

CRIMINAL AND JUVENILE JUSTICE INFORMATION SYSTEMS (CJJIS) COUNCIL

MINUTES of MEETING

Monday, September 30, 1996

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Kenneth Palmer at 9:25 a.m. on September 30, 1996, at the Florida Department of Law Enforcement Headquarters, 2331 Phillips Road, Tallahassee, Florida.

ROLL CALL

Members Present:

Chairman Kenneth Palmer, State Courts Administrator
Carolyn Snurkowski, Designee for Attorney General Robert A. Butterworth
Nancy Daniels, Public Defender, Second Judicial Circuit
Lawrence W. Crow, Jr., Sheriff, Polk County
Elaine W. Bryant, Designee for Secretary Calvin Ross, Department of Juvenile Justice
Harry Dodd, Designee for Secretary Harry K. Singletary, Department of Corrections
Edward Spooner, Chair, Florida Parole Commission
Karen Rushing, Clerk of the Court, Sarasota County
Sid Klein, Chief, Clearwater Police Department
Arnold A. Gibbs, Chief, Cape Coral Police Department
Daryl G. McLaughlin, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Law Enforcement

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 30, 1996 MEETING

Chief Klein moved the minutes be approved. Ms. Bryant seconded the motion, and the minutes were unanimously approved by the Council.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Ms. Daniels nominated Kenneth Palmer to serve another term as Council Chair, and Ms. Rushing seconded the nomination. Chairman Palmer relinquished control of the meeting and asked Deputy Commissioner McLaughlin to conduct the vote. The Council unanimously elected Chairman Palmer.

Ms. Daniels nominated Ms. Snurkowski to serve another term as Vice Chair, and Mr. Spooner seconded the nomination. The Council unanimously elected Ms. Snurkowski.

OPENING REMARKS

Chairman Palmer opened the meeting with a brief discussion of the 1996 Legislative mandates to the Council and actions taken since the last Council meeting. In early August, he met with staff from the House and Senate committees for appropriations and criminal justice to establish a clear understanding of the legislative intent regarding the scope of the Council's efforts to comply with the mandates. It was agreed that the Council, with its limited resources, time and expertise, would conduct its new duties on a strategic and conceptual level. The Council will work closely with the Information Resource Commission and review only those major issues that met certain criteria based upon the mandates. In mid-August he met with Department of Corrections staff to discuss budget review issues. In late September he established a steering committee, consisting of representatives from the Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE), the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) and the Department of Corrections (DC) to discuss a proposed Council work plan for fiscal year 1996-97. The proposed work plan will be fully discussed in agenda item one.

PRESENTATION OF AGENDA ITEMS

ITEM 10

The Criminal Justice Data Element Dictionary

Mr. Wayne Quinsey

Department of Law Enforcement

Mr. Quinsey informed the Council that the Dictionary has existed since 1987. Its purpose is to satisfy the statewide reporting needs of the Florida Department of Law Enforcement, the Florida Department of Corrections and Florida's court system.

In September of 1995, The Council asked the Juvenile Data Sharing Work Group to review the information needs for disposition reporting and recommend necessary changes to the Dictionary. By May of 1996, the review was done and a draft of the updated Dictionary was distributed to all Clerks of Court and other entities having vested interests in the subject, with a request for their comments by June 7, 1996.

This update included the addition of critical sub categories of data such as sexual predators, domestic violence and stipulated alien deportations, and clarifying language on disposition reporting. The update did not include any changes that would require major or expensive modifications in local information systems.

The Council will be provided copies of the updated Dictionary in October for review and will be asked at its next meeting to approve it as the uniform standard for sharing criminal justice information in Florida.

Chairman Palmer noted that the Dictionary is a dynamic document that will change along with changes in criminal justice reporting requirements and that it is not intended to be an all-inclusive dictionary for information systems at the local level. Mr. Quinsey added that it is meant to serve as dictionary for common data elements to be used and shared by criminal justice entities. Local system designs should include these data elements, but are in no way limited by the Dictionary if additional elements are needed.

ITEM 2

Discussion of National Name-Based Criminal History Checks

Commissioner James T. Moore
Department of Law Enforcement

Commissioner Moore began his presentation with congratulations to the Council for its fine work in improving criminal justice information systems in Florida.

FDLE recently conducted a survey of all law enforcement agencies in Florida, and the survey revealed that the most important issue regarding services offered by FDLE was the ability of those agencies to obtain, use and share accurate, timely information for the purposes of preventing and solving crimes. FDLE has positioned itself to respond to these information needs as effectively as possible. However, at the federal level (FBI and NCIC) there remains a number of entrenched barriers to the sharing of national criminal history information which could legitimately be used for vital public safety purposes by local law enforcement agencies and certain elements of the private sector.

There are basically two issues regarding availability of federal CCH information. Commissioner Moore stated that it is the Department's position that there should be:

- 1) an expansion of the definition of "criminal justice purposes" for on-line CCH checks, and
- 2) a relaxation of the fingerprint requirements for certain state sanctioned non-criminal justice CCH checks.

Under current NCIC rules, national on-line CCH checks can be done only for "criminal justice purposes" or for criminal justice employment. NCIC defines "criminal justice purposes" as: *"Performance of any of the following activities by the courts or a governmental agency: detection, apprehension, detention, pretrial release, post-trial release, prosecution, adjudication, correctional supervision, or rehabilitation of accused persons or criminal offenders"*. The definition does not include many of the crime prevention uses of CCH information or its use by private entities supporting these functions. In addition, NCIC permits national CCH checks for certain non-criminal justice purposes where required by specific state statutes. (Examples: teacher employment, day care employment, licensing of physicians, etc.) These checks must be based upon fingerprint comparisons, and take weeks or months to complete.

We have identified some situations where local law enforcement agencies should be able to use the NCIC system to conduct on-line "initial screening" of individuals (using names and

demographic information) for law enforcement-related purposes that do not fit under the current narrow NCIC definition of “criminal justice purpose”. Examples are preliminary checks on “safe house” parents, school bus drivers, school crossing guards, and other individuals wishing to volunteer their services. If an initial screening reveals a CCH record which is disputed, fingerprints can then be submitted to establish positive identification. Such preliminary NCIC name checks would clearly be in the best interest of the criminal justice community and the citizens of Florida.

In addition, we are urging the FBI to expand the states’ access to NCIC criminal history files by allowing on-line name-based *preliminary* CCH checks for certain non-criminal justice purposes, as specified by the using states. This will allow the sharing of critically needed criminal history information with users such as the education community and social services agencies.

Florida has always strongly supported the fingerprint requirement for criminal history checks as a way to establish positive identification of subjects, and we take the position that fingerprints should continue to be required for those existing purposes as required by law. However, a significant majority of the individuals with whom we deal can be properly identified by name and demographic data for the purpose of conducting initial CCH screenings. Again, where a dispute arises over the identity of the subject of a CCH record, fingerprints can be used to resolve the issue of identity.

Florida is successfully conducting over 600,000 name-based record checks per year, on Florida information only. With the great mobility of our population today, a criminal history check of one state only is not acceptable. Name-based record checks should be expanded to include nationwide information. If administered properly, name-based record checks can provide preliminary information quickly, and with minimal risk.

Sheriff Crow related his experience with this issue in Polk County, and characterized the unavailability of information for certain critical law enforcement purposes as “ludicrous”. He recommended the Council take a strong position in favor of Commissioner Moore’s recommendation. Commissioner Moore added that the Governor, the Attorney General and the Commissioner of Education strongly support this issue.

Ms. Daniels asked what “safeguards” have been considered when using information in this manner. Commissioner Moore said we would use the same care as we have been using for years in Florida, such as: disclaimers stating that the reports are based on demographic data only and the record displayed may belong to someone other than the subject being checked; fingerprints will be used to establish positive identity when reports are disputed; and the exercise of fundamental fairness and due care in the use of this information.

Commissioner Moore asked the Council to support FDLE’s efforts by adopting the resolution before them which urges expansion of the definition of “criminal justice purpose” for NCIC users and a relaxation of fingerprint requirements at the national level for certain state sanctioned name-based CCH checks. Chief Klein moved to adopt the resolution, Sheriff Crow seconded and the Council unanimously adopted it.

In closing, Commissioner Moore briefly discussed the organizational re-engineering which is occurring at FDLE to provide our customers with more efficient and effective delivery of Department services, and some of the related personnel reassignments. He announced that Jim Sewell has been asked to assume command of the Tampa Region and Ms. Donna Uzzell will be responsible for the Criminal Justice Information Program. He praised and thanked Jim for all his efforts and accomplishments in directing FDLE's Criminal Justice Information Program. Chairman Palmer also extended thanks to Jim and stated that, with all the dramatic changes in the Council's role in the last two years, Jim's efforts were critical to the Council's success in fulfilling its statutory duties.

ITEM 1

New Statutory Duties of the CJJIS Council and Proposed Work Plan

Chairman Kenneth Palmer

Chairman Palmer began by distributing to Council members a proposed work plan for fiscal year 1996-97. The plan was developed as a result of a series of meetings with: staff of House and Senate committees on appropriations, criminal justice and information technology resources; staff of the Department of Corrections (DC); the Information Resource Commission; and a CJJIS Council steering committee consisting of the Council Chair and representatives from FDLE, DC and DJJ. The proposed work plan is attached to, and a part of, these minutes. Chairman Palmer briefly explained each component of the work plan.

Pursuant to meetings with Legislative staff, Council oversight of FDLE, DJJ and DC will continue at the strategic policy level and will be accomplished by regular reports from those agencies on projects within the purview of the Council. As a voluntary group with limited time and resources, the Council cannot do in-depth reviews of agency programs and budgets or attempt to micro-manage their operations. The Council will review only those budget issues which meet established criteria developed around the scope of the Council's legislative mandates. Proposed criteria are attached. The IRC will research the information resource budget issues and inform the Council Chair on those which meet the criteria. The CJJIS steering group will review the issues and make recommendations to the Chair. This process will occur in October of each year, on the time table the IRC uses for the budget evaluation process. The same criteria will be used to evaluate agency strategic plans.

In response to one of the work plan tasks, Mr. McLaughlin volunteered to serve as the Council's representative on the Joint Task Force on Law Enforcement Communications, and the Chairman appointed him as such.

A draft report to the Legislature will be prepared for Council review at its January '97 meeting.

ITEM 3

Department of Corrections Offender Based Information System (OBIS)

Mr. Earl Kellow

Department of Corrections (DC)

Mr. Kellow introduced Mr. Harry Dodd who will begin serving as member of the Council as designee for Secretary Singletary.

Mr. Paul Maurer presented a historical overview of the OBIS, which has been in operation since late 1976. During that time, OBIS has been associated with three data centers: HRS, Florida State University and the Justice Data Center, which is now a part of DC. Over the years, OBIS has been expanded and improved to keep pace with the State's growing information needs.

OBIS currently tracks the following types of information: inmate data, parole and probation data, offender tracking data and risk management data. Improvements to OBIS such as the Computer Assisted Reception Process (CARP) have substantially reduced inmate processing time at the reception centers to less than a week. In total, the system supports 15 separate databases necessary for the operation of the corrections system, with more than 10,000 terminals. OBIS contains more than one million records with over 10,000 data elements, and has 15,000 users. OBIS handles over 900,000 transactions a day, with a response time of less than 2 seconds. There are 60 outside agencies connected to OBIS. Four other state have adopted OBIS and many other states are looking at it. Some future applications being considered are post sentence investigations, probation and parole contacts, and inmate risks. The number one goal at OBIS is quality of the data.

Mr. Frank Ellzey presented an overview of the Justice Data Center (JDC), which was created in 1978 to support the State court system and DC. Over the years, the percentage of JDC's support of DC applications steadily grew and the need for main-frame support of the State court system diminished. Consequently, JDC was transferred to DC last year and now exclusively serves DC.

JDC is a small specialized data center with 27 staff members. JDC maintains a statewide telecommunications network, with 18,000 terminals and 7,200-7,500 inquiries per day. Recent years have seen growth rates in the network of up to 40%. JDC maintains a help desk with five employees which handle an average of 7,000 calls per month. With the dramatic increases in the prison population during the past several years, the JDC has grown accordingly to meet the increasing demand for its services. As the system grew, its cost per transaction decreased.

Chairman Palmer stated that he saw the Council's role as overseeing the effectiveness with which JDC connects with the criminal justice community. Mr. Kellow responded that the number of agencies connecting to the system is constantly increasing, including: Sheriffs, Police Departments, State Attorneys, Public Defenders, Clerks of Court and many federal agencies. It is DC's policy to make it as easy as possible for qualified agencies to connect to JDC. There is no charge to connect to JDC.

Chief Gibbs asked about the status of JDC interfacing with the DJJ system. Mr. Kellow said the Joint Application Design being conducted in Tampa by DJJ should reveal the information needs of participating agencies, and that will lay the groundwork for developing a system for sharing the information.

Ms. Daniels said the Public Defender's Office (2nd Judicial Circuit) is connected to JDC, and the system saves them considerable time and effort.

ITEM 4
The Department of Corrections Sentencing Guidelines Score Sheet Project

Ms. JoAnne Leznoff
Department of Corrections

Ms. JoAnne Leznoff presented this item. She began with a brief overview of the history of Florida's sentencing guidelines, which govern the sentencing of adult felony offenders. All felony offenders must be scored under the sentencing guidelines, except those convicted of capital offenses or those sentenced under special categories, such as violent felony offenders. The Sentencing Guidelines Score Sheet is the document used to do the scoring. The score sheet is designed to evaluate a number of factors used in determining sentences of offenders and to capture certain criminal justice data. It provides for details on: the current and previous convictions of the offender, victim injuries, parole or probation status, whether a weapon was used, and a host of other pieces of relevant information on the history of the offender. The score sheet also provides Florida's sentencing policies and an area to calculate a score for the purpose of determining the recommended sentence. Finally, it displays the actual sentence applied by the Court.

With the passage of the Safe Streets Act, DC was given the responsibility to develop the score sheet. It was produced after receipt of input from other criminal justice agencies who would be using it, and is distributed to the Clerks of Court through Probation and Parole offices throughout the state. In addition, the Act mandated the collection of specified criminal justice data on the score sheet that had previously been collected by OSCA. Therefore, as of January 1, 1994, the score sheets began capturing the information on offenses committed on or after that date. The Act also mandated publication of an annual compliance report which essentially details the rates at which the Clerks of Court are submitting the score sheets. The rates are computed by comparing admissions into the correctional system to score sheets submitted to DC. When DC assumed responsibility for the score sheets, the compliance rate was approximately 57%. Compliance is now at 91.5%.

The score sheet database is very useful in analyzing the sentencing guidelines and making recommendations to the Sentencing Commission. It was designed with two purposes in mind: to capture sentencing data; and provide automated assistance in preparing score sheets, saving considerable manual preparation and calculations. With the automated assistance, the score sheets can be prepared in about 25% of the time that would be required to complete them manually.

The sentencing database is also used to analyze sentencing practices in Florida. The sentencing guidelines are simply guidelines, and court have the latitude to sentence above or below the recommended ranges. Mitigation is defined as sentencing below the recommended range. The mitigation rate for non-state-prison sanctions is 41%, where individuals are not sentenced to state prison when prison is mandated by the guidelines. Various other types of mitigation rates are also analyzed.

In the last session of the Legislature, Senate Bill 156 gave DC sole responsibility for preparation of score sheets as of October 1, 1997 so that: all score sheets can be prepared from the database, uniform policies will be applied in score sheet preparation, and manual duplication will be eliminated. DC received 50 new positions to accomplish the task.

DC is expanding access to the sentencing database by offering on-line access to all State Attorneys and Public Defenders.

Ms. Daniels asked if DC had a way of correcting the database when a sentence is modified on appeal. Ms. Leznoff said the database is modified if the Clerk of the Court submits the change.

Chairman Palmer raised the issue of the database not containing information explaining reasons for departure from the sentencing guidelines. Often, such departures are the result of complex pretrial decisions which are not reflected on the score sheets to explain the reasons for mitigation or aggravation in sentencing. Ms. Leznoff said DC enters departure information when they receive it, which is currently about 20% of the time. Each month, DC reviews admissions to its facilities or supervision, and attempts to obtain any missing score sheets for those admissions.

Mr. Dodd stated that care must be taken when reaching conclusions from the statistics generated by the score sheets. The circumstances behind the numbers must be understood. For example, you may have a judge who is specializing only in “hard core” repeat offenders. That judge’s aggravation departure rate will be understandably high. Mr. Dodd said DC’s quality assurance section is very sensitive to the importance of good data and aware of the adverse affect it can have if misinterpreted. A fully integrated criminal justice information system is needed to capture all important data. Chairman Palmer agreed, saying the State needs to work in that direction.

Ms. Snurkowski expressed concern over the accuracy of the sentencing data where sentences are modified on appeal. Ms. Leznoff said DC enters all supplemental information received.

Chief Gibbs also expressed concern over the percentage of score sheets not displaying the reasons for departure from the sentencing guidelines. Ms. Leznoff said the problem appears to be that the individuals responsible for submitting departure information are not doing so. Even though the judges are statutorily responsible for completing the score sheets, that responsibility is delegated differently in the various judicial circuits, and the information is commonly not submitted. Chief Gibbs also asked if the Council should become involved in this issue. Chairman Palmer said the issue appears to fall within the scope of the Council’s new duties and it may be appropriate to have one of the work groups work with DC and the Sentencing Commission toward a solution.

Mr. McLaughlin asked Ms. Leznoff who should logically be delegated responsibility for submission of the score sheet, and she responded that it may be appropriate to have different individuals responsible in different situations. There is no clear answer. Mr. McLaughlin recommended the Council look further into the issue. Ms. Rushing agreed. Chairman Palmer said a work group will be created to analyze the issue.

Before presentation of agenda item 5, Dr. James Sewell introduced Ms. Donna Uzzell, who will assume command of the Criminal Justice Information Program at FDLE on November 1, 1996.

ITEM 5

Discussion of Parole Commission Information and Technology Resources

Mr. Ed Spooner
Parole Commission

Mr. Spooner began with a discussion of the five programs administered by the Parole Commission.

1. The parole program began back in the 40's. It is a discretionary program which typically consists of a pool of about 5,000 individuals. About half are incarcerated and about half are released under supervision. The Commission must periodically review each of those incarcerated and decide whether they will be released under supervision. Individuals who were sentenced to life with a 25 year minimum incarceration for murder will soon begin becoming eligible for parole, and the Commission will be reviewing their cases. Today a life sentence means they will be incarcerated for their natural life, unless they receive clemency.
2. The conditional release program began in 1988. It is non-discretionary program for the more dangerous or habitual offenders, designed to require them to serve their entire court ordered sentence. They are incarcerated until released due to gain time. Then, they are automatically placed under supervision until they fulfill their entire court ordered sentence.
3. The conditional medical release program provides for release of inmates who are terminally ill or incapacitated. It is a totally discretionary program, and the Commission considers factors in addition to the health of the individuals, such as: their background, whether they are violent, etc. If the health of a released individual improves, he or she is brought back into the system.
4. The controlled release program was essentially closed in December '94. This program involved individual file reviews in which inmates were selectively released to relieve prison overcrowding. At its peak, the program was releasing 1,000 inmates a week. Mr. Spooner praised the law enforcement community, DC and the Legislature for the rapid expansion of prison space, allowing for the dramatic decrease of early releases.
5. The Commission also serves as the investigative arm of the Executive Clemency Board on cases such as pardons, restorations of civil rights, deportations and death row reviews.

The Commission maintains databases on the individuals in these programs in conjunction with DC, to include information such as: identification data, location, violation history, release dates, release criteria, revocation status, etc. The Commission operates an emergency warrant system whereby emergency warrants are obtained on individuals who are arrested for felonies while on supervised release. The statute provides for a 72 hour holding period, preventing many individuals from being released on bond before warrants can be obtained. Mr. Spooner praised the Attorney General for this program.

Chairman Palmer asked Mr. Spooner if there are any information issues regarding Parole Commission data. Mr. Spooner said there are some resource needs that, if met, would allow for a more timely availability of information. DC needs the resources to completely automate all of their files.

ITEM 6
Status Report from the Telecommunications Work Group

Ms. Brenda Owens
Florida Department of Law Enforcement

Ms. Owens began by introducing Mr. Raymond Finn, newly appointed Criminal Justice Network Administrator who presented a status report on the development of the Criminal Justice Information Systems Wide Area Network (CJIS WAN). On June 20, 1996, the Telecommunications Work group instructed Mr. Finn to prepare a proposed plan for a statewide CJIS WAN. The foundation of the CJIS WAN will be the FCIC II frame relay system. By using existing hardware and back-up circuits in FCIC II, the CJIS WAN can be operated at a savings of one half million dollars initially on hardware and 2.8 to 3.6 million dollars per year in recurring operational costs. The proposed CJIS WAN plan was distributed to the Council for review and comment. Chairman Palmer said the plan would be on the next Council agenda for a vote.

Ms. Owens reviewed some key issues in the plan which she thought members of the Council and their staff should consider during review.

The primary recommendation of the Telecommunications Work group is that the plan be accepted by the Council. Additional recommendations are:

1. That Mr. Finn should have permission to call informal meetings of technical people from the participating agencies as needed to resolve technical issues and make recommendations to the work group. Non-technical members of the work group will also be invited to the meetings.
2. The CJIS Council should send letters to all criminal justice agencies who are potential participants in the CJIS WAN: explaining the purpose and scope of the project; listing the state agencies involved; and introducing the Network Administrator and his duties.
3. The work group will address the following issues and recommend direction to the CJIS Council:
 - Will criminal justice agencies who connect to the CJIS WAN via non-FCIC sites be provided access to FCIC "hot files" and criminal history records?
 - Should the CJIS WAN support inter-agency E-mail for members at FCIC and non-FCIC sites?
 - Should the CJIS WAN provide Internet access?

- Will the CJIS WAN support intra-county communications?
 - Who or what body will define the structure of the data to be shared and the uniform specifications for access and retrieval of the data?
4. Remove any perceived oversight responsibility for the OBTS Pilot Program from the Network Administrator and clarify his role as limited to responsibility for coordinating the installation and testing of the frame relay circuits necessary to transport OBTS data files to FDLE and the State Courts.
 5. Access to the CJIS WAN should be limited to Florida criminal justice agencies, and traffic on the network should be limited to those activities that directly support criminal justice functions.

Pursuant to the unanimous recommendation of the Telecommunication Work group, Ms. Owens asked the Council to adopt these recommendations at the its next meeting. If the members have any questions, they should contact Mr. Finn at 904/488-6041.

Ms. Daniels asked if Public Defenders were to be included in the CJIS WAN. Ms. Owens said yes and asked Ms. Daniels to provide some clarifying language to be inserted in the plan.

ITEM 7
Status Report on FCIC II
 Ms. Brenda Owens
 Florida Department of Law Enforcement

Ms. Owens began with a reminder that the FCIC II replacement is a group of projects. The project to replace the network is progressing well. Lines have been installed at over 400 locations in criminal justice agencies at this time. The project to replace the workstation software to be used in the PC environment of FCIC II is progressing. As of last week, the new software was installed at 275 locations. The software development is an ongoing process, whereby a basic working version was installed initially, and, as further refinements are made, the software will be upgraded. The updates will be done on-line, at a considerable saving of time and dollars. Reviews of the workstation software by people in the local agencies have been mixed, but generally favorable. The most impressive advantage of the software to them is the elimination of the need for extensive training to use the system. There is also a special software development effort underway for operators who are visually impaired. A pilot version is being installed at the Liberty County Sheriff's Office this week.

The project to replace the message switch and "hot files" is a little behind schedule. The original Request for Proposals generated three responses, but an award could not be made due to some technical and cost issues. The Department of Management Services issued FDLE authority to negotiate with the three vendors. A series of meetings are being held with the vendors to clarify certain issues and best and final offers are due from them by October 30, 1996. Upon review of

those offers, an award is anticipated in December '96. The design phase would begin immediately and extend through the Spring '97.

Ms. Owens also informed the Council that the demands of the system are creating a capacity problem for the A-16 main frame computer. An upgrade is being planned at this time, and it will have to be done before all users can be brought on to frame relay. Mr. Dodd asked if this situation will cause a delay in moving users onto the system. Ms. Owens said no. The upgrade is expected to be done by January '97, and all users should be on the system by Spring '97, which is on schedule.

Mr. Dodd voiced concern over the possible impact that frame relay may have on the DC network. Ms. Owens said FCIC II will connect to DC via the Justice Data Center (JDC). The FDLE to JDC connection will be frame relay. DC will not be required to replace its network. Mr. Dodd asked the Council to defer giving blanket approval of frame relay at this time until it is thoroughly investigated. Chairman Palmer said the Council will continue to evaluate the various ways of sharing network resources among the participants in the criminal justice community.

ITEM 8
Status Report from the Juvenile Work Group
Ms. Jan Wright
Department of Juvenile Justice

Ms. Wright began with a brief review of the information sharing survey that was conducted by the work group. A principle finding of the survey was a reaffirmation of the need for the Joint Application Design (JAD) session on information sharing among criminal justice agencies. The JAD was held in Tampa on September 16-18, 1996, with over 120 participants from all areas of the criminal justice and education community, including: State Attorneys, Public Defenders, Sheriffs, Police Chiefs, Clerks of Court, the Court System, Department of Law Enforcement, Department of Corrections, Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles, Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, local school systems, Department of Juvenile Justice, Legislative committee staff, and the JAD coordinating group.

The JAD identified many important issues and generated considerable information regarding information sharing needs of participants. A report will be prepared and distributed for review to the Council members and JAD participants prior to the next Council meeting, at which time it will be formally presented.

Chairman Palmer commended DJJ for conducting this JAD. To his knowledge, this is the first time all of these participants have come together in a joint effort to discuss information sharing issues. Chief Gibbs said he was involved in the JAD, and he also commended DJJ.

ITEM 9

Status of Federal Grant Programs

Mr. Dennis Pritchett

Department of Community Affairs

Mr. Pritchett reported that the 2nd year NCHIP grant for Florida totals \$833,835. The federal funding work group had lengthy discussions on how the funds could best be used. One central issue was deciding whether the funds should be used to assist the Clerks of Court not presently participating in the consortium project. The work group decided to place this issue on hold until the infrastructure of the consortium project is in place, then address it. The grant will continue funding for the: CJIS WAN project, purchase of some CPU equipment, Integrated Criminal History Network (ICHN), and connectivity of all of Florida's counties through the network. Mr. Pritchett asked for the Council's approval of the proposed use of the grant funds. Chief Gibbs moved approval, Ms. Rushing seconded and the Council unanimously approved the proposed grant application. Chairman Palmer requested additional detail on the grant projects at the next meeting.

ITEM 11

Discussion of Calendar for Future CJJIS Council Meetings

Dr. James D. Sewell

Florida Department of Law Enforcement

Dr. Sewell suggested 11/21/96, 1/23/97 and 5/29/97 as proposed meeting dates for the Council. Members will be contacted regarding their availability on those dates. After the members are polled, they will be notified by FDLE staff as to the established meeting dates.

Dr. Sewell thanked the Council for all the good work they have done, and stated that it has been a pleasure to work with them.

Chairman Palmer adjourned the meeting at 12:54 p.m.