

OLEA-103

JOINT COUNCIL ON TECHNOLOGY
AND ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE
1965 - 1968

Summary Statement of Joint Council
Activity Prepared As A Final Report
For The Office Of Law Enforcement
Assistance - Grant No. 103

July 29, 1968

Department of Justice
Sacramento, California

P R E F A C E

In December 1965 the Governor of California created, by executive order, a new entity which became known as the Joint Council on Technology and the Administration of Justice. This Joint Council was composed of persons who are representative of the various disciplines engaged in the criminal justice process and who individually reflected the various levels of government in California. The Joint Council was directed to identify, assess and rank problem areas associated with the criminal justice process and develop programs that offered promise for practical solutions.

The Joint Council members responded to the Governor's invitation and, despite limited resources, they were able to discuss a number of key deficiencies and propose specific programs offering solution. With the advent of the Law Enforcement Assistance Act, an application was submitted to the U. S. Department of Justice asking that the Joint Council be recognized as the State Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee for California. The application was approved by O.L.E.A. and modest funds were made available to support certain Joint Council activities.

The Joint Council undertook as its primary project the sponsorship of a major statewide criminal justice information system design study. The study was proposed in response to a common-felt need among the members of the criminal justice community. An application for federal assistance was prepared and submitted to O.L.E.A. by the Attorney General of California. The request was approved and funds were appropriated by the State to establish a modest project staff to coordinate state and local participation and to work with representatives of a technical consulting organization. The Joint Council retained

responsibility to oversee the progress of this project and to advise the Project Director.

A number of other projects was proposed by state and local agencies. These projects were individually reviewed by the Joint Council functioning as a state/local coordinating screening committee. The projects reviewed by the Joint Council covered a wide range of needs - improvement of the image of law enforcement - improvement in quality and quantity of recruits for law enforcement - research into better radio communication for the individual field officer - research in the methods of taking and classifying fingerprints - integration of law enforcement services - etc. In several instances, local projects proposed for O.L.E.A. support were routed through the Joint Council to permit verification to O.L.E.A. that the proposal was consistent with the overall state program.

The effectiveness of the Joint Council was inhibited due to limitations of funds and certain changes in state administration and policy. However, the new state administration actively supported improvement in criminal justice and sponsored a law creating a new State Council with more extensive powers than its predecessor, the Joint Council. The new entity, known as the California Council on Criminal Justice, had a broader base of membership, was backed by statutory authority and was the recipient of a modest budget allocation. The new Council offers considerable promise to carry out the programs essential to the improvement of criminal justice in California. The experience gained through the modest operation of the Joint Council was drawn upon in preparing the legislation that created the new California Council on Criminal Justice. Several of the key members of the Joint Council have been appointed members of the new California Council on Criminal Justice and bring with them a continuity in purpose and goals.

The report that follows is a brief recap of those matters which demanded the attention of the Joint Council during its brief existence. The new California Council on Criminal Justice should be viewed as an extension of the former Joint Council.

JOINT COUNCIL ON TECHNOLOGY AND ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE
State of California

O.L.E.A. Grant No. 103

INDEX TO FINAL NARRATIVE REPORT

	Page
1.00	<u>Background of Joint Council Development</u> 1
1.10	Joint Council Membership 2 (See Appendix A)
1.20	Objectives of the Joint Council 2
1.30	Activation of the Joint Council 4
1.40	Functions and Responsibility 5
2.00	<u>Activities of the Joint Council</u> 7
2.10	Criminal Justice Information System Project (CJIS) 7
2.11	Preparation of CJIS Grant Proposal 7 (See Appendix B)
2.12	Selection of CJIS Project Director 8
2.13	Review of Consultant Proposals 9 (See Appendix C)
2.14	The CJIS Contract 10
2.20	<u>Review of the "Crime Package" Projects</u> 11
2.21	The CJIS Project 11 (See Appendix D)
2.22	State of California Law Enforcement Assistance Act 11 (See Appendix E)
2.23	Program to Restore Respect for Law Enforcement 12 (See Appendix F)
2.24	Feasibility Study Regarding Optical Scanning of 12 Fingerprints for Classification (See Appendix G)
2.25	Study to Develop New Methods to Record Fingerprints 12 (See Appendix G)
2.30	<u>Improvement in Crime Statistics</u> 12 California Department of Justice
2.40	<u>Other Agency Proposals</u> 13
2.41	Establishment of State Law Enforcement 13 Research Center
2.42	Program to Improve Quality of Applicants 14 Entering Law Enforcement Service
2.43	Coordination and Consolidation of Law 15 Enforcement Services in San Joaquin County
2.44	Integration of Communication and Record Services 16 for Law Enforcement in San Mateo County
2.45	Development of a Practical Law Enforcement 17 personalized radio transceiver

		Page
3.00	Review of California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System - Specification and Proposals	18
4.00	Special Activities of Executive Officer of Joint Council - Participation in Conferences, Committee Work, etc.	19
5.00	<u>Establishment of the California Council on Criminal Justice</u>	21
5.10	Provisions of California Senate Bill #84 (1967) (See Appendix H)	22
5.20	Membership of the California Council on Criminal Justice (See Appendix I)	24
5.30	California Crime Technological Research Foundation	24
5.31	Power and Duty of the Foundation	25
6.00	Summary Statement of Fiscal Support Provided Joint Council	27

APPENDICES

- A. Original Membership, Joint Council on Technology and Administration of Justice
- B. Grant Application in Support of the Criminal Justice Information System Study
- C. CJIS Request for Proposal Statement
- D. Brief Statement on the CJIS Project
- E. Brief Statement on Proposed California Law Enforcement Assistance Act
- F. Brief Statement on Proposed Program to Restore Respect For Law Enforcement
- G. Brief Statement on Proposed Studies to Improve the Utility of Fingerprints As A Medium of Identification
- H. Copy of California Senate Bill #84 (1967)
- I. Membership of the Present California Council on Criminal Justice

JOINT COUNCIL ON TECHNOLOGY AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE
State of California

O.L.E.A. Grant No. 103

FINAL NARRATIVE REPORT OF ACTIVITY OF THE
CALIFORNIA JOINT COUNCIL ON TECHNOLOGY AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE
PURSUANT TO LEAA GRANT REQUIREMENTS

FORMATION OF THE JOINT COUNCIL

The Joint Council on Technology and the Administration of Justice represents the initial attempt by the State of California to establish a mechanism to facilitate the overall evaluation and coordination of the many agencies involved in the criminal justice process. Criminal justice agency administrators were aware of the need to take immediate positive action to counter the growing challenge of crime in the street and the threat of major social disorders. They were actively seeking an effective vehicle to facilitate united action. Past attempts to identify and solve interagency problems enjoyed limited success, if at all, due in part to the restricted area of interest, the lack of skills and resources necessary to accomplish the task, and the absence of proper authority. The Attorney General of California recognized the need for proper organized effort, as well as the value of providing program identification at the highest level in the state. The Attorney General secured the active support of the Governor, who issued a directive establishing the Joint Council on Technology and the Administration of Justice on December 1, 1965.

JOINT COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

The membership of the Joint Council was broadly representative of the major government agencies which make up California's system of criminal justice. Members were chosen on the basis of their professional leadership, knowledge,

experience and demonstrated interest. The agencies represented were selected to provide a balance between the highly urbanized and more rural areas. Included were representatives of police and sheriffs' departments, district attorneys' offices, probation offices, state justice and correctional agencies, and the court system of California. The Attorney General of California was designated to serve as Chairman of the fifteen-member Joint Council.^{1/}

OBJECTIVE OF THE JOINT COUNCIL

The objective of the Joint Council was set forth in brief terms as follows:

" ... to provide leadership for the development of an improved statewide justice system. Its initial activity will be to provide guidance and direction to the criminal justice information system design."

The reference to leadership pertained to a broad frontal approach to the identification and assessment of problem areas for the purpose of seeking effective solutions. The specific reference to the "criminal justice information system design" was in recognition of the fact that improvement in the efficiency and quality of information management was fundamental to the attainment of broader goals. The focus of attention on criminal justice information management reflected the recommendations contained in resolutions endorsed by a number of criminal justice professional associations^{2/} and recent feasibility

^{1/}The members of the Joint Council, appointed by the Governor, are identified in Appendix A.

^{2/}California Peace Officers' Association
District Attorneys' Association of California
Judicial Council of California

studies performed for the state by leading consultant organizations.^{3/} These independent studies by contract consultants reached the conclusions:

- A. That an integrated information management system, utilizing modern computer technology, is feasible and necessary to support essential public services in California, and
- B. The agencies associated in the criminal justice process are in need of assistance and should benefit particularly from system analysis, design, and an implementation program.

It was the consensus among the persons called upon to organize the Joint Council that its formation and program should prove effective in many areas.

For example:

- A. For the first time, responsible officials concerned with the administration of criminal justice in California were brought together to engage in joint planning.
- B. Administrative decisions and operational action at one level of government or by one discipline within the criminal justice system will have an impact upon the decisions and operational requirements of an associated agency.
- C. Technological improvements can be developed, installed and operations measured so that resources can be more wisely distributed and coordinated to the end that the overall criminal justice process is more effective and performing with reasonable economy.
- D. Available resources and skills necessary to engage in an innovative attack upon the many current problems are in limited supply.

^{3/}Space General Report (1965) - "Prevention and Control of Crime and Delinquency in California." Lockheed Company Report (1965) - "California Statewide Information System Study."

Uncoordinated and restricted local programs may prove self-defeating and be needless duplications of other prior or current programs.

E. Particular attention should be directed toward the early development of a list of identifiable tasks arranged in order of priority based upon such factors as:

1. Area of application
2. Degree of urgency
3. Total system benefit
4. Resource availability
5. Time frame for probable execution

F. The offender is an important element in the total criminal justice process and comes into contact with many agencies as he passes through the system. He should be identified and dealt with in a manner that is consistent, humane and effective. The success of the total criminal justice system will be measured, to a significant degree, by our ability to control the offender and redirect his action along acceptable patterns.

The Joint Council was viewed as a vehicle that would stimulate imaginative cooperative programs and assist in marshalling official and public support.

ACTIVATION OF THE JOINT COUNCIL

The first meeting of the California Joint Council on Technology and the Administration of Justice was held in the Governor's Office in the City of Los Angeles, California, on December 1, 1965. The Governor addressed the meeting regarding the need for the Joint Council and the potential service the Joint Council could render the criminal justice community and the residents of the

state. The Attorney General, as Chairman, discussed several major problem areas that required attention. Specific attention was directed to the need to examine interagency information management and consider the employment of system analysis and design concepts which have proven effective in business and industry. The meeting concluded with agreement that a special subcommittee would prepare a statement regarding the need for a statewide justice information system design that would form the basis for a request for a federal grant under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act. This statement would also facilitate the seeking of fiscal support through the State Legislature.^{4/}

Each member of the Joint Council individually occupied a key administrative position within his respective agency which required full-time responsibility. Provision was made to employ an Executive Secretary to furnish staff support and otherwise perform administrative duties in behalf of the Joint Council. The Executive Secretary was also assigned responsibility to function as Project Director for the proposed Criminal Justice Information System Design Study. His major tasks during the first year were to schedule, coordinate and evaluate project assignments to be carried out by teams of agency and consultant specialists performing design work for the information system. He was also responsible for coordination of plans and programs among agencies and jurisdictions affected and direct, as necessary, staff effort in furtherance of Joint Council research studies and planning effort.

FUNCTIONS AND RESPONSIBILITY OF THE JOINT COUNCIL

The Joint Council accepted its responsibility to provide support and guidance in the development and conduct of the statewide criminal justice information

^{4/} See Summary Draft Proposal - Appendix B.

system study proposed for California. It was the consensus of the membership that the information system study be given top priority. In addition, to provide a frame of reference, the Joint Council approved the following statement of functions and responsibilities:

1. Function as a statewide planning and coordinating body to assist the development of an integrated program of law enforcement, crime and delinquency prevention, correction and rehabilitation and the overall administration of criminal justice in California.
2. Provide leadership and support for the development of local, regional and statewide programs that will make the administration of justice more effective and responsive to the needs of society under the law.
3. Coordinate with the federal government in the development and implementation of national crime prevention and control programs to assure greater state and local effectiveness.
4. Provide counsel and advice to local, regional and state agencies in California seeking assistance and support under the Federal Law Enforcement Assistance Act.
5. Propose, develop and initiate statewide action programs in support of the administration of criminal justice including the procurement of funded support through the State of California, the Federal Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, or other proper and acceptable source of fiscal assistance.
6. Conduct specific studies and determinations of the adequacy of functions within the realm of the administration of criminal justice as may be deemed essential to the execution of the responsibility of the Joint Council.

7. Provide a forum for the exchange of ideas, information, discussion of problems of mutual concern and coordination of policy programs for agencies involved in the administration of criminal justice in California.
8. Provide for the administration and management of California law enforcement assistance programs when funds and authorization for such programs are authorized by legislative enactment.
9. Nothing contained in this statement of functions and responsibilities shall be construed to authorize the Joint Council on Technology and the Administration of Justice, or a member or officer thereof, to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the organization, administration or personnel of any state or local agency or official associated in the administration of justice in California, in the absence of specific direction of legislative enactment or except as subject to prior mutual agreement on the part of all parties thereto.

ACTIVITIES OF THE JOINT COUNCIL

The activities of the Joint Council may be summarized under several general headings. The arrangement that follows seeks to group similar or related activity for ease of understanding and is not a chronological summary:

- A. Preparation and Submission of Application for OLEA Support of the Criminal Justice Information System Design Study (C.J.I.S.)

While the Joint Council was in its formative stage, members worked with the Attorney General and his representatives to prepare an acceptable application seeking O.L.E.A. fiscal support. A statement was prepared identifying the limitations of the existing

information exchange practices in the criminal justice community and proposing the conduct of a statewide study seeking the utilization of system analysis techniques to develop a design and implementation plan. The statement recommended that the study be financed by federal and state funds. The task was to be under the immediate direction of a State Project Director and would engage the participation of a qualified consultant organization. A proposed budget and project time table (18 months) was established. The grant application was submitted to the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance on June 2, 1966.^{5/} Concurrently, action was taken to secure funds through the State Legislature to cover the costs of maintaining the Project Director and his staff.

The Office of Law Enforcement Assistance processed and approved the grant application on June 9, 1966, and so notified the Office of the Attorney General of California. The grant became effective on July 1, 1966. The State Legislature also approved funds for fiscal 1966-67 to be effective the same date.

B. Selection of Project Director (C.J.I.S.)

Upon notification of the availability of funds to carry out the criminal justice information system study, it became necessary to select the Project Director. A canvass was made of persons qualified to undertake the responsibility and interviews were conducted. The Project Director (also to serve as Executive Secretary to the Joint Council) was selected and appointed with approval of the Joint Council.

^{5/}A copy of the application statement is attached as Appendix C.

His immediate task was to follow up on the grant approval (OLEA Grant #051) and prepare a "Request for Proposal" and release it to the professional consultant community as a means of soliciting a response.^{6/} He was also required to set up a staff organization to carry out the state's responsibility with respect to the proposed study. This staffing function was complicated due to the interplay of several factors: (a) a limitation of available funds (state allocation), (b) unique limitation as to duration of the program (18 months), (c) desired qualifications for staff members, and (d) readiness to travel throughout the state during the conduct of proposed field interviews, etc.^{7/}

C. Review of Consultant Proposals (C.J.I.S.)

The Project Director received fourteen individual proposals in response to the C.J.I.S. "RFP." Upon approval of the Attorney General, a special Proposal Evaluation Committee was organized to assist the Project Director in evaluating the proposals and recommending the one that offered the best potential product. Several members of the Joint Council served as members of the Proposal Evaluation Committee. The Committee reached agreement on the relative merits of the proposals and submitted its recommendations to the Attorney General. The Attorney General accepted the recommendation.

^{6/}A copy of the "Request for Proposal" is attached as Appendix D. This document was subject to review and comment by a special subcommittee of the Joint Council.

^{7/}Other limitations arose due to two sources: (a) Civil Service System job classification regulations, and (b) policy directives that were issued upon the change in state administration (1-1-67)

reviewed the evaluation with the Joint Council and, upon Joint Council approval, authorized the Project Director to enter contract negotiations with the Lockheed Missiles and Space Company, Government Information Systems Division.

D. C.J.I.S. Contract Approval - Initiation of Project

The contract for consultant services was completed and circulated among the members of the Joint Council for comment. It was approved as to content and executed between the State of California (grantee) and the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation (Lockheed Missiles and Space Company). Upon subsequent approval by O.L.E.A., the contract became effective for an 18-month study effort beginning June 26, 1967.

The first day of the contract, a special orientation class was conducted at the Department of Justice in Sacramento. The program was specifically designed to meet the requirements of twenty-two criminal justice agency representatives invited to Sacramento to review the proposed study program and to subsequently serve as local area contacts for the C.J.I.S. staff and consultant. Several members of the Joint Council participated in this orientation program and served as instructors, discussing their particular area of expertise.

During the conduct of the project, the Joint Council has received briefings on the study plan and its progress. Copies of Quarterly Progress Reports are submitted by the Project Director, as well as special releases such as the "Project Digest."^{8/}

^{8/}The "Project Digest" is a newsletter type of announcement prepared and released periodically to advise interested parties of the status of C.J.I.S. and related matters of interest.

The Joint Council has received and approved the proposed operating budget based upon recommendations of the Project Director and the availability of funds allocated to support the C.J.I.S. program.

JOINT COUNCIL REVIEW OF INDIVIDUAL PROJECT PROPOSALS

Since the activation of the Joint Council on December 1, 1965, the members have had occasion to review a number of study projects, and the Joint Council has endorsed action in behalf of many worthwhile projects. The prime limitation restricting immediate activation of these projects has been the absence of funding. In some of these cases, the lack of support occurred at the local level; in other cases, the federal government has found the project to have merit but funds were not currently available to meet the need.

A. Initial "Crime Package" Prepared for Consideration of the Joint Council.

Upon activation of the Joint Council, several area meetings were conducted throughout the state by the Attorney General's staff and members of the Joint Council. The following studies were proposed as touching upon critical areas of immediate concern to the criminal justice community and the public:

1. The Criminal Justice Information System Design Study

This project has been given adequate reference in the preceding section.

ACTION: Approved and endorsed for active support via O.L.E.A. and State. (O.L.E.A. Grant #051)

2. Establishment of a California Equivalent of a Law Enforcement Assistance Act.

This project would have as its objective the development of

a modest program of grants-in-aid and technical assistance to pursue studies that do not qualify under current federal O.L.E.A. regulations. The individual project proposals would be subject to review and approval of funds by the Joint Council.

ACTION: Approved and recommended for state support.^{9/}

3. Program to Restore Public Respect and Support For Law Enforcement.

This project considered the need to survey public attitudes regarding law enforcement, seeking to identify those events and policies that promote a negative image. The program would then prescribe a plan of action toward the development of a positive image for law enforcement.

ACTION: Approved. Attorney General to include budget request to cover project FY 1966-67.^{9/}

4. Propose a Research and Development Study as to the Feasibility of Optical Scanning to Code Fingerprints.

This topic touches on one of the critical needs in the field of law enforcement today. Many of the operational limitations in police service can be related directly to the cumbersome limitations imposed by the present methods of finger impression recognition, classification, storage and retrieval.

ACTION: Approved. Attorney General to include budget request to cover project FY 1966-67.^{9/}

5. Need to Develop a New Method of Taking Fingerprint Impressions.

The search here would be to develop a method of taking and

^{9/} State Legislature did not make any appropriation to support this project.

recording fingerprint impressions without the use of bulky or awkward equipment, the use of printer's ink, etc. The method should be easy to apply, be quick, clean, accurate, and minimize occasion for contact with the subject.

ACTION: Approved. Attorney General to include budget request to cover project FY 1966-67.^{9/}

B. Improve Crime Statistics in California

A proposal was submitted by the Bureau of Criminal Statistics, Department of Justice, that funds be requested to underwrite the cost of making several in depth studies vital to a realistic understanding of what is actually taking place in terms of crime and the criminal. The thesis put forward was that we have too long limited our statistics to numerical tabulations that pertain to things that are unique and unequal. We must begin to study crime in terms of the person involved (the arrestee) and trace this person through the system and for sufficient time to develop a base for adequate evaluation of the subject, the impact of the segments of the system, and the response of the subject to the total experience.

ACTION: Approved. Attorney General to include budget request to cover project FY 1966-67.^{10/}

C. Other Projects Sponsored by Individual Agencies or Disciplines.

1. Establishment of a Law Enforcement Research Center - a feasibility study sponsored by the California Peace Officers' Association.

^{9/} See Footnote on preceding page

^{10/} State Legislature did not fund this project. A limited study was initiated by the BCS within the limits of its normal budget.

This proposal was prepared following preliminary study by the Research Committee of the CPOA and offered as the basis for an O.L.E.A. grant application. The proposal asked for funds to underwrite the cost of retaining the services of a recognized consultant organization to make a survey of the need, the available resources, the status of current capability and to propose a plan for the orderly development of a research facility to meet law enforcement needs. The program also called for the identification and assessment of fiscal sources that would permit the activity to be self-sustaining.

ACTION: This program was subject to review at two successive meetings of the Joint Council. It was approved and a communication was addressed to O.L.E.A. urging support of the program.

NOTE: The interest and support generated as a result of this effort did not produce immediate fiscal assistance but was a fundamental element in the subsequent development of the Crime Technological Research Foundation portions of the legislation that was enacted in 1967 to create the California Council on Criminal Justice.

2. Establishment of a Program to Improve the Quality of Applicants Seeking Entrance into Law Enforcement Service in California - a study and implementation program sponsored by the Peace Officers' Standards and Training Commission of California.

When this proposal was introduced for consideration, it was referred to a special subcommittee of the Joint Council for review and recommendation. The proposal was to be submitted to O.L.E.A. seeking funding support. At the following meeting of the Joint Council, the subcommittee reported favorably on this proposal.

ACTION: The Joint Council endorsed the proposal and addressed a communication to O.L.E.A. requesting support for this program.

3. Study to Determine the Feasibility of Coordinating and Consolidating the Law Enforcement Services within San Joaquin County, California - sponsored by the Sheriff and Chiefs of Police of San Joaquin County.

This study, with the active support of the law enforcement officials, seeks to explore the feasibility of coordinating and consolidating of services in the interest of providing a higher level of public service and achieving operating economies. The operation of multi-agencies in a limited geographic area leads to needless duplication, jurisdictional conflicts and delays. This proposal seeks O.L.E.A. funding to underwrite the cost of procuring the services of a qualified system consultant to assist the local law enforcement representatives in the analysis and evaluation of service integration.

ACTION: The Joint Council received written material describing this project and heard verbal declarations as to the purpose, scope and

local resources that would be made available. The program was approved and a recommendation forwarded to O.L.E.A. urging support. This subject (coordination and consolidation of neighboring services) has received increasing attention over recent years and holds promise of significant public benefits.^{11/}

4. Study to Integrate the Records and Communication Services of Law Enforcement Agencies in San Mateo County, California - sponsored by the San Mateo County Law Enforcement Officers' Association.

This proposal has some characteristics that are similar to the San Joaquin County proposal mentioned above. The justification for separate consideration of the San Mateo County proposal lies in the significant demographic and socio-economic differences between these two counties and the critical impact of current communication requirements in San Mateo County. The San Mateo proposal seeks advantage of the existing high level of interagency cooperation and the resources of technical skills and experience in the community. The proposal seeks modest federal funding through O.L.E.A.

ACTION: The Joint Council reviewed a brief statement regarding the program and heard verbal explanation from a committee representing the sponsoring

^{11/}This subject was the basis of special study entitled: "Coordination and Consolidation of Police Service," Public Administration Service, Dec. 1966 (LEA Contract 66-3)

association. The Joint Council approved the project.

5. Proposal prepared and submitted by the Department of Communications, Orange County, California, to perform research and development leading to engineering design, building of a prototype working model and testing of an adequate personalized two-way police radio communication device.

The Communications Engineer of Orange County made a personal presentation and used visual aids. He reported the proposal had the endorsement of the County Board of Supervisors, the local chiefs of police and the Sheriff. He then reviewed the history of public safety communications from 1934 to date. He pointed out that radio communication is one of the most valuable tools in support of effective police service, yet there are some obvious disadvantages inherent in present equipment. He spoke of the need for new equipment design, increased capability, safety features, better power supplies, modular construction, need for multi-channel selection, direction finding capability, auto coding, etc. His project was scheduled as a 30-month endeavor to permit design development, building of prototype units and adequate field testing.

ACTION: The Joint Council endorsed the proposal and addressed a communication to O.L.E.A. recommending grant approval.

6. Review of the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS). The current program to upgrade the State Law Enforcement Teletype System under the sponsorship of the

California Department of Justice was described to the members of the Joint Council. This program is proceeding pursuant to a legislative directive and relates to a fundamental communication service that ties together all law enforcement agencies in the state. The present teletype system has served a vital purpose since its inauguration in the early 1930's but is now inadequate in terms of current needs. During 1966-67, the CLETS Committee developed a "Request for Proposal" (RFP) to solicit responses and technical statements from potential vendors in the field of communications. During the last months of 1967 and early 1968, the proposals were reviewed, evaluated and a recommendation made regarding the contracting for system implementation. The proposed contract will call for the installation, testing and operation of the new telecommunications system one year after start of contract. A significant feature of the new system will be message switching control by computers, with simultaneous send-receive capability at 100 words per minute. The system will also be engineered to permit interface with various types of local government computer installations and allow for a variety of terminal devices to accommodate individual agency requirements.

ACTION: The Joint Council has retained an interest in the development of this program and expressed its endorsement of the project. No federal funding is involved in this endeavor. The Joint Council accepts the position that CLETS will function as the communication utility for the CJIS program.

SPECIAL ACTIVITIES ENGAGING PARTICIPATION BY THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF THE
JOINT COUNCIL

A. Attendance at Conference of State Committees on Criminal Administration - University of Maryland - October 13-15, 1966.

This was a general meeting of representatives of various states which established or were contemplating the formation of Committees on Criminal Justice and Administration. The purpose was to discuss the implementation of findings developed in the reports produced under the direction of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice. The attendees represented forty-four states, of which only a minority had taken steps to organize a state committee to carry out the activities recommended by the President's Commission.

B. Attendance at Conference of Governors' Committees on Criminal Administration - Washington D. C. - June 26-27, 1967.

This was a follow-up to the University of Maryland Conference of 1966. During the interim period, a number of governors had initiated action to form a State Commission on Criminal Justice and Administration. The Washington Conference provided an opportunity for the State Commission representatives to meet, exchange experiences, discuss organization and program planning, etc. This Conference was attended by seventeen persons representing fourteen state committees organized to carry out the recommendations of the President's Commission.

- C. Participate as a panel member before the Law Enforcement EDP Study Section during the Fall Joint Computer Conference - Anaheim, California - November 16, 1967.

At this time, discussed current law enforcement problems and the possible application of computer technology. Also discussed the implications of the passage of California Senate Bill #84. (See reference to SB #84 on pages 21-26.)

- D. Participated in the planning and presentation of a two-day seminar sponsored by the State Intergovernmental Council on Urban Growth - Sacramento, California - February 19-20, 1968.

This event was conducted to bring together representatives of the several campuses of the University of California, public officials and civic leaders who were interested in objectively examining the social-political environment and project planning to solve specific urban problems.

- E. Participated in "Research Security Officers' Association" Conference - Sacramento, California - November 2, 1967.

Made presentation covering both the Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) and the proposed Senate Bill 84 establishing the California Council on Criminal Justice.

- F. Responded to invitation to serve in the capacity as a member of a Special Advisory Committee to the Chairman of the Assembly Committee on Criminal Procedures.

The Chairman has had particular interest in instituting action to conduct research into several areas pertaining to crime and

punishment as a means of gathering objective information to guide legislative policy. Areas of current interest include the following:

1. Assess the deterrent effect of punishments attached to crime.
2. Examine selected major offense reports to identify existence of significant variations in the acts that suggest redefinition and reassessment of penalties.
3. Examine selected major offense investigation reports to identify, to the extent possible, any social or physical factors amenable to modification as a means of reducing the crime potential.

G. Miscellaneous Correspondence regarding Joint Council Activity

The Executive Officer of the Joint Council had numerous occasions to participate in the exchange of correspondence with his counterpart serving crime councils in other states. Many of these councils were also sponsored by O.L.E.A. although, in a number of cases, the correspondence related to Council organization and was a prelude to the development of a council acceptable to O.L.E.A.

H. Miscellaneous meetings with visiting officials.

The Executive Officer met representatives of other jurisdictions who had occasion to visit his office at the Department of Justice in Sacramento for the purpose of discussing the council organization, various criminal justice action programs and related matters.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CALIFORNIA COUNCIL ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE - (CALIFORNIA

SENATE BILL #84 (1967)) (Penal Code Sections 13800 - 13807)

During 1966 and 1967, the Joint Council met on a number of occasions and engaged

in the activities enumerated herein. It was during this same period that a change occurred in the state administration which initiated an intense review of state organizations and fiscal matters. Restrictions were placed on funding of new programs and new employments were held to a minimum. Despite the limitations placed upon all departments and agencies, the administration has consistently supported improvements in the field of criminal justice.

No specific appropriation was provided during fiscal 1966-67 or fiscal 1967-68 to support the Joint Council. The new administration favored the establishment of a broader-based statewide council on criminal justice, authorized by legislative act rather than exist as an ad hoc entity, subject to the whim of the Governor. A number of conferences were held wherein the Governor, the Attorney General, members of the Legislature and representatives of key criminal justice organizations participated. A legislative bill was drafted to establish a California Council on Criminal Justice. After considerable study, Senate Bill #84 was introduced for consideration by the State Legislature on April 28, 1967. A number of subsequent hearings took place; and several amendments were added before final passage on August 1, 1967.^{12/}

Senate Bill #84 provides the authority for a statewide council that has responsibility to engage in a wide range of activities that should result in an improved capability to:

- Identify the nature, scope and magnitude of the crime problem
- Provide for the maintenance of an inventory and evaluation of criminal justice resources available to counter criminal activity

^{12/} Copy of Senate Bill #84 (California) attached as Appendix E.

- Encourage and direct research and innovative projects seeking effective crime prevention techniques
- Provide for improvement in personnel recruitment, selection and training in law enforcement and other disciplines associated with criminal justice
- Facilitate the conduct of studies leading to the improvement of services performed by criminal justice agencies and the system as a whole
- Assist local government agencies in carrying out similar activities at the local level
- Provide coordination between state and local project to maximize effective utilization of resources
- Function as the recognized state agency to coordinate state and local projects with the federal government in the administration and distribution of grants for the accomplishment of programs designed to improve the administration of criminal justice
- Serve as an advisory agency to the Governor, the Legislature and state and local agencies in matters pertaining to criminal justice
- Provide for the collection and dissemination of information regarding the status of criminal justice in California, the current trends in crime and related matters and the identification of proposed or active projects of interest to the criminal justice community

MEMBERSHIP OF CALIFORNIA COUNCIL ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE

The California Council on Criminal Justice consists of 25 members, some of whom are specified in the legislative act in recognition of the status of their office. Twelve members are appointed by the Governor; six members are appointed by the Senate Rules Committee; and six members are appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly. The Attorney General is a member by specification. The bill further requires that the appointments must include representation from various levels of government, specific state agencies involved in the criminal justice process, the legislature and professional disciplines.

The legislation provides that the Governor shall appoint the Chairman of the Council and the Council shall designate one or more vice-chairmen. The Council may appoint an Executive Officer and other employees and consultants.^{13/}

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CALIFORNIA CRIME TECHNOLOGICAL RESEARCH FOUNDATION - CALIFORNIA SENATE BILL #84 (1967)) (Penal Code Sections 14000 - 14017)

The same legislative act includes provision for the establishment of a California Crime Technological Research Foundation. The Foundation is a state agency organized as a public corporation and subject to the management and control of a Board of Directors of fifteen members. The members of the Board of Directors are appointed by the Governor, confirmed by the Senate and the statute provides that the appointees must include representatives of criminal justice agencies, the academic community, persons qualified in the field of research, development and system technology. Four members should

^{13/}Membership roster is attached as Appendix F.

represent the public. The Governor shall appoint the Chairman and the Board shall designate its vice-chairman. The Board may adopt regulations pertaining to the conduct of Foundation business and may appoint such officers and employees as it deems advisable.

The Foundation shall have the following powers:

- To foster and support scientific and technological research concerned with prevention and detection of crime in this state in cooperation with other governmental, public, educational or private agencies through contracts or other appropriate means
- To identify, review and evaluate research and development efforts applicable to crime prevention, detection, apprehension and treatment of criminals
- To sponsor and conduct conferences, collect and disseminate information, issue periodic reports, etc., relating to scientific and technological research pertaining to criminal matters
- To retain and employ technical and other specialized consultants on contract or other basis
- To receive, hold, invest, and use, etc., on behalf of the Foundation and for any of its purposes, real property, personal property, and money, etc., either absolutely or in trust
- To have and exercise all powers necessary or convenient to effect any or all of the purposes of the Foundation

The Chairman or his representative shall attend meetings of the California Council on Criminal Justice. The Foundation's budget shall be approved by the California Council on Criminal Justice before submission to the Legislature.

As of the date of this report, the members of the California Council on Criminal Justice have been appointed and have participated in several organizational meetings. The members of the Board of Directors of the Foundation are now under consideration and will be announced shortly. It is the considered opinion of the state administration that the California Council on Criminal Justice and the Foundation embrace all of the functional and legal requirements for qualification under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. Steps are now being taken to develop and formalize a statewide plan to satisfy the requirements to obtain recognition and approval of the California Council on Criminal Justice as a State Planning Agency as defined in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

7/3/68

The Financial Statement included in the
Index will be mailed later under separate
cover.

Page 27 plus

8/15/68

A P P E N D I C E S

GOVERNOR'S INTERIM COMMITTEE ON
TECHNOLOGICAL APPROACHES TO CRIMINAL JUSTICE

(Original Membership List)

Chairman:

Thomas C. Lynch, Attorney General
Department of Justice
Room 500, Wells Fargo Bank Building
5th Street & Capitol Mall, Sacramento

Vice Chairman:

Richard A. McGee, Administrator (445-7101)
Youth and Adult Corrections Agency
Room 447, State Office Building No. 1
Sacramento

Edward M. Toothman, Chief of Police
City of Oakland ((415) CR 3-9000)
45 - 7th Street, Oakland

Evelle J. Younger (626-3888)
District Attorney, Los Angeles County
211 Temple Street, Los Angeles

Edward V. Comber ((415) KL 3-9111)
Director of Criminal Information
San Francisco Police Department
Hall of Justice, 850 Bryant Street
San Francisco

Michael Canlis, Sheriff (HO 4-7761)
San Joaquin County, Drawer H, Stockton

Joseph G. Babich, Judge
Superior Court (454-5577)
Immediate Past President,
Conference of California Judges
Sacramento County Courthouse
Sacramento

Bernard J. Clark, Sheriff
Riverside County (OV 4-4530)
4050 Main Street, Riverside

Ralph N. Kleps, Director (557-1581)
Administrative Office of the Courts
Judicial Council of California
Room 4206, 350 McAllister Street
San Francisco (LL 597-1581)

August G. Kettmann, Member
Adult Authority (445-4071)
Room 504, State Office Building No. 1
Sacramento
(residence: 579 Highland Drive
Palm Springs)

Thomas Reddin, Deputy Chief of Police
Los Angeles Police Department
150 N. Los Angeles Street
Los Angeles (MA 4-5211)

John P. Kenny, Deputy Director
Department of Justice (445-5430)
Room 500, Wells Fargo Bank Building
5th Street & Capitol Mall, Sacramento

Kit L. Nelson, District Attorney
Kern County Courthouse ((805) 327-2111)
Bakersfield

John W. Brewer, Member (Sac. 445-7250)
Youth Authority Board
126 Terrace Avenue (residence)
Kentfield ((415) 453-2533)

John A. Davis, Probation Officer
Contra Costa County (228-3000)
PO Box 791
Martinez x. 401.

Harold R. Walt, Deputy Director
Department of Finance (445-9862)
Room 1145, State Capitol, Sacramento

11/26/65



OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Department of Justice

STATE BUILDING, SAN FRANCISCO 94102

June 2, 1966

Mr. Courtney A. Evans, Acting Director
Office of Law Enforcement Assistance
United States Department of Justice
Washington, D. C. 20530

Dear Mr. Evans:

Enclosed is our revised application for LEAA funds along with additional material describing the proposed project, the need for a program of this type, and its national significance.

As you review the application, I think you will find a program involving joint Federal and State financial support that is well planned and documented. We believe that the project results will provide far reaching and widespread benefits for the administration of criminal justice. The products of the program can serve as guides for every state in implementing an information system that offers optimal satisfaction of their particular requirements.

In many ways California is ideally qualified to serve as the research vehicle for such a system design effort. In 1965, this State financed a study which clearly established the feasibility of applying advanced systems technology to solving the justice information problem. Furthermore, there is a high degree of operational cooperation among all justice agencies in the State and these agencies are united in their support of the proposed program. The State budget for 1966-67 includes a planned contribution for financing the project. The budget amount is in excess of one-half million dollars; another \$260,000 is planned for the following fiscal year.

State funds will cover the salaries and operating expenses of state and local justice agencies' professionals who will be members of the project task force. So that the task force will have the required interdisciplinary skills, we will need the services of some outside consultants with

Mr. Courtney A. Evans

-2-

June 2, 1966

in-depth experience in large scale information system design. LEAA's funds will be utilized to contract for these skills that are most essential if we are to have a properly balanced task force.

Sincerely,



CHARLES A. O'BRIEN
Chief Deputy Attorney General

CAO'B:irm
Encl.



**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
OFFICE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT
ASSISTANCE**

APPLICATION FOR GRANT
Page 1

Application is hereby made for a grant under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965 (PL 89-197) in the amount and for the purposes indicated in the following application.

(Leave Blank)

Application Number _____

Date Received _____

1. Short Title of Project: (Do not exceed one typed line)

A STATEWIDE CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION SYSTEM FOR CALIFORNIA

2. Type of Application: (Check one)

Original Revision Continuation of Grant No. _____

3. Project Duration:

Total length 18 months

From July 1, 1966

Through December 31, 1967

4. Total LEAA Support Sought: (Complete for all projects)

\$ 350,000

5. Request for First Year: (Projects exceeding 16 mos.)

\$ 244,650

6. Applicant Agency or Institution (Name, address, and telephone)

California State Department of Justice
Room 500, Wells Fargo Bank Building
Fifth and Capitol Mall
Sacramento, Calif. Phone: 445-4334

7. Project Director (Name, title, address, and telephone)

Charles A. O'Brien
Chief Deputy Attorney General
Room 500, Wells Fargo Bank Building
Fifth and Capitol Mall
Sacramento, Calif. Phone: 445-4334

8. Financial Officer (Name, title, address, and telephone)

Hale Champion
Director, Department of Finance
State Capitol, Room 1145
Sacramento, Calif. Phone: 445-4141

9. Official Authorized to Sign Application (Name, title, address, and telephone)

Thomas C. Lynch
Attorney General and Director
California State Department of Justice
Room 500, Wells Fargo Bank Building
Fifth and Capitol Mall
Sacramento, Calif. Phone: 445-4334

10. Type of Agency or Institution:

Public Private nonprofit

11. Federal Tax Exemption Determination

Yes, Date _____ No Pending

12. Assurance of Compliance With Civi' Rights Act of 1964

The Applicant hereby agrees that it will comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) and all requirements imposed by or pursuant to Regulations of the Department of Justice (28 CFR Part _____) issued pursuant to that title, to the end that no person shall on the ground of race, color, or national origin be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity for which the Applicant receives Federal financial assistance from the Department; and gives further assurance that it will promptly take any measures necessary to effectuate this commitment, as more fully set forth in the Department's Grant Conditions heretofore furnished to the Applicant. This assurance shall obligate the Applicant for the period during which Federal financial assistance is extended to it by the Department and is given in consideration of and for the purpose of obtaining the grant for which application is hereby made, and the United States shall have the right to seek judicial enforcement of this assurance.



**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
OFFICE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT
ASSISTANCE**

APPLICATION FOR GRANT

Page 2

13. Budget Summary for Total Project (omit for projects of less than 16 months duration)

Budget Categories—LEAA Funds	1st Year	2d Year	Beyond 2d Year ____ Months	Totals
Personnel (Employees and Consultants)	\$116,185	\$ 50,041		\$166,226
Travel (Transportation and Subsistence)	\$ 16,000	\$ 3,848		\$ 19,848
Supplies, Communications, and Reproduction	\$ 9,760	\$ 7,214		\$ 16,974
Other:	Equipment			
	Miscellaneous			
	Indirect Costs	\$102,705	\$ 44,247	\$146,952
Total LEAA Funds Requested	\$244,650	\$105,350		\$350,000
Total Grantee Contribution	\$510,000	\$260,000		\$770,000

14. Explanation of Grantee Contribution. Describe nature, sources, and project utilization of the Grantee Contribution as specified in Item 13 or Budget Item F, page 3.

See Continuation Sheet attached.

15. Federal Support. Will other Federal support be available for any part of this project? Yes ____ No X
If yes, identify and explain _____

16. Federal Submissions. Have other Federal agencies been contacted for assistance on this or similar projects? Yes ____ No X If yes, identify and indicate status _____

17. Applicant's Agreement

It is understood and agreed by the Applicant: (1) that any grant received as a result of this application shall be subject to the Grant Conditions and other policies, regulations, and rules issued by the Department of Justice for the administration of grant projects under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965; (2) that funds awarded are to be expended only for the purposes and activities covered by the Applicant's approved plan and budget; (3) that the grant may be terminated in whole or in part by the Attorney General or his designee at any time; and (4) that appropriate grant records and accounts will be maintained and made available for audit as prescribed by the Department.

18. Date: June 2, 1966

20. Signature of Authorized Official

19. Total Pages in Application: 32

Thomas E. Lynch

PROPOSED GRANTEE BUDGET FOR A STATEWIDE
CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION SYSTEM FOR CALIFORNIA

FY 1966-67

FY 1967-68

Personnel

	No. of Positions	Amount	No. of Positions	Amount
Project Director	1	\$ 13,332.00	.5	\$ 6,666.00
Program Administrator	1	12,096.00	.5	6,048.00
Associate Data Processing Systems Analyst	4	43,872.00	2	21,936.00
Associate Administrative Analyst	3	32,904.00	1.5	16,452.00
Associate Crimes Study Analyst	1	10,968.00	.5	5,484.00
Assistant Supervising Modus Operandi Analyst	1	10,968.00	.5	5,484.00
Parole Agent III	1	10,440.00	.5	5,220.00
State Traffic Lieutenant	1	9,948.00	.5	4,974.00
Senior Modus Operandi Analyst	1	9,948.00	.5	4,974.00
Assistant Supervising Fingerprint Examiner	1	9,480.00	.5	4,740.00
Clerical	5	22,607.00	3	13,576.00

Estimated Staff Benefits

Total, Positions, Salaries, and Staff Benefits

	20	\$186,563.00	10.5	\$ 95,554.00
		18,437.00		9,446.00
	20	\$205,000.00	10.5	\$105,000.00

Contract Services--Funds to obtain personnel from police departments, sheriffs' departments, probation departments and district attorneys

	15	\$180,000.00	7.5	\$ 90,000.00
--	----	--------------	-----	--------------

Operating Expenses

General Expense	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 5,000.00
Printing	3,000.00	8,000.00
Communications	14,500.00	7,250.00
Travelling--In-state	56,800.00	28,400.00
Travelling--Out-of-state	1,000.00	1,000.00
Rent	14,500.00	7,250.00
Equipment Rental	10,000.00	5,000.00
Reserve for Contingencies	15,200.00	3,100.00

Total, Operating Expenses

	\$125,000.00	\$ 65,000.00
--	--------------	--------------

TOTAL CASH BUDGET

	\$510,000.00	\$260,000.00
--	--------------	--------------



**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
OFFICE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT
ASSISTANCE**

**APPLICATION FOR GRANT
Page 3**

Detailed Project Budget

Complete Project

First Year Only (projects exceeding 16 months)

Period from 1 July 1966

Through 30 June 1967

A. Personnel (Employees and Consultants)	Percent of Time Devoted	Annual Salary	Requested of OLEA	Category Total
(1) Employees (list each position)				
(2) Consultants (list by individual or type)		Fee		
(3) FICA, Retirement, etc. (employees only)				
				\$

B. Travel (Transportation and Subsistence) (Itemize)	Requested of OLEA	Category Total
		\$

C. Supplies, Communications and Reproduction (Itemize)	Requested of OLEA	Category Total
		\$

D. Other (Equipment, Miscellaneous and Indirect Costs) (Itemize)	Requested of OLEA	Category Total
		\$

E. Total Amount Requested (Sum of Categories A through D above)	\$ 244,650
F. Total Grantees Contribution (Page 2, Item 14)	\$



**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
OFFICE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT
ASSISTANCE**

**APPLICATION FOR GRANT
Page 3**

Detailed Project Budget

Complete Project

First Year Only (projects exceeding 16 months)

Period from 1 July 1966

Through 30 June 1967

A. Personnel (Employees and Consultants)	Percent of Time Devoted	Annual Salary	Requested of OLEA	Category Total
(1) Employees (list each position)				
NONE (Paid by Grantee funds)				
(2) Consultants (list by individual or type)		Fee		
See Continuation Sheet				
(3) FICA, Retirement, etc. (employees only)				\$ 116,185

B. Travel (Transportation and Subsistence) (Itemize)	Requested of OLEA	Category Total
Field Interview Trips within State of California		
138 Trips @ \$100	\$ 13,800	
Briefing Trips, California -- Washington, D.C.		
5 Trips @ \$440	2,200	
		\$ 16,000

C. Supplies, Communications and Reproduction (Itemize)	Requested of OLEA	Category Total
Communications (Approximately 1½% of salaries)	\$ 1,320	
Reproduction Services (Approximately 8% of salaries)	8,440	
		\$ 9,760

D. Other (Equipment, Miscellaneous and Indirect Costs) (Itemize)	Requested of OLEA	Category Total
Consultant firm supervision and administrative costs and housekeeping expense (i.e., rent, utilities, janitorial services, etc.)	\$ 58,590	
Consultant firm general and administrative expense (including top management, contracts, finance, personnel)	26,000	
Fee (including research and working capital)	18,115	\$102,705

E. Total Amount Requested (Sum of Categories A through D above) \$ 244,650

F. Total Grantee Contribution (Page 2, Item 14) \$

A. PERSONNEL (EMPLOYEES AND CONSULTANTS)	% of Time Devoted	Annual Salary	Requested of OLEA
(2) Consultants (list by individual or type)			
2 Computer System Specialist, Senior	100%	\$18,535	\$ 37,070
1 Computer System Specialist	100%	14,255	14,255
1 Human Factors Scientist, Senior	100%	19,952	19,952
1 Human Factors Scientist	100%	15,687	15,687
1 Communications Engineer	100%	18,535	18,535
1.5 Secretarial Support	100%	7,124	10,686



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
OFFICE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT
ASSISTANCE

APPLICATION FOR GRANT

Page 4

Budget Narrative

Begin below and add as many continuation pages (4a, 4b, etc.) as may be needed to complete the required justification and explanation of the project budget.

In assessing the dimensions of the system design task, we determined the type of interdisciplinary skills that the task force must possess. The attachment to Item 14 of page 2 details the skills that can be provided by state and local justice agencies' professionals. In addition to these specialists, the task force must include personnel who have in-depth experience in information systems, data communications, and the social sciences. These skills are essential but cannot be provided by government agencies in California because they are either not available or cannot be spared. Therefore, they must be obtained from outside consultants who are familiar with the justice information problem and can offer the required specialized services.

The entire eighteen month program, as planned, involves a joint Federal-State sponsored finance base of \$1,120,000. Plans call for a State of California contribution of \$770,000 to be combined with the requested LEAA funds (\$350,000). Item 14 also indicates that the state contribution would cover the salaries and operating expenses of project personnel from public agencies. The LEAA funds, detailed on page 3, would be utilized to obtain additional, essential task force skills.

The budget figures on page 3 represent reliable average costs for the services needed. These amounts were checked with individuals from a prominent nonprofit research firm with offices in California who found our estimates essentially valid.



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
OFFICE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT
ASSISTANCE

APPLICATION FOR GRANT

Page 5

Project Plan and Supporting Data

This section constitutes the heart of the grant application. It is the applicant's detailed statement of the project—its aims, precisely what will be done, who will be involved, and what is expected to result. Together with the project budget, it constitutes primary evidence to OLEA of the soundness of the project, the care and planning that has gone into its formulation, and the responsibility and qualifications of the applicant and others who will be involved in carrying it out.

Attach to this sheet as many additional pages (8" x 10½" or 8½" x 11" sheets—not legal size) as may be needed to complete the description of Project Plan and Supporting Data. Where the applicant wishes to append documents as supplemental information and these cannot readily be placed on continuation sheets, they should be listed on the last page of the Plan and 12 copies furnished with the application for staff and panel review.

* * * * *

Begin this section with a brief summary of the total project not to exceed 200 words in length.

Present information processing conditions point to the urgent need for the development of a model statewide advanced information system to serve all agencies participating in the administration of criminal justice (law enforcement, prosecution, courts, probation, corrections, and parole). The model system design and implementation plan can serve as a guide to all states.

California has provided leadership by proving the feasibility of applying the latest system technology to the justice information problem. Many other accomplishments uniquely qualify California to serve as the research vehicle for a project to design such a system. Further, California has developed detailed plans for accomplishing the design task. These plans cover project objectives, estimated costs, and evaluation methods. All affected agencies in the State support the proposed project and this application for funds and pledge cooperation in accomplishing the project objectives.

The State submits that \$770,000 in state funds combined with LEAA funds (\$350,000) can finance the eighteen month program. Thus, California has budgeted over one-half million dollars for FY 1966-67. These state funds will cover the cost of design task force members from justice agencies throughout California. LEAA funds are required to contract with outside consultants possessing in-depth information system design experience. This expertise is essential--the task force must include a proper balance of interdisciplinary skills to achieve project goals.

Organize the remainder of the Project Plan and Supporting Data as per instructions for this section, under the following headings: I. Goals; II. Methods; III. Results; IV. Resources.

PROJECT PLAN
AND
SUPPORTING DATA

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
I. GOALS	5a
A. The Administration of Criminal Justice Information System Problem	5a
1. Interactions and Information Dependency Among Agencies	5a
2. Present System Information Processing Methods and Operating Conditions	5c
3. The Need for an Advanced Justice Information System	5e
B. Impact on Organizations	5f
C. Project Benefits	5f
II. PROJECT METHODS	5g
A. Project Schedule and Task Description	5h
1. Orientation	5h
2. Existing System Configuration Analysis	5h
3. User Requirements Analysis	5j
4. Advanced System Functional Design	5j
5. Implementation Plan	5k
B. Project Management	5l
1. Organization Structure	5l
2. California Joint Council	5m
3. Project Director	5m
4. Review and Evaluation Board	5m
5. User Agency and Consultant Personnel	5n
III. RESULTS	5h
A. Evaluation	5n
B. Project Significance	5o
1. New Techniques or Approaches	5o
2. Stimulation of Change	5p
3. Broad Significance	5p
C. Continuation	5p
D. Dissemination	5p

IV. RESOURCES

Page
5q

- A. Qualifications and Facilities of Grantee
- B. Staff and Staff Assistance
- C. Cooperating or Participating Agencies

5q
5r
5r

ATTACHMENTS

- Figure 1. Scheduled Activities and Products
- Figure 2. Proposed Project Organization Chart
- Letter from Thomas C. Lynch, Attorney General
- Resolution, Peace Officers' Association of California

PROJECT PLAN AND SUPPORTING DATA

I. GOALS

A. The Administration of Criminal Justice Information System Problem

A system may be defined as a set of elements, components or sub-systems interacting in a prescribed manner in order to accomplish certain overall objectives. The administration of criminal justice in each state may be viewed as an operating system. Various agencies, acting as system elements interact in achieving the overall system objective--insuring the welfare and safety of the public. These agencies are found at both the state and local level of government. Each agency operates as a part of a specialized subsystem (law enforcement, probation, courts, correction, parole, etc.) of the total state justice system.

Of paramount importance to each agency is the quality and reliability of information required in the performance of its functions. Each agency collects, processes and stores data that are necessary to serve its own needs. Further, a great amount of data interchange exists among agencies with a consequent interdependence of agencies for decision making information. Therefore, a rather loosely integrated information system supports the agencies participating in the administration of criminal justice. However, there are serious deficiencies in the existing information system which cause the justice system itself to operate in a less than optimal fashion. The discussion below presents an examination of the information interaction among justice agencies, an exposition of deficiencies in the existing information system and a statement of the need which exists.

1. Interactions and Information Dependency Among Agencies

The state and local agencies that make up the administration of criminal justice system each have separate information processing support of varying quality. The information that is collected, processed and analyzed by all components of the criminal justice system is essential to their effective operations. Furthermore, the interchange of information among law enforcement, judicial and correctional agencies is basic to all operational and administrative activities.

Every agency depends on others for incoming information and supporting services. Field interrogation and arrest decisions by a law enforcement officer are dependent upon criminal record and other identification data, stolen property descriptions, wanted vehicles information and knowledge of prior criminal activities in a particular geographic area. A district attorney's decision to file a formal complaint is based on an original crime report prepared by a field officer. Activities in the trial court depend on the information submitted in evidence. That information incorporates the previous investigations by the law enforcement agencies and the district attorney, as well

as the data retrieved by search and investigation on the part of the defense. The sentencing decision of the judge is based in part upon the presentencing investigation made by probation authorities and in part upon the judge's perception of sentencing practice in similar cases. The presentence investigation, again, takes its roots in the law enforcement agency's files. Treatment decisions in correctional institutions are also based on presentence reports plus institutional studies or examinations. The parole board decision generally is based on the same information, augmented by reports of the individual's activities while he has been institutionalized and release plan information provided by parole field personnel. The use of these data in parole decisions is qualified by the board members' perceptions of good release practices.

Changes in policy or degree of effectiveness in one component may materially affect the planning or operations of another. Obviously, if the percentage of cleared offenses were increased from about 25% to 50%, there would be a reverberating surge throughout the total system. If improved presentence information led the courts to place larger percentages of offenders on probation and, in so doing, decrease the number of minimum security risks being institutionalized, there would be a two-fold result. The probation force would have a greater load while the institutional load would be reduced (assuming constant input). The nature of the institutional load also would be tilted toward higher risk, maximum custody inmates. This would reduce, at least in part, the need for minimum security facilities.

Overcrowded institutional facilities may result in increased use of probation or parole to relieve the situation. A change from a conservative to a liberal parole releasing policy, which may occur by changing parole board members, would result in a rapidly increased supervisory load for the parole arm of the system and a potential increase in law enforcement problems. A narrow and strict interpretation of parole conditions may lead to increased violation and rising institutional population. On the other hand, an effective program of treatment, administered in the institution and on parole, could lead to reduced institutional, court, law enforcement and other loads by reducing recidivism.

These few examples indicate only some of the ways these components of the justice system affect each other while striving toward the overall goal of protecting the public. Each needs information possessed by the other, not only to perform present line functions but to derive plans to cope with future situations. The inadequacies of the present methods of providing and exchanging information that cause the entire system to operate in a less than optimal fashion are described in the following discussion.

2. Present System Information Processing Methods and Operating Conditions

Existing information processing methods are inadequate to satisfy the present requirements, as well as the rapidly increasing future requirements of the overall system. Some of the deficiencies in present justice information systems are:

Important Information is Unavailable

This condition may result because there is no provision to collect certain data at the time it is originated, or because of an inherent inability to process and present the data when needed for decisions. An example of the limited collection capability is reflected in correctional institution files. These often have comparatively little information about an individual's institutional adjustment (except disciplinary reports), attitudes, shifts in goals, acquisition of skills or changing release situation.

To illustrate the processing problem, California law enforcement officers, among others, make field interview reports which are manually filed. These "FI cards" contain valuable data for investigations but much of that data cannot be readily retrieved.

Another kind of data unavailability is due to lack of uniformity among agencies. Because uniform meanings are not applicable to common terms, it is difficult for one part of the system to make use of another's data. This is even true within the same jurisdictions.

Information is of Poor Quality for Decision Making

Because the content and processing of documents usually vary with the discretion of individual investigators, law enforcement, corrections and other personnel, a great deal of irrelevant, erroneous or redundant information enters the system. This complicates the retrieval and diminishes the value of information for decision making. Packages of information on individuals grow to the point where much time is wasted by decision makers in scanning for isolated bits of data, to say nothing of the administrative costs in maintaining an inadequate record system. Parole board members may thumb back and forth through a two-inch jacket looking for information they need as they make forty or more decisions concerning releases in a few hours. Frequently, valueless data are presented to them while they are unable to retrieve the information required before their time for decision has expired.

Processing Volume is Overloading Present System

Each year, the justice system agencies must handle hundreds of thousands of people. Tens to hundreds of items of information are needed on each person subject to the justice process. The manual systems cannot even keep up with the present volume and, with the ever-increasing load associated with increased crime rates, these manual facilities will not be able to meet future demands.

Response Time is Too Slow

The manual system is slow, causing delays in the total process which impede justice. The law enforcement officer detains suspects in the field while making a warrant or stolen vehicle check. In most cases, this check proves negative and a citizen is detained unduly. In other cases, wanted felons may not be checked because of the excessive time delays involved. After a suspect is arrested, it is essential that all records be speedily searched and "wants" or "rap sheets" obtained prior to arraignment. Manual systems presently require several days delay to obtain these records, and arraignment often takes place before they are received. Prior to verdict there often is a lengthy waiting period between arrest and trial which is quite disruptive to those unable to raise money for bail. For those acquitted, this period is a costly burden, unjustifiably imposed. In addition, in many instances, excessively long periods intervene between the verdict or plea of guilty and the date of sentencing, due to the delay in preparation of the presentence report. Often the defendant languishes in jail during that time. A reduction in delay not only would result in a savings in expense and resources, but perhaps would enhance the rehabilitation process by providing swifter justice.

Some Basic Tasks are not Performed

For example, the detective needs the capability to compare a particular suspect's identifying characteristics with those of unknown suspects in a vast file of uncleared cases, perhaps 50,000. Similarly, he needs the capability to compare the pattern of activity in an unsolved crime with similar patterns in cases of known offenders. With several new crimes occurring daily, and limited detective staff, this need is not being met adequately. Also, today's manual systems do not enable the ready use of existing data in determining whether an accused should be released on his own recognizance or detained for bail.