



Criminal Justice Information System
Governing Board
State of Connecticut
55 Farmington, Hartford, CT 06105 • www.ct.gov/cjis

CJIS Governing Board Meeting

July 17, 2014, 1:30 pm

Division of Criminal Justice, 300 Corporate Place, Rocky Hill, CT 06067

CJIS Governing Board Members and Designees in attendance

Michael P. Lawlor, *Co-Chair, Under Secretary, Office of Policy and Management*; Judge Patrick L. Carroll, III, *Co-Chair, Chief Court Administrator, Judicial*; Brenda Bergeron, *Designee, Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection*; Hakima Bey-Coon, *Designee, Office of the Victim Advocate*; Brian Carlow, *Designee, Division of Public Defender Services*; Cheryl Cepelak, *Designee, Department of Corrections*; Melody Currey, *Commissioner, Department of Motor Vehicles*; Carleton Giles, *Chairperson, Board of Pardons and Paroles*; Kevin Kane, *Chief State's Attorney, Division of Criminal Justice*; Richard C. Mulhall, *Chief, Connecticut Police Chiefs Association*; Mark Raymond, *Designee, CIO, Department of Administrative Services, Bureau of Enterprise Systems and Technology*; and Joe Verrengia, *Designee, State Representative*.

Other attendees

Sue Brown (DPDS), Karen Buffkin (OPM), James Cetran (CPCA), Bob Cosgrove (DOC), Frank DiMatteo (DPDS), Chris Duryea (JUD), Evelyn Godbout (DCJ), Darryl Hayes (DESPP), Christian Jepsen (OPM), Karl Lewis (DOC), Jason Rosa (DESPP), John Russotto (DCJ), Celia Siefert (JUD), Richard Sparaco (BOPP), Thomas Sutkowski (JUD), Terry Walker (JUD) and Antoinette Webster (DESPP).

CJIS staff and contractors

Phil Conen (Xerox), Dennis Gage (MTG), Jeremy Katz (Xerox), Patty Meglio, Sean Thakkar, Elizabeth Ugolik and David Wright (Xerox).

I. Welcome and Introduction

- Mike Lawlor, Governing Board Co-Chair, brought the meeting to order at 1:45 pm and welcomed everyone.
- Mr. Lawlor welcomed new Board Member Carleton Giles and congratulated Richard Sparaco, BOPP's Executive Director of Board of Pardons and Paroles (BOPP), on his appointment. He also referenced that Garvin Ambrose has resigned and Hakima Bey-Coon, Designee for OVA, is here today.
- Mr. Lawlor also said that the major topics for discussion will be the progress on the Management Control Agreement (MCA) and the Xerox Contract Amendment.

II. Minutes of Previous Meeting

- Mr. Lawlor asked for any additions or corrections to the minutes of the previous meeting held on April 17, 2014. A motion was made to approve the minutes (with no modification) by Mark Raymond and seconded by Melody Currey. The minutes were approved unanimously.

III. Xerox Contract Amendment

- Karen Buffkin explained that since the last Governing Board Meeting, there have been several meetings with Xerox about the Contract Amendment. An agreement was reached in principal, but

some massaging of language was needed on what she considers the most critical part of the amendment, which is the clarification around the requirements for what the system is going to do. They have reached agreement on thirty items off of the original requirements list that needed further clarification. The new Release Plan that was agreed upon was extended to twenty-nine months and two weeks. This information was shared with stakeholders at a meeting yesterday and the stakeholders signed off on it. This would add five months to the original plan presented at the last Governing Board Meeting, and add \$400,000 to the \$2.1 million cost of the contract.

- She said that the agreement also includes \$50,000 in change overs that are on the table with several parties and would require a separate amendment. There is a change order in place in the contract and it was felt that it would be appropriate to just roll those in with the contract amendment. This involved the addition of requirements gathering and reworking some of the system design.
- In addition, there is a change order for the Offender Based Tracking System (OBTS). Xerox has agreed to separately (apart from the Contract Amendment) negotiate with CJIS on these matters. The Contract Amendment is on track for starting on July 28, 2014. She asked approval from the Board to go forward with negotiations with Xerox on requirements gathering.
- Sean Thakkar explained that the change order allows us to move OBTS into a new CISS environment at a cost of \$130,000. One benefit would be to retain the 147 million records stored in OBTS. Another benefit would be to have a source for historical data that is currently available to the criminal justice community. Once CISS takes over, OBTS will cease to exist. In the beginning, there will not be much in CISS to look at.
- Chief Mulhall said that local law enforcement has backed away from using OBTS because it was found that the information was dirty. Local law enforcement instead reaches out directly to agencies for information. Though CJIS tried to clean up the data a year ago, it was never completed and now there is a lack of confidence in the system. If OBTS is brought over, it would bring a negative aspect to the CISS project from the start. He doesn't see the users using it. He wants information that is reliable.
- Judge Carroll asked if the information would only be obtainable through OBTS. Terry Walker explained that CISS would start fresh, but would also gather history from the sources available through search. She felt that it was not necessary to access OBTS.
- Chief Mulhall said that with CISS, a fresh pure database will be built with clean data.
- Brenda Bergeron asked if the OBTS would be segregated from other data. Mr. Thakkar replied that it would be handled as another data source.
- Chief Mulhall asked who is currently using OBTS. Mr. Thakkar said that the Department of Motor Vehicles and Department of Correction. Ms. Currey said that they (DMV) don't use it.
- Mr. Lawlor said that at one time Mr. Thakkar created a list of agencies that are using OBTS. Mr. Thakkar was looking at a number of queries of OBTS.
- Kevin Kane wanted to know if there are any other costs besides the \$130,000; Mr. Thakkar said that there are not to his knowledge. Ms. Walker said that OBTS will always be involved in testing for future releases.
- Cheryl Cepelak wanted to know what would prevent CISS from sending bad data. Mr. Lawlor explained that CISS is not a system of record, but rather points the user in the direction of the records. Ms. Walker pointed out that it was a CISS search of the OBTS database that helped find information about the Razor, a person wanted for murder in Meriden. Ms. Walker went on to say that you will still occasionally get a variety of birth dates, but that you need to validate the information. Chief Mulhall said that when communicating through CISS, you should be able to get fairly clean records and make their own records as clean as possible.
- Ms. Bey-Coon asked which six agencies input information into OBTS. Judge Carroll said they are Judicial, Department of Correction (DOC), Board of Pardons and Paroles (BOPP), State Police,

Local Police, and Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV). For data sources, it's Criminal Motor Vehicle System (CRMVS), Paperless Re-Arrest Warrant Network (PRAWN), Centralized Infraction Bureau (CIB), Protection Order Registry (POR), and two more beyond that.

- Darryl Hayes added that the minute you stop feeding updated data to OBTS, all people with nolles will not be erased in the database after thirteen months. There is a danger now if OBTS is still there that they may still get data, but it won't be erased if they stopped feeding the database.
- Mr. Raymond asked how long will OBTS last and get the data feeds like it is getting today until CISS can get up to speed. Ms. Walker said that it doesn't affect the moving of OBTS to CISS. It will still get the data as it does now.
- Mr. Lawlor said that we are spending \$500,000 annually for maintenance of OBTS. If we don't spend the \$130,000 to move OBTS to the new CISS environment, we will turn off OBTS in 2.5 years. Chief Mulhall questioned the spending of \$500,000 a year when no one is using it. Chief Mulhall said that we shouldn't turn it off, but let Xerox use it as a test database.
- Ms. Cepelak suggested that we find out who exactly is using OBTS and decide whether is it worth the \$500,000 before the Board votes on spending the money to move it to the new environment.
- Mr. Thakkar said that the discussion should center on spending the \$130,000 now. Mr. Kane felt that we need to find out who is using it. If no one is using it or if they can get the same information elsewhere, he said that it should be shut off right now.
- Ms. Buffkin said that it made sense to wrap it into the agreement with Xerox, but after conferring with Xerox, it can be addressed later as a separate amendment and it would not delay the overall release plan. Ms. Buffkin and Mr. Raymond are to work out the details. Mr. Thakkar agreed to provide a list of costs and benefits, a list of users, and research whether OBTS is required in the statutes.
- Ms. Bey-Coon wanted to know from Xerox if there is a benefit to keep OBTS for testing purposes. Ms. Buffkin said that it is being used in the production environment and that it is accessible for that purpose. Mr. David Wright said that there is no additional benefit.
- Ms. Walker asked to have the count of users not by the Web pages, but rather by queries. Mr. Thakkar said that the data count was by the number of queries. This is not a Web application, even though it is accessed by the Internet.
- It was noted by Judge Carroll that a number of stakeholders were involved in the extension of the Release Plan. He said that Xerox and Ms. Buffkin did a great job in putting this plan together. Ms. Buffkin also commended Mr. Thakkar and Mr. Raymond for their work. Judge Carroll also said that Mr. Thakkar, Ms. Walker, and John Russotto were doing a great job with bringing the Governance Committee up to date on changes to the plan.
- Judge Carroll asked if there was any more discussion on the contract changes, of which there was none. He requested a vote be taken on the contract modification to allow Ms. Buffkin and Mr. Raymond to move forward. Judge Carroll made a motion to approve the contract changes and Chief Mulhall seconded the motion. A vote was taken. The contract changes were approved unanimously.

IV. PowerPoint Presentation

- Mr. Thakkar reviewed the details of the agenda.
- Mr. Hayes gave a short review of the Security Policy, saying that they are currently working on the last chapter, Chapter 5, which is a long and difficult chapter. He said that he will present a draft of the Security Policy to the Governance Committee on August 22, 2014. This security policy is the CT Security Policy, for those agencies that use non-FBI data. Mr. Thakkar explained the difference between the two types of security policies and concluded that the final draft version will be presented to the Governing Board for their approval.
- Mr. Russotto gave an update on the Management Control Agreement (MCA) which was included

in the Governing Board packet, including its relationship to the FBI Security Policy. He explained that the CSO is in charge of making sure that FBI data is secure. He also explained that the MCA gives authority to the CSO (Mr. Hayes), but the FBI leaves some terms generalized. It would not give the CSO any more authority than it already has today with COLLECT. He explained that some of the agencies here today are not used to that since they don't use COLLECT on a regular basis. However, it is a necessary agreement that they need to have in place.

- Ms. Currey asked Mr. Russotto how confident he is in the agreement presented today. Mr. Russotto said that he believes that the FBI will work with them if there is a problem with the changes made to the MCA document. They will need to send a project description and topography report with the MCA. Mr. Hayes added that there will be some negotiations with the FBI on those documents.
- Ms. Currey asked if they are approving the MCA pending on FBI approval and Mr. Russotto said yes, but that if there are more changes later, we will vote on those changes at that time.
- Mr. Hayes said that the FBI is looking more closely at is the topology and the project description and not concentrating on the MCA. He does not think that they will have a problem with the MCA.
- Judge Carroll mentioned that he still has some concerns on the MCA language and that he still doesn't have a clear idea of what FBI data is. However, he said that the focus has shifted to a hardware focus, rather than a function focus.
- Mr. Verrengia asked if the vote now would mean that the MCA is accepted. Mr. Thakkar agreed.
- Ms. Bergeron asked if the working groups are in place for those documents and Mr. Russotto said yes and described the tasks of the working groups. Mr. Russotto noted that he pointed out to the FBI the lack of understanding on the term, "Management Approval."
- Mr. Raymond mentioned that the approval of the MCA to move forward is an accomplishment compared to past issues.
- After discussion ended, Mr. Raymond made a motion to vote on accepting the current MCA. Mr. Verrengia seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the MCA was approved.
- Mr. Thakkar said that he is working with Antoinette Webster and COGENT/3M to get technical specifications for a state ID number. He said that he would provide more information later on that.
- Mr. Thakkar mentioned the process of hiring a new durational project manager and he mentioned that the cutoff for submissions was today.
- Mr. Thakkar presented the CJIS hiring status of the nineteen positions. They are ranked in order of importance and need. Mr. Lawlor mentioned that most of the nineteen positions are held by contractors.
- Mr. Thakkar went over the Action Items briefly and then he reviewed the status of each recommendation as described in the Office of the Attorney General's Report. Mr. Thakkar described the vote that needs to be taken. He asked for the approval of the mitigations of the AG report.
- Ms. Cepelak emphasized having a cost benefit analysis and plain language is important information to provide to the Board.
- Mr. Kane brought up the question of what the Governing Board should be making decisions about and in what case should they be voting on issues. He said that there must be a better process for making the important decisions. Mr. Lawlor said that is the role of the Governance Committee to bring decisions to the Board and that they will flag the important issues. Mr. Kane said that it may be incumbent on the Governance Committee to ask for cost/benefit analysis. Ms. Bergeron said that most governing boards have bylaws to guide them, but this one does not. Ms. Cepelak said that

they should not get caught in the weeds. And, she said that we don't want to hamstring Mr. Thakkar either. She wanted to hear about any policy changes. She said that if there is a cost involved or it is a high level decision, the issues should be discussed at the CJIS Governance Committee Meetings.

- Mr. Thakkar mentioned that he is meeting with Xerox prior to the Governance Committee Meetings to address issues that need attention, which has encouraged positive weekly conversations.
- Judge Carroll said that we are stuck with what we have, though cumbersome, but that is what the statute dictates. It's up to the Connecticut Legislature to change that structure. He said that he felt confident that we have done all of AG Report recommendations, whether ongoing or completed.
- Mr. Raymond made a motion to approve the submission of Office of the Attorney General Report Mitigations and Ms. Cepelak seconded the motion. A vote was taken. The Governing Board approved the mitigations unanimously.
- The discussion then turned to the Agency Liaison Delegation forms. Mr. Raymond asked why it is required. Mr. Thakkar said that it formalizes the relationship. Judge Carroll said that he felt that the agencies may need to go back to their agencies to discuss the decisions. Mr. Thakkar mentioned that there will be delays on the decision making process and the vendor will be delayed if there are not designated liaisons. Ms. Bergeron asked for a definition of Business and Technical Liaison, which Mr. Thakkar provided. Mr. Kane said that there was no information about what the CISS staff would do in return, but only what the agency staff would do. Some were concerned that the delegates would be making decisions that only Board members should make. Ms. Antoinette Webster said that she thought the purpose of these agreements was to provide a point of contact between the agencies and the vendor. Ms. Cepelak felt that she didn't need a formal agreement, but some might. Mr. Kane said that the agreement seems to give the person that authority to make decisions that the Governing Board might make. A suggestion to change the wording to Point of Contact was made. The use of the forms were not approved.
- Mr. Thakkar then presented the budget. Mr. Raymond asked if we are where we should be at this time in the project and Mr. Thakkar said that they are.
- Dennis Gaige of MTG gave the Independent Verification & Validation Report. He mentioned that a Request for Proposal for a Health Check Services company is being circulated since MTG's contract has ended.
- Mr. Gaige said that the risk score has gone down two points for the second consecutive quarter and that most of the key points are at medium risk, which is about what you would expect for a project like CISS. Overall, he said that the project is moving in a positive direction. The Xerox contract being signed will kick off the next positive direction for the project. When two key issues, the need to hire a durational project manager and the state hiring of consultants, are resolved, the risks will decrease.

V. Other Business

- Mr. Lawlor announced that next Governing Board meeting is October 16, 2014. He also mentioned the biweekly Governance Committee Meetings.
- Mr. Lawlor gave kudos to Mr. Thakkar and the CJIS team for doing a great job on the Racial Profiling Project with Central Connecticut State University. He said that when the first report is released in two weeks, it will demonstrate the ease of access to online data. He added that in one month, everyone will be able to mine data.

VI. Adjournment

- There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:29 pm.