



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

CJIS Governing Board Meeting
October 15, 2015, 3:30 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*; Judge Elliot N. Solomon, *Designee, Co-Chair, Judicial*; Brian Carlow, *Division of Public Defender Services*; James Cetran, *Chief, Connecticut Police Chiefs Association*; Cheryl Cepelak, *Designee, Department of Correction*; Kevin Kane, *Chief State's Attorney, Division of Criminal Justice*; Mark Raymond, *CIO, Department of Administrative Services, Bureau of Enterprise Systems and Technology*; Richard Sparaco, *Designee, Board of Pardons and Paroles*; Antoinette Webster, *Designee, Department of Emergency Services & Public Protection*; and George White, *Designee, Department of Motor Vehicles*.

Other attendees

Susan Brown (DPDS), Brian Clonan (DESPP), Chris Duryea (JUD), Evelyn Godbout (DCJ), Darryl Hayes (DESPP), Chief Mark Montminy (Manchester PD), Terry Schnure

CJIS staff and contractors

Phil Conen (Xerox), Theresa Czepiel (CJIS), Christopher Lovell (CJIS), Mark Morin (CJIS), Todd Priest (Qualis), (Xerox), Tanya Stauffer (Xerox), Mark Tezaris (CJIS), Elizabeth Ugolik (CHIS) and David Wright (Xerox).

I. Welcome

- Mr. Mike Lawlor, Governing Board Co-Chair, brought the meeting to order at 3:44 pm and announced that Judge Solomon would be standing in for Judge Carroll for the first part of the meeting.
- Mr. Lawlor introduced Theresa Czepiel as Patty Meglio's replacement at the CJIS office.

II. Minutes of Previous Meeting

- Mr. Lawlor suggested a review of the minutes from the July 16, 2015, Governing Board Meeting, after which a motion was presented to approve the minutes. Kevin Kane moved to approve and Cheryl Cepelak seconded the motion. The vote to approve was unanimous.

III. Introduction

- Mr. Lawlor provided a brief update on the second Governance MOU, (Item IV), which emerged to take advantage of the development of the data capability at DESPP in the Center for Excellence. Its Chief Information Technology Officer is Brian Clonan.
- Mr. Lawlor explained that two issues remain: (1.) The APO responsibility (by statute at OPM) was moved over to DESPP, by virtue of an MOU, which is going well. (2.) Attention to the

Governance Draft, though, which is a week or so away from sharing, is of utmost importance. An opportunity for everyone to review and make amendments to the draft will be available so that the autonomy of the Board to independently manage the project remains. An MOU should honor this commitment.

- Mr. Lawlor is the Governor's appointment to this board. Judge Carroll and Solomon by statute the Chief Court Administrator represents the branch. Karen Buffkin, Governor's Counsel, has taken the lead from Governor's position. Martin Libbin, Chief Court Administrator, is working on it from the Judicial branch, while Kevin Kane and Mark Raymond and others have had the opportunity to reach out to DESPP to weigh in. No decisions have been made in terms of a final approval. Everyone will have an opportunity to consider it and weigh in on it. There will be a meeting on the Board to take action on it and potentially amend it if deemed appropriate. Given that our next regular meeting isn't until January we could potentially do it by special meeting or conference call. The importance for everyone's input is to ensure that the authority of the Board isn't compromised in any way, and the autonomy and independence of the Board is being honored. This is a critical question for the progress of the project.
- Mr. Lawlor then introduced Mark Morin.

IV. Presentation

- Mr. Morin reported that agencies are providing one hundred percent support in time and effort, which is appreciated. He gave an overview of the agenda including the pilot for hosting CT: CHIEF, with a possible vote later in the meeting, and the Project Health Check.
- Mr. Morin explained there are six active projects with Release #7 starting shortly. He commented on the date changes resulting from Control Change #62, and how the huge effort in creating and combining new environments and code is building the new infrastructure. Effort in fine tuning the application at this level will be evident throughout the system.
- Mr. Morin explained that the *Percentage Done* column on slide #3 is representative of the Xerox's testing time, and approximately four to seven weeks will be added to that date for CJIS to do their testing.
- Mr. Phil Conen clarified Xerox's dates for going live when Mark Raymond questioned the projected completion dates, asking whether the dates are inclusive of all UAT testing activities.
- Mr. Morin explained that some of the dates are flipped. Because of the organizational release of #1 through #9, and because of extending Release #4, some of the releases will be delivered ahead of schedule.
- Mr. Morin explained that Release #4 shifts information from the paper world to an electronic world. The new electronic standards and practices will create an impact on the stakeholders' workload downstream. Additional questions may come as the design is put into process. Release #4 has been extended out to April 2017, from November 2016, but the change is worth the value to the courts to create the electronic process correctly the first time. He went on to say that even though the original release date plan shifted, the program is staying within the twenty-nine and a half month schedule, and with this, the workflow change affecting holiday deployment was well received.
- Mr. Morin explained the conditional discharge facet in Release #2, which releases pertinent information within an hour or so of arrest, saving time and work effort on the part of departments.
- Mr. Lawlor referred to the report released by the Child Advocate regarding the murder of the one year old child in Bristol, the guy was on probation, and the Waterbury police department

investigated. Everyone was not 100% plugged in everything that was going on at the time. References in the article were made that our system could have theoretically helped to avoid that tragedy by plugging in the address, the name of the individual and then it would have given everyone the pertinent information available that was needed.

- Mr. Morin explained that with Release #6, the real value will be become more evident, in officers not having to go through several main frames by having the information in one search engine. Release #9 in CISS Search is key for police officers in investigative situations and will shorten traffic violation stops and make domestic calls safer by bringing up weapons warnings and sex offender information immediately by direct access by officers and not through dispatch or other applications. Since security is a key component, CJIS will reach out to DESPP to see what statutes are involved that will impact Release #9 requirements and access to data.
- Mr. Morin continued with UAT testing and agency involvement which will validate the data. Recommendations will appear in upcoming releases. Only three departments are left for testing connectivity out of those twenty-one participating in Search Release #1.
- Mr. Morin clarified with Phil Conen that the dates for Training and Deployment would occur in November or early December. He said that once Xerox is ready, Hank Lindgren would start centralized training with a valid list of TAC officers. Training is set up from a CBT perspective online with the ability to be done in person also for POST accreditation. He explained that the project is going forward, and risks in the design area are undetermined, considering the project is the biggest change in the state from CISS' perspective for moving into an electronic system of data transference.
- Mr. Morin turned the meeting over to Mark Tezaris to address the expenditures.
- Mr. Tezaris noted the transfer of the CJIS administration from OPM to DESPP with both entities working on the procurement of invoices. Because of a backlog of invoices (slide #11), anticipated costs were recorded for this quarter, with concrete numbers to be supplied at the quarterly Governing Board meeting in January.
- Mr. Raymond asked for clarification regarding the amount of bills to be paid equaling \$3 million, siting that payment over the quarter resulted in approximately \$425,000 disbursements.
- Mr. Tezaris responded that the remaining invoices are in queue, and that Elizabeth Ugolik and our partners at DESPP are working on relieving the backlog.
- Mr. Tezaris explained that a meeting with Mark Raymond and Brian Clonan occurred to project out the budget for Phase 1 and Phase 2. The budget will reflect a monitoring of costs to produce a quality project; to do more with less.
- Mr. Raymond queried if Phase 1 is referring to Releases #1 through #9, and what would be included in Phase 2.
- Mr. Tezaris replied that Phase 1 does include Release #1 through #9. Mr. Tezaris then introduced the discussion of Phase 2 by recounting that the state hired MTG Management Consultants to put together the RFP several years back and to define the requirements for CISS. Phase 1 contains fourteen critical search sources with the workflow management design. The MTG document quantifies man-hours and rates of cost savings as \$15 million per year once Phase 1 is implemented.
- Mr. Tezaris continued that Phase 2 contains the requirements that were not critical to meet those benefits, but were really needed. A second review is being conducted currently to optimize value versus cost of the items contained therein. Phase 2 can be reduced significantly based on the critical

value of implementation only, or if the twenty state positions are to be filled, they can be done as scheduled releases.

- Mr. Raymond inquired as to what additional monetary value is connected to the Phase 2 requirements and, if there is \$15 million for Phase 1 in savings benefits, what is that figure for Phase 2 benefits. Was there a cost analysis done?
- Mr. Tezaris reported that Phase 2 looked as though it would be approximately \$24 million in costs, but that figure was being analyzed for reduction. He said that according to MTG's report, no benefit analysis was done for Phase 2 by MTG Management Consultants, but the methodology could be used to produce this same type of person-hours cost analysis to produce a savings figure. Mr. Tezaris agreed to take up Mr. Raymond's suggestion to revisit the benefit methodology with actual data to determine real value of Phase 2.
- Mr. Tezaris then introduced the Issues and Action Items pertinent to the last Governance Committee meeting. The issue of the eighteen CJIS State positions still presents a risk in continuity and forward progression. The issue is on hold until the Executive Director position has been filled.
- Mr. Raymond responded to Mike Lawlor's query about two positions that were recently filled, by saying that these are consulting positions.
- Mr. Tezaris reported a concern with high turnover of contracted staff, which is detrimental to the process especially when we have a string of turnover in a specific field like the .Net developers that impact our project critical path even though the positions are now filled. He agreed to Mr. Raymond's suggestion to report quarterly on this issue.
- Mr. Tezaris went on to explain the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Request Template that will be used for any request to CISS by FOIA and passed to the agency of record to fill the request. Mr. Tezaris suggested that there are conversations about new legislation proposals in the future and that the State Attorney General's Office may be asked for direction in the future should this process be challenged.
- Mr. Tezaris indicated that the next issue being worked on is the 3M interface to CISS from AFIS and then provide data elements to DESPP. Brian Clonan, Antoinette Webster, and Daryl Hayes are working on this.
- Mr. Tezaris explained that the Governance Committee is also working on the CT: CHIEF hosting by CJIS pilot. This will be discussed shortly in our meeting today.
- Mr. Tezaris announced that the Executive Director position was opened four weeks ago and extended out for two additional weeks.
- Ms. Antoinette Webster added that resumes were collected up to the most recent Monday and posting closed that day. We are currently reviewing the resumes, and will be coordinating interviews shortly.
- Mr. Tezaris went on to explain that Change Control #60 determines scope significance, which resulted in removal of information exchanges from Release #8 and its insertion of new information exchanges into Release #4, with approval from the Governance Committee.
- Mr. Tezaris reported that an issue with the Probable Cause Affidavit was brought out by Brian Carlow, in that the Incident Report needs to be produced at the same time that CISS receives it. Judge Caroll indicated that a meeting between occurred to resolve this, and progress was made, along with a proposal that worked for the Brian Carlow, the co-chairs and Kevin Kane.

- Mr. Tezaris turned over the meeting for the discussion on CT: CHIEF to Mark Morin.
- Mr. Morin thanked Kevin Kane for creating the summary document for the CT: CHIEF Pilot proposal. Discussions had been ongoing regarding a centralized Records Management System (RMS) database, and that with FBI approval to host data within the CJIS environment, the process can go forward. He explained that CT: CHIEF, owned by CRCOG, is an RMS system designed to be a centralized database, and that its value will accrue as more police departments sign on for use. A vote is needed to approve the CJIS pilot hosting of the database with the Wethersfield Police Department as the volunteer to be the pilot department. There is also an agreement in place with the New Britain Police Department to pilot should Wethersfield not be able to go forward with this pilot. Bi-weekly work sessions will be in place for evaluation of the process between Wethersfield, CRCOG and the State, to validate the infrastructure and involvement between the CJIS team and other agencies. The vote today asks for a potential one-year pilot, and that even though Wethersfield would have the opportunity to come back noting their satisfaction to the Board in six months, the Board will go forward beyond this to determine the pilot's viability for centralized, permanent use according to resources needed and cost structures.
- Mr. Raymond suggested that the primary benefit to CT: CHIEF Pilot hosting in the CJIS environment is that CJIS will not have to connect to multiple RMS systems but instead one. The secondary benefit is that they (Police Departments) are able to utilize the same network links and routers with CJIS. The centralization is reducing efforts for CJIS and DAS, and the pilot provides opportunity for reducing costs.
- Mr. Morin said that the FTP process demands that vendors update their own information. Centralization, however, will automatically update the information coming from Judicial daily. The process will benefit the courts also in that the refresh will provide for current documentation coming into the court system.
- Mr. Lawlor introduced the value of hosting the pilot over a year time span, in that it should address whether it is working for the customer, and what additional cost might there be to CJIS over time; Whether this cost will be chargeable and by how much; And, will departments be willing to pay that fee if it was a permanent feature. Assuming the presumable savings, would towns consider paying some or all of the costs?
- Mr. Raymond interjected that additional cost to CJIS might be offset by the gains that could be seen over a year's time span.
- Judge Carroll had considered whether doing this (hosting) goes beyond the statutory scope of the CJIS project, but in essence is a robust way of testing the system. Another concern had been whether the potential re-deployment of CJIS staff to this project will affect contractual deadlines to be met regarding the Xerox component. But confirmation with David Wright and Phil Conen dictates that this should not be the case.
- Mr. Morin added that there is no impact to resourcing, and that the environment would be ready tomorrow for the vendor to start loading. Page seven of the strategy document refers to the cost perspective. Consideration has been given to the fact that every police department needs main and backup storage, which has already been calculated. These costs are minimal compared to the cost being paid to an RMS vendor. CJIS is not responsible for the application and is acting only as a host. A one-time cost to come aboard must be paid by police departments for storage costs and support for a year. Therefore, ongoing monies should be coming in.
- Mr. Morin addressed Kevin Kane's statement that the purpose of the pilot is to verify this information, and to determine if there are any future unanticipated costs. He explained that proof

of the CJIS estimates should come quickly once Wethersfield is loaded. Should there be a problem with the application, the police departments will go to the vendor, and would only refer to CJIS if the environment crashes.

- Mr. Kane sited the difficult work being done to draft an MOU between Wethersfield and CRCOG and the Governing Board. He said that the MOU should be asking for the Governing Board to approve the Executive Director to enter into an MOU to create this pilot project. And, that draft MOU would be approved by the Governance Committee.
- Mr. Kane clarified that the motion is that the Governing Board authorizes the Executive Director to enter into an MOU with either the Wethersfield Police Department or the New Britain Police Department and CRCOG to establish this pilot program as described in the document and then approved by the Governing Board.
- Judge Carroll clarified that this is Kevin Kane's motion.
- Mr. Morin clarified that CJIS has been given the go-ahead by the Governance Committee to continue the technology perspective.
- Judge Carroll asked if everyone understood the MOU, after which Cheryl Cepelak seconded the motion.
- Mr. Lawlor clarified that at this moment the Executive Director would be Mark Raymond.
- Ms. Antoinette Webster, clarified by saying the actual MOU would be approved by the Governance Committee, not the Board.
- Judge Carroll called for a vote which was unanimously accepted. He continued by referencing the frustration or anger at the approach of the Governing Board and its scrutiny of this particular issue. He stated that it was important to note that we are all members of this Board in a public trust and I think we have an obligation to a careful look this after having drawn the attention of the state auditors once before. I think it was important to carefully approach this. The presentation was praised, and the information satisfied the needs of Judicial to have the project go forward.

V. Project Health Check

- Mr. Morin introduced Todd Priest from Qualis to deliver the Project Health Check.
- Mr. Priest explained that a slight change to Slide #19 reflects the reduction of the number of quarters on the chart for clarity purposes. Values for this quarter have not changed much. A slight dip in the numbers was reflected after the signing of the amendment as expected, and a further dip is predicted and driven by the timeline of addressing the key issues. Some slight progress with erasure was noted.
- Mr. Raymond reintroduced his need for clarity regarding the length of the bar in the graph on slide #19. He queried whether the bar represented the distribution of the input from the current survey and not from the previous year or previous six months. Mr. Raymond recounted the fact that someone had put in results around organization oversight vision and alignment that were very low.
- Mr. Priest verified that the values are averaged, and that the bar specifically represented only last quarter. He then reported that slide #20, the Project Group Scores by Report Quarter graph, reflects that agencies are highly engaged.
- Ms. Cepelak requested a re-visit to slide #19, and the representation of the bar. Her question was based on whether each bar is a continuum of responses for that area, making the range for Scope responses from 1. something to 3.76.

- Mr. Priest verified her understanding of the bar, stating that the bar represents both the range and the average.
- Mr. Raymond said that in comparison, a look at last year's Contract category shows that the average was much lower even though the value is much higher now.
- Mr. Kane added that the agencies who rated an area high might only be peripherally involved, and that agencies rating it low might be core agencies, and noting this as a critical distinction.
- Mr. Priest said that as agencies become more involved their ratings will reflect a more informed perspective. He said that cross-agency data is reflected in the Qualis report, but agreed that the degree to which agencies are involved, impacts the report.
- Mr. Priest continued that going forward the report will be broken up in project group areas: Agencies, Xerox, and PMO. Recommendations will be given in those specific areas. Overall there were very few changes in this quarter. Dips were reflective of delays in the parking lot coupled with the schedule and lining up resources.
- Mr. Priest, in addressing Key Risks (slide #22), reported that since the Qualis study has been released, work has been done on the issue of erasures, and an option has been accepted to move forward. Data sharing planned for Release #9 will be taking place in the next few months also showing progress since the release of the report. A new risk is that agencies are talking more now about the details, and how those details will affect them specifically. Their fear is that the system will not supply the agencies with data in a timely manner, and they will revert to their old processes or systems. This will have an impact on the project if stakeholders aren't totally engaged.
- Mr. Priest explained that the next quarter surveys will be out and that he and Craig Holt will be on site for interviews from November 17 through November 19.
- Mr. Morin reintroduced the dropping values on the report, citing the first Key Risk regarding stakeholder agencies not agreeing on major parking lot issues, like data sharing and security, stalling the project. Some of these issues like erasures have already been addressed. Down the road there may be some clarification needed in regard to design, but from a requirement perspective there is full agency agreement on how to go forward.
- Mr. Morin continued by addressing the release of documentation. His understanding is that during recent meetings, the issue of holding data back is close to being resolved, which Judge Carroll confirmed is in the hands of the State's Attorney.
- Mr. Morin said that some concerns regarding workflow are coming out from a prosecutor's perspective, and having people handle confidential documents. He also said that in regard to GA deployment, GA 15 is the first Court selected to going live with the CISS workflow process. Larry D'Orsi wants CJIS to shake that out for the first police departments that will go live with CT: CHIEF, which is Wethersfield and New Britain.
- Mr. Morin replied that GA 15 is New Britain in response to Judge Carroll's query. The process is, whatever department jumps on board, the court area will come on sixty to ninety days after. There will be added benefits but additional work for a while because departments will be asked to parallel their electronic system and keep paper to protect against a burp in the system. Until approval comes from Judicial, movement towards other GAs will not be taking place.
- Mr. Morin responded to Judge Carroll's query about an unresolved docket number issue by reporting that it's actually a design workflow issue. Docket numbers coming in from CRMVS stay within CISS. Agencies thought they were going to get the capability of having docket numbers

electronically sent to their systems. But, information exchanges were never put in that design flow. Going forward in design CJIS will be looking at agency access to docket numbers within CISS. Additional IEs may have to be created for the three agencies that want it in their system. The value will not show until the data is running through the system and being used.

- Mr. Morin stated that a strategy document was put together for GA deployment shared only with Larry D'Orsi. The timeline is meeting only the RMS vendors that have worked with CJIS within a reasonable financial request to certify CISS, and right now there are two.
- Judge Carroll expressed a concern regarding making Xerox wait while the Board is attempting to make pivotal decisions. This concern caused executive summary concerns to be circulated to key members of the Governance Committee regarding issues yet to be resolved. Judge Carroll's request was that CJIS provide a synopsis of key issues so that the Governance Committee could review them on their Action Log and address them at their bi-weekly meetings, which Mr. Morin agreed to.
- Mr. Morin then addressed the concern of the agencies regarding the CJIS move from PMO to DESPP. His research into this issue found issues of loss of control worth of the data, and federal security regarding who can see the data. The project is approved for FBI and not the criminal justice system. The data is protected by security. There is concern that in the move to DESPP there would be the loss of independence to meet the goals for the project. Todd (Priest) could not divulge the content of conversations on this matter; therefore, CJIS has not been privy to this information and cannot address concerns from specific agencies.
- Mr. Raymond then introduced the topic of the dates of the upcoming Governing Board meetings creating conflicts with JJPOC meetings, and asked if going forward there was anything that CJIS could adjust in their timing to avoid meeting conflict situations.
- Judge Carroll responded by apologizing for delaying the meeting and explaining that JJPOC sets the date for their meetings only two weeks prior. The Judge is a statutory member and the oversight committee is critically important to the Judicial branch. Judge Solomon has been and will continue to attend in his absence.
- Mr. Lawlor suggested that since a special meeting will probably be convened to approve the second MOU in the next few weeks, to hold this issue in abeyance and take up a change at the next meeting when there will be time for further discussion and resolution.
- Mr. Lawlor added that an MOU will probably exist for review within a week or so. He expressed the importance to provide plenty of time for the MOU to circulate before the meeting. After there is ample time for everyone's input, and depending on preference, a conference call or a regular meeting for approval can be scheduled.
- Mr. Morin asked if anyone would take on the responsibility to draft the MOU for CT: CHIEF.
- Mr. Raymond offered to manage the drafting of the MOU.

VI. Adjournment

- Judge Carroll asked for a motion to adjourn. The motion was moved to adjourn and seconded. There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:10 pm.