

CJCC Information Sharing and Integration Committee

Information Sharing and Integration Committee Meeting Notes

April 25, 2007

Annex 217 Conference Room

Ann Arbor, MI

2:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Participants Present: Susan Beecher, Troy Bevier, Mike Fried, Uma Harithsa, Steve Hiller, Jack Overhiser, Scott Patton, Mark Ptaszek, Delphia Simpson, Rick Visel

I. Eaton County Visit Update:

Steve Hiller and others visited Eaton County to investigate their “fileless” office as provided by Laserfiche. Warrants are received both electronically and in hardcopy format. The processing center either scans or imports the data into their system, where it is assigned a “Case Key” number and saved on a server. Media files and other miscellaneous information can be imported into the system as well. Information packets are then sent electronically to an Assistant Prosecuting Attorney for review.

Additional information, including video demonstrations, is available [online from the Eaton County Prosecuting Attorney](#).

Steven commented that the system works for Eaton County. Attorneys only need a laptop and docket sheet when they enter the court room – no need to bring excessively large case folders to court. All information is easily available at the attorney’s fingertips electronically. The packets are scanned in OCR, meaning that the attorneys can easily search through a document for relevant content. The system helps expedite the distribution of information. In some cases the attorneys get their information packet before finding out that they’ve been assigned to a case.

Two potential problems with this setup: (1) No backup system in place incase the system crashes and (2) concerns that files are not archived according to standards set by the State.

Uma noted that Teri Takai from the State of Michigan can possibly help identify applications and possible solutions that meet State standards.

II. CJCC Retreat Update

The CJCC retreat was held on Friday, April 20th at the Learning Library Resource Center. Uma presented the jail data reports to a workgroup. Overall, the data provided a good base but the group was unable to draw conclusions. As an example, the recidivism report over counted the recidivism rate in Washtenaw County because it double counted inmates who were booked into the system multiple times for the same charge. Overall, there is a need to refine some of the data.

Scott added that there were two other workgroups during the retreat – one focusing on alternatives to incarceration; the other discussing how to evaluate the impact of the criminal justice process and policies over the last 10 years.

III. Projects Update

Warrants: Susan met with Steve Hiller, Troy Bevier, Lori Butlet and Megan Wolfe (Budget Analyst) to discuss and prepare Infrastructure Resource Allocation (IRA), which has now been submitted; working on TCO. The next step is to do requirements and then to figure out the best way to implement an electronic process.

The Defendant Information Form (aka “Green Sheet”): Susan will be setting up a meeting to prepare the IRA request with the Sheriff and Courts’ staffs. Troy has suggested that booking data can be extracted from the new mug shot capture system, PictureLink, so we will be investigating that.

CJCC Information Sharing and Integration Committee

Electronic Citation: APS (vendor) visit scheduled; discussions. Troy is working on preparing the IRA.

IV. Demonstration of the Digital Bridge Paperless Warrant Process

Conference call with John Boyd, Brent Isrealson and Bruce Brown from Digital Bridge.

Digital Bridge designs a system that allows for digital warrant requests. This is accomplished by creating an environment for agencies to share and access each other's database information. The data from each agency's system is put into XML packets and moved around. The packets can include media files as well, such as audio and video clips. Users essentially are provided with a new interface that allows access to the data packets. A tool set is provided that allows customers to design their own packets. The XML packets can be used to show criminal history, consolidation, watch alerts, transactions (warrants), data gathering and reporting, distribution, and portals.

Privacy of certain data is assured via controls that restrict user access. The system also provides a detailed audit trail to show who accessed/viewed specific data. The system can encourage sharing between counties, as well as with state and federal entities.

The system has been implemented in Maricopa County, Arizona and Cook County, Illinois.

Maricopa County: Had the SOA architecture in place and was trying to process digital warrants with PDF and other file formats with little success. The Digital Bridge system was implemented, allowing officials to pull data from each system quickly and securely. Currently officials can initiate, sign, serve and quash warrant digitally. The County is looking to expand the Digital Bridge system to other projects, including distribution services and criminal history projects. Seven data systems are tied-in to the system.

Cook County: The focus was first on bond calling, but the system was later setup to include bench warrants and protective orders. Currently 50% of all warrants are processed digitally, with a move towards complete digital integration. The County processes 300-500 felonies per day.

In respects to savings and ROI, Cook County has reduced their out-of-pocket expenses (personnel costs, travel time, reduced liability) from \$263 to \$28 per warrant. The processing time is claimed to have been reduced from four days to twenty-five minutes.

In respects to cost, Digital Bridge charges \$50 per warrant. Washtenaw County or Digital Bridge can host the server; Digital Bridge can also provide the needed SOA technology. Digital Bridge is willing to perform a six week pilot. Uma will discuss more details around cost with them next week.

Discussion: Consensus within the group that there was a fair amount of vagueness in the presentation. There is some eagerness to learn more about the true costs of their system and how it compares to Imagesoft..

V. Wrap-Up

Adjourned at 4:28 p.m.

Next meeting will be held Wednesday, May 23, 2007, at 200 North Main Street in the Lower Level Conference Room at 2:30 p.m.