



2007

**Criminal and Juvenile Justice
Information Policy Group**

**Annual Report to the Governor,
Supreme Court and Legislature on
Criminal Justice Information
Integration**

(Version 1.0)

January 2008

2007 Annual Criminal Justice Information Integration Report
Table of Contents

I. Executive Summary.....	1
II. Legislative Recommendations.....	5
III. Activities of the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Policy Group and Task Force in 2007.....	7
IV. CriMNet Grant Program.....	14
V. 2007 MN Criminal Justice Integration Framework Initiatives...	15
VI. Ongoing MN Criminal Justice Integration Framework Support Activities.....	25
VII. Additional Legislative Reporting Requirements.....	29
VIII. Appendices.....	34

I. Executive Summary

Background:

The Challenge: Justice and public safety services in Minnesota are delivered by more than 1,100 agencies and branches of local, state and federal government. These agencies are often headed by elected officials and each agency may have different enabling authority and funding sources. Each agency's information system was developed to meet individual operational needs, sometimes without consideration of other criminal justice agency needs or the broader needs of the state. Justice and public safety services are composed of many decisions from the initial decision to investigate; to arrest; to detain; to release pre-trial; to charge, adjudicate or dispose a case; all the way to pronouncing sentence accompanied by an array of penalties and conditions. All of these decisions are based on information. Often that information is missing, incomplete, inaccurate or not available in a timely manner nor in a simple consolidated view for the particular decision point. Yet Minnesota state and local governmental units spent more than \$2.4 billion per year in 2004 on criminal justice operating costs (*source: legislative budget documents and state auditor reports*) to operate a justice system that is dependent on complete, accurate and timely information.

The Solution: To address this complicated problem, the legislature established a broad-based effort, including the range of criminal justice stakeholders and policymakers, to address the ongoing needs of information sharing. Through the creation of the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Policy Group and Task Force (Policy Group and Task Force) as provided in Minnesota Statutes 299C.65, the legislature provided the governance structure for this concentrated effort, and established the need for a strong policy foundation for integration efforts. In 2001, the legislature also created a central program office to coordinate and oversee criminal justice information integration in Minnesota, known as the CrIMNet Program Office (Program Office).

The Policy Group is comprised of four commissioners from the Executive Branch, four members of the Judicial Branch, and the chair and first vice-chair of the Task Force. The Policy Group is responsible for the successful completion of statewide criminal justice information integration – known as the “*Criminal Justice Information Integration Enterprise*” (Enterprise). The Task Force is currently made up of 35 individuals including criminal justice professionals, legislators, state agency representatives, local municipal representatives and citizen members. The Task Force was created to assist the Policy Group in making recommendations to the legislature regarding criminal justice information systems.

The Integration Enterprise: The original scope of the Enterprise was identified as follows:

Support the creation and maintenance of a criminal justice information framework that is accountable, credible, seamless, and responsive to the victim, the public, and the offender. ***As a result, the right information will be in the hands of the right people at the right time and in the right place.***

- By the *right information*, we mean that information will be accurate and complete and expressed in a standardized way, so that it is reliable and understandable.
 - By the *right people*, we mean that people with different roles in the criminal justice system will have access to the information based on their role in the system, and that access to certain private information is properly restricted.
 - By the *right time*, we mean that practitioners and the public are provided information when they need it.
 - By the *right place*, we mean wherever the information is needed – for example a squad car or a courtroom.
- The primary results sought are:
 - To accurately identify individuals;
 - To make sure that criminal justice records are complete, accurate, and readily available;
 - To ensure the availability of an individual’s current status in the criminal justice system;
 - To provide standards for data sharing and analysis;
 - To maintain the security of information; and
 - To accomplish our tasks in an efficient and effective manner.

The Enterprise has been made up of a number of projects and initiatives at the state and local level to improve integration. There has, however, been confusion about the activities of the Program Office versus all of the other Enterprise integration activities of the state agencies and the Judicial Branch, as well as activities of the local operational entities that are both the users and suppliers of criminal justice information. The strategic plan described below has helped to clarify these roles and activities.

Initial Integration Activities – Filling the Gaps

Early integration activities focused on filling huge gaps in statewide criminal and juvenile justice data. These gaps were found in statewide predatory offender data, electronic booking photos, electronic fingerprint records, statewide court data, pre-trial release, detention and probation data, serious juvenile and adult misdemeanor data, as well as domestic abuse orders for protection.

Systems to collect that information from agencies statewide are now in place, and are widely used by practitioners. However, this was accomplished by filling the gaps with new standalone systems. Connecting and integrating the information from these standalone systems present the new challenge for integration as we move forward.

Enterprise Integration, Phase II – Today and Going Forward

The future for enterprise integration in this decade is as follows:

- **Integrate the standalone systems** – Create the infrastructure to allow the systems to be visible to each other and to communicate with each other and with justice and public safety practitioners.

- **Consolidate the information** - Allow the justice and public safety practitioners to view records from a single event in a consolidated record. An individual in the criminal justice system has several interactions with different justice agencies, from law enforcement to prosecution and beyond. The goal is to allow access to view these records without having to resort to the time consuming effort of clicking through voluminous information from the various databases.
- **Link the information back to an individual (biometrically – to a fingerprint)** - Link records electronically and link more of them to fingerprints – the biological certainty that records belong to the same individual. This improves the justice process by eliminating both the problems of failing to identify a real offender and misidentifying someone as an offender who is not.
- **Deliver information based on role and event** - Tailor information delivered to the role of the user for example officer in a squad car, investigator at the office, judge in the courtroom at arraignment etc. This includes the type of device receiving the information such as a hand-held device, in-squad terminal, or office desktop computer. Criminal justice practitioners will have access to the specific information they need to do their particular job.

These initiatives will also be facilitated by security and other technologies that support accurate consolidated and customizable views based on the role of the practitioner and the lawful purpose for access. In addition, technologies are available today that will simplify delivery of these services beyond what was possible a few short years ago when integration efforts first began. As a result of this work the information will be delivered tailored to the **role** of the user, to the type of **event** and the type of device receiving the information.

Supporting activities include creation of system architecture, security, data practices and data quality policies, standards for integration, business process improvements, as well as local integration planning and implementation.

The Strategic “Framework” (Minnesota Criminal Justice Integration Framework and Blueprint) for Enterprise Integration Going Forward

In 2006, the Program Office, Task Force and Policy Group undertook an extensive prioritization process that has resulted in a “Framework”. This document identifies the long-term goals and strategies for integration.

This lengthy process engaged the Task Force and the stakeholder groups it represents in identifying key priorities and goals for enterprise integration. The Task Force conducted a survey of its constituent groups where criminal justice practitioners expressed their expectations. Those results were then considered by the Task Force members in deciding Task Force priorities, which were then reported to the Policy Group. These priorities are reflected in the Framework document.

The Framework shows where activities are dependent upon progress in other areas and identifies key ongoing activities that have become Program Office priorities. This Framework, along with

the detailed supporting plans for each initiative, represents in practice, the concept of the Blueprint for Integration. The Blueprint for Integration was identified by the early Strategic Plan and Scope Statement. However, this Framework is far more than a work plan – it also provides a high-level strategic vision for the Enterprise activities. The document provides specific business outcomes and proposed performance measures for each identified initiative.

In 2007, the Governor included core priorities from the Framework in the FY2008-2009 biennial budget recommendation to the legislature. The legislature approved some one-time funding for FY2008-2009 and an increase in base budget, beginning in FY2010, for the BCA to move forward on core priorities. In September 2007, the Policy Group and Task Force approved a FY2008-2009 biennial plan and revised the Framework based on the current, available funding (See Appendix A).

As each core priority in the FY2008-2009 work plan is started, project documentation will expand upon policies, definitions, standards and strategies. This documentation can be used by state and local agencies in their effort to participate in each initiative. Detailed project plans including business cases, scope statements, milestones and work breakdown structures will be added for each priority.

We are pleased to report on the progress to date and the plans for the core priorities and initiatives in the sections that follow.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the process to create the Framework represented a key turning point for Enterprise integration. The Policy Group, Task Force and the Program Office have all identified the same key goals and voiced their commitment to assuring the success of these initiatives in the coming years. The legislature has supported this vision for integration following the successful completion of the early CriMNet vision. This kind of cooperation and collaboration is an important milestone for Minnesota, as is the effort to view criminal justice information integration from an enterprise perspective. This sets the stage for phase two of the integration effort, where information will be consolidated, linked, and delivered to the practitioner in a format that reflects his or her work responsibility. All of this will be accomplished with appropriate security and data policy. This is a significant challenge, but also a significant opportunity and one based upon broad consensus and clear priorities that builds on the successes of the past.

II. Legislative Recommendations

Pursuant to Minnesota Statutes 299C.65, Subdivision 2, the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Policy Group (Policy Group) must provide a report to the Legislature on January 15 each year detailing the statutory changes and/or appropriations necessary to ensure the efficient and effective operation of criminal justice information systems. This same statute requires the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Task Force (Task Force) to assist the Policy Group in developing recommendations.

The Task Force adopted three legislative initiatives and forwarded them as recommendations to the Policy Group in November 2007. The Policy Group adopted the following legislative recommendations in December 2007 for the Legislature's consideration during the 2007 legislative session.

1. Required Fingerprinting (Minnesota Statutes 299C.10, Subd. 1).

Currently, law enforcement and community corrections' agencies operating secure detention facilities are responsible for taking fingerprints. However, when fingerprints are not taken (for various reasons), there is no back-stop for making sure fingerprints have been taken. The lack of fingerprints contributes to the number of records in "suspense" in the criminal history system (those records in which fingerprints are not linked to a court disposition and therefore not linked to an individual's criminal history). The accuracy of criminal history records is the ultimate goal of this initiative.

This language would tighten current fingerprinting requirements by requiring that fingerprints shall be taken for any adults or juveniles admitted to jails or detention facilities. The language would also require fingerprints to be obtained no later than 1) release from booking; or 2) prior to acceptance of a plea of guilty or not guilty. If fingerprints have not been successfully received by the Bureau of Criminal Apprehension (BCA), this language would allow an individual, upon order of the court, to be taken into custody for no more than eight hours to be fingerprinted.

2. Electronic Charging Service (eCharging) Data Classification (Adding a new section to Minnesota Statutes 299C).

Currently, there is no centralized process available to allow law enforcement and prosecution to electronically prepare and transmit charging documents with the courts. The eCharging Service is being developed to provide this electronic transmission of data and documents; it will not be an actual data repository but will serve as the infrastructure for this workflow. As the eCharging Service was designed and the data privacy impact was assessed, it was determined that there are gaps in the Data Practices Act for certain types of data in an electronic workflow environment.

This language would define and classify "credentialing" data (biometric and login) as private and "workflow" or "auditing" data as confidential. This language also authorizes sharing of data for specified purposes and allows the BCA to refer data requests back to the originating agency.

3. Additional Per Diem for Public Task Force Members (Minnesota Statutes 299C.65, Subd. 2).

In 2006, language passed that allowed the four public members on the Task Force to be compensated for the monthly meetings of the Task Force pursuant to Minnesota Statutes 15.059. This language would delete the reference to the monthly Task Force meetings which would allow the four public members to be compensated for other meetings of the Task Force such as delivery team meetings (subcommittees or working groups). The statutory change would be accompanied by a change in the Task Force by-laws which would cap the number of meetings members could request compensation for in any calendar year.

III. Activities of the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Policy Group and Task Force in 2007

Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Policy Group:

The Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Policy Group (Policy Group) was created by Minnesota Statutes 299C.65 and consists of the following ten members: commissioner of public safety, commissioner of corrections, commissioner of finance, state chief information officer, four members of the Judicial Branch appointed by the chief justice of the Minnesota Supreme Court, and the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Task Force (Task Force) chair and first vice-chair. This body has the authority to appoint additional non-voting members. The Policy Group is chaired by the commissioner of public safety and meets quarterly and other times as needed.

The Policy Group exists to provide leadership for the overall strategic and policy direction of the Criminal Justice Information Integration Enterprise. The Policy Group is responsible for establishing priorities and high-level performance measures for the Enterprise, approving and monitoring the CriMNet Program Office budget (and other state agencies/courts as they relate to the Enterprise), addressing high-level policy issues, determining Enterprise-wide strategies (including the distribution of grant funds), advocating for Enterprise initiatives, and appointing an executive director for the CriMNet Program Office.

The Policy Group is also charged with studying and making recommendations to the governor, Supreme Court and the Legislature on issues related to criminal justice information integration.

2007 Policy Group in Review

Background Check and Expungement/Sealing Policy

As part of the Policy Group's statutory responsibility related to information policy, the group has spent a significant amount of time on the issue of background check and expungement/sealing policy in Minnesota. In December 2006, the Task Force forwarded the *Report of the Background Checks and Expungements Delivery Team – November 2006*, without recommendation, to the Policy Group for its consideration. The Policy Group has spent a significant amount of time over the past year reviewing, analyzing and debating the recommendations of the delivery team – these policy issues have been the primary focus of the Policy Group in 2007.

In January 2007, the Policy Group adopted a motion to forward the delivery team report to the legislature for the 2007 legislative session without recommendation. This was due to the time constraints and complexity of the issues. As part of that motion, the Policy Group also committed to continue to study the policy implications of the delivery team's recommendations and to make its own recommendations.

The Policy Group created two subcommittees to develop some overarching principles related to background checks and expungements/sealings for the full Policy Group to consider. The Policy Group met in May and June 2007 and reviewed the principles brought forth by the subcommittees. As a result, the Policy Group adopted high-level recommendations related to expungement/sealing and background check policy in May and June 2007 (See Appendix B for detail on the recommendations). The Policy Group directed the Program Office to work with subject matter experts to analyze the fiscal and implementation considerations of these recommendations and report back to the Policy Group by November 2007. The Policy Group also noted the importance of public input on the adopted recommendations and solicited written public comment from July – September 2007.

In November and December 2007, the Policy Group discussed the analysis of the business and fiscal implications that result from the recommendations. The Policy Group noted that these two issues fit into the overall integration vision for the criminal justice information system in Minnesota and the integration priorities that have already been established (e.g. increased data linked to a biometric identifier such as a fingerprint). To fully implement both the background check and expungement/sealing recommendations, a substantial financial investment is needed. The Policy Group suggested that one possibility might be to phase the implementation of some of the recommendations, in which case, the financial investment could be made over a longer period of time. Finally, the Policy Group noted that some of the implementation options fit within the scope of current or future integration projects sponsored by the Policy Group.

In summary, the Policy Group continues to support the policy recommendations adopted in mid-2007. However, recognizing the current budget situation and other competing initiatives, the Policy Group chose not to recommend any specific implementation options but rather to forward the analysis and options to the Legislature for its consideration (*this report will be sent to the Legislature and available online at www.crimnet.state.mn.us by February 1, 2008*). Should the Legislature decide to act on these issues, the Policy Group encourages the Legislature to consider the recommendations as the foundation for any proposal and to bear in mind the fiscal impact to state and local agencies and the overall integration goals of the Policy Group.

The Policy Group also discussed the related issue of private entities receiving mass extracts of public data from state agencies (sometimes referred to as data harvesting or data mining) and the implications and unintended consequences of this issue on individuals and the criminal justice system. The delivery team noted in its report that this issue needs further study as the team did not have sufficient time to address this topic within the scope of its study. The Policy Group directed the Task Force to study this issue as they see fit and the Program Office to provide staff to assist with this study as staff is available. The expectation is that the Task Force and Program Office will begin work on the issue of data harvesting sometime after January 1, 2008.

Enterprise Framework and FY2008-2009 Biennial Budget

In March and September 2007, the Policy Group reviewed the core integration priorities and the status of key integration projects such as the Name Event Index Service, the Comprehensive Incident-Based Reporting System, and the E-Charging Service. At the September meeting, the Policy Group approved the revised Framework based on the additional one-time funding for

FY2008-2009 appropriated by the legislature for the core integration priorities of the Enterprise. The Policy Group also approved a correlating budget plan for FY2008-2009.

Alternative Funding Sources for Integration Costs

As part of the 2007 Omnibus Public Safety Finance Law, the Minnesota Legislature directed the Policy Group to study funding sources other than the general fund for new integration costs. The Policy Group recommended that the Task Force form a delivery team to consider possible funding sources. The delivery team submitted some “guiding principles” and a menu of options of possible funding sources for the Policy Group’s consideration.

The Policy Group met in December 2007 and reviewed the delivery team’s report. The Policy Group supports the guiding principles recommended by the delivery team and agrees that if protection of the citizenry is a core function of government, the Legislature should continue to fund statewide criminal justice integration efforts with state general funds. The Policy Group does not support any of the alternative funding sources considered by the delivery team at this time. There was consensus among Policy Group members that none of the options presented are a viable alternative or supplement to state general funds. The options have unintended consequences, divert general funding from other sources, or are not sustainable or feasible options. The Policy Group does support the state continuing to seek federal grant funds for criminal justice information integration which has been a successful supplement to state funds in the past (See Appendix C for the Policy Group’s report).

New Executive Director

The Policy Group began the search for a new executive director in October 2007 after the current director, Dale Good, announced his retirement. After a comprehensive interview process, involving both Task Force and Policy Group members, the Policy Group selected Dave Johnson to serve as the next executive director. Mr. Johnson will officially assume this position in January 2008.

Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Task Force:

The Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Task Force (Task Force) is authorized under Minnesota Statutes 299C.65 and consists of the following 35 members:

- two members appointed by the Minnesota Sheriffs Association, at least one of whom must be a sheriff;
- two members appointed by the Minnesota Chiefs of Police Association, at least one of whom must be a chief of police;
- two members appointed by the Minnesota County Attorneys Association, at least one of whom must be a county attorney;
- two members appointed by the Minnesota League of Cities representing the interests of city attorneys, at least one of whom must be a city attorney;
- two members appointed by the Board of Public Defense, at least one of whom must be a public defender;
- two district judges appointed by the Judicial Council, at least one of whom has experience dealing with juvenile court matters;
- two corrections administrators appointed by the Minnesota Association of Counties, representing the interests of local corrections, at least one of whom represents a community corrections act county;
- two probation officers appointed by the commissioner of corrections in consultation with the president of the Minnesota Association of Community Corrections Act Counties and the president of the Minnesota Association of County Probation Officers;
- four public members appointed by the governor for a term of six years, one of whom represents the interests of victims, and two of whom are representatives of the private business community who have expertise in integrated information systems and who for the purpose of meetings of the full task force may be compensated pursuant to section 15.059;
- two members appointed by the Minnesota Association for Court Management, at least one of whom must be a court administrator;
- one member of the house of representatives appointed by the speaker of the house, or an alternate who is also a member of the house, appointed by the speaker of the house;
- one member of the senate appointed by the majority leader, or an alternate who is also a member of the senate, appointed by the majority leader of the senate;
- one member appointed by the attorney general;
- two elected officials appointed by the Minnesota League of Cities, one of whom works or resides in greater Minnesota and one of whom works or resides in the seven-county metropolitan area;
- two elected officials appointed by the Minnesota Association of Counties, one of whom works or resides in greater Minnesota and one of whom works or resides in the seven-county metropolitan area;
- the director of the Sentencing Guidelines Commission or a designee;
- one member appointed by the state chief information officer;
- one member appointed by the commissioner of public safety;
- one member appointed by the commissioner of corrections;
- one member appointed by the commissioner of administration; and
- one member appointed by the chief justice of the Supreme Court.

Per Minnesota Statutes 299C.65, the Task Force is appointed by the Policy Group to assist the Policy Group in their duties. The statute also directs the Task Force to monitor, review and report to the Policy Group on CriMNet-related projects, in addition to providing oversight of ongoing operations, as directed by the Policy Group. The Task Force is also charged with assisting the Policy Group in writing an annual report to the governor, Supreme Court, and legislature by January 15 each year. The Task Force also has a role in reviewing funding requests for criminal justice information system grants and making recommendations to the Policy Group.

2007 Task Force in Review

Reaffirmation of Priorities

A key responsibility of the Task Force is to advise the CriMNet executive director and the Policy Group on Enterprise activities and business priorities. During 2006, the Task Force discussed a number of business priorities and identified six top priorities. These top priorities were presented to the Policy Group in July of 2006 for their use in preparing for the 2007 budget session. Following the 2007 legislative session, the Task Force reviewed these priorities and reaffirmed the top six listed below.

1. The ability to view all records from a single event in a consolidated record – being able to see when one individual has several interactions with different criminal justice agencies without having to click through a list of records to determine that information.
2. The ability to customize information received when querying state systems to view only information you need and to view that information from your own records management system rather than a special application.
3. Creating technical standards for electronic exchanges of information so that agencies building new systems or replacing systems know how to configure the technology and work with vendors to meet long-term needs.
4. The ability to access all BCA systems with one username and password.
5. Greater availability of local grants to connect to statewide systems or update local systems.
6. Working with local agencies to change business practices to increase data accuracy in all statewide systems.

Delivery Teams

As the Policy Group and Task Force discussed the role of the Task Force in 2006, both groups agreed that the work of delivery teams was a major strength and asset of the Task Force. The by-laws state that the Task Force Executive Board solicits participation and appoints members of delivery teams to ensure appropriate representation, the Task Force approves the creation of delivery teams, the Task Force maintains ultimate authority over delivery teams, and participation by non-members is encouraged but that a Task Force member must serve as the chair. The Task Force utilized the efforts of many Task Force members and other stakeholders for delivery teams and committees in 2007 including the following:

- **Background Check/Expungement Delivery Team.** This team presented recommendations in a report to the Task Force in December 2006. The Task Force forwarded the report to the Policy Group, which has continued to consider the recommendations and is now working on legislative recommendations.
- **By-Laws Delivery Team.** In August of 2006, the Task Force by-laws were amended. Also at that time, a request was made to put a formal process for making amendments into the by-laws. The by-laws delivery team presented language for that process in March of 2007 which was approved by the Task Force.
- **Legislative Delivery Team** (see legislative recommendations section)
- **Fingerprint/Suspense Delivery Team.** This delivery team presented recommendations in a report to the Task Force. Many of these recommendations correlated to issues submitted to the Task Force by the Minnesota Sheriff's Association in July 2007. These concerns related to processing problems, lack of prints, and linking of data. No specific resolution to these concerns occurred this year; however, the Sheriff's Association has requested that the issue be put back on the agenda once specific outcomes and timelines are established on the work of the delivery team. The delivery team recommendations were amended during the May and June 2007 meetings of the Task Force and then passed on to the Policy Group for consideration.
- **Legal Advisory Board.** This group works to promote and educate practitioners about the Minnesota Criminal Justice Statute Service. The group also recommends best practices and standards regarding criminal statutes and consistent formatting for charging documents, including citations and complaints.
- **Minnesota Offense Codes (MOC) Committee.** This committee provides input and requirements to the CriMNet Program Office as it evaluates the future use of MOC codes or a replacement solution. The initial findings and recommendations of this group were presented to the Task Force during the March 2007 meeting and the work of the group continues.
- **Court Disposition Summary Delivery Team.** The delivery team finalized its requirements proposal to provide a more efficient and consolidated way to retrieve disposition information from bail and sentencing documents. Given the limited Program Office resources available for this project, the CSTS (Court Services Tracking System) User Group took over project implementation. The court information summary reporter tool was implemented in July 2007.
- **Warrants Business Process Improvements Project.** In April 2007, the Task Force received the report of the team established to evaluate the existing arrest warrant practices. The team provided various recommendations for streamlining these procedures. The Task Force voted to accept the recommendations and establish a delivery team that would further study the recommendations. That group is currently meeting to examine the report's recommendations and determine which process-oriented recommendations can be implemented in the short-term without allocated funding.
- **Alternative Funding Sources.** As part of the 2007 Omnibus Public Safety Finance Law, the Minnesota Legislature directed the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Policy Group (Policy Group) to study funding sources other than the general fund for new CriMNet costs. The Policy Group recommended that the Task Force form a delivery team to consider possible funding sources. This team will be reporting back to the Task

Force before the start of 2008 and information on their findings is included in this report (See Appendix C).

Program Activities Updates

The CriMNet Program Office has the responsibility, per the Policy Group, to provide regular reporting on the activities of the Program Office to the Task Force. The Task Force typically reviews monthly, written project status and financial reports and has the opportunity to ask questions and offer comments. The Task Force also regularly hears presentations/updates on Program Office projects and provides input on those projects. A number of projects were discussed by the Task Force in 2007, with major items including: the Suspense project; Integrated Search Services; the Comprehensive Incident-Based Reporting System (CIBRS); the Name and Event Index Service (NEIS); the Warrants Business Process Improvements project; the Statute Service; and the Electronic Charging Service (eCharging).

Outreach Work

The Task Force also devoted time in 2007 to better communication efforts with the public, legislature, and member organizations.

- **Communication Plan.** During 2007, the Task Force worked with the Department of Public Safety's public information officer to develop a plan for Task Force members and CriMNet Program staff to utilize when communicating with the public on criminal justice integration efforts. The plan provides general information on key topics that are frequently asked about by members of the public.
- **National SEARCH Conference.** The executive director of the CriMNet Program Office and the chair of the Task Force spoke about Minnesota's integration efforts at the *Innovations in Justice: Information Sharing Strategies and Best Practices* SEARCH conference held in Minneapolis in March 2007.
- **Legislative Testimony.** The Task Force chair and co-chair were present at the legislature to provide testimony on multiple topics during the 2007 session. Topics included the recommendations on background checks and expungements, the budget priorities of criminal justice integration projects, as well as the Task Force priorities set during 2006.
- **Fall Conference.** The Task Force held its bi-annual conference in September 2007. The focus of the conference was 'back to basics' and leaders of the organizations represented by Task Force members were invited to join the discussion and learn more about integration efforts.

IV. CriMNet Grant Program

Since 2002, the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Policy Group (Policy Group) has awarded approximately \$7 million in grant funds to local jurisdictions for integration planning and implementation projects. The majority of those funds were awarded to the five largest counties (Hennepin, Ramsey, Dakota, Anoka, and St. Louis) for their local integration efforts. In 2006, the Policy Group adopted an alternative strategy – targeting specific statewide purposes – for distributing the grant funds currently available to Minnesota. As the first test of the new strategy, the Policy Group, in consultation with the Task Force and the Program Office, agreed to dedicate approximately \$1 million in federal Congressional Earmark funds to connect local agencies to the Comprehensive Incident-Based Reporting System (CIBRS) and to implement a single standard for the exchange of information. This single standard will apply not only to CIBRS but to the Name Event Index Service and the E-Charging Service as well.

In 2006, it was also agreed by the Policy Group that the best way to accomplish the goal of connecting locals to CIBRS was to allow the Program Office to contract directly with vendors of local agencies, thus changing the process from a grant process to a contract process and eliminating the need for a local match requirement. This approach ensures that the development costs are only paid for once and all Minnesota users of that vendor's application will benefit from the one-time development costs.

The Request for Proposals (RFP) was published by the Program Office in April 2007. Nine vendors responded to the RFP. Between August and November 2007, the Program Office negotiated with the vendors and all nine vendors who applied were awarded contracts. Currently, the vendors are working on the development of the adaptors. As this work is completed, vendors will work with BCA staff to test the interface. After each vendor is successful in the test environment, each local agency will test the interface separately to ensure that any individual challenges are addressed.

By the end of 2008, it is anticipated that nearly 200 law enforcement agencies, across the nine vendors, will be submitting data to CIBRS.

V. 2007 MN Criminal Justice Integration Framework Initiatives

The following is a summary of the active initiatives/projects (those currently funded) included in the MN Criminal Justice Integration Framework (Framework). These projects are all Enterprise initiatives and are under the oversight of the Policy Group. The next section of the report provides a summary of the ongoing support activities included in the Framework. Most of the projects are managed and funded through the BCA's CriMNet Program Office (Program Office) and Criminal Justice Information Systems (CJIS) divisions. The exceptions are the Minnesota Court Information System (MNCIS) and Statewide Supervision System projects, which are managed and funded through the Courts and the Department of Corrections, respectively.

Background Checks and Expungement/Sealing Study

As a continuation of the study on background check and expungement/sealing policy from 2006, The Task Force forwarded the Background Check and Expungement Delivery Team Report to the Policy Group with no recommendation in December 2006.

The Policy Group spent time in December 2006 through June 2007 digesting and analyzing the policy options and potential impacts highlighted in the delivery team report. As part of this effort, the Policy Group directed the Program Office and Management Analysis and Development Division (MAD) within the Department of Administration to complete the background check matrix included in the report. This matrix designates four background check levels considering risk factors and the data sources included in the check for the approximately 40 background checks currently in statute. MAD led this effort with a small group of analysts with expertise in background check processes and law to complete the matrix. A report, *Background Checks – Follow Up Report*, was submitted to the Policy Group in June 2007.

As stated earlier, the Policy Group adopted high-level recommendations related to expungement/sealing and background check policy in May and June 2007 (See Appendix B). The Policy Group directed the Program Office to work with subject matter experts to analyze the fiscal and implementation considerations of the high-level recommendations and report back to the Policy Group by November 2007. The Policy Group also solicited written public comment on the adopted recommendations.

The Program Office, with the assistance of the Information Policy Analysis Division (IPAD) within the Department of Administration, drafted legislation to capture the essence of the recommendations adopted by the Policy Group. From that draft legislation, the Program Office worked with a number of state and local agencies to determine the fiscal and implementation impacts and considerations. A report with the findings from this effort was presented to the Policy Group in November 2007. After extensive discussion on these two issues, the Policy Group agreed to forward the high-level recommendations as adopted by the Policy Group and to forward the implementation options, without recommendation, for the Legislature's consideration.

Progress and milestones:

- Completed background check matrix - June 2007
- Adoption of high-level expungement/sealing policy recommendations by the Policy Group – May 2007
- Adoption of high-level background check policy recommendations by the Policy Group - June 2007
- Solicited public comment on Policy Group recommendations – July – September 2007
- Studied fiscal and implementation considerations of Policy Group recommendations – July – October 2007
- Presented fiscal and implementation findings to the Policy Group – November 2007

Name-Event Index Service (NEIS)

Accurate identification is a cornerstone principle for criminal justice information sharing. Minnesota has no statewide process to link names and events in the criminal justice system. The Name-Event Index Service (NEIS) – a component of the larger Identification Roadmap initiative – is a service which will establish a definitive one-to-one relationship between an individual and the records stored and shared on that individual. NEIS will answer three fundamental questions:

1. Who are they?
2. What have they done?
3. Where are they in the criminal justice system?

NEIS will relate to the records it links much like the card catalog in the library relates to books. Eventually all critical records identified will be linked by a biometric identifier (such as a fingerprint). Biometrically supported identification enables positive linking of individuals to names and events in multiple jurisdictions. NEIS will provide criminal justice professionals an accurate and comprehensive view of a person's criminal activity. This information is currently not available without significant, time-consuming research. While NEIS will allow criminal justice professionals to hold offenders accountable, it will also prevent innocent individuals from being wrongfully accused and assist in the fight against criminal identity theft.

Progress and milestones:

- Completed Phase 1: discovery and design – October 2007
- Completed Phase 2: statement of work – October 2007
- Complete Phase 2: implementation in pilot sites – January 2008 – March 2009
- Begin Phase 3: statewide rollout – 4th Quarter 2009 (estimated) (*dependent on available funding*)

Automated Fingerprint Identification Service (AFIS)/Livescan

The Automated Fingerprint Identification Service (AFIS) matches fingerprints submitted electronically (through Livescan devices) against those in the system to assist in the accurate identification of individuals. This project has been pivotal in reducing the time it takes to determine accurate identification from what was months to minutes.

This project is designed to upgrade and replace the present AFIS. The new service will address expanded technology capabilities and anticipated additional legislative and functional work requirements. The mission of AFIS is a critical part of the criminal justice system and additional needs will be identified as biometrics evolve and as Minnesota requires quick and accurate identification of individuals. In addition to the new AFIS, a second major component of this project is Biometric Identification (BioID) workflow. This is a business process management service to coordinate how information flows between services generating biometric identification, such as Livescan devices, and the service receiving the results, such as criminal history record. These two components will need to be completed in conjunction with each other.

Progress and milestones:

- Designed BioID workflow management – 1st Quarter 2007
- Tested AFIS/BioID combined functionality - Second Quarter 2007 - Fourth Quarter 2007
- Completed implementation - December 2007

Livescan Replacement

Livescans are devices that capture fingerprints electronically and transmit them, along with other data, to the BioID Service (see the AFIS project description above) to match the fingerprints against AFIS and updating the criminal history database. For example, Livescan devices are housed at local criminal justice agencies and used to submit fingerprints electronically to the BCA.

Livescan devices purchased for local agencies with Katie's Law funds in 2000-2001 have allowed over 98% of all fingerprints to be submitted electronically, reducing the turnaround time for accurate identification of individuals from weeks to hours. A number of these Livescan devices have come to the end of their lifecycle and need to be replaced. The new Livescan devices also have an increased capability to capture palm prints in support of latent (crime scene) processing.

Progress and milestones:

- Awarded contract for Livescan proposal – October 2007
- Designed Livescan user interface – 3rd Quarter 2007 – 4th Quarter 2007
- Tested Livescan functionality – 4th Quarter 2007
- Deploy Livescan devices – 4th Quarter 2007 – 2nd Quarter 2008

Security Architecture/Identity Access Management (IAM)

As state electronic information repositories were developed in Minnesota, they each developed separate security protocols and user administration systems. This has resulted in dozens of usernames and passwords for the different systems available. Each system bases its access on the job duties assigned by the agency. Because of this, there is vulnerability when data is shared between agencies. There is also a reduction in efficiency due to the lost time caused by the cumbersome processes used to access information. In mid-2005, the Program Office

contracted with an independent consulting firm, Deloitte and Touche, to evaluate current practices and develop a Security Architecture Plan.

One of the recommendations in the Security Architecture Plan was to implement a coordinated identity and access management (IAM) system within key criminal justice organizations in the state, including BCA systems. Through the implementation of this system, the users of the BCA information systems will see a number of benefits including creation of a “single sign-on” (reducing the number of IDs and passwords that each user must maintain), a security service which will determine user identity and privileges, and implementation of user-to-system and system-to-system security protocols. This project will greatly increase the security of information shared by the BCA and will ensure data practices are being adhered to.

Progress and milestones:

- Complete plan and design for IAM – 2nd Quarter 2007 – 2nd Quarter 2008
- Develop and implement IAM – 2nd Quarter 2008 – 1st Quarter 2009 (*dependent on available funding*)

Minnesota Offense Codes (MOC) Analysis

Minnesota Offense Codes (MOC) are a listing of codes used to classify and systematically describe the details of a specific offense. The codes are used primarily for the compiling of statistical information, such as information about the offenders and/or victims of certain types of crimes or about the frequency of certain crimes. The MOC system is exceedingly complicated, is not utilized in the same way among criminal justice professionals, does not meet many of the business needs of data consumers, and places unnecessary burdens on those who apply the codes to criminal offenses. The purpose of this project is to analyze current practices and identify the business needs that are supposed to be met by the MOC system and recommend and implement any necessary changes.

The current plan, based on feedback from the MOC workgroup, is to phase out MOCs in favor of discrete codes (consistent with or mapable to NIBRS codes) related to drug, weapon, and victim information, and change relevant data systems to accept these codes.

Progress and Milestones

- Developed recommendations – December 2006
- Developed implementation plan – July 2007 – November 2007
- Complete implementation on relevant state systems – December 2009 (estimated)

Integration Planning

Two specific resources from the CrimNet Program have been provided to agencies as part of the Integration Planning Project – the Integration Cookbook and Direct Planning Assistance.

1. Integration Cookbook

The CriMNet Program finalized the *Integration Cookbook (Cookbook)* in late 2007. Plans were revised as a result of feedback and resource limitations in the Program Office, but the initial version of the cookbook, a how-to guide to assist agencies with their integration activities, was released in December 2007. Additional releases, with case studies and other more specific information, are planned through late 2008, including revisions to existing content based on practical experience with the *Cookbook* and other feedback. The guide is geared toward small- and medium-sized agencies that typically do not have the resources or the know-how to even begin integration planning. Tutorials accompany the guide, and training opportunities will be made available in 2008, through the liaison outreach program.

Progress and milestones:

- Publish Version 1.0 – January 2008
- Publish Version 1.5 (including case studies) – 2nd Quarter 2008
- Publish Version 2.0 (with feedback on version 1) – 3rd Quarter 2008
- Review and revise – December 2008
- Review and revise – March 2009

2. Direct Planning Assistance

Direct Planning Assistance lends local jurisdictions and agencies Program Office staff to assist them in their strategic integration planning efforts. Many of these local jurisdictions do not have the resources necessary to dedicate to integration planning. Program Office staff provide key facilitation and analysis functions, as directed by the lead agency within a jurisdiction. They also draft project documents for review, including recommendations for realizing stated integration objectives and goals. Direct Planning Assistance serves as a resource for agencies and jurisdictions as they create specialized roadmaps that identify current processes and systems related to criminal justice operations, potential areas of improvement, and the steps necessary to achieve future integration.

Progress and milestones:

- No direct planning assistance was provided during 2007 due to resource constraints.

Suspense Prevention

When a valid court disposition cannot be matched to an arrest record with a fingerprint, the record goes into “*suspense*.” There are many variables as to why this occurs such as processing problems, linking data errors, and fingerprints not being taken. This suspense issue creates gaps in criminal history records and consumes resources to fix other related problems. The suspense problem is two-fold – eliminating records from going into suspense (the “flow”) and clearing up those records already in suspense (the “tub”).

The purpose of the Suspense Prevention project is to: 1) identify the root causes of the suspense problem; and 2) recommend technical, legal, or business practice changes that will address the root causes of suspense; 3) implement recommendations. Current activities are broken down into three separate sub-projects:

- A) **Business Process Improvement.** This project works with local governments to implement business process changes based on best practices models derived from counties with the best suspense rates, and to measure the extent to which these changes succeed in reducing suspense rates. The BCA is currently working with Scott and Kandiyohi counties.
- B) **Data Quality.** The purpose of this project is to examine approximately 1,000 suspense cases to identify the specific points in the criminal justice process where data quality problems appeared, allowing for more accurate targeting of business and technical solutions to these projects. BCA has contracted with the Department of Administration's Management Analysis and Development division for this study. Their report was completed in November 2007.
- C) **MN Court Information System/Computerized Criminal History System Conversion.** A large proportion of suspense problems are caused by data architecture, differences between the original designs of the court data system and the BCA data system. The Court is in the process of converting to an upgraded data system, and the BCA is in the process of converting its data systems to take advantage of the new data architecture. The purpose of this project is to ensure that the conversion process documents the business logic of merging court data with BCA data, and that the conversion process eliminates existing architectural suspense causes and avoids the creation of new suspense categories.

The BCA's CJIS division continues to work on the records that are currently in suspense.

Progress and Milestones

- Created a comparison suspense statistical report (will allow individual county suspense numbers to be compared with other counties) – July 2007
- Completed more detailed and comprehensive quantitative assessment of data quality problems leading to suspense - November 2007
- Complete business process redesign implementation in two Minnesota counties – February 2008

Minnesota Criminal Justice Statute Service (Statute Service)

The Minnesota Criminal Justice Statute Service (Statute Service) is a Web service that provides a central database for Minnesota criminal justice statutes, accessible to criminal justice and non-criminal justice professionals statewide. This service provides prosecutors the most current information on charging and penalty statutes so the charging process is more accurate. This service can be used to search criminal justice statutes and to connect directly and populate users' in-house systems. This system will lead to more accurate criminal history data.

An advisory board, made up of a number of criminal justice stakeholders, works with the CriMNet Program Office to promote and educate practitioners about the Statute Service. This group also recommends best practices and standards regarding criminal statutes and consistent formatting for charging documents, including citations and complaints.

Progress and milestones:

- Final release of the Statute Service – March 2007
- Discontinued the Microsoft Access version of the Statute Table – March 2007
- Developed sample statewide “cheat sheet” for most common citations – August 2007
- Evaluated project and documented lessons learned – October 2007
- Begin project to identify possible enhancements (guided by the Advisory Board and other users – December 2007

MN Criminal Justice Information Integration Services (MNCJIIS)

The four key components of information integration are infrastructure, information sharing, information exchange and Service Oriented Architecture (SOA). Without these core components, the individual statewide services would not be consistent or cohesive but would continue to be disconnected, standalone systems. These components provide the foundation for future statewide integration efforts.

Infrastructure is the hardware, software and network services that enable communications. The services that search disparate repositories of information and consolidate the results are information sharing services. Information exchange services send, transport or receive information that is stored in repositories throughout the Minnesota Justice Enterprise. Service Oriented Architecture defines how the infrastructure, exchange and sharing services are packaged and interact to form a comprehensive and cohesive set of criminal justice information integration services.

This project includes multiple smaller projects such as a pilot project in Dakota County. It also includes the technology refresh of the Integrated Search Service – formerly known as the “backbone”. However, this project is much broader than the Integrated Search application in that it provides the collection and distribution services for all major Enterprise initiatives.

Implementation of technology has been significantly more challenging than predicted in 2006, resulting in some delays in progress and milestones. Competition for resources, need for additional training, product issues, and vendor support issues have all contributed to the delays. A plan was developed in September 2007 to address these issues.

Progress and milestones:

- Implemented base infrastructure for MNCJIIS – June 2007
- Reengineer basic search services – December 2006 – June 2008
- Dakota County consuming five services through MNCJIIS – November 2006 – November 2007
- Services produced for Dakota County pilot will be consumed by other justice agencies – December 2007
- Implement enhanced and expanded search services – June 2009

Electronic Charging (eCharging)

The Electronic Charging Service (eCharging) will allow for routing, temporary retention, filing, and printing on demand of all charging documents (including electronic signatures) for all felony, gross misdemeanor and statutory misdemeanor cases. Currently, there is no centralized process available to allow law enforcement and prosecution offices to electronically prepare and transmit charging documents with the courts. The eCharging service will result in a tremendous increase in process efficiency. It will improve management of the DWI administrative process. It will also eliminate the manual/paper charging process which will allow for more officer time on the streets. There will be an increase in data accuracy and a reduction in delays within the criminal justice system. This effort builds on the work already begun by the courts on an electronic charging process.

Progress and Milestones

- Completed Phase 1: business requirements - June 2007
- Completed Phase 1: system design - August 2007
- Complete Phase 2: pilot testing – October 2007 – December 2008
- Complete Phase 3: statewide rollout - estimated December 2009 (*dependent on available funding*)

Warrants Process Improvements

In 2005, a local user group identified the criminal warrants process as a priority candidate for business process review and improvements, given the lack of a statewide standard to gather and store warrant information. The Warrants Business Process Improvement project report was completed in April 2007. The project evaluated existing warrants processes in order to provide recommendations for streamlining and otherwise improving these processes to avoid re-keying of data, reduce the associated number of data errors, and increase the accuracy and timeliness of warrant information to users statewide. This included the timely removal of warrants in the event of service or cancellation. The legislature did not allocate any funding in the FY2008-2009 biennium for implementation of electronic warrant integration; however, the Task Force created the Warrants Delivery Team to examine the report's recommendations and determine which process-orientated recommendations could be implemented in the short-term without allocated funding.

Progress and Milestones:

- Review and assess report recommendations – June 2007 – 1st Quarter 2008 (estimated)
- Create a document of delivery team findings and present to the Task Force – 1st or 2nd Quarter 2008

Comprehensive Incident-Based Reporting System (CIBRS)

The Comprehensive Incident-Based Reporting System (CIBRS) is a database containing Minnesota law enforcement incident data for investigative purposes. This is data maintained by a law enforcement agency, in a records management system (RMS) regarding calls for service and/or officer-initiated events. The database was completed in December 2005; however, to

date, there still is only one local agency submitting data to CIBRS. There are several reasons for this including limited resources, lack of vendor cooperation, and lack of technical capability. In the spring of 2007 the CriMNet Program Office published an RFP to enable records management system vendors to build an interface to CIBRS and implement it in all of their current Minnesota law enforcement client sites (see grant program section).

Progress and milestones:

- Train and certify individuals who will be accessing CIBRS – Ongoing
- Awarded vendor contracts for submission of CIBRS data – August – September 2007
- Develop adaptors (vendors) and test submissions (BCA) for 183 local agencies – September 2007 – December 2008 (estimated)

Minnesota Court Information System (MNCIS)

The Minnesota Court Information System (MNCIS) was designed to replace the old legacy court management system (TCIS). TCIS is a case and county-based system whereas MNCIS is a person-based system and statewide. To date, 86 sites (85 entire counties and portions of Ramsey County and Dakota County) have been converted from TCIS to MNCIS. Part of the MNCIS rollout is to provide integration services so information can be consumed and supplied between the courts and other criminal justice business partners. Integrations are in place in Hennepin County, and several smaller counties are also working toward integration between court and local justice agencies. Over 64,000 “court events” occur each day. These events generate over 22,000 messages that are consumed over 25,000 times. Some messages are consumed by more than one justice agency. Ramsey criminal court and Dakota County are scheduled for conversion in the spring of 2008.

Progress and Milestones:

- Complete implementation of the remainder of the judicial districts – April 2008
- Provide training for one new release to current MNCIS counties – June 2008

Statewide Supervision System (S³)

The Statewide Supervision System (S3) is a centralized repository containing information on anyone under probation/supervised release, as well as anyone booked into jails, prisons or detention facilities. Information in S3 is delivered to users via a secure Web application. In addition, the Department of Corrections and the Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines Commission have collaborated to eliminate the manual sentencing guidelines worksheet process by including automated sentencing guidelines worksheets in S3. The Statewide Supervision System is accessible to criminal justice agencies only, as per Minnesota Statutes 241.065 and public defenders as per Minnesota Statutes 611.272.

Progress and milestones:

- Implemented new probation survey reporting categories – January 2007
- Implemented new jail facility data maintenance module – April 2007
- Implemented jail upload process with new jail system vendor – July 2007

- Implemented new probation/detention upload process for Hennepin County following MNCIS conversion – September 2007
- Completed business requirements documentation on assessment modules – October 2007

VI. Ongoing MN Criminal Justice Integration Framework Support Activities

The following projects are those ongoing activities that the CriMNet Program Office is primarily responsible for as part of the foundational work for criminal justice information integration – these activities are included as Framework initiatives. There are also other internal support services such as management, grants/contracts, legislative, and office support which the Program Office provides.

Technical/Business Standards

In order to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of information sharing, the CriMNet Program has been charged with coordinating, championing, and maintaining technical standards. These standards define the format for data exchanged from system-to-system based on business standards, including data practice statutory requirements. The CriMNet Program develops security and connectivity standards and defines system architecture for the integration and sharing of information. The CriMNet Program also develops standard statewide data dictionary definitions and standard message formats that define event content, data standards, and definitions based on the recognized business needs of criminal justice stakeholders. These state standards comply with federal standards where applicable.

Progress and milestones:

- Created a policy for approving standards (based on the outcomes of the vetting standards pilot) – June 2007
- Developed and published a technical standard for single submission of data which covers three core priority projects – February 2007
- Revise criminal justice integration repository Web site for the publication and vetting of business, architectural, and technical standards (<https://cjir.crimnet.state.mn.us/cjir/default.aspx>)- January 2008
- Implement Service Oriented Architecture standards - Ongoing
- Create technical data reference model – Ongoing
- Define standards for system message formatting - Ongoing
- Create architecture and infrastructure standards – Ongoing
- Create, publish and maintain the Minnesota Criminal Justice Data Dictionary - January 2007 – Ongoing
- Continue vetting and approving standards - Ongoing

Liaison Program/Assistance to Criminal Justice Agencies

The Liaison Program is a concentrated effort by the CriMNet Program Office to provide strong communication and connections between and among the Program Office, different stakeholder groups, and criminal justice agencies within Minnesota.

The Program Office arranges meetings across the state that local and county law enforcement, county/city attorneys, public defenders, court personnel, and corrections/ probations agencies are

all invited to attend. The purpose of these meetings is twofold. First, Program Office representatives present information about integration and provide updates on criminal justice projects being developed at the state level through BCA. Second, representatives solicit feedback from agency participants to capture their specific requirements and ensure that the Program Office considers their differing needs.

Program Office liaisons also participate in focused stakeholder conferences and give presentations on projects of interest whenever possible. Types of conferences include: League of Minnesota Cities, Association of Minnesota Counties, Minnesota Sheriffs Association, Minnesota Chiefs of Police Association, Minnesota District Public Defenders, Minnesota Jailors Conference, Minnesota Association of County Probation Officers, Minnesota Professional Law Enforcement Assistant's Association, and Minnesota Association of Court Management, among others.

As a complement to its liaison efforts, the Program Office additionally provides general assistance to criminal justice agencies and stakeholders on an as-needed basis. As a program that is committed to facilitating collaboration and integration across agencies within the criminal justice community, providing business and technical support as requested is a critical component of the Program's work. Assistance may take one of many forms such as answering specific questions regarding business processes, use of technical systems, or strategic directions, and/or forwarding these questions to other criminal justice contacts who may serve as better references. Assistance may additionally require troubleshooting access to specific systems or presenting the diversity of information options available for daily use in decision-making. Overall, the philosophy that underlies assistance given to criminal justice agencies is the firm commitment to vetting every question, concern, comment, and critique - regardless of its direct relationship to integration projects or initiatives - in order to be responsive to stakeholders statewide.

Progress and Milestones (Presentations):

- Newly Elected County Attorney Conference – January 2007
- Minnesota Police and Peace Officers Association, annual conference – January 2007
- Minnesota Chiefs of Police and Sheriffs Associations, executive board meetings – January – February 2007
- Newly Elected Sheriff's Conference – February 2007
- US Department of Justice Global Infrastructure and Standards Working Group – March, July, August and November 2007
- Minnesota Chiefs of Police Association, annual conference - April 2007
- Professional Law Enforcement Assistants Association Conference – April 2007
- 911 Communications Conference – April 2007
- Minnesota State Association of Narcotics Investigators Conference - May 2007
- McLeod County, general update – May 2007
- Region 3 PSAP Meeting- June 2007
- Minnesota Counties Computer Cooperative, annual conference - June 2007
- Minnesota Sheriffs Association, summer conference - June 2007
- Minnesota Association of Court Management, annual conference - June 2007

- League of Minnesota Cities, annual conference - June 2007
- Government Information Symposium Conference - July 2007
- Minnesota Criminal Justice Institute – August 2007
- National NEIM Conference - August 2007
- Digital State Conference - August 2007
- Minnesota Sheriffs Association Jailor’s Conference - September 2007
- Toward Zero Deaths Conference - September 2007
- Ramsey County Probation, general update - October 2007
- Koochiching County, general update - October 2007
- Winona County, Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee Meeting – November 2007
- Association of Minnesota Counties, annual conference - December 2007
- Minnesota Sheriffs Association, winter conference - December 2007
- Minnesota County Attorneys Association, annual conference - December 2007
- County IT Director’s Meetings- Monthly 2007

Communications

The CriMNet Program aims to enhance communication regarding the integration of criminal justice information. In addition to the communication-related activities (such as the “Cookbook” and Liaison Program, both detailed previously, as well as communication activities for the Policy Group and Task Force) are regular vendor conferences. These meetings engage two principal entities: vendors who provide services to state and local criminal justice agencies, and professionals in those agencies responsible for information management and integration. These conferences help to inform vendors of the standards Minnesota is moving forward with and the future vision of the state. This has been well-received by the vendor community and has proven to be a key strategy for the future.

In 2007, these meetings were expanded in two ways: greater outreach to IT staff in criminal justice and county agencies, and creation of a working group for technical issues. The technical working group will continue to meet on an ad hoc basis throughout 2008 to validate standards developed as part of system development at the BCA and other agencies.

Vendor conferences are held quarterly at the BCA in St. Paul and delivered to remote participants via Web conference. On average, 60 people attend each meeting from outside the BCA, as well as a number of staff from both the CJIS and the CriMNet Program Office.

Progress and milestones:

- Facilitate quarterly vendor conferences - Ongoing

Data Practices/Data Quality

Data Practices and Data Quality at the state and local levels are two foundational policy areas which the CriMNet Program focuses on to ensure that data shared between agencies is accurate and that fair information practices and privacy principles are adhered to. The Data

Practices/Data Quality Program presently consists of three major components: agreements; policies, procedures and practices; and data privacy and practices information and tools.

Updated agreements that delineate the roles and responsibilities between the BCA, courts, and other state and local systems in accessing and sharing information has been a key project over the past two years. This effort has resulted in the Agency Data Access Limitation Agreement (Agency Agreement). The Agency Agreement was formally adopted in August 2006 and includes requirements for following the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act, the security policies established by the BCA and the federal guidelines for access. The Court Data Sharing Agreement has been put on hold due to other priority projects.

The CriMNet Program Office works closely with the Information and Policy Analysis Division (IPAD) of the Department of Administration and others to develop data practices standards for information sharing based on the federal Fair Information Principles. Those efforts include the publishing of the Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) which is designed to assist practitioners in assessing the data practice issues that may impact their projects and establishing policies and procedures for individuals to review their non-confidential BCA data and to process a challenge to the data accuracy. Compliance standards are included in the Agency Agreement as well as posted on the secured Criminal Justice Data Network (CJDN) website.

The Program Office will be developing a data practices booklet which will detail the basics of data quality and how to implement and enforce it. This booklet will include the definition and components of data quality and assist agencies with data privacy and data practices compliance. This project has been delayed due to resources limitations.

Many local agencies want to comply with data privacy requirements but have not had adequate training or do not have an adequate understanding of state law. These new resources will equip state and local agencies with the knowledge needed to comply with federal and state law.

The main thrust of the data practices/data quality program is now centered on a project that is closely linked to the Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) in the BCA and the deployment of services that will manage and audit access to criminal justice data by role/profile. This project will identify and classify data shared in the integrated systems.

Progress and milestones:

- Completed scope statement and basic framework for data classification project – April – July 2007
- Complete data classification for basic Enterprise Service Bus (ESB) exchanges – September 2008
- Create data practices/data quality information booklet - December 2008

VII. Additional Legislative Reporting Requirements

In addition to the annual report required in Minnesota Statutes 299C.65, Subd. 2, the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Policy Group is also charged with studying and making recommendations to the governor, the Supreme Court and the legislature on the following 15 items (Minnesota Statutes 299C.65, Subd. 1(d)).

299C.65, Subdivision 1d.	Status/Comments
<p>1. A framework for integrated criminal justice information systems, including the development and maintenance of a community data model for state, county, and local criminal justice information</p>	<p>In 2006, the Policy Group undertook an extensive prioritization process that has resulted in a “Framework” document that identifies long-term goals and strategies for integration. The Framework elements are divided into three parts – policy considerations, enabling activities (such as standards), and delivery of systems or applications.</p> <p>This process was lengthy and engaged the Task Force and the stakeholder groups it represents in identifying their key priorities and goals for enterprise integration. This Framework, along with the detailed supporting plans for each initiative, represents, in practice, the concept of the Blueprint for Integration, identified by the early Strategic Plan and Scope Statement.</p> <p>In 2007, the Governor included core priorities from the Framework in his FY2008-2009 biennial budget recommendation to the legislature. The legislature approved some one-time funding (for FY2008-2009) and an increase in base budget (beginning in FY2010) for the BCA to move forward on core priorities. The Policy Group and Task Force approved a 2008-2009 biennial plan. The plan calls for moving forward on core enterprise integration priorities to begin to achieve the outcomes as described in the Framework.</p> <p>As each prioritized strategic initiative is commenced, project documentation will expand upon policies, definitions, standards and strategies for use by state and local agencies in their effort to participate in each initiative. Detailed project plans including business case, scope statements milestones and work breakdown structures will be added as to when things will be done and when the goals for each initiative will be finished.</p> <p>Recommendation: As each approved core priority/initiative is commenced, policies, definitions, standards and strategies for use by state and local agencies in their effort to participate in each initiative will be developed. When complete, the Blueprint will include policies (data policies and others) business and technical integration standards, strategies, infrastructure definition, and interfaces. The Blueprint will describe what is required to participate in each justice information sharing initiative. Report annually on progress.</p> <p><i>Included in current Scope Statement</i></p>

299C.65, Subdivision 1d.	Status/Comments
<p>2. The responsibilities of each entity within the criminal and juvenile justice systems concerning the collection, maintenance, dissemination, and sharing of criminal justice information with one another</p>	<p>See #1 above. Recommendation: Report annually on progress. <i>Included in current Scope Statement</i></p>
<p>3. Actions necessary to ensure that information maintained in the criminal justice information systems is accurate and up-to-date</p>	<p>The Program has initiated a Data Quality Project that consists of three major initiatives: development of service agreements with users and data providers, development of data quality standards and measures, and development of security measures. Recommendation: Report annually on progress. <i>Included in current Scope Statement</i></p>
<p>4. The development of an information system containing criminal justice information on gross misdemeanor-level and felony-level juvenile offenders that is part of the integrated criminal justice information system framework</p>	<p>Development of this system was completed in early 1998. The Program Office continues to work on prevention efforts for juvenile records still going into suspense. Recommendation: Future reporting as needed.</p>
<p>5. The development of an information system containing criminal justice information on misdemeanor arrests, prosecutions, and convictions that is part of the integrated criminal justice information system framework</p>	<p>The Minnesota Court Information System (MNCIS) integration to the Computerized Criminal History file (CCH) includes targeted misdemeanors; as counties are converted to MNCIS, the data is now available in CCH. In 2005, the courts passed <i>all</i> targeted misdemeanors from April 2002 to present to CCH and initiated a process to pass to CCH the archived TCIS targeted misdemeanor data (1997- April 2002) on a county-by-county basis as counties are converted to MNCIS. Recommendation: Report annually on progress. <i>Included in current Scope Statement</i></p>
<p>6. Comprehensive training programs and requirements for all individuals in criminal justice agencies to ensure the quality and accuracy of information in those systems</p>	<p>There are a number of training programs available to criminal justice agencies related to the accuracy and quality of data. Currently, the BCA's Data Integrity Team and the Training/Auditing Division within CJIS are offering specialized training statewide on criminal history, Livescan, the Integrated Search Services application and other statewide data functions. In addition, the Program Office has implemented an outreach/liaison program to assist local agencies in developing plans to improve their data quality and accuracy through business process improvements. Recommendation: Report as needed on any issues identified by the business analysis and progress made. <i>Included in current Scope Statement</i></p>
<p>7. Continuing education requirements for individuals in criminal justice agencies</p>	<p>A number of training/certification programs are available through the BCA in such areas as CCH, Livescan, National Crime</p>

299C.65, Subdivision 1d.	Status/Comments
who are responsible for the collection, maintenance, dissemination, and sharing of criminal justice data;	<p>Information System (NCIC), Predatory Offender Tracking, MN Repository of Arrest Photos, and suspense file improvement. Other integration-related projects also offer specialized training (Statewide Supervision System, Court Web Access, etc). Data Practices training programs are planned to be developed and incorporated into existing training as appropriate.</p> <p>Recommendation: Future education requirements should be identified and prioritized through the user prioritization and outreach efforts.</p>
8. A periodic audit process to ensure the quality and accuracy of integrated criminal justice information systems	<p>As a part of the initial Strategic Plan, the importance of data quality standards was identified as a key objective. However, adding additional training and auditing capacity to the BCA was not recommended in the Governor's FY2008-2009 budget and was not approved by the legislature.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Program Office has also developed a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) template which is being used on all projects that deliver any kind of technology solution. The Program is rolling out this measure to other solution providers as well.</p> <p><i>Included in current Scope Statement</i></p>
9. The equipment, training, and funding needs of the state and local agencies that participate in the criminal justice information systems	<p>See #1 above.</p> <p>In support of this approach The Program Office conducted a technology inventory of criminal justice agencies in the state. The purpose of the assessment was to identify the status of hardware/software platforms for agencies, as well as identify information technology resources. This information will help to establish a baseline measure of readiness for integration. Agencies were also asked to provide information about planned technology initiatives, e.g., future upgrades or replacements of systems. This information will help to determine the degree of effort involved in rolling out particular services to specific agencies and the agencies' ability to participate in information sharing and integration efforts. This database was successfully used to identify priorities for agency participation in the Comprehensive Incident-Based Reporting System (CIBRS), the Name-Event Index Service (NEIS) and the eCharging Service.</p> <p>Recommendation: Report as needed on technology resource status of criminal justice agencies and needs related to specific enterprise information sharing and integration initiatives and projects in accordance with the Framework Plan.</p> <p><i>Included in current Scope Statement</i></p>
10. The impact of integrated criminal justice information systems	<p>The Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Task Force has, through "Delivery Teams," developed recommendations for the 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2007 Legislatures related to the privacy interests of individuals. To date, most recommendations have been enacted.</p>

299C.65, Subdivision 1d.	Status/Comments
	<p>In addition, a Task Force Delivery Team including broad public participation has made recommendations on changes to statutory background checks and to the criminal record expungement process. See Appendix B for the specific recommendations of the Policy Group on changes to statutory background checks and the criminal record expungement process. In addition the Policy Group directed further study on the fiscal and implementation considerations of the Policy Group's recommendations. This report was completed and presented to the Policy Group in November 2007.</p> <p>As noted above, the Program Office has also developed a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) template which will be used on all projects that deliver any kind of technology solution. The program plans to roll out this measure to other agencies involved in providing technology solutions, as well.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Policy Group has additional issues for study and recommends continued work in this area. Report as needed.</p> <p><i>Included in current Scope Statement</i></p>
11. The impact of proposed legislation on the criminal justice system, including any fiscal impact, need for training, changes in information systems, and changes in processes	<p>Recommendation: The Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Policy Group and Task Force will monitor proposed legislation and fiscal impacts and report as needed.</p>
12. The collection of data on race and ethnicity in criminal justice information systems	<p>As referenced in the 2003 Annual Report, the BCA assisted with the Racial Profiling study coordinated by the Office of Drug Policy and Violence Prevention. The Council on Crime and Justice completed a final report based on data collected through the BCA for report to the Minnesota Legislature.</p> <p>Recommendation: Report completed. Future reporting as requested.</p> <p><i>Included in current Scope Statement</i></p>
13. The development of a tracking system for domestic abuse orders for protection	<p>Though the original system is complete, an issue has been identified regarding temporary restraining orders that are extended and the Brady indicator (weapons prohibition) is not set. A study was conducted and the results reported to the Judicial Branch. The report recommended additional training of court personnel on the impact of the extended temporary orders, as well as changes to the Orders for Protection (OFP) system. These activities have been added to Judicial Branch work plans. In addition they have made changes to the standard petition to help alert the petitioner to the impact of the extended temporary orders.</p> <p>Recommendation: Report on progress of the recommended changes.</p>
14. Processes for expungement, correction of inaccurate records, destruction of records, and other matters	<p>A Task Force Delivery Team including broad public participation has made recommendations on changes to statutory background checks and to the criminal record expungement process. At a high</p>

299C.65, Subdivision 1d.	Status/Comments
relating to the privacy interests of individuals	<p>level, consideration of automatic expungements for arrests and dismissals; automatic expungement for continuances for dismissal and stays of adjudication; eligibility to petition for expungement for certain convictions under certain circumstances (including juveniles); access to expunged records; effect of expungement; and, expungement process is recommended. Included in this Report are the specific recommendations of the Policy Group on changes to statutory background checks and the criminal record expungement process (see Appendix B). In addition the Report contains the Policy Group findings on fiscal impact and implementation issues associated with these recommended changes.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make recommendations for process standardization and legislative/policy changes as needed.</p> <p><i>Included in current Scope Statement</i></p>
15. The development of a database for extended jurisdiction juvenile records and whether the records should be public or private and how long they should be retained	<p>There has been a database for Extended Jurisdiction Juvenile (EJJ) records for many years. These records are governed by Minnesota Statutes 299C.65 prior to the imposition of the adult sentence. Once the adult sentence is imposed, the records would be handled in the same manner as adult records.</p> <p>Recommendation: Monitor and report as needed.</p>

VIII. Appendices

- A. Minnesota Criminal Justice Integration Framework
- B. Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Policy Group Background Check and Expungement/Sealing Policy Recommendations
- C. Alternative Funding Sources Report

**MN CJ Integration Framework & Blueprint:
Initiatives, Projects and Outcomes**



Projects in white background are planned 2008/2009 biennium BCA initiatives/projects based on state and federal funds, or are enterprise initiatives managed by other agencies under the oversight of the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Policy Group. All other items shaded in red are part of the enterprise vision but are on hold dependent on future funding.

	<i>INITIATIVE</i>	<i>PROJECT</i>	<i>OUTCOME</i>	<i>PERFORMANCE MEASURE/ ROI (based on available funds for FY08/09)</i>	<i>FY08/09 Funding</i>
POLICY					
	P1. Criminal Justice Information Policy Issues	<p>a. Study of Background Check Law in MN</p> <p>b. Study of Expungement Law in MN and effects of State v. Schultz decision</p>	<p>Recommendations on options for simplified but comprehensive statutory background check policy.</p> <p>Recommendations on policy to balance public safety needs for history data vs. an individuals need for employment/housing after satisfaction of sanction.</p>	<p>Specific policy recommendations, as well as implementation and fiscal assessments will be determined.</p> <p>Specific policy recommendations, as well as implementation and fiscal assessments will be determined.</p>	<p>Funding included in the <i>Data Practices/Data Quality</i> budget activity (Total amount allocated \$150,000).</p> <p>Funding included in the <i>Data Practices/Data Quality</i> budget activity (Total amount allocated \$150,000).</p>
	P2. Privacy/Access	<p>a. Polices for user authentication and system to system authentication (verification that a user or system is who they say they are and what their privileges are).</p> <p>b. Polices for acceptable use</p>	<p>Security of data and implementation of data security policy in an integration environment.</p> <p>Acceptable use.</p>	<p>Justice agencies with statewide systems will have access to authentication policies and will have to adhere to those policies when engaging BCA systems.</p> <p>Justice agencies with statewide systems will understand, sign, adhere to and implement the Acceptable Use Policy.</p>	<p>Funding included in the <i>Data Practices/Data Quality</i> budget activity (Total amount allocated \$150,000).</p> <p>Funding included in the <i>Data Practices/Data Quality</i> budget activity (Total amount allocated \$150,000).</p>
Task Force Rank 6th	P3. Data Practices	a. Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) Policy	Policy for statewide systems development, implementation and management to insure fair information practices and privacy principles are considered.	Agencies building or buying new statewide systems will utilize a PIA in the development lifecycle.	Funding included in the <i>Data Practices/Data Quality</i> budget activity (Total amount allocated \$150,000).

MN CJ Integration Framework & Blueprint: Initiatives, Projects and Outcomes



Projects in white background are planned 2008/2009 biennium BCA initiatives/projects based on state and federal funds, or are enterprise initiatives managed by other agencies under the oversight of the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Policy Group. All other items shaded in red are part of the enterprise vision but are on hold dependent on future funding.

INITIATIVE	PROJECT	OUTCOME	PERFORMANCE MEASURE/ ROI (based on available funds for FY08/09)	FY08/09 Funding
ENABLING				
Task Force Rank 1st Dependent Project	E1. Identification (Rollout of Identification Roadmap)	a. Name Event Index Service (NEIS)	Criminal justice records will be linked electronically with some linked to a biometric (fingerprint)	10 – 12 events will be linked from selected statewide systems (BCA, Courts, DOC)
				Three to four pilots will be implemented by the end of FY09 (selected agencies within the pilot counties).
		Non-dependent Project	b. Completion of submission to statewide booking photo database (MRAP)	Statewide Arrest Photos. Currently there are approximately 20 counties that do not have the technology to capture arrest photos and provide them to the MN Repository of Arrest Photos (MRAP)
Dependent Project		c. Enhanced Biometric Identification Capability	Ability to capture different types of fingerprints (two print, slap print etc.), as well as palm and side of palm prints for faster, more reliable identification and crime solving (latent processing) This will significantly enhance both officer and public safety.	Speed up 10-print biometric processing commonly used in jail bookings, reducing average processing times from approximately 1 hour to 5 minutes or less. Reduce data errors in 10-print biometric transactions to 3% or less. Equip at least 50 percent of squad shifts, arraignment courtrooms, and probation check in locations with rapid ID units by 2010.

**MN CJ Integration Framework & Blueprint:
Initiatives, Projects and Outcomes**



Projects in white background are planned 2008/2009 biennium BCA initiatives/projects based on state and federal funds, or are enterprise initiatives managed by other agencies under the oversight of the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Policy Group. All other items shaded in red are part of the enterprise vision but are on hold dependent on future funding.

<i>INITIATIVE</i>	<i>PROJECT</i>	<i>OUTCOME</i>	<i>PERFORMANCE MEASURE/ ROI (based on available funds for FY08/09)</i>	<i>FY08/09 Funding</i>	
<i>ENABLING</i>					
	d. Livescan Replacement	Electronically capture fingerprints and increased capability to capture palm prints in support of latent processing (crime scenes) through upgraded and updated livescan devices.	Replace 60 livescan devices by the end of FY08.	\$2,190,000	
Task Force Rank 4th Dependent Project	E2. Security (ability to exchange and search information in a secure manner)	a. Implementing user-to-systems and systems-to-systems security (Identity Access Management or IAM) and complete implementation of single sign-on.	Secure exchange of information between criminal justice entities. Ensuring that data policy rules are enforced across the entities.	Lay the foundation for a “single sign-on” for future statewide systems (implementation of the selected product, rollout of the provisioning components, and plan for modification of existing applications) and allow the BCA to begin the conversion of current BCA systems/repositories to single sign-on.	\$1,000,000
Non-dependent Project	E3 Continuous operations of mission critical systems	a. Business Continuity Plans and Infrastructure.	BCA managed mission critical criminal justice information systems and statewide integration infrastructure will have business continuation plans and infrastructure as well 24 by 7 support.	Business continuation Plan completed by FY’09	<i>DPS received partial funding for this initiative. TBD how much of BCA systems and services can be incorporated in the plan.</i>

**MN CJ Integration Framework & Blueprint:
Initiatives, Projects and Outcomes**



Projects in white background are planned 2008/2009 biennium BCA initiatives/projects based on state and federal funds, or are enterprise initiatives managed by other agencies under the oversight of the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Policy Group. All other items shaded in red are part of the enterprise vision but are on hold dependent on future funding.

<i>INITIATIVE</i>	<i>PROJECT</i>	<i>OUTCOME</i>	<i>PERFORMANCE MEASURE/ ROI (based on available funds for FY08/09)</i>	<i>FY08/09 Funding</i>	
<i>ENABLING</i>					
Task Force Rank 6th Non-dependent Project	E4. Information Audit Capability – Security; Data Quality, and Data Practice	a. Performing Audits	Ability to audit criminal justice agencies on integration security policy, practice and technology; compliance with data policy and data accuracy standards and agreements.	By FY'11 the BCA will have the capability to audit all agencies once every three years.	On Hold
Task Force Rank 6th	E5. Data Quality	a. Service and Data Quality Agreements	All criminal justice users and providers will have signed User and provider agreements governing quality, access and security by FY'08.	Agreements between data providers and users of state managed statewide systems will be in place by end of FY 08.	Funding included in the <i>Data Practices/Data Quality</i> budget activity (Total amount allocated \$150,000).
Task Force Rank 3rd	E6. Technical Standards and Policies	a. Architectural Standards for new systems or vendor systems	Standards for new systems architecture to facilitate integration.	The technical standards and integration tool website (CJIR) will be continuously maintained and updated by the Program Office in collaboration with criminal justice partners and vendor community. The standards will adhere to state enterprise standards and will be tied to all program activities and funding.	Funding included in the <i>Technical Standards</i> budget activity (Total amount allocated \$200,000).

**MN CJ Integration Framework & Blueprint:
Initiatives, Projects and Outcomes**



Projects in white background are planned 2008/2009 biennium BCA initiatives/projects based on state and federal funds, or are enterprise initiatives managed by other agencies under the oversight of the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Policy Group. All other items shaded in red are part of the enterprise vision but are on hold dependent on future funding.

<i>INITIATIVE</i>	<i>PROJECT</i>	<i>OUTCOME</i>	<i>PERFORMANCE MEASURE/ ROI (based on available funds for FY08/09)</i>	<i>FY08/09 Funding</i>
ENABLING				
	b. Data Standards	Minnesota Criminal Justice Data Model (MNJ) and Dictionary that is an extension of the US Global Data Model and Dictionary (Nat'l Information Exchange Model – NIEM)	The Model and Dictionary will be continuously maintained and updated by the Program Office in collaboration with criminal justice partners. Future integration projects will adopt the MN CJ Data Model (MNJ).	Funding included in the <i>Technical Standards</i> and <i>Communications</i> budget activities (Total amount allocated \$340,000).
	c. Technical Assistance to Local Agencies	Assess new technologies and their applicability relative to architectural and data standards.	Assess the feasibility of providing this service by FY'07, and if feasible rollout by FY'09	On Hold
E7. Business Standards/Business Process Improvement	a. Business standards and processes as needed (e.g., MOC's)	Business process and business standard issues not included in a separate project will be analyzed and considered within priorities.	Business standards and business process improvement activities will be included in scope statements and planning documents for individual projects in FY08/09.	Funding included in multiple project budget activities (\$80,000 allocated for general business stds).
E8. Communications and Assistance to Local Agencies/Local Government	a. Communication/Liaison Outreach/ Agency Assistance	Local agencies will be informed about program activities to understand the statewide vision for integration and how it can affect their agency.	Activities include six to eight conferences and 12 to 20 liaison meetings per year.	Funding included in the <i>Liaison/Assistance to Criminal Justice Agencies</i> and <i>Communications</i> budget activities (Total amount allocated \$200,000).

**MN CJ Integration Framework & Blueprint:
Initiatives, Projects and Outcomes**



Projects in white background are planned 2008/2009 biennium BCA initiatives/projects based on state and federal funds, or are enterprise initiatives managed by other agencies under the oversight of the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Policy Group. All other items shaded in red are part of the enterprise vision but are on hold dependent on future funding.

<i>INITIATIVE</i>	<i>PROJECT</i>	<i>OUTCOME</i>	<i>PERFORMANCE MEASURE/ ROI (based on available funds for FY08/09)</i>	<i>FY08/09 Funding</i>
ENABLING				
Non-dependent Project	b. Small County/Agency Integration Planning	Small Agency Planning Assistance and Integration Cookbook	The integration “Cookbook” will assist medium/smaller counties in integration planning/implementation Cookbook will be written in a way that supports local effort with minimal assistance from Program Office staff.	Funding included in the <i>Integration Planning</i> budget activity (Total amount allocated \$20,000).
	c. Local Agency Assistance Team. Staff dedicated to providing direct planning assistance to medium/smaller jurisdictions to facilitate county-based and regional integration	Medium/smaller jurisdictions will have the assistance they need to integrate locally or to gain access to the new state services such as eCharging and Name Event Index Service	Twelve agencies will be assisted each year commencing in FY’09	On Hold
	d. Vendor Communication and Assistance	Vendors will be knowledgeable of state integration initiatives and standard as they enhance their products. Major system vendors will be aware of state integration initiatives through vendor conferences facilitated by the Program Office, and will incorporate state standards and connection to state services (NEIS, eCharging, etc.) in future releases.	Program Office will coordinate quarterly vendor conferences (on-site and via webex). Agency interested parties also invited to participate. Two – three technology workgroups will be created by the end of FY08.	Funding included in the <i>Communications</i> budget activity (Total amount allocated \$140,000).

MN CJ Integration Framework & Blueprint: Initiatives, Projects and Outcomes



Projects in white background are planned 2008/2009 biennium BCA initiatives/projects based on state and federal funds, or are enterprise initiatives managed by other agencies under the oversight of the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Policy Group. All other items shaded in red are part of the enterprise vision but are on hold dependent on future funding.

<i>INITIATIVE</i>	<i>PROJECT</i>	<i>OUTCOME</i>	<i>PERFORMANCE MEASURE/ ROI (based on available funds for FY08/09)</i>	<i>FY08/09 Funding</i>
<p>ENABLING</p> <p>Task Force Rank 5th</p> <p>E9. Financial Assistance for the Benefit of Local Agencies</p>	<p>a. Grants and Contracts to Local Agencies and Vendors – Enterprise-wide Focus</p>	<p>Local grant/contract program to focus on supporting statewide initiatives such as making changes to local record and case management systems to supply data to CIBRS, use the eCharging Service, Name Event Index Service or Identity Access Management Service. The State of Minnesota will see a direct, statewide benefit from local agencies on any state funding provided.</p>	<p>See CIBRS (D2.d)</p> <p>Any agency receiving a grant will utilize the state service for which grant funding is provided.</p>	<p>See CIBRS (D2.d) funding. The \$1,000,000 allocated to CIBRS will be distributed through contracts to vendors/agencies. Additional funding for locals may be available through the NEIS and eCharging projects.</p>
	<p>b. Continued County -based Integration Implementation in Large Counties</p>	<p>Provide additional integration implementation funds to the large counties that have previously received grant funds.</p>	<p>The largest five counties that have previously received integration planning and implementation grants have project in queues awaiting funding.</p>	<p>On Hold</p>
	<p>c. County-based Implementation in Medium and Small Counties</p>	<p>Provide integration implementation funds to medium and small counties that receive implementation assistance per E8.b above (cookbook).</p>	<p>Medium and small counties may want to do implementation work based on the planning tools and planning assistance from the Program Office.</p>	<p>On Hold</p>

**MN CJ Integration Framework & Blueprint:
Initiatives, Projects and Outcomes**



Projects in white background are planned 2008/2009 biennium BCA initiatives/projects based on state and federal funds, or are enterprise initiatives managed by other agencies under the oversight of the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Policy Group. All other items shaded in red are part of the enterprise vision but are on hold dependent on future funding.

<i>INITIATIVE</i>	<i>PROJECT</i>	<i>OUTCOME</i>	<i>PERFORMANCE MEASURE/ ROI (based on available funds for FY08/09)</i>	<i>FY08/09 Funding</i>	
<i>ENABLING</i>					
Task Force Rank 5th Non-dependent Project	E10. State-Provided Systems for Local Agencies	a. Analyzing the feasibility of providing systems for local agencies to more efficiently manage information electronically.	This project would establish the feasibility of the state providing such systems and if deemed feasible, would establish the criteria and requirements for building such systems, without determining who should build the systems.	Feasibility study completed by FY'09.	On Hold

MN CJ Integration Framework & Blueprint: Initiatives, Projects and Outcomes



Projects in white background are planned 2008/2009 biennium BCA initiatives/projects based on state and federal funds, or are enterprise initiatives managed by other agencies under the oversight of the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Policy Group. All other items shaded in red are part of the enterprise vision but are on hold dependent on future funding.

<i>INITIATIVE</i>	<i>PROJECT</i>	<i>OUTCOME</i>	<i>PERFORMANCE MEASURE/ ROI (based on available funds for FY08/09)</i>	<i>FY08/09 Funding</i>
DELIVERY				
D1. Increased Data and Kinds of Data Available	a. Reduction of Suspense Records (traditional criminal history records not linked to a fingerprint)	Business process reengineering, the new Name Event Index Service and Roadmap as well as the eCharging Service will all help to facilitate suspense reduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Data quality analysis and recommendations will be completed and published by end of FY08. - Business processes/logic for linking dispositions to arrest records will be redesigned by the end of FY09. - 20 targeted counties will implement best practices processes and reduce new suspense records by 50% by end of FY09 . - As a result of the new MNCIS to CCH process, the number of new possible matches and duplicate documents in suspense will be reduced by 25% by the end of FY08 and an additional 25% by the end of FY09. (Unforeseen issues may result in a change in strategy/approach.)	\$90,000 Partial funding also included in the <i>Operations</i> budget activity.
	Non-dependent Project	b. New Computerized Criminal History (nCCH) System	Criminal history will be accurate and complete with the addition of new linked data sources (nCCH to replace to replace 20 year old CCH).	New system to be implemented by FY' 10 and to meet user requirements. On Hold
	Non-dependent Project	c. MN NIBRS (Component of CIBRS)	More detailed data to meet federal reporting standards; More ease of local collection and reporting	Implementation of the new system by FY' 10 and including local adaptations by FY' 12. Replaces 30 year old system. On Hold

**MN CJ Integration Framework & Blueprint:
Initiatives, Projects and Outcomes**



Projects in white background are planned 2008/2009 biennium BCA initiatives/projects based on state and federal funds, or are enterprise initiatives managed by other agencies under the oversight of the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Policy Group. All other items shaded in red are part of the enterprise vision but are on hold dependent on future funding.

<i>INITIATIVE</i>		<i>PROJECT</i>	<i>OUTCOME</i>	<i>PERFORMANCE MEASURE/ ROI (based on available funds for FY08/09)</i>	<i>FY08/09 Funding</i>
DELIVERY					
Non-dependent Project		d. MN Criminal Justice Statute Service (Statute Service)	More accurate charging by prosecutors resulting in more accurate criminal history records.	Identify future enhancements and maintain the Statute Service - Ongoing	\$90,000 Partial funding also included in the <i>MN Offense Codes</i> budget activity.
Task Force Rank 2nd (D2a)	D2. Criminal Justice Information Capture & Distribution Services (Role and event based delivery, and system to system workflow)	a. MN Criminal Justice Information Integration Services (MNCJIS) Role-Based Delivery, System-to-System Workflow, Single User Interface. Creating a portal that will allow criminal justice users to enter statewide repositories through a single point.	Will increase speed, usability, easy of use. Includes single point of delivery/data entry (portal) to BCA systems. Individual justice practitioners will have data tailored to their specific business event and location e.g., traffic stop, booking, arraignment, etc.). Delivery will conform to state data policy.	Two – three BCA applications delivered as services through a portal (single point of entry) by end of FY09.	Funding included in the <i>MN Criminal Justice Information Integration Services</i> budget activity (Total amount allocated \$1,200,000). Additional funding will also be allocated from <i>Operations, Technical Standards, and Business Standards</i> budget activities.
Dependent Project					

**MN CJ Integration Framework & Blueprint:
Initiatives, Projects and Outcomes**



Projects in white background are planned 2008/2009 biennium BCA initiatives/projects based on state and federal funds, or are enterprise initiatives managed by other agencies under the oversight of the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Policy Group. All other items shaded in red are part of the enterprise vision but are on hold dependent on future funding.

<i>INITIATIVE</i>	<i>PROJECT</i>	<i>OUTCOME</i>	<i>PERFORMANCE MEASURE/ ROI (based on available funds for FY08/09)</i>	<i>FY08/09 Funding</i>	
DELIVERY	Dependent Project	b. eCharging Service Rollout.	Law Enforcement agencies and county and city attorneys will be able to electronically prepare and file with courts, including electronic signatures all felony, gross misdemeanor and statutory misdemeanor cases. Printing will be on demand. Will result in reduction in paper process and staff inefficiencies. It will contribute to traffic safety by including DWI charges.	Four pilot counties will be implemented by end of FY09. eCharging will contribute to the comprehensiveness of the event data indexed by NEIS (eCharging workflow will maintain linkages of certain law enforcement, prosecution, and courts data which will allow that data to be indexed by NEIS).	\$1,900,000
	Non-dependent Project	c. Warrant Processing.	Implementation of electronic distribution of warrant information between justice agencies. The final plans will be know at the completion of the business analysis in E7.a above.	Design phase to commence in FY'09.	On Hold <i>Business analysis of the warrants process was completed in spring of 2007. A delivery team is meeting to consider those recommendations (\$70,000 has been allocated for Program Office staff to assist this delivery team.)</i>

**MN CJ Integration Framework & Blueprint:
Initiatives, Projects and Outcomes**



Projects in white background are planned 2008/2009 biennium BCA initiatives/projects based on state and federal funds, or are enterprise initiatives managed by other agencies under the oversight of the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Policy Group. All other items shaded in red are part of the enterprise vision but are on hold dependent on future funding.

<i>INITIATIVE</i>	<i>PROJECT</i>	<i>OUTCOME</i>	<i>PERFORMANCE MEASURE/ ROI (based on available funds for FY08/09)</i>	<i>FY08/09 Funding</i>
DELIVERY Non-dependent Project	d Comprehensive Incident Based Reporting System (CIBRS)	Implement a statewide database of law enforcement incident data for investigations	At least 187 agencies submitting data by the end of FY09.	\$987,000
D3 .Other Agency Enterprise Initiatives	a. MNCIS – convert from multiple trial court case management systems to a single system and convert from multiple data repository designs to a single data repository design. Implement statewide to all 10 judicial districts in all counties.	MNCIS implemented in 66 counties as of Sept. 22, 2006. The third, fifth, sixth and eighth districts are completely converted to the new case management system. The fourth, seventh, ninth and 10 th districts will be completed by July 2007. The first and second districts will be completed by the end of December 2007.	Completion of the rollout of a single case management system will improve the capability of consistent service delivery in the trial court system regardless of court location. Improved performance and measurement capacity will also be available, as well as the capacity to handle increased workloads through productivity improvements.	<i>To be provided by the Courts.</i>
	b. Statewide Supervision System (S3)	Complete security and functionality enhancements for Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines Commission (MSGC), Assessments, and load processes.	Enhancements for MSGC and Assessments will be complete by 7/1/08. Load process complete and recommendations for future load enhancements by 7/1/08.	<i>To be provided by DOC.</i>

Background Checks Policy Questions and Policy Group Recommendations:

1. Should statutory background checks become more consistent in their approaches, guided by a set of principles?

Current Law Summary:

Statutory background checks, which have been authorized by various legislative committees at various times since 1945, vary in their approaches and in their specificity. See pages 58-63 of the Delivery Team report for a summary table of Minnesota statutes that authorize background checks. A more detailed and updated summary by Minnesota House Research is located at:
<http://www.house.leg.state.mn.us/hrd/pubs/bkgdchck.pdf>

Recommendation: The Policy Group recommends that background checks be more consistent and be guided by the following principles.

- A. **Like-type statutory checks should be treated similarly** (similar occupations and license types) (Recommended by Delivery Team)
- B. **Potential risks to the public, vulnerable populations, systems and data ought to influence how much information is sought about individuals on background checks** (Recommended by Delivery Team)
- C. **Checks of fingerprint-based repositories, such as the BCA's Computerized Criminal History, ought to be performed with a fingerprint** (Recommended by Delivery Team)
- D. **In the longer term, the state should pursue national (FBI) checks for most statutorily-required checks** (Not recommended by the Delivery Team, but there is a national direction toward facilitating access to FBI records)
- E. **Potential risks to children call for mandatory (rather than voluntary) checks in situations where individuals will have frequent unsupervised contact with children** (A more detailed recommendation was made by Delivery Team)
- F. **Sensitive data, including older arrest data and suspense information should be provided only to public agencies** (Recommended by Delivery Team)

The Policy Group also discussed the following items and requested that they be given further consideration.

The BCA should reconcile records from the suspense file when background checks are requested, and should support adequate funding to reconcile records in suspense.

Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Policy Group
Background Checks

v 1.0 June 27, 2007

A Center of Excellence or “one-stop shop” for conducting background checks should be considered. While making the sources used for background checks consistent, the process for conducting the background check itself should also be consistent – get all information from a single source. If conducted by the BCA, all of the listed sources should be part of the check.

Convictions that are in suspense vs. arrests that are in suspense should possibly be approached differently or given different consideration.

2. Should statutory background checks adopt consistent procedures to ensure that individuals are given sufficient information and process protections while undergoing a background check?

Current Law Summary:

Statutory background checks, which have been authorized by various legislative committees at various times since 1945, vary in their requirements. The protections of the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act (MGDPA) apply when the background check entity is a government entity.

Recommendation: The Policy Group recommends the following procedures to make statutory background checks more consistent and to provide more safeguards and process protections for individuals.

- A. Provide information to individuals that a background check is required by law or provide a consent form. The information provided or consent form should include, at minimum:**
 - 1. The type of criminal history records check authorized by the law, including the databases that would be checked;
 - 2. The scope of the check;
 - 3. The duration of the check, including the number of years of a “look back” period
 - 4. Whether the check covers automatic updates to check results;
 - 5. Whether re-disclosure is allowed and, if so, under what circumstances; and
 - 6. The extent to which the law allows storage and re-use of the information obtained to conduct the check.
- B. Provide notice of disqualifying offenses, if any, identified in statute.**
- C. Provide individuals with a copy of the background check (with the exception of confidential data).**
- D. Provide notice of the data subject’s rights to access and correct data.**
- E. Provide notice to the background check subject when the background check is completed, and identify who initiated the check.**
- F. Use information, fingerprints or other data provided by the subject of a background check, solely for the purpose of the background check.**

The Policy Group also recognized that there could be significant costs associated with implementing these procedures and requested further study of the fiscal impact.

3. Should state agencies provide background checks at no charge for volunteers?

Current Law Summary:

User charges are authorized for Minnesota background checks. These charges are not waived when citizens intend to volunteer their time. However, background checks for some nonprofit volunteers are already reimbursed in state and federal program budgets.

Recommendation: The Policy Group recommends that background checks be provided by state agencies for volunteers at no charge or at a reduced charge, depending on future cost estimates to be considered by the Policy Group.

Volunteers would be considered individuals who volunteer their time for public benefit. This would apply only when the check is mandated by statute or authorized by statute and only when the check is not otherwise reimbursed.

Expungement Policy Questions and Policy Group Recommendations

1. For what purposes should expunged records continue to be used (meaning, they are accessible for certain purposes)?

Current Law Summary:

An expunged record may be opened for these purposes:

- for a criminal investigation, prosecution, or sentencing, upon an *ex parte* court order¹
- for purposes of evaluating a prospective employee in a criminal justice agency *without a court order;*” (records of convictions only)²
- for purposes of a background study under section 245C.08 unless the court order for expungement is directed specifically to the commissioner of human services³

The use of expunged records for additional criminal justice purposes

Recommendation: The Policy Group recommends that expunged records be accessible to the courts, law enforcement, prosecutors, probation officers, and corrections officers without a court order.

This is in addition to the allowed access to expunged records authorized in current law, as noted above. Data may be transmitted between and among these agencies. This is recommended with the understanding that audit trails and purpose codes should document access to records and the purpose for the access.

Recommendation: The Policy Group recommends that expunged convictions still be considered convictions for purposes of gun laws, sex offender registration, expungement proceedings, sentencing, subsequent prosecution, other crimes evidence, impeachment, probation and statutorily mandated background checks (*Policy Group noted this list may not be exhaustive*).

The use of expunged records for non-criminal justice purposes

Recommendation: The Policy Group recommends that expunged records be accessible for statutory background checks, if the government agency provides, in statutes or rules, for a review process including the right to administrative or judicial review.

The Policy Group is concerned that there may be some other high risk occupation categories that do not have background checks mandated by statute. In these categories, the government entity conducting the background check should have a review process, and should obtain a statutory mandate by legislative determination.

The Policy Group requested that an addendum list some possible high risk categories for the legislature to consider.

¹ M.S. 609A.03, subd. 7, (b)(1)

² M.S. 609A.03, subd. 7, (b)(2)

³ M.S. 609A.03, subd. 7, (b)(3)

2. Should expungements be more uniform across all government entities?

Current Law Summary:

- Until March 2004, expungements ordered from the judicial branch were generally effective on executive branch records – there was general parity between what was sealed in the courts and in the executive branch⁴
- The Court of Appeals decision *State v. Schultz* in March 2004 limited the effectiveness of expungements on executive branch records. They are now generally limited to three statutorily-authorized categories:
 1. for certain controlled substance offenses, upon dismissal and discharge;
 2. for juveniles prosecuted as adults, upon discharge; and
 3. for actions or proceedings that were resolved in favor of the petitioner.
- Expungement orders are effective on executive branch records if constitutional rights are violated.
- Courts may still order expungement of *court records* under the inherent authority of the courts

Some reported consequences of the lack of parity between the two branches:

- Consequences for the petitioner – the remedy has limited effectiveness and is only useful in select circumstances
- Consequences for the systems and data users – you can access data from executive branch databases – but you cannot see the court records for the same case.

Recommendation: The Policy Group recommends that expungements should be more uniform across all government entities, and that there should be a statutory remedy.

⁴ This is a simplification. *Schultz* clarified some previous case law that some judges were already following.

3. Who should be statutorily eligible to petition for expungement?

Current Law Summary:

- Current law states that the following are eligible to petition for expungement and to have the expungement be effective upon executive branch records:
 1. for certain controlled substance offenses, upon dismissal and discharge;
 2. for juveniles prosecuted as adults, upon discharge; and
 3. for actions or proceedings that were resolved in favor of the petitioner.
- Offenses for which predatory offender registration is required are not may not be expunged.

The Policy Group believes there ought to be some minimum amount of time that a person with a conviction should wait before they file a petition for expungement, and that some other restrictions should serve as “gatekeepers” to prevent a person from petitioning for expungement. However, there other factors that should not prevent someone from petitioning, but should be considered by the court when deciding whether to issue an expungement order.

Waiting periods and other “gatekeepers” regarding eligibility to petition for expungement

Recommendation: The Policy Group recommends that eligibility to petition be after a specified number of years following discharge from supervision.

The Policy Group adopted the timeframes in the table below; however, the Policy Group agreed that these timeframes might be arbitrary and could possibly be refined based on research-based criteria. Years shown are *from* the date of discharge *to* the date of first eligibility to petition for the expungement of convictions under statute.

Convictions	Felony	Gross Misdemeanor	Misdemeanor	Petty Misdemeanor
Person crime	15 years	10 years	7 years	3 years
Other crimes (property, drug)	5 years	3 years	2 years	1 year

Recommendation: The Policy Group recommends that if there is a conviction subsequent to the crime sought to be expunged and that subsequent conviction is for a felony, gross misdemeanor, or targeted misdemeanor, then the “clock starts over” – that is the eligibility date to petition for expungement for the earlier crime is reset to the date of discharge from supervision for the later conviction.

Recommendation: The Policy Group recommends that convictions for certain crimes are ineligible to petition such as: (1) registration crimes, as in current law; and (2) traffic offenses, for example DWI, speeding.

Recommendation: The Policy Group recommends that a person may not file a petition for expungement if the petitioner is under correctional supervision for an offense, is currently involved in a diversion program, or is currently charged with violating a criminal law.

Recommendation: The Policy Group recommends that eligibility to petition should be extended to juvenile records that are public.

Factors to consider when deciding whether to issue an expungement order:

Recommendation: The Policy Group recommends that the following factors be considered when deciding whether to issue an expungement order:

- (a) When deciding whether to issue an expungement order under this section, the court shall consider the following factors:
 - (1) whether the petitioner's sentencing conditions were satisfactorily completed for the underlying crime whose record is the subject of the expungement petition;
 - (2) whether the petitioner's restitution has been paid for the underlying crime whose record is the subject of the expungement petition;
 - (3) whether any treatment has been completed for the underlying crime whose record is the subject of the expungement petition;
 - (4) the nature and severity of the underlying crime whose record is the subject of the expungement petition;
 - (5) the danger, if any, the petitioner poses to any individuals or society;
 - (6) the length of time since the crime occurred;
 - (7) the steps taken by the petitioner towards rehabilitation following the crime;
 - (8) extenuating or mitigating factors relating to the underlying crime, including, but not limited to, the petitioner's level of participation, claims of innocence, and irregularities in the trial;
 - (9) the reasons for the expungement, including, but not limited to, the petitioner's attempts to obtain employment, housing, or other necessities;
 - (10) the petitioner's criminal record;
 - (11) the petitioner's record of employment and community involvement;
 - (12) the recommendations of interested law enforcement, prosecutorial, and corrections officials;
 - (13) the recommendations of any victims of the underlying crime;
 - (14) any expungement already obtained by petition; and
 - (15) any other factor deemed relevant by the court.
- (b) Except as provided in paragraph (a), a court may grant an expungement if it determines by a preponderance of the evidence that the benefit to the petitioner outweighs the disadvantages to the public and public safety after considering the factors listed in paragraph (a).
- (c) If the proceedings had been resolved in the petitioner's favor the expungement shall be granted unless the agency or jurisdiction whose records would be affected established by clear and convincing evidence that the interests of the public and public safety outweighs the disadvantages to the petitioner of not sealing the records.

4. Should any expungements happen without a petition? (Require no action by the subject?)

Current Law Summary:

The subject of the criminal record must petition. However, in the case of proceedings resolved in favor of the petitioner, the court shall grant the petition to seal the record unless the agency or jurisdiction whose records would be affected establishes by clear and convincing evidence that the interests of the public and public safety outweigh the disadvantages to the petitioner of not sealing the record.

Recommendation: The Policy Group recommends that expungements be granted without the need for the subject to file a petition with the court in certain circumstances.

Proceedings resolved in favor of the petitioner

- For those who were arrested but not charged
- For those who were charged but the case was dismissed
 - There should be a waiting period for arrests and dismissed charges, mentioned above, for one year
 - These expungements of arrests/charges should apply only to non-person crimes.

Other non-conviction categories

- For those who received a continuance for dismissal
- For those who received a stay of adjudication
- For those successfully completing diversion
 - The prosecutor should agree to the continuance, stay or diversion, mentioned above
 - There should be satisfactory completion of conditions imposed for the continuance, stay or diversion
 - Automatic expungements should apply only to non-person crimes

Alternative Funding Sources for Integration Costs

Report Submitted by the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Policy Group

January 15, 2008 v.1.0

As part of the 2007 Public Safety Omnibus Bill, the Minnesota Legislature directed the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Policy Group (Policy Group) to “*study funding sources other than the general fund for new CriMNet costs and present its ideas to the House of Representatives and Senate committees having jurisdiction over criminal justice policy and funding by January 15, 2008*” (Chapter 54, Article 1, Section 10). The Policy Group recommended that the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Task Force (Task Force) form a delivery team (working group) to consider possible funding sources and report back to the Policy Group.

A Task Force delivery team was created with representation from the following entities: Association of Minnesota Counties, League of Minnesota Cities, Metropolitan Inter-County Association, Minnesota House of Representatives, Minnesota Senate, Hennepin County Community Corrections, Ramsey County Sheriffs Office, Minnesota Department of Corrections, and the Minnesota Bureau of Criminal Apprehension. The delivery team discussed and reviewed a number of potential, supplemental funding sources, including funding options that other states have successfully implemented. The delivery team did not consider how much funding is needed for future integration efforts or what the funds would be used for (as this was not within the scope of the delivery team’s work).

The delivery team created some “guiding principles” that should be considered when making decisions regarding alternative funding for criminal justice information integration efforts. Those principles are outlined below. The top principle agreed upon by the delivery team was the need for continued state general fund appropriations as the primary source of funding. The team felt strongly that if criminal justice information integration is truly a state priority (as the criminal justice system is dependent on complete, accurate and timely information), future sustainability is dependent on general fund appropriations. The delivery team did not make any specific recommendations for alternative funding sources, but rather, chose to submit all of the ideas that were discussed to the Policy Group, including background information and other considerations.

The Policy Group met in December 2007 and reviewed the delivery team’s report. The Policy Group supports the guiding principles recommended by the delivery team and agrees that if protection of the citizenry is a core function of government, the legislature should continue to fund statewide criminal justice integration efforts with state general funds. The Policy Group does not support any of the alternative funding sources considered by the delivery team at this time. There was consensus among Policy Group members that none of the options presented are a viable alternative or supplement to state general funds. The options have unintended consequences, divert general funding from other sources, or are not sustainable or feasible options. The Policy Group does support the state continuing to seek federal grant funds for criminal justice information integration which has been a successful supplement to state funds in the past.

Guiding Principles:

- 1. The legislature should continue to fund criminal justice information integration efforts with general fund appropriations and supplement with other funding options.**
- 2. The need for funding for criminal justice information integration will be ongoing. Integration is a process – not an event – that will continue to evolve as criminal justice agencies, business practices and technology all continue to evolve.**
- 3. Multiple funding options may need to be considered – no one option can fully fund criminal justice integration efforts in Minnesota.**
- 4. Any sources of funding should be sustainable.**
- 5. Any sources of funding should be linked to public safety and the costs to provide criminal justice information services.**
- 6. The administrative ability to collect potential revenue should not be too onerous.**