



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

CJIS Governing Board Meeting
October 26, 2017, 1:30 pm

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

CJIS Governing Board Members and Designees in attendance:

Patrick L. Carroll, III, *Judge, Co-Chair, Chief Court Administrator, Judicial*; Mike Lawlor, *Under Secretary, Co-Chair, Office of Policy and Management*; Kevin Kane, Esq., *Chief State's Attorney, Division of Criminal Justice*; Antoinette Webster, Esq., *Senior Administrator and Special Counsel, Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection (Designee)*; Christine Rapillo, Esq., *Chief Public Defender, Division of Public Defender Services*, Natasha Pierre, Esq., *Victim Advocate, Office of Victim Advocate*; Mark Raymond, CIO, *Department of Administrative Services/Bureau of Enterprise Systems and Technology (Designee)*; Michael Bzdyra, *Commissioner, Department of Motor Vehicles*, and Marc Montminy, *Chief, Connecticut Police Chiefs Association (Designee)*

Other attendees:

Brian Clonan (DESPP), Frank DiMatteo (DPDS), Chris Duryea (JUD), Evelyn Godbout (DCJ), Darryl Hayes (DESPP), Jason Rosa (DESPP), John Russotto (DCJ) and Theron A. "Terry" Schnure

CJIS staff and contractors:

Phil Conen (Conduent), Theresa Czepiel (CJIS), Christopher Lovell (CJIS), Mark Tezaris (CJIS), and David Wright (Conduent)

I. Welcome and Introduction

- Co-Chair, Mike Lawlor, brought the meeting to order at 1:45 PM with the introduction of Mr. Humayun Beg, the new CJIS Executive Director. Mr. Lawlor explained that Mr. Beg was the perfect candidate for this position having come from the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) where he worked with various branches of military service. The work Mr. Beg had done at the DOD is similar to the work being done here on the CISS project, in that the Governing Board is dealing with different criminal justice agencies each having its own unique culture. Finding the highest common denominator of these groups is the key to the success of the project.
- Co-Chair, Judge Patrick Carroll, took the opportunity to welcome Ms. Christine Rapillo, the State's new Chief Public Defender. Attorney Rapillo had already participated in Governance Committee meetings but was attending the Quarterly Board meeting for the first time.

- Executive Director Beg took the floor to thank the Board for entrusting him to carry out its work. He stated that his intent is to begin with ensuring that current projects are completed and that CISS is in a good position to be implemented successfully. His attention will be on the areas where CISS can be enhanced and where CJIS can work for the whole community. Director Beg continued with the next item on the agenda, which was the approval of the July Governing Board meeting minutes.

II. Approval of Minutes

- Judge Patrick called for a motion to approve the minutes provided there were no corrections, additions or deletions. Mr. Mark Raymond (DAS/BEST) called for the motion to approve, while Attorney Antoinette Webster (DESPP) seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously; none opposed.

III. CISS Project Update

Release Schedule

- Mr. Beg turned the CISS Project Update over to Mr. Chris Lovell, CJIS Sr. Project Manager. Mr. Lovell stated that there has been much movement in the project and many challenges that the CJIS and Conduent teams have overcome to begin delivering CISS. He opened the presentation with a discussion of the project schedule and Release 6, which is the first MultiVue release.

Search 6

- MultiVue is a component that brings all the data (people, places and things) together in one place and presents it to the user. This is where the power of CISS lies. Over the last three months, the quality of the MultiVue data has been an issue. Mr. Lovell cited an example of one of the problems, which is using “homeless” as an address. A search would bring together people who have nothing more in common than that at one time they were homeless; this is their only relationship to each other. In order to rectify this, Conduent built an exception database to gather this data together and disregard it. Several other data sets existed that had been improperly matching fields together. The Conduent team feels that this issue has been resolved.
- A second issue was identified with a State Police Bureau of Identification (SPBI) number, which was established to be a unique number given to a person who has been arrested. One number was found in different source systems that was duplicated under 600 different people. This, of course, would not work in the CISS system, but through the exception database built by Conduent, the teams have moved past this issue.
 - Mr. Lovell clarified to Mr. Lawlor that this was a case of 600 different people all having the same SPBI number, and that the information is drawn from systems that are 30 or 40 years old. The information, which might have been put into a database 20 or 30 years ago, might have been a training issue at that time, and it was never corrected. CISS is finding these existing issues, and in the later releases when data quality management is in place, the issues can be corrected making these databases function much more accurately.
 - Requirements for Search 6 were revisited with stakeholders to ensure accuracy going forward, since this information was gathered three or four years ago. The issues surrounding Search 6 have produced a four-month delay.

Search 10

- Mr. Lovell continued with an account of the progress being made on Search 10. In the Criminal Motor Vehicle System (CRMVS) there are over 10,000 changes to the database daily, making it necessary to adjust CISS to be robust enough to handle those changes. With Search 10, information will be coming in from the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV). Ten thousand changes can occur on a slow day for DMV. This will involve substantially more incrementals, making it very difficult to meet the scheduled rollout date. The new DMV computer system, Connecticut Integrated Vehicle Licensing System (CIVLS), data is significantly cleaner than before because a substantial amount of work has been done to bring it into a better space. However, CISS is bringing in Registrations and Driver History. Driver History is on the DMV's old mainframe system, which Commissioner Bzdyra confirmed. Therefore, data issues might be found there also. Commissioner Bzdyra added that substantial improvements have been made with registration data, but steps are needed and are continuing toward further improvements in the data system. Mr. Lovell closed the Release 10 discussion stating that there is risk with this release due to the sizeable amount of data involved, including data transactions at DMV windows and online.

Workflow 11

- Mr. Lovell announced that workflow is running smoothly and is on target with the schedule. In December, the Model Office, with the complete arrest process, will be presented to Chief State's Attorney, Kevin Kane and Deputy Chief State's Attorney, John Russotto from the Division of Criminal Justice (DCJ) as well as Mr. Larry D'Orsi from the Judicial Branch. The implementation of the workflow is an area, which will produce savings for the State.

Searches 9 and 5

- These two searches have been combined with a production date pushed to July 1 at the earliest. Since this proposed date has moved from February, CJIS is asking approval from the Board to accept this shift in schedule. In regard to a hard and fast date, Mr. Lovell reminded the Board that the date is only as good as the data that is brought in. The biggest risk is the DMV data because of the size of the data in the incrementals. If Conduent resolves the incremental issue, the project can meet that date. Hidden issues are always a possibility, however.
- Mr. Tezaris added that the team has gained a lot of experience and has gone through a learning curve handling the challenges of CRMVS within MultiVue. The same type of effort is necessary with DMV. There are improvements in hardware taking place, and CJIS will also be able to run multiple processes in parallel. All of these facets combined will improve performance.
- Mr. Lovell addressed Attorney Webster's query regarding costs associated with this proposed revision in the schedule. He responded that cost is being discussed in the financial portion of the presentation by Mr. Tezaris.

Summary

- Release 5 has been combined with Release 9 and is in development. Release 6 will be in systems testing through December 15, after which stakeholder users will be able to come in and look at the data in CISS. Release 11 is on schedule and will be leaving development on December 15.

Accomplishments

- Mr. Lovell emphasized that all project requirements and designs are complete. The team is now building, testing and deploying. He stated that to get through requirements and design was a

monumental effort by the whole CJIS community. He noted the work done by Mr. Darryl Hayes (DESPP) and Attorney Webster in supplying specific elements that were necessary to move forward. Thanks to all.

- Mr. Beg added that typically the design segment in most projects is the most difficult, especially when diverse agencies and stakeholders need to be brought together. Once that portion has been completed, the rest is building time, which goes much smoother. It is a major milestone to have reached this place.
- Mr. Lovell added that every agency across the State who handles criminal justice data is bringing their data into this system. In the course of this process, relationships have been developed and trust has been built across State agencies, which has never been done before. This is a huge accomplishment. The CJIS project team is grateful to those who contributed to the building of these relationships.
- Release 2.1 Records Management System (RMS) Constraint Easement is an add-on software package implemented onto the front end of the arrest package. To prevent data issues going forward, one of the goals of CISS is to make sure that the only time that anyone is entering data is when an officer makes an arrest and enters that information into the RMS system. This data must be accurate. This software package, referred to as the constraint validator, will interrogate the data to make sure it is correct, and if not, it will send a message back to the arresting police department.
- The Software AG upgrade to the latest version is taking place right now since the version currently in use is at end of life.
- The Gap Analysis has been discussed during earlier Governing Board meetings. The CJIS team has spoken to all the stakeholders and are at the end of this process. The Department of Correction (DOC) is the only agency that needs further attention since it is currently in the midst of a new system upgrade and will not be consuming data from CISS until approximately January 2018.
- Release 11, Workflow, Model Office will be in the building stage next week to be ready for a walk-thru for the first week of December with Attorneys Kane and Russotto and Mr. D'Orsi. The process will begin with the arrest and continue as the data makes it into the new case management system. The workflow will follow whatever data that continues into the Judicial system.
- Statute Table Distribution has been added on in order to replicate data from Judicial to distribute to RMS vendors, DESPP and DOC.
 - Attorney John Russotto commented that it appeared that the Statute Tables would be used in a broader way than usual; therefore, it might be wise to take a further look at it. The data, while not incorrect, is not as detailed as it could be to make it easier for police charging and prosecutors filing supplemental information. The issue is about sub-sections of statute and that level of detail.
 - Mr. Lovell responded that this involved Court Administration and would take a close working relationship to ensure replication accuracy for use in the DCJ Case Management System. Attorney Russotto added that it was not the intention to re-do something from scratch, but to do it only if it can be done easily or to otherwise leave it as something for later.

- Judge Carroll asked if charges were incurred when RMS vendors update statute tables to local police departments. Chief Montminy said that they did not typically charge.
- Mr. Lovell informed the group that today when a police officer is filling out the charge portion in an RMS, they are actually referring to the CISS statute table, which is the most up-to-date.
- Attorney Russotto stated that a common example brought up in a DCJ work session has to do with drug statutes and identifying specific types of drugs. Federal prosecutor partners use convictions to enhance penalties in the federal system, but cannot use some convictions quite readily when there is no stipulation regarding the specific drug. Attorney Russotto continued that it would be beneficial to establish the details of the type of drug and sale versus possession at the time of arrest so that these need not be handwritten in at a later time. Judge Carroll will follow up ensuring accuracy in records coming from the Courts.
- The contract with NexGen has been executed after a month and a half of discussions. This vendor represents the majority of the police departments in the State of Connecticut. Their progress with level 1, Early Arrest Notification, is excellent. Once they are on board, 70 percent of the police departments will be sending in Early Arrest Notifications. Thank you to Mr. Brian Clonan, (DESPP) for managing the contract negotiation and administration.

Risks

- State Budget Cuts – Stakeholder involvement with the CISS project is still very strong in light of stress from the budget cuts.
- CISS Demands on Stakeholders – From a testing perspective, demands on stakeholders will increase; however, with the Gap analysis complete and design documents signed, the project has made it over a major hurdle.
- Phase 1 funding will be discussed later in the presentation.
- Access to National Crime Information Center (NCIC) Wanted and DMV Photos – CJIS Project Management has been working with Mr. Darryl Hayes (DESPP), and they have found that some un-forecasted work is still necessary. A more fine-tuned audit tool is essential to show who is pulling NCIC data as well as DMV photos. The team will pull back an Internet Protocol (IP) address from a user’s machine, which is not currently in scope, but a design for a plausible solution is at hand. The risk is in the additional two or three weeks of development.
 - Mr. Lawlor’s understanding was that each query would supply audit information regarding the requester. A discussion ensued with Mr. Tezaris explaining that records of IP addresses are necessary for FBI security standards. The routers, however, will change the IP addresses coming out of COLLECT. A prototype is being designed with DESPP as a fix that will take the CISS autobot and combine it with a newly designed autobot. This will collect all the vital information on the requester including the IP address. Records of the IP addresses are always captured and available in COLLECT.

Mr. Raymond explained further that large organizations have an internal pool of IP addresses called a private space. When an email goes outside of the organization to the public, a router assigns a new IP address and the original is hidden as a security

mechanism. In addition, the number of IP addresses are limited since numbers are running out across the globe making this a resource issue.

IV. CT:CHIEF

- Two of the Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) have been signed; therefore, building has begun for those police departments. Plainville Police Department is approximately half-way through their data migration process and should be hosted by the State of Connecticut by the next Governing Board meeting in January.
- KT International, Inc. (KTI) has been replaced with Telepartner International as the developer for CT:CHIEF. CJIS Project Management is in discussions with this new hosting provider regarding certification for level 2, since there are five police departments using CT:CHIEF that are level 1 compliant.
- There remains only one incident report to this date.

CISS Phase 1 Workflow Rollout

- Release 11's development is expected to be completed by February 2018. The second piece is a partnership with the RMS vendors in testing for reliability in passing information through CISS out to Judicial and DCJ as well.
- The initial plan calls for all law enforcement agencies in a geographical area (GA) going live at one time. This has not changed.
- The "controlled" rollout refers to the process in which one law enforcement agency (LEA) in a GA goes live and then expands to the Courts and State's Attorneys. The expansion will happen to the other LEAs when it is certain that the process is functioning well.
- RMS vendors need to be level 1 and level 2 certified to take that next step. NexGen will most likely be the first vendor to become level 1 and 2 compliant.
- The GAs, where the rollouts will first occur, will be coordinated in the first quarter with Mr. D'Orsi. Judge Carroll acknowledged the stress on the shrinking work staff to do the paper checks and the electronic portion simultaneously. Adequate staff need to be on hand at that particular GA when the rollout occurs.

Project Summary

- Mr. Mark Tezaris opened the next portion of the presentation by welcoming Executive Director Beg, and thanking Mr. Raymond for his wisdom and leadership as Acting Executive Director.
- Mr. Tezaris addressed the project delays and discussed the dates moving forward. He explained that data issues exist due to the scale, complexity and depth of the project. The team has been treading new ground with technology to the point where the vendor that wrote the MultiVue software is changing the software to accommodate the project's needs to move forward with Release 10, DMV information and photos. The team is at the "bleeding edge" of this technology in many ways. This is an example of what is being encountered in the project that is creating delays. The CJIS team is working with Conduent to be creative in solutions by combining releases, updating the schedule on a regular basis, thinking outside of the box and being highly vigilant of details.

- Once the MultiVue issue has been successfully addressed, the speed of the project will increase. Although there will still be hurdles in updating Software AG and updating MultiVue, the team feels that the project will have reached the half-way point where the acceleration of deploying releases and onboarding users will escalate.

Records Management System (RMS)

- The NexGen contract has been signed, which represents 70 percent of the Early Arrest Information coming in to CISS. NexGen serves all of State Police and approximately 36 police departments, which is expected to grow.
- An agreement with Accucom has been established, which means they will be level 1 and 2 certified.
- An agreement with TriTech is formulating with help from Mr. Clonan and Mr. Beg's input.
- Telepartner International has already been discussed.
- The pie chart on slide 11 establishes that 90 percent of the arrest information will be captured through contracts with the aforementioned RMS vendors. This is important since this arrest information feeds the workflows. This accomplishment reduces the risk on the CISS project dramatically.

CISS Budget and Funding

- Funding for the project remains an important topic since the CISS bond fund draw was expected to occur around July or August. The cancellation of Bond Commission meetings has created a major delay. To compensate, finances are being stretched to keep the project moving. Mr. Tezaris will be reaching out to Mr. Clonan for help with IT capital funding for a hardware refresh.
- Two CJIS Project Managers who left for fulltime employment will be replaced with only one, being that the new CJIS Executive Director is in place. The cost of the four-month delay (approximately \$800,000) is associated with consultant labor. To mitigate this, releases are being combined, CJIS and Conduent are working together to resolve technical issues and labor capacity utilization is high.
- Tiger teams are comprised of qualified consultants brought into stakeholder agencies to accomplish CISS work. This process helps defray the impact on agency staff who already have fulltime job responsibilities and limited time to devote to CISS. DESPP, Judicial and BEST networking have tiger team members. While not inexpensive, the process is working well.
 - Mr. Lovell added that a consultant who had previously worked at Judicial was hired to work as the Judicial tiger team member to build an interface to ensure the quality of the data coming in to the application. The data will be interrogated by a Court clerk before it is entered into CRMVS. This interface is so successful that it will be presented to DCJ next month as a way for that agency to review data before it is entered into their case management system.
 - Mr. Tezaris stated that CISS brings the technical plumbing with the data to the stakeholder's door where it can be reviewed or printed, and where current workflows and information can be compared to see how it looks. This goes a long way later on in bringing information in to a case management system.
- Because Phase 2 has not been defined formally, there is no schedule and no budget allocation. The idea has been to use any moneys left over from Phase 1 for Phase 2, to integrate the remaining

RMS vendors, create a few information exchanges (IEs) for DESPP and DCJ, to provide some additional reports and bring in the 13,000 users. The CJIS team will help define the scope for Phase 2, vet it out with the stakeholders and put together a draft schedule and a draft budget. The process will then be carried out through the normal management approvals to move forward properly.

Financials

- Mr. Tezaris explained that the financial report presented is relevant up to September 30, 2017. The project has received \$50,972,000. The last draw was in 2016. Total expenses from the bond fund is \$45,023,092. Expected expenses are \$14,891,277. Total expenditures for the project to this point is \$59,914,368. The differential needs to be covered by the \$10 million remaining, approved bond fund request. In approximately June or July, \$1 million should remain.
- The details of the financial summary consists of \$4.7 million in expected costs up to June 2018. Conduent's remaining contract costs are \$5.5 million. The risk contingency is \$.5 million because of the unknowns in a high-risk project such as this. The RMS vendor budget was \$3,020,000, but was reduced down in negotiations by \$420,000. Hardware needs to be purchased for CISS to improve the capacity for the 13,000 users and all the arrest information, which will run approximately \$1.2 million. The SharePoint upgrade (\$375,000) needs to happen as soon as Phase 1 is complete. The total expected cost is \$14,891,277.
- Mr. Raymond introduced the conversation regarding project rollout costs. It was determined that Phase 2 costs would exceed the \$1 million that would remain. Mr. Beg interjected that discussions with the CJIS team have not only been about the next phase, which is the rollout, but expected enhancements or development that might be needed. Other areas will also be examined, like enhancing the infrastructure and needed upgrades. A discussion in detail is necessary to produce solid numbers, which is a priority for the Executive Director. He will be speaking with Mr. Lawlor and Judge Carroll regarding the quote and instituting the appropriation process.
- Inmate phone revenue dollars and the approval for four positions will help support CISS. Rollout costs include labor costs for consultants to complete RMS connectivity, to rollout, that is to train the 13,000 users and to help the integration of the information on the CJIS/agency side. For example, CJIS can help to integrate CISS into DCJ's new case management in a way that will be most useful to DCJ.
- Mr. Tezaris addressed the query from Attorney Webster regarding the additional \$800,000 dollars. He confirmed that it is included in one of the financial line items.
- Attorney Webster also asked for the burn rate per month for the four remaining months of Phase 1. Mr. Tezaris explained that there are inputs that would help establish that, including filling the four positions with qualified people. The request for proposal (RFP) will go out shortly to have companies submit detailed bids on the cost to support CISS. The burn rate has included the build, test and implementation. The general fund dollars will help support CISS on an operational side. Scope for Phase 2 needs to be defined with discussions taking place internally. Should the project go beyond the four months expected, there is a two-month cushion at \$500,000 per month. It is possible that as the project proceeds down to the last release, the number of staff needed will shift creating a different burn rate. After vetting out possibilities with the team, a presentation will be made to the Board.
 - Mr. Beg said that his guidance to the team is to look at any risks to the June date and mitigate as far ahead as possible because \$1 million is not enough of a cushion.

- Mr. Tezaris said that the project can go forward with a \$.5 million burn rate, or it can be done with a lot less and take longer. That flexibility is available, as well. Mr. Beg will guide this issue internally.

V. OBTS Discussion and Vote

- In the planned decommission of the Offender Based Tracking System two things are taking place. Judicial is rewriting CRMVS. Judicial wants to save the money from having to rewrite the feeds going into the OBTS system since CJIS is planning on turning off OBTS and replacing it with CISS anyway. They would like to shut off OBTS on December 31, 2017. CJIS will accommodate that date.
- Research by CJIS and Judicial has shown that there are 339 active OBTS users. Of these users, the preponderance of the systems that they are using is CRMVS, and the second is Centralized Infraction Bureau (CIB). CRMVS is in Release 3, while CIB is coming in January. CJIS is identifying the 339 users and setting them up for CISS training by December 31, so that they are trained while OBTS is still open. They will be able to look at their work in OBTS with the instructor and learn how to do their work within CISS. The savings for CJIS is \$27 thousand per month in maintenance.
- A request is being made of the Board today for a vote to shut down OBTS by December 31, 2017.
- Mr. Lawlor voiced a concern as to what would happen if the shutdown occurred but the users could not access CISS. Mr. Tezaris said that the request for the shutdown is contingent upon having the 339 users doing their work in CISS and/or existing source systems. The users could go directly to CRMVS and CIB to access that information so that they would still have the ability to do their work. The team will validate that users also have access to COLLECT since they are getting OBTS from a COLLECT terminal.
- Judge Carroll asked if the users have been identified since there might be easier ways to access data. He referred to the process that is used by the Office of the Victim Advocate (OVA) and the Division of Public Defenders Services (DPDS). Attorney Natasha Pierre said that she has not recently used OBTS but refers to the Judicial Branch website. Chief State's Attorney, Kevin Kane suggested that the Board be made aware of users in their agencies. Mr. Lawlor suggested sharing the list of users with agency heads so that confirmation can be made that users have alternate sources to accomplish their work tasks.
- Mr. Raymond made a motion that the vote to shutdown OBTS be contingent on current users having acceptable alternatives for their work. Judge Carroll accepted that motion and said that this issue will be revisited only if needed. Attorney Kane seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous. Attorney Kane iterated the need to alert the agency heads as soon as possible with the list of user information. Mr. Tezaris said that the information would be sent by email.

VI. CJIS Budget and Funding

User Rollout

- Referring to slide 17, Mr. Tezaris explained that there are approximately 182 users currently in CISS. These users are actively looking at the data and user interface while providing feedback, so that when the rollout continues to 1,000 and progressively to 3,000 and 5,000 users, the system has integrity, it is easy to use and the data quality is good.
- The plan is to tie 1,000 users to Release 10. Together, the current 182 users, with the 339 OBTS users, will compile the CISS pilot group that will be doing real work within the application. CJIS

will be listening to their feedback intently so that the data quality will be good when the 13,000 users are rolled out. The next 3,000 users are tied to Release 5 in June 2018, with 5,000 users in January and the rest in December 2019.

- Slide 18 indicates that Release 10's source system, when in place, will bring significant value to CISS. The data includes DMV Line of Business (LOB), DESPP's Master Name Index (MNI), Computerized Criminal History (CCH) and Weapons. The implementation of these will be the trigger to bring on the 13,000 users.
- The pool of users on slide 19 shows that there are 3,714 projected users from agencies and police departments, out of which 182 have full CISS connectivity end to end. This is the starting pool. An escalation to the Governance Committee has been requested through Chief Cetran and the CPCA for the purpose of getting router configuration completed for search and for workflow. CJIS is also working with the RMS vendors who have a role in this process, along with Mr. Darryl Hayes (DESPP) and Mr. Clonan to get the DESPP routers configured, as well. This is a big effort, but is necessary for everyone to have access to CISS. The demographics of the first 1,000 users will be a combination of CJIS agencies and sworn law enforcement (SLE) depending on who can connect and who needs it first.

Phase 2

- Mr. Tezaris stated that high-level scope includes the completion of the integration and certification of all RMS vendors that are remaining. There are RMS vendors with a cost benefit of spending \$300,000 to \$400,000 for a few police departments. This will have to be worked out.
- As arrest information from CISS is going to the agencies, the agencies have a choice to consume the data, which means that it would be electronically integrated into their systems, or to just view and print. CJIS will partner with the agencies to produce the system that works best for them.
- Training the remaining 13,000 users will be part of Phase 2 scope along with approximately 47 information exchanges (IEs) out of the envisioned 500 exchanges. Research showed that the 47 IEs represented 90 percent of the IEs needed. The remaining IEs can be satisfied with search and reports. There are two IEs lined up for Phase 2, one for DCJ and one for DESPP. CJIS has developed the technology internally and independent of Conduent to create information exchanges. One IE is in process now.
- When additional data elements are requested by agencies, that information will be brought in and vetted out with the community to be implemented in planned releases.
- CISS has applications that could cost up to \$1 million per year for maintenance and support. Replacing these with less costly ones is a viable solution. Reducing the cost of ownership is also being discussed with Mr. Beg, Mr. Raymond and Conduent.
- CISS has hardware that was purchased in 2012, which is coming to end of life. Maintenance and support can be as expensive as buying new hardware that comes with two years of maintenance; therefore, a hardware refresh is inevitable.
- A goal of the Governing Board is to implement the Center of Excellence and will be discussed by Mr. Beg later in the presentation.
- A support model for the CISS infrastructure needs to be constructed that is affordable and that will support the quality and the performance of the application.

VII. Stakeholder Legal Council

- Mr. Raymond stated the CJIS statute allows the Board to create ad hoc or standing sub-committees as required. One of the areas that has been looked at is having a dedicated legal counsel to work through project issues that come up over time. Some of these are not single-agency issues, but are more community-based around how things are reflected within the information system. An example of this would be the disclaimer language that users see when they sign into the system. This actually applies to everyone and not a single agency's policy. What has been discussed by the Governance Committee is that a working committee be formed that can handle legal issues as they come up on behalf of the entire CJIS community. What is being asked of the stakeholders or the Members of the Governing Board is for volunteers from each organization who can participate in that committee, and then for the Board itself to authorize the creation of a legal counsel to help guide the project. This is the specific request and the rationale behind it.
- Judge Carroll inquired about the prospect of an attorney general (AG) being assigned to CJIS. Mr. Raymond said that communication from the AG's office is that they prefer to weigh in on a specific issue and that they would like this group to develop their recommendations and seek specific AG involvement rather than having someone sit on a standing committee. They said that they would engage around a specific question but did not feel they had the resource to participate.
- Judge Carroll voiced his concern again to the extent that the Judicial Branch is a separate branch of government and cannot engage in what is essentially providing legal advice to Executive Branch agencies. In its limited context, and to the extent that they can do that, the Judicial Branch would certainly participate, but there may be some pull-back from Judicial's legal services unit.
- Mr. Lawlor said that OPM agrees to participate.
- Attorney Kane added that DCJ should also participate to the degree that they can.
- Attorney Webster interjected that part of this issue is having awareness, as well. As decisions are being made as the project rolls out, it is important for all the community agencies to be involved in the discussion so that awareness occurs.
- Attorney Natasha Pierre (OVA) agreed that awareness is critical and that OVA wants to participate, as well. Attorney Pierre said that it is possible to prevent matters from escalating into legal issues by raising the topic for group discussion beforehand.
- Mr. Raymond said that without having this committee, together we were able to look at and affect change in the budget implemented for the CJIS enabling legislation. So, the language actually affects how this group works. And, what are the protections that come along with that? Attorneys Russotto and Webster worked to craft that language to say that this is what we're doing as a Governing Board. How does that get reflected back in statute that represents not just a singular agency's view, but that of the committee at large? That is the reason why we see the need for a group. As we begin to work more heavily with implementation at the municipal level there may be other issues that come up as well.
- As a point of action, Mr. Raymond said that an official endorsement by the Governing Board is needed. A charter for the legal council needs to be created that outlines the purpose and expectations of the committee to the extent that Governing Board Members could identify someone from their agency who would participate. This information should go to Mr. Beg to help craft the charter. The specific ask today is that if Members have anyone to volunteer for this group that this information is given to Executive Director Beg.

VIII. Digital Evidence

Introduction

- Executive Director Beg stated that a large amount of evidence will and already has come into the State agencies. This topic relates to how video streams will be collected and stored. Consideration also has to be given to surveillance equipment and drones that are now gathering digital evidence.
- The State has approximately 1,300 State troopers, 7,000 sworn officers and this alone totals 8,500 potential body camera users. At some point in the future when these are in use, this will constitute a tremendous amount of data for an eight-hour video for each one of those troopers and officers. How the CJIS community goes forward with this data as evidence for the Judicial system, with FOIA requests and how to take out the pieces that need to be redacted, is a difficult issue that needs to be addressed. Digital evidence is being discussed here to bring to light the issues in that there is a vast amount of data with multiple technologies and standards that the CJIS community will be handling. There is also manpower required to review or to redact data, which is of public and media interest.
- Mr. Beg introduced the speakers that would offer insight to this topic. Mr. Clonan will speak about the progress on the State Police pilot. Chief Montminy will talk about how different police departments are using body cams, and Attorney Russotto will do a review of the digital media topic.
 - [Body Cams, Standards, Legislation and Statutes](#)
 - [Progress on State Police Pilot](#)
 - Mr. Clonan informed the group that legislation was put into effect in 2015, mandating that all sworn troopers in the State of Connecticut wear a body cam. Bond money was allocated totaling \$15 million for the State. Two million dollars was set aside for the State Police to use for the program. Thirteen million dollars was to be used for municipalities that met the policy and standards that were established by a coalition of State entities, including the State Police, Police Office Standards Training Council (POST), Division of Criminal Justice (DCJ) and the Connecticut Police Chiefs Association (CPCA). The major law enforcement agencies along with UCONN and some other colleges, as well, created that policy on how body cameras were to be used in Connecticut. Also developed were the minimum technical specifications. Issues had been seen in DCJ that had to do with the smaller law enforcement agencies buying cheaper cameras that could not be read without their specific software. This was partially the reason for creating the technical specifications as the standard. The effort was made in trying to make sure that the folks that were using bond money from the State and from OPM would limit their choice to the top tier of body cam vendors. This way the systems would be interoperable with other towns and other agencies so that everyone could read everyone else's data.
 - There are towns that are applying for money allocated for body cams. Up to this point law enforcement agencies have been developing data collection systems in silos with different Records Management Systems (RMS), different License Plate Reader (LPR) systems and different Dash Cams. Mr. Clonan said that he was working closely with Chief Montminy, head of technology for CPCA, to determine how to develop a plan to share data and not create more stand-alone systems. The effort was in trying to establish a baseline for State Police and Resident Troopers using body cam vendors. Panasonic, WatchGuard and other vendors were brought in, in an attempt to meet the legislation that is in place, but the vendors did not have an enterprise product ready to go.

- What is being discussed now is a system that has data that comes in wirelessly. When an officer or trooper drives up to a barracks or police department, it will automatically offload its metatag. The data can be searched. It goes into a database and is also easily searchable by someone else by sending a link instead of carrying around a Digital Versatile Disc (DVD). Substantial movement is taking place among the companies that are attempting to establish the enterprise view of data management. It is being referred to as a Unified Digital Evidence Management System. Every company has a different flavor of the concept. It is not just the storage of the video but the management of the video also. Digital evidence management includes ensuring the chain of custody, ensuring the original raw format, having the audit in place of persons performing redaction, persons viewing, persons handling, the sequence of movement of where it went and where it ended up. These facets of data management are now being built into software. Most vendors are also looking at tying in the integration of the dash cam, the body cam from the interrogation room and building surveillance video, because these are being asked for by the Court. The Court also needs everything all in one place.
- There are two possible solutions. The data can be put up in the Cloud, although it all has to be pulled down again to access it. The other option is to build a storage structure within house. Doing it statewide would entail handling a vast amount of data, referred to as petabytes, which is the next measure larger than terabytes. The question that remains is, should the State, whether it is State Police or CJIS, be in the business of managing this amount of data. The IT resource pool is changing. Is it easier to point to a location and store it? The State could manage the program, the redaction and how the case gets handled. Should the State be concerned with the underlying storage? The ask here is, given the challenges and responsibilities that CISS has on its plate right now, should managing this amount of data be on their plate moving forward?

- [Body Cam Implementation in Municipal Police Departments](#)
- [Issues, Hurdles, Lessons Learned](#)

- Chief Montminy agreed that the issue is not the body cams themselves because they are fairly inexpensive and readily available. It is the storage solution that is the real challenge. Both the technology and the law is immature on this issue, but this is the future. Body cams already exist. Soon there will be a mobile architecture called First Net, which will supply mobile data with significant throughput. An officer's body cam will capture a motor vehicle stop while dispatch will be watching the scenario from the station. This will be our future. The problems are still in working out the details, one of which is storage. Storage is possible in the Cloud and also locally.
- The problem is that in law enforcement everyone is addressing this issue separately, which is terribly wasteful. Manchester Police Department is setting up a petabyte storage server for body cams, along with East Hartford, Glastonbury and State Police, who will do the same. Everyone will have the architecture set up to handle the storage and everyone will be replicating what each other is doing. Storage is inexpensive for this. It is mass storage that can be expensive, especially for local police departments; therefore, everyone is doing something different.
- What vendors are offering is a turnkey system for a specific fee, which puts all the data in the Cloud at Amazon or elsewhere. This is the most expensive way to handle data. Discussions have been taking place with the State around what the potential is for standing up a State repository for this data. Understandably, there is a financial obligation

behind this, but it would be far less expensive than each town doing it separately or with Amazon or other Cloud storage solutions.

- Contact has been made with a not-for-profit company, regarding the potential to stand up a storage location here in the State that would take all comers. The infrastructure in the State can support data movement of this size. Mobile data is also on the brink of transmittal. What is needed is an inexpensive solution to store this data long term that will provide a back-end system that will support Judicial when they need to view a video of a motor vehicle stop or any other type of digital evidence. Recently discussions with Judicial had to do with the potential to store their important video long term. If the State had a centralized storage area that everyone agreed to use, Judicial would not have an issue since files could be tagged and stored forever. Judicial's issue occurs when someone appeals a homicide conviction 10 years later. That data has to be available. A Cloud solution is a good option, but being able to control our own destiny with the storage solution here in the State is a more comfortable scenario.
- Chief Montminy continued that another challenge exists in that the law has not caught up with this new technology. There is no protection for law enforcement or criminal justice agencies in the State of Connecticut from someone making a mass request of video footage. Almost every other state using body cams has had this issue. For example, Seattle received a request for all body cam video. The question is, how does one deliver that amount of data? Another example is State Police Troop H, who received a request for six months of trooper body cam video for the dayshift. This represents 1 gig to 1.5 gig of data per officer per day. With ten officers on a shift, this equals 70 gig of data, and by multiplying this by 24 weeks, it equals 1.68 terabytes of data.
- What other states have done is offer a free service to interested parties to come in and watch the video that they are requesting. But, if someone requests 1.68 terabytes of data, time is needed for someone to review and redact it. Mr. Lawlor questioned whether there is an obligation to hand out a copy of the video or just make it available to view. Chief Montminy said that his interpretation of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) is that the public has a right to have the video just as though it were a document. Therefore, redaction of children, victims, addresses, license plates, etc., must take place prior to handing it out. There are automatic redaction options, but that technology is in its infancy, as well. A standard frame of video, that is usually 30 frames per second, would be 3,600 frames per hour, making it 108,000 individual frames that need to be redacted.
- Individual vendors are developing automatic redaction tools, but none of them are 100 percent accurate. They identify a face and remove that face from every subsequent scene. This is not typical of how a police video goes. No one is standing directly in front of the camera. Typically, an officer is running down the street chasing a suspect or is engaged in some type of other law enforcement action. The opportunity for an automatic system to redact all the video in question is next to zero. Typically, it takes an hour and a half to five hours to redact one hour of video. How long would it take to redact 1.68 terabytes worth of video as in the Troop H situation?
- Chief Montminy asked Mr. Clonan how many State Troopers are dedicated to redact video? The answer is zero. The industry standard is one administrative person for every 100 cameras. The State Police with 1,100 troopers needs 11 administrative people, but they have zero. Every town is in the same situation. In other states, they can charge for this data. In Connecticut, FOIA law says the only charge that can be made is for

programming, if that needs to happen. If the data is small enough to fit on a DVD, a small fee for the disc could be charged. To produce 1.68 terabytes of data, charging for a hard drive would most likely be the option.

- A discussion ensued with Mr. Lawlor and Attorney Webster regarding delivery time of data requested. Mr. Lawlor said that he was not aware of a mandated timeline or number of staff needed to produce video evidence. Attorney Webster said that people have argued that DESPP does not have enough staff to meet the requirements for FOIA requests because of delays in delivering requested video. DESPP has received decisions from the FOIA Commission for the agency to increase resources for requests.
 - Chief Montminy said that two things need to be addressed, and they are the amount of data that can be requested and the fee that should be attached. Other states charge anywhere around \$100 to \$150 per hour for video production. Local law enforcement is concerned about these issues, along with the maturity of the technology; therefore, they are waiting before they jump into the process. Others have already jumped in. Chief Montminy said that he was unable to find any state where video capture has been enacted that mass request was not an issue. Seattle Police Department was not unusual. They eventually solved their issue by shutting down all police video, after which they decided to make low-resolution versions of every video and put in on YouTube daily.
- [Digital Media Evidence Review](#)
 - [Communication and Redaction](#)
- Attorney Russotto said that Mr. Clonan and Chief Montminy did a great job laying out the big picture, and that there are challenges for police, prosecutors and for the Judicial Branch regarding digital evidence. Every problem cannot be solved today, but the discussion regarding what the best vehicle is to address these issues can be introduced. Attorney Russotto reported that in the last two weeks alone he has gotten three phone calls from State's Attorneys who have said that their municipalities are going live with their body cams, one of which is New Haven. Luckily, all three towns are using the Taser product; therefore, Evidence.Com is the storage solution. A two-hour webinar was conducted to explain the technology involved with this product.
 - A vast majority of videos will have to be reviewed by prosecutors. This had been taking place in Tolland with the University of Connecticut police. The State's Attorney in Tolland was downloading videos to his office computer and crashed the system. DCJ is on the Judicial Branch's network, so he crashed Judge Carroll's network. It was quickly remedied, but it was an "aha" moment. The revelation was that working with this amount of data was going to lead to a lot of problems, so internal conversations began. Judge Carroll has already put together a group within Judicial that is analyzing issues that are going to come up for the Branch which, admittedly, are a real small sub-set of all this video that is going to come in through police departments. Included in this are the criminal trials in a given year, and the videos that come into evidence. This is a daunting amount of video, some of which has to be redacted to give to defense lawyers. There are constitutional discovery obligations that prosecutors have to comply with, so, DCJ is as concerned about redaction as much as the police are.
 - Aside from police video, there are video sources like the mom and pop shop surveillance systems that catch robberies on video. The challenge in viewing this type of video is that there are hundreds of systems with different players. The other issues are the habeas cases

that are 20 years old with 20-year-old technology. Will we have the technology to play this old video? This is a daunting task.

Next Steps

- Executive Director Beg closed out this information session on digital evidence in suggesting that the Center of Excellence be the vehicle where the issues and challenges be brought out for discussion. He continued by saying that industry experts and others will be brought in who can provide a broader view of the issues regarding digital media and provide some advice that is cost effective, efficient and meets the needs of the CJIS community.

IX. CISS Project Health Check

- Mr. Todd Priest introduced himself to new attendees and defined the project health check work as it stems from data collection from interviews and surveys with stakeholders, Conduent and the CJIS Project Management Office (PMO).
- Release 6, MultiVue issues caused frustration for those stakeholders not involved with the project at this moment. Those that were involved understood the issues, knew how big the problem was, could see the progress being made, had hope that all issues would be resolved and that the project would move forward.
- The workflow gap analysis, which has been discussed at prior Governing Board meetings, has identified gaps and has given a clearer view of the workflow process to those agencies involved.
- Agencies working on Releases 10 and 11, felt that there will not be a hold-up with these releases as there has been with Release 6.
- For those stakeholders who were not involved, not seeing progress in an operational support plan was another issue reported.
- Funding was a concern for all agencies regarding the continuation of Phase 2, bringing users on board and seeing funding for long-term operational support.
- Agencies feel that their resources are constrained, making it difficult to meet the timeline of the project. The PMO has been aware of this.
- Agencies that were less involved want a consistent two-week status report from the PMO including what the different agencies are working on, who the people are in those agencies that are doing the work and a transparent timeline.
- Stakeholders would like a clear change request status, including what team is working on the change and when it will be implemented. Agencies want to make sure that when a change request is introduced that it is prioritized and carried out to fruition.
- Slide 27 reflects the struggle that agencies feel in meeting project dates. Conduent, along with CJIS Project Management, is concerned about documenting change requests and implementing only those that are critical. Project Management is also concerned about project funding and having operational support in place.

Key Risks

- Although the new CJIS Executive Director is in place, Risk #4 is still being recorded to avoid the high PMO turnover as in the past.

- Risk #5 indicates that the more time it takes to put an operational plan in place, the less knowledge transfer time CJIS has with Conduent before they exit the project.
- Risk #7 highlighted RMS vendors signing on to the project. This risk has been dropped in light of the movement with NexGen, Accucom and the other vendors.
- Risk #8, which is to pursue only critical change requests prior to implementation, has already been discussed.
- Risk #11, which refers to the State budget, has also been discussed.

Looking Forward

- Mr. Priest ended the project health check portion of the meeting by informing attendees that surveys will be sent out to stakeholders in the first week of December and interviews will begin the week following.

VI. Other Business

- With no other business, Mr. Beg announced the next CJIS Governing Board meeting, which will take place on Thursday, January 25, 2018.

VII. Adjournment

- Judge Carroll asked for a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Bzdyra (DMV) made the motion and Mr. Raymond seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 3:40 PM.