

CJCC Information Sharing and Integration Committee

Information Sharing and Integration Committee Meeting Minutes

February 14, 2007

200 N. Main, Lower Level Conference Room

Ann Arbor, MI

2:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Participants Present: Julie Chaffee, Mark Ptaszek, Steve Hiller, Uma Harithsa, Alan Jackson (Dataspace), Jack Overhiser, Mike Fried, Troy Bevier, Karen Edman

Meeting called to order at 2:33 p.m.

Members were given the following documents:

- Project Road Map

I. Approval of Minutes

Uma Harithsa suggested that the previous meeting minutes be approved. She asked if there were any changes. She said that she had not brought copies to be distributed, given that they were emailed. A motion to accept the minutes was then made, seconded, and unanimously approved by the group.

II. Dataspace Jail Reporting Update

Alan Jackson reported that one of the big issues discussed here previously was figuring out how to get the court case numbers into the Sheriff's New World system. He said that this problem has been resolved. The jail managers have now trained their staff to enter the complete court case number as new inmates are booked. Alan said that for 15th District Court cases, the case number will be entered despite the fact that it is a different format; 15th District Court does not use the eNACT system.

Julie asked if this relevant to both the district and circuit courts, and has the process already begun. Alan Jackson said both. Alan indicated that this has began, all those already in the system had been converted, and are now entering new cases as they go. Alan Jackson thanked the jail staff, specifically Commander Filsinger, Lt. Gary Greenfield and Lt. Karen Korte. He said that the old cases will not have the court case number entered.

Discussion ensued. Mike Fried asked will they use the CTN. The answer is no; only the eNACT case number.

Julie Chaffee asked about how it is done in New World when cases are plead down or remanded back to district court. For example, if a case starts in Circuit Court, it is assigned a Circuit Court case number, which is entered into the New World system by the jail staff. If the charges are modified so that the case has only misdemeanor charges, the case would be remanded ("sent back") to District Court. At this point, it would get a new court case number reflecting that it is a District Court case. The question is whether the case is then updated in New World to show the new case number. If it is not, it could inaccurately inflate the number of Circuit Court cases that appear in the jail reporting system.

Mike Fried asked if the case numbers have a suffix. Alan said that while some do, it is not required and not being captured in the jail reporting system.

Alan Jackson said that they have incorporated the CJCC danger/severity level code into the jail reporting system. Steve Hiller classified all the charge codes used by the courts as to danger/severity level. However, there are about 1200 codes used in New World that have no corresponding code to the master list of charges from the eNACT. Alan asked Steve if he would classify this list of codes and he agreed.

Alan Jackson said he could send some samples that don't match. The solution is having someone go through the jail list and classify the ones that don't have a match. Alan Jackson stated that he would send samples to Steve.

CJCC Information Sharing and Integration Committee

Alan then gave a general overview of project status. He stated that there were three stages in the building project. They include:

- 1) Analysis to determine data source locations and system design. This is complete.
- 2) Constructing of the reporting database itself and the mechanisms by which data would be extracted from eNACT and New World systems and inserted into the reporting system. This is approximately 95% complete.
- 3) Building the reporting mechanism. Construction will begin within the next week or two.

Alan stated that he talked to Scott Patton and J. Cedric Simpson, and reported that J. Cedric Simpson would be the point person to look at the reports and give feedback. He stated that there are five reports that will be produced within the first release of the jail reporting system.

Julie Chaffee asked if the group could get a short description of what data will be in the reports. She stated that the reports may be beneficial for the Community Corrections grant application. Alan gave Julie a copy of document produced by the CJCC Data Definition Committee that outlined the data elements the CJCC requested.

Uma Harithsa indicated that Kirk Filsinger has expressed interest in doing a website much like one in Kalamazoo County. This may be a project for 2008.

Alan stated that Oakland County publishes a list of all inmates booked and released during the last 72 hours.

Uma extended a special thanks to Alan, Susan Beecher, and Jack Overhiser for their excellent work on the project.

III. Search.com Meeting Update

Mark Ptaszek briefed the group on the recent SEARCH visit. We requested technical assistance from SEARCH in our justice integration efforts. Mark stated that over the two-day visit, the group reviewed current data and architecture and identified a few projects to work on, one being data integration. Mark stated that they are going to host a JIEM Training the last week of February. JIEM is a business process modeling tool that SEARCH developed.

Mark reported that the group talked about integrating various components of the projects into the 2008-2009 Planning Process. He stated that the committee is finally making headway on the integration piece.

IV. Road Map for Projects - Green Sheet & Warrant Requests

Uma Harithsa asked the group to turn their attention to the road map that was handed out at the last meeting.

Uma Harithsa reported that during the two day SEARCH visit, it was stated that the committee should follow the steps on the sheet for the three projects that they identified. The projects previously recommended by this group include:

- The Defendant General Information Form (also know as the “Green sheet”)
- Detective bureau document sharing
- Electronic citations
- Automate warrant requests

Discussion ensued about the goals of the three projects identified during the SEARCH visit. The group raised several items that they would like to see accomplished. They include: (see flow chart notes for additional information).

Business drivers

- To eliminate the physical movement of the warrant requests from the Sheriff to the Prosecutor’s office.

CJCC Information Sharing and Integration Committee

- Eliminating the duplicate data entry.
- Reduce materials cost/paper – making things electronic
- Reducing staff time
- There's not a warrant module in Clemis, and there should be a way of tracking that process electronically.
- Ensuring that police deputies can be out doing their core work, more saving costs, and a more efficient use of time.
- Allow multiple agencies to have access to data at one time.

Legal Requirements

The question was raised as to whether there are there any legal requirements to keep in mind.

Troy indicated that this encompassed policy requirements as well. Steve stated that the most important concern is accountability. There needs to be a way of tracking who sends things and what does the document consist of. This sentiment was echoed by several committee members.

Uma asked if there were any policy directives or any time governmental limitations by the state that should be considered.

Steve said that if someone was arrested and there was no warrant, then they have a warrant signed and be arraigned within 48 hours.

Uma asked were there any secondary gains or pains to consider. Steve Hiller stated that there might be some saving in physical storage space once electronic storing is implemented. Troy stated that there could be gas savings from not having to drive things around.

Steve stated that warrant request on a domestic violence case has to be turned around the same day, so this is another legal requirement to consider. Steve also stated that a charge and further investigation or a denial must be done the same day. Also, once the judge signs a warrant it has to be entered into LIEN within 72 hours.

Uma then turned the discussion to organizational changes that may occur as a result. The group offered the following potential changes:

- CLEMIS rollout: Troy stated that all the police agencies in the county will be using it.
- Same format of warrant request.
- Savings in auto population of complaint and warrant forms.

Uma then asked about environmental trends and if there were any mandates that are coming.

- Efforts to get MDC's in all the cars.
- May not need to staff an outside office depending on how electronic the system becomes

Uma then asked about strategic business intent and whether the group should we identify any other guiding principles other than those already known by the County. The group agreed that the County's principles were comprehensive enough.

Uma then raised several other issues that the group should consider. They include:

- Sourcing decisions: whether to build or buy
- Business architecture and questions of domain
 - Security issues
 - Various agencies are not privy to certain information
 - Privacy issues, such ass SSN
- Information on Warrant Request
 - Name
 - DOB
 - Race

CJCC Information Sharing and Integration Committee

- Gender
- Address
- State ID #
- FBI #
- TCN #
- Charge request #
- Charge
- Police report #
- Names of co-defendants and aliases
- Police officer re-question
- Date and location of offense
- School code (if applicable)
- Township code
- Police agency
- Police officer signing the complaint.
- Future Capabilities
- Incident report and tape written statements
- Photos
- All calls
- Videos

Some things that the group will like to see in the future include:

- Warrant requests that draw from data in CLEMIS
- Data to populate down to ENACT and PA and State Agencies, such as DOC and MSP)
- Log of who handled the documents (create, modify, etc.)

Uma indicated that this is a good start. She reported that there will be a pretrial services meeting so that the group could get feedback from Judge Simpson.

Mark Ptaszek asked whether there was going to be a hierarchy on these projects, or will they all be done simultaneously.

Karen Edman offered that the group should also try to figure out what it will get from On Base.

Uma asked if there were any recommendations in terms of what projects should be tackled first. She offered that if something does not require tremendous workflow, but just putting data into the system, those projects could be started soon.

V. Updates

Troy gave a brief CLEMIS update. He stated that Milan is in CLEMIS training this week, and Pittsfield and Ann Arbor are looking at starting CLEMIS in March or early April. He reported that this is a huge undertaking, but the goal is to have everybody live on CLEMIS by mid summer.

Mark gave a brief update on JIS. He stated that he was on the evaluation committee to determine the vendor and that Unisys was selected. Scot Cannell is also involved in this project.

VI. 2007 Meetings

Uma gave a brief recap of the 2007 meeting schedule. She reported that Feb 27th and 28th are JIEM training days. She stated that there are only a few RSVPs.

Uma then reported that the 2007 calendar has been modified, and that meetings are scheduled for the 4th Wednesday of every month. The committee will now meet from 2:30-4:00 pm, instead of 3:30-5:00 as it was originally planned.

CJCC Information Sharing and Integration Committee

VII. 2007 Conferences – NAJIS, SEARCH

Uma reported that there will be two conferences that are related to public safety later this year. One is for [NAJIS](#) and will be held in Santa Fe, NM in October. Uma reported that SEARCH will hold two conferences; a March conference in Minneapolis, and another in Jacksonville in June.

Karen stated that there will be Court Technology conference in Tampa in October and that she is hoping to do a presentation during the conference.

Adjourned at 4:02 p.m.

Next meeting will be held Wednesday, March 28, 2007, Lower Conference Room of 200 N. Main.