

**Department of Justice  
ATTORNEY GENERAL'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
ON CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD IMPROVEMENT  
Minutes**

California Department of Justice (DOJ)  
1300 I Street, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
September 26, 2017  
9:00 A.M. – 3:00 P.M.

Present: Ryan Wong, California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR)  
Jason Bartlett, California Highway Patrol (CHP)  
Suzanne Schleder Judicial Council of California  
Jill Ramirez, California Court Clerks' Association  
Mark Bonini, Chief Probation Officers' Association of California  
John Carli, California Police Chiefs Association (CPCA)  
Juan Gallardo, California State Sheriff's Association (CSSA)  
Sheryl Wolcott, California District Attorney's Association (CDAA)  
Mark Pazin, California Office of Emergency Services (OES)

Absent: Heather Fong, Senate Committee on Rules  
Gabrielle Zeps, Speaker of Assembly  
Cathy Anderson, California Peace Officers Association

Others: Joe Dominic, Department of Justice's (DOJ) California Justice Information Services Chief  
Arwen Flint, DOJ BCIIS Assistant Director  
Marc St. Pierre, DOJ BCIA Assistant Director  
Keith Dann, DOJ BCIA Assistant Director  
Erin Choi, Client Services Program Manager  
Catherine Brown, Deputy Attorney General

Assistant Director Keith Dann called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m.

Attendees were welcome and introduced.

**Role, Purpose and Objectives of the Attorney General's Criminal Justice Advisory Committee**

Assistant Directors Keith Dann and Marc St. Pierre explained the role of the DOJ regarding criminal history information. The following information provided to the committee and reviewed:

- Roles and Responsibilities, Statutory Authority: the committee will try to make beneficial decisions for criminal justice agencies.
- Role: to have discussions with statewide data sharing task force and want to continue to collaborate.
- Purpose: recognizing there are opportunities to improve business process, collect information, etc. Technology-based improvements. Hope to discover improvements (standardization, etc.) from vendors, contracts, etc.

- Objectives: Data gap term will be mentioned often (AKA, open arrest). Working together as a collaborative effort to make the process better. DOJ wants to know what agency challenges are and will provide DOJ challenge information.
- A presentation of the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, stated that the committee will meet twice a year, and also that a Deputy Attorney General, Catherine Brown, has been assigned to ensure there are no Bagley-Keene Act violations

### **State of the Criminal History Repository**

Assistant Directors Keith Dann and Marc St. Pierre provided a PowerPoint presentation on the current state of the DOJ's criminal history repository including how the repository was established and maintained, the definition of Criminal Offender Record Information (CORI) and current repository statistics including an organization chart breakdown, which included the responsibilities of the various Programs within BCIA. The PowerPoint presentation is available on the AG's website.

Information provided focused on the issue of missing dispositions and included that most courts are submitting records electronically. Disposition reporting is not uniform throughout all counties. Some aggregated and others leaving aggregated model with each agency doing individual pieces of process. Some are reporting both ways (electronic and manual). Of the electronic records, some records cannot be processed for various reasons, such as missing information. At this time, only about 5 percent of the records cannot be processed. Electronic reporting has improved. Half the counties are going through some kind of case management migration and working with DOJ to learn how to report electronically. Law enforcement agencies (LEAs) have made a big push to reporting dispositions to DOJ. Prosecuting agencies and the LEAs have the responsibility to report (the information to DOJ).

Discussion arose around JADE, which is the application that can be used by local agencies to update criminal history records at the LEA and court levels instead of correcting it by submitting a form. DOJ is working to make it an easier system to use for agencies reporting electronically. DOJ wants to use JADE to share information about the data gap and report errors back to LEAs as they occur.

### **Agency Specific Challenges**

Discussion arose about how data is being linked between agencies. The creation of the SID (State Identification Number) otherwise known as CII (Criminal Identification Index Number) number was one of the original mandates for this committee. Since policy and standards are not being used uniformly by all parties, it is apparent that the SID/CII and the arrest event SCN (State Control Number) are primary keys between each of our disparate systems and the criminal justice system. As such, it is important that each of our respective agencies employ rules/programming, etc..., which can utilize these numbers when communicating/transferring data between systems.

Disposition reporting requirements (NIEM Web Services, ATDR, JADE) led to discussion about a DOJ Play Book, which can be shared with respective members to help solve the disposition reporting issues. Most, if not all, of the connection (i.e., arrest/disposition reporting) requirements including their associated data are already available. However, DOJ is working on compiling all of these requirements into a DOJ Play Book in addition to creating easy "use cases" in a training format, which better explains when and how an agency needs to report a disposition.

Further discussion arose around the DOJ providing statistics to local agencies on their open arrests. Some of the statistical issues posed where if CHP were to arrest someone and book them in a county. Even when booked and detained in a county would not provide visibility between CHP, booking and

courts. DOJ plans on doing this, but can only tell you how many arrests are in each county, but mainly by the booking agency since arresting agency is an optional field and not always utilized properly.

It is apparent that the state needs to look at a stop in the field vs. process to ensure the life cycle of a record. There is a need to start better practices earlier in the process that will negate issues in the life of the record for the Courts and the LEAs. Accordingly, there is a clear need for improvement of collection, standardization, and sharing of data. It needs to be easier to follow the life cycle of an arrest since some pieces of information are not making it through the process. It is also important for DOJ to confirm receiving the record so that an LEA knows everything is going well for the record, e.g., that the SID/CII match throughout the system. Members indicated that the DOJ needs to take the initiative regarding cite-release field bookings since there are budget problems with investments for local agencies. As such, the DOJ will explore mobile booking possibilities through its Business Managers Alliance (BMA) meeting venue. The BMA is comprised of statewide Cal-ID Managers, which oversees your agencies arrest fingerprint submissions and any new fingerprint capture technology. Accordingly, the BMA is the obvious venue to accomplish this initiative.

### **Offense Code Table Standardization**

It was determined that the DOJ will take ownership of a Statewide Master Charge Code Table and determine the scope of such ownership. Additionally, a Governance Board will be created and will be comprised of specific associations' (CPCA, CSSA, CDAA, Judicial Council) representatives (attorneys) and a DOJ attorney with staff support. This Governance Board will determine all of the appropriate charges to be added/deleted/modified on the table. However, more important to the success of this undertaking is the commitment/engagement of DOJ and the Governance Board associations and the acceptance by all of the determinations made by the Governance Board.

Discussion arose that the California Statewide Data Sharing Task Force is already in the process of deliberations around a state-wide master table and is ready to work with the DOJ on the Master Charge Code Table. The California Statewide Data Sharing Task Force has already been dealing with technical problems with different codes that don't match between agencies, which is why the task force set up a Subcommittee. The Subcommittee conversations revolve around progress of technology and how different systems come into play when trying to build a single streamlined source. So the question is: What additional elements could be built into the table to support all needs?

The DOJ has the challenge of reporting offenses on table. This is also a problem with dispositions. The offense is tabled as felony, arrested as a felony, then a judge says it is a misdemeanor. DOJ can't change level of charge because it is tabled as a felony. Every year new legislation requires adding new offenses and sometimes this is difficult to do in a timely manner. There are around 30 different tables. There is a need to standardize for offense and disposition tables, yet have a flexible structure for felony/misdemeanor charges that also accounts for local ordinances.

As such, the next logical step is to take feedback of California Statewide Data Sharing Task Force Subcommittee to make sure their already collected table information is relevant for all and is standardized and create a Governance Board.

### **Schedule Next Meeting**

The next official meeting is scheduled for Thursday, March 15 at the California OES Office with a notification forthcoming.