information - victims, accounting
- Criminal histories
- Case scheduling - what is coming? Judicial assignments?
- Accounting - clerk
- Writs

Corrections to AOC

- Supervised judgments and judgement changes
- Warrants
- Commitment orders (some counties)
- Termination orders or early release information
- Changes in restitution monies to bookkeeping
- Changes to victim information

B. Information Needs Not Currently Being Met

- Link criminal and accounting
- More accurate and up to date accounting information
- Accountability for clerk's office
- Need real-time entry of disposition information (jails, DOC, etc.)
- Current delays can be days / weeks before disposition information is entered
- Inadequate staffing levels in clerks' offices causing delays - need adequate staffing to workload
- Probation warrants delayed due to process issue of judges having to sign them when a magistrate should be able to sign
- Need uniformity of rules to access information (re: access / ease of collecting information regarding bondsmen differs from county to county)
- AOC not collecting some information that would be useful:
 - Address
 - Bond
 - Pretrial release information
 - Bond limit information
- Provide most access points
- Ease of access major issue. Needs to be ultra user-friendly (icons, etc.)
- Positive identifier
- Training and support needed on current systems. Communicate systems that are available
- Case management system to track defendant through the system
- Eliminate duplication of data entry with on-line process:
 - Automatically keeps hard copy
 - Generations
 - On-line process replaces hard copy process
 - Programmed for automatic notifications i.e., to jails, victims, etc.
- Law enforcement needs flag for outstanding child support that may not have a warrant issued yet
- Capability to hold data in some form for X amount of years:

- Events, dates, locations, all disposition data
- Collapse for retrieval purposes 5 year / 10 year bands
- Contiguous states sentencing data
- Relevant juvenile adjudication information from all counties and neighboring states for structured sentencing purposes

C. Key Factors for Success of CJIN

- Leadership
- Resources - personnel, hard and soft equipment, mandatory training, and money
- Takes into account current integrated systems
- Must demonstrate ease of use
- Access issues vetted by Attorney General
- Define scope of CJIN
- Recognize the importance of CJIN to the NC Academy of Trial Lawyers
- Consider role of bondsmen - they have more accurate address information and could be required to collect / share information as part of their licensing
- May want to contact Institute of Government (Tom Thornburg, Stevens Clark), and Joann Tilley, Administrative Office of the Courts, judicial forms

D. Oversight of CJIN

- Management of cross-agency project desired characteristics:
 - Mandatory participation
 - Oversight commission representing users chaired by Chief Judge or Governor
 - Cabinet level
 - Has to have teeth and take leadership role

E. Impetus for CJIN

- Significant number of people who see need
- Inaccessibility of data
- Old systems need rework so timing is good
- Cost - clear that efficiencies can be achieved

F. Keys to CJIN being accepted/supported/funded

- There are mistakes being made that affect people's pocket books
- Inefficiencies work to criminal's benefit
- Criminals slipping through cracks in the system now
- Inefficiencies cause multiple appearances and delay justice. Delayed justice always works to the benefit of the criminal
- Cover letter to bipartisan group at the General Assembly

Focus Group 3: Users of DCI Information

Thursday, January 19, 1995

Department of Insurance

Participants

Name

Chuck Conkling

Jeffrey Forbes

Nevelle O. Jones

Kevin P. Tingen

Curtis Ellis

Brenda Haraldson

Carolyn McCullers

Title

ALE Agent II

Magistrate

Classification Support Services

Juvenile Investigator

Special Agent

Clerk of the Superior Court

Administrative Officer

Organization

Alcohol Law Enforcement

Mecklenburg County

NC Department of Correction

Cary Police Department

State Bureau of Investigation

New Hanover County

NC Department of Correction

General Topics of Discussion: *Users of DCI Information*

- Overview of CJIN
- Current Information Environment
- Information Needs
- Key Points for Success

I. Project Overview

Price Waterhouse Project Manager, Steve Holdridge, gave a brief overview of the Criminal Justice Information Network Study Committee and its goals and objectives for the term of this project. Mr. Holdridge also discussed the roles of the various focus groups and how their input will help shape the development of the CJIN Committee's final plan. Mr. Holdridge presented the schedule of public forums to be held throughout the state.

II. Focus Group Highlights

Price Waterhouse consultants, Dr. Deborah Cheesebro and Gilbert Skinner, facilitated the focus group which promoted discussion on the following topics:

A. Current Information Environment

Law Enforcement from DCI

- CCH
- DMV registration & driver history for locating people
- AOC record checks for court dispositions
- NCIC criminal history
- Fugitive warrants
- Receive messages from other in / out state agencies
- Other DMV - hot items includes missing persons/property
- Training, certification and miscellaneous administrative information
- NLETS

Law Enforcement to DCI

- Mirror information exchange back from DCI
- UCR data local levels
- NCIC hot files
- CCH

Correction from DCI

- Criminal history
- Hot files
- NLETS - fingerprint classification, FBI number etc., information at the same level from other states
- Messages
- Certification and academy schedule

- DMV through DCI
- AOC through DCI

DCI from Correction

- Who we've got - prints, demographics
- Who we don't have - absconders logged in

Courts from DCI (through LE)

- Clerks use driver and criminal history
- Magistrate use - criminal history, parole / probation information status, deserted military, civil process (AOC), DMV history, stolen property, runaways, inmate location

Courts to DCI

- Warrants and process through LE agencies to DCI

B. Information Needs Not Currently Being Met

- District Attorney information access
- Extradition information
- Parole / probation information - current status, parole officer assigned, conditions of probation / parole
- Tracking juveniles case histories
- Tracking misdemeanor
- Tracking involuntary mental commitments
- Identification standard

- Current incarceration data - local and state level
- Identifiers at DMV level
- Photo imaging
- Fingerprints - a way to capture at scene and speed of turnaround
- Current status drivers license from here and other states
- Access to Division of Youth Services
- Information on alcohol beverage permit control - contact point and business ownership
- Pending criminal cases within state and in other states
- Name search procedure: exact name first inquiry

C. Key Factors for Success of CJIN

- Funding
- Keeping all stakeholder, agencies, counties involved
- Deal with turf wars in general - no one wants an encroachment on their power
- Political - proprietary information
- Need to overcome fragmentation of law enforcement by involving local, county and state levels
- Overcome natural resistance to change
- Make it look as attractive as possible
 - Easier to do job
 - Answer what's in it for me
 - An enhancement versus a replacement
 - Add resources as an inducement
- Proper training in mandatory files across components
- Critical for funding success with legislature
 - Reduce / eliminate duplication
 - Currently offenders falling through cracks of the information system. Need to be able to better track to identify, locate, prosecute and properly sentence them

- Anti-crime initiative will assist law enforcement in their mission

D. Impetus for C,JIN

- Increase in crime
- Governor support for information highway
- Support for cutting edge

E. Oversight of C,JIN

- Organizational system
- Board of directors representative of users
- Need authority

Focus Group 4: Users of DOC Information

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Department of Insurance

Participants

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Mike Ledford	Classification Coordinator	NC Division of Prisons
Ron Hawley	Assistant Director	Department of Correction/SBI
Nick Barnet	Data Administrator	Office of the State Controller/IRM
David McDuffie	Asst. Division Chief, Cumberland County	Probation & Parole
Nancy Lanier	Pre-Trial Program Director	Wake County Re-Entry Inc.
Chuck Johnson	Pre-Trial Program Coordinator	Wake County Re-Entry Inc.
Peter Gilchrist	District Attorney	Mecklenburg County
Bob Brinson	Assistant Secretary for Management	NC Department of Correction
Doug Kapler	Criminal Info. Statistic & Field Sup. Mgr.	State Bureau of Investigation/DCI
Albert R. Little	Director of Information Services	Dept. of Crime Cont. & Public Safety
Coy E. Brewer, Jr.	Superior Court Judge	Cumberland County

General Topics of Discussion: *Users of DOC Information*

- Overview of CJIN
- Current Information Environment
- Information Needs
- Key Points for Success

I. Project Overview

Price Waterhouse Project Manager, Steve Holdridge, gave a brief overview of the Criminal Justice Information Network Study Committee including its goals and objectives for the term of the project. Mr. Holdridge also discussed the roles of the various focus groups and how their input will help shape the development of the CJIN Committee's final plan. Mr. Holdridge presented the schedule of public forums to be held throughout the state.

II. Focus Group Highlights

Price Waterhouse CJIN consultants, Dr. Deborah Cheesebro and Gilbert Skinner, facilitated the focus group which promoted discussion on the following topics:

A. Current Information Environment

DOC to Law Enforcement (LE) & District Attorney (DA)

- Inmate location
- Probation & Parole
- Release date
- Term of parole
- Notification of release
- Real time escape information (Also to victims and witnesses)
- CCH
- P&P absconders
- Work release
- Infractions / violations
- Visitor log information
- Mental health information (court order required)

LE to DOC

- Suspect / witnesses
- When to house / keep inmates separate
- Help put together crime version information for probation
- Detainer's: wanted information notify probation / parole suspects of current crime
- Threat information about probationers/parolees to P&P agents

DOC to Pre-Trial

- See LE
- Release dates, characteristics, background information

Pre-Trial to DOC

- None

DOC to Users

- Release information
- Daily county, crime, etc., to SBI (some local LE probation / parole)
- Work release data to Social Service agencies (i.e., confirm working for child support inquiries)
- Infractions if asked by an authorized user
- P&P intensive case load information
- Victim notification of release, escape, parole hearing
- Photos to local LE
- P&P structured sentence information to court
- Current and past P&P history to Judge's and the DA
- Inquiries from private attorneys regarding what a sentence would be if a client pled guilty to a specific charge
- On release mental health clinic or other medical for after care

Users to DOC

- Commitment from court
- All personal characteristic data is done from "scratch"
- Crime versions - from DA includes LE report to P&P to case analyst prisons and photos that accompany post-sentence need for classification
- Pre-sentence investigation information (PSI) information from DA
- Death row inventory from DA
- Criminal defendant file - Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC)
- Financial information, restitution, etc., AOC system automated

- DCI criminal history
- Driver's history
- P&P - to local LE information about probationers / parolees behavior
- Judges as part of sentence conditions - geographic exclusions
- LE reports to probation officer about probationer

B. Information Needs Not Currently Being Met

- Currently mental health evaluations DA has may not get passed along to DOC
- Short term LE data about:
 - Probation
 - Parole
 - Release
- In real-time, easily access offender information
- At point of arrest, be able to attain through an automated system:
 - Who's on probation / parole
 - Who's on work release i.e., is it a rearrest of current offender?
- One comprehensive, cohesive criminal history automated and accessible to all CJ
- Positive identifier
- Pretrial P&P information from start (now go through AOC - convoluted process)
- Provide access to PTR information (automated, consistent)
- Standardization of PTR information capture
- Comprehensive records check (see Criminal History)
- Automated, records check:
 - Criminal history
 - Trial history
 - DMV
 - P&P

- Court cases
- Arrest / LE
- Demographics
- Warrants
- Issue: Information must be readily available otherwise information not used
- Real-time entry of disposition in the courtroom
- Event - record electronically passed from arrest to court to corrections to NCIC
- DOC needs future bed planning capabilities
- Information needed for DOC bed-planning:
 - Criminal history (bond, prosecutor's priority)
 - Probation / parole
 - FTA (failure to appear) past / current warrants
 - PTR (pretrial release) information
- Worthless checks (some key demographics not captured by LE)
- Easy access to FTA information
- Question information accuracy of:
 - Unserved warrants
 - Worthless checks
 - Court disposition
 - Eliminate redundancy of writing, entry multiple times
 - Address ID issue
- Benefit of in-court computer:
 - Timely disposition entry
 - Notification of warrants
 - Verify address
 - Pass information to other departments
- At point of scheduling, automatic triggers for preplanned inquiries i.e., traffic case standard inquiry for traffic driving record, etc., eliminates need for manual inquiries at each point of system
- Verify ID at point of probation (fingerprint?)

- Fingerprint or ID at some point all offenders except motor vehicle offenses (some cited to go from infraction to court and not taken into custody)
- Video imaging:
 - Photo
 - Fingerprint
 - Signature
 - Documents
- Standardization

C. Key Factors

- Current systems (AOC, DCI, DOC, DMV) based on their own needs
 - Others have a greater need for information
- Current initiatives need to redo current systems
- Recognize need to standardize and rebuild user friendly issues
- Over reliance on in-house data processing / need users prospective
- Recognize cuts across all branches of Government. "Turf" issues need to be able to connect
- State moving to information age
- Central management team to set priorities and oversee CJIN:
 - Team represents local LE, AOC, DOC, DCI
 - Key: Governor and Chief Justice agree & co-chair committee
 - Committee composition?
 - Local LE
 - Sheriff's
 - AOC / Chief Justice
 - Governor
 - DCI
 - DOC

DMV

DA

- Role of IRMC? CJIN operates as its own commission

- Key: System is so valuable that it motivates use
- Do not mandate CJIN
- Common dictionary needed throughout criminal justice
- Recognize need of larger agencies for technology first. Greatest need lies in most populated areas
- Cost issue between large & smaller jurisdictions needs to be reviewed
- Build the system to meet the requirements of the larger agencies' needs, with the ability to scale down to the smaller agency needs
- CJIN management has to allow for ability to make decisions and move forward in a timely fashion
- Not so many steps of approval that it inhibits progress
- Commission role:
 - At interfaces, provide this data in this form and in a timely fashion
 - Allow system owners flexibility internal to their operations
 - Training dictionary
 - Guarantee quality
- Commission explore and define interfaces and boundaries
- \$ Options:
 - Commission approves funds expenditures
 - Commission funds independently to fund interface initiatives
 - State subsidy to jurisdictions that can not afford to buy in
- Historically justice has been impacted if information is not available statewide
- How do we ensure proper bridges are built? An agency may need to collect information it does not need in order to satisfy another agency's need for information
- Recognize reciprocity of information needs
- Available, accurate information impacts positively i.e., someone doesn't sit in jail longer than they should, etc.

- Show that expenses can be cut with better information and eliminates delay, eliminates mistakes and increases efficiencies
- Accountable for funds and show results
- Staff availability to enter data: match effort required with bodies available
- Start to think about CJ system as a corporation
- System works for users not users for system
- System directly benefits operation of Administration of Justice
- User friendly to expectations established in other arenas (home computers)
- Appeal process

Focus Group 5: Users of DMV Information

Thursday, January 26, 1995

Administrative Office of the Courts

Participants

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Marcy S. Mills Probation & Parole	Officer	Division of Adult
Bob Brinson	Assistant Secretary for Management	NC Department of Correction
Peggy Cox Bradley	Lieutenant	Duke University Public Safety
Doug Kappler	Criminal Info. Statistics & Field Support	State Bureau of Investigation
Mike Ledford	Classification Coordinator	NC Division of Prisons
Albert R. Little	Director of Information Services	Dept. of Crime Cont. & Public Safety
James L. Carr	Clerk of the Superior Court	Durham County
Coy D. Blackman	Major, Director of Zone Two/Operations	NC State Highway Patrol
Fred Davis	Lieutenant	NC State Highway Patrol
Howard Higgins	Sergeant	NC State Highway Patrol
Don Adams Vehicles	Captain, Enforcement Section	NC Division of Motor

General Topics of Discussion: *Users of DMV Information*

- Overview of CJIN
- Current Information Environment
- Information Needs
- Key Points for Success

I. Project Overview

Price Waterhouse Project Manager, Steve Holdridge, gave a brief overview of the Criminal Justice Information Network Study Committee including the goals and objectives of the project. He also discussed the roles of the various focus groups and how their input will help shape the development of the CJIN Committee's final plan. Mr. Holdridge presented the schedule of public forums to be held throughout the state.

II. Focus Group Highlights

Price Waterhouse CJIN team member, Dr. Deborah Cheesebro, facilitated the focus group which promoted discussion on the following topics:

A. Current Information Environment

DMV to DOC

- Drivers license information: number, DOB, last known address, social security number
- DMV convictions
- Personnel (employee) information
- Suspicious vehicle check
- Pending charges in other counties
- Known addresses of escapee relatives
- Photograph (not digitized)
- Restrictions on license

DOC to DMV

- None

Clerk to DMV (uniform across the state)

- Infractions
- Dispositions
- Failure to appear
- Order to transfer special proceeding based on sale of a motor vehicle

DMV to Clerk

- Driving records
- Any identification information

DMV to LE (initial contact)

- North Carolina driver's license information:
 - #, DOB, address, social security number
- Driver's license photo image
- Driver's license restrictions
- Driver's license endorsements
- Civil infractions pending
- Civil infractions disposition
- Record of failure to appear on previous court cases
- Driving record: history, status
- Personal identification information: age, height, weight, sex, race, etc.
- Motor vehicle registration information: tag identification, vehicle identification, purchase date, status, county tax, lien information, insurance, ownership history, impound, execution, etc.
- Identification card information

DMV to LE (investigative)

- Information from initial contact (above) applies to investigative (below)
- Traffic accident data
- Safety inspection certification
 - To whom inspection certification stickers were assigned
 - Varies by county whether safety or emissions
- Temporary registration "tags"
 - To whom temporary tags were issued
 - To be reduced/replaced with online system
- Certified driver's record
 - DL49
 - Judge requires a hard copy on a case by case basis

- Driver's license information from other states
- Driver's citations issued in other states
 - If driver has a N.C. license and was cited in a state with a reciprocal agreement
- Motor carrier information

LE to DMV

- DMV 349 traffic accident report
- DMV reciprocity information from out of state through AOC fails to appear
- Disposition information: driver's license information
- Ad hoc traffic related reporting statistics
- Fatality and accident information on a daily basis
- Warning ticket if requested
- Stolen/stored vehicles
- Chemical test operators log information
- Breath test forms: LE to clerk to DMV
- Statistical information compiled and submitted annually

DMV Internal Users

- Vehicle correspondence (trouble) file
- Driver's license revocation information
- DCI downloads stolen vehicles and DMV enters stop
- Driver's license fraud
- Registration fraud
- Driver's license examiner automated system

B. Information Needs Not Currently Being Met

- Positive identification in minutes
 - Photographs stored in a way that law enforcement can capture immediately when needed (digitized)
 - Fingerprints (livescan)
- One option: one state standard for imaging. Image goes to DCI who sorts to state DMV, NCIC, and IAFIS for sender
- Increase the penalty for driver's license and registration fraud
- Electronic transfer of accident investigation information from Highway Patrol

To DMV and from all LE to DMV

- Revisit the special proceedings to impact owner address problem
- Statistical data from DMV to LE is not currently timely and it needs to be timely
- LE reports on-line to DMV-DOT
- Able to access data immediately and in a user friendly fashion
- Pending driving offenses
- Knowledge of and convenient access to current systems
- Consolidated driver's history including registration information and information from other states

C. Key Factors for CJIN Success

Oversight Committee Issues

- Representative group: SHP, DCI, AOC, Clerk of Superior Courts, DMV, DOC, Sheriffs, municipal police
- IRMC input
- Independent entity with clout
- Understanding by representatives that some individual issues may have to be given up for the greater good
- Possibly a commission that sets standards
- Not SIPS or any other receipt based agency
- Locals should fund themselves to connect to system
- Fund state systems directly to their agencies to retool where needed for connectivity

Success Issues

- System benefits so attractive that it sells itself
- Avoid ways for agencies to receive funding directly from legislature for information projects not compatible with CJIN
- Option: initial window period for funding to locals. Could require a local match for funding from the state
- Solicit public support

IAFIS v. NCIC 2000

- IAFIS: booking process, livescan electronically transfer prints, 2 hour turnaround time
- NCIC 2000: hot files, textual data, criminal history through individual identification file, imaging capability

Focus Group 6: AOC / DCI Interface

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Administrative Office of the Courts

Participants

<u><i>Name</i></u>	<u><i>Title</i></u>	<u><i>Organization</i></u>
Nancy Kiesenhofer	Criminal Information Training Supervisor	State Bureau of Investigation / DCI
Stan Lewis	Fingerprint ID Supervisor	State Bureau of Investigation / DCI
Cheryl George	Database Administrator	State Bureau of Investigation / DCI
Fran Taillefer	Administrator	Administrative Office of the Courts
Keith Halva	Assistant Administrator	Administrative Office of the Courts
Jerry Reutlinger	Computer Operations Manager	Administrative Office of the Courts
Fred Benson	Quality Assurance Manager	Administrative Office of the Courts
George Bakolia	Data Processing Manager II	State Bureau of Investigation / DCI
Janet Greene	Applications Group Supervisor / Criminal	Administrative Office of the Courts
James Fishel	Fingerprint ID Processing Supervisor	State Bureau of Investigation / DCI
Dick Arbutina	Analyst Programmer	Administrative Office of the Courts
Frank Johnson	Systems Programmer Supervisor	State Bureau of Investigation / DCI
Tom Havener	Decision Support Manager	Administrative Office of the Courts

General Topics of Discussion: *AOC / DCI Interface*

- Existing Information Flows
- Existing Technology
- Potential Information Flows
- Potential Technology
- Opportunities and Concerns
- Alternatives for Implementation
- Analysis of Alternatives

I. Project Overview

Price Waterhouse Project Manager, Steve Holdridge, gave a brief overview of the Criminal Justice Information Network Study Committee including the goals and objectives for this term of the project. Mr. Holdridge also discussed the roles of the various "user" and "interface" focus groups, and how their input will help shape the development of the CJIN Committee's final plan. In addition, Mr. Holdridge posted the schedule of public forums to be held throughout the state.

II. Focus Group Highlights

Price Waterhouse Technical Team Leader, Mitchell Kemp, facilitated the focus session which promoted discussion on the following topics:

A. Current Information Flows

DCI to AOC

- Check digit number
- SID and FBI number
- Arrest date
- Arrested name or alias
- Local law enforcement inquiries for AOC criminal history
- Fingerprint mismatch - rejection records
- Federal agencies (located in NC only) inquires to AOC
- Management information (e.g., Annual Reports)
- Fingerprint mismatch resolutions
- Undisposed arrest list
- Court scheduling inquiry by local law enforcement agencies
- Arrest event changes

AOC to DCI

- Expungement information
- Check digit number
- Disposition
- Date of arrest
- Changes from court records
- Inquiry to state criminal case records (including non-fingerprinted)
- Fingerprint mismatch resolutions
- Management information
- Court schedule

B. Current Network Architecture Diagrams

- Please refer to the included network diagrams for the AOC and DCI

C. Concerns and Opportunities

Voice, Video, and Imaging

The focus group identified the following concern in employing imaging technologies:

- Image compression standards - State versus Federal

The focus group identified the following areas as opportunities to employ voice, video, and imaging technologies:

- Arraignment
- Training
- Interviews
- Image on the warrant
- Court document imaging
- Fingerprint imaging
- Electronic forms (e.g., commitment forms)
- AFIS ("Printrak" to be upgraded in June / July time frame)

GIS

System The focus group identified the following areas as opportunities to employ Geographic Information Technology:

- Crime statistic reporting by geographic location
- Message route determination "call response"
- Growing user and application base

Security

The focus group identified the following security concerns:

- Public information access versus. updates by authorized access (AOC)
- Public data interpretation (AOC)
- Dial-in security (DCI)
- NCIC "device specific" messaging (DCI)
- Tran code specific access levels (DCI)
- Encryption alternatives

Organizational

The focus group identified the following strengths to the current organizational structure:

- Meetings are functionally oriented
- Meetings are bottom-up to address working needs
- Top management is committed to interfaces

The focus group identified the following concerns with the current organizational structure:

- Is the structure expandable to the future?
- Can the organizations adapt to the overlap created in a distributed environment?

Support Issues

The focus group pointed out the increase in support issues. The group predicted the following to be the most significant new issues with which they will have to deal with:

- Growing user / LAN Base
- Infrastructure
- NCIC 2000 will require use of PC's-Intel 486
- Database distribution standards

D. Envisioned Communication Architecture

Please refer to the envisioned architecture diagram

E. Requested Future Functionality

DCI to AOC

- Warrants and subpoenas entered by magistrate
- Arrests and warrant entered at the local level and passed to DCI and AOC
- Fingerprinting of all juveniles
- IBR information passed from local systems to DCI without rekeying

- Fingerprint all offenders charged
- Barcode link to eliminate fingerprint card reentry
- Real time transaction processing of disposition, SID number, and FBI number
- Eliminate deceased records
- Access mugshot (perhaps b/w version of DMV picture with thumb print) from DCI and AOC

AOC to DCI

- Magistrate passing warrant and subpoena information
- Dispositions entered and passed for all persons charged
- Link Highway Patrol information without rekeying
- Notify users of scheduling conflicts for:
 - Expert witnesses
 - Subpoenas
 - Defendants

F. Technology Assumptions

In order to develop alternatives, certain base assumptions were agreed upon by the attending group. The focus group agreed that over time all Criminal Justice Workstation will be replaced by PC's or other intelligent workstations, connected to a LAN, and GUI driven. In addition, the following are assumptions agreed upon:

- Both agencies will implement TCP / IP standard communication to the North Carolina Information Highway (NCIH)
- The user base will move toward PC's or workstations
- CJIN will move toward a distributed database architecture

Implementation of these assumptions was evaluated with the technical alternatives in the following section.

G. Technology Alternatives

For each alternative, the group identified the internal and external strength and weaknesses. The first alternative is that both agencies implement TCP / IP standard communication to the North Carolina Information Highway (NCIH).

Internal Strengths	Internal Weakness
Already Completed	Applications will need redesign
Internal Standard	Security issues
	Cost
	Lack of expertise
External Strengths	External Weakness
Industry Standard	Security issues
Flexible for future connectivity	Standards do not keep up with technology
Allows LAN connectivity	Addressing concerns

The second alternative is that the user base will move towards PCs or workstations.

Internal Strengths	Internal Weakness
User Friendly	Security Concerns
Uses Familiar User Applications	Administrative Costs
	Support Costs
External Strengths	External Weakness
	New Operating System

The third alternative is that CJIN will gravitate toward a distributed database architecture. The distributed architecture assumes implementation of synchronized commits, rollbacks, recovery, and transaction logging.

Internal Strengths	Internal Weakness
Centralized Control	Implementation Cost
User Friendly	Development / Application Coordination
Reduced Database Administration	Increased Dependency
External Strengths	External Weakness
Follows Industry Compliance	No Set Standards
Eases Integration with Other Agencies	Security Concerns
	Cost
	Development Weakness within the Industry
	Performance

Based upon the opportunities, concerns, and assumptions identified in the morning session, the focus group identified and prioritized three application alternatives. These three alternatives in priority order are:

- Single access to all systems in CJIN
- Global name search for all systems
- Offender based tracking that implements a single, statewide identifier and single case initiation

In addition the participants identified two application principles or standards that need be implemented in any new development:

- Single data entry
- Standard presentation management for all applications

All of the alternatives were evaluated for internal and external strengths and weaknesses. The following chart summarizes the discussion of all of the alternatives.

Internal Strengths	Internal Weakness
Integration	Increase Need for Coordination
Standardization	Implementation Costs
Less Support	Larger Security Implications
Less Training	Performance
Cost Savings After Implementation	Accountability of Data
Improvement in Available Information	
External Strengths	External Weakness
Increase Sharing of National Information	Nonstandard Products
Ease of Adoption of sNIBRS	Standardization Problems
Savings to Legislature	
Easy to Grant Access to External Users	

Focus Group 7: AOC / DOC Interface

Thursday, January 26, 1995

Department of Insurance

Participants

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Kent Register	Telecommunications Systems Analyst	Statewide Info. Processing Services / STS
Ed Glover	On-line Systems Manager	Statewide Info. Processing Services / SCC
Mark Lang	DCI Systems Programmer III	State Bureau of Investigation / DCI
Stan Lewis	DCI Fingerprint ID Supervisor	State Bureau of Investigation / DCI
Kern Rose	Information Resource Manager	OSC / Information Resource Management
Marian Guerrero	Project Coordinator / Grant Project	NC Department of Correction / AECJDP
Cheryl George	Database Administrator	State Bureau of Investigation / DCI
Deborah Webb-Clark	MIS Data Administrator	NC Department of Correction
Carroll Willis	DCI Telecommunications Sys. Analyst I	State Bureau of Investigation / DCI
Val Christiansen	System Programmer II	Statewide Info. Processing Services / SSC
Tom Bersuder	Systems Analyst	Statewide Info. Processing Services / CSS
Nevelle O. Jones	Classification & Support Services	NC Department of Correction
Larry Wilkie	AFIS Manager	State Bureau of Investigation / DCI
James Fishel	DCI Fingerprint ID Processing Supervisor	State Bureau of Investigation / DCI
Fran Taillefer	Administrator	Administrative Office of the Courts
Keith Halva	Assistant Administrator	Administrative Office of the Courts
Jerry Reutlinger	Technology Architecture	Administrative Office of the Courts / ISD
Fred Benson	Computer Operations Manager	Administrative Office of the Courts
Janet Greene	Applications Group Supervisor / Criminal	Administrative Office of the Courts
Dick Arbutina	Analyst Programmer	Administrative Office of the Courts

General Topics of Discussion: *AOC / DOC Interface*

- Overview of CJIN
- Focus Group Objective
- Existing Information Flows / Technology
- Potential Information Flows / Technology
- Alternatives for Implementation
- Analysis of Alternatives

I. Project Overview

Price Waterhouse Technical Team Leader, Mitch Kemp, gave a brief overview of the Criminal Justice Information Network Study including the goals and objectives of this term of the project. He also discussed the roles of the various “user” and “interface” focus groups, and how their input will help shape the development of the CJIN Committee’s final plan. In addition, Mr. Kemp posted the schedule of public forums to be held throughout the state.

II. Focus Group Highlights

The focus group identified the current information flow between their agencies. The following keys apply to the information exchanges:

* = automated

\$ = biggest payoff to automate

A. Current Information Environment

DOC to AOC *DOC is assumed to include Parole Board and parts of Division of Human Resources. DOC is assumed not to include juveniles.*

- Parole restitution *
- Inmate master *- allows limited access for District Attorney and Public Defenders
- Transportation schedule \$
- Financial management for fines and restitutions *
- Check / report for parole restitution * (duplication between AOC and DOC)
- Notice of release
- Public notice \$
- Copies of notices on interstate transfers
- Copies of pre-sentence diagnosis
- Probation violation revocations * (entry duplication between AOC and DOC)

AOC to DOC

- Arrest history
- Judgment / commitment (paper) \$
- Transportation request \$
- Financial management for fines and restitutions *
- Statistical management information for planning purposes *
- Court schedule (from AOC Director's office)

After identifying current information flows and assessing the benefits of automation, the group envisioned future information exchanges. Those exchanges marked with an asterisk (*) have significant financial or performance benefits.

DOC to AOC

- Bed forecast *
- Judgments that go to prisons and Division of Parole * (30k and 60k - in progress)
- Release notification *
- Parole board case review
- Access by DAs (exists but needs to be expanded)
- Extension of inmate master- extension of access and functionality
- Global name search *
- Inmate accountability system (DOC wants to know where we can go to find out how much money is outstanding and to whom?)
- Automated access request procedure to the AOC system for DOC users
- E-mail between both agencies
- Video conferencing for arraignments and other court appearances
- Video conferencing for management meetings between agencies
- Elimination of duplication of victim / witness coordinator *
- Parole from county jail needs to be automated (local Law Enforcement)
- Gang information (local Law Enforcement)

AOC to DOC

- Subpoenas *
- Writs *
- Subsequent judgments on current probation and prison inmates should be automated *
- Global name search *
- Accountability system (know that things are due at parole and terminate)
- SID and check digit (derived from DCI but it would pass through the AOC) *
- Common offense code*
- Invalid judgment exchange (disposition change)

- E-mail between both agencies
- Elimination of victim / witness coordinator duplication
- Local commitment documents
- Disposition (especially Mecklenburg)

Mitch Kemp asked the focus group participants to rank the envisioned interfaces. A quick poll found the following to be the top three envisioned interfaces:

1. Automated judgment and probation including check digit and SID
2. Common crime code
3. Automated notification (especially notification of release)

There has been much discussion about a single, statewide identifier.

The focus group raised many questions about the identifier, as well as the most appropriate method for its implementation, and its usefulness.

Questions included involvement of the DMV as the originator of the State ID. This method would be the most comprehensive but includes weighted political aspects. In addition, group participants indicated that the DMV option would help in catching the low end felony and misdemeanors but would not assist in the reduction of large scale crime.

A counter point was made that the identifier could be implemented by fingerprinting all offenders. Currently many offenders are never fingerprinted and can thus not be positively identified.

The following are significant points raised in the discussion of the Statewide Identifier:

1. Barcode of identification on driver's license
2. Magnetic strip information on driver's license

3. It takes three fingers to make a positive ID but one finger can be used with name, sex, race, DOB to narrow a search
4. Statewide identifier goes through other agencies as well (such as Department of Revenue).
5. Payoff in automation - the name and demographics do not need to be entered at each stage in the process. Information is entered at DMV and carried forward automatically.
6. Payoff to DOC is in the passing of the Fingerprints along to CJIN process, specifically probation.

The group was in agreement that we need a Statewide ID, but there was not consensus for the method of its implementation.

As in the AOC-DCI and DCI-DOC focus groups, the group attempted to envision a technical architecture that promotes sharing between criminal justice agencies.

There was significant resistance to users from systems logging on to other systems. Many participants felt that one should log on to one's own system and allow software agents to access other systems. Users should not have to know that they are on other systems. Significant points that arose from this argument are:

1. There should be a common user interface
2. Users should not need to know in which system data resides
3. Users should not have to log on to multiple systems to get data

Inherent in the technical architecture discussions is the issue of security. Data security in using program agents versus direct access to data was discussed. Group participants agreed that LAN access is the biggest security risk. The outcome of this agreement is that administrative procedures must be in place to control access to LANs within the CJIN network.

1. Entrust LAN access responsibility to CJIN LAN administrators
2. Secure at the NCIH level
3. Restrict the access at the mainframe

Two alternatives for the seamless access to data were discussed:

1. Centralized database for the state of North Carolina
2. Programs written to access data rather than systems. Distributed database management system with one logical database (software agents).

Three concerns were voiced against one of the envisioned architecture alternatives:

1. Security at the server level
2. Resources minimized by messaging
3. No terminal should log onto the other mainframes or servers

The AOC pointed out that requirements to explain and prove security techniques are crucial when dealing with the Clerk of Courts because they have constitutional duties for the use and validity of the court data.

The focus group concluded after the discussion of the technical architecture and security requirements.

Focus Group 8: DOC / DCI Interface

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Administrative Office of the Courts

Participants

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Kent Register	Telecommunications Manager	State Info. Processing Services / STS
Ed Glover	On-line Systems Manager	State Info. Processing Services / SCC
Mark Lang	Systems Programmer III	State Bureau of Investigation / DCI
Stan Lewis	Fingerprint ID Supervisor	State Bureau of Investigation / DCI
Kern Rose	Information Resource Mgr.	OSC / Info. Resource Management Div.
Marian Guerrero	Grant Project	Department of Correction / AECJDP Project
Cheryl George	Database Administrator	State Bureau of Investigation / DCI
Deborah Webb-Clerk	Data Administrator	Department of Correction / MIS
Carroll Willis	Telecomm. Sys. Analyst I	State Bureau of Investigation / DCI
Val Christiansen	Systems Programmer II	State Info. Processing Services / SSC
Tom Bersuder	Systems Analyst	State Info. Processing Services / CSS
Nevelle Jones	Classification Sup. Serv.	Department of Correction / Div. Of Prisons
Larry Wilkie	AFIS Manager	State Bureau of Investigation / DCI
James Fishel	Fingerprint ID Proc. Sup.	State Bureau of Investigation / DCI

General Topics of Discussion: *DOC / DCI Interface*

- CJIN Study Overview
- Focus Group Objective
- Existing Info Flows / Technology
- Potential Info Flows / Technology
- Alternatives for Implementation
- Analysis of Alternatives

I. Project Overview

Price Waterhouse Technical Team Leader, Mitch Kemp, gave a brief overview of the Criminal Justice Information Network Study Committee including the goals and objectives of this term of the project. Mr. Kemp also discussed the roles of the various "user" and "interface" focus groups, and how their input will help shape the development of the CJIN Committee's final plan. In addition Mr. Kemp posted the schedule of public forums to be held throughout the state.

II. Focus Group Highlights

As an introduction, session attendee's listed their primary information needs from this interface. The following are examples of interface information requirements:

- On-line terminal requirements and connectivity requests
- Fingerprints, demographics, and criminal histories (CCH's were identified as the most important information flow between the DOC and DCI)
- Real time exchange between OPUS and DCI database for fingerprints and criminal history
- DOC needs to know who they have, who they are, where they are going

The following concerns were also voiced in the discussion:

- Physical connectivity requirements (note - currently 2000 terminals in the DCI Network)
- Network architecture, configuration, and security

A. Discussion of the current communication architecture

The focus group agreed that the technical strategy is to migrate away from SNA networking and toward the use of TCP / IP as the standard communication protocol. This protocol will facilitate the future transmission of images, such as the fingerprint card that can contain 650K bytes of data in an uncompressed format. In applying this strategy, the North Carolina Information Highway can be considered to support the communication as long as it meets the needs of the individual agencies. However, use of the NCIH should not be required.

B. One envisioned future communication architecture

1. The following concerns arose while envisioning a future communication architecture:

- Dial-in access
- Internet access in the network must not open the databases to unsecured access

2. The focus group discussed the following security options:

- Restrict at the point of connection
- Limit the internet access to E-mail or specific application access
- Implement firewalls
- Challenge NCIH to set up a secure channel, PVC (private virtual circuit), for the CJIN network

- Is there a need to develop a CJIN security group?
 - Statutory prohibition of information that is collected by a probation officer increases the security requirements
 - This creates internal "agency" information and external "shared" information that is not necessarily the same (information available to one is not necessarily available to the other)
3. Participants also discussed the security issues inherent in mobile data communication. Options include:
- Data encryption
 - Passcard with auto-changing ID's
 - Terminal ID's tied to the tower
 - Application control between the tower and the network

C. Current Systems

DCI

- | | | |
|-----------|------------------|---|
| 1. Unisys | DMS-hierarchical | Criminal history |
| 2. Unisys | RDMS | All new applications near future
State wanted persons
DCI certification
Stored vehicle |
| 3. Mapper | | SBI internal database
Form of relational
GUI designer workbench |

(A and B are LEMS accessed. C is not and currently cannot because there LEMS is currently not client server).

DOC

The Department of Corrections supports 95 prisons and 135 offices of Division of Adult Probation and Parole (DAPP). The department is transitioning from a VSAM system to the DB2 based Offender Population Unified System (OPUS) system.

1. VSAM System

- 56 VSAM files
- 1 of them is Probation & Parole - 100,000 handled manually because probation and parole officers keep files in the back of the car (possible MDT solution)
- Remainder of files are prisons
- They are all being replaced because of the overhead to keep the files in sync
- Consist of Master File (MF) and Inmate Assignment System (IAS)
- Structured sentencing and other systems drove change in reaching physical limitations of VSAM
- Gener / OI (Pansofic / CA) product was used to write systems. CA threatened no support. So approved rewrite

2. OPUS - Implementing Release 2A

- OPUS is dictionary based ASI on mainframe hooked up to PC by SNA network
- Security to row level
- ASI - dictionary
- Facility Staff Reference (FSR) - done
- Offender Reception Process (ORP) - system test, builds the offender table:
 - Assigns a unit
 - Track court / previous conviction
 - DNA samples

- Inmate Population Tracking (IPT) - system test, counting inmates
- Offender Time Comp (OTC) - on-line entry into entry receiving area (redundant with other agencies but use different codes)
- Probation Parole Services (PPS) - used to count parolees, restitution counts

3. Outer Circle - 2C

- Inmate Monitoring and Transfer (IMT) - transportation, buses, etc.
- Inmate Custody Classification (ICC) - classification and approvals - (perhaps input from locals could be helpful)
- IJP - end of March - every inmate is employed on a job or program keeps track of assignments, training, programs (AA, church, etc.)
- Also drives sentence reduction credit
- Inmate Control Status (ICS) - things to keep the inmate secure from others and self automated approval at certain time limits
- IBS - Communication of monies - eliminates writing of checks to the bank.
- Prison is trustee of the inmates funds. Interface with commercial banks
- Parole Commission Action (PCA) - when person can get out

4. Outer Circle - 2D

- ITS - Investigation tracking system - from Florida - use with probation and parole officers
- Medical

D. Current Information Flows

- From DOC to DCI

- Daily release file (batch)
- Prints (finger and palm) - only people who are in custody in prison - no probation and no jail
- Demographics
- Conviction charges
- Abscond DCI list (hard copy and then rekeyed - manual)
- Enters a warrant (DCI terminal)
- Sentencing
- Change is sentence (manual)

E. From DCI to DOC

- SID or FBI
- Notification of warrant check hit (done in case of misidentified person)
- Consolidation of record identifiers SID and FBI

F. Interface Concerns

- 1988 DCI disconnected the prison information and the court information. They still do not connect because the DOC only reports conviction charges and not all charges. They cannot correlate to the arrest charges.
- Charges are based upon different code values for each agency.
- Arrest charges use NCIC offense codes.
- AOC codes are used in the court segment but cannot be used for statistical reporting.
- The list of currently used Offense Codes include:
 - NCIC
 - AOC
 - DOC

- Local
- Ibase (independent of NIBRS in NC)
- NIBRS

G. Interface Opportunities

- There is an opportunity between local jails and DOC to allow the local agencies to schedule inmates and enter diagnostic (admission) information.
- A data administration opportunity is to organize all of the data types and develop a plan for the implementation of standard codes.

H. Envisioned future data interfaces

DOC to DCI

- Video conferencing for inmate investigation by law enforcement
- A CJIN TCP / IP network with all agencies connected to information exchange removing the point to point SNA network
- Abscond (escapees from community supervision) entry into OPUS automatically generating a warrant on the DCI system to eliminate entry in both OPUS and DCI
- Interagency E-mail

DCI to DOC

- E-mail

- Inmate investigation in OPUS
- Identification / fingerprinting of all offenders (local law enforcement, DCI, local confinements, and possibly courts)
- Positive ID at the arrest site
- CCH available at diagnostic center
- Non-DOC escape records
- Juvenile record
- State ID, SID, FBI
- Warrants

I. Major Systems / Developments to Meet Envisioned Points

- AFIS Livescan - partially budgeted - need \$0.25 million
- Automated exchange of criminal justice data between AOC-DOC-DCI
- Federal grant from the Bureau of Justice Statistics including \$465k through September

1. Exchange Should Include

- Daily letter (of releases from DOC)
- AOC disposition (from OPUS)
- Probation information to DCI and AOC / DOC
- Two hour identification turnaround
- Automated exchange for jail transportation between local law enforcement and DOC
- State fingerprint file (NFF concept) exchange with local law enforcement and DOC

2. Less Manual, Paper Driven Processes Including

- Warrants

- Commitments
- Judgments
- Requests for information
- Orders

Focus Group 9: AOC / DMV Interface

Wednesday, February 15, 1995

Aspen Building Conference Room

Participants

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Cheryl George	DCI Database Administrator	State Bureau of Investigation / DCI
Frank Johnson	DCI Systems Programmer	State Bureau of Investigation / DCI
Carol Oliver	Adjudication Team Leader	Department of Transportation / MIS
Tammy Mitchell	MIS Department	Department of Transportation / MIS
Nick Barnet	Data Administration Manager	State Controller's Office / IRM
Doug Haynes	MIS Department	Department of Transportation / MIS
Janet H. Greene	Applications Group Supervisor / Criminal	Administrative Office of the Courts
Keith Halva	Assistant Administrator	Administrative Office of the Courts
Tony Spence	Asst. to the Director of Driver's License	DOT / Division of Motor Vehicles
Mike Decker	Director of MIS	DOT / Division of Transportation
Dwayne Smith	Manager of DMV	DOT / Division of Motor Vehicles
Doug Hanes	Driver's License Registration	DOT / Division of Motor Vehicles
Dale Clark	Registration	DOT / Division of Motor Vehicles
Bob A. Church	Enforcement	DOT / Division of Motor Vehicles
Rosey Gill	Accident, Collision and Reporting	DOT / Division of Motor Vehicles
Alex Killens	Commissioner	DOT / Division of Motor Vehicles

General Topics of Discussion: *AOC / DMV Interface*

I. Project Overview

Price Waterhouse Project Manager, Steve Holdridge, gave a brief overview of the Criminal Justice Information Network Study Committee and its goals and objectives for the term of the project. Mr. Holdridge also discussed the roles of the various "user" and "interface" focus groups, and how their input will help shape the development of the CJIN Committee's final plan.

A. Future Application Requirements

- C Client Server
- C Image
- C Fingerprint
- C Mugshot
- C Document images
- C Signature
- C Large text files
- C Encryption and security
- C Distributed databases

B. Communication Requirements

- C TCP / IP
- C SNA
- C Internet
- C Mobile data

C. Geographic Requirements

- C LAN
- C MAN
- C WAN
- C Mobile data

D. Security

- C LAN access
- C Server access
- C Log on
- C Limited or no dial in
- C Application
 - View
 - Table
 - Transaction
 - Database
 - DCE / Kerberos

E. Information Flows

AOC to DMV

- C Convictions
- C Compliances
- C Non-compliance
- C Civil revocations
- C Appeals
- C Court ordered suspensions

both All information is currently sent in one batch file transfer for gs-20 (motor vehicle cases), data is kept at AOC and DMV

in DMV users have inquiry access to AOC records, by case number, defendant ID, (user must know County order to perform inquiry).

Driver's information: license number, registration (name, city, tag, VIN)

DMV to AOC

- C Customer information: address information, demographics, driver history
- C Demographics may not match AOC data
- C DMV will use AOC demographic data only for add purposes or if none is present in DMV records
- C AOC users have inquiry capability into the DMV registration database
Also, some local agencies access DMV data through AOC

Driver History Including

- C Tickets (court convictions)
- C Issuance of driver's license
- C Accidents
- C Suspensions
- C Status of driver's license privilege code

Highway patrol has trouble interpreting new DMV codes.

DMV information is currently available through NLETS nationwide. However, users need help file to interpret DMV codes.

When Issuing A Ticket

- C Ticket may be entered into a local law enforcement database
- C Ticket information is entered in AOC system
- C Ticket information is forwarded to DMV only after conviction or after court date, or non-compliance

F. State Highway Patrol (SHP)

- C The number sequence will differ, for citations issued by the SHP, because SHP issues their own ticket books, other citations books are issued by the Clerk of Court to law enforcement, these number sequences will be different.

DMV to DCI Information Flow

DCI initiates all inquiries to DMV for data including;

- C Driver's license
- C Driver issuance
- C Name
- C Demographics
- C Driver history

DCI users, those users who accesses DCI information, include out of state law enforcement agency users.

Vehicle registration inquiry system, scheduled to come on line in November 1995, will have a shared customer base.

Driver's license file and vehicle registration file are currently separate databases. The new system utilizes a shared database.

DCI provides a listing of stolen vehicles. This information is manually entered into the DMV system.

An average of 20 - 40 vehicles are reported stolen each day.

The listing, one to two pages in length, includes stolen vehicle information as well as information about recovered vehicles.

DCI does not want DMV vehicle status information returned because DCI / NCIC stolen vehicle data is updated in real time via the DCI / NCIC user.

A comment was made that, " The Enforcement Section of DMV needs help."

NCIC will allow access to the stolen vehicles information.

II. Future Interfaces

Currently statute requires the Court to enter citation data, exactly as written by the officer, even if inaccurate information is being entered. The citation data subsequently provided to DMV, following case disposition, is often erroneous. These records cannot be processed and are placed in a dead record file. The problem of law enforcement and the courts capturing and entering inaccurate information could be avoided by providing AOC users with access to information already available from DMV. A change in the current statutes would be required to allow for corrections to be made to citation data prior to entry into the AOC system.

A. Examples of Erroneous Citation Data

- C Misspellings
- C Name does not match
- C Use of State ID number in place of driver's license number
- C Data is entered into incorrect field on citation form

Incorrect the driver's moving *Approximately 500 citations per day, 5-10% of the total number of citations written, have some data. This results in a driving conviction that is never entered into DMV records. As a result, history is never updated and the insurance company is never notified of the conviction. Serious violations data, for out of state licenses, is not getting reported to the home state.*

begin to *Problem Driver Pointer System (PDPS) a national driver registry located in New York, is scheduled to operating in April 1995. PDPS is a national system and will replace the manual process currently used notify home states of serious driving convictions.*

of Drivers *For serious convictions and suspended licenses, PDPS is sent a pointer including driver name and date birth. States will be able to check PDPS prior to issuing a driver's license. CDLIS, the Commercial License System, currently provides the same information on commercial drivers.*

AOC / DMV Data Requirements

- C Accurate data capture using barcode or magnetic stripe reader.
- C Some of the data, currently required by statute to be sent to DMV from AOC, is not used by DMV i.e., non-moving violations data is not translated into an adjudicable offense, no points are generated and DMV does not take action. Note that future legislation might change this.
- C AOC requires a mugshot, or driver photo, for warrant processing.
- C AOC would receive data, and images by request, from DMV.
- C Link DMV with highway patrol CAD system. Currently DMV cannot get to CAD system data on stored and impounded vehicles.
- C The current CAD system interface to DMV enforcement is a manual system, information needs to be passed to the National Insurance Crime Bureau System.
- C Contact Richard Suggs, at SIPS, re: CAD system.

make database *The DMV enforcement system, an AS-400 based system, currently generates letters. DCI would like to information on stored vehicles available to DMV users. DCI would enter information into national of stored vehicles. DMV enforcement is supposed to be receiving data on stored vehicles.*

contact *Currently there is a DMV request for proposal being issued for a driver's license photo imaging system, Wayne Smith for additional information.*

A statement was made that NCIC standards are lagging the state of current technology.

B. National Plans

- C PDPS
- C CDLIS
- C DLR, Driver's License Registry

C. DMV Wish List

- C Automated passing, of stolen / impounded vehicle information, from DCI to DMV.
- C DCI wants DMV to have access to warrant information. Provide an automated search linking DMV systems to NCIC. Note: this may currently require DMV to have an ORI number to access the NCIC network.

Focus Group 10: Local Integrated Criminal Justice Information Systems

Friday, February 10, 1995

Department of Insurance

Participants

<u><i>Name</i></u>	<u><i>Title</i></u>	<u><i>Organization</i></u>
Nick Barnet	Information Resources Manager	Office of the State Controller / IRM
French Bolt, Jr.	Gaston County M.I.S.	Department of Correction
Bob Brinson	Assistant Secretary	Department of Correction
Worth Brock	Crime Reporting Coordinator	State Bureau of Investigation / DCI
Karen Courtney		Mecklenburg County
Terry English	Clerk of Superior Court	Buncombe County
Cheryl George	Database Administrator	State Bureau of Investigation / DCI
Janet Greene	Applications Group Supervisor	Administrative Office of the Courts
Norm LeBlanc	Sergeant	Wake County Sheriff's Department
Stan Lewis	Fingerprint ID Supervisor	State Bureau of Investigation / DCI
Jo Anne Stokes	Applications Analyst Programmer	Administrative Office of the Courts / ISD
John Wyatt	Co-Chair CJIN Committee	Mecklenburg County

General Topics of Discussion: *Local Integrated Criminal Justice Information Systems*

- Current Local Integrated Systems
- Local Integrated Systems Needs - CJIN
- Key Factors for Success
- Financing

I. Project Overview

Price Waterhouse Project Manager, Steve Holdridge, gave a brief overview of the Criminal Justice Information Network Study Committee including the goals and objectives for this term of the project. Mr. Holdridge also discussed the roles of the various “user” and “interface” focus groups, and how their input will help shape the development of the CJIN Committee's final plan. In addition Mr. Holdridge posted the schedule of public forums to be held throughout the state.

II. Current Local Integrated Systems

1. Buncombe County

Goals

- Eliminate redundant data entry.
- Ability to examine and access defendant status across agencies.
- Get officers back on the street. Arresting officer stays with the suspect through the PC hearing.
- Allow magistrates to concentrate on making decisions.
- Decrease the need for additional personnel.

Actual Systems

- The
- Magistrate Module.
 - a. Criminal cases enter the system at this point.
 - b. Persons related to a case are cross-referenced against the master names index.
 - Computer Aided Dispatch System.
 - a. System hooks into the master name index.
 - b. Criminal history and warrants are checked.
 - There is centralized data entry:
 - a. The goal is to decrease the time a law enforcement officer spends getting information. arresting officer goes back on the street, another staff member maneuvers the suspect through the booking process.
 - b. Allows for greater county / city control of data integrity.
 - c. Magistrates no longer have responsibility for data entry, and can concentrate on decision-making.
 - Central Repository for Original Warrants.
 - Available 24 hours a day.
 - Uniform Crime Reporting.
 - a. DCI provided software assistance to develop this system.
 - b. This system is summary based (versus incident based).

Planned Systems

- There are plans to upgrade the current, manually operated jail management system.
 - a. Right now everyone is looking at the same data but there is a plethora of phone calls to determine whether a suspect / defendant is in jail or has been released.
 - b. The local jail wants a dynamic data exchange with the AOC.
 - c. The jail wants judges to update defendant status in-court and to have that information available immediately, everywhere.

- d. The records management module has not been debugged yet.
- The county wants to develop a prosecution module.
- Wants to access state information through one circuit with many interfaces. Now only the AG can do this. The security arrangements are very specific. For example, law enforcement agencies and the courts control the box to get state information on criminal history.
- Intends to have Public Defender on line, but currently paper based.

Other Information

- No livescans.

2. Pitt County

Actual Systems

- Warrant Tracking System.
 - a. Keeps up with papers served on line.
 - b. Reports are generated nightly off of the mainframe; they are sorted by officer, warrants not served, and by date.
 - c. The warrant system is a stand alone.
 - d. Process - 1) magistrate types warrant; 2) magistrate sends warrant to sheriff; 3) sheriff enters warrants into system.
 - e. There is no integration between the warrant system and the jail system.
- Pawn Shop Tickets.
 - a. The sheriff keys in pawn shop tickets.
 - b. Process - 1) Pawn show produces pawn ticket; 2) Officer picks up tickets from pawn shops; 3) Sheriff's office keys in tickets; 4) Can view database by article.

- c. It was mentioned that tracking pawn tickets should be a statewide practice for locating stolen goods.
- Jail Management Module.
- Two livescan units (Greenville Police Department and Sheriff's Office). They are DBIs (Digital Bi-Metrics).
 - a. Process - 1) Law enforcement captures images; 2) Puts information on mail cards; 3) Sends mail card to SBI.
 - b. It was unclear whether or not there is integration between livescans and the jail, and whether or not there is redundant data entry.
- There are numerous modules (IBASE, Vision).
 - a. For example, the sheriff's office enters arrest and incident reports, but has no interface with the warrant system.
 - b. For reporting purposes, the state receives disks and paper reports, and reenters data.

3. Mecklenburg County

Goals

- Share accurate, complete, and timely information with all local criminal justice agencies.
- Improve productivity.
- Assure accountability.
- Get the officer back on the street. Arresting officer signs an affidavit, does not see the magistrate.
- Provide near real-time jail status of inmates to all local criminal justice agencies.

Actual Systems

- The county has a centralized intake center with 10 subsystems.
- Arrest Processing System.
 - a. Central point for entering arrest, charge, and witness information. From AFIS to arrest processing suspect is given a PID (local fingerprint number). Information is posted to APS.
 - b. Built to receive disposition information from the trial court system. This is not being done. If users want disposition information they must query the trial court system directly.
- Mugshot System.
 - a. Mugshot is networked to the police at two remote sites.
 - b. Mugshot system receives arrest data from APS.
 - c. Detailed, physical identifier information keyed into the system by deputy can be used later to search the database.
- AFIS (city / county single DBI livescan).
 - PID number confirmed via AFIS is posted to APS and provided to all other systems.
- Pre-trial (bond risk assessment).
 - Pre-trial release
 - Client history
 - Current client folder (community contacts, employment history, etc.)
- Central Repository System (warrant repository).
 - a. Warrants and orders for arrest are automatically posted to this system when created by magistrate (magistrate system) or clerk (court system).
 - b. When a warrant is served it is automatically blocked in the system.
 - c. Just started processing civil, non-support judgments. This was housed in the sheriff's process. Formally these were tracked in a separate system.
 - d. Documents are automatically assigned to police division for service by reference to geographic file.
 - e. Recently territorial restrictions in probation judgments were added to central repository.

paper

- f. Information in central repository is automatically available to law enforcement officers by mobile data terminals (MDT's) in police cars.
- g. Juvenile pickup orders.
- Magistrate System.
 - a. The bridge between APS and the trial court system (TCS), and central repository system.
 - b. Does not keep unserved cases in this system, they are kept in APS.
 - c. Automatically receives defendant, witness, and charge information from APS; magistrate may override.
 - d. Creates case filings in trial court system 24 hours a day / 7 days a week.
 - e. Produces warrants, magistrates orders, criminal summons, and commitment/release orders.
- Trial Court System.
 - a. System was originally implemented in 1975; was converted to IMS in 1980.
 - b. 28 on-line functions that interface between the trial court, jails, APS, central repository, and magistrate system.
 - c. Can tell if an offender is in jail, this information is available on-line and is printed on calendars.
 - d. System produces numerous reports used by local courts and District Attorney for management purposes.
- Jail System.
 - a. There is no interface with prisons or other counties' jails.
- Police Street File.
 - a. Provides geographic information to police computer aided dispatch system, arrest processing system (APS), and central repository system.
 - b. Is being upgraded to cross-reference the county's GIS file.
- Police Department Computer Aided Dispatch System.
 - a. This system is not integrated with other Mecklenburg CJIS systems.
 - b. The complaint number is captured in APS to track codefendant in MCCJIS.
 - c. Data does not flow.

- Stand Alone Jury System.

System Weaknesses

- The system is PID driven but users must make inquiries into each subsystem.
- There is no master name index.
- The Charlotte Mecklenburg Police Department does not use incident based reporting.
- MCCJIS does not provide adequate management reporting.

Planned Systems

- A comprehensive jail information system containing 27 modules will replace the existing jail system in summer 1995.
- APS, Central Repository, and Pre-trial Systems will be replaced by a well integrated arrest processing system in spring 1996.
- Replace the magistrate system.
- DA / PD case management system.
- New systems are designed to minimize redundant data entry.

Other Information

- The Public Defender can view anything on the system other than the District Attorney's notes. Likewise, the DA cannot view the PD's notes.

4. Wake County

Actual Systems

- Criminal Management System.
 - a. Remote LAN nodes (Client / Server off of an AS-400.)
 - b. Local municipalities are networked.
 - c. Locals are using the CM software and entering data.
- Offense Module.

Creates criminal reports for the sheriff's office and other agencies.
- Arrest Module.
 - a. City County Bureau of Investigation processes arrests prior to probable cause.
 - b. Digital mugshots. Available to anyone networked through the LAN.
 - c. Data is automatically copied over to the Jail Management System
 - d. The warrant section receives information; enters data into the arrest module.
- Pre-trial Module.

The application looks at the jail application system for case management. It automatically updates for pre-trial and probation.
- Jail Management System.
- Civil Process Management Packet (sheriff's office).

Includes pistol permits.
- City of Raleigh has a Computer Aided Dispatch System.
- Remote AFIS connection for latent database.

CCBI has search capabilities and can review comparisons for investigations.

Additional System Information

- Can do a global search on all of these systems.
- There is a master name index with name, date of birth, and social security number.
- Uses a number like the PID. Individuals have one number in the county for life. The number is based on demographics, not fingerprints.
- CCBI is in the process of imaging old charges from cases in effect prior to the system.
- Has laptops in the field. RAM mobile data. The target is 200, there are about 30 now.
- The system interfaces with AOC, DMV, DCI and DOC. There are approximately 950 Wake based users accessing state systems.
- The Public Defender must access information through the District Attorney who controls CCBI.

Planned Systems

- Planning to issue a RFP for livescans.
- Working on a warrant program to integrate with the magistrates and use AOC crime codes. The software for this is coming from Spokane, Washington. This will save the magistrate from keying information. Currently magistrates are doing this by hand.
- Prosecutor's package is coming.

5. Gaston County

Actual Systems

- Warrant System (on AS-400).
Magistrate enters data real time. This is a stand alone system.
- Two AFIS Systems (county and city police).
Like Wake County, does latent reviews. Gaston does not have a livescan.
- Mugshot System (Vision).
- County officers have computers in their cars that connect with DCI. They can search hot files but not criminal case histories.
- Computer Aided Dispatch System.
- Law Enforcement Records System.
 - a. Feeds off of the CAD.
 - b. Tracks arrests, incidents, follow-up, property.
 - c. Not tied to warrants (due to political reasons.)
- Civil Papers System (on AS-400).

Other Information

- No jail system.

6. Other General Discussion

Charge Codes

- How will CJIN keep locals in synch? How do you get local agencies to use codes?
- The locals want codes with greater detail than the state.
- From a strategic point of view how do you capture codes at the front end? It was suggested that PCS be put the courtroom, or with the magistrate.
- CJIN should consider a statewide help file that brings up codes by category, and the user can tab down for details. The list should be designed to show the most frequently used codes first.

Security

- DCI is continually reviewing security matters as they pertain to NCIH, federal standards, and encryption.

Process

- If information were input at the time of arrest, then when magistrates make decisions they can review the input and correct mistakes. Rather than reinput the same data and potentially create more mistakes. This would greatly enhance quality control.

III. Local Integrated Systems Needs - CJIN

- Statewide Identifier
 - a. An identifier for everyone arrested or charged.
 - b. Identification should take place at the earliest point in the process as possible.
 - c. Verification of identify is critical. How will a SID be tied to one person? Will fingerprints and / or mugshots be used? It is necessary to prevent multiple or incorrect entries.
 - d. Counties need to recognize and understand the benefits to the county of entering arrest / charge data for the state.
 - e. Tie SID to the FBI Number.
 - f. A single identifier could be controversial if law abiding citizens are identified.
- Jail Information
 - a. Need other jurisdictions' jail information.
 - b. Right now tracking down a defendant can take 99 phone calls.
- Statewide access to the Automated Warrant Repository.
 - a. Automatic feed to DCI.
 - b. Valid warrants.
 - c. Warrants created by magistrates.
 - d. This information is available, the problem is with the procedures. "You have a warrant, you come get your guy."
 - e. DOC has an elaborate transportation system, why can't it be used to move warrant captures around?
 - f. There is a hierarchy of charges when reviewing warrants. Process - 1) County #1 calls County #2 that issued the warrant and asks if they want to pick up their defendant; 2) If no, then the County #1 issues a court date, and releases the defendant; 3) if the defendant does not show up for the court date, County #2 issues a FTA.
 - g. Why can't the system attach a tag to the warrant informing the county that picks up a defendant on a warrant: 1) We will pick-up; 2) We will not pick-up; 3) We will travel X distance to pick-up. There is a NCIC field that indicates how far an agency will travel.

- h. There should be legislation that states, if individuals have outstanding process then they cannot obtain things like drivers' licenses.
- Statewide Mugshots.
 - Want to be able to digitally transfer between jurisdictions for investigative purposes.
- Barcode paperwork.
 - a. In order to generate forms.
 - b. Ties documents to the system.
- MO (modus operandi).
 - a. Want to search based on MO crimes / organized crime.
 - b. MO information is not captured as part of IBASE reporting.
 - c. SBI has a section dealing with MOs. It tries to research across the state and put agencies in contact with one another. This is currently done manually.
- On-line search by description criteria.
 - a. Vehicles in a particular area.
 - b. Partial tag.
 - c. Currently this can be done through DCI but there is not a fast turnaround. This kind of search currently requires a programmer's involvement.
 - d. Pitt County does this by going through tax files. Pitt and Buncombe county sheriff's offices both have on-line access to the county tax department.
 - e. Local law enforcement agencies want a statewide stored / impounded vehicle file. They want to be able to share this information with the national system.
- Statewide standards
 - a. Charge codes.
 - b. Help file.
 - c. Technical standards.
 - d. Information standards.
 - e. Interface standards.
- Statewide Pawn System.
 - Georgia recently implemented such a system.

- Statewide Gun Permit System.
 - a. Although the need exists, North Carolina does not want statewide registration.
 - b. Currently pistol permits are issued by sheriffs' offices.
 - c. NC has a permitting system, not a registration system. The Brady bill requires registration by vendors. The problem is an individual buys a pistol from a gun dealer and the information never gets transferred to a law enforcement agency.
- Master Name Index.
 - a. Automatically generate to central county / city computer, and poll to the state. The problem is 75% of the counties cannot afford central computers. They do all have AOC terminals.
 - b. Index should be basic information, such as who, when, where, where to get detailed information.
 - c. Intake should be driven by jails, this will be a problem, however, for those counties without jail systems.
 - d. Provide access to local agencies.
 - e. From the local perspective this is the "portal of entry" - A guy comes into the courthouse to pay a ticket, there should be a flag if he has outstanding warrants and should be arrested.
 - f. Buncombe County has discussed contact based entry (as opposed to incident based). There should be a log kept of any business at the courthouse. There is resistance to this idea.
 - g. The IRMC recommended that a statewide number be implemented.
 - h. Wake and Mecklenburg Counties' jail software captures information on visitors, and searches if visitors should be arrested.
 - i. When CCBI runs job application searches, they run a warrant check. The clerk will call a deputy to go serve warrants.

- Livescan / AFIS.
 - a. Near real-time fingerprint scan just before, or contemporaneous to, magistrate hearing. Then identify can be checked against files, and the magistrate can provide commitment orders.
 - b. Traditionally fingerprinting is delayed until the offender gets to jail, and the opportunity is lost if the suspect is released with PC.
 - c. If probable cause is not found it would be necessary to destroy fingerprint records. A convincing argument could be made to not destroy the records. (For the person's benefit.)
 - d. The key is livescan is a search, not a fingerprint card that has to be destroyed.
 - e. As benefits of using livescan become apparent local law enforcement agencies will use it.
 - f. This technology is improving and becoming cheaper with time.
- Prison Information.
 - a. Query DOC system to see if person is in prison.
 - b. This is a soft search if based on name, a hard search if based on SID.
 - c. Some counties have access to DOC system (Wake, Mecklenburg), many other counties do not have access.
- Bail Information.
 - a. Department of Insurance need information on bondsmen. They are supposed to be regulated but there is no effective tracking mechanism. There is no statewide tracking of liability limits. (Are limits set by the county or the state?) This part of the system is being abused.
 - b. Pitt County tracks this locally with on-line capability with the clerk. Mecklenburg County would love to be able to do this.
 - c. A history of FTAs, and performance of defendants, could help the bail system.
 - d. Courts are not collecting forfeited bonds.
- Bullet Cartridge Identification System.
 - a. For three months, the SBI has been doing this.
 - b. A high percentage of NC's homicides are done with guns and rifles. Like vehicle registration, this is not attached to a person, until there is a second occurrence.

- Other interfaces.
 - a. Regulatory functions.
 - b. Support enforcement and spillover to the Department of Human Resources.
 - c. Domestic Violence Restraining Orders.
- A reason to be a part of CJIN.
 - a. Locals without computer systems still have to report to the state. They will need to be equipped if the state wants to get information from all 100 counties.
 - b. There are little agencies that are paper based and only have 10-15 people in jail. Why should they input basic information into a system, do a livescan, and input more information when the individual is released? A sense of responsibility / obligation must be cultivated, that encourages all agencies to check that folks are not hiding out in the far east or west.

Project Ranking

Statewide ID / FP	1
Jail System	1
Warrant Repository	1
Mugshot System	2
Magistrate Link to Warrants / Courts	1
MO Search Ability	2
Vehicle Description	2
Statewide Standards	1
Pawn Shop System	2
Gun Registration	3
Master Name Index	½
Bond Information	1
FTA History	1.5 (eventually)
Stored / Impounded Vehicle	2
Bullet Identification	2
ID @ Driver's License	1

IV. Key Factors for Success

- Usage is the bottom line. If CJIN is not used it will not be successful. Potential reasons CJIN would not be used include:

- a. If it is difficult to navigate through the system; if the system is not user friendly and intuitive.
 - b. If it does not meet user expectations.
- Accomplishable and complimentary roles must be defined:
 - a. Data entry problem.
 - b. Court, magistrate, law enforcement agency hand-offs.
 - c. Intake.
 - d. Data integrity.
 - e. Labor relations.
- Set accomplishable goals with short-term deliverables that do not cost huge amounts amount of money.
- Link CJIN to the process of truly improving government service in the justice area.
- Focus on safety and efficiency.
- Discuss safety as an investment from a statewide perspective. Determine how much the state should invest upfront.
- Need the legislature's support. Some of the CJIN recommendations will require legislative changes. If such changes get bogged down in the legislature the entire system could get bogged down.
- Like DCI's incident based system, CJIN must be voluntary and it must be a natural extension of an agency's work.
- Incremental implementation, so that the system is not overloaded.
- Make sure agencies recognize benefits up front. Otherwise, there will be resistance from organizations who already feel they have too much work to do.
- If the most important recommendation will be the most difficult to accomplish do not insist that it be done first. Structure recommendations so that they will be building blocks to success. CJIN will need some short-term successes. Look at the criticality and difficulty of individual projects.
- Coordinate CJIN recommendations with other statewide initiatives. For example, NCCAN is reengineering social services delivery towards an experience in one-stop shopping.
- Look at what should staff be doing versus what are they currently doing. Assess what work can be eliminated.

V. Financing

- The Office of State Budget and Management, at the request of DCI, is conducting a study of operating costs. Utilizing the operating costs, the study will recommend pricing models. These models will be used to assist in setting DCI's rates in the future. When the study is complete, DCI users will be notified of the outcome.

Historically, DCI has favored a flat monthly rate rather than a transaction based fee structure. The theory being decisions to run records checks should not be influenced by how much it might cost. Further, flat rates are easily budgeted.

- Approximately 45 counties have 10 percent of the caseload, and 8 counties have 37 percent of the caseload.

Focus Group 11: Law Enforcement Vertical

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

Aspen Building Conference Room

Participants

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Don Adams	Captain	North Carolina Division of Motor Vehicle
Nick Barnet	Information Resources Manager	Office of State Controller / IRM
Tim Brown	Automation Specialist	City / County Bureau of Investigation (Raleigh)
R. Keith Bulla	SAC	State Bureau of Investigation
Robert E. Cansler	Chief	Concord Police
E.W. Horton	Major	State Highway Patrol
Eugene Jordan	Superintendent	North Carolina Parks and Recreation
Donna Maynard	Executive Officer	North Carolina Sheriff's Association
Fred Mohn	Deputy Commissioner	North Carolina Department of Insurance
Bill Patterson	Deputy Director	North Carolina Alcohol Law Enforcement

General Topics of Discussion: *Law Enforcement*

- Current Information Environment
- Information Needs
- Key Points for Success

I. Project Overview

Price Waterhouse consultant Dale Lefever provided a brief overview of the Criminal Justice Information Network Study Committee including the goals and objectives for this term of the project. He also discussed the roles of the various “user” and “interface” focus groups, and how their input will help shape the development of the CJIN Committee’s final plan.

The participants of the Law Enforcement Vertical Focus Group were given a business process map to analyze information needs at a an operational level. Other focus groups did not do this. The maps outlined major functions, tasks, decisions which need to be made and information required to make them. Discussion focused on the adequacy of current information and what additional information is needed. On the following pages, materials in bold and the accompanying “notes” are the result of the group’s discussion.

1. Enforce Local and State Traffic Laws

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
1.1 Identify and take enforcement action for traffic violations	1.1.1 Initiate contact with violator	1. Traffic laws		
		2. "Be on the lookout for"		
	1.1.2 Type of action to take	3. Positive identification	1. The use of fake IDs and names are a big problem.	1. Positive identification is not happening in a timely manner, if at all. 2. It would be helpful to be able to verify pictures on a mobile data terminal. There is a DMV RFP for digital photos.
		4. Active warrants		3. This is key.
		5. Traffic accident analysis data		
		6. Driver's license information: - Name - DOB, etc.		
		7. Driver's license restrictions	2. Cannot access this immediately, there is a delay from the magistrate.	
		8. Driver's license endorsements		

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
		9. Motor vehicle registration & insurance information	3. This information is currently shown as codes on the registration. DOI approves insurance companies, DMV records and codes the information. Trooper has to call in to get information, there is a delay and information is often inaccurate.	4. Registrations would be easier to use if insurance company names and policy numbers were listed. There are other states with better systems.
		10. History of involuntary commitment - mentally ill - developmentally disabled - emotionally disturbed		5. This is a judicial finding, so information should be legally accessible.
		11. History of assaultive behavior		
		12. Gun permit		6. Under current law permits are issued to purchase not to carry guns. There is pending legislation on this issue now.
		13. On probation or parole for felony		

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
		14. State history		7. This does not exist, but maybe it should be considered.
	1.1.3 Type of documentation to complete	15. Nature of violation		
		16. Positive identification		
		17. Driving record		
		18. Warrant verification and hard copy		
		19. Name of parent of guardian of juvenile		
1.2 Accident investigation	1.2.1 Traffic violation exist	20. Knowledge of laws		
	1.2.2 Type of enforcement to take	21. Positive identification		8. This is unavailable but needed at each point of contact.
		22. Driver's information		
		23. Accident analysis		
		24. Active warrants		
		25. Driver's license information: - Name - DOB, etc.		

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
		26. Driver's license restrictions		
		27. Motor vehicle registration & insurance information		
		28. Traffic engineering information		
	1.2.3 Type of documentation to complete	29. Positive identification		
		30. Driving record		
		31. Nature of violation		
		32. Warrant verification and hard copy	4. When LEA processes arrestees for the county system, often the system shows an "active" warrant when one no longer exists.	

Other Notes / Questions

1. There will be greater public acceptance of digital photographs than widespread fingerprinting. The public objects when asked for additional information.
2. A review is needed of NC administrative law regarding acceptable documentation to determine positive identification when a driver's license is issued.
3. DMV can query the number of licenses received by a single individual. It is a red flag if someone says they've never obtained a duplicate license.

4. DMV has dropped race from drivers' licenses. There is a state statute that went into effect in January that says information on race can no longer be collected. Although this is a national trend, a decision has been made in NC to put this information back into records. It was noted that photos would help eliminate the need for a race identifier.
5. DMV's capacity to capture digital images, store them in a statewide database, and make them available to law enforcement agents in the field is more than 5 years away. As an interim measure, officers in the field would like digital images on file, accessible through a DCI terminal through dispatch.
6. When dealing with juveniles who are less than 16 years old, there are a different set of rules regarding confidentiality, and there are numerous safety issues. It may be politically acceptable to flag juveniles who have committed crimes equivalent to a felony offense. If a juvenile is bound over to Superior Court and charged as an adult information is more easily accessible. Also, law enforcement agents are most interested in knowing the real names of parents and guardians, who are required to be notified if a juvenile is taken into custody.
7. The AOC system is not updating warrant records when fines are paid off. This problem is impacted by a huge volume of warrants, and time delays up to six months. The clerk operates on a 40 hour week and law enforcement needs this information 24 hours a day.
8. When warrants are issued they are in the sheriff's possession for awhile, and if they are not served they are sent back to the clerk and put into a cabinet. There are differences between counties regarding the use of original warrants and whether service can take place with or without a hard copy warrant.
9. According to Chapter 15A law enforcement can make an arrest based on the knowledge that a warrant exists. The tie to paper warrants is a training problem rather than a legal issue.
10. Process - 1) magistrate determines probable cause; 2) magistrate issues warrant, using original signature; 3) warrant is given to a law enforcement agent (LEA); 4) LEA serves warrant / arrests suspect; 5) LEA returns person to magistrate; 6) magistrate should clear out database at this point.

1. Enforce Local and State Traffic Laws

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED			
1.3 Enforce state OUIL laws	1.3.1 When to arrest	1. Traffic laws					
		2. Blood alcohol level/ probable cause					
		3. Driving record to determine charge					
	1.3.2 Content of report		4. Driving record				
			5. Positive identification				
			6. Driver's license information				
			7. Nature of charges				
			8. CCH				
			9. Record of vehicle storage		1. A central repository of vehicle storage locations would be helpful when offender is released from jail, or when spouse comes to pick up the car.		
			1.3.3 Where to incarcerate		10. Space available		
					11. Medical needs		

Other Notes

1. The new intox-analyzer machines should be hooked-up to a data repository. On the AIR form there is a question, "where did you do your last drinking?" It would greatly help ABC agents to target enforcement actions if this information were input into a database. Washington State does this.
2. The NC Department of Environment, Health, and Natural Resources is the agency that regulates intoxicilizers. Information from forensic testing is supposed to go directly to the courts. This should be handled administratively rather than by statute. The AOC was prepared to handle a link-up but the project was put on hold.

2. Enforce Local and State Criminal Laws

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
2.1 Apprehend persons who have committed criminal violations	2.1.1 Whom to arrest	1. Active warrants		
		2. "Hot files"		
		3. Probable cause crime committed		
		4. Positive identification		1. This is critical. There are lots of out-of-state people coming in; there is a need for a national repository to quickly ID folks.
	2.1.2 Where to concentrate enforcement activity	5. Crime analysis		
		6. Probation / parole information - conditions - officer / supervisor - location of officer		2. Local LEA wants this information through an automatic trigger.
		7. Prison release information		3. This information is very difficult to access.
		8. "Be on the lookout for"		
		9. Active warrants		

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
		10. Escapee information		4. Local LEA does not have, the only way to know is by personal knowledge.
	2.1.3 Content of report	11. Knowledge of criminal laws		
		12. CCH		
		13. Warrant verification and hard copy		
		14. Positive identification		
		15. Nature of violation		
	2.1.4 Probable cause to search	16. Controlled Substance		

Other Notes / Questions

1. Desired notification regarding offenders / parolees include:
 - a) When a parolee is released from prison. (Maryland has a good model.)
 - b) When an offender is on a work release program. In the past, DOC notified the local sheriff, but this was stopped.
 - c) Victim notification. This is actually farther along than sheriff notification.
 - d) Sex offender notification. There is pending legislation regarding this now.
 - e) Escapees. DOC puts an alert on DCI, but there is still the issue regarding positive identification.
 - f) Parole review. Even when a police department notifies the Parole Board it wants to be notified, law enforcement is rarely involved in parole review. DA is often left out for all cases except perhaps homicides. Victims are not automatically notified either.

2. There was a discussion regarding using driver's history versus state history. It was agreed that the less need there is for independent searches, the better.
3. Under structured sentencing the current Parole Commission may be eliminated. However, it was noted that structured sentencing may be revisited in the legislature. DAs charges are used on the sentencing chart. Judges do not see original charges.
4. Probable Cause for Search - Controlled Substance
 - a. Process - 1) Department of Revenue administers a controlled substance tax assessment program; 2) Police get print-out; 3) Local agency makes arrest; 4) Local agency fills out form; 5) Local agency sends form to DOR; 6) DOR assesses tax based on dosage.
 - b. This is seizure / forfeiture information. However, there is an interpretation issue regarding access to the information. It is not income tax data which is confidential by statute. Police departments would like to know if a person is in the DOR database for determining probable cause for investigations.
 - c. Also, if the police search an individual carrying \$2,000 and that person is on the DOR list and owes \$4,000, the police can seize the money. Now, the only way the police know a person might be on the DOR list is if they made the original arrest. If this information were more readily available, DOR collections would go up.

3. Conduct Investigations

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
3.1 Investigate alleged criminal violation	3.1.1 Determine if, in fact, a criminal violation exists	1. Nature of incident	1. DCI currently collects information on uniform crime reporting.	1. If local LEAs had better access to DCI uniform crime reporting data, which is incident based, it could be helpful identifying common crimes, and making links across agency lines. However, this is less important than positive identification.
		2. Evidence and analysis (lab reports)		2. A tracking system for evidence is needed.
		3. Witnesses		
		4. Knowledge of law		
		5. "Hot files"		
		6. Active warrants		
		7. Probable cause		
		8. Positive identification		3. There is a big need for access to a photo of individual arrested.
		9. Prior complaints and reports		

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
		10. Initial police report (if not original responding officer)		
		11. Other agencies similar investigations	2. Police Departments, Sheriff's Offices, DMV, and SBI trip over each other all the time during investigations.	
		12. Crime analysis - similar crimes		
		13. Incarceration status		
		14. Pawn shops	3. Get paper format.	4. Need electronic match with stolen property. Currently there are two applications being marketed in the state.
3.2 Investigate non-criminal incidents: - Missing persons - Unidentified persons - Employment background investigations - Internal investigations	3.2.1 The location of a reported missing person	15. See attachment (A)	4. Missing and unidentified persons is an NCIC capability.	5. There is some database capability to access this information, but not sure where.
	3.2.2 The positive identification of an unidentified person	16. See Attachment (B)		

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
	3.2.3 Suitability for employment as a law enforcement / corrections officer	17. Positive identification		
		18. Military history		
		19. Criminal history		
		20. Employment history	<p>5. The Criminal Justice Training Standards Commission will have information if the individual has previous criminal justice experience. There is no information for new officers.</p> <p>6. The Sheriff Standard Commission has information too.</p>	<p>6. There is no database to query employment history. The Employment Security Commission should have a work record. Department of Revenue would have tax information, but it is confidential.</p>
		21. Education		
		22. Driving record		
		23. Medical history (physical & mental health)		
		24. Training & certification records		

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
3.3 Conduct internal investigations	3.3.1 Proper disposition of alleged violations / misconduct against officers	25. Citizen complaint	7. Under existing law, agencies do not share information on individuals under investigation. 8. In NC a false report is subject to criminal penalties.	
		26. Physical evidence		
		27. Witness statements		
		28. Department rules / regulations		
		29. Accused officer statement		
		30. Complainant background: - Criminal history - Driving record - Prior complaints		
3.4 Conduct bondsmen investigations	3.4.1 Have bondsmen exceeded liability levels	31. Liability levels	9. This information is available by calling each county clerk.	
	3.4.2 Have bondsmen been arrested on misdemeanor or felony charges	32. Arrest information		
		33. Charge information		

Other Notes / Minutes

Bondsmen

1. DOI / AOC interface systems with county clerks to track bondsmen liability limits. DOI does not have the staff to audit all bondsmen. There are technical violations where bondsmen are writing over their limits. On a minimum deposit of \$5,000, bondsmen can write up to 8 times, and can post up to one-quarter of the deposit on a single bond. Bondsmen are supposed to submit monthly reports, and it is now a felony to falsify a report.
2. If a judgment is not satisfied, a clerk in a Superior Court can suspend a bondsman for that district. The bondsman can still write bonds in other districts. DOI has the authority to cut off a bondsman statewide.
3. If a bondsmen goes bankrupt, or dies, judgments become civil cases, and clerks are not collecting them.
4. Political strength of bondsmen? They are independent business people. No government agencies are interested in replacing them. They have a viable association, with which the DOI tries to work. The system is here to stay.

Mental Health Records

5. Local law enforcement wants access to mental health information on suspects and offenders. Officer safety is a concern in the field, and often officers have no way to know who they are dealing with. Officers do not need detailed reports, they just want an alert to determine whether an individual is dangerous. Access to mental health records is not available at the county-level. This is primarily a confidentiality issue. Records are kept by the county clerk and the Department of Human Resources.
6. Driver's license hearing officers and insurance hearing officers would like mental health alerts on the folks they deal with.
7. Rules vary by locality, but when a police department serves involuntary commitment papers, that department can track the individual. There is no information sharing though.
8. Although according to federal law sheriffs are not to issue gun permits to individuals who have been involuntarily committed, there is no way for sheriffs to access this information.

9. Currently there are 3 bills in the legislature on concealed weapon permits. There is also an issue regarding permits to purchase weapons. It was noted that because involuntary commitment is a judicial determination, this may be a way to get the foot in the door to access mental health information. LEAs would like to have this information. Anything beyond involuntary commitment information would be politically unpalatable.

Reporting

10. If all agencies do not report to DCI's incident based system then it is no good. The system is not being used because it is not helpful to local agencies. The only output is a yearly report of consolidated information.

Photos / AFIS

11. Mecklenburg County's electronic photos are not very high quality. They are flat and light. CCBI has good quality photos with high resolution. NC has approximately 26-28 (out of 400) "Chiefs" software users (AS-400 / PC). Users include New Bern, Morganton, Hickory, and Cary. Other software packages being used are AMT (mainframe / PC), and Vision (PC based). If an agency has a PC it can do a terminal emulation or direct connection with all 3 packages.
12. DOC is working on a livescan grant to automate 12 sites. The digital image portion is out to bid.
13. Last year four or five grants were awarded in the state for AFIS (Larry Wilkes is the state contact). The state is developing an AFIS standard.
14. By state statute there are lots of misdemeanor charges that cannot be fingerprinted. Cannot print traffic violators.
15. If the scope of fingerprinting is increased, there will be a huge increase in the sheriff's workload. There was discussion on the need for another identifier other than fingerprints. Also, there will never be fingerprinting on minor traffic violations, because there is no custody.

Missing / Unidentified Persons

16. Although a small number of cases, when they happen they are high pressure. There is a problem identifying bodies from other counties and from out-of-state. This is not as important as establishing DMV pictures.
17. Process - 1) Body found; 2) Query local area agencies; 3) Contact DCI; 4) Contact NCIC; 5) Search based on broad descriptors such as sex, race, approximate height and weight; 6) Conduct state medical search.

Employment History

18. Because there is an accompanying sworn statement, if an officer lies about employment history there are grounds for dismissal. The local DA would have to decide if there is false pretense or perjury.
19. The issue is less with sworn officers than with other personnel. For example, the Department of Parks and Recreation has problems getting information on individuals hired as maintenance workers, service and seasonal staff. A "state history" would help alleviate this problem. Other examples of non-sworn positions, but with high public contact, or positions of trust, include: fire agency personnel, emergency medical technicians, staff at consolidated communication centers. NCIC cannot be used to query their criminal history.
20. Accessing information on individuals who have worked in state is generally not as big a problem as officers who come to NC with experience in other states.

Other Information Needs

21. Police departments would like to cross-index AOC cases to an officer's name. For example, Officer X was involved in the following cases with the following dispositions. If 90% of an officer's cases are dismissed due to lack of evidence the police chief needs to know. It helps point to targets of internal investigations, and it identifies training needs and other weaknesses. Other information that would be useful on an officer by officer basis includes:
 - a. The number of cases that pled to lesser charges.
 - b. The number of convicted charges.
 - c. The number of voluntary dismissals.This information is currently being collected but can not be accessed.

22. There is no automated interface between police departments and district attorneys. In many counties hand-offs are made by printing documents and hand carrying them to the next agency.
23. The police department has no clue as to the disposition of misdemeanor cases. Process - 1) Police go to the county clerk's office; 2) Reference a specific case; 3) Clerk prints the case; 4) Police reinputs into own system. (It is physically impossible to run dispositions for every officer.)
24. A system is needed to internally close a file. This exists for felony-level investigations, but they are only a very small percentage. The SBI tracks closed files by fingerprint check digit number (felony only). Process - 1) SBI agent reports an arrest to AOC; 2) AOC pulls disposition; 3) AOC authorizes closing.
25. There is no statewide database on misdemeanors, even though misdemeanors can include assault with a deadly weapon and concealed weapon charges.

State Role in Local Investigations

26. The SBI's Criminal Information Support Section has set up a reporting system, gathers intelligence, answers queries, and disseminates information. The section is set up to answer queries from local terminals and by phone line. The SBI accesses the information for other agencies; local law enforcement cannot directly access this information. SBI evaluates whether or not to put law enforcement agencies in contact with one another. This is a very sensitive issue because of under cover operations, and concerns for officer safety. In addition, there are statutory restrictions on accessing this type of information. SBI does a great job. They meet regularly with agencies.
27. Part of the reason for having the SBI do information searches is because its staff know how to find the information. There would be a huge training curve for local agencies if this function were decentralized.

4. Respond to Emergency Situations

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
4.1 Develop emergency plans for a variety of situations	4.1.1 Other agencies to be involved	1. Nature of emergency		
		2. Other agencies roles, resources and capabilities		1. The biggest problem with large-scale emergencies is there is no radio communication compatibility.
	4.1.2 Number of offices, resources, and method of response	3. Nature of emergency		
		4. Geographical location	1. Emergency Management is just beginning to develop a centralized GIS system. They have bought hardware and software, but it is not operational.	
		5. Emergency response methods and techniques		
		6. Probability of damage and injury		

4. Respond to Emergency Situations

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
4.2 Respond to a variety of emergency situations to protect property, render aid, and restore order	4.2.1 How and where to respond	1. Nature of emergency		
		2. Hazardous materials, if present		
		3. Hospital locations and capabilities		
		4. Routing information: - Self - Detour routes		
		5. Other agency resources: - Airlift availability - Large scale searches or blockades - Large equipment - Portable lighting - Emergency power	1. Many large counties have put pools of equipment into databases. Smaller counties rely on personal knowledge and word of mouth.	
		6. Location and actions of other law enforcement		1. There is a need to be able to cross patch agencies over various levels of frequency.
		7. Location and actions of fire service, medics, etc.		

Other Notes / Questions

1. The Governor has the power during a state of emergency to cease the sale of alcohol. ABC has no database that assists in identifying and notifying establishments that sell alcohol. This becomes an administrative nightmare. (Mayors have the same power at the local level.)

Focus Group Summary

1. The number one priority is a positive identifier. This should either be digitized photographs or livescan.
2. There was some discussion of fingerprinting recipients of driver's licenses. It was stressed again the need to verify identification when a driver's license is issued. Proper forms of identification should not be an administrative decision.
3. Officer safety should be a high priority, and it should be used to sell CJIN projects. The information an officer needs in the car includes:
 - a. Involuntary commitment alert
 - b. Probation and parole
 - c. History of violence
 - d. Issuance of gun permits
 - e. Outstanding warrants
4. The climate may be right to sell a statewide 800 MHZ project. The CJIN team should consider recommending a statewide bond measure to fund it.
5. State versus Driver's History
 - a. Such a history should include criminal related items such as bondsmen, ABC permits, and gun permits.
 - b. Ten years ago the resistance from civil liberties groups would have been a lot stronger than it might be today. There was a discussion on whether the climate had changed. It was noted that misinformation and misidentification can be a big civil liberties issue. If this issue is wrapped around the positive identifier it will be easier to justify.

6. From an investigative standpoint there are lots of databases that the state is desirous to more easily access, these include:
 - a. County / municipal utilities permits and licenses
 - b. County / municipal locations of individuals, houses and neighborhoods
 - c. National databases on telephone numbers, addresses and maps
 - d. Many NC counties have implemented 911 systems enhanced with addresses. But these systems are generally by county and not connected to any systems. If connected to a system it could be a great investigative tool.
7. The need to track warrants is high. Except for felonies, which are a relatively small number, there is no statewide system to track warrants. Plus, it is very difficult for officers to get their hands on warrants, especially during off-hours.
8. LEAs need information on offenders who are out on bond, the area with jurisdiction, and conditions attached to the bond. Most bonds carry conditions, and if worded correctly the individual is arrestable immediately.
9. Dispositions need to be tracked. Duplicate entry must be eliminated. This is a lower priority.
10. Data entry should originate with the magistrate.
11. A concern was expressed that agencies may feel a need for additional personnel. A lot of this work is already being done, it is just a matter of how.
12. Are DCI terminals being considered as the point of access to CJIN? All 100 sheriffs have DCI terminals. Smaller police departments do not have direct access to DCI terminals. But officers can call in to someone with a DCI terminal. Police departments can not search on their own. Many smaller departments have PCs, with proper authority they can access DCI.

Governance

13. It was suggested that CJIN should be based in DCI with a Board representing other interests.
14. There was discussion regarding how representatives to such a board would be selected. There was concern that appointed positions would be too political. It was suggested that members be solicited from professional affiliations. It was also suggested that the DMV Commissioner be represented.

15. Because so much of the CJIN information is tied to a person's record, it might be easier to manage if this were housed within a law enforcement agency.
16. Federal regulations and constraints on who can have access to information must be considered. There is US code that limits access to NCIC.
17. The Department of Justice and DCI already interface with both national and local databases and organizations.
18. The public thinks CJIN should enhance public access to information. If an individual walks into a local LEA with a release of information he or she can get information for that county but there is no way to do a statewide search. It was noted that employers and landlords should access information through a LEA intermediary.
19. It was suggested that a CJIN board include representation from:
 - a. Superior Court Clerk's Association
 - b. Sheriffs
 - c. Chiefs of Police
 - d. Department of Motor Vehicles
 - e. DCI / SBI / Attorney General
 - f. Department of Correction
 - g. Courts
20. The CJIN board should not be called "advisory," it must have some control.
21. The purpose of the board should be to establish policies and procedures and answer complaints.

Funding

22. Municipal police departments spend a lot of time on non-criminal accident reports for insurance adjustors who pay \$2.00.
23. Beware of user fees, they can be a big problem for small agencies that must watch every penny.
24. Consider increasing existing fees. Clerks charge outside users (attorneys, private investigators, bail bondsmen, persons applying for occupational licensing), DCI charges regulators. DCI would be opposed to charging user fees within the criminal justice world.

Other

25. Police departments and sheriff's offices get subpoenas on Fridays for court dates on Monday. The subpoena is good until the court date. There is about a 50% service rate. The delay is from the clerk's office.

Focus Group 12: Courts Vertical

Thursday, February 17, 1995

Aspen Building Conference Room

Participants

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Nick Barnet	Information Resources Manager	Office of the State Controller/IRM
Cindy Bizzell	Guardian ad Litem Services Division	Administrative Office of the Courts
Leah Brown	Information Services	Administrative Office of the Courts
Martha Curran	Clerk of Superior Court	Mecklenburg County
Linda Dilling	Applications Analyst Programmer II	Administrative Office of the Courts/IS
Janet Greene	Applications Group Supervisor	Administrative Office of the Courts/IS
Rick Greeson	Superior Court Judge	Guilford County
Keith Halva	Assistant Administrator	Administrative Office of the Courts/IS
Donn Hargrove	Area Administrator	Juvenile Service Division, AOC
Tom Havener	Statistical Decision Support Manager	Information Services, AOC
William M. Neely	Chief District Court Judge	(19-B)
Fran Taillefer	Administrator	Administrative Office of the Courts
Ed Taylor	Juvenile Service Sys. Administrator	Juvenile Service Division, AOC
Angus Thompson	Public Defender	Robeson County
Ken Titus	District Court Judge	(14)

General Topics of Discussion: *Courts*

- Current Information Environment
- Information Needs
- Key Points for Success

I. *Project Overview*

Price Waterhouse consultant Dale Lefever provided a brief overview of the Criminal Justice Information Network Study Committee including the goals and objectives for this term of the project. He also discussed the roles of the various “user” and “interface” focus groups, and how their input will help shape the development of the CJIN Committee’s final plan.

The participants of the Courts Vertical Focus Group were given a business process map to analyze information needs at a more operational level. Other focus groups did not do this. The maps outlined major functions, tasks, decisions which need to be made and information required to make them. Discussion focused on the adequacy of current information and what else is needed. On the following pages, materials in bold and the accompanying “notes” are the result of the group’s discussion.

1. Arrest / Charge (Warrant)

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
1.1 Issue a Warrant	1.1.1 Determination of probable cause (crime/person)	1. Proof of all requisite elements of a crime	1. Warrants are input into the AOC system, but there are frequent data entry mistakes, such as misspellings, which result in two identities for the same individual.	1. If a magistrate issues a warrant prior to the clerk assigning a court number, the information will not be on CIS.
		2. Proof of identity of defendant		2. Proof of identity is often based on personal knowledge of the law enforcement agent or the citizen seeking a warrant. Often false information is entered due to lack of knowledge.
1.2 Serve Warrant	1.2.1 Communicate with other law enforcement regarding defendant	3. Identity/description of person		3. All counties struggle with using original warrants versus faxes or copies. The rules are unclear whether they should put a hold on an individual or not. Current culture places a high value on the actual piece of paper.
		4. Charge/offense		

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
		5. Location of warrant		4. There is a big problem with getting a hit on a record in another county, but the warrant is not accessible.
		6. Time limits on warrant		5. Individuals are being served old or recalled warrants that have not been taken out of the system. Also, cases get old and the ADA takes a dismissal, but leaves the outstanding warrant in the system.
1.3 Apprehend/legally serve warrant	1.3.1 Determine right person/arrest	7. Identity/description of person		
	1.3.2 Secure person	8. Charge/offense		
	1.3.3 Inform person of charge	9. Location of warrant		
1.4 Take person to judicial official (initial appearance)	1.4.1 Right person arrested	10. Identity/description of person		6. It is not uncommon for a defendant to go through the entire process under a false name because a positive identification was never made.

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
	1.4.2 Warrant properly served	11. Charge/offense		<p>7. It is not uncommon to have a defendant on calendar with unserved warrants that no one knows about.</p> <p>8. Magistrates must worry about determining whether a defendant brought in on a DUI is safe to let go.</p>
	1.4.3 Conditions of pre-trial release	12. Prior criminal history	2. Some magistrates use DCI. If they do not have a DCI terminal then information is obtained orally from the law enforcement officer.	
	1.4.4 Inform defendant of charge	13. Behavior during arrest		
1.5 Determine whether defendant meets condition of pre-trial release/custody of Sheriff	1.5.1 Set time/place for first appearance in District Court	14. Court availability		

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
	1.5.2 Release or incarcerate	15. Ability of defendant to comply with terms of pre-trial release	3. Currently this is largely based on self-reported information, such as: how long defendants have lived in the community; whether or not they own property; have employment history; and have an address.	9. Prior FTAs are a key factor. This information is available from a statewide global search, but magistrates say the information is not accessible. This may be a training issue.
				10. FTA histories only show FTAs for pending cases. A FTA is dropped from the defendant's history if there is a dismissal or disposition. Judges want to see a comprehensive FTA history. FTAs do not disappear from motor vehicle cases.

Other Notes / Questions

1. Counties have huge amounts of unserved warrants, often because the individual has moved, or the only known address was a Post Office box. Mecklenburg County has a central warrant repository with an automatic purge criteria. Three-quarters of its warrants are for worthless checks. The State's rules for unserved warrants are changing. Right now indexing of warrants is a local option. Generally warrants that have been obtained by an officer from a magistrate have a high rate of service.
2. Process if a law enforcement officer cannot serve a warrant: 1) in most counties, the law enforcement officer returns the warrant to the clerk; 2) the clerk puts the warrant into a filing cabinet; 3) if there is a hit in another

county, or a probation violation by the individual, there is a statute requiring the physical paperwork be accessible. Mecklenburg County's central repository is located at its intake center.

3. Accessing DCI information:
 - a. District Attorneys have DCI terminals.
 - b. Most people go to the sheriff for DCI information.
 - c. Magistrates can query AOC criminal information 23 hours/day. They have the ability to look across the state with one inquiry. The problem is determining a positive identification. Plus, they have difficulty filtering information. For example, they can access a list of all charges, but not just convictions. (This may be a training issue because the MIS folks at the session say it is possible to filter for convictions.)
 - d. At a bond hearing, it is important to know the number of arrests.
 - e. At a sentencing, it is important to see all convictions.
4. If a person is indigent and requests counsel, criminal procedure allows for counsel at initial appearance and this information should be input into the system. However, local practice is to ignore the request until the first appearance. Magistrates are not authorized to appoint counsel. In jurisdictions without Public Defenders (there are 12 PD systems) the clerk is supposed to make an effort (7A 450) to secure representation, but it is rarely done.

2. Arrest / Charge (Without Warrant)

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
2.1 Arrest without warrant	2.1.1 Officer determines that crime has been committed	1. Proof of all requisite elements of a crime		
	2.1.2 Particular person should be arrested	2. Proof of identity of person, witnesses and victims		
		3. Justification for warrantless arrest		
2.2 Initial appearance (Magistrate)	2.2.1 Determine probable cause	4. Identity/description of person		
	2.2.2 Probable cause of particular person	5. Charge/offense		
	2.2.3 Issue Magistrates Order			
2.3 Determine pre-trial release	2.3.1 Commitment/release	6. Ability of defendant to comply with terms of release		

Other Notes / Questions

1. Some defendants enter the court system with a Criminal Summons issued by a Magistrate. The defendant is given a court date but is not arrested.
2. Defendants can be issued a citation to appear, which bypasses the Magistrate; the officer turns it in directly to the clerk. The courts have problems with officers who do not turn in their tickets before scheduled court dates. Defendants show up for court and the court employees cannot tell them why they are supposed to be there.
3. In districts with pre-trial release programs the magistrate is not involved until later. If there is not a pre-trial release program, misdemeanors and felonies are treated differently. A person waits in jail if they cannot make bond. There needs to be a tripwire to notify district court judges that the person is sitting in jail. How this is handled is based on local practice. It was expressed that all defendants should be seen by a judge within 24 hours.

3. First Appearance (Felony / Misdemeanors In Custody)

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
3.1 Advise defendant of charges	3.1.1 Properly charged	1. Warrant/ Indictment		
		2. Elements of offense		
3.2 Inquire regarding counsel	3.2.1 Decide counsel	3. Indigence screening information	<p>1. Depends if the county has pre-trial screening programs (less than 12). Informally the jailer screens if the jail is crowded.</p> <p>2. Collected on Affidavit of Indigency (common form) and screener form.</p>	<p>1. Information is self-reported and unverified. Screening is funded by the AOC, it is routinely ignored due to lack of time and lack of verification.</p> <p>2. It is not uncommon for defendant's attorney to tell the judge the guy has a job and the form says he is indigent. Also, defendants will pay for bonds before they will pay for an attorney.</p>
3.3 Bond review	3.3.1 Bond level	4. Magistrate information	3. Availability of information varies widely, in some counties the magistrate is better informed than the district court judge, in others the judge has better information.	3. Information needs include: residence and utility records.

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
		5. Any additional gained to date		
3.4 Prosecutorial review	3.4.1 Dismissal/plea go forward	6. Charge	4. This depends on the county and whether a PC hearing is held or not.	
		7. Additional information from police/victims	5. It would be an exception, rather than the rule, if the DA has anything in writing at this point in the process.	4. There are no investigative reports available at the first appearance. In some counties the judge must rely on an affidavit from the arresting officer, in other counties the officer is at the hearing.
3.5 Set the case for trial (District Court - misdemeanor)	3.5.1 Selection of date	8. Availability of witness		
		9. Availability of court		
		10. Availability of District Attorney		
		11. Information about defendant	6. Need to know if the defendant has other pending charges, trial dates, or cases.	
3.6 Set the case for probable cause in District Court if felony	3.6.1 Selection of date	12. Court availability	7. How this is done varies dramatically. It is the DA's decision whether or not to have a PC hearing.	

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
		13. Next Grand Jury date	8. Some DAs are more vigorous than others when setting Grand Jury dates. (There is a statewide, 6 month cycle.)	
3.7 Public Defender/Counsel	3.7.1 Whether to represent	14. Everything District Attorney has to date		
		15. Consultation with defendant		
		16. Codefendants	9. This information is on the AOC's case management system, but it is not easily accessible.	5. Not available by querying AOC system (codefendants are not grouped together until judgment).
		17. Charging officers		
		18. Date of offense		
		19. Victims		
		20. Defendant assets	10. Judges want this information; records are available, but not in an easy or timely manner.	
	3.7.2 Plea negotiate			
	3.7.3 Seek bond review			

Other Notes / Questions

1. This process can be initiated by a Grand Jury indictment. Therefore, the first appearance can actually come after the Grand Jury involvement.
2. Some counties dispose of 50 percent of their cases by the first appearance with a plea. In some counties this is being driven by federal caps on jail occupancy.
3. Setting PC dates is a formality. The range for determining a date is set by statute (no more than 15 business days). The statute can be waived and generally defendants only care about compliance with the statute if they are sitting in jail. Also, every time a motion is filed the clock stops.
4. North Carolina's speedy trial considerations for Superior Court were repealed in the mid-1980's.
5. At District Court, judges are dealing with hundreds of cases. They do not have the luxury to spend one extra minute gathering information. The current hoops to reviewing information are not practical. Often a decision is based on the judge's best guess.
6. Every judge wants a different format for viewing information.
7. The more easily a user can query, sort and filter information, the better. Judges need to be able to format information, and call it from the bench. Currently, when they query information the files contain data overload.
8. The DMV changed their record format and now no one has time to use it.

4. Probable Cause Hearing (Before District Court Judge)

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
4.1 Determine probable cause	4.1.1 Waive by defendant	1. Charge	1. It was noted that 90 percent of the PC hearings are waived, and 50 percent plead to misdemeanors.	1. Some focus group members felt that no useful information is gleaned from PC hearings.
	4.1.2 Present probable cause/dismissal	2. Witness/victim contacts		
		3. Evidence/results of investigation		
4.2 Review bond if bound over	4.2.1 Charge/conditions of pre-trial release	4. All available at this point		
		5. Bond information		
		6. Police reports		2. DAs would like scanned police reports.

5. Indictment

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
5.1 Schedule Grand Jury hearing	5.1.1 True Bill/no true Bill of Indictment	1. Draft Bill of Indictment alleging all elements required	1. There is no Bill when witnesses do not show up, or when paperwork is not submitted. Generally the hearing is continued.	
		2. Testimony of witnesses	2. At this point in the process there is no additional information that the law enforcement officer does not already have.	
5.2 Schedule/subpoena witnesses for Grand Jury				
5.3 Draft Bill of Indictment				

6. Arraignment in Superior Court

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
6.1 Schedule arraignment	6.1.1 When/where	1. Court/participant availability		
		2. Custody status/location		1. Judges need a flag to know when the defendant is out of jail, or on parole.
		3. Other court dates throughout state		2. This information is set by the clerk and is not dependable.
6.2 Plea Negotiations	6.2.1 Reduce/not reduce charge	4. Case evaluation		3. Need a release from the DOC on prior offenses.
	6.2.2 Dismiss other charges	5. Proof/legal conditions		
6.3 Plea Decision	6.3.1 Stop/proceed with case at trial	6. Qualitative evaluation of strength of case		
6.4 Motions	6.4.1 Admit/not admit evidence, etc.	7. Factual		
	6.4.2 Dismiss the indictment	8. Evidentiary		
6.5 Sentencing (if guilty plea)	6.5.1 Determine sentencing options	9. Offense classification		
	6.5.2 Select range	10. Offender's record		
	6.5.3 Sentence	11. Release information		

Other Notes / Questions

1. Failures to appear are rare. In Durham County 15 to 20 percent of the docket are FTAs. At Mecklenburg Superior Court (where crimes that reach the Superior Court are generally of a more serious nature) only 5 to 8 percent of the docket are FTAs. It was noted that the cause of FTAs is usually due to a lack of notice to the defendant to appear. In some counties, defendants who are not represented by counsel no longer receive letters informing them of arraignment dates. The defendant is responsible for calling the clerk's office to ascertain when the date is set. This may be an exception, as the AOC has an automated notice system, and it was noted that most counties notify their defendants of court dates. It was also noted that it is the defendant's responsibility to make it to court.
2. There was discussion regarding courtroom data entry, including direct input of scheduling, disposition, and sentencing information, which would automatically produce notifications, update the criminal history, and notify the jail of a defendant's disposition. Durham County is trying to do real-time data entry of judgments which are forwarded to the jail and bookkeeping. Permanent records are still made of signed commitment orders.
3. There is a "forms project" that should be complete by the end of this calendar year.
4. Mecklenburg County received a workstation grant. It expended a lot of time and effort. Two courtroom clerks were required in the real-time courtrooms, and the county decided the technology is too cutting edge. The problem is the county still assumed that the judge would control the pace of the docket, so courtroom clerks were not really able to do their work in real time. If they could not keep up with the pace, they had to put work aside to be input later. This became a management problem because the courtroom clerks were not allowed to work past 5:30 and could not receive overtime pay. It was also noted that expectations for the project were too high, and the quality of data was compromised. Mecklenburg has decided it wants to move toward having terminals in the courtroom, but not for real-time data entry.
5. Some of the focus group members were quick to point out that bringing technology to the courtroom would require judges to change how they currently conduct their business. They can work the same way they have been working for the last 20 years, or they can reengineer the process. Doing so will require trade-offs, but it will result in efficiencies for all participants in the court process.
 - a. Judges should be concerned with how they would like to work.
 - b. They must look at if there is a reason why they are doing what they currently do.

- c. The process must be reviewed as a whole, not just as individual parts.
 - d. It was pointed out, from a clerk's perspective, that there is a lot of concern regarding the shifting of responsibilities and work between employees within the system.
 - e. The challenge is to find the appropriate mix of technologies that will increase the speed of the court process.
 - f. Also, the group was reminded that just because things are currently paper based, it does not mean that information is more accurate or timely. For example, it is not uncommon for a defendant to be sentenced, and then sit in the county jail for a week waiting for his paperwork to be signed and forwarded to DOC. Or, future court dates pass before the clerks have even input them into the AOC system.
 - g. There needs to be ways to improve accuracy and integrity of data. For example, currently a judgment is written, but the clerk who prepares the cost sheet does not see the judgment. If everything were electronic, the clerk could review the judgment at the time the cost sheet is prepared. This would be much easier than discovering mistakes and trying to correct them two years later.
6. Traffic Court
- a. It was suggested that real-time input of speeding citations would be a great time saver. (They are now paper based.) The courtroom clerk could input the imposed fine, the computer could calculate court costs, and electronically queue the information to the cashier.
 - b. Barcoding was also seen as a good technology to introduce to traffic court. The courtroom clerk could scan the imposed fine, which would then automatically populate the fields in the required paperwork.
7. Signatures - Judges often end up at the end of the day with a huge stack of paperwork to review and sign.
- a. Mecklenburg County uses judge's signature stamps, and judges never sign their own paperwork. Some judges feel it is a matter of security to sign their own work.
 - b. Others felt that the signing, and process, got in the way of review and maintenance of quality.
 - c. One judge noted that he would like a way to electronically sample the day's paperwork and then with the use of a PIN code assign a global electronic signature.
8. Mecklenburg County is in the process of discussing a paperless jail system. The big concern is that information must be in the system, it must be correct, and if it kicks back at the jail it becomes a problem because there is a body and a computer that does not know where it is supposed to go.

7. Trial / Sentencing

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
7.1 Jury selection	7.1.1 Jury Pool	1. Driver's license	2. Most counties have jury commissions. Their information is very unreliable because people die, move or change their names. Generally there is a 25 percent FTA rate for prospective jurors.	2. DMV has extended the length of time between renewals; this will result in more "bad" names in the juror pool.
		2. Voting registration		
		3. Juror profile		
		4. Tax list		
	7.1.2 Select specific jury	5. Voir Dire		
	7.1.3 Empanel jury			
7.2 Trial	7.2.1 Guilty/not guilty			
	7.2.2 Hung jury			
7.3 Sentencing	7.3.1 Determine sentencing options	6. Offense classification		
	7.3.2 Select range	7. Offender's record	1. PD needs criminal history including criminal records in other states (NCIC information).	1. This information needs to be filtered better. The judge needs to see prior convictions.
	7.3.3 Sentence	8. Matters in aggravation or mitigation (range)		

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
		9. Current victim/restitution information		
7.4 Monitoring/compliance	7.4.1 Report violations of probation	10. Conditions of probation		
		11. Allegations of non-compliance		

Other Notes / Questions

1. There is a huge waste of resources in the way that jurors are called. The poorer the county, the more transient its population, and the more difficult it is to summon jurors. Another data source to generate names, such as payroll tax rolls, is needed. It was noted that social security numbers and income tax information are protected. Property tax lists may be a good source of information, especially since vehicles have been added to the list. However, it is important to review the implications of using other sources of information. For example, many folks do not own vehicles in their own name because they are registered under another family member's name, or they drive company vehicles.
2. With structured sentencing, public defenders will be more active in plea negotiations. However, they need criminal history at the beginning of the process, not at the time of sentencing.
3. Open discovery rules between Public Defenders and District Attorneys differ by county. Where there is open discovery, generally there is no probable cause hearings.
4. At the district court level, 90 percent of the defendants will not have a probation officer to monitor compliance of judgments and violations. In most counties DWI compliance is monitored manually. Assessments are being done by state, county, and private organizations. The private organizations are approved and licensed by the state, and they work through the DMV. There is a sense that the private assessors are not held accountable to the court. The integrity of the system is being compromised, because defendants have a high contempt for judicial orders since they know no one will follow up on compliance. Automatically scheduling defendants for

reviews is not the answer because it creates a huge burden on the court. Court reviews should be limited to those individuals who do not comply (i.e., do not show up for community service). Ultimately it is the responsibility of the defendant to follow up with court orders and obtain the necessary paperwork as proof of compliance. However, there is a great concern among the judges that if there are no consequences to actions, then the entire system is bankrupt. It was suggested that the abuse/neglect case model be looked at as a way to handle subsequent assessment hearings.

Juvenile Notes

Process

1. Juvenile petitions are filed by the Department of Social Services for child neglect/abuse cases. If there is criminal activity juvenile petitions are filed by the Clerk. Both types of petitions are treated the same for informational purposes.
2. When transient juveniles are picked up it is difficult, if not impossible, for local law enforcement officers to know whether the juvenile has pending cases, or prior adjudications in other counties. There is no database. Information is passed by word of mouth and phone calls. Often the officer must rely on the juvenile to self-report any prior criminal history.
3. Juvenile counselors and intake officers are employees of the court system.
4. The juvenile record is an official record that combines both delinquency and dependency activity.
5. There are differences in process between general criminal and juvenile cases. For example, juveniles do not have a right to bail. They are required to have representation.
6. Secure Custody Hearing - In some jurisdictions when juveniles are detained, this is the equivalent to the first appearance. Information issues that arise are often due to self-reporting, and internal county records. There are tight rules regarding how long a juvenile can be detained. Judges want information on the juvenile's parents so they can decide whether the juvenile can be supervised or not.

Information Sources / Needs

7. Because of self-reporting, identification of other parties involved in juvenile cases can be difficult. All information is kept in internal, manual records. There is no computerization or record checks.
8. Juvenile records are contained within a district. It would not be a violation of the law to have a statewide, confidential juvenile information system.
9. Most counties' juvenile records are paper based and manually indexed. Some counties have their juvenile records on PCs. A few have loaded information into dBase or Foxpro. There is not much uniformity.

10. Information regarding the commitment or release of juveniles is kept within the county where it happens. There is no interchange with other counties, and there is no interchange between the county and local schools.
11. It is now required to include a witness's social security number on juvenile petitions.

Constraints / Opportunities

12. Lack of money is the biggest barrier to enhancing the current juvenile information environment. There is no uniformity (like CIS) to collection of information. There is uniform data collection of caseload statistics which are sent to the central office.
13. What may encourage change in the juvenile recordkeeping environment is the fact that juvenile records can be used for structured sentencing.
14. Three to four years ago there was a general assembly memorandum to build a juvenile system. A decision was made not to proceed due to the complications of meeting confidentiality requirements and the high cost of security.
15. There is federal money coming down the pipe for juvenile delinquency/dependency systems.
 - a. DAs want to know if an adult defendant abused a child but was not convicted (404B). There is disagreement regarding whether DAs should be able to access this information. In Durham County the DA will be able to in the near future.
 - b. DAs need access to certain juvenile records, especially for structured sentencing.

Focus Group Summary

Information Sources / Needs

1. In the new clerk's system, victims are required to report their social security number. They cannot receive restitution checks without a social security number. This is true for all checks cut by the clerk

(i.e., civil judgments). This information is self-reported and there is no attempt to verify it. The DMV is also capturing social security numbers.

2. Judges want to be able to download information from CJIN and use the information on their PC. They do not want to reenter the data.

Constraints

3. County and judicial districts are very political.
4. Managing change and dealing with people issues is critical. "Don't forget the touchy feely stuff."
5. Training is extremely important. People are afraid of technology. Just-in-time training is necessary, because if staff are trained before they are able to use the technology on a daily basis, they forget how to use it.
6. Citizens are concerned about the cost of technology. Once the investment is made, the State must make a commitment to update and upgrade technology as the environment changes.
7. Mecklenburg County has its own system, the State and the 99 other counties are on CIS. This is not the right direction to take.
8. If costs are shifted throughout the criminal justice system, agencies must be given the resources to cover new costs. Otherwise CJIN will fail. For example, county clerks do a lot of administrative work that benefits other agencies, and they need the resources to cover the cost of doing business.
9. Standardization is important. Especially for juvenile.
10. Local jurisdictions are going after grants to develop or enhance their current systems.
11. In order to gain support from county commissioners, the CJIN report should make recommendations that will result in:
 - a. getting people out of the local jails.
 - b. the elimination of delays.
 - c. the reduction of pre-trial detention.
12. Individual privacy concerns and CJIN were discussed. If information is on CJIN, it only takes a court order for a law enforcement agency to access that information.
13. It will take legislative changes for some agencies to be a part of CJIN. This could be a very big obstacle.

14. It was asked whether or not "public" information had been defined. Is everything but juvenile information public? There should be a statewide policy regarding what is public information. Perhaps a public access program, suitable for public use, could be developed as an adjunct to CJIN. The participants expressed concern about the public misinterpreting data, codes, etc.

Governance

15. CJIN needs to be a partnership where individual agencies can be players without getting swallowed up. It was noted that in the criminal justice world people often forget that the court system exists.
16. If CJIN goes sour, the courts want to be able to walk away from the table. This will encourage the different players to work harder to make the system work from the beginning.
17. Because CJIN is about changing how the court system works, and it is not just a technology issue. The IRMC is not the proper organization for governance. IRMC is perceived as being too technical. The participants of the focus group felt emphasis should be on reengineering the daily work of the justice community.
18. The AOC is considered the least political of the major players; thus, perhaps it is the appropriate organization to lead CJIN's governance. Convictions drive the system and all organizations already pull information from the AOC.
19. It was noted that the AOC is not a monolith, and that within the organization there are different agendas and opinions. Court clerks, DA and PD versus judiciary.
20. It was suggested that CJIN should be a joint venture of the three branches that shares the costs and benefits. The benefits of CJIN must be spelled out clearly. A czar-like system will not work.
21. A non-political organization is impossible.

Funding

22. Fines cannot be used, by state constitution they must go to the local school board.
23. Court costs could be increased, but they should not increase to such an extent that they limit access. A flat \$5.00 fee to pay for hardware costs was suggested.
24. Charge a public access fee such as \$5.00 per record. Or, charge a monthly modem access fee to private landlords, grocery stores, private investigators, and bail bondsmen.
25. Some Boards of Election charge a fee for the use of their mailing labels from voter registration records. It was noted that state law prohibits advertising agencies from using voter registration records for advertising purposes.
26. Private organizations are buying government databases for nominal amounts. Cottage industries develop around firms who buy information from the government and then sell it for less, or sell a new and improved version of the information at a profit. The government loses out on anticipated revenue. This is happening with attorney solicitation letters.
27. Washington State has contracted with a private firm to handle all issues regarding public access.

Focus Group 13: Corrections Vertical

Thursday, February 9, 1995

Aspen Building Conference Room

Participants

Name

Randy Eggen

Marian Guerrero

Al Little

Sherry Pilkington

Donne Weaver

Title

District Manager

Project Coordinator

CJIN Committee Member

Assistant Director

Organization

Division of Adult Probation and Parole

Department of Correction/AECJDP

Department of Crime Control and Public Safety

Division of Adult Probation and Parole

Department of Corrections/AECJDP

General Topics of Discussion: *Corrections*

- Current Information Environment
- Information Needs
- Key Points for Success

I. Project Overview

Price Waterhouse consultant Dale Lefever provided a brief overview of the Criminal Justice Information Network Study Committee including the goals and objectives for this term of the project. He also discussed the roles of the various “user” and “interface” focus groups, and how their input will help shape the development of the CJIN Committee’s final plan.

The participants of the Corrections Vertical Focus Group were given a business process map to analyze information needs at a more operational level. Other focus groups did not do this. The maps outlined major functions, tasks, decisions which need to be made and information required to make them. Discussion focused on the adequacy of current information and what else is needed. On the following pages, materials in bold and the accompanying “notes” are the result of the group’s discussion.

1. Intake / Release

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
1.1 Identification	1.1.1 Verify Identification	1. State ID Number - Fingerprints - Photograph - Blood Sample (DNA) - Personal Characteristics Name Age DOB Sex Race Physical marks Limitations Aliases	1. Probation has experimented with electronic photos. They would like photos to be taken at the arrest process, and passed on to all subsequent actors.	1. Often it is not identified when an offender is taken into custody in one county, and is a probation violator in another county. Making a "hit" is based on limited data elements.
			2. Demographic information is generally available elsewhere, but it is usually recreated and reinput by Corrections, unless the individual has already been through the Probation/Parole (P/P) system.	2. In the post-corrections environment, the bulk of the offenders have not been fingerprinted by Probation. The technology is available but it is not used. This is an identification issue.

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
			<p>3. When OPUS becomes operable P/P will no longer need to reenter data that the prisons have already input. (Currently they can view the data, but they cannot use the data.)</p>	<p>3. Only 10% of the Probation Violators have prints available through DCI.</p>
				<p>4. There is a need to fingerprint all individuals who go through the criminal justice system.</p>
				<p>5. P/P does not have access to DNA information even though inmates are being tested. Probationers are not being tested. DNA records are more useful to LEA than P/P. Also, there are still unresolved legal issues.</p>

Other Notes / Questions

1. The AOC system is name and case number driven.

1. Intake / Release

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
1.2 Classification	1.2.1 Security Level and Assignment	1. Criminal History	1. P/P has a sophisticated system to determine risk classification.	
		2. Inmate History - Suicide - Previous rule violations - Escape history	2. Prisons use DCI terminal to access criminal history.	
		3. Pending Arrests and Detainers		
		4. Crime Versions - Current charge and circumstances - Photo of victim		
		5. Prior dispositions and sentencing - Currently probation/parole	3. When there is a new conviction of a parole violator, a PRI must call the P/P officer to classify.	1. This information is not on a system, the P/P officer must look at a hard copy file. Each officer has many cases per day.
		6. Conflicts with other inmates		
		7. Threats to inmate		

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
		8. Financial - Restitution - Child Support		
		9. Current behavior in order to anticipate potential problems while handling offender.	4. This is communicated informally between jailer and transportation (not put in a database.)	
		10. Parole offender not eligible for bond		2. Jails need a system that signals when a parole offender is not eligible for bond. A uniform notification system to jails does not exist.
		11. Out-of-state probation or parole violator	5. To classify an out-of-state PV case requires that phone calls be made to the out-of-state officer.	3. There is an effort underway to develop a national database of probation/parole violators.
		12. Detainers		4. Define who and when, in order to avoid wrongful release.

1. Intake / Release

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
1.3 Preliminary Health Screen	1.3.1 Status of physical and health & treatment needs	1. Medical exam results - Disease - Disability - Injuries - Substance Abuse	1. Medical records do not follow inmates out of prison (legal issue).	1. Discovery of medical and mental health needs is up to the P/P intake process. There are legal constraints on sharing information. P/P would like access to historical information.
		2. Current prescriptions/ medications	2. The medical/mental health information that P/P captures is in hard copy files, not on a system.	2. P/P is working with prisons to conduct similar intake processes, even though they cannot share information.
	1.3.2 Status of mental health & treatment needs	3. Psychological screening results - Suicide tendency - Other diagnosis	3. OPUS will provide P/P with some substance abuse data.	3. P/P officers want to be able to ask OPUS specific questions, in an automated fashion.
		4. Current prescriptions/ medications		

Other Notes / Questions

1. Are the laws prohibiting the sharing of information between Corrections and Probation/Parole federal or state?

1. Intake / Release

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
1.4 Determine Special Needs	1.4.1 What special needs, if any, exist?	1. Education	1. Much of this should be covered in OPUS. There are restrictions regarding the sharing of information.	
		2. Mental capacity - Developmentally disabled	2. Although it does not happen widely, mental health information is easier to share than medical information.	
		3. Religion - Food - Services		
		4. Work - Restrictions - Vocation - Work release eligibility		
		5. Other		

Other Notes / Questions

1. Restrictions regarding sharing information exist to guard against discrimination in treatment. Agencies practice universal precautions.

1. Intake / Release

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
1.5 Inventory & Secure Property	1.5.1 Ownership of Property	1. Inventory of items in inmate's possession - Money - Things	1. The folks at this focus group did not know about the informational needs for this process.	
		2. Verify ownership - Hot files		
	1.5.2 Stored vs. Retained	3. Inmate guide - Allowable possessions		
		4. Ownership verification		
		5. Tracking & retrieval information		
		6. Classification level		
1.6 Issue Institutional Items	1.6.1 What to issue inmate?	7. Charge	2. The current timelag from sentencing to receiving disposition data is too long.	1. Want real-time entry in court. (The courts have a project to put PCS in the courtroom and print out disposition at the time of sentencing.)
		8. Sentence		
		9. Classification Level	3. Preliminary classification for jail transport will be in OPUS.	

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
		10. Inmate abilities - blackbelt - disarming methods - picks locks		2. Transportation needs to know this type of information for safety reasons.

Other Notes / Questions

1. Probation/Parole staff have counted 8 points in the system where the same data is input over and over again.

1. Intake / Release

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
1.7 Release	1.7.1 Release proper inmate on proper date	1. Release date		
		2. Positive inmate identification		
		3. Detainer	1. There is an entry on the screen that a detainer is on file. Sometimes detainers are for other states. (what screen?)	1. Electronic filing of detainers would require a statutory change. Currently the process is lengthy and cumbersome. 2. Need to know if a detainer or warrant is current.
		4. Victim notification	2. OPUS will notify/access victims regarding parolees release from prison.	
	1.7.2 Return of property	5. Inventory list of items & cash		
		6. Verification of ownership		
	1.7.3 After care	7. Mental health needs, referral		
		8. Physical health needs, referral		

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
		9. Other special needs		

Other Notes / Questions

1. The issue of electronic warrants was discussed. Currently, the use of paper warrants is firmly entrenched in the law enforcement culture. However, a hard copy warrant does not assure an officer that he or she has the right person.
2. An automated warrant process is on a list of projects the state is considering. There is a need for the criminal justice community to have the ability to know that warrants exist for an offender. This is important to protect both officers and the community. Right now, conducting a warrant search requires a county by county review.
3. Maybe detainers and/or warrants should include fingerprints and pictures to help reduce misidentification of offenders.

2. Probation

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
2.1 Pre-Sentence Investigation	2.1.1 What is the recommendation to the Judge?	1. Structured sentencing		
		2. Family history		
		3. CCH	1. DA must prove criminal history, which is then plugged into a matrix to determine options and ranges.	
		4. Socio-economic - Employment - Education - Stability		
		5. Inmate history incarceration, probation, parole, etc.	2. This is the only information that P/P has access to, if they want other information they must dig for it.	
		6. Crime versions for current charge		
		7. Pending charges/ detainers		
		8. Substance abuse		

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
		9. Risk	3. There are two assessment instruments: 1) risk of fleeing and 2) history of substance abuse.	1. Want this computerized.
		10. Financial ability (for sentencing and paying restitution to victims)		

Other Notes / Questions

1. Structured sentencing is divided into: 1) Active - Prison; 2) Intermediate - Intensive Probation; and 3) Community Regular Probation.
2. Who is responsible for checking criminal records for PSIs? The judiciary needs to decide how comprehensive a record is needed for sentencing misdemeanors.
3. Community Penalties Programs (CPP) write plans for prison bound felons, and do some Pre Sentence Investigation work. There ought to be a way to automate data collected by CPPs. **Does anyone know what percentage of all plans or PSIs are done by CPPs?**
4. PSIs are driven by speed, as well as accuracy. Generally a judge wants a PSI within 30 minutes.

2. Probation

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
2.2 Monitor Probationer	2.2.1 Adherence to conditions of probation	1. Disposition & sentencing: - Restitution - Conditions - Payments	1. Financial issues are a big time drain for POs. In many counties, the PO must go to the bookkeeper to review payment history. It would be helpful to assess on day one if an offender has a history of chronic non-payment.	1. AOC is automating this, OPUS will have docket #. These should link in the future so that PO can view.
		2. Officer assignment		
		3. Positive identification		
		4. Complete case file	2. This includes any information in the case file, the PO makes narrative entries regarding contacts with the offender. It is not envisioned that entries should be automated.	
		5. Ongoing status - Other jurisdictions - Re-arrests		
		6. Address/location		
		7. Substance abuse issues		

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
		8. Assault history		

2. Probation

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
2.3 Monitor Probationer	2.3.1 Revise conditions or revoke probation	1. Complete case file		
		2. Arrest information from all counties		1. This is a HOT ISSUE because it is very easy for this information to fall through the cracks. When John Doe is arrested in County X the system/arresting officer ought to know he is on probation in County Y, and his PO should be automatically notified of the violation.
		3. Restitution, fines & payment		
		4. Other compliance information		

Other Notes / Questions

1. There is a new regulation that if a PO detects a probation violation he or she must go to the chief, who decides whether to arrest the violator and/or hold a revocation hearing.
2. Right now a system is being developed to automate probation transfers between counties.
3. When a probation violator is arrested, it is common practice to proceed on the conviction, rather than the new charge (unless the charge is assault or a drug violation that breach conditions of probation. It is important to remember that a lot of criminal charges vaporize in court, so it is easier to prosecute someone on a violation of probation regarding a prior conviction. This is especially true with domestic violence cases.

3. Custody and Security of Inmates

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
3.1 Supervise Inmates	3.1.1 Adherence with special conditions	1. Special conditions assigned by court or at intake		
	3.1.2 Adherence to institutional rules	2. Rules and regulations		
3.2 Provide Safe & Secure Environment	3.2.1 Assess risk & determine need to re-classify	3. Threats		
		4. Nature of offense		
		5. Gang activity		
		6. Sexual orientation/assaults		
		7. Pending court case information - Witnesses		
	3.2.2 Determine count as appropriate	8. Physical count information		
	3.2.3 Notification of escape	9. Identification and description of escapee		1. Local law enforcement agency, last PO of record, and victim need to know. This should be automatic, not a decision point, via OPUS input.

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
		10. Co-defendant - Location		2. Need to know if a co-defendant is in the same facility.

4. Parole

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
4.1 Parole Hearing	4.1.1 Grant parole?	1. Case file - Institutional	1. The screen shows that parole was granted, if the offender is still in the system, it probably means parole was denied.	1. In the current system, the DA must call or research. OPUS will change this.
		2. Evaluation and recommendation		
		3. Testimony from state officers, victims, etc.	2. Some classes required by statute to notify victims. 3. OPUS will notify state prosecutors, DA, judge, and victim. Parole Commission does this now, but it is not automated.	2. Before parole hearing, POs are being asked to go to the field and find victim's current address. P/P has no victim information in their system.
		4. Prison population needs		
		5. Eligibility		
		6. Prior criminal history	4. Raleigh uses CCBI (City/County Bureau of Investigation) to get criminal history information.	3. This may be an ACLU concern.

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
4.2 Monitor Parolee	4.2.1 Adherence to conditions of parole	7. Disposition sentencing - Restitution conditions - Child support, etc. - Conditions of parole	5. Release of this type of information to local law enforcement agencies, and the community in general, is a hot button.	4. There is no formal notification, police officers must pick up a file and call.
		8. Officer assignment		
		9. Positive identification		
		10. Complete case file		
		11. On-going status - Other jurisdictions - Re-arrests		

Other Notes / Questions

1. It is up to victims to keep their addresses up-to-date. Victims have the opportunity to meet with members of the Commission in a special hearing.
2. Tennessee has an integrated Prison/Probation/Parole system. It was designed so that the Parole Commission could receive information in an automated fashion, not by hard copy file. It was assumed that the automated file would be readily adopted but people are still using paper files.
3. The Parole Commission in NC is driven by the case file. A case analyst reviews the file, writes a summary, makes recommendations, and then Commission members review each file.
4. Parolees are not represented by counsel at parole hearings.
5. There are questions regarding what the state can legally tell law enforcement agencies about parolees living in their communities. Buncombe County and Charlotte have special projects to let LEAs know when parolees have territorial restrictions. There is pending legislation regarding registration and community notification of sex offenders.

4. Parole

TASK	DECISION	INFORMATION	CURRENTLY EXISTS	NEEDED
4.2 Monitor Parolee	4.2.2 Revise conditions or revoke parole	1. Complete case file		
		2. Arrest information	1. Each month there are 100's of PC-14s, arrest requests for violations of parole.	1. There is a move toward computerizing parole warrant generation. Hope OPUS will address this.
		3. Payment of restitution, fines, etc.		
		4. Other compliance information		
		5. Address/location		
		6. DMV information		2. There are a high number of requests for this type of information for finding fugitives.

Other Notes / Questions

1. Process - 1) Police arrest parolee; 2) Police notifies Parole Officer; 3) Parole Officer contacts Parole Commission to authorize arrest; 4) Parole Commission sends paper warrant to local parole office; 5) Local office determines who serves the warrant; 6) Violator arrested; 7) Hold Hearing.
2. Wake County has a centralized system for Parole Officers to advise the Parole Commission whether or not to issue an arrest warrant.

3. A Parole Officer who witnesses a parolee make a violation has no authority to arrest the parolee. This is frustrating to the PO and the parolees on the street know it. Also, the amount of time/work to get authorization to arrest a parole violator is not rational. A change to the current process would require a change in statute.
4. There are approximately 100,000 persons on probation, and 19,000 on parole. Probation violators go through the courts, parole violators go through the Parole Commission. With structured sentencing the future of the Parole Commission is uncertain.

Focus Group Summary

Information Needs

1. There is the need for a DCI (Division of Criminal Information)/NCIC inquiry. When an offender is arrested, the DCI should be able to identify if he or she is a probation violator, and from which county, and automatically notify the Probation Officer. Although the organization, staff and tools are available, this transfer of information is not happening.
2. Currently, an arresting officer must call NCIC, through the home office, to determine whether an arrestee is a parolee.
3. Information needs to be presented in an organized and useful manner. Officers receive lists of arrest cycles and dispositions but they cannot match them up.
4. There is a need to automate safekeeper tracking and accounting.
5. There is a population of jail parolees who never enter the DOC system because they serve their full time in the county jail (usually six months or less). This is an input issue for the sheriff.
6. The DA might want "diversion" information when charging an offender with a new crime. This would be a big information gap.

Funding Alternatives

1. Consider implementing a user fee to members of the public who want to query criminal histories (i.e., renters, employees, insurance claimants). In Raleigh, Joe Public can view a criminal history screen for free, but he does not receive a print-out. Usually the public must review AOC records at the clerk's office. In each county, the controller has unused terminals.
2. A state lottery is not the way to go.
3. The question was raised whether other states, agencies, divisions, and/or the FBI can be charged? It was also pointed out that internal billing costs could exceed the benefit of charging government agencies.
4. When looking at agency budgets, CJIN should review initial and maintenance costs. Also, there is the potential to free up employees to do value added work, rather than the busy work they are currently doing. This means there may not necessarily be immediate savings from staff reductions.
5. The state should investigate whether it is eligible for federal funding.
6. Is there DOC money available through the Criminal Justice Partnership Act (discretionary spending on dealing with the jail population)? Nancy Lowe is the contact person.
7. Perhaps there can be an equipment exchange. Counties who are upgrading their hardware can give their old equipment to smaller, poorer counties.
8. Make criminals pay by adding \$1.00 to their court costs.
9. Improve accounting procedures to enhance collection rates.
10. Increasing the probation supervision fee is not a good idea. It has already reached its limit and increasing it may actually result in increased costs because more individuals may go to prison.
11. Tap money confiscated from drug traffic.

Governance

1. The CJIN governing body must be independent. A recommendation was made for AOC/DCI representatives under DOC management. It was then pointed out that authority should not be put under one organization's management.
2. Users and those who are involved in data collection must be heavily involved. Beware of developing an empire reputation (there are groups who are known for their "abide, or get lost" attitudes.)
3. The governing body must be able to act quickly. If initial response to those who have contact with defendants and offenders is not quick, standardization is compromised because the locals will solve their own problems.
4. Stay away from political swings.
5. There was a discussion on the role of the IRMC. It was noted that the IRMC approved OPUS, so it is already making decisions in the justice area. There was a concern expressed that if CJIN is governed by IRMC it will be forced to compete with other all other programs, and would not be able to act quickly or flexibly. Also, the IRMC does not have representatives from local agencies.

Concerns

1. There was a concern expressed regarding hackers and the corruption of data on a piecemeal basis.
2. Although increased public safety benefits the entire state, NC is strongly anti-government. Problems often stop at county borders. CJIN must be sold as public safety by being tough on crime. CJIN must show how crime from the big cities impacts smaller counties. For example, shoplifters, who are often cross-county violators, come to small areas from the big cities.
3. Buy-in from the private sector is essential.

Focus Group 14: Individual Statewide Identifier

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

Aspen Building Conference Room

Participants

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Nick Barnett	Information Resources Manager	Office of the State Controller / IRM
Ed Brow	Sheriff	Onslow County Sheriff's Office
Tana Calloway	Chief	Charlotte Probation Department (DAPP)
Cheryl George	Database Administrator	State Bureau of Investigation / DCI
Marian Guerrero	Project Coordinator	Department of Correction / AECJDP
Tom Havener	Statistical Decision Support Manager	Administrative Office of the Courts
Ron Hawley	Assistant Director	State Bureau of Investigations
David Jones	Director of Statistical Analysis Center	Governor's Crime Commission
Nevelle Jones	Classification Support Services	Department of Correction
Stan Lewis	Fingerprint ID Supervisor	State Bureau of Investigations / DCI
Al Little	CJIN Committee Member	Department of Crime Control and Public Safety
Brenda Pugliese	Commander of Communications	Onslow County Sheriff's Department
Donne Weaver	Grant Team	Department of Correction / AECJDP
Aaron Allan Wood	Magistrate	Johnston County
John Wyatt	Co-Chair CJIN Committee	Mecklenburg County

General Topics of Discussion: *Individual Statewide Identifier*

- Need for Statewide Identifier
- Existing Identification Processes
- Options for Statewide Identifier
- Analysis of Options

I. *Project Overview*

Price Waterhouse Project Manager, Steve Holdridge provided a brief overview of the Criminal Justice Information Network Study Committee. He also discussed the purpose of the focus group, and the need for the statewide identifier. He stated that the goal of creating a single statewide personal identifier is to link incidents, arrests, cases, dispositions, inmates, treatments, victims, custody, and release data. It was noted that Mecklenburg County has implemented a livescan system that records and optically stores fingerprint records, and is linked to an Automatic Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS). This system is only used for persons arrested in Mecklenburg County and does not interface with the state system. By and large the rest of the state uses a manual system and transfers fingerprint cards to the State Department of Criminal Investigations via U.S. mail.

Steve Holdridge facilitated the focus session which promoted discussion on the following topics.

Identification Issues (AS-IS)

1.1. At what points in the system do we currently identify people

*Critical Points

Where	How
Incident (crime scene, investigation, missing persons, ID problems, traffic)	Local ID Number (due to timing delay / no standards) State ID Number Federal Bureau of Investigation ID Number
Warrant Issuance	
Decision to Arrest without a warrant / Service of Warrant (service decision)	
Arrest*	
Initial Appearance (Magistrate)*	
Jail Booking (fingerprint after magistrate review)*	
Jail Release (ensure we are releasing the right person)	
Court Appearance	
Prison Intake*	Department of Correction Number
Probation / Parole (supervised, unsupervised, etc.)	

Where	How
Release from Custody / Supervision <ul style="list-style-type: none">• courts• state hospitals• between jails and prisons• community	OCA (case incident number); Fingerprint Card Number
Name Change	
Expungements	
Deferred Prosecution	

1.2. Identification numbers used throughout the system

- OCA # - Usually an OCA is a local agency’s unique event tracking number, not a unique number for an individual.
- LID # - Local Identification Number (format is unique by city / county).
- PID # - Mecklenburg County's LID Number.
- SID # - State Identification Number (this number is generally not put back into local record).
- FBI ID - Federal Bureau of Investigation Identification Number.
- Department of Correction does not reliably populate SID # field in its databases.
- Mecklenburg County - uses an incident number (complaint number) that is produced by police departments. It is an agency specific number comprised of julian date and time.
- Mecklenburg stopped using driver's license numbers and social security numbers for identifying suspects. It was too difficult to maintain accurate data.

1.3 Issues

1.3.1 General

- The Automated Exchange of Criminal Justice Data Project determined that local agencies should use the SID Number.
- Name identification is usually done prior to sending a fingerprint card to AFIS. All AFIS hits are based on fingerprint minutiae matching, not name.
- There was disagreement regarding the need for federal, state and local numbers to have hierarchical relationships, or logical one-to-one relationships.
- Approximately 30 percent of all Charlotte's calendared district court cases do not go forward because of inability to notify witnesses using address and telephone numbers available in the system.

1.3.2 Misdemeanors

- Currently most persons arrested for misdemeanors are not fingerprinted.
- The LID # can go away if a SID # is available for all felony and misdemeanors.
- Statewide, if full misdemeanor and felony prints were taken it would be 500,000 per year.
- Fingerprinting of most but not all misdemeanants is allowed by law; however, actual practice is controlled by administrative orders issued by the Senior Resident Superior Court Judges.

1.3.3 False Identify

- Upon arrest defendants sometimes use innocent persons name, social security number, and DOB. We need a way to effectively deal with this abuse.
- The NCIC (National Crime Information Center) warrant file contains fictitious names which are known.

1.3.4 Expungement of Records

- The expungement process impacts the identification process, because it results in holes in a person's record. Facts regarding expungement in North Carolina include:
 - P It is only allowed for misdemeanors.
 - P It is supposed to be a one time occurrence; however, sometimes judges issue multiple expungements for the same person. (This is a relatively low volume issue, but when it occurs it causes problems.)
 - P Expungements are based on name only; therefore, when a defendant uses more than one name and address it is possible to receive multiple expungements.
 - P If an expungement is ordered, the county clerk will delete the person's records, the local law enforcement agency will delete their records for that person, and then forward the order to DCI. At this point it is not uncommon for DCI to discover that the order is based on incorrect information. However, the clerk and law enforcement agency have no way to recoup the records.
 - P Sometimes expungement orders are not forwarded to the state.
 - P By law, each agency is supposed to remove any index to the expunged record.
 - P It was suggested that records should be sealed rather than expunged. It was also noted that sealing records has its own set of issues and problems. Currently there are no sealing laws in North Carolina.
 - P DCI has the capability to expunge records. The state does not track the number of expungements it processes.
 - P The AOC records that an expungement took place, but if the person changes his / her name it can not be tracked. There were anecdotes about single individuals with multiple expungements because they keep changing their name.
 - P If misdemeanants are fingerprinted, the number of expungement orders will rise.
 - P The process surrounding expungements is not rational, this is an area where statutory requirements should be reviewed.

1.3.5 Non-Criminal Uses

- There are frequent requests for non-law enforcement queries and screening. For example, screening job applications for bus drivers and teachers.
- There are numerous issues regarding the use of DMV records to identify suspects.
- If all driver's license recipients are fingerprinted, then there will be statewide fingerprint records for most residents that can be used to identify suspects. The problem is that millions of prints are recorded and stored for a very small (1%) return.
- A benefit is the ability to have a method to identify other persons involved during an incident, such as witnesses and victims.
- DMV records could provide a link to records outside a Criminal Justice Information Network.
- By fingerprinting driver's license recipients, one driver's license number per person can be enforced. This would help law enforcement reduce the number of false identifications when stopping vehicles, and thereby enhance officer safety and public safety.
- DMV currently has an RFP in process for digitized photographs.
- Moving the identification process to DMV records would result in a huge workload shift to DMV.

1.3.6 State / Federal Link

- If a defendant is already recorded in the FBI database, the state does not forward fingerprint cards to the FBI.
- The state sends fingerprint cards for felons and some serious misdemeanors to the FBI.
- Often state or local law enforcement agents arrest people for drug offenses, and then turn them over to federal authorities. Courts and corrections information for these individuals is never recorded in the state system. (This information is available in III.)
- Is it possible to get fingerprint cards from the feds into local AFIS? Is a fingerprint card needed to do

this?

- If it is possible to get fingerprint cards from the feds, then the state could indicate "no disposition forthcoming."
- North Carolina and South Carolina cannot easily communicate at time of arrest with one another to identify suspects. This is especially an issue in counties that are located near the state borders.

Fingerprint Issues (AS-IS)

2.1 Why does it take two weeks to conduct a fingerprint check

Activity	Approximate Time
Roll prints	1 day
Local identification process / fill out fingerprint cards	2 days
Batch for mailing	1 day
Mail time to State Bureau of Investigation	2 days
SBI/DCI internal mail	2 days
Open, record, and prepare for processing	1 day
Demographic identification	1 day
Fingerprint search (SBI / AFIS): <ul style="list-style-type: none">• data entry• store images• respondents come back, if positive then manually identify	2 days
Input criminal history	2 days

Activity	Approximate Time
Notify agencies on-line of SID number	real-time when entered into CCH.

2.2 Issues

2.2.1 State Issues

- The SBI processes 300 criminal fingerprint cards per day. In total it documents 600 fingerprint cards per day (these include non-criminal cards)???. SBI inputs information into various computer systems at least three times on every fingerprint card. On average it takes two weeks to process a fingerprint search. Fourteen staff members are involved in this process. If a fingerprint search is rushed through the system the process can be completed in less than an hour once the card arrives at the fingerprint area.
- AFIS is not linked to the state CCH (Criminal Case History). No names are stored in AFIS. If information were available on fingerprint cards, SBI could automatically update AFIS and CCH information.
- If an individual is not identified through previous records, then DCI must input all information on the individual into the CCH database.
- Errors on fingerprint cards can be a problem, sometimes cards are rejected by the state because of bad prints, bad information and / or missing information.
- There is a concern that if the identification process is reduced from two weeks to two days, nothing will be improved because identification is needed within 2 hours of picking up a suspect. SBI fingerprint identification is currently a Monday through Friday business hours operation.
- CJIN should be mindful of the National Fingerprint File (NFF) approach to local systems.

- DCI Tasks
 - P Verify check digit number from each card.
 - P Review date of fingerprint.
 - P Check names.

- P Link to court disposition.
- P If a fingerprint already exists, update CCH databases.
- P If better quality fingerprints come through, update the AFIS database.
- P There is a two week turnaround time once a fingerprint card hits DCI.

2.2.2 Local Issues

- Local agencies consider fingerprint cards to be information required by the state, not a part of the investigation / identification process.
- County manpower is required to service external requests for criminal information.
- Law enforcement agencies can fingerprint suspects before they see the magistrate; however, it is the custom in the state not to print beforehand because if probable cause is not found the records must be destroyed. (A statute change would be required to maintain prints.)
- If a warrant has been issued, then a defendant can reasonably be fingerprinted before seeing the magistrate because probable cause has already been found.
- Fingerprinting misdemeanants is allowed under most circumstances, but it is not mandated. (The majority of the persons arrested in NC are misdemeanants, and they are never printed.)
- Local law enforcement agents want the ability to identify suspects on the road, especially if they have no identification, or fake identification.

- Mecklenburg Process
 - P Fill out work sheet.
 - P Take suspect to booking center.
 - P Clerk performs data entry and produces draft arrest report for arresting officer's review.
 - P Arresting officer completes affidavit (which incorporates the arrest report) and executes affidavit.
 - P Livescan system roll prints (**DBI**).
 - P Transfer to AFIS for search.
 - P Check candidates.
 - P If no match, generate LID # (locally called "positive identification number" - PID).

- P PC catches image and physical description information.
- P Check DCI and AOC databases.
- P Queue information to magistrate.
- P Whole process takes about 2 hours.
- Mecklenburg Issues
 - P Charlotte is not moving to incident based numbering.
 - P If no probable cause is found, the county still saves the data. (There is a 3-4 percent no probable cause rate.)
 - P Often there is no live testimony in front of a magistrate, instead the affidavit is presented.
 - P Saves fingerprint images on hard disk then on optical disk.
 - P Mecklenburg County conducted a 3 month study that found it had a 71 percent rearrest rate.
 - P Mecklenburg County processes ??? fingerprint cards per year. With a peak of 160 cards per day.

2.2.3 National Trends

- The national IAFIS (Integrated Automated Fingerprint Information System) standard states that states should send fingerprint images to the FBI.
- Must use full image in the near future.
- NIBRS collects only serious offenses and there are no plans to link to CCH. A few years ago DCI (and possibly other states) recognized the need to link IBASE and CCH. DCI IBASE collects all offenses, plus fields were added to both IBASE and CCH to do this. At this time the fields are optional and have not accomplished this purpose.

2.2.4 Other Issues

- The state should reconsider its position on fingerprinting juveniles. With the decreasing crime age, there is a high possibility of identifying suspects based on latent juvenile prints.
- A distinguished fingerprint - 10 prints systems match on 2 of the 10 and then bring up the rest.

- Early in the life cycle of one system, it was estimated that latent print identification leading to conviction was costing as much as \$37,000 per offender.
- Issues regarding fingerprinting at birth:
 - P A Duke University Hospital study found babies difficult to fingerprint. Baby fingers are not dry, there are problems with proper spacing between minutiae, and prints enlarging as the children get older.
 - P Hospital staff are not trained how to capture good fingerprints, and it has been found that often children's fingerprints are not of matching quality. Hospital staff are accustomed to printing baby feet.
- Issues regarding DNA identification:
 - P Currently the state is capturing DNA samples on all felony releases. There are 12,000 to 20,000 samples in the SBI's PC database. SBI is getting ready to flag CCH records if they have a DNA sample.
 - P DNA “prints” are being developed and stored in a state DNA database. When the FBI DNA database is available, the DNA “prints” will be stored at the FBI also. Currently there have been no “cold” searches due to the small number of DNA “prints” in the state database.
 - P Currently there are acceptance problems with using DNA as a means of identification. However, solutions devised by CJIN should account for its future use.

Future Options

3.1 Statewide Identification Information

- 3.1.1 What information do we need for statewide identification?
 - Fingerprint (most reliable).
 - Demographics.
 - P Name.
 - P Date of Birth.
 - P Social Security Number.

- P Driver's License Number.
- Personal Knowledge.
- FBI Number.
- Imaging / Photograph.
 - P Tattoos.
 - P Mugshots.

3.2 Livescan Information / Process

- Scan fingerprint (livescan extracts minutiae).
- Fill out "card" and transfer arrest data to livescan.
- Identify whether there is a match or not by transferring fingerprint and searching the AFIS system.
- Update SBI, CCH, and AFIS databases.
- Livescan should flow electronically from arrest information.
- IDEA: Move AFIS technology to regional / county sites.
- 3 strategies - AFIS store / search

3.2.1 Where do we put livescan systems?

Where	Critical Number
Point of entry	100
Intake facility	
County jails (103)	10 - 20 counties
State prisons (94)	18 - 24 (11 exact intake places)
Court (112+ court buildings) (1 finger)	
DAPP Offices (Division of Probation and Parole)	

Counties	Top 10 - 12 counties
----------	----------------------

Political decision - there are natural political pockets for placing livescan equipment.

Alternatives

4.1 Fingerprint ID methods

4.1.1 Livescan and mail fingerprint card to SBI - advantages and disadvantages:

- Can print as many cards as needed from one set.
- Filling out cards only needs to be done once.
- Fingerprints can be redone one at a time.
- Cards will not have matching problems.
- Can type in arrest number and have all information filled in automatically - transfer arrest information to livescan.
- Bypass editing of cards.

4.1.2 Livescan and electronically transmit fingerprint card - advantages / disadvantages:

- Will eliminate mail bottleneck.
- This is currently an 8 hour operation, it could speed up to a 24 hours process, 7 days a week, with a new AFIS system.

4.2 Fingerprint comparison methods

4.3 Fingerprint storage methods

4.3.1 Central Statewide AFIS System - advantages / disadvantages:

- Easier to manage the process.
- Ensures data integrity.

4.3.2 Regional (Multi-County) AFIS Systems - advantages / disadvantages:

- County manpower is required to service external requests.
- Time limits are tight to meaningfully service requests.
- Record has to be available 24 hours a day.
- Requires trained individuals and staff available 24 hours / 7 days.
- Message transaction system in duplicate.

4.3.3 Livescan regional AFIS central - advantages / disadvantages:

- Would consolidate system management.
- There are performance issues.

4.4 Mobile / Remote Issues

4.4.1 Law enforcement agents need the ability to identify suspects on the road.

- Is a single fingerprint to mobile data sufficient?
- What if the fingerprint does not meet the IAFIS standard?
- One fingerprint with 15 to 1 image, does not include minutiae data.
- Should locals send minutiae or image?
- Can this be combined with a photo?

- Reasons for supplying this technology:
 - P protect police.
 - P serve process.
 - P establish identification.

Group Goals / General Points of Consensus

- 5.1 Create a single statewide personal identifier that links incidents, arrests, cases, dispositions, inmate, treatments, victims, custody, and release data.
- 5.2 Fingerprint identification should take place at point of first contact with defendant. For example, at:
 - Initial appearance before a magistrate.
 - First appearance before a district court judge.
- 5.3 All local and state systems should use SID Number and FBI Number.
- 5.4 Identification must take place within two hours or less. (Currently it takes 2 weeks or more.)
- 5.5 There should be at least one livescan per county. The county should have the authority to determine its appropriate location.
- 5.6 Need incident base tracking.
- 5.7 Local agencies should use SID numbers.
- 5.8 We should be mindful of potential links external to CJIN, and that it is within the scope of the project objectives that CJIN should support general government functions.

Group Recommendations / Ideas:

- 6.1 The courts should flag if a defendant needs fingerprinting, and send the defendant to the sheriff's office or jail for printing immediately.
- 6.2 Certain courts may need their own livescan equipment if the nearest one is kept far away.
- 6.3 When planning and installing regional AFIS, it is important that the local level realize its value by eliminating wasted local efforts.
- 6.4 The state must rethink the logical issues regarding not having pre-trial detention. (This is a huge reengineering - statute change issue).
- 6.5 There is a need for fictional identification caution indicators at the state and local levels.
- 6.6 There needs to be a statewide definition of a criminal record check.

Benefits

- 7.1 General
 - Improved information.
 - Protect past and future victims.
 - Improve system credibility.
 - Reduction of redundant data entry at both local and state.
 - Improved accuracy/timeliness of data.
 - Better quality of decisions if identity is known before suspect reaches the Magistrate. Charges will better reflect credit for prior convictions.

- Increased tracking ability.
- Perception of automation, and the perception of improved ability to track defendants, makes criminals more cautious.

7.2 State

- Statewide standards for doing business.
- Proper sentencing/enforcement of structured sentencing.

7.3 Local

- Local agencies will not waste current investments.
- Local decisions will be a part of a statewide / nationwide plan, not a short-term project.
- There will be better information on pretrial release conditions.
- Improved service of process.
- Avoidance of false positives (There are many anecdotes regarding individuals arrested three times for something which they were not responsible.)
- Increased public safety, because there will be a reduction in the number of unknown criminals released into the community, on bond, by local law enforcement agents.

Focus Group 15: Chiefs and Sheriffs

Thursday, March 9, 1995

Aspen Building, Suite 1

Participants

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Terry Hill	Chief	Roxboro Police Department
Tom Moss	Chief	Garner Police Department
Donna Maynard	Executive Director	North Carolina Sheriff Assoc.
James Wise	Sheriff/President NCSA	Moore County Sheriff Department
Al Stewart	Captain	Greensboro Police Department

General Topics of Discussion: *Chiefs and Sheriffs*

- C Overview of CJIN
- C Overview of Selected Projects
- C Roadblocks and implementation strategies for selected projects

I. Project Overview

Price Waterhouse consultant, Deborah Cheesebro, gave a brief overview of the Criminal Justice Information Network Study and its goals and objectives for the term of the project. Price Waterhouse consultant, Gilbert Skinner, provided an overview of the agenda and distributed a handout of draft summary sheets for selected projects to be discussed. Mr. Skinner stressed with the group the importance of their input on the selected projects.

II. Focus Group Highlights

Deborah Cheesebro and Gilbert Skinner facilitated the focus group which promoted discussion on each of the projects presented. Key points made by the group are listed for each project.

A. Governance Structure for CJIN

- C Keep politics out of the governance. The group cited many difficulties with politics in the training commissions.
- C A private management model may be appropriate for governance of CJIN.
- C The North Carolina Micro Electronic Center was cited as a model to consider for CJIN.
- C Mandating the state telling agencies what to do, is a major concern for both small and large agencies. Mandates related to money i.e., follow our rules or we (the state) will not give you money, are viewed as undesirable.
- C All sectors of criminal justice must be represented in whatever governance model is selected.

B. Data Sharing Standards Project

- C All standards must be in compliance with any federal government regulations.
- C There must be adequate provisions for security because of liability for improper data release.
- C There should be provisions for mandatory fields and discretionary fields that allow for agency specific data entry. An inventory of screens currently used by individual agencies should assist in culling out mandatory and discretionary fields.
- C All drivers licenses should have the individuals thumbprint.

- C Once entered, common information for different processes (forms) can be electronically transferred and incorporated where needed without duplicate data entry.

C. Statewide Automated Identifier Project

- C Centralized livescan (and centralized booking) may be a problem for some of the counties. One central location may create transportation problems for some police departments due to geographical layout or terrain. Some counties have multiple court jurisdictions so one central booking area with the magistrate and central warrant repository is virtually impossible. However, two booking centers matching the court jurisdictions may be possible.
- C One county have three magistrate locations. In a similar case, a video system may substitute for a personal appearance in front of the magistrate.
- C The drivers thumbprint should appear on every issued drivers license.
- C A requirement to fingerprint all misdemeanor represents a major change. The logistical issues for local law enforcement needs to be resolved.

D. Statewide Magistrate System Project

- C The key to acceptance and success is the reliability of data i.e., timeliness of entries.
- C Because of liability issues, there may be a problem with selling law enforcement on something

other than a hard copy.

C It is already difficult to serve civil process on a warrant issued with sketchy information based on a citizen complaint to the magistrate. The new process should require that adequate information is provided prior to issuing a warrant. For example, a citizen initiated warrant for a medium sized male or with a name that has only a post office box would not be enough for the police to act upon.

C The system will require well trained magistrate personnel.

E. Statewide Warrant System Project

C Clerk of court warrants must be on the automated system.

C Clerk of court warrants must remain available for easy access.

C There should be a cost / benefit study to determine if the proposed central repository for hard copies of warrants should be bypassed in favor of the electronic, “paper less” system.

C There should be a security screen that allows the police to prepare the warrant for the magistrate.

F. Mobile Voice / Data System Project

C The system should be tied directly to the police departments and not to the 911 centers. This is a locus of control issue.

- C The state initiative should be compatible with existing systems. The APCO 25 standard should be adopted. The state should assist locals with any infrastructure changes required to be on the statewide system.
- C There was some concern about the benefits to local agencies versus the cost, both long and short term. Of all the projects presented, the Mobile Voice / Data System Project was the lowest priority. Until all of the other projects are operational, the Mobile Voice / Data System Project is not useful enough, for the cost, to the locals. If the General Assembly must choose between funding all of the other projects or funding this project, the group favored funding all of the other projects first.

G. Master Name Index Project

- C Incorporate all names entered on police documents.
- C Have a three-tier system:
 - Arrested persons
 - All names which have been in police documents
 - Field interrogation forms
- C Have the Master Name Index interface with the Division of Motor Vehicles

H. Statewide Integrated Criminal History Repository Project

- C It should include all felony and misdemeanor history.
- C The user-friendly narrative format will be useful.

Regional Public Hearings

To gauge public interest, solicit input, generate awareness, and communicate with individuals and agencies across the state on the development of a Criminal Justice Information Network, Price Waterhouse and the CJIN Study Committee conducted six public forums in the following cities: Asheville, Charlotte, Edenton, Fayetteville, Kinston and Winston-Salem. Invitation to these forums was extended to over 4,500 criminal justice professionals through mailings to members of the North Carolina Bar Association, League of Municipalities, North Carolina Sheriff's Association, Chiefs of Police, and all judges, magistrates, and clerks of the court. Press releases were also sent to all daily, weekly, and biweekly newspapers across the state. In addition, notification of the public forums was distributed on the interagency E-Mail networks of the Division of Criminal Information, the Administrative Office of the Courts, and the State Highway Patrol.

A list of the 158 individuals, representing a broad cross section of the criminal justice system, including the courts, law enforcement, corrections, local governments, and community action groups, that attended one or more of the six public forums, follows this section.

The following is an overview of the main issues, as well as individual comments raised by forum participants. The statements below represent a summary of the participants concerns, frustrations, and questions and are provided for background information purposes only. The contents of this section do not necessarily represent Price Waterhouse's findings and recommendations.

General Topics and Themes:

- C The vast majority of interviewees, focus group and public hearing participants expressed their support for the development of an integrated automated criminal justice information network. Many respondents expressed frustration at current system weaknesses and are eager for a "better way of doing business".

- C The need for uncompromised cooperation between key criminal justice stakeholders across North Carolina, from both local and state agencies, is imperative if a truly integrated Criminal Justice Information Network is to be realized.
- C The CJIN Study cannot ignore the fact that some counties and other local government agencies have made substantial investments in their own systems, and therefore, CJIN needs to develop standards for integration that optimize desirable current-system features.
- C The need for a single automated statewide identifier was unanimous among public hearing participants. The most desirable types of identification systems discussed included livescan fingerprint analysis and digitized photographic imaging. Consensus was also reached on the need for a minimum two hour turn-around-time on fingerprint identification - systemwide.
- C Assure that all new systems are "open" and have the ability to communicate with each other in a seamless fashion. The user shouldn't have to "manually" access multiple databases belonging to different agencies. The goal is to access information from a single entry point and let the network query various computer systems and report the appropriate information back to the user.
- C Users want the information presented in an understandable and "user-friendly" format.
- C Questions and concerns were raised regarding the cost and financing of CJIN. Although cost estimates will not be available until the completion of this project, participants in general agreed that the need for timely access to criminal justice information was significant from both a public safety and officer safety standpoint, and that they would therefore, fully support a statewide integrated criminal justice information network. Citizen participants even suggested raising funds to support a CJIN system through voter bond issue, increased court costs, and / or ballot referendum as possible alternatives.
- C NCIC 2000 standards need to maintain high-priority status in the planning of any local or statewide criminal justice information and communication network.

- C The need for information linkages from agencies outside the criminal justice system, who maintain valuable information on individuals also involved in the criminal justice system, would be highly beneficial. Information held by agencies that administer programs such as public housing, AFDC, Medicaid, and the like, could be shared and compared with information obtained by criminal justice agencies for verification and identification purposes.
- C Citizen participants expressed incredulity that current information systems do not allow access to information on offenders on a statewide basis. For example, officers stopping a suspect in one county would not necessarily be able to access criminal history information and / or outstanding warrant information from another county, even if they were able to positively identify the suspect.
- C CJIN should provide easier access to conviction records and other criminal case history information to landlords, creditors, employers, or any citizen desirous of information deemed public record.
- C The amount of time criminal justice personnel, including law enforcement officers, spend transporting and couriering documents (e.g. warrants) is highly inefficient and a waste of valuable resources.
- C The need for "open" mobile communication and data systems for officers in the field was seen as a high priority by many of the law enforcement participants. The need for timely criminal history information and positive identification methods, readily accessible to the officer in the field, is highly desired.
- C The need for a statewide warrant repository was discussed at each of the six public hearings. There was a strong consensus that an easily accessible statewide warrant repository should be an integral part of the CJIN system.
- C Citizen participants agreed that access to statewide warrant information for criminal justice professionals was paramount for maintaining public safety and would greatly enhance officer safety.
- C Law enforcement participants provided poignant examples of on-duty experiences where their inability to properly identify suspects, access criminal case history and warrant information, or communicate with other law enforcement agencies, resulted in situations that proved detrimental to public and / or officer safety.

- C Participants offered several different scenarios on the "ownership" or management of the new CJIN enterprise including the development on a new governmental agency; an ad hoc committee structure with representation from the various user organizations; and oversight by the SBI's Division of Criminal Information, were among the most common responses.
- C Information users desire a system that has both information reporting and case management functionalities.
- C Concerns were raised about the ability of smaller, poorly resourced communities (cities and counties) to participate in a statewide network if adequate funding is not provided.
- C The CJIN plan needs to recognize the need for, and the cost of on-going user training and system support.
- C Planning for security requirements is paramount. Issues regarding information access and user certification must be addressed across all user groups prior to full system development. In addition, pre-approved access to on-line NCIC information for all officers of the court would simplify information gathering processes currently in place.
- C Several participants from the courts expressed a desire for in-courtroom computers to capture disposition and sentencing information on a real-time basis. In addition, in-courtroom systems should include calendaring functions as well as provide access to criminal history and conviction information, thereby enhancing judicial decision making processes.
- C Access to the Clerk's Office information systems, via personal computer modem, for all officers of the court was thought to be highly desirable.
- C Access to juvenile offender information would be of tremendous value to law enforcement officers, judges, magistrates, and other criminal justice professionals. Juvenile case histories, identifying demographic information, and system status (e.g. dependency, runaways) would help to determine appropriate remedies for juvenile offenders coming into contract with the criminal justice system.
- C Statutory changes will need to be identified and implemented in order to take full advantage of proposed technologies. For instance, an electronic warrant relay system would allow for warrant information to be

electronically transferred from a central warrant repository to an officer in the field. Current statutes require an original signature and original document for "legal" warrant service.

- C Lessons learned from past attempts at developing integrated statewide information and communication systems need to be focused on during the course of CJIN planning.
- C Criminal justice information systems currently in place are not keeping pace with the growing need to share information electronically. This situation results in the receiving agency having to rekey information into their own computer system.

Charlotte, North Carolina: January 30, 1995

Adam's Mark Hotel

555 South McDowell Street

Attendees: Eddie Ginn, First Sergeant, State Highway Patrol
Lloyd Steve Goodson, Captain, State Highway Patrol
Hank McKiernan, Chief, Davidson Police
Halley Johnson, Systems Administrator, Court Services
Jerry Pinkard, MIS Director, Mecklenburg County
Bob Brinson, Assistant Secretary for Management, Department of Correction
John Wyatt, Co-Chair, CJIN Study Committee and Executive Director, Mecklenburg County Criminal Justice Commission
Janie Beaver, Director, Court Services
Stephen J. Allan, Principal, Grief-Fripp Architects
Lynn Brennan, Administrative Assistant, Iredell County Superior Court
Anne Fawcett, Project Manager, Mecklenburg County Data Processing
Albert Little, CJIN Study Committee Member, Director of Information Systems, Dept. of Crime Control
and Public Safety
Bill Post, Captain, Hickory Police Department
Robert Cansler, Chief, Concord Police Department
Hugh Polland, Director, Univ. of NC Police Department
Bob Ward, Assistant Public Defender, Mecklenburg County
Greg McCall, Assistant Public Defender, Mecklenburg County
Jenny Matthews, Systems Administrator, Mecklenburg County
Robert Bennett, Lieutenant, Statesville Police Department

Lloyd Johnson, Communication Supervisor, Statesville Police Department
Sis Kaplan, Chairperson, Mecklenburg County Criminal Justice Commission

Asheville, North Carolina: January 31, 1995

Buncombe Superior Court

60 Court Plaza

Attendees: John Stokes, Magistrate, Orange County
J.S. Bennett, First Sergeant, State Highway Patrol
C.H. Pitts, Lieutenant, State Highway Patrol
Frank Ross, Chief, Waynesville Police Department
Blaine Jones, Captain, Waynesville Police Department
Dan Summey, Captain, Hendersonville Police Department
John Nicholson, Captain, Hendersonville Police Department
Tom Battle, Lieutenant, State Highway Patrol
Sue Sutton, Magistrate, Buncombe County
Mike Davis, Lieutenant, Buncombe County
Larry Bopp, Director of Operations & Information Services, City of Asheville
Kathy Glass, Systems Analysts, City of Asheville
N. K. Goering, Sergeant, State Highway Patrol
Karen McDonald, Juvenile Services
Marie Little, Citizen
Albert Little, CJIN Study Committee Member, and Director of Information Systems, Department of Crime Control & Public Safety
Robert Wiseman, Town Manager, Spruce Pine
Lorna Snyder, K-9 Officer, Asheville Police Department
Al Williams, Assistant District Attorney, 28th Judicial District
Nanci Farmer, Asheville Police Department
Curtis Cannaday, Buncombe County, CJIS Committee

John Wyatt, Co-Chair, CJIN Study Committee and Executive Director, Mecklenburg County Criminal Justice Commission

Winston-Salem, North Carolina: February 1, 1995
Winston-Salem Sheraton
5790 University Parkway

Attendees: Don George, Magistrate, Winston-Salem
Mary Rumble, Records Supervisor, Winston-Salem Police Department
Gary Ward, Detective, Winston-Salem Police Department
Jane Davis, Citizen
Jimm Davis, Citizen
Lou Taylor, Detective, Winston-Salem Police Department
Linda Sapp, Parkview Action Committee
Robin Dean, Citizen
Richard Austin, Parkview Action Committee
Jack Moore, Chief Court Counselor, Juvenile Services
Robert Leaf, Citizen
Oliver Redd, Officer, Winston-Salem Police Department
Glenn Peddle, Project Analyst, Forsyth County Management Info. Services
Doug Brinkley, Sergeant, Winston-Salem Police Department
William J. Wood, Superior Court Judge
Paul James, Defense Attorney
J. T. Moser, Investigator, NC Baptist Hospital
David Walker, Captain, Winston-Salem Police Department
Michael Catlett, Citizen
Donald L. Diamont, Lieutenant, Winston-Salem Police Department
Ron Hawley, Co-Chair, CJIN Study Committee and Assistant Director, SBI / Division of Criminal Information

Laura Sherman, Court Counselor, Juvenile Justice
Dan Yemiola, Davidson County Sheriff's Office
John Wyatt, Co-Chair, CJIN Study Committee and Executive Director, Mecklenburg County Criminal Justice Commission

Winston-Salem, North Carolina: February 1, 1995 (Continued)

Robert Tussig, Davidson County Sheriff's Office
Judson D. DeRamus Jr., Superior Court Judge
Franklin Holman, Officer, Winston-Salem Police Department
Jerry Ferris, Officer, Winston-Salem Police Department
F. W. Lucas, Officer, Hickory Police Department
Byron Jones, Captain, Winston-Salem Police Department
Norman Rowdy, Safety & Security, NC Baptist Hospital
Chuck McMann, Albermarle Police Department
Ronnie Michael, Albermarle Police Department
Robert L. Parker, Citizen
Irma Goodwin, Winston-Salem Political Action Council
M.C. McNauglet, Attorney, Winston-Salem Police Department
Jane Clark, Trial Court Administrator, Superior Court
Lena Bryant, President, Parkview Action Committee
Sarah Puryear, President, NC Association of Law Enforcement Planners
Larry Williams, First Sergeant, State Highway Patrol
David Hawkins, Lieutenant, State Highway Patrol
Dana Hart, Citizen
Joseph Walker, University of NC Police
Eugene Barr, Citizen
Leigh Dryer, Winston-Salem Journal
Riley Spoon, Officer, Winston-Salem Police Department
Wayne Sumpter, Major, Hickory Police Department
George Sweat, Chief, Winston-Salem Police Department

Laura Davis, Officer, Winston-Salem Police Department
Brenda Anderson, Winston-Salem Political Action Council
Robert Greer, Winston-Salem Coalition on Alcohol & Drug Dependency

Edenton, North Carolina: February 2, 1995
Swain Auditorium
377 Queen Street

Attendees: Warren Sawyer, Magistrate, Chowan County
Marguerite McCall, Associate Editor, Chowan Herald
H. Hardy Gillam, Inspector, DMV Enforcement
J. W. Narron, 1st Lieutenant, DMV Enforcement
Clifford Midgett, Detective Lieutenant, Nags Head Police
Ginger Candelora, Computer Science Coordinator, Town of Nags Head
R. W. Byrum, Captain, Nags Head Police
W. G. Whitehurst, Deputy, Chowan County Sheriff's Office
E. Elmo Benton, Sheriff, Gates County
D. G. Dail, Lieutenant, State Highway Patrol
S. M. Compton, Lieutenant, State Highway Patrol
Ron Hawley, Co-Chair, CJIN Study Committee, Assistant Director, SBI / Division of Criminal

Information

Gregory K. Bonner, Captain, Edenton Police Department
Charles H. Williams, Chief, Edenton Police Department
Randy M. Smithson, Investigator, Pasquotank County Sheriff's Office
W. Sam Keith, Investigator, Pasquotank County Sheriff's Office
Ben Martin, Deputy Sheriff, Pasquotank County Sheriff's Office
Mike McAuthur, Clerk of Superior Court, Chowan County
Becky McAuthur, Citizen
John McAuthur, Citizen

Jason Banks, Detective, Elizabeth City Police Department
Pamela Byrum, Deputy, Chowden County Sheriff's Office
W. O. Leary, Captain, Elizabeth City Police Department
Lionel Potts, Policeman, Edenton Police Department
Charles W. Corey, Citizen

Kinston, North Carolina: February 6, 1995

Lenior County Superior Court Room

130 South Queen Street

Attendees: Herb Rouse, Captain, Rocky Mount Police Department
Larry Newborn, Field Representative, SBI / Division of Criminal Information
Dave M. Brown, Field Representative, SBI / Division of Criminal Information
Stan Lewis, Identification Supervisor, SBI / Division of Criminal Information
C. A. Danieleley, Lieutenant, State Highway Patrol
D. L. Turner, Inspector, Division of Motor Vehicles Enforcement
W. E. Brinson, Captain, Division of Motor Vehicles Enforcement
S. Winstead, Sergeant, Rocky Mount Police Department
Deral W. Raynor, First Sergeant, State Highway Patrol
Joe C. Grady, Magistrate, Lenior County
Roland Best, Kinston Police Department
George Gentry, Magistrate, Trenton, North Carolina
Janice Sellers, Administrative Probation Officer, NC Department of Correction
John Aldridge, Assistant Attorney General, Attorney General's Office
Ron Perozzi, Chief, Surf City Police
Richard N. Taylor, Telecommunications Director, City of New Bern
Sgt. Steve Winstead, Rocky Mount Police Department
Ron Hawley, Co-Chair, CJIN Study Committee and Assistant Director, SBI / Division of Criminal Information

Fayetteville, North Carolina: February 7, 1995

Holiday Inn at Bordeaux

1707 Owen Drive

Attendees: Billy Thomas, Captain, Division of Motor Vehicles Enforcement
S. P. McCorquedale, First Sergeant, State Highway Patrol
W. R. Price, Lieutenant, State Highway Patrol
Ron Hawley, Co-Chair, CJIN Study Committee and Assistant Director, SBI / Division of Criminal Information
Nancy Kiesenhofer, Training Coordinator, State Bureau of Investigation/DCI
Beverly Gregory, Training Specialist, State Bureau of Investigation/DCI
Edward Farr, Park Superintendent, NC State Parks
Jim Hallsey, Chief of Operations, NC State Parks
Albert Little, CJIN Study Committee Member and Director of Information Systems, Department of
Crime Control & Public Safety
Susan Rich, Program Developer, Robeson County Health Care Corporation
Charles Dean, Professor, Department of Criminal Justice, University of NC
Jennifer Hill, Controllers Office, Administrative Office of the Courts
Susan Miller, Controllers Office, Administrative Office of the Courts
Margaret Russ, Assistant District Attorney, Cumberland County
Elizabeth Keever, Judge, Cumberland County
Bob Pait, Police Officer, Fayetteville Police Department
Ken Wiseman, Police Officer, Fayetteville Police Department
Steven Parlett, Lieutenant, Cumberland County Sheriff's Department
Gene Melvin, Training Specialist, SBI/Division of Criminal Information
Fred McKinney, Supervisor in Charge, SBI/Division of Criminal Information
Michael Longmore, Captain, Raleigh Police Department
Charles D. Phelan, Lieutenant, Cumberland County Sheriff's Office
Marshall L. Evans, SBI/Division of Criminal Information

Fayetteville, North Carolina: February 7, 1995 (Continued)

Tommy Griffin, Clerk of the Superior Court, Cumberland County
Kitty Petti, SBI / Division of Criminal Information
Diane Phillips, Public Defender, Robeson County
John M. Cooper, Attorney, Sampson County

National Survey

Introduction

Price Waterhouse proposed a national survey of states to collect information about integrated, automated criminal justice information systems. There is a lack of readily accessible information about existing efforts in this important area. The survey method provides the most up-to-date and accurate information relevant to this project.

The purposes of the national survey are to:

1. Identify the extent to which statewide criminal justice information networks exist and meet user needs in the other 49 states.
2. Examine states with processes most applicable to the Criminal Justice Information Network (CJIN) Study for best practices that could be applied to North Carolina.

Methodology and Findings

Initial Telephone Survey

The first step was to determine which of the 49 states should be contacted as part of the initial telephone survey. CJIN team members contacted a number of criminal justice professionals and national associations / organizations, and based on the teams collective knowledge from working with almost every state, they identified a subset of the 49 states that may have experiences relevant to the CJIN study.

Based on this information, team members compiled a list of eleven (11) states to include in the initial survey. The CJIN team developed a structured interview guide so that all desired elements for a CJIN "best practices" follow-up survey would be identified. The team decided to use the Director of the Statistical Analysis Center for each state as the primary point of contact. Directors of the Centers would either possess the information needed or be able to refer us directly to the individual best suited to respond to the survey.

An interview team consisting of five members of the Price Waterhouse CJIN team conducted the telephone interviews. Additional states were added to the list, if appropriate, based on other respondent information. In total, team members completed 20 telephone surveys which included the following states:

Alaska, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Florida, Hawaii, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin.

Four other states were contacted but had not responded in time for this report. The states were: **Illinois, South Carolina, Georgia, and Colorado.**

A brief summary of findings from each state follows.

Alaska

Alaska does not have a fully integrated, automated, statewide CJIN. They are satisfied with their criminal history database administered by the Alaska State Police. Except for law enforcement, criminal justice agencies cannot access the database electronically. There is a current automation project to describe what criminal justice information systems exist and assess existing technologies.

The state has recently implemented a single person identifier number which is linked to the person's fingerprints. Currently the state is testing two livescan stations. There is statewide standardization of only five data elements. They suggested their appellate case management system as a model.

Arizona

Arizona did not have any experience relevant to the North Carolina CJIN study project.

California

California does not have a fully integrated, automated statewide CJIN. The state does have certain aspects of an integrated system. For instance:

- C The California Law Enforcement Telecommunications Network (CLETS) allows law enforcement agencies to communicate and interface with the State Bureau of Criminal Information and Identification whose databases include: criminal history, firearms, wanted persons, stolen vehicles, parole, and supervisory release. Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) is also available to law enforcement over CLETS.

- C The courts do not interface with law enforcement on a statewide basis, however some county initiatives have begun.

- C The Cal-ID system is an Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS) network for statewide tracking of fingerprints, but it is not connected to a statewide communication network. Submissions are all 10-print and may be livescan or ink. Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) fingerprint cards are used for all fingerprint submissions. The DMV uses a thumbprint and digitized image, but neither is linked to the criminal history file. Criminal histories and AFIS use the same number, but these are the only two files so integrated.

Other examples of integration reported are:

- C Corrections submit fingerprints to Bureau of Criminal Information and Identification
- C Law Enforcement provides criminal history to corrections
- C Courts provide disposition information, but method and sources vary by county

Mobile voice and data terminal decisions and implementation is on a county, not statewide, basis.

Oversight responsibility for the existing system is with the California Department of Justice, Attorney General's Office, Division of Law Enforcement. Maintenance of the system is paid for from the general fund.

Connecticut

Connecticut has a comprehensive plan to integrate and automate their criminal justice information systems on a statewide basis. The plan has been partially implemented resulting in the Collect Network. This network operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, connecting law enforcement, bail commissioners, and probation. The next phase will connect law enforcement with the judiciary.

There is a uniform fingerprint card with the uniform arrest record, but it takes 2 weeks for a fingerprint identification. The state has a uniform data dictionary. Oversight of the network is assigned to the Office of Policy and Management. There is a CJIS policy board consisting of user group representatives. Connecticut is small and highly centralized. It has a state unified court system.

Florida

The State of Florida has developed two criminal justice data dictionaries. One dictionary is used by agencies sharing information on a statewide basis. The other is used in the counties to promote consistency of data collection among all users. The Administrative Office of the Courts has taken the lead in allowing other agencies to start linking with their system. The development of the dictionaries was recently completed after an 18 month effort.

Hawaii

Most aspects of the criminal justice system in the state of Hawaii are centrally controlled. The state does have an automated information system. Aspects of the system are integrated. However, the size of the state makes it comparable to a county system in North Carolina. Therefore, team members did not pursue this as a potential site for follow-up activity.

Indiana

Indiana is considering a CJIN type project because of problems revealed in an audit of court dispositions. The Indiana State Police have installed an 800 Megahertz (MHz) communication system in parts of the state. The United States Army funded \$3 million of this partial implementation. The current plan is to use a "lease to buy" option and complete statewide implementation of an 800 MHz system in approximately four years.

Fingerprints are currently used as a statewide personal identifier. However, there are no electronic interfaces between the criminal justice information systems except in local areas.

Maryland

Maryland does have integration among their state criminal justice databases. To the degree possible, they designed a system based on the data that is needed by all system users.

They have an identification index which references the name in the database. **It is interfaced with 23 other computer databases.** A state identification number is assigned to a set of fingerprints. No data is entered or removed without the fingerprints. The rate of fingerprint cards submitted is 98% of those arrested. Arrest data is the most complete. The high rate of fingerprinting to those arrested in Maryland compared to other states is due to their state definition of arrest. An arrest is defined as detention for purposes of complaint and warrant. AFIS created a major change. There is an

interface established between AFIS and the Computerized Criminal History (CCH) database. The state just completed an upgrade increasing its capacity and introducing livescan technology for direct fingerprint entry.

Users can query criminal history data by using a state identification number. The state prison system electronically provides the names, crime types, etc., of all prisoners released on a weekly basis. The rap sheet has been changed to narrative format so that users can easily read and use the information. DMV barcodes drivers licenses.

The booking system is fully automated and used by all counties. The process is virtually paperless. There is a 30 minute turnaround time for information and identification for law enforcement.

Maryland developed this system through process of negotiation with all parties. There is a Criminal Justice Advisory Board of 20 people. The Directors, Data Center, MIS, and CJIS all report to an overall coordinator.

The system is not as seamless as the Director of CJIS would like it to be in the future. A limited statewide dictionary exists. There is a training center which offers 2 weeks of training.

Legally some juvenile data can be shared with law enforcement. The remaining juvenile data is confidential and can not be co-mingled with the integrated system.

Massachusetts

Massachusetts is in the early planning stages of integrating their systems. The initial effort is to develop one criminal history file. This effort is directed by an oversight policy board.

The remaining aspects of integration are not currently being addressed. For example, the court system is developing new databases still independent of any integration plan.

Michigan

Michigan has completed a plan to implement a statewide 800 MHz system using the APCO 25 standards for the Michigan State Police. Other law enforcement agencies are being solicited to join the communication network. A contract has been signed with Motorola for the implementation of the system. The projected infrastructure cost for Michigan is \$187 million over a 5-10 year period.

Michigan Consumers Power Company has already implemented a statewide 800 MHz system for their employees based on Erickson and Motorola technologies. Their experience indicates that the 800 MHz structure is not pager friendly as it relates to voice communication. This restriction may impact potential users of the system, such as volunteer fire departments that depend on pagers to communicate with their firefighters.

Michigan does not have an automated, integrated statewide CJIN. The Department of Management and Budget is leading two related efforts at this time. One effort is to consolidate 10 state mainframe information systems, including the State Police and Department of Corrections. The other effort is to adopt and implement one statewide personal identifier. The fingerprint option is under consideration as the personal identifier technique.

New Mexico

New Mexico is considering a CJIN type project in 2 years. They only receive 30% of fingerprints at a central repository.

New York

Jails, law enforcement, and district attorneys are provided with software to link with the Division of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS). The Office of Court Administration provides specifications for software for court information system dial-up arrangement. Thirty two of sixty counties are using a jail management system provided by DCJS.

The New York City Police Department (NYPD) has a direct link to DCJS. NYPD uses on-line booking and fax fingerprint system. The fingerprint system provides a one-hour positive identification.

New York has developed a Spectrum Justice System (SJS) that can run on a stand-alone PC or Local Area Network (LAN).

The system includes:

- C Warrant tracking
- C Arrest booking
- C Incident data

It is capable of passing arrest data online. There are currently 200 users of SJS.

New York has developed standardized arrest reports and is moving toward an incident based data system.

The NYSID is a personal identifier and it is fingerprint based. The identifier follows the defendant through the system. The Core Control Number represents the arrest event. Sometimes the identification system breaks down, especially at the local level. They are beginning a best practices project to improve their process. If fingerprints are faxed, 90% of requests take 1 hour. Only New York City and some other counties can fax the prints. Mailed fingerprints can take a few weeks. New York uses fingerprint because it is the most unique identifier. The identification system works in conjunction with the Spectrum system.

The data processing and criminal justice people looked at processes and made an effort to coordinate at the state and local levels. New York created a Director of Criminal Justice. They began a dictionary of terms in 1988, governed by DCJS, and they receive 400 user requests for each update.

Through a personal computer, local judges can dial up a criminal history rap sheet and use it at arraignment, plea bargaining, and sentencing. It used to take too long to get this information from law enforcement to the courts for the information to be useful. The system uses software that is very user friendly.

New York recommended:

- C Standardize data through a data dictionary
- C Standardize practices: compare agencies' business practices and create a manual for collecting and passing information

Ohio

The state does not have a fully automated, integrated statewide CJIN at this time. They anticipate receiving federal funds from the National Criminal History Improvement Project to improve their current system. Mobile voice and data terminal decisions are made and implemented at the county, not state, level. The DMV is implementing digitized

technology in 1995. The only statewide effort is a prosecution information system. The state is planning a "cookbook" of suggested data elements.

Pennsylvania

Pennsylvania has been working on criminal justice information systems for 15 years. They do not have a fully automated, integrated statewide CJIN. There is a standing committee representing all state criminal justice agencies working in this area. Juvenile justice data is automated but not integrated.

Some formal plans exist to improve the information systems in connection with NCIC 2000. It is mandatory to fingerprint all arrests. The single identifier number is based on individual fingerprints. The identifier allows the system to link the court disposition to the arrest records.

The level of integration is described below:

1. *Law Enforcement to Corrections*

The state level confirms identification of individuals. Law enforcement provides a verification of criminal history data. Community corrections is notified in the event of a re-arrest situation.

The system is based on the premise that people are fingerprinted. Pennsylvania is using livescan to increase compliance with fingerprinting everyone arrested. They have livescan capability in 28 areas of the state representing 70% of the fingerprint volume of the state.

2. *Law Enforcement to Courts*

Currently they have very good information flow. When police make an arrest, the Single Identifier Digit (SID) is assigned. When fingerprinted and forwarded to court, the case is assigned a Offense Tracking Number (OTN). The courts receive the SID and the police receive the OTN so all data is linked. The problem occurs when there is no fingerprint in the file. Dispositions may "sit" for a while to be processed.

3. *Corrections to Courts*

Only corrections communicates with the courts for Offense Tracking Numbers.

The state is working on a final statewide dictionary. When completed, it will be called the Justice Assistance Network (JANET). All existing criminal justice databases are automated but not integrated. The cost estimates are \$6 to \$10 million.

Rhode Island

The State of Rhode Island has had planning for a CJIS ongoing since 1980. They have used a number of consultants to provide planning and implementation strategies.

Implementation has never been effected because of budgetary and political factors. They currently have no information system integration. A statewide dictionary, developed many years ago, is not up-to-date or in use by agencies.

Tennessee

The state does not have a fully automated, integrated statewide CJIN. This type of project has been discussed but not planned. Aspects of the system that are integrated through electronic network are as follows:

- C Corrections has access to the law enforcement NCIC database.
- C Law enforcement has access to the DMV driver's records.
- C Law enforcement has access to the state and local corrections offender databases.

The aspects of the system that are integrated are perceived as user friendly. Tennessee is upgrading the message switch for NCIC 2000 by July, 1995.

Utah

All aspects of the system can access the Criminal History File (CHF). Users have to access the system before they can access the CHF. The remainder of criminal justice information systems are piecemeal. The user has to know about the other systems to access them. The state is currently working to develop a wide area network link. There is a statewide warrants file that originates at the court, and which law enforcement and the Board of Pardons can access.

The juvenile justice system is integrated. Courts, corrections, and law enforcement can access a subset of the juvenile data.

The mainframe is located at Salt Lake City, State Department of Law Enforcement. Maintenance responsibility is still with individual state agencies: Department of Public Safety, Administrative Office of the Courts, Department of Correction. The most difficult aspect of integration is changing the culture. For example, courts manage cases not people. The courts were offered AFIS and do not want to use it. Public safety is specifically charged with the overall system. The Information Technical Service Center (ITS) handles the juvenile court and corrections hardware.

The ITS has a board for decisions about operating hardware upgrades. The 1984 Information System Consortium no longer operates. The Commission of Juvenile Criminal Justice does operate.

The state is working on implementing a mobile voice and data terminal system with ITS / legislative oversight. Law enforcement are going to Mobile Data Terminals (MDT). It is ITS / legislative oversight responsibility.

The state is just starting to digitize photo images at the point of driver's license issuance. There is no single positive identifier.

There is a statewide standardization of terms on a small scale. They only use standardization with data elements that everyone in the system uses.

Utah personnel believe their system should be a model for:

- C Ease of criminal history
- C Ease of juvenile justice - provides narrative rap sheets

Virginia

The criminal justice information systems are automated within agencies, but not integrated. There is a resolution before the General Assembly to conduct a two year study to plan and develop a CJIN.

All fingerprints for felony and jailable misdemeanors are sent to the state police. Offenders who have been previously arrested are assigned their previous individual state identification numbers. This process entails a one week turnaround time.

Department of Motor Vehicles is using hologram images. The state police are responsible for maintaining criminal history records. Probation and parole can access CCH data. Currently one-half of all arrests are missing dispositions.

Washington

There are a number of criminal justice information systems with varying levels of integration. Two systems are under the Washington Highway Patrol (WHP): criminal history and wanted file. The Office of the Administration of the Courts (OAC) has two systems and one under development. Superior Courts and District Courts are in place and under development is an indexed access to each of the above.

There is a current project underway to perform scope analysis for the statewide Justice Information Network (JIN). The Office of Financial Management administers the budget of the JIN development. The WHP holds the criminal databases and the OAC holds the judicial databases. The JIN is being developed on a cooperative basis between all three of these agencies and the local jurisdictions. Policy and standards issues are discussed and resolved by a legislative cabinet level committee - Justice Information Committee. Day to day operations of the systems are up to their owner agencies. Oversight of policy is debated.

Excluding the cost of hooking-up local agencies, the cost for JIN is \$11 million over four years. One goal of the JIN is to eliminate redundant communication networks owned and maintained by localities, WHP, and the OAC. At this time

the communication developments do not include mobile voice and data, but they are intentionally open ended for future possibilities. Counties and cities are developing MDT systems rather than waiting for state implementation.

All fingerprints are FBI 10-print by either livescan or ink. There is currently no electronic data submission. Identification timing is a major issue. The JIN study committed to 24 hour turnaround time for fingerprint identification. The Department of Licensing may begin thumbprinting in the future. They currently do not store or share digitized driver's license photographs. There is a single identifier. An event is tracked by a process control number. This number links all events from incident / arrest through case disposition and incarceration.

There has been a statewide study and publication for data standards. There is no mandate to use the standards. Cooperation and a local need to request state funds facilitated implementation of standards.

There are three elements of the Washington JIN that they recommend:

- C A business rule study performed with change integration in mind to maximize current processes.
- C Clear documentation, publication, and understanding of the mission statement.
- C Implementation of a Process Control Number to link events across multiple systems.

Wisconsin

Wisconsin does not have an automated, integrated CJIN or any integration of significant state databases. They have a state law that mandates a personal state identification number based on fingerprints. They recommend their identification system as a model to others based on the accuracy of the results.

Best Practices Follow-up Survey

Based on the information provided in the initial survey, CJIN team members selected 2 sites for on-site follow-up study.

Maryland

Maryland has the most advanced, automated, integrated criminal justice information network. They have negotiated for cooperative working relationships and exist with an oversight board representing users. They also have an 800 MHz system and a drivers license barcode system.

Mr Earl Gillispie agreed to meet with members of the CJIN Study Committee on March 3, 1995. In addition, attending from the state of North Carolina CJIN Study Project were Richard Little and Nick Barnett. Mr. Gillispie was joined by various members of his staff and in the afternoon by members of the Maryland Administrative Office of the Courts.

Mr. Gillispie provided an overview of the Maryland Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) which included the following points:

- C They have approximately 1.2 million personal identifier records, all of which are driven by fingerprints. They average 2.5 aliases per record.
- C Extensive training is required for accurate information. They train between 3,500 and 5,000 people per year on their system.
- C There are 213 agencies, with 11,000 users, operating on 3,500 computer terminals linked to CJIS. They conduct approximately 22 million transactions per month.
- C Maryland started their system in 1962 with "hot files". In 1970 they began using computers and in the 1970's, added Central Criminal History Files and a Personal Identification Database.
- C Anyone in criminal justice can access the system and then access only the data for which they are authorized.
- C There are statewide standards for data entry.
- C Jurisdictions are required by law to report information to CJIS.

Mr. Gillispie recommended:

- C Posting "No Trespassing" notices on CJIN data. This makes it easier to prosecute hackers or others who improperly enter the system.
- C Posting "This information is valid for 10 days from this date" on rap sheets.

C That tradition be acknowledged and respected, as far as possible, in integrating to a statewide system.

There are specific charges for lines, terminals, access, and maintenance. Currently, the cost is \$439 per month, per line plus the cost of the terminal. In addition, there is a \$39 monthly access fee, and a \$38 monthly maintenance fee.

Maryland CJIS uses a 13 digit number as an event tracking number. The first 2 digits are the year, the next 4 numbers are the work station, the following 6 numbers are serial, and the 13th number is a mod check number. The numbers are assigned by his office and are adhesive label formatted. Once an arrest is made, the officer attaches an adhesive label to the arrest report and to the fingerprint card. The court also uses this number and the same number continues to be used through final disposition.

In 1983, approximately 40% of arrests and data matched. Today, the match rate is in the high 90% range. The latest AFIS turnaround time is 18 minutes from entry to return. They are currently studying the feasibility of using a single digit identification that would allow them to use the smaller biometric devices at a much lower cost than purchasing livescan for all their desired locations. The single digit scan is a closed search and only indicated if the fingerprint is already in AFIS. If they identify a match with the single digit, they would not have to do an entire fingerprint card. They believe their false identification from this system would be less than 1/2 of 1%. Mr. Lamont showed us their AFIS system, and Mr. Gillispie had us watch a livescan entry.

Another project CJIS is currently pursuing is a mug shot repository. CJIS is working with the Maryland Motor Vehicle Administration to digitize driver's license and then to cross reference those with the CJIS files.

Janet Moses of the CJIS staff, has developed another notification system linking their Criminal Case History (CCH) and Identification systems. Under this program, the inquiring party enters a SID# and then responds to screen questions. Currently, this program holds 220,000 notification requests and allows persons who have committed crimes or are on unsupervised probation to be monitored across the state.

The rap sheet narrative of the CCH is seen as particularly useful. This narrative format makes it easier for people to read the rap sheet and consequently increases the likelihood that the rap sheet is used correctly.

In August of 1995, CJIS hopes to have an Automated Arrest Booking System operational for the Baltimore County Jail. The idea is to make the booking process as swift and as paperless as possible. Maryland owns the software for this system, but IBM can individually market the software. The system was described to the CJIN team and a one page ABS Overview is attached to this report. All incoming prisoners will receive a plastic bracelet that would contain a barcoded number.

The correction officers will carry barcode readers that will:

- C Identify prisoners
- C Signal to check prisoners on suicide watch
- C Ensure that the correct prisoner is moved to the correct location

The booking system is designed to allow the officer to prepare reports while the prisoner is being processed. Once processed, the officer and the prisoner met for the initial hearing. The system will hopefully save time and money while ensuring better tracking of prisoners and collecting of data.

The governance of CJIS is all mandated by law. Serving as co-chairs are the Secretary of Public Safety and the Chief Judge of the Maryland Courts. They have a 20 member advisory board whose membership is also governed by law to assist them in administering the system. The Secretary then issues regulations that the CJIS group follow and the Chief Judge issues court rules which govern the court side of the system. This structure has worked very well for Maryland.

The Maryland court system has been working to modernize and improve operational efficiency. Over the past four and a half years, the Circuit Court has been developing a Case Management System. In addition, the courts have automated the in-courtroom functions. The court commissions do direct data entry at time of charging.

Michigan

Michigan has completed the largest study and plan for an 800 MHz mobile voice and data terminal system. Price Waterhouse met with Mr. Jeffrey J. Steffel, Inspector Asst. Division Commander of the Maryland State Police on March 22, 1995 to discuss Michigan's Public Safety Communication's System.

The Department of State Police and the Department of Management and Budget have concluded a vendor evaluation process for the selection of a vendor to implement a radio system for the state of Michigan. Initially, the new 800 MHz radio system and Telecommunications Backbone Network (TBN) will replace 50 year old technology presently being used by the Michigan State Police in their dispatch centers, vehicles, and by officers in the field. ¹

This project has been gaining momentum for seven years since the first requirements studies were conducted by the State Police and an outside consultant. Since 1984, the existing radio equipment has been cannibalized due to unavailability of replacement parts. Maintenance costs have increased by 15% annually because of extensive efforts to extend the usefulness of the equipment beyond its normal life. Additional law enforcement requirements on the State Police have surfaced, such as the additional responsibility of underground gas storage tank inspections and participation by the State Police in new countywide 911 systems.

Additionally, Inspector Steffel provided an overview of the following topics:

History

- ! 1929 - First Statewide Michigan State Police Radio System (AM one way system)
- ! 1944 - Current system - two way FM (low band/42.58 MHz)
- ! 1984 - Action Committee formed to study Maryland State Police (MSP) radio system

¹ State of Michigan 800 MHz Radio System and Telecommunications Backbone Network Vendor Selection Report; Michigan State Police and Department of Management and Budget

- ! Commissioned Sach Freeman - 1985-1987
- ! 1985 through 1989 several studies were conducted recommending use of 800 MHz trunked systems
- ! MSP prepared specifications - 1988-1992
- ! October 1992, RFP was disseminated
- ! Telecommunications Taskforce
- ! Legislative and customer visits
- ! Needs analysis
- ! Personnel assigned 1988
- ! May 1993, three question and answer periods were completed and bids were received from Motorola and Harris Corporation
- ! September 1993, both bids were determined unacceptable and were rejected
- ! November 1993, BAFO bids were received
- ! March 1994, Harris bid was determined to be non-compliant and Motorola was awarded contract
- ! December 1996, acceptance of phase one

Problems addressed

- ! Poor radio coverage
- ! Co-channel interference
- ! 83% of radio equipment older than industry standard of 7 years
- ! 58% of the radio equipment over 15 years old

Inviolate Requirements (Evaluation criteria)

- ! 97% area coverage at CM-3 (audio quality standard)
 - Divide the state into 2 X 2 mile squares
 - No two adjacent squares were allowed to be left without coverage

- ! 14,000 individual talk groups
- ! Tower sites on state property
- ! Federal Aviation Administration
- ! Agree to Michigan's Acceptance Testing Standard
- ! Wide area talk groups

Award

- ! State announced award to Motorola in Governors Press Release - March 30, 1994
- ! \$187,275,915.00
- ! Largest award by the state to any single vendor
- ! Largest award ever to Motorola LMPS
- ! Contract will be implemented in four phases over 10 years

- ! Contract includes:
 - 181 towers
 - 4 to 6 base stations per tower
 - Radio infrastructure equipment
 - Microwave systems
 - Control centers
 - 3000 subscriber units

What are the Benefits

- ! Latest technology

- ! Officer safety
- ! Integrated systems
- ! One infrastructure
- ! Less maintenance
- ! Improved coverage
- ! Can be used by all state law enforcement and public safety agencies

Future Additional Support

- ! "Paperless" environment
- ! Mobile digital terminals (MDT's)
- ! Automatic vehicle locators (AVL)
- ! Future digital systems with public safety purpose
- ! Vendor has agreed to upgrade all equipment to APCO project 25 standards
- ! NCIC 2000

State Survey

Introduction

The state survey is one of many techniques for in-state data collection. Unlike the interviews or focus groups, the written survey method provides a unique opportunity to solicit information from hundreds of criminal justice professionals. The CJIN team views the in-state survey as a mechanism to collect initial data and to validate information collected in other forums. The purposes of the survey are to determine the:

1. Degree of satisfaction that system users have with existing state and local criminal justice information systems in North Carolina.
2. Information needs of criminal justice agencies in North Carolina.
3. Degree to which technology exists or would be useful to agencies where currently not available.

Survey Design and Distribution

Criminal Justice Information Network (CJIN) team members reviewed written documents about existing information systems, interview notes, and all appropriate focus group summaries. The overall survey design consists of five sections. Each section of the survey was drafted and reviewed by survey team members. Each section is described on the following page.

Section I. Information Needs

This section lists possible information needs gleaned from the focus group data. Respondents are asked to rate the importance of each information need presented. Survey responses will be compiled to identify an overall importance level and importance levels specific to courts, corrections, and law enforcement. This data assisted the team in establishing information need priorities.

Section II. User Issues

Section two lists possible user needs regarding access to information and processes associated with using the information systems. Respondents were asked to indicate how important it is for CJIN to meet each user need listed. The survey analysis was similar to section one.

Section III. Current Satisfaction with Systems

This section provides a descriptor of information currently provided by state and local entities. Respondents were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with each information source. The survey responses provided additional information for CJIN team members considering options for maintaining and improving current systems.

Section IV. Current Satisfaction with Technology

Section four lists various types of technology. Respondents were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with technology that they possess. Respondent agencies that do not possess technology were asked to rate how useful a specific technology listed would be to them. This data assisted CJIN team members considering options for technology recommendations.

Section V. Respondent Information

Respondents were asked limited information. They were asked to indicate 1) whether their agency is court, correction, or law enforcement related; 2) their position within the agency; and 3) how frequently they currently use the automated information systems available.

A copy of the survey is provided as an attachment. Richard Little, CJIN Study Project Manager, provided several mailing lists to the Price Waterhouse Research Center. The center used the lists to direct mail or courier the survey to more than 1,000 criminal justice professionals working in courts, corrections, and law enforcement throughout the state of North Carolina.

Given the survey purposes and the CJIN Study time frame, the team planned to compile and analyze surveys with a 30% return rate. Within two weeks of distribution, three hundred ninety five surveys were returned. The Price Waterhouse Survey Research Center reviewed the surveys, entered the responses, and generated summary data tables using descriptive statistics.

The CJIN survey team reviewed all tables and analyzed the responses in relationship to earlier data collection results, current information systems environment, and proposed CJIN projects. The survey results support staff conclusions from earlier data collection efforts. We identified individual data tables related to specific CJIN projects and distributed these selected tables for further review to the CJIN staff responsible for each project. CJIN staff used these tables to assist in refining their recommendations and priorities. The survey results are included for review.

Information Needs

Instructions: Read each information type listed in this section. For each type of information indicate **how important it is** for your agency to collect that specific information in a timely an accurate manner.

Traffic Related Activity Needs

North Carolina Drivers license information: number, DOB, address, social security number

(Note: The survey results from law enforcement, courts, and corrections are indicated as a percent of the total. Total number of responses are also indicated by column and row.)

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	91.45	8.55	0	0	234
Courts	70.95	17.57	8.11	3.38	148
Corrections	66.67	33.33	0	0	3
Total	83.38	12.21	3.12	1.3	385

Drivers license photo image

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	53.68	32.03	11.26	3.03	231
Courts	15.44	20.81	30.87	32.89	149
Corrections	0	33.33	33.33	33.33	3
Total	38.38	27.68	19.06	14.88	383

Drivers license restrictions

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	48.07	36.48	13.73	1.72	233
Courts	20.81	28.86	25.5	24.83	149
Corrections	0	33.33	0	66.67	3
Total	37.14	33.51	18.18	11.17	385

Drivers license endorsements

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	34.91	38.36	21.55	5.17	232
Courts	12.24	25.17	29.93	32.65	147
Corrections	0	0	33.33	66.67	3
Total	25.92	32.98	24.87	16.23	382

Civil infractions pending

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	9.87	30.47	40.34	19.31	233
Courts	23.29	26.71	17.12	32.88	146
Corrections	0	33.33	33.33	33.33	3
Total	14.92	29.06	31.41	24.61	382

Civil infractions disposition

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	9.96	26.84	40.26	22.94	231
Courts	31.03	26.90	17.93	24.14	145
Corrections	0	33.33	33.33	33.33	3
Total	17.94	26.91	31.66	23.48	379

Record of failure to appear on previous court cases

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	45.92	37.34	15.88	0.86	233
Courts	60.67	28.67	8.67	2.0	150
Corrections	100.00	0	0	0	3

Total	52.07	33.68	12.95	1.30	386
--------------	-------	-------	-------	------	-----

Driving record: history, status

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	76.92	20.51	1.71	0.85	234
Courts	81.88	11.41	4.70	2.01	149
Corrections	33.33	33.33	0	33.33	3
Total	78.50	17.10	2.85	1.55	386

Personal identification information:
age, height, weight, gender, race, etc.

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	77.16	20.26	2.59	0	232
Courts	40.69	29.66	16.55	13.10	145

Corrections	100.00	0	0	0	3
Total	63.42	23.68	7.89	5.00	380

Positive identification by fingerprints

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	52.81	29.87	14.29	3.03	231
Courts	26.90	24.14	17.93	31.03	145
Corrections	100.00	0	0	0	2
Total	43.12	27.51	15.61	13.76	378

Positive identification by photograph

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	67.83	26.96	5.22	0	230
Courts	27.27	27.97	20.28	24.48	143

Corrections	66.67	0	33.33	0	3
Total	52.39	27.13	11.17	9.31	376

Motor vehicle registration information:
tag identification, vehicle identification, purchase date, etc.

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	76.86	19.21	3.06	0.87	229
Courts	16.33	25.85	37.41	20.41	147
Corrections	0	0	0	100.00	3
Total	52.77	21.64	16.36	9.23	379

Traffic accident data

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	7.73	41.20	39.91	11.16	233

Courts	10.20	25.17	36.73	27.89	147
Corrections	0	33.33	0	66.67	3
Total	8.62	34.99	38.38	18.02	383

Safety inspection certification

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	6.90	28.45	47.41	17.24	232
Courts	3.38	7.43	27.03	62.16	148
Corrections	0	0	33.33	66.67	3
Total	5.48	20.10	39.43	34.99	383

Temporary registration "tags" identification

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	44.21	40.77	12.88	2.15	233

Courts	2.70	10.14	31.08	56.08	148
Corrections	0	0	33.33	66.67	3
Total	27.86	28.65	20.05	23.44	384

Drivers license information from other states

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	63.09	31.76	4.72	0.43	233
Courts	31.54	36.24	19.46	12.75	149
Corrections	33.33	33.33	0	33.33	3
Total	50.65	33.51	10.39	5.45	385

Drivers citations issued in other states

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
-----------------------	----------------------------	------------------	---------------------------	----------------------	----------------------------------

LE	25.75	41.20	27.04	6.01	233
Courts	19.73	31.97	27.21	21.09	147
Corrections	66.67	0	0	33.33	3
Total	23.76	37.34	26.89	12.01	383

Motor carrier information

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	9.48	37.50	39.66	13.36	232
Courts	2.04	8.84	25.85	63.27	147
Corrections	0	0	0	100.00	3
Total	6.54	26.18	34.03	33.25	382

Traffic related statistics

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	8.62	26.72	48.28	16.38	232
Courts	1.39	12.50	24.31	61.81	144
Corrections	0	0	66.67	33.33	3
Total	5.80	21.11	39.31	33.77	379

Stolen vehicles

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	90.13	9.01	0	0.86	233
Courts	18.92	18.92	25.68	36.49	148
Corrections	33.33	0	0	66.67	3
Total	62.24	12.76	9.90	15.10	384

Stored vehicles

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	25.64	49.57	17.09	7.69	234
Courts	2.03	7.43	25.68	64.86	148
Corrections	0	0	0	100.00	3
Total	16.36	32.99	20.26	30.39	385

Chemical test operators log information

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	11.06	37.45	33.19	18.30	235
Courts	15.65	28.57	23.13	32.65	147
Corrections	0	33.33	33.33	33.33	3
Total	12.73	34.03	29.35	23.90	385

Breath test forms

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	20.94	36.32	29.49	13.25	234
Courts	33.11	27.03	15.54	24.32	148
Corrections	0	0	0	100.00	3
Total	25.45	32.47	23.90	18.18	385

Criminal Case Related Activity Needs

Criminal case history instate

Adult felony

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	88.89	10.26	0.43	0.43	234
Courts	89.19	8.11	1.35	1.35	148
Corrections	100.00	0	0	0	2
Total	89.06	9.38	0.78	0.78	384

Adult misdemeanor

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	60.68	36.75	2.14	0.43	234
Courts	85.81	10.81	2.03	1.35	148
Corrections	100.00	0	0	0	2
Total	70.57	26.56	2.08	0.78	384

Juvenile felony

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	76.82	17.60	4.72	0.86	233
Courts	56.46	20.41	12.93	10.20	147
Corrections	50.00	0	0	50.00	2
Total	68.85	18.59	7.85	4.71	382

Juvenile nonfelony

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	39.91	42.49	14.59	3.00	233
Courts	45.58	19.05	21.09	14.29	147
Corrections	50.00	0	0	50.00	2
Total	42.15	33.25	17.02	7.59	382

Involuntary mental commitment histories

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	51.50	33.91	12.02	2.58	233
Courts	32.88	23.29	28.08	15.75	146
Corrections	50.00	0	0	50.00	2
Total	44.36	29.66	18.11	7.87	381

Criminal case history out of state
Adult felony

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	83.33	14.96	1.28	0.43	234
Courts	76.35	12.16	6.08	5.41	148
Corrections	100.00	0	0	0	2
Total	80.73	13.80	3.13	2.34	384

Adult misdemeanor

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	53.42	39.74	5.98	0.85	234
Courts	65.54	20.27	8.11	6.08	148
Corrections	100.00	0	0	0	2

Total	58.33	32.03	6.77	2.86	384
--------------	-------	-------	------	------	-----

Juvenile felony

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	68.80	23.93	5.98	1.28	234
Courts	44.90	18.37	19.73	17.01	147
Corrections	50.00	0	0	50.00	2
Total	59.53	21.67	11.23	7.57	383

Juvenile nonfelony

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	34.19	42.31	19.66	3.85	234
Courts	31.97	18.37	27.89	21.77	147

Corrections	50.00	0	0	50.00	2
Total	33.42	32.90	22.72	10.97	383

Involuntary mental commitment histories

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	50.00	33.76	11.54	4.70	234
Courts	25.17	22.45	31.29	21.09	147
Corrections	50.00	0	0	50.00	2
Total	40.47	29.24	19.06	11.23	383

Outstanding warrants

Within county

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	96.15	3.42	0.43	0	234

Courts	77.18	14.09	5.37	3.36	149
Corrections	100.00	0	0	0	2
Total	88.83	7.53	2.34	1.30	385

Statewide

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	94.02	5.56	0.43	0	234
Courts	68.46	18.79	8.05	4.70	149
Corrections	100.00	0	0	0	2
Total	84.16	10.65	3.38	1.82	385

Out of state

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
-----------------------	----------------------------	------------------	---------------------------	----------------------	----------------------------------

LE	85.04	14.10	0.85	0	234
Courts	57.05	20.13	16.11	6.71	149
Corrections	100.00	0	0	0	2
Total	74.29	16.36	6.75	2.60	385

Extradition information

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	70.59	24.43	4.52	0.45	221
Courts	54.48	28.28	14.48	2.76	145
Corrections	100.00	0	0	0	2
Total	64.40	25.82	8.42	1.36	368

Single positive identification mechanism

Fingerprints

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	66.52	30.04	2.15	1.29	233
Courts	40.54	24.32	14.19	20.95	148
Corrections	100.00	0	0	0	2
Total	56.66	27.68	6.79	8.88	383

Photograph

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	74.25	23.61	2.15	0	233
Courts	36.05	29.25	18.37	16.33	147
Corrections	100.00	0	0	0	2
Total	59.69	25.65	8.38	6.28	382

Master name index number

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	40.89	46.22	10.22	2.67	225
Courts	32.39	26.76	21.13	19.72	142
Corrections	100.00	0	0	0	1
Total	37.77	38.59	14.40	9.24	368

Pending criminal cases in state

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	46.78	42.06	9.44	1.72	233
Courts	62.59	21.77	8.84	6.80	147
Corrections	100.00	0	0	0	2
Total	53.14	34.03	9.16	3.66	382

Pending criminal cases out of state

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	38.03	45.73	14.10	2.14	234
Courts	47.62	27.89	14.29	10.20	147
Corrections	100.00	0	0	0	2
Total	42.04	38.64	14.10	5.22	383

Arrest and release orders

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	41.45	43.16	13.68	1.71	234
Courts	56.08	26.35	15.54	2.03	148
Corrections	100.00	0	0	0	2
Total	47.40	36.46	14.32	1.82	384

Bond information

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	17.09	40.17	35.04	7.69	234
Courts	56.08	30.41	10.14	3.38	148
Corrections	100.00	0	0	0	2
Total	32.55	36.20	25.26	5.99	384

Active warrants

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	90.52	8.62	0.86	0	232
Courts	72.30	19.59	5.41	2.70	148
Corrections	100.00	0	0	0	2
Total	83.51	12.83	2.62	1.05	382

Served and expired warrants

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	22.32	35.19	33.91	8.58	233
Courts	43.54	29.25	19.73	7.48	147
Corrections	100.00	0	0	0	2
Total	30.89	32.72	28.27	8.12	382

Case file information:

check digit number, identification number, offense, fingerprint card, etc.

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	35.62	41.63	21.03	1.72	233
Courts	42.57	24.32	20.95	12.16	148
Corrections	50.00	0	0	50.00	2
Total	38.38	34.73	20.89	6.01	383

Pretrial release information

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	20.60	43.78	28.33	7.30	233
Courts	48.30	36.73	10.88	4.08	147
Corrections	100.00	0	0	0	2
Total	31.68	40.84	21.47	6.02	382

Disposition information

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	26.29	51.29	17.24	5.17	232
Courts	68.92	24.32	4.05	2.70	148
Corrections	100.00	0	0	0	2
Total	43.19	40.58	12.04	4.19	382

Case management reports:

aging reports, case status, etc.

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	15.65	47.83	32.17	4.35	230
Courts	30.82	28.77	28.77	11.64	146
Corrections	66.67	0	33.33	0	3
Total	21.90	40.11	30.87	7.12	379

Restitution information

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	8.62	37.07	41.81	12.50	232
Courts	52.03	33.11	10.14	4.73	148
Corrections	100.00	0	0	0	3
Total	26.11	35.25	29.24	9.40	383

Victim information

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	19.48	52.38	24.68	3.46	231
Courts	54.36	33.56	8.05	4.03	149
Corrections	66.67	33.33	0	0	3
Total	33.42	44.91	18.02	3.66	383

Probation information:
status, officer, conditions

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	34.63	53.25	9.96	2.16	231
Courts	54.67	37.33	4.67	3.33	150
Corrections	100.00	0	0	0	3
Total	42.97	46.61	7.81	2.60	384

Probation violation reports

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	30.87	48.70	16.09	4.35	230
Courts	60.14	30.41	6.08	3.38	148
Corrections	100.00	0	0	0	3
Total	42.78	41.21	12.07	3.94	381

Parole information: status, officer, conditions

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	36.96	46.09	13.04	3.91	230
Courts	42.76	37.24	14.48	5.52	145
Corrections	100.00	0	0	0	3
Total	39.68	42.33	13.49	4.50	378

State incarceration information by offender:
Facility

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	13.79	47.84	29.74	8.62	232
Courts	20.13	30.87	26.17	22.82	149
Corrections	66.67	33.33	0	0	3
Total	16.67	41.15	28.13	14.06	384

Sentence

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	17.75	49.78	24.68	7.79	231
Courts	35.14	36.49	16.89	11.49	148
Corrections	66.67	33.33	0	0	3

Total	24.87	44.50	21.47	9.16	382
--------------	-------	-------	-------	------	-----

Classification

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	13.48	41.74	31.74	13.04	230
Courts	16.22	25.00	32.43	26.35	148
Corrections	66.67	33.33	0	0	3
Total	14.96	35.17	31.76	18.11	381

Prison record of behavior

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	14.66	41.38	29.74	14.22	232
Courts	14.09	20.13	32.89	32.89	149
Corrections	66.67	33.33	0	0	3

Total	14.84	33.07	30.73	21.35	384
--------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-----

Work release

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	16.38	41.81	31.03	10.78	232
Courts	15.54	26.35	33.11	25.00	148
Corrections	66.67	33.33	0	0	3
Total	16.45	35.77	31.59	16.19	383

Release date

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	25.86	46.98	19.83	7.33	232
Courts	24.32	36.49	24.32	14.86	148

Corrections	66.67	33.33	0	0	3
Total	25.59	42.82	21.41	10.18	383

Escape

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	71.43	19.91	6.06	2.60	231
Courts	43.24	24.32	20.27	12.16	148
Corrections	66.67	33.33	0	0	3
Total	60.47	21.73	11.52	6.28	382

County incarceration information by offender:
Facility

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	21.12	45.69	25.00	8.19	232

Courts	27.52	28.19	24.16	20.13	149
Corrections	66.67	33.33	0	0	3
Total	23.96	38.80	24.48	12.76	384

Sentence

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	20.26	49.57	23.71	6.47	232
Courts	38.93	31.54	18.79	10.74	149
Corrections	66.67	33.33	0	0	3
Total	27.86	42.45	21.61	8.07	384

Classification

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	16.38	42.24	29.74	11.64	232

Courts	19.59	22.97	32.43	25.00	148
Corrections	66.67	33.33	0	0	3
Total	18.02	34.73	30.55	16.71	383

Jail record of behavior

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	17.67	37.93	32.76	11.64	232
Courts	14.09	20.81	34.90	30.20	149
Corrections	66.67	33.33	0	0	3
Total	16.67	31.25	33.33	18.75	384

Work release

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
-----------------------	----------------------------	------------------	---------------------------	----------------------	----------------------------------

LE	18.53	41.81	29.31	10.34	232
Courts	19.46	22.82	33.56	24.16	149
Corrections	66.67	33.33	0	0	3
Total	19.27	34.38	30.73	15.63	384

Release date

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	27.27	46.32	19.48	6.93	231
Courts	30.20	32.21	24.16	13.42	149
Corrections	66.67	33.33	0	0	3
Total	28.72	40.73	21.15	9.40	383

Escape

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	72.29	19.91	6.06	1.73	231
Courts	44.97	24.16	18.12	12.75	149
Corrections	66.67	33.33	0	0	3
Total	61.62	21.67	10.70	6.01	383

Division of Youth Services information:
Facility

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	17.75	43.29	29.87	9.09	231
Courts	21.09	28.57	24.49	25.85	147
Corrections	66.67	33.33	0	0	3
Total	19.42	37.53	27.56	15.49	381

Length of incarceration

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	17.75	45.45	26.84	9.96	231
Courts	22.97	39.86	20.27	16.89	148
Corrections	66.67	33.33	0	0	3
Total	20.16	43.19	24.08	12.57	382

Record of behavior

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	17.32	40.26	29.87	12.55	231
Courts	16.22	33.11	28.38	22.30	148
Corrections	66.67	33.33	0	0	3
Total	17.28	37.43	29.06	16.23	382

Administration Related Activity Needs
Law enforcement certification information

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	50.22	38.53	6.49	4.76	231
Courts	4.67	16.67	22.67	56.00	150
Corrections	100.00	0	0	0	3
Total	32.81	29.69	12.76	24.74	384

Law enforcement training information

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	46.12	41.38	8.62	3.88	232
Courts	4.00	12.00	24.67	59.33	150
Corrections	66.67	33.33	0	0	3
Total	29.87	29.87	14.81	25.45	385

Bond limits

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	12.45	39.91	32.62	15.02	233
Courts	14.29	24.49	21.77	39.46	147
Corrections	33.33	0	33.33	33.33	3
Total	13.32	33.68	28.46	24.54	383

Alcohol beverage permit control:
Contact point and owner

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	15.88	43.78	27.47	12.88	233
Courts	4.70	8.05	25.50	61.74	149
Corrections	0	0	33.33	66.67	3

Total	11.43	29.61	26.75	32.21	385
--------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-----

II. USER ISSUES

Instructions: This section lists possible user needs regarding access to information and processes associated with using information systems. For each possible need indicate **how important it is** for CJIN to meet this need for your agency.

Uniform standards throughout the state governing access to information

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	59.38	33.48	6.70	0.45	224
Courts	56.62	27.21	6.62	9.56	136
Corrections	100.00	0	0	0	3
Total	58.68	30.85	6.61	3.86	363

Transformation to a more "user friendly" system

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	45.41	43.12	8.26	3.21	218
Courts	56.93	32.85	8.03	2.19	137
Corrections	66.67	33.33	0	0	3

Total	50.00	39.11	8.10	2.79	358
--------------	-------	-------	------	------	-----

Ability to query global name search with exact name first

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	44.09	43.18	11.36	1.36	220
Courts	51.52	31.82	10.61	6.06	132
Corrections	66.67	33.33	0	0	3
Total	47.04	38.87	10.99	3.10	355

Training on capabilities and use of current systems

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	43.64	46.36	8.64	1.36	220
Courts	53.33	32.59	10.37	3.70	135

Corrections	100.00	0	0	0	3
Total	47.77	40.78	9.22	2.23	358

Master index of current information systems for users

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	42.99	45.79	10.28	0.93	214
Courts	47.58	33.06	15.32	4.03	124
Corrections	100.00	0	0	0	3
Total	45.16	40.76	12.02	2.05	341

Capability to enter data electronically at time of occurrence ("real time") for the following:
Magistrate - arrest warrant

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	55.45	33.18	8.53	2.84	211

Courts	57.14	32.33	6.77	3.76	133
Corrections	66.67	0	0	33.33	3
Total	56.20	32.56	7.78	3.46	347

Magistrate - bond

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	34.29	42.38	15.71	7.62	210
Courts	51.88	37.59	6.77	3.76	133
Corrections	66.67	0	0	33.33	3
Total	41.33	40.17	12.14	6.36	346

Jail - booking

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	29.19	39.71	23.44	7.66	209

Courts	40.77	36.92	14.62	7.69	130
Corrections	66.67	0	0	33.33	3
Total	33.92	38.30	19.88	7.89	342

Courtroom - disposition information

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	30.77	38.46	25.00	5.77	208
Courts	67.39	26.09	4.35	2.17	138
Corrections	66.67	0	0	33.33	3
Total	45.56	33.24	16.62	4.58	349

Prison system -intake and classification

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
-----------------------	----------------------------	------------------	---------------------------	----------------------	----------------------------------

LE	24.88	38.05	26.83	10.24	205
Courts	32.28	33.07	23.62	11.02	127
Corrections	66.67	0	0	33.33	3
Total	28.06	35.82	25.37	10.75	335

Enter offender data at one point in the system and electronically transfer the data to other information users in the system

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	34.65	47.52	13.37	4.46	202
Courts	50.77	34.62	11.54	3.08	130
Corrections	100.00	0	0	0	3
Total	41.49	42.09	12.54	3.88	335

Mobile voice communications among all law enforcement jurisdictions in the state

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	61.26	27.93	8.56	2.25	222
Courts	26.61	27.52	18.35	27.52	109
Corrections	33.33	33.33	0	33.33	3
Total	49.70	27.84	11.68	10.78	334

Mobile data terminal capability to all law enforcement jurisdictions in the state

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	62.04	31.02	6.02	0.93	216
Courts	33.33	29.82	17.54	19.30	114
Corrections	66.67	0	0	33.33	3
Total	52.25	30.33	9.91	7.51	333

Ability to send/receive fingerprints from a mobile location

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	33.33	35.19	25.93	5.56	216
Courts	18.18	30.00	17.27	34.55	110
Corrections	33.33	0	33.33	33.33	3
Total	28.27	33.13	23.10	15.50	329

Ability to send/receive photo images from a mobile location

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	49.77	32.26	14.29	3.69	217
Courts	24.78	27.43	15.93	31.86	113
Corrections	66.67	0	0	33.33	3
Total	41.44	30.33	14.71	13.51	333

Drivers license query to trigger hot files search automatically

Type of Agency	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total Number of Responses
LE	83.26	15.84	0.45	0.45	221
Courts	45.30	25.64	13.68	15.38	117
Corrections	66.67	0	0	33.33	3
Total	70.09	19.06	4.99	5.87	341

III. CURRENT SATISFACTION WITH SYSTEMS

Instructions: Information is currently available through various systems in the state. This section provides a descriptor of information provided by state and local entities. IF YOU have used the information described from the state or local source indicated, check the box which best represents your level of satisfaction with that information service.

State Information Sources

Administrative Office of the Courts
Offender traffic information

Type of Agency	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Number of Responses
Law Enforcement	18.90	74.60	5.97	0.49	201
Court	19.51	69.10	8.94	2.43	123
Correction	33.33	33.33	0	33.33	3
Total	17.07	63.96	6.23	1.36	327

Offender financial information (restitution, fees)

Type of Agency	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Number of Responses
Law Enforcement	7.81	60.93	28.90	2.34	128
Court	9.80	57.84	28.43	3.92	102
Correction	0	66.67	33.33	0	3
Total	5.60	38.94	18.77	1.96	233

Warrant and bond information

Type of Agency	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Number of Responses
LE	14.25	69.0	18.12	5.84	171
Courts	13.46	53.84	27.88	4.80	104
Corrections	33.33	33.33	33.33	0	3
Total	7.48	48.48	16.90	4.16	278

Criminal offender information (case file, disposition)

Type of Agency	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Number of Responses
LE	9.79	71.64	13.91	4.63	194
Court	20.00	57.60	19.20	3.20	125
Correction	33.33	66.67	0	0	3
Total	12.33	58.36	13.97	3.56	322

Juvenile offender information (case file, disposition)

Type of Agency	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Number of Responses
LE	7.14	52.85	25.71	14.28	140
Court	10.97	53.65	23.17	12.19	82
Correction	0	0	0	100.00	2

Total	5.49	34.10	15.90	35.55	224
--------------	------	-------	-------	-------	-----

Department of Correction

Division of Prisons: counts and tracks inmates (location, status, history, etc.)

Type of Agency	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Number of Responses
LE	7.07	64.64	18.18	10.10	99
Court	3.70	53.70	31.48	11.11	54
Correction	66.67	0	0	33.33	3
Total	3.53	29.81	11.22	5.45	156

Probation and parole: tracking and logs encounters (offender location, status, history, etc.)

Type of Agency	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Number of Responses
LE	3.15	63.15	22.10	11.57	95
Court	6.66	44.44	42.22	6.66	45

Correction	66.67	0	33.33	0	3
Total	2.56	25.64	13.14	4.49	143

Combined records: manual jacket system on every inmate

Type of Agency	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Number of Responses
LE	3.65	63.41	23.17	9.75	82
Court	4.76	50.00	33.33	11.90	42
Correction	66.67	0	33.33	0	3
Total	2.28	23.78	11.07	4.23	127

Division of Motor Vehicles
Drivers license and registration information

Type of Agency	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Number of Responses
LE	31.55	60.44	7.55	0.44	225

Court	14.78	62.60	16.52	6.08	115
Correction	0	0	50.00	50.00	1
Total	24.51	57.94	10.31	2.23	341

Drivers history

Type of Agency	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Number of Responses
LE	31.86	61.50	5.75	0.88	226
Court	16.52	58.67	18.18	6.61	121
Correction	33.33	0	33.33	33.33	3
Total	25.83	58.33	10.00	2.78	350

State Bureau of Investigation (SBI) - Division of Criminal Information (DCI)

Computerized criminal histories: instate criminal arrest, court, custody files

Type of Agency	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Number of Responses
-----------------------	-----------------------	------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	----------------------------------

LE	32.28	61.43	4.93	1.34	223
Court	12.04	56.62	22.89	8.43	83
Correction	0	50.00	50.00	0	2
Total	23.43	52.86	8.86	2.86	308

NCIC/DCI "hot files": wanted/missing persons and stolen/recovered property

Type of Agency	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Number of Responses
LE	36.32	59.64	2.69	1.34	223
Court	10.63	63.82	19.14	2.50	47
Correction	50.00	0	50.00	0	2
Total	24.93	46.70	4.58	1.72	272

NCIC criminal history information: other states criminal history of arrests

Type of Agency	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Number of Responses
-----------------------	-----------------------	------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	----------------------------------

LE	29.77	56.88	10.22	1.77	225
Courts	8.10	52.70	28.37	10.81	74
Corrections	50.00	0	50.00	0	2
Total	21.08	47.58	12.82	3.42	301

NCIC fingerprint search

Type of Agency	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Number of Responses
LE	24.50	58.94	11.92	4.63	151
Courts	6.25	62.50	25.00	6.25	32
Corrections	0	50.00	50.00	0	2
Total	11.57	32.64	8.01	2.67	185

NLETS exchange of messages with other states and Canada: drivers license information, vehicle registration, criminal history, etc.

Type of Agency	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Number of Responses
LE	28.00	63.00	5.00	4.00	200
Courts	8.57	40.00	31.42	20.00	35
Corrections	0	0	50.00	50.00	2
Total	17.25	40.94	6.43	4.39	237

State uniform crime and incident based crime system: crime statistics, incident reports

Type of Agency	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Number of Responses
LE	18.68	70.20	7.07	4.04	198
Courts	2.63	71.05	23.68	2.63	38
Corrections	0	0	50.00	50.00	2
Total	11.18	48.82	7.06	2.65	238

Laboratory system: index and tracking of crime scene data submitted to SBI labs

Type of Agency	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Number of Responses
LE	15.54	75.00	4.72	4.72	148
Courts	9.09	57.57	18.18	15.15	33
Corrections	0	0	50.00	50.00	2
Total	7.78	38.92	4.19	3.59	183

Criminal Intelligence System: index and tracking trend analysis for SBI intelligence analysis

Type of Agency	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Number of Responses
LE	13.44	71.42	9.24	5.88	119
Courts	4.54	68.18	13.63	13.63	22
Corrections	0	0	50.00	50.00	2
Total	5.18	30.49	4.57	3.05	143

SBI Case Records: index and status of SBI agent case assignments

Type of Agency	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Number of Responses
LE	11.95	68.47	9.78	9.78	92
Courts	5.55	77.77	5.55	11.11	18
Corrections	0	0	50.00	50.00	2
Total	3.69	23.69	3.38	65.85	112

Local Information Sources

County jail information: offender, booking, etc.

Type of Agency	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Number of Responses
LE	13.11	66.12	15.84	4.91	183
Courts	5.31	63.82	23.40	7.44	94
Corrections	33.33	66.67	0	0	3
Total	8.57	52.29	14.57	4.57	280

Municipal police records: arrest, etc.

Type of Agency	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Number of Responses
LE	12.75	75.00	9.69	2.55	196
Courts	2.73	57.53	31.50	8.21	73
Corrections	33.33	66.67	0	0	3
Total	8.00	54.57	12.00	3.14	272

Sheriff department law enforcement records: arrest, etc.

Type of Agency	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Number of Responses
LE	12.43	68.64	14.05	4.86	185
Courts	2.29	64.36	21.83	11.49	87
Corrections	33.33	66.67	0	0	3
Total	7.43	52.86	12.86	5.43	275

Magistrate: warrants, bonds, etc.

Type of Agency	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Number of Responses
LE	8.06	63.97	17.74	10.21	186
Courts	7.14	73.46	13.26	6.12	98
Corrections	33.33	66.67	0	0	3
Total	6.57	55.14	13.14	7.14	287

Clerk of the Court: case information, etc.

Type of Agency	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Number of Responses
LE	9.79	66.49	19.07	4.63	194
Courts	19.08	64.12	6.66	2.50	120
Corrections	66.67	33.33	0	0	3

Total	12.89	59.94	12.61	3.36	317
--------------	-------	-------	-------	------	-----

District Attorney: case information, etc.

Type of Agency	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Number of Responses
LE	9.71	59.42	21.71	9.14	175
Courts	13.48	61.79	17.97	6.74	89
Corrections	33.33	66.67	0	0	3
Total	8.65	46.40	15.56	6.34	267

IV. CURRENT SATISFACTION WITH TECHNOLOGY

Instructions: Criminal justice agencies throughout the state currently use various technology. If your agency uses any of the technology listed below, check the box which best represents your level of satisfaction with that technology. If your agency DOES NOT use this technology indicate how useful it would be to your agency.

Voice:

800 MHZ - How Satisfied?

Type of Agency	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Number of Responses
LE	35.29	49.09	8.82	8.82	34
Courts	0	100.00	0	0	1
Corrections	0	0	0	0	0
Total	34.29	48.57	8.57	8.57	35

800 MHZ - How useful would it be?

Type of Agency	Very Useful	Useful	Not Very Useful	Total Number of Responses
LE	57.42	29.68	12.90	155
Courts	3.28	24.59	72.13	61

VHF - How satisfied?

Type of Agency	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Total Number of Responses
LE	17.86	75.00	7.14	28
Courts	0	100.00	0	1
Corrections	0	100.00	0	1
Total	16.67	76.67	6.67	30

VHF - How useful would it be?

Type of Agency	Very Useful	Useful	Not Very Useful	Total Number of Responses
LE	23.76	34.65	41.58	101
Courts	3.33	25.00	71.67	60
Corrections	0	0	0	0
Total	16.15	31.06	52.80	161

UHF - How satisfied?

Type of Agency	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Number of Responses
LE	17.65	61.76	17.65	2.94	34
Courts	0	100.00	0	0	1
Corrections	0	0	0	0	0
Total	17.14	62.86	17.14	2.86	35

UHF - How useful would it be?

Type of Agency	Very Useful	Useful	Not Very Useful	Total Number of Responses
LE	23.40	42.55	34.04	94
Courts	5.00	23.33	71.67	60
Corrections	0	0	0	0
Total	16.23	35.06	48.70	154

Livescan - How satisfied?

Type of Agency	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Number of Responses
LE	16.67	66.67	16.67	6
Courts	0	100.00	0	1
Corrections	0	0	0	0
Total	14.29	71.43	14.29	7

Livescan - How useful would it be?

Type of Agency	Very Useful	Useful	Not Very Useful	Total Number of Responses
LE	64.43	27.84	7.73	194
Courts	14.49	18.84	66.67	69
Corrections	0	100.00	0	1

Total	51.14	25.76	23.11	264
--------------	-------	-------	-------	-----

Photo Image - How satisfied?

Type of Agency	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Total Number of Responses
LE	25.00	75.00	8
Courts	0	100.00	1
Corrections	0	0	0
Total	22.22	77.78	9

Photo Image - How useful would it be?

Type of Agency	Very Useful	Useful	Not Very Useful	Total Number of Responses
LE	75.13	22.80	2.07	193
Courts	20.55	30.14	49.32	73

Corrections	100.00	0	0	1
Total	60.30	24.72	14.98	267

AFIS - How satisfied?

Type of Agency	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Total Number of Responses
LE	45.45	50.00	4.55	22
Courts	50.00	50.00	0	2
Corrections	0	0	0	0
Total	45.83	50.00	4.17	24

AFIS - How useful would it be?

Type of Agency	Very Useful	Useful	Not Very Useful	Total Number of Responses
LE	68.16	26.26	5.59	179

Courts	16.90	22.54	60.56	71
Corrections	0	100.00	0	1
Total	53.39	25.50	21.12	251

Mobile Data Terminals - How satisfied?

Type of Agency	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Number of Responses
LE	45.45	27.27	18.18	9.09	11
Courts	0	100.00	0	0	1
Corrections	0	0	0	0	0
Total	41.67	33.33	16.67	8.33	12

Mobile Data Terminals - How useful would it be?

Type of Agency	Very Useful	Useful	Not Very Useful	Total Number of Responses
-----------------------	--------------------	---------------	------------------------	----------------------------------

LE	73.26	19.79	6.95	187
Courts	19.40	19.40	61.19	67
Corrections	0	100.00	0	1
Total	58.82	20.00	21.18	255

Other - How satisfied?

Type of Agency	Satisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Number of Responses
LE	66.67	33.33	3
Courts	100.00	0	1
Corrections	0	0	0
Total	75.00	25.00	4

Other - How useful would it be?

Type of Agency	Very Useful	Useful	Not Very Useful	Total Number of Responses
LE	0	66.67	33.33	6
Courts	6.67	13.33	80.00	15
Corrections	0	0	0	0
Total	4.76	28.57	66.67	21

Other - Specified

Type of Agency	Pagers	Total Number of Responses
LE	100.00	1
Courts	0	0
Corrections	0	0
Total	100.00	1

Overall - How satisfied is agency with communication to other agencies?

Type of Agency	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Number of Responses
LE	8.29	41.45	36.27	13.99	193
Courts	0	41.03	38.46	20.51	39
Corrections	0	100.00	0	0	1
Total	6.87	41.63	36.48	15.02	233

V. RESPONDENT INFORMATION

Instructions: Please complete the respondent information requested below. Your individual survey will remain confidential.

Type of agency (select one):
(Law enforcement, court, correction, other)

Type of Agency	Total Number of Responses
LE	239
Courts	152
Corrections	4
Total	395

Other - Specified

Type of Agency	Assist. Public Def.	Campus Police/ Security	Campus Security	Clerk of Court	Clerk of Superior Court	DA's Office	District Attorney	Private Education	Probation and Parole	Public Defender	Total Number of Responses
LE	0	33.33	33.33	0	0	0	0	33.33	0	0	3
Courts	7.14	0	0	7.14	14.29	7.14	57.14	0	0	7.14	14
Corrections	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100.00	0	1

Criminal Justice Information Network Study

In-State Survey Results

Total	5.56	5.56	5.56	5.56	11.11	5.56	44.44	5.56	5.56	5.56	18
--------------	------	------	------	------	-------	------	-------	------	------	------	----

Your position within the agency (select one):
(Elected official, executive, supervisor, line staff, other)

Type of Agency	Elected Off.	Executive	Supervisor	Line Staff	Other	Total Number of Responses
LE	7.89	53.95	26.32	2.19	9.65	228
Courts	82.99	2.04	4.76	2.72	7.48	147
Corrections	0	33.33	66.67	0	0	3

Total	37.04	33.60	18.25	2.38	8.73	378
--------------	-------	-------	-------	------	------	-----

Other - Specified

Type of Agency	Asst. Public Def.	Assistant Chief	Assistant District Attorney	Asst. Public Def	Assistant DA	Chief	Chief of Police	Civil Officer of	DCI Operator	Deputy Clerk of Court	Deputy Sheriff	Det Sgt
LE	0	4.55	0	0	0	9.09	40.91	4.55	0	0	4.55	4.55
Courts	10.00	0	20.00	10.00	10.00	0	0	0	10.00	10.00	0	0
Corrections	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	3.13	3.13	6.25	3.13	3.13	6.25	28.13	3.13	3.13	3.13	3.13	3.13

Other - Specified (Continued)

Type of Agency	Detective	Director /Chief	Elected D.A.	Judge	Office Deputy	Records Specialist	Sergeant / Research	Secretary	Telecom.	Total Number of Responses
LE	4.55	4.55	0	0	4.55	4.55	4.55	4.55	4.55	22
Courts	0	0	10.00	20.00	0	0	0	0	0	10

Criminal Justice Information Network Study

In-State Survey Results

Corrections	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	3.13	3.13	3.13	6.25	3.13	3.13	3.13	3.13	3.13	32

How frequently do you use the automated information provided by:
Administrative Office of the Courts

Type of Agency	Frequently	Occasionally	Not at All	Total Number of Responses
LE	44.35	45.65	10.00	230
Courts	74.48	19.31	6.21	145
Corrections	100.00	0	0	3
Total	56.35	35.19	8.47	378

Department of Correction

Type of Agency	Frequently	Occasionally	Not at All	Total Number of Responses
LE	7.42	52.84	39.74	229
Courts	22.86	42.14	35.00	140

Corrections	100.00	0	0	3
Total	13.98	48.39	37.63	372

Division of Criminal Information

Type of Agency	Frequently	Occasionally	Not at All	Total Number of Responses
LE	86.03	12.23	1.75	229
Courts	55.00	17.86	27.14	140
Corrections	100.00	0	0	3
Total	74.46	14.25	11.29	372

Division of Motor Vehicles

Type of Agency	Frequently	Occasionally	Not at All	Total Number of Responses
LE	92.61	6.96	0.43	230

Courts	64.83	27.59	7.59	145
Corrections	66.67	33.33	0	3
Total	81.75	15.08	3.17	378

Local integrated information system

Type of Agency	Frequently	Occasionally	Not at All	Total Number of Responses
LE	28.76	35.84	35.40	226
Courts	30.71	30.71	38.58	127
Corrections	66.67	0	33.33	3
Total	29.78	33.71	36.52	356

Stakeholder Interviews

A total of 33 individual and group interviews involving 55 people were conducted to collect information at various points in the CJIN study. The Price Waterhouse CJIN team interviewed CJIN Committee members, cabinet officials, directors and key managers within state agencies, sheriffs, judges, prosecutors, court clerks, magistrates, county commissioners, information systems managers and analysts.

Approach

The CJIN team began by identifying individuals to be interviewed. The list consisted of CJIN Study Committee members and selected criminal justice professionals involved with state and county information systems. Additional interviews were added based on information collected throughout the study. CJIN Study Committee members were the first interviews scheduled to solicit their views on information needs, the CJIN vision, project priorities, and strategies for success within their particular areas of expertise.

The project team developed a structured interview guide to utilize specifically with CJIN Study Committee members. Each interview guide consisted of core questions for all interviewees and specific questions based on individual positions. A sample structured interview guide follows this discussion.

State, county, and local interviews were scheduled and conducted in various parts of the state. In some cases, group interviews proved to be a more efficient and effective manner to collect the targeted information. Where possible, interviews outside of the Raleigh area were scheduled in conjunction with public forums for the best use of travel time.

and expense. CJIN team members conducting these interviews identified targeted data collection for each interview conducted.

Information collected from the interviews was compiled and reviewed to identify the most common themes in relevant areas to the CJIN Study. A list of committee members and others interviewed, as well as, a summary of the common themes for key information needs, CJIN vision, project priorities, and strategies for success are provided in this Appendix.

CJIN Study Committee Member Interviews

1. Mr. Ronald P. Hawley, Assistant Director, State Bureau of Investigation, Division of Criminal Information
2. Mr. John C. Wyatt, Executive Director, Mecklenburg County Criminal Justice Commission
3. Mr. William C. Clontz, Director of Information Services, New Hanover County
4. Mr. James C. Drennan, Director, Administrative Office of the Courts, and Mr. Dan Becker, Deputy Director, AOC
5. Ms. LaVee J. Hamer, Legal Counsel, Department of Correction and Mr. Bob Brinson, Manager of Information Resources, Department of Correction
6. Chief Chester Hill, Goldsboro Police Department
7. Mr. Albert R. Little, Director of Information Systems, Department of Crime Control and Public Safety
8. Dr. Lenny Superville, Director of Information Systems, Office of the State Auditor (proxy for Ralph Campbell, Jr.)
9. The Honorable James E. Long, Commissioner, Department of Insurance, and Mr. John Coan, Director of Information Systems, Department of Insurance

-
10. Lieutenant Fred Davis, State Highway Patrol (proxy for Colonel Robert Barefoot)
 11. Colonel Robert A. Barefoot, Commander, State Highway Patrol

 12. The Honorable Rufus Edmisten, Secretary of State, and Mr. Glenn Wells, Special Deputy
 13. Janet Smith, Senior Vice President, Wachovia Bank and Trust Co.
 14. The Honorable Ralph Campbell Jr., State Auditor

State, County, and Local Resources Interviewed

1. AOC information system group interview: Fran Taillefer, Keith Halva, Claude White, Don Beal, Fred Benson, and Dyke Hostettler, SIPS
2. Jim Broadwell, Director of State Telecommunication Systems, State Information Processing System (SIPS)
3. Alexander Killens, Commissioner, Division of Motor Vehicles and four of the DMV staff
4. The Honorable Burley Mitchell, Jr., Chief Justice, Supreme Court
5. Jo Anne Stokes, Local Interface Project Director, AOC
6. Jane Patterson, Governor's Advisor on Technology
7. Tommy Griffin, Clerk of Superior Court, Cumberland County
8. Rob Lubitz, Director, Sentencing Commission
9. The Honorable Michael Easley, Attorney General
10. The Honorable James Pendegraph, Sheriff, Mecklenburg County
11. Mr. Gerald Fox, County Commissioner, Mecklenburg County
12. Chief Dennis Nowicki, Chief of Police, Charlotte

13. The Honorable Tom Dooley, Commissioner, Mecklenburg County
14. The Honorable Peter Gilchrist, District Attorney, Mecklenburg County
15. The Honorable Robert Lewis, Superior Court Judge, Buncombe County
16. The Honorable Martha Curran, Clerk of the Superior Court, Mecklenburg County
17. Buncombe County group interview: Bob Christy, Clerk of Superior Court; Terry English, AOC LAN Administrator,
Marc Shimberg, Trial Court Administrator; Sue Sutton, Magistrate Coordinator; Larry Bopp, Director of Information Services; Kathy Glass, Systems Analyst.
18. DYS group interview: Gwen Chunn, Director; Dr. Richard Rideout, Deputy Director; Ben Lassiter, Computer Operations; James Bowden, Assistant Director.
19. AOC, Juvenile Services group interview: Dr. Thomas Danek, Administrator; Donn Hargrove, Area Administrator; Ed Taylor, Assistant Administrator; Harold Rogerson, Area Administrator.

Summary of Themes

Key Information Needs

1. *The ability to enter and retrieve offender information in a more efficient and timely fashion:* The current system requires duplicate data entry of the same information at multiple points in the criminal justice system. There should be only one data entry transaction necessary per person entering the system. This would eliminate duplication of effort, reduce the margin for error, and reduce required personnel time for data entry. Once data is entered, any authorized user of the system should be able to retrieve

information about an offender from anywhere in the state regardless of where the information is stored. Data should be entered in a timely fashion, as close to real-time entry as possible.

2. ***A statewide electronic warrant system:*** Criminal justice agencies cannot access any single source to determine if an individual has active felony or misdemeanor warrants. Currently, an offender with an active warrant in one county may have contact with the criminal justice system in another county. Because comprehensive, statewide warrant information is not available, this offender may be released without an arrest for the active warrant.

North Carolina needs a statewide, electronic central warrant repository to be updated by the magistrates and clerks on a real-time basis. With this type of statewide system law enforcement officers, magistrates, clerks, judges, prison officials, and others in the system can make more informed decisions about arrests, sentencing, and incarceration.

3. ***One comprehensive criminal history:*** Currently a user must access multiple databases to conduct a complete criminal history check. Information from one source may not be the same as from another source. One authorized user of a system may not be an authorized user of another system. It is very time consuming and difficult for a criminal justice professional to query the various systems and receive thorough criminal case history information. The state needs to redesign the process so that all authorized users can access one comprehensive criminal case history and feel confident that the information is complete, accurate, and up-to-date.

4. ***A single statewide individual identifier:*** The current system makes it impossible to identify an individual in a timely fashion. This leads to several problems. It is possible for an offender to use a false identity and subsequently avoid prosecution. For example, an offender who is arrested gives the officer a false name. The officer completes the arrest procedure under the name given by the offender. The offender is released on bond. The charge is processed under the false name. The fingerprint card taken during the arrest procedure is not completely processed for a positive identification for two weeks. The law enforcement agency has released the offender back into the community on bond before learning of the false identity. The actual offender may go unprosecuted. The individual whose name was used during the arrest process must now endure the process of expunging this arrest from his or her record.

Fingerprints, digitized photographs, and DNA were all cited as possible methods for obtaining a positive identification on a person. The positive identification mechanism can be linked to a state identification number (SID). Each person would have only one SID. One possibility with the fingerprint option is to equip law enforcement agencies with livescan technology that transfers the fingerprint images to a central Automated Fingerprint Identification System. Larger agencies could each have livescan equipment while smaller agencies could have the technology available on a regional basis.

5. ***A statewide radio communication system for law enforcement and emergency response agencies:*** Law enforcement agencies do not have a common radio system statewide. It is probable that two law enforcement agencies responding to the same emergency situation can not communicate with each other over their respective radio systems. A recent example of this occurred with the US Air plane crash in Raleigh. Responding law enforcement agencies could not communicate with each other. It is also possible that officers are not able to send or receive radio transmissions to others in their own department

because they experience "dead spots" in certain areas of the state. The State Highway Patrol indicated that this occurs in the southwest region of the state.

One proposed solution to the radio problems is the installation of a statewide 800 MHz mobile voice and data communication system. The system would allow law enforcement to: 1) communicate to and from mobile units of the same agency without the problem of dead spots, 2) communicate between mobile units from different agencies, and 3) send and receive needed data in the field. There are different views about funding the system. Most individuals who addressed the need for the communication system supported state funding only for the system infrastructure. In their view, the local agencies should be responsible for purchasing the equipment necessary to become a system user. However, others felt that the state needed to fund local equipment purchases to make the system a viable option for agencies who could not afford the necessary equipment change.

6. ***An automated magistrate system:*** The magistrates are responsible for arrest warrants and for setting the initial bond. There is no current statewide system for data entry. Each county differs in their approach to the magistrate system. Buncombe County has developed an automated system that could serve as a model for others in the state. The automated system provides more detailed, accurate information to the magistrate when making arrest and bond decisions. The manual system allows offender history information and active warrant information to "fall through the cracks." The state should develop an automated magistrate system to be used in each of the counties.

7. ***An automated juvenile record system:*** Juvenile records are not automated. The delay in automation is primarily due to the fact that most records can not be shared with most members of the criminal justice system. Confidentiality laws restrict access to juvenile court records to the attorneys and the presiding

judge. However, the records need to be automated to improve case management and to enable better analysis of juvenile crime trends.

8. *A system that provides needed information not currently available* : Law enforcement, courts, and corrections representatives feel that current systems do not provide proper access nor collect adequate information to meet their needs. A few examples are provided below.

- . The Insurance Commission needs access to the clerks' bond information. The Commission is charged with enforcing bondsmen's limits.
- . Law enforcement would like information on: runaways, juvenile offender histories, drug enforcement activity, probation/parole community placement and visits.
- . The district attorneys need comprehensive calendar/scheduling information.
- . The Department of Correction needs timely information on sentencing dispositions.

Vision of CJIN

CJIN should link current criminal justice information systems and communications. The first priority should be to put an infrastructure in place interfacing legacy systems and establishing keys for users to access proper databases. The information becomes available to criminal justice users at the time the user needs it. The system is programmed for one criminal history query to automatically retrieve all available offender information.

Where a desired system is not already in place, establish the uniform standards for a new system. Force standardization from a technical architecture point of view, including issues such as: all names have the same personal identifier,

standard definitions of a case throughout the system, a standard statute numbering scheme, uniform application standards, a statewide charge table, open systems, and client / server architecture. Real time data entry should be a goal.

Project Priorities

Project priorities are not presented in any order of preference. The common priorities stated by those interviewed are:

1. Eliminate duplicate data entry.
2. Establish a system for positive identification of an individual within an hour. Link the positive identification with an individual state identifier number which can also be communicated to an agency within the hour time frame.
3. Implement an 800 MHz mobile voice and data communication system for law enforcement and emergency responders. The system should: a) provide a common communication channel for law enforcement agencies, b) work anywhere in North Carolina without dead spots, c) provide for data entry and receipt, and d) be forward compatible.
4. Implement the infrastructure changes in a timely fashion. It should take no longer than 5 years to implement these changes. A longer time frame will jeopardize the project momentum and ability to complete the plan in full.

5. Provide the needed security for the system. Security measures must be in place to limit access to authorized users.

Strategies for Success

1. Manage people's expectations of the CJIN Study. Educate people as to what can and can not be accomplished in the project scope.
2. Cross link existing information, needed by people in the system, who can not access it now. Make sure that current information is accessible from any location in the state.
3. Any plan for implementing CJIN will have to be cost effective for local agencies. The state system should avoid any appearance of totally displacing existing automated local systems that currently work for the local users. Provide local users with such obvious added value with CJIN that it motivates voluntary participation. One option for encouraging compliance with CJIN standards lies with the IRMC. The IRMC can decide to refuse state dollars to agencies not in compliance with established CJIN standards.
4. The state needs to address the issue of adequate funding for CJIN, including the 800 MHz system. One option is to establish a dedicated revenue source through a court user fee.
5. In the long term, CJIN should be on the North Carolina Information Highway. This creates a greater need for security measures to protect confidential information from members of the public.

6. If CJIN introduces new software or hardware, there must be adequate training and support staff on an on-going basis.
7. There should be a CJIN oversight committee (entity) that has enforcement power of some sort. In determining the structure of the committee, CJIN will need to address the separation of powers issue between the judicial and executive branches of government.

Definition of Terms

This section contains a definition of key terms and abbreviations that are referenced within the CJIN Study report as a convenience to the reader.

ABC	Alcohol Beverage Control
ADA	Assistant District Attorney
AECJDP	Automated Exchange of Criminal Justice Data Project
AFIS	Automated Fingerprint Identification System
ALE	Alcohol Law Enforcement
ALI	AOC Local Interface Project
AOC	Administrative Office of the Courts
APCO	Associated Public-Safety Communications Officers
APIs	Application Programming Interfaces
APPC	Advanced Program to Program Communications
APS	Arrest Processing System (Mecklenburg County)
ARDIS	A Commercial Radio Messaging Service
ASCII	American Standard Coding for Information Interchange
ATM	Asynchronous Transfer Mode

AVL	Automated Vehicle Locator System
BISYNC 3270	An IBM Communications Protocol for Terminals
BPT	Business Process Transformation
CASE	Computer Aided Software Engineering
CCBI	City/County Bureau of Investigation
CCH	Criminal Case History or Computerized Case History
CDLIS	Commercial Driver's License System
CDPD	Cellular Digital Pocket Data
CHF	Criminal History File (Utah)
CIS	Court Information System
CJIN	Criminal Justice Information Network
CJIS	Criminal Justice Information System
CLETS	California Law Enforcement Telecommunications Network
Client/Server	Division of the database storage and access functions from the user-oriented software between a central system (server), and the user desktop machine (client).
CPP	Community Penalties Program
DA	District Attorney
DAPP	Division of Adult Probation and Parole

Data Management	The control of information from its introduction to the enterprise to its final point of use.
DBA	Database Administrator
Dbase	A PC-based database
DBI	Digital Bi-Metrics (livescan)
DBMS	Database Management Systems
DCE	Distributed Computing Environment
DCI	State Bureau of Investigation's Division of Criminal Information
DCJS	Division of Criminal Justice Services (New York)
DDBMS	Distributed Database Management System
DES	Data Encryption Standard
DHR	Department of Human Resources
DLR	Driver's License Registration
DMV	Department of Transportation -- Division of Motor Vehicles
DOB	Date of Birth
DOC	Department of Correction
DOI	Department of Insurance
DOJ	Department of Justice

DOP	Department of Correction -- Division of Prisons
DOR	Department of Revenue
DOT	Department of Transportation
DUI	Driving Under Influence
DWI	Driving While Impaired
DYS	Department of Human Resources -- Division of Youth Services
EDI	Electronic Data Interchange
EIS	Executive Information Systems
ETN	Event Tracking Number
FBI	Federal Bureau of Investigation
FCC	Federal Communications Commission
FSR	Facility Staff Reference
FTA	Failure to Appear
GIS	Geographic Information System
GPS	Global Positioning Systems
GUI	Graphical User Interface
IAFIS	Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System
IAS	Inmate Assignment System

IBASE	Incident Based Database
IBR	Incident Based Reporting
ICC	Inmate Custody Classification
ID	Identify, Identification
IEEE	Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers
III	Interstate Identification Index
IMT	Inmate Monitoring and Transfer
Internet	A Worldwide Public Computer Network
IPT	Inmate Population Tracking
IPX	A Novell Communications Protocol
IRM	Office of State Controller -- Information Resource Management Division
IRMA 3270	A PC-based 3270 emulation package
IRMC	Information Resource Management Commission
IS	Information Systems
ITS	Investigation Tracking Systems (Florida)
ITS	Information Technical Service Center (Utah)
JANET	Justice Assistance Network (Pennsylvania)
JIN	Justice Information Network (Washington)

Kerberos	A computer security system first developed at MIT
LAN	Local Area Network
LEMS	Law Enforcement Message Switch
LID Number	Local Identification Number
Livescan	A System that Scans and Digitizes Fingerprints
LLE	Local Law Enforcement
LU 6.2	An IBM Communications Protocol
MDT	Mobile Data Terminal
MF	Master File
MHS	Message Handling Switch
MHZ	Megahertz
MIS	Management Information Systems
MIT	Massachusetts Institute of Technology
MNI	Master Name Index - also known as Identification Index
MODAP Pilot	Mobile Data Access Pilot
MUX	Multiplexor
NC	North Carolina
NCBA	North Carolina Bar Association

NCIC	National Crime Information Center
NCIC 2000	A New Computer System Being Developed to Replace the Current National Crime Information Center System
NCIH	North Carolina Information Highway
NCRPC	North Carolina Regional Communications Planning Committee
NCSHP	North Carolina State Highway Patrol
NCSUN	North Carolina Smartnet Users' Network
Network	Connections between computers which allow sharing of data.
NFF	National Fingerprint File
NIBRS	National Incident Based Reporting System
NICB	National Insurance Crime Bureau
NLETS	National Law Enforcement Telecommunications System
NPSPAC	National Public Safety Planning Advisory Committee
NYPD	New York Police Department
OBTS	Offender Based Tracking System
OCA	Originating Case Agency Number
OFA	Order for Arrest

OOPS	Object Oriented Programming Systems. A programming approach built around defining "objects" that contain both information and the business rules regarding a set of data. Systems are then created by linking reusable objects together to support broad processes.
Open Systems	Hardware and software products which are available in the same or similar versions from multiple vendors and may be supported by multiple vendors.
OPUS	Offender Population United System
OSC	Office of State Controller
OSF	Open Software Foundation
OTC	Offender Time Comp
OTN	Offense Tracking Number
OUIL	Operating Under the Influence
P&P	Probation & Parole
PC	Personal Computer
PCA	Parole Commission Act
PD	Public Defender
PDPS	Problem Driver Pointer System
PID	Personal Identification Number
PIN	Police Information Network

PO	Probation (or Parole) Officer
PPS	Probation/Parole Services
PRI	Pre-Release Investigator (P/P)
Proprietary	Hardware and software products available from only one vendor rather than one available and supported by multiple vendors.
PSI	Pre-Sentence Investigation
PTR	Pre-trial Release
PV	Probation (or Parole) Violation
PVC	Private Virtual Circuit
QCR	Query Case Records (DCI)
RAM	Random Access Memory
RDBMS	Relational Database Management System
RFP	Request for Proposals
SAA	System Application Architecture
SBI	State Bureau of Investigation
SDLC	Synchronous Data Link Control
SHP	State Highway Patrol
SID	Single Identifier Digit (Pennsylvania)

SID	State Identification Number
SIPS	Office of State Controller -- State Information Processing Services
SISP	Strategic Information Systems Planning (SISP) is the process of developing a plan for the use of information system within an organization which is both cost-effective and aligned with the prioritized management and operational needs of the organization. SISP focuses on the use of information systems as an integral part of an organization's business strategy. The question SISP asks is "How can Information Systems support the strategic goals of the organization for managing current and future operations." SISP leads to the identification of strategic initiatives, either new or underway, which can be aided by application systems, information systems technology and organizational changes. The term 'strategic planning' denotes that aspect of planning which is carried out at a high level (statewide), focusing clearly on the use of information systems which are of strategic importance to the state as a whole, both in the long and short term.
SJS	Spectrum Justice System (New York)
SNA	Systems Networking Architecture
SSN	Social Security Number
SWIPS	Statewide Interagency Public Safety Radio Communications Plan
TCA	Trial Court Administrator
TCP/IP	Transmission Control Protocol/Internet Protocol
TDMA	Time Division Multiple Access

TGS	Ticket Granting Service
UCR	Uniform Crime Reporting
UHF	Ultra High Frequency
VHF	Very High Frequency
VSAM	Virtual Sequential Access Method (mainframe file system)
WAN	Wide Area Network
Windows	A development environment created by Microsoft which displays computer information to a user in "windows" on the screen and makes liberal use of a mouse's point and click features to initiate an action.
WWW	World Wide Web

Reference Materials

Administrative Office of the Courts, Information Services Division, <i>Criminal IMS Database Layout</i> .
Administrative Office of the Courts/ <i>Local Interface Overview Report</i> .
Administrative Office of the Courts/Local Interface Project (ALI) <i>SCOPE DOCUMENT</i> - 8/31/94.
Administrative Office of the Courts, <i>North Carolina Courts 1991-1992</i>
Administrative Office of the Courts, <i>North Carolina Courts 1992-1993</i> .
Administrative Office of the Courts, <i>SNA Network</i> - 3/1/94.
Administrative Office of the Courts, <i>The Judicial Branch</i> - 1994.
Administrative Office of the Courts, <i>The Judicial System in North Carolina</i> - 1994.
APCO Bulletin, <i>Communications Equipment Funding a Part of Crime Bill</i> - December, 1994.
APCO Project 25 News Release, <i>Phase One to be Completed in August, 1995</i> - 1/25/95.
APCO Project 25 - New Technology Standards Project, <i>Setting the Issues Straight, A Message to the Public Safety Communications Community</i> .
Arizona Judicial System, Arizona Judicial Council, Committee on Technology, <i>Vision 2004-A Technology Visions Plan for the Arizona Courts to the Year 2004</i> - 6/93.
Barnes & Noble, <i>Dictionary of Computer Terms</i> , Copyright 1993.
Barron's Business Guide, <i>Dictionary of Computer Terms, Third Edition</i> , Copyright 1992.

<p><i>Birth of an Information Network</i>, By Neil R. M. Stratton, M.P.A., Captain, Administration Division, Walnut Creek, California, Police Department.</p>
<p><i>Career Criminal Program and the Criminal Justice System</i></p>
<p><i>Commission for the Future of Justice and the Courts</i>, Remarks by James G. Exum, Jr., 6/21/94.</p>
<p>COMPUTERWORLD Publication, <i>Client/Server Journal</i> - February, 1995.</p>
<p>County of Wilson, Mr. J. Danny Hickman, Chairman, <i>FCC Region 31, North Carolina 800 MHz Regional Communications Plan</i> - 3/9/93.</p>
<p>Criminal Justice Information Network, <i>Pre-Study Data Collection Project, A Survey of Data, Information Systems, and Technology Used by State and Local Criminal Justice Agencies in North Carolina</i> - 9/12/94.</p>
<p>Criminal Justice Information Services, <i>Gearing up for the Future</i> by William S. Sessions, FBI Director.</p>
<p><i>DCI Applications</i>.</p>
<p><i>DCI Newsletter</i> - September, 1994.</p>
<p>Deloitte & Touche LLP, <i>North Carolina Information Highway Vendor Cost Review</i> - 8/94.</p>
<p>Division of Criminal Information, <i>A Guide to Services Provided</i>.</p>
<p>Division of Criminal Information, <i>North Carolina Administrative Code</i>.</p>
<p>Division of Motor Vehicles, Department of Transportation, <i>Customer Service Guide</i>.</p>
<p>Division of Motor Vehicles, Department of Transportation, <i>State Automated Driver License System Inquiry Guide</i> - November, 1994.</p>

Division of Youth Services, Department of Human Resources, <i>Embracing Diversity, Expanding Common Ground, The Disproportionate Incarceration of North Carolina's Minority Children</i> - January, 1995.
Federal Bureau of Investigation, National Crime Information Center Advisory Policy Board, <i>Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System (IAFIS) Planning Guide 4/30/93</i> .
Federal Bureau of Investigation, National Crime Information Center (NCIC) 2000, <i>Interface Requirements Specification</i> - August, 1993.
Florida's Approach to Establishing an Automated Offender Based Transaction System.
<i>FUSION - Integrating IE, CASE, and JAD: A Handbook for Reengineering the Systems Organization</i> , Published by Yourdon Press Computing Series, Written by Dorine C. Andrews & Naomi S. Leventhal.
Government Technology Publication, <i>America's Infostructure, Volume 8, Number 2</i> - February, 1995.
Government Technology Publication, <i>Bringing AFIS to the Streets</i> - November, 1994.
Government Technology Publication, <i>States Gearing up for NCIC 2000, Volume 8, Number 1</i> - January, 1995.
Institute of Government, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Tom Thornburg, <i>Descriptive Summary of The Committee on Improving and Expediting the Administration of Justice</i> (a.k.a. the Bell Commission) - 10/94.
Institute of Government, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, <i>North Carolina Legislation 1993</i> .
Institute of Government, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, <i>North Carolina Legislation 1994</i> .
Maryland Database Data Dictionary.
Mecklenburg County <i>Citation Master File Layout (Citation)</i> - 8/21/92.
Michigan Public Safety Communication System, <i>Only the Facts</i> .

<p>Michigan State, <i>800 MHz Radio System and Telecommunications Backbone Request for Proposal #93-NE0001</i>, Department of Management and Budget.</p>
<p>Michigan State Police, Vendor Selection Report, <i>For the Procurement of an 800 MHz Radio System and Telecommunications Backbone Network</i>.</p>
<p>Motorola Communications and Electronics, Mid-Atlantic Division, <i>The State of North Carolina/Motorola, Inc., Radio Communications Contract, Rate Schedule Summary</i>, - 4/1/92.</p>
<p>North Carolina <i>Amended Plan for Fingerprinting Criminal Defendants and Reporting Disposition of Criminal Charges</i>.</p>
<p>North Carolina Chamber of Commerce, Office of State Planning, <i>Population Projections</i> - 4/94.</p>
<p>North Carolina Criminal Justice Information System, <i>New System Requirements</i> - April, 1977.</p>
<p>North Carolina Department of Correction, Automated Exchange of Criminal Justice Data Project, Marian Guerrero/Project Coordinator, <i>Communications Study</i> - 12/94.</p>
<p>North Carolina Department of Correction, Automated Exchange of Criminal Justice Data Project, Marian Guerrero/Project Coordinator, <i>Detailed Requirements Data From DOC to DCI, DOC to AOC and DCI to AOC</i>.</p>
<p>North Carolina Department of Correction, <i>Documentation of Common and Positive Identifier</i> - 8/94.</p>
<p>North Carolina Department of Correction, <i>Offender Population Unified System Data Flow Diagram and Database Overview (Level 1)</i>.</p>
<p>North Carolina Department of Correction, <i>Offender Population Unified System (OPUS) Application System Inventory (ASI) Functional Design Specifications</i> - 10/94.</p>
<p>North Carolina Department of Correction, <i>Offender Population Unified System (OPUS) Overview</i>.</p>

North Carolina Department of Correction, <i>Offender Population Unified System (OPUS) Sample Screen Demo</i> .
North Carolina Department of Crime Control and Public Safety, Division of State Highway Patrol, <i>Highway Patrol Microwave System - 3/7/95</i> .
North Carolina Department of Justice, State Bureau of Investigation, <i>Memorandum of Understanding Regarding the National Fingerprint File Pilot Project</i> .
North Carolina Department of Justice, State Bureau of Investigation, Crime in North Carolina, <i>Uniform Crime Report 1991</i> .
North Carolina Department of Justice, State Bureau of Investigation, Crime in North Carolina, <i>Uniform Crime Report 1992</i> .
North Carolina Department of Justice, State Bureau of Investigation, Crime in North Carolina, <i>Uniform Crime Report 1993</i> .
North Carolina's Judicial System, <i>Organizational and Statistical Information</i> .
North Carolina Juvenile Justice Agency Records, <i>A Comparative Examination</i> .
North Carolina Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, <i>Revised Summary of New Sentencing Laws and the State-County Criminal Justice Partnership Act - 4/94</i> .
North Carolina, <i>State Capitol Area Telephone Directory - Summer, 1993</i> .
North Carolina State Highway Patrol, <i>Administration & Organization</i> .
North Carolina State Highway Patrol, <i>Requirements for Trooper Positions</i> .
North Carolina State Highway Patrol, <i>A Brief History of the North Carolina State Highway Patrol "From Whence We Came"</i> .

North Carolina Statewide Integrated Public Safety Communications (SWIPS) Project
North Carolina <i>Statewide Interagency Public Safety Radio Communications</i> - 7/12/94.
North Carolina <i>Statewide Interagency Public Safety Radio Communications</i> - 1/5/95.
Novell's, <i>Dictionary of Networking</i> , Published by Novell Press.
Office of the State Controller, Information Resource Management Commission, <i>Statewide Technology Strategy and Initiatives</i> - February, 1995.
Price Waterhouse <i>Change Integration</i> , Reference Materials Version 1.00.
Price Waterhouse <i>Justice Market Initiative: A Business Plan, About the Justice System</i> - Volume I.
Price Waterhouse <i>System Management Methodology, Strategic Information Systems Planning</i> , Version 2.0.
Senator William S. Cohen, <i>Computer Chaos, Billions Wasted Buying Federal Computer Systems, an Investigative Report</i> - 10/12/94.
State Bureau of Investigation, <i>Annual Report 1992-1993</i> .
State Bureau of Investigation, <i>Linkage To Databases</i> .
State of Maryland, <i>CJIS Rapid Identification Response System, RIRS</i> .
State of Maryland, Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services, Data Services Division, <i>Criminal Justice Information Systems -CJIS- Fingerprint Card Instruction Manual</i> .
State of Maryland, Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services, Data Services Division, <i>Criminal Justice Information Systems -CJIS- Reference Manual</i> .

State of Missouri, Office of Administration, <i>Systems Automation for the Missouri State Courts, EC/2004 Project</i> - 1/25/95.
State of North Carolina, <i>North Carolina Criminal Law and Procedure</i> - 1994 Edition.
State of North Carolina, <i>Request for Proposals (RFP) # 404872 Technical Proposal</i> - 9/12/94.
State of North Carolina, <i>Request for Proposals (RFP) # 404872 Technical Proposal</i> - 10/11/94.
State of North Carolina, <i>State Automated Driver License System Inquiry Guide</i> - 11/94.
State Justice Institute, National Center for State Courts, <i>The Challenging Voyage to Statewide Court Automation, A National Assessment</i> - 1994.
State Telecommunications Services, <i>STS-1000 Telecommunications Wiring Guidelines</i> - 4/23/93.
Touche Ross & Company Study, <i>Consolidation of North Carolina's Criminal Justice System</i> - April, 1977.
<i>Triangle Region 800 Mhz Emergency Network Proposed Organizational Structure</i> - 1/12/95.
U.S. Department of Justice, <i>Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook</i> - 1980.
U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs, <i>Assessing Completeness and Accuracy of Criminal History Record Systems: Audit Guide</i> - 1/92.
U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs, <i>Attorney General's Program for Improving the Nation's Criminal History Records</i> - 2/92.
U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Criminal Justice Information Policy, <i>Criminal Justice "Hot" Files</i> - November, 1986.

U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs, *Criminal Justice Information Policy on Strategies for Improving Data Quality* - 4/89.

U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Survey of Criminal History Information Systems, 1992.*

U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Survey of Criminal History Information Systems 1993, with Supplementary Information on Presale Firearm Checks, 1994.*

U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Use and Management of Criminal History Record Information: A Comprehensive Report* - 11/93.

Wachovia Corporation, Remarks by John G. Medlin, Jr., Chairman of the Board, *North Carolina Conference of Superior Court Judges, Winston-Salem, NC* - 10/23/94.

Legal Issues Related to CJIN Projects

The following statutes and federal regulations affect the projects recommended by this study. It is not intended as legal research, however, we recognize that legislative action may be required to fully implement some of our project recommendations and the governance board.

Project: Juvenile Automation

N.C.G.S. 7A-675

Confidentiality of records

1. Specifies records clerk shall maintain for the juvenile record: summons, petition, custody order, court order, written motions, electronic or mechanical recording, and other papers filed in the proceeding.
2. Specifies who may examine record without an order from the judge:
 - a) juvenile, parent, or other authorized juvenile representative.
 - b) prosecutor in a subsequent criminal proceeding against the juvenile.
3. A record of adjudication for class A through E felonies may be used in subsequent criminal proceedings.
4. Reports of social, medical, psychiatric, or psychological information, probation reports, interviews with the family, and other information dictated by judge may only be examined by order of the judge.
5. Law enforcement juvenile records should be kept separate from adult files. Law enforcement juvenile records are open to: prosecutor, juvenile court counselors, juvenile, parents / guardian.

6. Division of Youth Services (DYS) files only open to juvenile, DYS staff involved in case, juvenile court counselors, judge, and by order of the judge.

N.C.G.S. 7A-676 et seq.

Expunction of records of juveniles

1. If the juvenile has attained the age of 16 and a) has NOT committed a class A through E felony, and b) has stayed out of trouble may petition for expunction of record.
2. Expunction allows a juvenile to say that he / she has no record.

Project: Statewide Automated Fingerprint Identification Systems

N.C.G.S. 7A-601

Destruction of records resulting from non-testimonial identification procedures.

1. The results of any non-testimonial identification procedures shall be retained or disposed of as prescribed by law.
2. Destroy evidence of non-testimonial identification (law enforcement agency is responsible for the destruction)
 - a. petition is not filed;
 - b. district or superior court finds juvenile not guilty;
 - c. juvenile is under age 13 and adjudicated for an act that is less than a felony had the juvenile been an adult.

3. Retain the evidence of non-testimonial identification
 - a. at least 13 years of age and committed an act that would be a felony if an adult retain evidence in the court file. Use of this evidence must be limited to "comparison purposes by law enforcement officers only in the investigation of a crime."
 - b. transferred to superior court all records treated same as adult.

N.C.G.S. 15A-266 et seq.
DNA Database and Databank Act of 1993

1. As of July 1, 1994, a person who is convicted of certain crimes (murder, rape, sexual offense, felonious assault, robbery, indecent liberties, stalking and first-degree arson, etc.) will have a blood sample taken for DNA analysis. Also those convicted of these crimes who have not been released prior to July 1, 1994 will have the sample taken prior to release. The SBI will maintain the database and provide DNA profiles to law enforcement agencies, approved crime laboratories serving law enforcement agencies, and district attorney's upon written or electronic request for criminal investigative purposes. The information can only be released to others via court order.
2. A request for a non-testimonial identification (fingerprints, palmprints, footprints, blood specimens, etc.) order may be made prior to the arrest of a suspect or after arrest and prior to trial.

Project: Statewide, Integrated Criminal History

N.C.G.S. 15A-1340.21

Prior conviction level for misdemeanor sentencing

Proof of prior convictions - copy of records maintained by SBI / DCI, DMV, or AOC; original or copy of court record.

1. State has to show by a preponderance of the evidence prior conviction exists.
2. They also have to show that the offender before the court is the same offender named in the prior conviction

N.C.G.S. 15A-1374

Conditions of Parole

There are several conditions of parole that may apply to a parolee. For example, the parolee may have as a condition of parole that he / she refrain from possessing a firearm, destruction device, or other weapon unless granted permission by the Parole Commission.

Project: Magistrate System

N.C.G.S. 15A-301 et seq.
Criminal process generally

1. “....Upon execution or service, a copy of the process must be delivered to the person arrested or served.”
2. “If criminal process is not served or executed within a number of days indicated below, it must be returned to the clerk of the court in the county in which it was issued, with a reason for failure to serve...”
 - a. warrant for arrest - 180 days
 - b. order for arrest - 180 days
 - c. criminal summons - 90 days or appearance date whichever is earlier

Failure to return the process to the clerk DOES NOT invalidate the process. The clerk may make a certified copy of the process when the original has been lost. Nothing prevents the making and retention of uncertified copies for information purposes.

N.C.G.S. 15A-401
Arrest by law enforcement officer

Warrant Not in Possession of Officer - An officer who has knowledge that a warrant for arrest has been issued and has not been executed, but who does not have the warrant in his possession, may arrest the person named therein at any time. The officer must inform the person arrested that the warrant has been issued and serve the warrant upon him as soon as possible.

Project: Statewide Identification Index

Article 13 of Chapter 15A of the N.C.G.S.

DNA database and databank

As of July 1, 1994, a person who is convicted of certain crimes (murder, rape, sexual offense, felonious assault, robbery, indecent liberties, stalking, and first-degree arson, etc.) will have a blood sample taken for DNA analysis. Also those convicted of these crimes who have not been released prior to July 1, 1994 will have the sample taken prior to release. The SBI will maintain the database and provide DNA profiles to law enforcement and district attorney's for investigative purposes. The information can be released to others via court order.

Project: Statewide Warrant System

N.C.G.S. 15A-1376

Arrest and hearing on parole violation

A parolee is subject to arrest by a law enforcement officer or a parole officer for violations of parole conditions only upon issuance of an order for temporary or conditional revocation of parole by the Post-Release Supervision and Parole Commission.

Project: CJIN Security Project

N.C.G.S. 132-1.4

Public access to records of criminal investigations and criminal intelligence information

There is no right to public access except for six kinds of information:

1. Time, date, location, and nature of violation or apparent violation of the law reported to public law enforcement agency.
2. The name, sex, age, address, employment, and alleged violation of law of a person arrested, charged or indicted.
3. The circumstances surrounding an arrest: time and place, weapons, pursuit, items seized.
4. The contents of 911 calls (see exceptions).
5. The contents of communications between or among employees of public law enforcement agencies that are broadcast over the public airways.
6. The name, sex, age, and address of a complaining witness (unless withholding the information is justified for a time period for the safety of the complainant or the integrity of the case).

The law provides that the following are open to public inspection: executed warrants, returned warrants after attempted execution, indictments, criminal summons, and non-testimonial identification orders.

N.C.G.S. 114-19.2

N.C.G.S. 114-19.3

Criminal record checks of certain employees.

1. Allows criminal records check for schools for a) employee, b) applicant for employment or volunteer with consent to the record check.
2. Allows criminal records check for hospital, area mental health, developmental disabilities, or substance abuse authority for an employee or applicant with consent to check.

N.C.G.S. 114-101.1

Defense Attorney access to PIN cases

Rules governing the police information network may NOT preclude an attorney representing a defendant charged with an infraction, from obtaining the defendant's driving record or criminal history.

N.C.G.S. 7A-276.1

Court orders prohibiting publication or broadcast of reports of open court proceedings or reports of public records.

“No court shall make or issue any rule or order prohibiting or restricting the publication or broadcast of any report concerning: evidence, testimony, argument, ruling, verdict, decision, judgement, or other matter occurring in open court...”

Mental Health Act, N.C.G.S. 122C-52 and N.C.G.S. 122C-54
Right to Confidentiality

Confidential information acquired in attending or treating a client is not a public record. A court of competent jurisdiction may issue an order for disclosure.

1. If the individual is a defendant in a criminal case and a mental examination has been court ordered: The results or report may go to the clerk of the court, district attorney, or prosecuting officer, and to the defense attorney.
2. Voluntary or involuntary commitments facing district court hearings - written exam results can **SHALL** be furnished to client's counsel, state's attorney, and court. Confidentiality of information shall be preserved. Court records pursuant to proceedings are confidential.
3. The Department of Correction may share information about mental illness, substance abuse, etc. about an inmate to a facility for the purposes of treatment. This information is restricted from further disclosure.

Advanced Technologies

This section analyzes advanced technologies and their use with regard to CJIN. These technologies will improve the accessibility and usability of criminal justice information network data and systems. Accurate information will be available, on a timely basis, to authorized users located anywhere in the network. In addition, advanced technologies will provide the public with enhanced service. This section discusses the following topics:

1. North Carolina Information Highway
2. Livescan and Automated Fingerprint Identification Systems (AFIS)
3. Automated Indexing Systems
4. Workflow and Groupware
5. Text Management and Electronic Imaging Systems
6. Artificial Intelligence and Expert Systems
7. Geographical Information Systems and Global Positioning Systems
8. Mobile Data Terminals
9. Smart Cards
10. Voice Recognition
11. Client Server Architecture
12. Electronic Data Interchange
13. Interactive Broadband Networks
14. Object Technology

1. North Carolina Information Highway

The North Carolina Information Highway (NCIH) provides Asynchronous Transfer Mode (ATM) cell relay, Switched Multimegabit Data Services (SMDS), and multipoint video bridging. This section discusses these technologies and provides insight to their value and potential use in the CJIN network.

Asynchronous Transfer Mode

ATM is a packet-switching technology that uses fixed-length, 53-byte data cells on virtual circuits. Since packet size is fixed, switching can be done entirely in hardware, which is much faster than software switching. This system allows low overhead, very high speed, negligible delay, and constant time intervals among cells. The latter two characteristics are crucial to real-time voice and video. Therefore, ATM is ideal for a wide range of applications, including traditional data communications, imaging, video, and multimedia. Its characteristics make it ideal for the mixed traffic expected on data networks in the future. Of all switching technologies, ATM is the one that holds the promise of handling all types of traffic well and providing a common telecommunications architecture in public, private, and premise networks.

ATM was originally conceived for implementation at high speeds (155 Mbps and above) on broadband public telephone networks, but the first implementations are in private networks and premises networks at lower data rates, such as 1.5 Mbps. Public networks will have to wait until inter-networking standards are worked out, which is expected in late 1995. First-generation ATM products are available at the chip, board, and system levels. Most major vendors have announced ATM switch products.

Switched Multimegabit Data Services (SMDS)

SMDS is a connection-less packet service. SMDS communications allows each packet to be sent independently to its destination. Unlike frame relay, a virtual circuit does not have to be set up to establish communications between two parties. This setup requires more overhead, but less network management attention for the customer. As it was

originally conceived by Bell Communications Research Inc., SMDS was intended to fill the gap for broadband services until BISDN was widely available. Near-term considerations have led to lower-speed 1.5 Mbps connections as SMDS options. Thus, the differentiation between SMDS and frame relay has diminished. The major remaining difference is one of emphasis, with SMDS oriented more toward public networks (with easy connections among customers), while frame relay, with its permanent virtual circuits, is more oriented toward private virtual networks.

SMDS is still relatively new, with service limited to U.S. local exchange carriers. The customers that have been using SMDS appear to like it, for them interconnectivity is seen as a critical problem. In 1994, MCI and a start-up carrier, PACKETS, joined with local carriers Pacific Bell, Bell Atlantic, Ameritech Corp., Bell South, and GTE Corp. to test intercity SMDS service. So far, other long-distance carriers have snubbed SMDS, planning to serve SMDS long-distance needs with frame relay and ATM.

Opportunity

The NCIH can be a fundamental building block in the construction of the CJIN. It has the potential to provide the network capacity necessary for envisioned imaging and text applications. It will provide the necessary high-speed links among mainframes and connectivity to local agencies through a variety of connectivity options. Additionally, it may provide video conferencing and interactive video solutions necessary for applications such as video arraignment. If used appropriately, it will provide a cost-effective solution to the accumulative network requirements imposed by CJIN.

2. Livescan and Automated Fingerprint Identification Systems

Two of the most promising technologies available to law enforcement today are livescan and Automated Fingerprint Identification Systems (AFIS). Livescan systems facilitate the capture of fingerprint information through technology similar to scanners and copiers. Basically, the fingerprint image is captured on the scanner, demographic and charge information is entered at a workstation, and then the card is printed or stored electronically. This technology simplifies the fingerprinting process: by enabling a single print to be recaptured without having to redo the entire card; by printing

or electronically transferring as many copies of the information as required; and by capturing demographic and charge information once which may then be used throughout an integrated system. AFIS technology facilitates the automated comparison of fingerprint minutiae. Minutiae counts and styles are first extracted from the fingerprint and then indexed based on specific algorithms. When a search is being conducted it checks the index for potential matches and then presents those matches to the technician for verification. AFIS improves processing by providing a technician with a concise list of probable matches. AFIS systems enable the rapid identification through fingerprints which would otherwise be too man-power intensive for most applications.

Opportunity

Livescan systems are a cornerstone technology for improving the accuracy of CJIN information. Livescan data capture technology, when coupled with a statewide information network, will automate the capture and transmission of fingerprint data. When fully deployed, livescan systems will enable the state to perform a positive identification of a suspect in as little as two hours. Livescan terminals will be placed at strategic law enforcement, court, and correction facilities. Mobile livescan equipment will, when widely available and deployed, enable law enforcement to verify the identity of an individual.

When livescan and AFIS are integrated, law enforcement officials will be able to positively identify suspects within minutes of being fingerprinted.

3. Automated Indexing Systems

The heart of any information retrieval system is information indexing. The indexing will enhance or detract from the user's ability to find the needed information. Most indexing systems allow for searching either specified fields or data elements of the database, or searching the entire text of the database. Both are based on matching keywords that are part of the index. Some systems have utilized a relevance ranking component to rank and order the output of the search by relevance, which is usually defined as the number of times the term appears in a document.

As publishers attempt to replace the printed word with the electronic word, they are finding features of printed books and documents that need to be retained in their electronic counterparts. One of these features is the "back-of-the-book" or conceptual index that allows the user to find ideas discussed without knowing the exact terminology the author used.

A number of products have been developed to meet this need. Oracle's ConText, the Intelligent Text Management System from Information Access Systems Inc., and Information Navigation Inc.'s Train of Thought are all based on concept retrieval rather than a keyword-based system. Concept retrieval engines evaluate documents for frequently used terms that are related to the search query, so synonyms and synonymous phrases may also be retrieved with this technique. In effect, these systems classify the information in a document rather than just indexing the terms used. This process is analogous to what a library does with a book, identifying its primary topics and providing access with "see" and "see also" references in the library catalog if the searcher needs more than the first classification term. As conceptual indexing systems expand, information retrieval in an electronic environment will be greatly enhanced.

International Business Machines Corp.'s BookManager and SearchVision have a linguistic-based search engine that supports 20 languages, words, stems, variants, or synonyms. So searching for the term "mouse" will also retrieve documents with mice, rodent, or rodents. A type of relevance ranking is also included ranking search results based upon where the term appears in the document. This is based upon a document hierarchy (terms found in headings are given more weight than those found in the body of the text). However, that hierarchy cannot be modified by the user, so this feature may be more useful with some documents than with others.

Automated indexing systems can provide law enforcement with the tools necessary to perform an automated search. Fingerprint records, latent fingerprint evidence, crime scene evidence, ballistic evidence, and DNA evidence can all be codified and searchable by the proper authorities.

4. Workflow and Groupware

Groupware is software that facilitates collaborative work and sharing information. This group of products is designed for use in a network and serves groups of users working on related projects. Lotus Notes is recognized as the premier groupware product. It is a client-server platform for developing and deploying applications. Lotus Notes allows people to access, track, share, and organize information in numerous ways even if they are only occasionally connected to a network.

The gradual acceptance of Lotus Notes has exemplified a trend toward collaboration that is now driving much of the applications market. Corporate departments now want more than the standard E-mail connection. Ideally, they would like users to view and access information concurrently, perhaps even work interactively, without leaving their desks.

Lotus Notes' success has spawned an array of competitors, including enhanced E-mail with sophisticated form-routing capabilities. This trend has given rise to several innovative "groupware" products that promise to do anything from planning meetings (including scheduling the room and slide projector) to structuring the work or process flow.

Indeed, many observers viewed Novell's acquisition of WordPerfect as an indicator of groupware's importance. Novell controls much of the local area network (LAN) infrastructure with NetWare, but it lacked a credible product to compete with Lotus Notes and Microsoft's expected Electronic Messaging Server. WordPerfect's PerfectOffice - with its E-mail capabilities and InForms for electronic forms routing - was seen as the foundation for a new generation of groupware, much of which is expected to end up closely tied to NetWare itself.

Workflow products, which help automate processes in a structured way while still facilitating information sharing, are beginning to complement groupware products. Third parties, including Action Technologies Inc. and Reach Software Corp., carved niches for themselves with workflow packages that enable corporations to map out their work flow graphically and automate it. There are signs that the premium price that Lotus Notes commands could face pressure. Lotus Notes now costs about \$495 a seat, but companies such as Collabra Software Inc. are offering software that provides some of what Lotus Notes does at a fraction of the price. Visual Basic with Microsoft Mail provide another

promising solution for applications which require more sophisticated integration requirements. This environment provides a great deal of flexibility for organizations to resolve their workflow problems, but requires technical staff to support development and implementation. Several third party products are also entering the market to facilitate workflow productivity enhancements.

Opportunity

The deployment of powerful desktop computer systems will enable CJIN users to utilize dynamic Workflow software to automate the routing of information. Text, image, voice, and ultimately video data will be routed through the network to the appropriate user. Work queues will present CJIN users with the information necessary to complete a specific task. Background processes, where required, will automatically retrieve available information before presenting the case information to the user. Workflow will enhance the exchange of information between law enforcement, the courts, and corrections.

5. *Text Management and Electronic Imaging Systems*

Much of the growth and development in electronic publishing and information retrieval is based on current text management systems. Combined with advances in imaging systems, the paperless office prophesized some 20 years ago comes much closer to reality. Text management systems usually contain the complete text of a document, but the more traditional document management systems hold only certain elements of information about a document. Furthermore, these elements were located in specific data fields, so if the user did not search for the right element in the right data field, nothing would be retrieved.

Having the entire document in the database allows the user to search the full text of the document. This full-text searching is possible, in part, because of increased storage capacity, increased processing speed, and improved indexing algorithms. The major advantage of information retrieval in a text management system is obvious: the user can search an entire file or document, not just the selected data fields. Special indexes do not need to be developed manually. The user can also employ natural language, or the words as they appear in the text, rather than using a controlled vocabulary,

or standardized terms that the system will recognize.

However, full-text searching has its drawbacks. The searcher still needs to use terms exactly as they appear in the file. Misspellings and synonyms are not retrieved. Terms that have multiple meanings become problematic as well. In a large file, too much data will be retrieved. Even with a relevance-ranking system to identify the most promising documents, the possibility of overlooking important information remains. Both Oracle Corp. and Verity Inc. are developing solutions to these problems based on concept retrieval rather than a keyword-based system. Concept retrieval engines evaluate documents for frequently used terms that are related to the search query. Synonyms and synonymous phrases may also be retrieved with this technique.

Among the challenges information managers will face over the next few years is the fact that text is becoming just one part of the information picture. The movement is toward systems that can integrate text with other data types and become true document management systems. Now these document management systems need to be integrated with other applications, such as electronic mail and workflow software. The software to manage all this has been around for a while, but at a price of \$75,000 to \$250,000 or more, it was too costly for many organizations. New products with significantly lower prices, such as Lotus Notes: Document Imaging (a companion product), SoftSolutions Technology Corp.'s SoftSolutions, and Westbrook Technologies Inc.'s FileMagic, now provide the capability to handle multiple data types. Watermark Software Inc.'s Watermark Professional Edition provides software to image-enable applications using Object Linking and Embedding (OLE). It permits developers to add functionality to applications for integrated scanned and faxed documents.

Compatibility, however, is still a problem in bringing various information formats together in one searchable database. One aspect of compatibility involves bringing together documents that have been produced using a variety of word processing and desktop publishing systems. Importing files into the database usually involves removing the formatting, leaving a document that can be unrecognizable.

With electronic distribution packages like Adobe Systems Inc.'s Acrobat, No Hands Software Inc.'s Common Ground, or Farallon Computing Inc.'s Replica, text, fonts, and formats can be translated into files that appear on screen the same

way they were designed to appear on paper. This capability allows documents produced to be distributed electronically.

Another compatibility issue is being addressed. With the age of multimedia, LAN-based document management systems will include text, graphics, audio, and video. Systems such as these will drive the electronic publishing industry over the next few years. One scenario of how this will work is based in Folio Corp.'s Views 3.0. Views 3.0 allows the user to create an "infobase," which combines features of word processing, desktop publishing, database management, full-text indexing, and a powerful search engine. An infobase could be a technical manual, a parts catalog, or a work of literature. The idea is to access the needed information, regardless of location or format; revise the information to meet a particular need; and share that information with others on the network. Another scenario is based in Odyssey Development Pty Ltd.'s Isys. Isys is an information retrieval system that provides access to documents as well as images. It uses boolean, proximity, and range operators, in addition to conceptual searches.

Excalibur Technologies Corp. EFS is designed to handle imperfectly OCR'd text. The interface works like a paper file system with icons for file cabinets, drawers, folders and documents. Users can collect, file, find and distribute documents using cursor and mouse. The product provides automatic indexing each time a document is filed or a new page is added to a document and fuzzy searching capabilities to allow searches which ignore OCR errors, misspellings, typos, and filing mistakes.

Hypertext enables an associative mode of thinking rather than the sequential approach of classic database structures. This more truly mimics the manner in which a reader would progress through a book. If there is an interesting footnote the reader can turn to that reference, and if desired, can lead off to another reference. The reader can always return immediately to the text start point. This can be mirrored electronically with text or sound or image. Two types of Hypertext link exist: static and dynamic. Static links are predefined at database creation and are fixed. They are more common than dynamic which are configurable at search time and may or may not be saved for later reuse. The time to create these links is considerable and requires real expertise.

Opportunity

Electronic document imaging systems will provide CJIN users with direct access to traditional paper-based records. Automated databases will reduce, but not eliminate, the need for paper records. The following types of paper documents may continue to coexist along with the electronic record:

- Incident report documents and local law enforcement files
- Court documents
- Judge's notes
- Department of Correction records
- Division of Probation and Parole documents

Document scanners will be used to scan and store an electronic image of these documents, eliminating a good deal of data entry. By utilizing a high-speed CJIN network and Workflow automation, information can be effectively routed and distributed throughout the CJIN enterprise.

6. Artificial Intelligence and Expert Systems

The field of Artificial Intelligence (AI) studies how to make computers exhibit intelligent, human-like behavior. In addition to expert systems and neural systems, which have long been considered part of AI, constraint programming, genetic programming, case-based reasoning, and fuzzy logic are now included.

Early assumptions about the nature of "intelligence" were naive, and that computer systems that can reason over a wide range of topics in a human manner are still a distant goal. However, some of the software tools that were developed as part of the early effort have practical value. Focused application of these technologies to specific high-payoff areas has enabled numerous companies to reap operational or strategic advantages.

Expert and neural systems are similar in that they both mimic aspects of human thinking. Expert systems try to emulate conscious, logical thought - the kind of thinking the practitioner can explain to someone else. Neural systems are built

from elements that behave somewhat like individual nerve cells (neurons), which can change the strengths of their connections to each other to modify their collective behavior (“learn”) over time. The behavior of neural systems tends to be imprecise and hard to explain - quite appropriate for tasks such as face recognition, for which it is difficult to specify a solution algorithmically.

Constraint programming is a new development that lets users interactively define and manipulate restrictions with different priorities. Unlike traditional programming with its linear, one-way computation capability, constraint programming makes it possible to specify complex relationships, and to narrow the scope of the computer’s search. This makes for a more flexible intelligence system that also can be faster. Constraint-based programming systems are expected to become increasingly useful in areas such as manufacturing and computer-aided design.

Fuzzy logic is a formulation of logic that deals with inherently vague human concepts such as most, few, very, and so on, in a rigorous mathematical framework. It is not, as its name might imply, a technique that draws inaccurate or imprecise conclusions. Rather, it is an attempt to build a consistent, rigorous mathematical, multi-valued logic - a logic that admits values ranging between truth and falsity.

Opportunity

AI is already being applied in law enforcement within North Carolina, specifically the matching of fingerprints. Other applications, such as license plate recognition, are being implemented in state and federal applications. Some of these technologies will eventually play a role in CJIN initiatives. However, to be cost effective, CJIN should implement AI technologies only after they are proven.

7. Geographical Information systems and Global Positioning Systems

Global Positioning System (GPS) technology is ideally suited to the law enforcement, emergency medicine, transportation, utilities, and real estate industries. GPS refers to the U.S. Defense Department's satellite system, which

can pinpoint a user's location anywhere on Earth. Law enforcement agencies are using mobile hardware and custom mobile geographic information systems (GIS) applications along with GPS units to automatically report location information. Emergency-service uses include the mounting of GPS sensors on top of emergency vehicles. The GPS units provide dispatchers with the vehicle's exact locations. This information is useful for determining which vehicles can respond to an emergency most quickly.

GPS and other mobile technologies also have proved to be vital in disaster relief efforts. In conjunction with the University of Florida GeoPlan Center, several mobile technologies were combined to assist in assessing the damage caused by Hurricane Andrew in 1992. The pilot project combined a pen-based computer, specialized GIS software, a Global Positioning System, and a digital camera to collect field data for south Florida's Metro Dade Property Appraiser's Office. They used pen-based computers to assess damage in disaster-stricken areas of Dade County, where the hurricane had destroyed street signs. The appraisers recorded observations, collected digitized photographs, and received Global Positioning System data, using applications on the mobile computers. The integrated mobile system reduced the time and cost associated with keying handwritten data, developing film, and storing photographs.

The mobile application displays GPS data describing the appraiser's location (by latitude, longitude, and altitude) through the use of a portable GPS sensor, which is affixed to the bottom of an IBM ThinkPad. Live images are displayed at a rate of up to two frames per second via a digital still video camera mounted to the computer. The application's Viewfinder allows users to compose images on the screen prior to capture. This information is combined with pre-loaded data and text entry fields on a single electronic "form."

Data gathered in the field was uploaded to existing Metro Dade property-appraisal systems for evaluation and storage. The data was used to formulate reconstruction plans for the devastated area.

GPS technology, a satellite-based locator system, together with customized GIS applications are being used by law enforcement agencies to automatically report location information. The precision of different GPS-based locator systems vary widely. GPS precision is directly related to the cost of the type of technology used to compensate for the distortions inherent in the satellite signals. Precision can range from 100 meters, with no distortion correction, down to

a fraction of a meter using sophisticated signal correction. Law enforcement and public safety users must determine the level of precision that is required.

Opportunity

Vehicle locator systems, and other customized applications can benefit from GPS technology. GIS applications can be used in conjunction with portable pen-based computers to capture on-scene accident information. GIS systems can be used to provide real-time information about vehicle location. In addition, dead-reckoning systems can be employed to track a vehicle from a last known position.

8. *Mobile Data Terminals*

Public safety agencies were some of the earliest adopters of mobile systems. This trend has continued as notebook computers have replaced terminals inside patrol cars. High performance commercial notebook computers configured with fast microprocessors, color display screens, and large capacity memory and disk systems can be used to provide CJIN law enforcement users with effective enforcement and safety tools. In addition, newer modular designs permit commercially available technologies such as bar code readers, magnetic stripe readers, digital cameras and scanners, and radio-frequency modems to be configured to support custom applications. Mobile data terminals will be an important component of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's National Crime Information Center (NCIC) future system, NCIC 2000. Color images of suspects and stolen property will be retrieved using mobile computers. In addition, portable pen-based computers will allow law enforcement users to record incident information from outside the vehicle. NCIC 2000 mobile data applications, together with customized GPS and GIS applications, will combine to make mobile data terminals will become a standard law enforcement tool.

9. *Smart Cards*

Smart card technology employs a credit card sized device capable of performing the functions of a microcomputer. The cards feature a microprocessor, memory, and an input / output interface. Smart-card technology may become practical for use within CJIN to provide an additional level of network security. Smart cards can be used as tokens for granting access

to the CJIN network. Readers can be added to specific CJIN workstations and mobile data terminals. Smart cards that use the industry standard Personal Computer Memory Card International Association (PCMCIA) interface common on notebook computers are readily available.

10. Voice Recognition

Voice recognition system technology has matured into a commercially available technology. Today voice recognition is used in many different hands-free applications such as on-site field inspections. The technology can be readily adapted to meet the requirements of CJIN law enforcement users. Portable data recorders, pen based computers, and personal digital assistants can all be enabled with voice recognition. Voice recognition is best suited to those applications that will require a limited vocabulary. By training the software to recognize letters of the alphabet, single digit numbers, and single word commands voice recognition can be effectively used in a variety of law enforcement applications. When combined with pen-based systems, GPS systems, and GIS software, voice recognition technology can be an effective tool for law enforcement.

11. Client Server Architecture

Client-server is a form of distributed computing technology that has begun to change the way many new applications are designed and constructed. Systems built using a client-server model are inherently modular, with some of their functions running on client machines and others running on server machines. Clients and servers are linked via a network.

Most early adopters of client-server during the late 1980s expected the technology to reduce their systems costs by allowing them to switch from mainframes and minicomputers to lower-cost personal computers and servers. In practice, however, savings on hardware in these user sites were canceled out by increased costs of development, training, and new software required for client-server applications, and higher support costs.

As a result, most users now justify client-server investments by citing the flexibility and user-productivity benefits of the technology. Client-server architectures leverage Microsoft Corp.'s Windows, International Business Machine Corp.'s

OS/2, and other graphical user interfaces available on PC, Macintosh, and UNIX workstation platforms. These interfaces are believed to contribute to improved user productivity - particularly in decision-support applications. A second catalyst for client-server architectures is the desire of many corporations to equip each line-of-business organization with the data it needs to accomplish its mission. To achieve this goal, many corporations give internal organizations the ability to manage their own data. Many of these corporations rely on client-server architectures to coordinate these localized databases with the rest of the corporate data. Lastly, client-server architectures offer users the ability to break applications into modules that in the long run may be less expensive to maintain and better able to support changing requirements and growth than monolithic, mainframe-based applications.

Despite the substantial investments user organizations are making in client-server technology, distributed computing applications remain "leading edge" for many customers. Most organizations have not yet committed to build operational applications - the transaction-oriented systems required to run any business enterprise - using client-server technology. Client-server technology is currently used primarily for business intelligence (decision-support, data interpretation, query and reporting) and communications applications that do not involve management of the organization's vital business data.

There are four barriers to the use of client-server technology in operational applications. The first is that current client-server development tools limit the size and scope of applications. The second is the lack of robustness and reliability of client-server platforms and tools. Many customers hold client-server technology up to the robustness and reliability standards of mainframe products - and find client-server wanting. The third is the fact that many new tools force customers to learn a new model for building software, without providing any migration aids. The fourth problem is the complexity and effort involved in managing and supporting a client-server environment. There are few well established tools that support configuration management, problem identification, and performance monitoring, or deal with new problems such as software distribution. Client-server simplifies distributed computing, but it is still difficult to design client-server applications that perform well. Ironically, the design of many client-server applications is highly centralized because that is a model that current developers understand.

Until these barriers are removed, client-server will have to coexist with current centralized architectures. During the

forecast period, however, client-server technology seems destined to mature enough to become the primary platform for *new enterprise applications*. The increasing availability of packaged client-server applications is likely to change this situation dramatically. And in the more distant future, it seems inevitable that client-server will supplant centralized architectures for the majority of corporate applications.

12. Electronic Data Interchange

Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) consists of routine information exchanges between computer-based processes. Processes that exchange information through EDI are typically mirror-image business application owned by two or more trading partners. The most common EDI partners are vendors and their customers. An example of a mirror-image process is the generation of orders by a customer's purchasing system for transmission to a vendor's sales-order-entry system. Another example is a vendor's billing system preparing invoices for a customer's accounts payable system.

The technology of EDI consists of three primary components:

- C Translation
- C Communications
- C Value Added Networks(VANs)

EDI's primary tool is software that transforms data from and to the defined EDI standard formats. These formats conform to Accredited Standards Committee (ASC) X12 committee standards, in the U.S., and the International Standards Organization's (ISO) Electronic Data Interchange For Commerce and Transport (EDIFACT) standards. This computer-based process can be referred to as translation.

The sender's originating application, such as purchasing, produces the same data regardless of whether or not EDI is being used. When EDI is used, the purchase order data is sent to the translation process instead of the printer. The translator software accepts the purchasing system's view of the data, applies user-defined mapping, and converts the

purchase order (PO) to a standard version of the transaction.

The transaction is delivered through a communication process to the receiving vendor, who reverses the EDI process. The standard PO is filtered through a mapping defined by the vendor and is converted to the order entry system's view of the data. The order entry system processes the information just as though it had originated from a paper PO received through the supplier's mailroom and entered by a sales clerk.

How EDI partners are connected depends on whether the EDI user selects switched or dedicated mode. In switched mode, the connection is established via a network or by placing a call through the public switched telephone network. As long as the computers at opposite ends of the telephone circuit are exchanging data, the connection will remain open. The connection ends when one of the computers terminates the call by hanging up. In dedicated mode a telephone circuit is connected constantly. The computers connected to either end of the circuit may exchange data at any time by entering into a predefined dialog.

EDI exchanges tend to occur in bursts of activity at the end of a production cycle. Therefore, dedicated mode level of service is typically not required. A dedicated circuit is needed when transactions are volume or time-sensitive, as is the case with just-in-time programs. In addition to dedicated or switched mode connectivity, an EDI user must decide whether to support direct communication with each trading partner or engage a Value-Added Network (VAN) provider.

A VAN customer needs only a single connection between itself and the VAN's nearest point-of-presence, usually a local telephone call. The sender may communicate with the VAN at its convenience, and the VAN will deliver the sender's transactions to electronic mailboxes. Each mailbox belongs to a specific recipient of transaction data, and transactions from multiple senders may be collected in the same mailbox. Since the sender's and receiver's communication sessions are independent of one another, the VAN acts as a security buffer between the two organizations' networks. The fact that sender and receiver are never directly connected also means that a VAN user is not required to support various data communication protocols and speeds based on the abilities of individual trading partners. Other value-added features of VAN's include: audit trails and activity reports; translation and compliance checking; and VAN interconnection with trading partners on different VANs.

Businesses using EDI have many advantages, including fewer personnel required to perform or manage processes, fewer errors, reduced redundant re-keying of data, faster cycle times, and more strategic business relationships for competitive advantage.

13. Interactive Broadband Networks

As fiber-optic technology is deployed, and as carriers contemplate interactive video services, providing both services on integrated networks becomes attractive. This opportunity has spawned the development of digital fiber / coax networks that can provide any type of service. For example, Pacific Bell plans to spend \$16 billion to upgrade 5.5 million subscriber lines to fiber optics and coaxial cable by the year 2000, thus providing it with the capacity to compete with cable television companies in the delivery of television programming, pay-per-view, and video-on-demand to the home as well as providing more efficient and capable voice and data services.

14. Object Technology

Object technology is an umbrella concept for describing a group of technologies used to create software products that are highly modular and reusable. Objects are modules composed of both procedures and data. Objects can be combined more flexibly than data or procedure taken separately. Functionality can be shared more easily among a set of business applications.

Object technology will have a broad impact on information technology. New languages have been proposed and old languages extended to support object-oriented programming. New storage systems are needed for objects, new methods are required for analysis and design, and new standards are emerging. Robust testing methods are needed for systems built with objects. The entire software life cycle is affected.

Sometimes object technology is used for application development. At other times, objects themselves are put into the hands of users. In the former case, when objects are on the inside, they contribute to software that is more animated and

graphical, and may be easier to build. When objects are on the outside, they become building blocks for users who can adapt software more flexibly to their needs. As a result, some of the boundaries between programmers and users have begun to break down. Inside or out, objects are becoming commonplace in business systems, particularly for workstation and client-server applications.

Object technology has evolved over the past few years into a key tool for business applications. Driven by the need to build more animated and graphical applications, and improve programmer productivity, object technology is showing some signs of maturity. Many areas of object technology lack industry standards, and the technology will not penetrate the market fully without the emergence of standards. In several crucial areas, such as object storage, industry standards have yet to emerge and the technology remains immature. Discussion about standards abound, an indication that users and suppliers are nearly ready to reduce the differences among the existing implementations of object functionality. Standards organization formed by companies, such as the Object Management Group (OMG), will have a key role in the adoption of industry-wide standards.

The center of activity for standards in object technology is an industry-sponsored organization called the Object Management Group. Founded in 1989, the OMG is attempting to help suppliers more quickly converge on de facto standards, which in turn will accelerate the acceptance of these standards by public organizations such as the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) and the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers (IEEE). The OMG was founded by eight corporations: Hewlett Packard, Data General Corp., 3Com Corp., American Airlines Inc., Canon Inc., Sun Microsystems Inc., Unisys Corp., and Philips International B.V. Its membership includes 390 corporations and universities, with a growing trend toward consumers joining the organization, rather than suppliers.

There are two categories of standards in the object technology industry. First, standards bodies such as ANSI, International Standards Organization (ISO), and IEEE continue to work toward public standards, particularly in the language area. There has been an ANSI C standard for many years, and a draft C++ standard is nearly ready for acceptance. A second category of standards is de facto, or proprietary, such as Smalltalk and Eiffel. Large areas of object technology are entirely without de facto or public standards. In the domain of object storage, for example, each supplier has its own object description and manipulation languages.

The most active arena for object standards is the workstation desktop. Microsoft's Object Linking and Embedding (OLE) protocol is in its second version and by volume is the most frequently used protocol for interchanging information among desktop applications. Microsoft's OLE provides an application the ability to delegate to other computing machines or processes the responsibility for executing and returning results of computation effort encapsulated in an object. In this sense, objects become a form of remote procedure call, with data encapsulate with the procedure. Other similar projects include OpenDoc from Apple, IBM and Novell, and Common Object Request Broker Architecture (CORBA) from OMG.

Opportunity

CJIN should maintain an active interest in the development and use of object oriented technology and begin to train technical staff, through course and hands-on pilot efforts, in the concepts and use of this technology. However, CJIN should be careful to not fully invest or rely on object oriented technology in key projects until the technology matures to where there is a wealth of mature tools, standards, and skilled personnel.