AN ASSESSMENT OF THE STATUS OF THE NATIONAL COMPUTERIZED CRIMINAL HISTORY PROGRAM

Final Report

November 1979

Prepared for:

U.S. Department of Justice
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
NCJISS/SDD
Washington, D.C. 20531

SRI International
333 Ravenswood Avenue
Menlo Park, California 94025
(415) 326-6200
Cable: SRI INTL MPK
TWX: 910-373-1246

SRI International

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE STATUS OF THE NATIONAL COMPUTERIZED CRIMINAL HISTORY PROGRAM

Final Report

November 1979

By: W. T. Connor

Prepared for:

U.S. Department of Justice
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
NCJISS/SDD
Washington, D.C. 20531

SRI Project 7897

This project was supported by Contract Number J-LEAA-017-78 awarded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

SRI International

ABSTRACT

This report offers an assessment of the national Computerized Criminal History (CCH) program in the various states. The report was prepared to (a) assist the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) in determining the current status of state-level CCH efforts and (b) lay a logical foundation for future LEAA activities in the area of CCH. The report, prepared under contract by SRI International, addresses not only current CCH system development efforts, but also common problems faced by the states in developing CCH systems and areas of potential LEAA activity that benefit the states' CCH efforts.

To prepare the report, SRI synthesized the results of (a) on-site visits to several states, (b) regional conferences with state officials, (c) a limited survey of state planning agencies, state identification agencies, and state CCH agencies, (d) meetings with LEAA and FBI/National Crime Information Center (NCIC) officials and (e) consultation with SRI staff.

The overall conclusions of the reports can be summarized as follows:

- LEAA money has been responsible, in part, for the initiation of state-level CCH systems that now serve or will serve in the future the vast majority of the U.S. population.
- Although most attention is focused upon the national controversies surrounding the NCIC-CCH system, a significant pool of information and service has been developing at the state level.
- State-level CCH systems will continue to develop regardless of the resolution of national issues.
- Current state-level CCH systems contain approximately only 20% of the individuals in State Identification Bureau (SIB) files.
- Increased attention to identification is critical to successful future CCH operation.

CONTENTS

TABLES

EXHIBITS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report has been prepared by SRI International under contract to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA). SRI is solely responsible for its content. However, the report would not have been possible without the participation and cooperation of a great many people. Over the past several months, SRI has sought the time, services, and consultation of a great many people at both the state and Federal levels of government. Their assistance has been rendered despite their regular workload and thus represented additional effort on their part. This willingness to share in discussions and deliberations reflects their desire to maximize the effectiveness of CCH as a tool for criminal justice in the United States. For this attitude, SRI both thanks and commends them.

SUMMARY

During 1979, SRI International, under contract to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), undertook an assessment of the Computerized Criminal History (CCH) programs in the various states. The purpose of this assessment was to establish where the states were in their respective CCH efforts, what were the problems with and hindrances to those efforts, and what actions LEAA might initiate to assist the states.

To perform this assessment, SRI collected data and insight from a variety of sources. This information was analyzed in order to draw knowledgeable, reasoned conclusions about current status and issues.

The major findings are:

- Although national controversies surrounding National Crime Information Center (NCIC)-CCH continue, the various states are proceeding with the development of state-level, state-oriented CCH systems.
- Such systems will probably continue to develop regardless of the ultimate resolution of national issues (although alternative resolutions might help or hinder such development).
- LEAA financial support has played a significant role in permitting many states to initiate CCH system efforts.
- SIB file sizes reflect a massive data base of potential subjects for future inclusion in CCH files.
- Increased attention to identification is critical to ultimate CCH success.
- The various manual aspects of identification represent a continuing potential hindrance to CCH development and operation.
- Interstate and Intrastate compatibility and coordination issues continue to hinder CCH efforts.
- Many states are not happy with the structure, components, and guidelines of LEAA's Comprehensive Data System (CDS) program.
- LEAA, at the national level, is logically situated to undertake selected research and development efforts for CCH that are beyond the scope of individual states.

I INTRODUCTION

In October of 1978, SRI International entered into a contract with the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) to provide technical assistance in the area of criminal justice information systems. A major component of that contract was directed toward LEAA efforts in and support of a national program to facilitate the development of intrastate Computerized Criminal History (CCH) systems. One aspect of this component was an assessment of the status of the state CCH systems. This report presents the findings of that assessment.

SRI recognized that any effort to provide an overall assessment of intrastate CCH systems requires an awareness of multiple issues and multiple perspectives. Contrary to what seems to be the perspective of some, the intrastate CCH systems are not merely extensions of a monolithic, uniform national computer network. In reality, probably no two intrastate CCH systems are identical. Variations in state governments, goals, priorities, laws, governmental structures, and finances all combine to produce CCH systems unique to the particular states. Similarly, state officials do not think of their CCH system first as part of a national system. Rather, they regard it first as a tool intended to aid criminal justice within their particular state. To the extent that a national CCH system benefits their state, they will support a national system. But their first priority is, and logically should be, their own state.

With this perspective in mind, SRI anticipated potential differences among the states with respect to system status, problems, priorities, and solutions. Thus, it was determined that the assessment effort would look to multiple information sources. Ultimately, SRI utilized

- On-site visits to several states.
- Meetings with FBI personnel involved with the CCH program.
- A series of four regional conferences attended by most of the states.
- Meetings with LEAA/NCJISS personnel.
- Reviews of appropriate literature and documentation.
- A voluntary state-level survey (the survey instruments are presented in Appendixes A, B, and C).

Information Sources

On-Site Visits

During late 1978 and early 1979, SRI undertook on-site visits to a number of states. The sites were selected to provide a geographical, population, and level-of-CCH development mix. The on-site visits provided an opportunity for SRI to observe first-hand the day-to-day activities, issues, and problems confronting current or would-be state CCH agencies. The visits also permitted one-on-one discussions with state personnel regarding CCH.

Meetings with NCIC-CCH Personnel

During the project, SRI had an opportunity to meet various FBI staff members associated with the National Crime Information Center (NCIC)-CCH effort. This not only promoted a greater understanding of the status of NCIC-CCH, but also permitted SRI to gather data regarding such matters as file sizes, system activity, and degrees of participation of the states.

Regional Cluster Conferences

In February and March of 1979, SRI and the LEAA hosted four regional cluster conferences on CCH. These conferences were very well attended and provided a valuable forum for the exchange of views regarding a wide variety of CCH issues.

The insight gathered at these conferences influenced SRI's assessment and analysis incorporated in this report. A more detailed report on the conferences is presented in Appendix D of this report. This material is an excerpt from SRI's report to LEAA following the four regional cluster conferences. The reader is cautioned that the conferences were deliberately left as unstructured as possible in order to foster open discussion. Although this approach was very successful in terms of discussions, it has resulted in conference write-ups that are really just summarizations of the discussions.

Meetings with LEAA/NCJISS Personnel

During the course of this effort, SRI has had the benefit of continuing contact with key LEAA/NCJISS staff members. This interaction not only provided SRI with insight into LEAA activities, issues, and problems, but also served to keep SRI aware of changing conditions that impacted LEAA or the development of this report.

Review of Literature/Documentation

As part of the SRI assessment effort, SRI has reviewed a great deal of written material regarding CCH. This material has ranged from the findings of various study groups or committees to guideline documents and system descriptions. This information was utilized to develop elements of the survey instruments.

State-Level Survey

Another part of the SRI assessment effort was the development and conduct of a survey of the states during April and May of 1979. Participation by the states in this survey was voluntary and SRI was pleased with the response. The survey was intended to provide insight into the status of CCH from the perspective of state planning agencies (SPA), state identification agencies (SIB), and state CCH agencies. The survey also provided an opportunity to obtain input from such agencies regarding what they perceived to be problems and what they regarded as potentially useful LEAA activities.

Separate survey instruments were mailed to each of the above agency types in each state. Although the different instruments each posed different questions, the instruments were all directed at a common issue: CCH status and future LEAA activities. Table 1 presents an overall summary of participants in the survey.

Report Orientation

This report focuses upon CCH from the perspective of state system efforts, problems, and issues and upon how LEAA might assist in these areas. In preparing this report, SRI is aware of the national issues and debate surrounding NCIC-CCH. Although the ultimate decisions regarding NCIC and CCH are relevant to the states and LEAA, ongoing CCH efforts within the states and LEAA's responsibilities to the states are such that a state-oriented assessment is both useful and timely.

II STATE PLANNING OFFICES

The LEAA-sponsored State Planning Agencies (SPA) generally have an active role in state-level information system and CCH development efforts. In addition to providing financial support, the SPAs may also provide coordination and technical assistance for CCH and the entire CDS program of a state. For these reasons, a separate survey document was distributed to the SPAs.

A total of 31 SPAs responded to the questionnaire survey. These 31 states represented approximately 59% of the U.S. population as estimated in 1976. An overall summary of the SPA status responses is presented in Table 2. The survey instrument is presented in Appendix A. A review of various elements of the responses follows:

CJIS Master Plan

Of the 31 responding SPAs, 22 (71%) reported their states had Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) Master Plans. Of the 22 states with CJIS Master Plans, the plans were originally adopted in the following years:

1965 - 1 State
1970 - 1 State
1971 - 1 State
1972 - 4 States
1973 - 1 State
1974 - 4 States
1975 - 3 States
1976 - 4 States
1977 - 2 States
1979 - 1 State

Updates were reported to have occurred on 13 of the 22 plans (59%). Two of the states reported their plans had been updated in 1979. Four states said their plans were currently being updated and one state reported its plan was updated yearly.

CDS Plans

To participate in the CDS, each state must have a CDS Plan (as specified in LEAA's CDS Program Guideline Manual M6640.1A). Of 31 states, 24

Table 1

SURVEY RESPONDENTS

	SPA	SIB	CCH
Alabama		XXX	XXX
Alaska	XXX		
Arizona	XXX	XXX	XXX
Arkansas			
California		XXX	
Colorado		XXX	
Connecticut	XXX	XXX	XXX
Delaware	XXX		
Florida	XXX	XXX	XXX
Georgia	XXX	XXX	XXX
Hawaii	XYX	XXX	XXX
Idaho			
Illinois	XXX	XXX	XXX
Indiana			
Iowa	XXX		XXX
Kansas	XXX	XXX	XXX
Kentucky	XXX	XXX	XXX
Louisiana	XXX	XXX	XXX
Maine		XXX	XXX
Maryland	XXX		
Massachusetts	XXX	XXX	XXX
Michigan		XXX	XXX
Minnesota	XXX	XXX	XXX
Mississippi			
Missouri	XXX	XXX	XXX
Montana	XXX	XXX	XXX
Nebraska		XXX	XXX
Nevada			
New Hampshire	XXX	XXX	XXX
New Jersey		XXX	XXX
New Mexico	XXX	XXX	XXX
New York	XXX	XXX	XXX
North Carolina	XXX		
North Dakota	XXX	XXX	
Ohio			
Oklahoma			
Oregon	XXX	XXX	XXX
Pennsylvania	XXX	XXX	XXX
Rhode Island			
South Carolina	XXX	XXX	XXX
South Dakota	XXX	XXX	
Tennessee	XXX		
Texas	XXX	XXX	XXX
Utah	XXX	XXX	XXX
Vermont	XXX		
Virginia		XXX	XXX
Washington			
West Virginia			
Wisconsin			
Wyoming		XXX	XXX
Percent of 1976 U.S. population represented by respondents	59	73	63

Table 2

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY
FOR SPAs

	CJIS Master Plan?	Date Plan Adopted	Date Last Update	CDS Plan?	Date Plan Adopted	Date Last Update	State Received CDS $?	State Received CCH $?	Block $ Used for CCH/OBTS?	State Received SJIS $?	State Received OBSCIS $?	Is CCH Operational?	Is OBTS Operational?	Nonoperational CCH Status	Integ. CCH and OBTS?	SPA System Specialists on Staff?	SPA Involvement with CCH
Alabama																	
Alaska	Yes	1974		Yes	1977	1978	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes	f, h
Arizona	Yes	1965	Now	Yes	1973	1975	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes	e, f, g
Arkansas																	
California																	
Colorado																	
Connecticut	Yes	1976	Now	Yes	1976	1978	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	a	Yes	Yes	e, f, g
Delaware	Yes	Now	Now	Yes	1974	1979	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	a	Yes	No	e
Florida	Yes	1972	Now	No			Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes	
Georgia	Yes	1972	1974	Yes	1972	1977	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes	e, g
Hawaii	Yes	1976	--	Yes	1973	--	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	No	
Idaho																	
Illinois	Yes	1972	1979	Yes	1972	1979	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes	f, g
Indiana																	
Iowa	No			Yes	1977	--	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No		Yes	Yes	g
Kansas	Yes	1976	--	Yes	1976	--	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	a	Yes	Yes	f, g
Kentucky	No			No			No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	
Louisiana	Yes	1971	1978	Yes	1971	--	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	a	Yes	Yes	g
Maine																	
Maryland	Yes	1975	1977	Yes	1973	Now	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes	e, g
Massachusetts	No			No			Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	a	Yes	Yes	f, g
Michigan																	
Minnesota	Yes	1977	--	Yes	1972	1976	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	e, g
Mississippi																	
Missouri	No			Yes	1972	1976	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	a	Yes	No	e, g
Montana	Yes	1977	--	Yes	1977	--	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	c	No	Yes	
Nebraska																	
Nevada																	
New Hampshire	No			Yes	1974	Now	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	a	Yes	No	e
New Jersey																	
New Mexico	Yes	1974	1979	Yes	1974	--	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	a	Yes	Yes	g
New York	Yes	1975	--	Yes	1974	--	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	e, g
North Carolina	Yes	1974	1976	No			No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No		Yes	Yes	e, g
North Dakota	No			No			No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No			
Ohio	Yes	1973	--	Yes	1973	--	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	e, f, g
Oklahoma																	
Oregon	No			Yes	1972	Now	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No		No	Yes	g
Pennsylvania	Yes	1976	1978	Yes	1975	Now	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No			No	g
Rhode Island																	
South Carolina	Yes	1974	--	Yes	1974	--	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No		Yes	Yes	e, f, g
South Dakota	No			Yes	1976	--	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	a	Yes	Yes	f, g
Tennessee	Yes	1975	1976	No			No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	a	Yes	No	e, g
Texas	Yes	1972	1972	Yes	1975	1978	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No			No	e
Utah	Yes	1970	Yrly	Yes	1973	Yrly	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	e, f, g
Vermont	No			No			No									No	
Virginia																	
Washington																	
West Virginia																	
Wisconsin																	
Wyoming																	

Note: a = under development
b = running parallel
c = not planned
e = funding only
f = system design
g = multi-agency coordination
h = other

Source: SRI International, 1979

(approximately 77%) reported that they had such plans. The reported adoption dates of the 24 CDS Plans were:

1971 - 1 state
1972 - 5 states
1973 - 5 states
1974 - 5 states
1975 - 2 states
1976 - 3 states
1977 - 3 states

Of the 24 states reporting CDS Plans, 13 states (54%) reported that their plans had been updated since their original adoption.

Exhibit 1 provides a summary analysis of the SPA responses regarding the CCH portion of CDS.

SPA Involvement With CCH

Given the rather technical nature of the state CCH efforts, the survey instrument asked whether the SPA had an information system specialist on the SPA staff. Of the 31 responding states, 22 (71%) reported they had such a specialist on staff.

The survey also sought to determine the nature of SPA involvement with CCH. These findings were:

Funding	15 states (60%)
System design	8 states (32%)
Multiagency coordination	22 states (88%)
Other	1 state (4%)

Problems Experienced by SPAs

Table 3 provides a summary of the SPA responses regarding common problems and potential activities. The survey instrument is presented in Appendix A.

With respect to problems experienced by SPAs, the need for more data was the most common. Of 29 states, 21 (72%) reported this as either "a serious problem" (9 states) or "a problem" (12 states). State/local system coordination difficulties significantly affected 16 of 29 states (55%) with 4 states rating this a "serious problem"; only 3 of 29 states (10%) reported this was "not a problem." Of 28 states, 15 (54%) reported either "a serious problem" (5 states) or "a problem" (10 states) with discretionary programs that were nonsupportive of other programs. On the other hand, of possible problems that were rated less serious, 27 of 29 states (93%) reported that lack of SPA involvement in state-funded systems was a "minor problem" (5 states) or "not a problem" (22 states). Similarly, 20 of 29 states (69%) described the need for more technical expertise as either a "minor problem"

Exhibit 1

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF SPA RESPONSES

SURVEY QUESTION	RESPONSES	YES
Does The State Have a CDS Plan?	31	24 (77%)
Has The State Received CDS Funds?	31	26 (84%)
Has The State Received CDS-CCH Funds?	29	19 (66%)
Have Block Funds Been Used for CCH/OBTS?	29	16 (55%)
Has The State Received SJIS Funds?	30	13 (43%)
Has The State Received OBSCIS Funds?	30	22 (73%)
Is CCH Operational?	30	18 (60%)
Is OBTS Operational?	25	8 (32%)
Is CCH Integrated With OBTS?	26	24 (92%)

Table 3

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY FOR SPAs: COMMON PROBLEMS AND POTENTIAL LEAA ACTIVITIES

	Ratings* of Common SPA Problems						Ratings† of Potential LEAA Activities				
	Need More Data	Need More Technical Expertise	Information System Plans Out of Date	Discretionary Programs Not Supportive	SPA Not Involved In State-Funded Systems	State/Local Coordination Difficult	Provide CCH/OBTS Guidelines	Provide National Technology Resource	Conduct CCH/OBTS Seminars	Develop Technology Packages	Provide Technical Assistance
Alabama											
Alaska	2	4	1	1	4	3	3	3	1	1	1
Arizona											
Arkansas							1	2	2	3	2
California											
Colorado											
Connecticut	2	3	3	1	4	2	2	1	2	2	1
Delaware	1	3	4	4	2	3	3	2	2	1	1
Florida	2	4	4	4	4	4	3	2	3	2	1
Georgia	1	3	3		4	3	1	1	1	1	1
Hawaii	4	2	4	4	4	3	1	2	2	2	1
Idaho											
Illinois	1	4	4	2	4	3	2	2	1	1	2
Indiana											
Iowa	2	2	3	3	3	2	1	1	2	1	1
Kansas	1	2	2	2	3	2	1	1	1	1	1
Kentucky	1	4	4	1	4	4	3	2	2	1	1
Louisiana	2	4	4	4	4	3	3	2	3	2	3
Maine											
Maryland	4	4	4	2	4	3	2	1	3	2	2
Massachusetts	1	3	1	4	3	2	3	2	1	2	2
Michigan											
Minnesota	3	4	3	2	4	3	3	2	3	1-2	2
Mississippi											
Missouri	2	3	3	2	4	1	3	2	3	3	2
Montana	2	4	4	3	4	4	2	1	1	1	1
Nebraska											
Nevada											
New Hampshire	4	2	2	3	4	2	1	3	2	2	2
New Jersey											
New Mexico	2	4	3	4	3	2	2	2	1	2	2
New York	2	4	1	4	4	1	1	2	2	2	3
North Carolina	1	4	3	2	3	2	2	1	1	2	2
North Dakota	3	4	3	1	4	2	3	3	3	1	2
Ohio	4	4		1	1	1	3	3	3	3	3
Oklahoma											
Oregon	1	3	1	2	4	2	3	1	1	2	1
Pennsylvania	3	1	1	2	4	2	2	2	2	1	1
Rhode Island											
South Carolina	3	3	3	3	4	2	3	1	3	1	1
South Dakota	1	2	2	2	4	2	2	1	2	2	1
Tennessee	2	2	3	3	4	1	2	1	2	1	1
Texas	2	1	2	2	4	3	2	2	2	2	2
Utah	2	2	4	3	4	3	3	2	2	1	1
Vermont											
Virginia											
Washington											
West Virginia											
Wyoming											
Average	2.10	2.86	2.82	2.54	3.66	2.41	2.20	1.77	1.97	1.65	1.57

*1 = serious problem; 2 = a problem; 3 = minor problem; 4 = not a problem.

†1 = very useful; 2 = might use; 3 = doubtful use.

Source: SRI International, 1979

(7 states) or "not a problem" (13 states). And 19 of 28 states (68%) indicated that out of date information system plans were either a "minor problem" (10 states) or "not a problem" (9 states).

Future LEAA Activities

In assessing potential future LEAA funding activities, 16 of 30 states (53%) said providing technical assistance would be very useful. An additional 11 states (37%) said they "might use" such assistance. LEAA efforts to develop technology packages was rated as "very useful" by 14 states (47%) and as "might use" by 13 states (43%). Of 30 states, 26 (87%) reported that LEAA efforts to provide a national technology resource would be either "very useful" (11 states) or "might use" (15 states). CCH/Offender-Based Transaction Statistics (OBTS) seminars was rated as "very useful" by 9 states (30%) and "might use" by 13 states (43%). Providing CCH/OBTS guidelines was rated "very useful" by 7 of 30 states (23%). Conversely, 13 states (43%) said this was of "doubtful use."

SPA Summary

LEAA involvement with and support of state-level CCH efforts has been widespread. A majority of the states have both CJIS and CDS Master Plans. Similarly, a majority of these states report that these plans have been updated since their original adoption. It is, however, uncertain how current or how influential these plans are. The peak period for adopting CJIS and CDS plans appears to have been 1972 through 1976. The intervening years have seen significant political, fiscal, and technological changes.

Analysis indicates that LEAA financial support of state CCH efforts has been extensive. In addition to discretionary funding for CCH, State Judicial Information System (SJIS), and Offender-Based State Corrections Information System (OBSCIS), LEAA monies have also been obtained via block funds. These funds have been utilized for a variety of CCH-related activities such as training, forms design, and planning, as well as for the anticipated CCH systems development needs of hardware and software. Thus, LEAA seed money for CCH has, over the past several years, been utilized by states representing a vast majority of the population of the United States.

Representing LEAA within the states, the SPAs have had a varying role in CCH development. This role has ranged from computer-level technical assistance in some states to coordinating system development via controlling grant awards in other states.

III STATE IDENTIFICATION AGENCIES

Identification of an individual by law enforcement agencies is an integral component of any state CCH system. Generally, the first step in preparing or obtaining CCH data is to establish the identity of the subject. Therefore, to assess the status of CCH, it is also necessary to consider the status of the various state-level identification agencies (commonly referred to as State Identification Bureaus or SIBs). Thus, a separate survey instrument was prepared for distribution to SIBs.

A total of 32 states responded in the SIB survey. These states represented 73% of the U.S. population as estimated in 1976. The SIB survey instrument is included in Appendix B. An overall summary of the status of State Identification Agencies is presented in Table 4.

SIB File Size: Number of Persons

The 32 respondents reported a total of approximately 33,566,000 persons in their SIB files. This total was made up of 23,477,000 criminal records and 9,570,000 noncriminal (see Exhibit 2). One state (Oregon) with a file containing 519,000 records did not provide separate counts for criminal and noncriminal records.

In terms of size, SIB files ranged from approximately 6,200,000 persons (California) to approximately 40,000 persons (Wyoming). Eleven states have in excess of 1,000,000 people in their files whereas four states have less than 100,000 people in their files. The average file size of the 32 states was approximately 1,049,000 people.

Twelve of the 32 states reported no noncriminal records in their SIB. One state (Kansas) reported "minimal" noncriminal records in their SIB. Two states (Hawaii and New Jersey) reported more noncriminal than criminal records in their SIB and two states (California and Michigan) reported approximately equal criminal and noncriminal records. Approximately 71% of the records (excluding Oregon's) in the SIBs were criminal records.

SIB File Size: Fingerprints

A total of approximately 52,555,000 fingerprints are stored in the SIB files of the 32 responding states (see Exhibit 2). These fingerprints were divided 39,791,000 criminal and 11,875,000 noncriminal (Oregon did not divide its 889,000 fingerprints). Fingerprint file sizes ranged from approximately 8,099,000 (New York) to approximately 103,000 (Wyoming). Thirteen states had an excess of 1,000,000 fingerprints on file. Six

Table 4

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY FOR SIBs

	SIB Established by Law?	Persons in SIB Files (thousands)		Fingerprints in SIB Files (thousands)		Names in SIB Files (thousands)		Fingerprints Received Annually (thousands)		F/P Submission Law?	Estimated Current Compliance (%)	SIB Use Name Search?	"Hit Rate" (% of Total Submissions)	Full Technical Search?	F/P Classification System	F/P Filed	Name File	Response Time
		Crs	Ncrs	Crs	Ncrs	Crs	Ncrs	Crs	Ncrs									
Alabama	**Yes**	**450**	**10**	**1,500**	**10**	**660**	**10**	**200**	**20**	**Yes**	**80**	**Yes**	**75**	**No**	**N, H**	**Cl**	**b**	**2.5 mo**
Alaska																		
Arizona	**Yes**	**544**	**70**	**544**	**70**	**544**	**70**	**60**	**46**	**Yes**	**85-90**	**Yes**	**52**	**Yes**	**N, H**	**Cl**	**b**	**14 d**
Arkansas																		
California	Yes	3,100	3,100	3,100	3,100	7,200	1,800	900	521	Yes	75	No	69	Yes	H	Cl	b	8 d
Colorado	Yes	200		450		235		50	25	Yes	98	Yes	40	Yes	H	Cl, S	c	n/a
Connecticut	**Yes**	**550**	**339**	**431**	**339**	**550**	**339**	**42**	**25**	**Yes**	**35-40**	**Yes**	**70**	**Yes**	**N, H**	**Cl, S**	**c**	**2 d**
Delaware																		
Florida	**Yes**	**1,050**	**0**	**1,050**	**0**	**1,585**	**0**	**227**	**97**	**Yes**	**100**	**Yes**	**60.5**	**No**	**N**	**Other**	**c**	**2 d**
Georgia	Yes	600	0	610	0	600	0	96	50	Yes	85-90	Yes	50	Yes	H	cl	c	3-4.5 w
Hawaii	Yes	182	897	182	897	218	1,000	8	18	Yes	99	Yes	65	Yes	H	cl	b	1-2 w
Idaho																		
Illinois	**Yes**	**1,400**	**5**	**3,500**	**5**	**2,000**	**5**	**200**	**5**	**Yes**	**95**	**Yes**	**60**	**Yes**	**N, H**	**cl**	**c**	**10 d**
Indiana																		
Iowa																		
Kansas	Yes	750	min	500	min	750	min	20	4	Yes	60	Yes	70	Yes	H	cl	b	None
Kentucky	Yes	300	50	300	50	1,000	75	17	3	Yes	30-35	Yes	20-25	Yes	N, H	cl	m	7 d
Louisiana	Yes	1,021	500	3,500	500	1,021	500	87	26	Yes	40	Yes	50	Yes	H	cl	c	12 d
Maine	**Yes**	**278**	**0**	**160**	**0**	**278**	**0**	**10**	**1**	**Yes**	**40**	**Yes**	**30**	**Yes**	**H**	**cl**	**m**	**30 d**
Maryland																		
Massachusetts	**Yes**	**1,000**	**10**	**4,000**	**10**	**1,958**	**10**	**40**	**2**	**Yes**	**65**	**Yes**	**50**	**Yes**	**N, H**	**cl, e**	**b**	**1 d**
Michigan	Yes	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	6,500	2,500	170	90	Yes	unk	Yes	60	Yes	N, H	cl	b	6 d
Minnesota	Yes	100	0	100	0	140	0	14	3	Yes	93	Yes	33	Yes	N	s	c	3 d
Mississippi																		
Missouri	**Yes**	**505**	**0**	**1,197**	**0**	**1,250**	**0**	**40**	**22**	**Yes**	**75**	**Yes**	**58**	**Yes**	**N, H**	**cl**	**b**	**1 d**
Montana	**Yes**	**77**	**0**	**157**	**0**	**429**	**0**	**5**	**.3**	**Yes**	**20**	**Yes**	**33**	**Yes**	**H**	**cl**	**m**	**7 d**
Nebraska	**Yes**	**250**	**0**	**250**	**0**	**300**	**0**	**12**	**0**	**Yes**	**90**	**Yes**	**40**	**Yes**	**N, H**	**cl**	**b**	**1 d**
Nevada																		
New Hampshire	Yes	150	50	100	300	160	50	10	3	No	50	Yes	25	Yes	N, H	b	m	7 d
New Jersey	Yes	921	1,039	1,921	2,166	1,152	1,299	93	102	Yes	98	Yes	CR-68 NCR-30	Yes	N, H	b	b	CR-1 d NCR-30 d
New Mexico	**Yes**	**193**	**137**	**185**	**35**	**210**	**137**	**20**	**4**	**Yes**	**80**	**Yes**	**45**	**No**	**N, H**	**cl**	**m**	**10 d**
New York	**Yes**	**2,778**	**784**	**6,285**	**1,814**	**5,850**	**1,650**	**379**	**171**	**Yes**	**95**	**Yes**	**49**	**Yes**	**A**	**c, s**	**b**	**3H-14 d**
North Carolina																		
North Dakota	Yes	52	0	156	0	156	0	2	0	Yes	50	Yes	100	Yes	H	cl	m	1 d
Ohio																		
Oklahoma																		
Oregon	**Yes**	←519*→		←889→		←1,610→		←53→		**Yes**	**94**	**Yes**	**64**	**Yes**	**N, H**	**cl**	**b**	**1-2 d**
Pennsylvania	**Yes**	**1,323**	**54**	**3,000**	**54**	**1,600**	**54**	**113**	**48**	**Yes**	**unk**	**Yes**	**60**	**Yes**	**H**	**b**	**m**	**2-3 d**
Rhode Island																		
South Carolina	Yes	218	0	600	0	247	0	86	2	Yes	75	Yes	55	No	N, H	cl	b	2-6 w
South Dakota	Yes	100		335		400		12		Yes	unk	Yes	49	Yes	H	cl	m	2-5 d
Tennessee																		
Texas	**Yes**	**2,325**	**22**	**2,325**	**22**	**4,919**	**22**	**299**	**28**	**No**	**f-80 mis-50**	**Yes**	**50**	**Yes**	**N, H**	**cl**	**c**	**2-3 d**
Utah	**Yes**	**70**	**0**	**300**	**0**	**95**	**0**	**20**	**0**	**Yes**	**85**	**Yes**	**45**	**Yes**	**own**	**cl**	**c**	**30 d**
Vermont																		
Virginia	Yes	453	0	453	0	759	0	80	18	Yes	unk	Yes	55	Yes	N, H	cl	c	5 d
Washington																		
West Virginia																		
Wisconsin																		
Wyoming	**Yes**	**37**	**3**	**100**	**3**	**not avail**	**3**	**10**	**2**	**Yes**	**90**	**Yes**	**40**	**Yes**	**H**	**c**	**m**	**1 d**
		23,477	9,570	39,791	11,875	42,766	9,524	3,322	1,336									

Note: Crs = Criminals; Ncrs = Non-criminals; min = minimal; unk = unknown; F = Felony; mis = misdemeanor; N = NCIC; H = Henry; A = American; cl = class; S = State Identification Number; m = manual; c = computer; b = both; mo = months; d = days; w = weeks; n/a = not applicable.

*Combined.

Source: SRI International, 1979

Exhibit 2

SIB FILES

Persons in SIB Files (32 states)	Criminal	23,477,000*
	Noncriminal	9,570,000*
	Total	33,566,000
Fingerprints in SIB Files (32 states)	Criminal	39,791,000*
	Noncriminal	11,875,000*
	Total	52,555,000
Names in SIB Files (32 states)	Criminal	42,766,000*
	Noncriminal	9,524,000*
	Total	53,900,000
Fingerprints Received Annually (32 states)	Criminal	3,322,000*
	Noncriminal	1,336,300*
	Total	4,711,300

*Does not include Oregon.

states had between 500,000 and 1,000,000. Thirteen states had less than 500,000 fingerprints on file. The average number of fingerprints per state was approximately 1,652,343.

For the 31 states (excluding Oregon), approximately 77% of the fingerprints were criminal. In 11 states, 100% were criminal fingerprints. Two states (Hawaii and New Jersey) reported more noncriminal than criminal fingerprints, with Hawaii having the highest percentage (approximately 83% of the Hawaii SIB fingerprints are noncriminal).

SIB File Size: Names

The SIB files of the 32 states contain a total of approximately 53,900,000 names. Excluding the names from Oregon, approximately 42,766,000 (82%) of the names are associated with criminal records, 9,524,000 (18%) are noncriminal.

Total name file sizes ranged from approximately 9,000,000 in California and Michigan to approximately 95,000 in Utah. Fourteen states had names in excess of 1,000,000 on file. Six states had between 500,000 and 1,000,000 names. Eleven states reported less than 500,000 names (Wyoming not included in this count).

Fingerprints Received Annually

The 32 agencies reported receiving approximately 4,711,300 fingerprints annually. Excluding Oregon, 3,322,000 (71%) of the fingerprints received are for criminal charges. The remaining 1,336,300 fingerprints (29%) are noncriminal. Reported annual fingerprint receipts ranged from approximately 1,421,000 in California to approximately 2,000 in North Dakota. Five states reported total annual receipts in excess of 250,000 fingerprints. Seven states reported receiving between 100,000 and 250,000 fingerprints per year. Seven states reported receiving between 25,000 and 100,000 fingerprints annually. Thirteen states received less than 25,000 fingerprints per year.

Fingerprint Submission Law and Compliance

Of the 32 responding states, 30 reported that they had a statewide fingerprint submission law. Of the 30 states that reported a fingerprint submission law, 4 reported that the degree of compliance with the law was unknown. One state distinguished felony and misdemeanor reporting. For states that reported an estimated compliance range, a midpoint was used.

For 27 reporting states, the average estimated compliance was 74%. The extremes ranged from an estimated high of 100% (Florida) to an estimated low of 20% (Montana). Of the 27 states, 20 estimated compliance in excess of 50%, and 10 estimated 90% or better.

"Hit" Rate

Of 32 states reporting "hit" rates (e.g., the successful matching via name matching of submissions to existing files), 1 state distinguished between felonies and misdemeanors. Of the remaining 31 states, the hit rate ranged from a reported high of 100% (North Dakota) to a low of 20-25% (Kentucky). Overall, the average was 52%.

Of the 31 states, 2 states reported hit rates of 29% or less; 3 states reported 30-39%; 7 reported 40-49%; 8 reported 50-59%; 7 reported 60-69%; 3 reported 70-79%; and 1 state reported 100%.

Full Technical Search

Of the 32 reporting states, 28 (88%) reported performing a full technical search.

Fingerprint Classification System

Of 32 reporting states, 12 states (38%) reported classifying fingerprints by the Henry system; 2 states (6%) classified by the NCIC classification; 16 states (50%) classified by both NCIC and Henry; 1 state classified by the American system; and 1 state by its own system.

Fingerprint Filing

Twenty-two of the 32 states (69%) filed fingerprints by State Identification Number (SID). Four states (13%) used both fingerprint classification and SID.

Name File

Nine of the 32 states (28%) reported using a manual name file. Ten of the states (31%) reported using a computerized name file. Thirteen of the states (41%) reported using both manual and computerized name files.

Response Time

This category reflected significant diversity of response. The data in this column of Table 4 reflect an attempt to characterize responses in common terms. Although the diversity of the questionnaire results makes it inappropriate to attempt to obtain averages, these results indicate that 18 states reported that they had responded in 1 to 7 days. The fastest reported response was 3 hours, and one state reported that it had made no response.

Identifying SIB Problems

Table 5 provides a summary of the responses concerning common SIB problems and potential LEAA activities. The survey instrument is presented in Appendix B.

In identifying common SIB problems, the responses rated the need to improve the quality of fingerprint submissions as the most serious common problem. Out of 32 states, 27 (84%) reported this was either a "serious problem" (14 states) or a "problem" (13 states). The remaining 5 states classified it as a "minor problem." No state reported this was not a problem.

The second most common problem reported was a need for additional clerical staff. Of 32 states, 19 (59%) reported this to be either a "serious problem" (12 states) or "a problem" (7 states). This was described as a "minor problem" by 6 states and "not a problem" by 7 states.

The third-ranked problem, "a disposition collection system," was described by 19 of 31 states (61%) as either a "serious problem" (11 states) or "a problem" (8 states). Of the remaining potential problems:

- A need for more fingerprint technicians was either "a serious problem" (5 states) or "a problem" (12 states) for 17 of 32 states (53%).
- A need to reduce delay in complying with the submission law was cited by 15 of 32 states (47%) as either "a serious problem" (6 states) or "a problem" (9 states).
- A need to expedite in-house processing of fingerprints was cited by 14 of 31 states (45%) as "a serious problem" (6 states) or "a problem" (8 states); 17 states (55%) reported this as either "a minor problem" (12 states) or "not a problem" (5 states).
- The need to reduce a fingerprint backlog was either "a serious problem" or "a problem" to 17 of 31 states (55%); however, 14 states (45%) describe this as either "a minor problem" or "not a problem."
- A need for computer support was "a minor problem" or "not a problem" for 22 of 32 states (69%).

Potential LEAA Activities

In reviewing potential LEAA activities, providing assistance for in-states fingerprint training was rated as "very useful" by 18 of 32 states (56%); an additional 4 states (13%) rated it as "might use." Ten states (31%) assigned this a "doubtful use" rating.

The second most popular activity was for LEAA to provide scanner research and development. Of 32 states, 17 (53%) rated this "very useful." Interestingly, this activity also received the second highest number of "doubtful use" ratings (13 states).

Table 5

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY FOR SIBs: PROBLEMS AND LEAA ACTIVITIES

	Ratings* of Common SIB Problems								Ratings† of Potential LEAA Activities						
	Need More F/P Technicians	Need More Clerical Staff	Need to Speed Up In-House Process	Need to Improve Quality of F/P Submissions	Need to Reduce Backlog	Need System to Collect dispositions	Need Computer Support	Need to Reduce Submission Delay	Provide Name Search Packages	Provide Scanner R&D	Provide Facsimile Transmission Information	Provide Assistance for In-State F/P Training	Need Disposition Collection System	Design Improved F/P Processing Procedures	Provide Technical Assistance
Alabama	1	3	1	2	1	3	3	4	3	3	3	1	3	3	2
Alaska															
Arizona	3	1	3	2	1	2	4	1	3	3	3	1	2	3	1
Arkansas															
California	2	4	1	1	2	2	2	4	3	1	3	1	3	1	3
Colorado	4	1	4	2	1	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1
Connecticut	3	1	1	2	1	3	2	3	2	1	2	3	3	2	1
Delaware															
Florida	4	3	3	3	4	2	3	3	3	1	2	3	3	3	3
Georgia	2	2	1	2	1	2	3	3	1	1	2	1	3	2	3
Hawaii	1	2	1	1	2		1	1	1	1	1	2		1-2	2
Idaho															
Illinois	2	1	3	3	3	1	2	1	3	3	3	3	1	1	1
Indiana															
Iowa															
Kansas	2	2	3	1	2	1	2	3	1	3	3	3	2	1	1
Kentucky	2	1	3	1	2	1	3	3	2	1	2	1	1	2	2
Louisiana	3	4	3	1	4	3	2	2	1	3	3	1	1	2	1
Maine	3	1	2	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	2	3	3	2	2
Maryland															
Massachusetts	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	3	1	2	1	1	2
Michigan	2	1	2	2	2	2	4	2	1	1	2	3	3	1	2
Minnesota	4	1	3	1	3	4	4	1	1	3	1	1			
Mississippi															
Missouri	3	3	4	2	4	1	4	2	3	1	2	1	1	2	2
Montana	2	1	2	1	3	1	3	2		2	2	1	2	2	1
Nebraska	2	2	4	1	4	3	3	3	3	1	2	1	2	2	3
Nevada															
New Hampshire	3	4	2	1	4	4	1	4	1	3	3	1	3	1	3
New Jersey	1	1		2		4	4	2	2	1	2	1		3	1
New Mexico	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2
New York	2	1	2	1	2	2	3	3	2	1	2	1	2	2	2
North Carolina															
North Dakota	3	3	3	2	4	1	4	2	2	1	1	3	1	2	2
Ohio															
Oklahoma															
Oregon	4	3	3	1	4	4	4	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	2
Pennsylvania	2	2	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Rhode Island															
South Carolina	4	4	3	2	2	2	4	3	3	2	1	2	1	2	2
South Dakota	3	3	4	2	4	1	4	3	3	3	3	1	1	2	2
Tennessee															
Texas	2	2	3	2	2	1	4	2	3	1	1	1	1	2	2
Utah	2	4	2	2	2	4	4	3	3	1	3	1	1		1
Vermont															
Virginia	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	1	3	3	3	3	3
Washington															
West Virginia															
Wisconsin															
Wyoming	4	4	2	1	4	1	2	2	1	3	1	1	1	3	3
Average	2.50	2.25	2.52	1.72	2.55	2.26	2.94	2.50	2.16	1.88	2.09	1.75	2.00	2.02	1.97

*1 = serious problem; 2 = a problem; 3 = minor problem; 4 = not a problem.

†1 = very useful; 2 = might use; 3 = doubtful use.

Source: SRI International, 1979

Of 31 states, 23 (74%) rated LEAA providing technical assistance as either "very useful" (9 states) or "might use" (14 states).

Of 28 states, 11 (39%) rated need disposition collection system as "very useful." Six states (21%) rated this as "might use."

Potential LEAA activity to design improved fingerprint processing procedures was rated as "very useful" by 8 of 30 states (27%) and as "might use" by an additional 14 states (47%).

Future LEAA efforts to provide facsimile transmission information was rated by 23 of 32 states (72%) as of "doubtful use" (12 states) or as (might use" (11 states).

The lowest rated potential activity was to provide name search packages. Of 31 states, 14 (42%) rated this as of "doubtful use" and 8 states (26%) rated it as "might use."

SIB Summary

Caught up in the technological glamour of the computer in computerized criminal history, identification has seemed at times like the forgotten stepchild of the process. However, the cluster conferences, the on-site visits, and the survey responses all served to reemphasize the critical role of this function.

As noted in the survey responses, the 32 responding states have files on over 33 million people. Over 50 million fingerprint cards are stored in these 32 states; 13 states have over 1 million fingerprints on file. These 32 responding states have to deal with over 50 million names. Finally, these 32 states report receiving nearly 5 million fingerprints annually; these receipts represent less than 100% compliance with fingerprint submission laws.

In terms of processing fingerprints, the responding states indicated that matching on identification data (other than fingerprints) is successful on over 50% of the fingerprints received. The vast majority of the states also perform a full technical search. (It should be noted that questions of cost/effectiveness arise with respect to the SIB performing a full technical search after a name search fails to find a match.) Over 70% of the responding states indicated the use of either a computerized name file or both manual and computerized files.

The quality of the fingerprint submissions was reported to be a significant problem by over four-fifths of the responding states. (This reinforces one of the findings made at the regional cluster conferences.) As might be expected in view of the volume of fingerprint data, the survey respondents also indicated a need for additional clerical staff.

In considering potential LEAA activities, the survey, cluster conferences, and on-site visits suggest that LEAA could perform valuable services in the areas of:

- Support for training activities that facilitate the identification process.
- Research of potentially useful technologies.
- Provision of appropriate technical assistance.
- Identification of functional procedures and specifications.

IV STATE COMPUTERIZED CRIMINAL HISTORY AGENCIES

A total of 29 CCH agencies responded to the survey. These 29 states represented approximately 63% of the estimated U.S. population in 1976. A summary of these responses is presented in Table 6. The CCH survey instrument is included in Appendix C. A summary analysis of the CCH agency responses to the survey is presented in Exhibit 3.

Current CCH Status

Twenty-nine responding states indicated current CCH status to be as follows:

	Number of States
Operational, including NCIC-CCH updates	9
Operational, including NCIC-CCH access	6
Operational, in-state only	4
In development	6
In planning	4
Not planned	2
NCIC-CCH only (no state CCH)	1
Total	30*

Expected Operational Dates

At the time of the survey, 9 states indicated anticipated future operational dates. These dates were as follows:

	Number of States
1979	2
1980	2
1981	4
1985	1

*One state reported its CCH was operational for NCIC-CCH access and in development with respect to in-state operations.

Table 6

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY FOR COMPUTERIZED CRIMINAL HISTORY AGENCIES

	Current CCH Status	Expected Operational Date	CCH Available On-Line?	Update NCIC-CCH?	CCH for Intra-state	CCH and SIB Same Agency?	Own CCH Computer?	Number of SIDs in CCH (thousands)	% of Total SIDs in SIB	Number of Arrests in CCH (thousands)	% of Arrests Having Dispositions
Alabama	4		Yes		p	No	Yes	700	100	115	20
Alaska											
Arizona	4		Yes		s	Yes	Yes	273	50.2	273	0
Arkansas											
California											
Colorado											
Connecticut	2	7/1/80	Yes	No	p	Yes	No				
Delaware											
Florida	5		Yes		p	Yes	Yes	1,050	100	2,897	52
Georgia	3		Yes	No	p	Yes	No	210	33.6		40
Hawaii	3	6/79	Yes	Yes	p	No	No	141	70	251	80-85
Idaho											
Illinois	4		Yes		p	Yes	Yes	629	45	962	22
Indiana											
Iowa	NCIC only	6/30/81	Yes	Yes	p	Yes	No				
Kansas	2		Y--Partly	Yes	p	Yes	Yes	100	20	0	0
Kentucky	2, 4		Yes	No	p	Yes	No	180	90		65
Louisiana	2	1980	Yes	Yes	p	No	No				
Maine	1										
Maryland											
Massachusetts	2	12/79	Yes	No	p	No	Yes				
Michigan	5		Yes		p	Yes	Yes	354	15	1,130	55
Minnesota	5		Yes		p	Yes	No	100	100	40	90+
Mississippi											
Missouri	1	1981	Yes	No	p	Yes	Yes	500	100		60
Montana	6		Yes	Yes							
Nebraska	5		Yes		s	Yes	No	25	10		35
Nevada											
New Hampshire	1	1981	Yes	Yes	p	Yes	Yes				
New Jersey	3		Yes		p	Yes	Yes	375	38	600	80
New Mexico	1	1985	Yes	Yes	s	Yes	No				
New York	3		Yes		p	Yes	Yes	1,400	40	3,400	70
North Carolina											
North Dakota											
Ohio											
Oklahoma											
Oregon	4		Yes		p	Yes	No	183	45	552	72
Pennsylvania	6						Yes				
Rhode Island											
South Carolina	5		Yes		p	Yes	Yes	461	100	132	48
South Dakota											
Tennessee											
Texas	5		Yes		p	Yes	Yes	2,300	100	2,400	40
Utah	4		Yes	No	p	Yes	No	70	25	196	50
Vermont											
Virginia	5		Yes		s	Yes	Yes	65	14	121	78
Washington											
West Virginia											
Wisconsin											
Wyoming	2	1981	Yes		p	Yes	Yes				

Table 6 (Concluded)

	File Conversion Plan?	Data Collection System?	Courts Provide Dispositions?	Corrections Provide Data?	Dispositions via Computer?	Integrated OBTS/CCH Data Collection?	Integrated OBTS/CCH Data Storage?
Alabama	DO	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Alaska							
Arizona	DO	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Arkansas							
California							
Colorado							
Connecticut	DO	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Delaware							
Florida	Other	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Georgia	DO	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Hawaii	BX	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Idaho							
Illinois	DO	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Indiana							
Iowa	BX	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Kansas	DO	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Kentucky	BX	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Louisiana		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Maine							
Maryland							
Massachusetts	Other	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Michigan	DO	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Minnesota	DO	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mississippi							
Missouri	DO	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Montana	BX	Yes	Yes	Yes			
Nebraska	Other	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Nevada							
New Hampshire	DO	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
New Jersey	DO	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
New Mexico	DO	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
New York		Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
North Carolina							
North Dakota							
Ohio							
Oklahoma							
Oregon	Other	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Pennsylvania		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Rhode Island							
South Carolina	DO	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
South Dakota							
Tennessee							
Texas	DO	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Utah	DO	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Vermont							
Virginia	Other	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Washington							
West Virginia							
Wisconsin							
Wyoming	BX	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes

Note: p = primary; s = supplemental; DO = "Day One" approach; BX = Back X number of years.

Source: SRI International, 1979

Exhibit 3

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF CCH AGENCY RESPONSES

ISSUE	SURVEY FINDINGS
CCH Available On-line (Respondents - 29)	Yes - 27 93%
CCH as Primary or Secondary Criminal History Source (Respondents - 26)	Primary - 22 85%
Same Agency in Charge of CCH and SIB (Respondents - 26)	Yes - 22 85%
Number of SIDs in CCH (Respondents - 19)	9,116,000
Number of Arrests in CCH (Respondents - 14)	13,069,000
Formal Disposition Collection System (Respondents - 28)	Yes - 24 86%
Courts Provide CCH Dispositions (Respondents - 28)	Yes - 25 89%
Corrections Provide Dispositions (Respondents - 28)	Yes - 26 93%
OBTS Integrated With CCH Collections (Respondents - 25)	Yes - 22 88%

State CCH Relationship to NCIC-CCH

Of the 29 states, 7 reported that their state CCH systems were operational, including NCIC-CCH updates. Of 8 states that reported CCH as either "in planning" or "in development," 4 states indicated that their CCH systems would include updating NCIC-CCH, and 4 states said that their systems would not include this. In addition, 3 other states not yet updating NCIC-CCH said they planned to do so. Two other states reported that they did not plan to update NCIC-CCH.

Same Agency in Charge of CCH and SIB

Of 26 states, 22 (85%) reported that the same agency was in charge of both CCH and SIB. The same percentage of the responding states (85%) indicated that their CCH systems would serve as the primary source of intrastate criminal history information.

Number of SIDs in CCH

Nineteen states reported a total of approximately 9,116,000 people (e.g., SIDs) in their CCH systems. In size, these ranged from approximately 2,300,000 in the largest (Texas) to 25,000 in the smallest (Nebraska). Three states reported CCH files in excess of 1,000,000; 3 states had file sizes between 500,000 and 1,000,000; 10 states were between 100,000 and 500,000; 3 states' CCH files were less than 100,000.

CCH SIDs as Percentage of SIB

Of 19 states, 6 reported that their CCH files contained 100% of the SIDs in the SIB files. Three other states reported that their files contained more than 50% of the SIDs in the SIB files. The remaining 10 states contained less than 50%. The lowest reported states contained 10%.

Number of Arrests in CCH

Fourteen states reported a total of approximately 13,069,000 arrest records in their state CCH files. These files ranged from approximately 3,400,000 arrest records (New York) to approximately 40,000 arrest records (Minnesota).

Percentage of Arrests Having Dispositions

Eighteen states reported disposition percentages ranging from a low of 0% to a high of 90% plus. Of the 18 states, 4 reported disposition percentages in excess of 75%; 7 states reported between 50-75%; 4 states reported between 25-50%; and 3 states reported a disposition rate of less than 25%.

Common CCH Problems

Table 7 provides a summary of state CCH agency responses regarding common problems and potential LEAA activities. The survey instrument is presented in Appendix C.

In reporting on common CCH problems, 7 states described insufficient programming staff as a "serious problem," 7 states rated this "a problem," 10 states said it was a "minor problem," and only 4 states said it was "not a problem." Difficulty in achieving compatibility between national, state, and local systems was described by 16 of 28 states (57%) as either a "serious problem" (7 states) or "a problem" (9 states). Thirteen states said that the need to cost/justify to the legislature the CCH cost assumption was either a "serious problem" (8 states) or "a problem" (5 states). However, 10 states (35%) said this was "not a problem."

Although 11 of 28 states (39%) said resolving problems of interagency cooperation was a "serious problem" (3 states) or "a problem" (8 states), 17 states (61%) said this was a "minor problem" (10 states) or "not a problem" (7 states). Nine states said insufficient computer capacity was either a "serious problem" (4 states) or "a problem" (5 states). However, 19 states said this was either a "minor problem" (9 states) or "not a problem" (10 states). Of 28 states, 18 (64%) said lack of awareness of how other states are resolving similar systems problems was "not a problem." Of the 28 responding states, 25 (89%) said that inadequate manual files upon which to build an initial data base were either "not a problem" (21 states) or a "minor problem" (4 states).

Potential LEAA Activities to Assist State CCH Agencies

In assessing potential future LEAA activities to assist state CCH agencies, 13 of 28 states (47%) said seminars, workshops, etc., regarding CCH systems efforts would be "very useful." Ten states (36%) said they "might use" this. Twenty-two states rated efforts to resolve compatibility issues via standardization as either "very useful" (8 states) or "might use" (14 states). Potential LEAA activities to develop cost analysis models to assist in cost justification efforts were rated "very useful" by 9 states, "might use" by 10 states, and "doubtful use" by 9 states.

Ten states rated potential LEAA activities to provide a technical assistance team regarding CCH as of "doubtful use." The development of transferable software packages was rated as of "doubtful use" by 13 states and as "might use" by 9 states. Six states said this would be "very useful."

State CCH Agency Summary

Analysis suggests that much more has been happening in CCH than is reflected by the participation in NCIC-CCH. Although the NCIC-CCH system contains approximately 1.5 million individuals, 19 states responding to the survey instrument reported a total in excess of 9 million people in

Table 7

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY FOR CCH AGENCIES: COMMON PROBLEMS AND POTENTIAL LEAA ACTIVITIES

	Ratings* of Common CCH Problems							Ratings† of Potential LEAA Activities				
	Insufficient Computer Capacity	Programming Staff	Inadequate Manual Files	Cost/ Justify CCH	Lack of Awareness of Approaches in Other States	Inadequate Interagency Cooperation	Lack of National, State, and Local Compatibility	Develop Software Packages	Develop Cost Analysis Models	Resolve Compatibility Issues	Conduct CCH Seminars	Provide Technical Assistance
Alabama	3	3	3	1	2	2	3	2	1	2	2	3
Alaska												
Arizona	3	1	4	1	2	1	1	3	1	2	2	2
Arkansas												
California												
Colorado												
Connecticut	4	1	4	4	4	4	4	1	1	1	1	1
Delaware												
Florida	3	3	4	4	4	3	4	2	2	2	1	2
Georgia	1	1	1	4	4	2	2	2	3	1	2	2
Hawaii	4	3	4	2	4	3	3	3	1	3	2	2
Idaho												
Illinois	2	3	4	4	4	2	1	3	3	3	2	3
Indiana												
Iowa	3	2	4	1	3	3	3	1	2	2	1	1
Kansas	2	3	4	1	1	2	4	2	1	2	1	1
Kentucky	4	3	3	3	4	3	1	2	2	1	1	2
Louisiana	3	1	4	2	4	4	4	3	1	1	2	1
Maine												
Maryland												
Massachusetts	4	2	3	2	3	1	2	1	3	2	2	2
Michigan	3	2	4		3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2
Minnesota	4	2	4	4	4	4	2	3	2	2	3	3
Mississippi												
Missouri	2	2	4	1	4	2	2	3	1	1	3	2
Montana	1	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Nebraska	4	3	2	3	4	2	3	2	2	2	1	2
Nevada												
New Hampshire	1	1	4	2	2	3	1	1	2	2	1	3
New Jersey	2	4	4	4	4	4	2	3	3	3	3	3
New Mexico	2	1	1	1	3	2	2	1	1	2	1	1
New York	3	3	4	4	4	3	1	3	3	2	2	3
North Carolina												
North Dakota												
Ohio												
Oklahoma												
Oregon	3	4	4	3	4	3	1	2	3	1	1	2
Pennsylvania	4	4	4	1	4	4	2	3	3	3	3	3
Rhode Island												
South Carolina	1	3	3	2	4	3	4	3	2	2	1	3
South Dakota												
Tennessee												
Texas	4	3	4	4	4	4	2	3	3	2	1	2
Utah	4	2	4	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3
Vermont												
Virginia	3	4	4	4	4	2	2	3	2	1	1	2
Washington												
West Virginia												
Wisconsin												
Wyoming	4	2	4	3	4	4	4	2	2	3	2	3
Average	2.89	2.39	3.57	2.59	3.39	2.75	2.43	2.25	2.00	1.93	1.71	2.11

*1 = serious problem; 2 = a problem; 3 = minor problem; 4 = not a problem.

†1 = very useful; 2 = might use; 3 = doubtful use.

Source: SRI International, 1979

state-level CCH systems. Because this number reflects only 19 states and several other states are developing CCH systems, the implication is that states will have CCH systems regardless of how the national CCH issues are resolved.

The assessment also suggests that the state-level CCH systems now have or will have in the future certain characteristics. For example, over 90% of the states will make CCH data available on-line. Over 80% will use CCH as the primary state criminal history source. Similarly, in most states, formal disposition collection mechanisms are either in place or planned; most of these mechanisms anticipate collecting dispositions from the judicial and correctional agencies. States are also planning to integrate the collection and storage of CCH and OBTS data.

With respect to common CCH agency problems, the cluster conferences, on-site visits, and survey responses indicate the following problem areas:

- Lack of resolution of national issues.
- Disagreement as to the components of and guidelines for the CDS program.
- Difficulty in obtaining skilled computer personnel.

To assist the states, the following potential activities merit consideration:

- Interchange of knowledge through workshops, seminars, etc.
- Efforts to resolve compatibility issues.
- Reexamination of CDS program modules grouping.
- Research in specific CCH-related technologies.

V SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS OF PROBLEMS AND POTENTIAL LEAA ACTIVITIES

This chapter presents two summary tables (8 and 9) showing the results of the survey regarding common problems and potential LEAA activities.

Table 8

RANKING COMMON PROBLEMS

SPA	SIB	CCH
1. Need more data	1. Improve quality of F/P submissions	1. Insufficient programming staff
2. State/local coordination difficulty	2. Need more clerical staff	2. Lack of national, state, and local compatibility
3. Discretionary programs not supportive of state efforts	3. Need systems to collect dispositions	3. Need to justify CCH cost assumption
4. Information systems plans out of date	4. Need more fingerprint technicians	4. Problems of interagency cooperation
5. Need more technical expertise	5. Need to reduce delay in F/P submissions	5. Insufficient computer capacity
6. SPA not involved in state-funded systems	6. Need to expedite in-house processing	6. Lack of awareness of approaches in other states
	7. Need to reduce backlog	7. Inadequate manual files for initial data base

Table 9

RANKING POTENTIAL LEAA ACTIVITIES

SPA	SIB	CCH
1. Provide technical assistance	1. Assistance for in-state F/P training	1. Conduct CCH seminars
2. Develop technology packages	2. R&D in F/P scanners	2. Resolve compatibility problems
3. National technology resource	3. Provide technical assistance	3. Develop cost analysis
4. Provide OBTS/CCH funding seminars	4. Develop disposition collection system	4. Provide technical assistance
5. Prepare OBTS/CCH system development guidelines	5. Design improved F/P processing procedures	5. Develop transferable software packages
	6. Information source on facsimile transmission equipment	
	7. Name search packages	

Appendix A

STATE PLANNING AGENCY SURVEY INSTRUMENT

SRI International
Intrastate CCH Project

STATE PLANNING AGENCY

I. AGENCY

A. Agency Name _____

_____

B. Mailing Address _____

_____

_____

_____

C. Telephone Number ( ) _____

D. Name and Title of Agency Director _____

_____

_____

II. INFORMATION SYSTEM PLANNING

A. Does your state have a Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) master plan? Yes_____ No_____

1. If yes

a. When was the plan originally adopted? _____

b. When was the plan most recently updated? _____

c. Is the plan used for

LEAA Funding	Yes_____	No_____
State Funding	Yes_____	No_____
Local Funding	Yes_____	No_____
System Planning	Yes_____	No_____
Other	_____	

B. Does your state have an approved Comprehensive Data System (CDS) plan? Yes_____ No_____

1. If yes:
   a. When was the plan originally adopted? _____
   b. Has the plan been revised? When? _____
   c. Is the plan used for
      LEAA funding Yes_____ No_____
      For State funding Yes_____ No_____
      Local funding Yes_____ No_____
      System planning Yes_____ No_____
      Interagency coordination Yes_____ No_____
      Other _____
      _____
      _____

2. If no:
   a. Is there not a plan because
      (1) State does not want to participate? _____
      (2) Already have the CDS components? _____
      (3) Can't afford ongoing CDS costs? _____
      (4) Do not agree with all the elements of CDS? _____
      (5) Still under development? _____
      (6) Other _____
      _____
      _____
      _____

III. FUNDING

A. Has your State received CDS monies Yes_____ No_____

B. OBTS/CCH

1. Has your State received discretionary funding for OBTS and/or CCH? Yes_____ No_____

Grant Number	Award Year	Award Amount
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

2. Have block funds been used for OBTS and/or CCH development? Yes_____ No_____

Award Year	Award Amount
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

C. Has your State received SJIS monies? Yes_____ No_____

D. Has your State received OBSCIS monies? Yes_____ No_____

IV. SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT

A. CCH Status

1. Does your State have an operational
   a. CCH Yes_____ No_____
   b. OBTS Yes_____ No_____

2. If CCH is not now operational, is CCH
   a. Under development _____
   b. Running parallel _____
   c. Not planned _____

3. Is or will the CCH be integrated with the OBTS data collection? Yes_____ No_____

B. SPA Participation

1. Does the SPA have a information system specialist on staff Yes_____ No_____

2. SPA involvement in CCH Yes_____ No _____

   Funding only _____
   System design _____
   Multi-agency coordination _____
   Other _____
   _____
   _____
   _____

V. NEEDS and PRIORITIES

A. The following is a list of problems commonly confronting State planning agencies. Please review this list in terms of your own experience and conditions.

RATING

- Need more data upon which to plan and make funding decisions _____

RATING

- Need more technical expertise in order to (a) participate in information system planning, (b) coordinate system development, and (c) evaluate funding requests _____
- Information system plans are out of date _____
- Discretionary programs do not support in-state plans and activities _____
- SPA not involved in State-funded information system activities _____
- Difficult to coordinate between State and local level criminal justice information systems _____
- Other _____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

* RATING

1. Serious Problem
2. A Problem
3. Minor Problem
4. Not a Problem

B. The following is a list of activities which LEAA could possibly undertake to assist SPA's. Please indicate those activities which might benefit your State.

RATING

- Prepare CCH/OBTS system development guidelines to be used when reviewing grant applications _____

RATING

- Provide national resources which maintain expertise in the State of the Art of relevant technologies _____
- Conduct seminars/symposiums regarding the funding of the OBTS/CCH related activities _____
- The development of appropriate technology packages which would be available via the SPA _____
- Technical assistance teams available to the SPA _____
- Other_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

* RATINGS

1. Very Useful
2. Might Use
3. Doubtful Use

Appendix B

STATE IDENTIFICATION AGENCY SURVEY INSTRUMENT

SRI International
Intrastate CCH Project

STATE IDENTIFICATION BUREAU

I. AGENCY

A. Agency Name _____

_____

B. Mailing Address _____

_____

_____

_____

C. Telephone Number ( ) _____

D. Name and Title of Agency Director _____

_____

_____

E. Is the SIB authorized/ established by State law? Yes_____ No_____

_____

_____

_____

F. When was the SIB established? _____

_____

II. FILE SIZE

A. How many persons are in the SIB files?

1. Criminal _____
2. Non-Criminal _____

B. How many fingerprints are currently in SIB files?

1. Criminal _____
2. Non-Criminal _____

C. How many names in SIB files?

1. Criminal _____

2. Non-Criminal _____

D. How many fingerprints are received annually?

1. Criminal _____

2. Non-Criminal _____

III. FINGERPRINT SUBMISSION

A. Is there a State law requiring fingerprint submissions on arrests? Yes_____ No_____

1. If Yes

a. Does this cover all arrests? Yes_____ No_____

b. What percentage of compliance are you currently experiencing? _____%

2. In No, on what percentage of arrests are fingerprints received? _____%

B. How many fingerprints are received annually?

1. Criminal _____

2. Non-Criminal _____

IV. FINGERPRINT PROCESSING

A. Does your agency use a name search? Yes_____ No_____

B. If a name search is used, what percentage of fingerprints (total received) are matched via the name search (including other identifiers such as height, weight, etc.)? _____%

C. Is a full technical search performed? Yes_____ No_____

_____

_____

_____

D. How are fingerprints classified? NCIC_____ HENRY_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

E. How are fingerprints filed? By Classification _____

By SID _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

F. If a name search is used, is the name file

1. Computerized _____
2. Manual _____

G. How long from receipt of fingerprints until response to submitting agency? _____

V. NEEDS and PRIORITIES

A. The following is a list of problems commonly experienced by SIB's. Please review the list and assess your State's situation vis-a-vis the problem.

	RATING
• Need more fingerprint technicians	_____
• Need more clerical staff	_____
• Need to speed up in-house processing time	_____
• Need to improve the quality of fingerprint submissions	_____
• Need to reduce backlog	_____
• Need system to collect dispositions	_____
• Need computer support to find records	_____
• Need to reduce time between arrest and receipt of fingerprint card	_____

RATING

- Other _____ _____
  _____ _____
  _____ _____
  _____ _____

* RATINGS

1. Serious Problem
2. A Problem
3. Minor Problem
4. Not A Problem

B. The following is a list of activities which LEAA could possibly undertake to assist SIB's. Please indicate those activities which might benefit your State.

RATING

- Generalized name searching package or packages _____
- R & D in automated fingerprint scanners _____
- Technical information source on facsimile transmission equipment _____
- Materials and/or funds for in-state fingerprint training _____
- General disposition collection system and/or forms _____
- Design of improved fingerprint processing procedures _____
- Technical assistance teams available to the States _____
- Other _____ _____
  _____ _____
  _____ _____

* RATINGS

1. Very Useful
2. Might Use
3. Doubtful value

Appendix C

STATE COMPUTERIZED CRIMINAL HISTORY AGENCY SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

SRI International
Intrastate CCH Project

STATE CCH AGENCY

I. AGENCY

A. Agency Name _____

_____

B. Mailing Address _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

C. Telephone Number ( ) _____

D. Name and Title of Agency Director _____

_____

_____

E. Name and title of person in charge of CCH _____

_____

_____

II. CCH STATUS

A. Current status of CCH's

1. In planning _____
2. In development _____
3. Operational, in State only _____
4. Operational, including NCIC-CCH access _____
5. Operational, including NCIC-CCH updates _____
6. Not planned _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

B. If CCH is not operational yet, please indicate the expected operational date _____

C. Is or will CCH be available via on-line terminals? Yes_____ No_____

D. If CCH is not yet operational, will the operational system including updating NCIC-CCH? Yes_____ No_____

E. Does or will the CCH serve as primary source of intrastate criminal history records or a supplemental source (e.g. duplicates manual SIB files)? Primary_____ Supplemental_____

F. Is the same agency in charge of both CCH and SIB? Yes_____ No_____

G. Does the CCH agency have own computer? Yes_____ No_____

III. FILES

A. If CCH is operational

1. How many persons (SID's) are in CCH? _____

2. This number is what percentage of the persons (SID's) in the SIB files? _____%

3. How many arrests are in the CCH files? _____

4. What percentages of the CCH arrests have dispositions? _____%

B. File conversion plan

Day One approach _____

Back X years _____

Other _____

IV. CCH DATA COLLECTION

A. Has a formal post-arrest data collection system been established? Yes_____ No_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

B. Are/will the courts provide criminal dispositions to CCH? Yes_____ No_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

C. Are/will the state correctional agencies provide dispositions to CCH? Yes_____ No_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

D. Are/will any dispositions be received via computers (e.g., tapes, on-line, etc.)? Yes_____ No_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

V. OBTS

A. Is/will OBTS be integrated with CCH data collection? Yes_____ No_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

B. Is/will OBTS be integrated with CCH data storage? Yes_____ No_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

VI. NEEDS and PRIORITIES

A. The following is a list of problems commonly experienced by State CCH agencies. Please review the list in terms of your own experience and conditions.

RATING

- Insufficient computer capacity _____
- Insufficient programming staff _____
- Inadequate manual files upon which to build an initial data base _____
- Need to cost/justify CCH cost assumption to legislature _____
- Lack of awareness of how other states are resolving similar system problems _____

RATING

- Need to resolve problems of interagency cooperation _____
- Difficulty in achieving compatability between national state and local data elements, records procedures, etc. _____
- Other_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

* RATINGS

1. Serious problem
2. A Problem
3. Minor Problem
4. Not A Problem

B. The following is a list of activities which LEAA could possibly undertake to assist state CCH agencies. Please indicate those activities which might benefit your state.

RATING

- Develop transferrable software packages (either at the design or actual program level) _____
- Develop cost analysis models to assist in cost justification efforts _____
- Undertake efforts to resolve compatability issues via standardization _____

	RATING
• Conduct seminars, workshops, etc. regarding CCH system efforts	_____
• Provide technical assistance team regarding CCH	_____
• Other _____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

* RATINGS

1. Very Useful
2. Might Use
3. Doubtful Use

Appendix D

REPORT ON CCH CLUSTER CONFERENCES

SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF
CCH CLUSTER CONFERENCES

During the period from February 21 through March 14, SRI International conducted four regional CCH Cluster Conferences. The dates and locations of these four conferences were:

February 21-22, 1979	San Francisco
March 5-6, 1979	Atlanta
March 8-9, 1979	St. Louis
March 13-14, 1979	Philadelphia

These conferences were attended by 86 people representing 36 States and one private firm (under contract to an attending state). No LEAA funds were expended to reimburse conference attendees. In addition to the attendees above, LEAA, the FBI, and SRI attended each of the four conferences. A total of 11 people from these three organizations attended one or more conferences (four of the 11 attended all four conferences). An attendance roster is attached (Attachment B).

The purpose of the conferences is explained in the letter (Attachment A) from Mr. Harry Bratt. This letter was mailed to SPA directors, SAC directors, CCH agency directors, state idenfication agency directors, state correctional agency directors, and state courts administrators. In addition, telephone contacts were made with States from which no notice of intent to attend was received but which SRI knew had CCH activity or interest.

The conferences were intended to be as unstructured as possible, consistent with the need to cover a wide range of CCH-related topics. This approach was adopted to convey to the attendees LEAA and SRI's desire to receive the States' views on CCH issues, problems, and future direction. It was emphasized throughout the conferences that SRI and LEAA were focusing primarily upon 'intrastate' CCH.

THE CONFERENCES

Attachment C provides a summary of each of the four conferences. However, a brief recap of each of the conferences is useful:

The San Francisco conference (February 21-22) was attended by 14 people representing 9 States. Geographically, the states ranged from Colorado to Hawaii and Idaho to Arizona. In terms of CCH development, the states varied from no current CCH system (such as New Mexico) to highly developed systems (such as California's). With respect to LEAA'S CCH funding and support efforts, the conferees generally favored LEAA focusing upon research (e.g., packages, technology assessment, etc.), multi-state support (e.g., training programs, technical assistance) and information dissemination (e.g., newsletters, conferences). Philosophically, the attendees seemed to feel the intrastate CCH systems should not be constrained (via funding requirements) by any national CCH system (e.g., NCIC-CCH).

The Atlanta conference (March 5-6) was attended by 26 people representing 10 states and one private firm. The states ranged geographically from Michigan to Florida and Louisiana to Virginia. In terms of CCH development, the attendees were relatively homogeneous with the exceptions of Kentucky and Tennessee. Five of the attending states are currently classified as fully participating in NCIC-CCH. The attendees were generally supportive of LEAA's role in CCH. They felt additional LEAA emphasis in such areas as identification, development of transferable packages, technology research, and funding coordination would be beneficial. The attendees supported the CDS program and guidelines but said (a) requiring interstate CCH participation for funding was currently inappropriate, and (b) the CDS guidelines should not be treated by LEAA as mandatory requirements.

The St. Louis conference (March 8-9) was attended by 19 people representing 8 states. Geographically the states ranged from Texas to Iowa and Kansas to Ohio. With respect to CCH development, the states ranged from little or no current systems to fairly well developed systems. Four of the attending states are currently fully participating in NCIC-CCH. The attendees felt LEAA support would be helpful in such areas as identification, CCH cost justification, development of packages, and the definition of various CDS modules and their relationship. They expressed concern regarding system development controls imposed via LEAA funding.

The Philadelphia conference (March 13-14) was attended by 27 people representing 13 states. These states ranged from Maine to South Carolina and Washington (state) to Massachusetts. In terms of CCH development, they varied from highly sophisticated to no current system. One of the attending states was currently fully participating in NCIC-CCH with another state a previous participant. The attendees generally supported an LEAA emphasis on identification, development of packages, CCH program knowledge interchange, CCH cost justification analysis techniques, and awareness and utilization of technical assistance. They also suggested LEAA should re-examine CDS with respect to (a) LEAA treating the guidelines as mandatory, and (b) whether the various CDS modules should be grouped within the CDS program.

ANALYSIS

It should be noted at the outset that the following represents an analysis of the input received at the four conferences. It does not represent SRI's report for Task 3A as agreed to by LEAA and SRI. This distinction is important because the Task 3A report will represent the findings of the on-site visits and the 50 state survey as well as the four cluster conferences. Thus, the following should be regarded as preliminary to that report. Within that perspective it is intended to be insightful and useful for planning purposes.

After reviewing the four cluster conferences, seven general topic areas can be identified. These seven topics represent an attempt to categorize specific issues from the conferences in a manner which will facilitate the development of plans and action programs. The order in which the topics are discussed below should not be construed as reflecting any priority or ranking.

1. Overall CDS Program

During the four cluster conferences, the overall CDS program was repeatedly discussed by the attendees. These discussions generally focused on the following four areas:

A. The grouping of the various CDS components within the CDS program

B. The problem of lack of definition of the program modules

C. The elements, interpretation, and enforcement of the CDS guidelines

D. The use of LEAA funding controls to control state activities.

The questioning of the grouping of the CDS program components has been going on since the inception of the CDS program. During the course of this questioning, two points have become clear: one, many states disagree with the current grouping of the CDS components; two, those who disagree with the current grouping do not agree with each other regarding alternative groupings. Among the many proposals were CCH without OBTS or SAC, CCH/OBTS without SAC, CCH without OBTS, and so forth.

After listening to the attendees discuss this matter, it has become apparent that many states regard CDS as a program which has been forced upon the states--not forced in the sense that the states must develop CDS, but rather in the sense that they must adopt the total CDS program if they wish to receive discretionary funding for any one of the components. Under this structure some states have candidly admitted that they have prepared CDS plans saying they would implement all CDS modules when in fact they really only wanted to, and intended to, implement a single module (for example, only CCH).

There are at least two negative results of this condition. First, LEAA is perceived (rightly or wrongly) as dictating to the states rather than assisting the states. Second, as states fail to carry out all the activities which they said in their plan that they would do, this can result in a negative image in terms of overall program performance.

In light of the above, one of the more interesting conference proposals was that the CDS program should be treated as a goal or target which LEAA would encourage the states to strive for. Under this concept the states would not have to commit to everything in CDS. Rather LEAA would present to the states the benefits of CDS but the individual states would work on the particular components which they most needed and could afford.

The concept of presenting CDS as a target or goal raises another recurring issue at the cluster conferences. Many attendees said that LEAA should work to further define the CDS program modules. Under the current program structure, each state is given great latitude in defining the particular modules (note: there was no discussion or apparent controversy regarding UCR). This approach seems in keeping with the position of the states that LEAA should generally defer to the states in questions of system design, content, and usage. In requesting that LEAA further define the CDS modules, it would seem the states run the risk of seeing additional constraints imposed upon them. However, if such definition, perhaps by examples of outputs and uses, could be developed and presented as examples (but not requirements), the states could use these to gain in-state support and participation as well as assisting in system planning and design.

If such a definition effort is undertaken, it would be important that any resultant examples not be imposed upon the states as a requirement. One of the most persistent complaints of the attendees was that LEAA treated the CDS guidelines (M.6640.1A) as requirements with the burden for justifying any deviations resting upon the individual states. While it is clear

that if LEAA is to be responsible for the CDS program it must have a reasonable amount of control with which to affect its outcome, it is not clear that the current use of (or content of) the guidelines is the best way to accomplish this.

The current CDS guidelines postulate a number of hypothesis, standards, and criteria as being either absolutely or generally correct, sound, or proper. However, when these guidelines are placed in context of the real world of state and local criminal justice, the guidelines begin to become less obviously correct. In as much as LEAA and the CDS program represent but a small fraction of the cost of state and local criminal justice and associated supporting information systems and in as much as LEAA has recognized that state and local governments have the primary and ultimate responsibility for crimal justice, including its structure, performance and financing, it would seem that the burden should lie with LEAA to re-examine and, if necessary, refine the CDS guidelines in order to maximize the value of the program to the states.

If such a re-examination is undertaken, and if perhaps this resulted in some lessening of guidelines or requirements (the possible nature of these changes is not yet fully thought out), it may be that LEAA would risk having the CDS program fail in the sense that not all participants would achieve total success (ignoring the significant task of trying to define 'total success'). However, the following seems reasonable:

1. The current CDS program and guidelines are founded upon the premis that (a) the various CDS modules would benefit the states individually and the nation collectively, and (b) the program will be most effective if all the modules are implemented by the states. With this foundation, the current guidelines call for a commitment by a state to all the CDS modules in order to be eligible for any CDS mudule funds. The potential effect of this is to deny access to CDS funds to a state which may have a pressing and legitimate need for a single module but which does not want one or more of the other modules. Thus, as expressed by some conference attendees, the state's need for funding a single CDS module can have the effect of fiscally coercing a state to adopt the entire CDS program.

2. The use of CDS development monies, which represent only a fraction of the total development and operational costs of CCH/OBTS, results in the states being forced to agree to a series of LEAA-imposed system design requirements. While many, and perhaps all, of the requirements are basically sound, the use of fiscal control does not seem the most appropriate way for LEAA to convince the state of their soundness. This seems particularly annoying to the states as they begin to reach the point where they must begin to assume the on-going fiscal costs.

3. The current guidelines have not resulted to-date in a major program success for CDS. Along with the aforementioned issues of CDS elements and issues, it should be noted that, like the states, LEAA must operate in the real world. Thus, LEAA has in the past had to be quite flexible in the interpretation and enforcement of the guidelines. Therefore, while the current structure has not yet produced 'total success' (still undefined)and it seems unlikely this would result, it can forcefully be argued that strict and uniform guideline enforcement has probably not yet been fully tried.

4. The current posture seems to result, all too often, in an almost adversary relationship between LEAA and the states.

5. The states want to be able to look to LEAA for leadership, guiddance and experise as well as funding but naturally resent requirements, mandates, controls, and so forth.

6. The ultimate success of CDS as well as other LEAA programs will be determined not by the ability of LEAA to control the overall program, but by the individural states working in partnership with LEAA to move the program from concepts and guidelines to operational reality.

2. Identification

One consistent result of the four cluster conferences was the attendees belief that increased LEAA support for identification agencies and processes would be beneficial to the states. This recognizes that an identification process which is accurate and timely is vital to both CCH and OBTS as well as the criminal justice process. During the conferences four potential LEAA activities were indentified:

A. General functional requirements for state identification bureaus.

B. Support for training activities which support the identification process

C. Research of potentially useful technologies

D. Technical assistance.

The conference attendees expressed the general view that LEAA, as well as the states, had generally given insufficient attention to the importance and problems of identification. It was noted that the identification process is labor intensive and that this labor is

(a) sometimes difficult to obtain, (b) sometimes a processing bottleneck, and (c) increasingly expensive. With this in mind, the attandees were generally focusing upon LEAA activities which would (a) improve the quality of the labor, (b) identify potential technology alternatives to the labor, and (c) systematize the functions and administration of the idenfication process.

The attendees were advised that LEAA currently has an active grant to the International Association for Identification (IAI) which, among other tasks, called for conducting a functional requirements analysis of identification bureaus and for providing technical assistance. They were generally pleased to learn about this project but expressed some unhappiness that they were not previously aware of the project.

One of the proposed major identification efforts would be support for in-state identification training activities. This support might include such areas as:

- Funding the development of a curriculum for a state identification training program.
- Make available a resource of expertise to either conduct training or assist in establishing a training program.

In discussing support for training, the attendees all agreed that it was important that the Identification Division of the FBI be involved.

The attendees repeatedly said that LEAA should take an active role in exploring technologies which may assist the identification process. Among the potential technologies mentioned were fingerprint scanners, facsimile transmission, and cable television. Most of the attendees were aware that LEAA had previously funded identification technology tested in Arizona, but they were not as aware of the results of these prototype efforts. Likewise, many attendees were aware that some states, such as New York and Illinois, were using facsimile transmission equipment but they were not well informed about such matters as costs, performance, configuration alternatives, etc. While it is possible that some states might be financially able to undertake their own identification R & D efforts, there was general agreement that such efforts would have maximum impact if they were under the auspices of LEAA.

3. CCH Cost Justification Analysis

At several times during the conferences, attendees mentioned the problem with and need for analyzing the on-going costs and benefits of an intrastate CCH. Many attendees said that this was an increasingly significant issue with more states facing the need to assume the on-going costs of an operational CCH. At this point some state legislators are asking particularly relevant but difficult questions regarding

the justification for operational CCH funding. It was also noted that the states were becoming more astute regarding the less apparent but very real on-going costs associated with federal seed money programs such as CDS.

The attendees also said that this type of effort would be very difficult. They suggested that many legislatures would desire to quantify the benefits of CCH and that this could be a problem. They explained that improperly handled, this type of analysis could jeopardize a CCH development effort prior to the effort reaching an operational status which would generate support from in-state criminal justice agencies.

Recognizing the difficulty of the task and the state to state variations, the attendees suggested that each state should conduct it's own analysis. Useful LEAA support could take the form of (a) developing cost analysis and justification tools for use by the states, and (b) making expert technical assistance available to states undertaking such analysis.

4. CCH Knowledge Exchange

It was particularly interesting to hear the conference attendees remarking about how the cluster conferences were especially useful in learning what other states were doing in the area of CCH. In talking with the attendees, two points become apparent. First, most states do not really know what the other states are doing. Second, due to personnel turnover there is a continuing need to exchange knowledge regarding CCH.

In keeping with this desire to exchange knowledge, the attendees expressed a desire for LEAA to identify and/or develop mechanisms for such interchange. Possible techniques which were suggested included a newsletter, seminars, and conferences.

5. Transferable Packages

Transferable packages was a potential LEAA activity which also received attendees' support during all four conferences. However, this support was more solid in terms of the concept of transferable packages than in the specifics of what such packages might contain. This distinction reflects two points emphasized by the attendees. First, the attendees' noted that state to state differences would require that a package be modifiable to meet the particular needs of a state. Second, they felt that actual programming costs were minimal when compared to design costs. Therefore, they believed that the greatest utilization of

transferable packages would be at the system analysis and design level.

It should be noted that the above position might reasonably be characterized as the middle ground. The more extreme positions on this topic ranged from attendees who said transfer never works and they would not use it to attendees who said they need a system (e.g., name search) right now and would like to have a fully programmed package available as soon as possible.

In light of the above, several points should be made:

A. The value of packaging systems has been proven in the past. With the very real prospect of reduced LEAA funds, transferable, off-the-shelf system packages may be the best way to offer future support.

B. If more agencies are faced with funding restrictions (as with Proposition 13 in California), the acceptability of such packages may increase.

C. LEAA's experience with systems such as PROMIS has shown that, indeed, provision must be made to tailor a package to a particular jurisdiction's needs.

D. Properly undertaken, packages can be developed which are transferable at the conceptual design, detail design, or program code level. This permits the user to select the level of transfer.

E. Several states seem to be eager for LEAA to offer a name search software package.

6. Funding

The matter of LEAA funding came up at each of the cluster conferences. In addition to the naturally expected desire for additonal LEAA funds and their concerns regarding program guidelines, the attendees also raised the following:

A. There should be better coordination by LEAA of projects funded with discretionary monies. This would include CCH/OBTS, SJIS, OBSCIS, and PROMIS.

B. LEAA should reconsider the current time and money formula used in the CDS program. The attendees noted that early participants in a program such as CDS often 'paid the price of leadership'.

The question of coordinating LEAA's discretionary funding of systems development is somewhat complex. As currently operating, LEAA attempts to promote coordinated efforts through such techniques as:

- Developing national models which address compatability
- Requiring states to develop information system master plans
- Conditioning grant awards to require interaction.

However, it is obvious that the above can not ensure coordinated system development. The ultimate responsibility for system coordination must reside with the individual states. For LEAA to attempt to assume this role would appear to be both impractical and improper.

With regard to LEAA's formula for funding CCH/OBTS and CDS, the attendees mentioned several problems with the current approach. However, there was nothing even approaching a consensus as to what would constitute a better approach.

7. Technology Research

There was general agreement that it would be beneficial for LEAA to continue to serve as a focal point in technology research as related to criminal justice information systems generally and CCH specifically. It was suggested that the technology could be divided between technology which was specific to criminal justice (e.g., voiceprints) and that technology which was more general but had potential criminal justice application (e.g., OCR for data input). There was some expression that LEAA should, in the area of information systems, focus upon applied technology rather than basic research.

The activity discussed above reflects two basic perceptions by the attendees. First, there already exists a great deal of technology which criminal justice has, for a variety of reasons, not yet utilized. Second, the vast amount of available technology almost precludes an individual state from being able to maintain a sufficient level of awareness.

SUMMARY

After attending the four conferences, discussing the issues with the attendees, recording their views, and analyzing the overall conclusions of the conferences, some summary comments seem appropriate.

1. The level of interest in CCH remains very high. This was reflected by (a) the level of conference attendance, with no travel reimbursement from LEAA, and (b) the forthright and generally constructive nature of the attendees' comments and suggestions.
2. The attendees welcomed the opportunity to provide input to future LEAA planning.
3. The attendees, like LEAA, regard CCH first and foremost as an intrastate system intended to satisfy intrastate needs but recognize the utility of interstate information.
4. The states would like to see LEAA, with respect to CCH, in more of a cooperative partnership and special resource role and less as basically a funding source.

Attachment A

LETTER OF INVITATION

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20531

January 31, 1979

Dear Colleague:

During the past seven years, the Computerized Criminal History (CCH) program has received both LEAA and state support as a major criminal justice effort. Increasingly severe budgets at the state and federal levels and a desire to formulate plans for the continued improvement of the CCH Program highlight the need for LEAA and the states to meet and assess past efforts, identify existing issues, and chart the future direction and support of the state level CCH program.

To initiate this reassessment, LEAA, assisted by SRI International, will conduct four regional cluster conferences:

February 21 - 22, 1979	San Francisco, California
March 5 - 6, 1979	Atlanta, Georgia
March 8 - 9, 1979	St. Louis, Missouri
March 13 - 14, 1979	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Details concerning the locations of these conferences are contained in the enclosure.

The conferences are intended to promote the interchange of ideas so that LEAA and the states can arrive at a mutually satisfactory resolution of the issues confronting the state level CCH program. Although the conferences will be conducted in a relatively informal atmosphere, there are a number of areas that must be covered, including:

> Users and uses of CCH, identification as the foundation for CCH, CCH disposition reporting, distributed versus centralized CCH, intrastate CCH as the basis for the interstate CCH, the CCH - OBTS relationship, CCH costs and funding sources, planning the future of CCH, and any other suggested subject which is relevant to the success of the CCH program.

LEAA's need for input from all of the states currently involved in the program as well as from those states which have had experience in the successful implementation of CCH can not be too strongly emphasized. In addition to the input we will be receiving from LEAA's state planning agencies, we are soliciting a broad spectrum of personnel from each state. This will permit us to secure managerial and planning representation from the courts, corrections, law enforcement, identification, and the agencies responsible for CCH development and operations.

While our current funding does not permit LEAA reimbursement of your travel costs, we nevertheless strongly urge your attendance at one of the conferences. If you have any questions regarding these conferences, please feel free to call Mr. Ashton or Mr. Manson at (301) 492-9053, or Messrs. William Connor or Ted Lyman of SRI International at (415) 326-6200 ext. 3233 or 4179. Confirmation of your attendance should be made with SRI.

We look forward to your joining us in this important project. Your attendance will afford an opportunity for the exchange of views and to provide us with ideas for planning improvements to the CCH Program.

Sincerely,

Harry Bratt
Assistant Administrator
National Criminal Justice Information
and Statistics Service

TRAVEL INFORMATION

Each conference will start at 1:00 p.m. on the first day and conclude at noon on the second day. Please make your travel arrangements accordingly.

Meetings will be held at the Motel/Hotel.

Special rates have been arranged with the motels/hotels below. However, rooms must be reserved at least two weeks prior to the particular conference date. Please contact the following if you wish a room:

CONFERENCE-February 21-22, 1979

El Rancho Inn ($26)
1100 El Camino Real
Milbrae, California
(415) 588-2912

CONFERENCE-March 5-6, 1979

Admiral Benbow ($20)
1470 Spring Street
Atlanta, Georgia
(404) 872-5821

CONFERENCE-March 8-9, 1979

Howard Johnson ($17)
I-270 and Route 67
9075 Dunn Road
St. Louis, Missouri
(314) 895-3366

CONFERENCE-March 13-14, 1979

Howard Johnson ($17)
I-95 and Penn. 320/352
Chester, Pennsylvania
(215) 876-7211

Attachment B

ATTENDANCE ROSTER

CLUSTER CONFERENCE ATTENDEES

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

February 21-22, 1979

Arizona

Robert C. Edgren
CJIS Technical Coordinator
Arizona Department of Public Safety

Jack C. Stillwell
Research Analyst
Office of Pina County Attorney

California

Robert Dickover
Statistician
California Department of Corrections

F. W. Johnston
Program Manager
Bureau of Identification
California Department of Justice

James Rasmussen
Bureau Chief
California Bureau of Criminal Justice Statistics

Dorothy Tuma
Assistant Chief,
Management Information
California Department of Corrections

Max A. Wendel
Research Manager
Planning Division
California Office of Criminal Justice Planning

Colorado

Lucinda Gaston
Systems Analyst
Colorado Statistical Analysis Center

Hawaii

Fred Witte
Systems Analyst
Hawaii Criminal Justice
Statistical Analysis Center

Idaho

Richard Burns, Chief
Criminal Identification Bureau
Department of Law Enforcement

Nevada

Steve Burgess
Special Agent
Nevada Department of Law Enforcement Assistance

New Mexico

Captain D. C. Kingsburn
Chief, Technical Services Bureau
New Mexico Criminal Justice Department

Oklahoma

Jim Wilson
Statistics Administrator
Oklahoma Crime Commission

Wyoming

Steve Tarris
Systems Analysis
Wyoming Office of the Attorney General

LEAA

S. S. Ashton
Don Manson
Paul Sylvestre

FBI

Jim Hoffman

Institute for Intergovernmental Research

Emory Williams

SRI International

Bill Connor
Ted Lyman
Kaye Tomlin

CONTINUED

1 OF 2

CLUSTER CONFERENCE ATTENDEES

ATLANTA, GEORGIA

March 5-6, 1979

Alabama

Eugene Akers
Director of Systems Development
Alabama Criminal Justice
Information Center

Florida

Peggy Horvath
Deputy Director
Florida Crime Information Center

B. G. Monroe
Systems Specialist
Florida Bureau of Criminal Justice Assistance

Georgia

Walter R. Boles
Director
Georgia Crime Information Center

Ed Manseau
Deputy Director
Georgia Crime Information Center

George Nolan
Systems Analyst
Administrative Office of the Courts

Mike Shenbenger
Director - Statistical Analysis Center
State of Georgia

Ben Wychoff
Director - Information Systems Division
Georgia Department of Offender Rehabilitation

Kentucky

Bob Stallings
Kentucky State Police

Mike Young
Kentucky Bureau of Corrections

Louisiana

N. Patrick Lemoine
Louisiana Criminal Justice
Information System

Lieutenant Leon B. Millet
Louisiana State Police

Derald Smith
Louisiana Criminal Justice
Information Center

Charles M. Stanton
Systems Consultants, Inc. for
Louisiana Criminal Justice
Information System

Michigan

Edward Lenon
Michigan State Police

Allan Shaw
Michigan State Police
E. Lansing, Michigan

Ohio

Jeff Knowles
Ohio Statistical Analysis Center

South Carolina

Jerry Hunter
Director - Information Systems Division
South Carolina Department of Corrections

Andy Surles
System Analyst
South Carolina Court Administration

Dorothy Truesdale
Systems Analyst
South Carolina Department of Corrections

Tennessee

Captain Erwin Dinsmore
Police Department
Chattanooga, TN.

Tennessee

Major N. L. Huffman
Tennessee Department of Public Safety

H. Dean Tyler
Systems Analyst
Tennessee Department of Public Safety

Virginia

W. R. Wagner
Virgina State Police

Batelle Institute

Bob Bowman
Gary Yates

FBI

Jim Hoffman

Institute for Intergovernment Research

Bill Reed

LEAA

Don Manson
Paul Sylvestre

SRI International

William Connor
Kaye Tomlin

CLUSTER CONFERENCE ATTENDEES

ST. LOUIS MISSOURI

March 8-9, 1979

Arkansas

Charles McCarty
Director-Statistical Analysis Center
Arkansas Criminal Justice
Informaton Center

Charles Pruitt
Systems Analyst
Arkansas Criminal Justice
Information Center

Illinois

R. H. Bunker
Systems Specialist
Illinois Law Enforcement Council

J. David Colder
Illinois Law Enforcement Council

John Loverude
Illinois Department of Law Enforcement

Gary D. McAlvey
Chief-Identification Bureau
Illinois Department of Law Enforcement

Iowa

Carroll Bidler
Deputy Director
Iowa Department of Public Safety

James Felker
Corrections Specialist
Iowa Crime Commission

Warren Stump
Director-Identification Bureau
Iowa Department of Public Safety

Kansas

J. Carey Brown
Director of Identification
Kansas Bureau of Investigation

Michael E. Boyer
Director
Statistical Analysis Center
Topeka, Kansas

Kentucky

Larry Lewis
Administrative Office of the Courts
State of Kentucky

Glenn Sewell
Administrative Office of the Courts
State of Kentucky

Missouri

Bob Bradley
Director-Information Systems
Missouri State Highway Patrol

Brad Bryant
Systems Analyst
Division of Data Processing
State of Missouri

Lieutenant Marlin Luker
Chief of Identification
Missouri State Highway Patrol

Major Paul V. Volkmer
Missouri State Highway Patrol

Ohio

Herman L. Slonecker
Bureau of Criminal Identification
State of Ohio

Texas

Captain H. A. Albert
Director-Division of Identification
Texas Department of Public Safety

FBI

Jim Hoffman

IAI

Jim Paley

Institute for Intergovernmental Research

Emory Williams

LEAA

Don Manson
Paul Sylvestre

SRI International

William Connor
Kaye Tomlin

CLUSTER CONFERENCE ATTENDEES

PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

March 13-14, 1979

Connecticut

Bob Welsh
C.O., CJIS Services
Connecticut State Police

Delaware

Lieutenant Jay R. Brackin
State Bureau of Identification
Delaware State Police

Tom Burn
Systems Analyst
Statistical Analysis Center
State of Delaware

Francis S. Coyle III
Systems Analyst
Delaware Department of Corrections

Rodney W. Gibbons
Director of Information Systems
Delaware Department of Corrections

Captain Jerry R. Pepper
Director-State Bureau of Identification
Delaware State Police

Don Roderick
Director-Statistical Analysis Center
State of Delaware

Maine

Robert E. Wagner
Director-State Bureau of Identification
Maine State Police

Maryland

Earl L. Gillespie
CJIS Coordinator
Maryland Department of Public Safety

Joseph J. Kovalevski
Deputy Director-JIS
Administrative Office of the Court
State of Maryland

Maryland

Michael A. Lettre
Chief, Information Statistics
Maryland Governors Commission on Law Enforcement

Massachusetts

Frank Keefe
Director-Criminal History Systems Board
State of Massachusetts

New Hampshire

Bob Allison
Criminal Justice Planner
State of New Hampshire

Mark C. Thompson
New Hampshire State Police

New Jersey

Captain Bob Dalton
New Jersey State Police

Wally Miller
New Jersey State Police

Herbert E. Plump
New Jersey State Police

Edward P. White
New Jersey State Police

New York

Andrea Cooper
Director of Technicial Services
New York State Division of
Criminal Justice Services

Adam F. D'Alessandro
Director-Division of
Identification and Information
New York State Division of
Criminal Justice Services

John Penn
New York State Division of
Criminal Justice Services

North Carolina

Cheryl George
Systems Analyst
North Carolina Police
Information Network

Pennsylvania

Joe Riggione
Director-Governor's
Task Force on CJIS

Martin Walsh
Pennsylvania Commission
on Crime and Delinquency

South Carolina

Shelby Cote
CCH Supervisor
South Carolina Law
and Enforcement Division

Bill Hamm
Director-Statistical Analysis Center
State of South Carolina

Washington

Cameron Dightman
Law and Justice Planning Office
Office of the Governor
State of Washington

FBI

Jim Hoffman

Institute for Intergovernmental Research

Emory Williams

LEAA

Myron Cohon
Don Manson
Paul Sylvestre

SRI International

William Connor
Ted Lyman

Attachment C

CONFERENCE SUMMARIES

CCH CLUSTER CONFERENCE
San Francisco, California
February 21-22, 1979

MAJOR TOPICS

1. How do you "sell" CCH benefits to users and legislatures and thereby generate the level of funding, committment and enthusiasm necessary to ensure long-term system viability?

   - LEAA should provide as much on-site T.A. as possible. These visitations should include cost-benefit assessment, coordination sessions, and legislative analysis and funding justifications.

   - LEAA should provide packaged materials that indicate the value of CCH to users, and so forth.

2. What can be done about the "archaic" identification situation found in so many states?

   - LEAA could support new technologies on certain components of the problem, provide on-site system analysis of the problem, package capabilities to handle certain components of the problem, shift local I.D. funding to centralize state operations, and/or train fingerprint technicians.

   - FBI could change its policy such that only prints for first-time offenders would be required (assuming sufficient state capabilities are present).

   - States could recover some of the costs of identification by charging for many of the non-law enforcement services provided by its I.D. bureau, checks on applicants, etc.

3. How can LEAA focus its resources on users of CCH systems?

   - By developing and funding CCH data-use training programs.
   - By developing a state-level entrapeneur that could train users from throughout the state.

4. Where should LEAA put its resources? In the past funds have been directed toward state-level central repositories.

   - LEAA should fund "lowest common denominator" systems such

as local level subpeona generators, on-line booking systems, name search capabilities, etc.

- LEAA should study exemplary systems, modify them, and package them for eventual transfer to recipient jurisdictions.

- LEAA should provide technical assistance in project management for improvements in the identification function and to enhance the capabilities of users. (This should be targeted to the local level on the theory that, by and large, states are ready to move ahead but local jurisdictions are not yet capable to support).

5. Is the CDS requirement for NCIC-CCH data elements in LEAA-funded state systems a costly barrier to successful implementation of state systems?

- Yes! This requirement caused some states to over-design their systems. It also increases costs when "useless" data is input so as to comply with NCIC requirements.

- States also don't want to invest in CCH designs to meet NCIC requirements that are in a total state of flux.

- LEAA should relax the guidelines requiring NCIC-CCH data elements in LEAA-funded systems or take the guideline much more liberally.

6. Should LEAA support users directly? If so, how?

- LEAA should support users by providing training and packaged CCH materials in addition to technical assistance.

- LEAA might require that some state-level grant funds be set aside for "field service" or user training staff.

7. How can LEAA keep CCH states informed of developments in the area?

- LEAA should consider periodically sending a brief newsletter to each state.

- The results of the survey, especially, should be sent to all states.

8. How long should LEAA fund CCH projects?

- Rather than fund for arbitrary periods of time LEAA could tailor a funding program for each state. For example, first year funds for developing the necessary CCH infrastructure. Second year funds would be granted only after a state demonstrated top-level committment to CCH and a sound project management plan. Third year funding would be granted only after a year or more of successful CCH operation or other such signs that things were proceeding smoothly. The idea would be to evaluate past progress before granting the next level of funding.

9. Is there any need to re-name CCH or to split CCH from the CDS program in order to gain more state participation?

- There doesn't seem to be any inherent need to re-name CCH. It is what it is! Computerized Criminal Histories under any other name wouldn't necessarily make it any less controversial.

- There doesn't appear to be much to gain from breaking CCH apart from CDS. However, it may be desirable to collapse the CCH concept into the larger OBTS concept. Consolidation could minimize confusion and generate maximum support for the benefit of each.

CCH CLUSTER CONFERENCE SUMMARY
Atlanta, Georgia
March 5-6, 1979

MAJOR TOPICS

1. Upgrade Identification

The attendees expressed general agreement regarding the need to upgrade the state identification function. Among the several suggestions were:

- Assess the current status of the state-level identification function.
- LEAA support of identification training.
- Educate the criminal justice community regarding the role and importance of identification.
- LEAA-funded R & D in such areas as standardized techniques, software, equipment, and so forth.
- Technical assistance.

2. LEAA Funding

The attendees expressed two major thoughts regarding LEAA funding. First, there should be better coordination among the various LEAA-funded projects. Second, the current CDS (and CCH) funding process may be too structured. Among the thoughts expressed were (a) re-evaluate the time and money limits of CDS, (b) understand that the early CDS states must make the mistakes which will benefit the other states, and (c) speed up the grant review and approval process (the LEAA representatives present expressed an openess to any suggestions which would do this).

3. Develop Packages

The development by LEAA of transferable packages was generally favored by the attendees. They expressed the view that

such packages would be especially useful to local jurisdictions. The attendees expressed concern that LEAA recognize the difficulty of developing a single package for all jurisdictions. They felt that any jurisdiction seeking to implement such a package would also need the resources required to modify the package to meet the particular characteristics of the jurisdiction.

4. Technology Research

There was general agreement that LEAA has a valuable role in technology research. The general view was that NCJISS should focus upon current or applied technology as opposed to basic research. The attendees also noted the distinction between technology which is more purely criminal justice (e.g., voiceprints) and that technology which has general application but which could benefit criminal justice (e.g., optical scanners for data input). Among the more specific suggestions were:

- An assessment of research in current technology as applied to criminal justice
- A clearinghouse on technology
- Possibly a newsletter.

5. CDS Guidelines

Generally, the attendees supported the current guidelines. They felt that the guidelines were helpful in promulgating standards. Changes in the guidelines at this point might have a negative impact on work done to-date. However, comments were also expressed on the following:

- Requiring interstate CCH participation was inappropriate until the national CCH issue is resolved
- Guidelines should not be construed as mandatory requirements
- LEAA should be more specific as to goals of the CDS program.

CCH CLUSTER CONFERENCE SUMMARY
St. Louis, Missouri
March 8-9, 1979

MAJOR TOPICS

1. Identification Support

The attendees noted the need for continued, and perhaps increased, LEAA support for identification. The need for identification support was based upon the recognition of identification as the basis for both CCH and OBTS. The attendees did however express concern that any identification support should not be treated as a 'new program' but rather be recognized as integral to the current programs.

2. Reduced Federal Control

One of the recurrent themes of the conference was the attendees' belief that there should be less federal control associated with LEAA monies and programs. Several attendees expressed that LEAA should recognize that the states know best what the states need and should do. Among the examples given where the states believe LEAA's approach causes problems were:

- Combining CCH and OBTS
- Treating CCH as focusing upon computers.

It was suggested that LEAA should defer to state priorities in a particular area (for instance, upgrading the Criminal History System). As expressed by one attendee, LEAA should identify targets to pursue. It was suggested that LEAA's CCH role should be assisting state CCH efforts rather than setting forth definitions and requirements.

3. Relationship of CCH and OBTS

Several attendees expressed a desire to eliminate any requirement of CCH and OBTS integration. They agreed that if a state wanted to have OBTS, there should and would be a relationship to CCH. However, the state should determine the relationship.

During the course of the discussion it was noted that one of the problems faced by the participating states was the lack of a model or goal for CCH and particularly OBTS. Some attendees commented that such models exist for SJIS and OBSCIS. It was felt that LEAA needed to further explain CDS and its components. It was suggested that perhaps LEAA should talk in terms of capabilities (e.g., uses) rather than titles. This would provide goals which the states could move toward.

4. CDS As A Program

The question was posed as to whether the CDS modules should be connected together under the CDS program. Some attendees felt that it was in the states' interest to keep CDS as a total program. Others commented that problems arise when multiple development activities are tied together. One attendee commented that the CDS philosophy was good, but that the CDS guidelines should be more flexible. There was general agreement that it would be desirable for the CDS guidelines to permit the states to selectively undertake particular CDS modules. This approach would still recognize the desirablility of the overall CDS goals.

5. CCH Cost Justification Analysis

One of the major tasks for states developing a CCH is to identify and justify the costs of CCH. This is particularly important in explaining to the state legislatures the need to assume the on-going CCH costs. Thus, it was suggested that perhaps LEAA could assist in this area. Several attendees commented that, in view of the obvious difficulty of identifying the true CCH costs and uses, this was an activity best left to each state. It was suggested that LEAA might develop a cost justification analysis package for state use and/or provide a source of qualified expertise for temporary assistance.

6. Develop Transferable Packages

The attendees also discussed the potential utility of LEAA sponsoring the development of transferable packages. Some attendees expressed the view that there were plenty of packages currently available. They also believed that programming costs were low

relative to system design costs. Thus, they felt it would be more useful to focus upon concepts and designs rather than complete software packages. There was general agreement that conceptual-level packaging would be useful in multiple jurisdictions. Some persons present said they might be able to use selected software packages such as a name search system.

7. Better Coordination in System Funding

The attendees expressed a desire for better coordination with LEAA in funding information system projects. As related to CCH, this topic focused upon the need to coordinate CCH and discretionary programs as SJIS, OBSCIS, and PROMIS.

CCH CLUSTER CONFERENCE SUMMARY
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
March 13-14, 1979

MAJOR TOPICS

1. Increased Support for Identification Function

There was general agreement that increased support to the identification function would benefit the states. Among the potential LEAA-supported activities suggested were:

- R & D of new technologies (e.g. fingerprint scanners, facsimile transmission, television, etc.).
- Funding for training
  - Develop curriculum for state training programs.
  - National group of experts to either conduct training or assist in setting up training programs.
- Technical assistance - for both training and also such issues as facilities requirements studies.

2. Develop Transferable Packages

Selected LEAA-developed 'packages' would be useful to many states. In light of the development work already undertaken by many states, LEAA should first survey existing systems before developing new systems. Existing systems might be certified as meeting certain, appropriate criteria. Potential packages might include name searching routines, fingerprint classification searching, and data communications. Packages might be either at the conceptual or design level or at the actual software level.

3. Revise CDS Guidelines

The attendees generally favored re-examining the CDS guidelines. The attendees expressed concern with two major aspects of the guidelines. First, the guidelines are treated by LEAA as mandatory, minimum requirements which the state must meet or justify any exceptions. Second, the grouping of the several CDS components under one program and treating the guidelines as requirements has placed states in the position of agreeing to the whole CDS program when the state may have only wanted a single component.

Most attendees felt that LEAA should treat the CDS program as a desirable goal for which the states should strive. However, some attendees expressed the view that the CDS program and guidelines served as a necessary catalyst to obtain state participation.

4. CCH Knowledge Exchange

LEAA should actively promote the interchange of knowledge regarding CCH efforts. This interchange should reflect successes and failures, problems and solutions, techniques, systems, and so forth. Potential means of interchange might include seminars, bulletins, on-site visits, and technical assistance.

5. Cost-Justification of CCH

The attendees felt that while a CCH cost-justification would often be useful, it would be very difficult. Among the alternatives discussed were: one, a study similar to the LEAA-funded CDS Costs and Benefits study; two, tools for states to perform their own cost-justification study. It was suggested that technical assistance might be useful in this area.

6. Ensure Data Relationship of LEAA-Funded Projects

There was concern expressed that some LEAA-funded system efforts do not always correlate with LEAA-funded CCH systems. It was suggested that LEAA make greater efforts to ensure both data compatability and coordination. Examples of such programs include PROMIS, SJIS, and OBSCIS.

7. Awareness of Technical Assistance Availability

LEAA needs to promote the awareness of various T.A. programs. Many attendees were not aware of some current T.A. programs.

Attachment D

MATERIAL PROVIDED TO ATTENDEES
AT CCH CLUSTER CONFERENCES

COMPUTERIZED CRIMINAL HISTORY

- Users and uses of CCH
  - Is CCH really understood?
- Intrastate CCH
  - The primary focus is intrastate
  - Beneath the national controversy, progress continues
- CCH and OBTS
  - Is this a good combination?
  - Is terminology an obstacle?
- Identification as a foundation
  - Can SIB's do the job?
- CCH dispositions
  - Are we doing better?
  - How do we improve?
  - Selling disposition reporting to the courts
  - SJIS and OBSCIS - Good or bad for CCH?
  - Arrests vs. dispositions - Which to use?
  - Cooperation vs. coercion
- CCH costs and funding
  - Seed money vs. total costs
  - Costs vs. benefits
  - LEAA
    - Where to put the money
    - Money as power
    - New ways to help
- The future of CCH
  - Intrastate with or without interstate
  - Congress

AUTOMATED CCH STATES

POPULATION

In NCIC	Est. 1976 (000)	Percentage*	Rank
AZ	2,270	1.06	32
CA	21,520	10.06	1
FL	8,421	3.94	8
IL	11,229	5.25	5
MI	9,104	4.26	7
MN	3,965	1.85	19
NB	1,553	.73	35
NC	5,469	2.56	11
OH	10,690	5.00	6
SC	2,848	1.33	26
TX	12,487	5.84	3
VA	5,032	.95	13
		42.83%	
State Only			
AL	3,665	1.71	21
CO	2,583	1.21	28
IA	2,870	1.34	25
NJ	7,336	3.43	9
NY	18,084	8.45	2
OR	2,329	1.09	30
UT	1,228	.57	36
WA	3,612	1.69	22
		19.49%	
TOTAL		62.32%	

* Percentage of total U.S. population.

Source: SRI International, February 1979

STATE CCH DATA

Nine states represent over 50% of U.S. population.

	Population*	Percent of U.S. population
California	21,520,000	10.06
New York	18,084,000	8.45
Texas	12,487,000	5.84
Pennsylvania	11,862,000	5.54
Illinois	11,229,000	5.25
Ohio	10,690,000	5.00
Michigan	9,104,000	4.26
Florida	8,421,000	3.94
New Jersey	7,336,000	3.43
	110,733,000	51.77

Five states represent over 50% of the fingerprint cards submitted to the FBI in 1977.

	1977 Fingerprint Submissions	Percent of Total Submissions
California	485,911	20.76
New York	301,326	12.88
Florida	149,479	6.39
Illinois	133,675	5.71
Texas	123,243	5.27
	1,193,634	51.01

*Estimated as of 1976

Source: SRI International, February 1979

STATE DATA RELEVANT TO CCH

State	State Population Est. 1976 (000)	Pct.	Rank	FBI Fingerprint Submissions 1977	Pct.	Rank	in NCIC-CCH	Auto. State CCH
AL	3,665	1.71	21	27,096	1.16	22		X
AK	382	.18	50	7,462	.32	40		
AZ	2,270	1.06	32	30,375	1.30	20	X	
AR	2,109	.99	33	9,526	.41	36		
CA	21,520	10.06	1	485,911	20.76	1	X	
CO	2,583	1.21	28	24,020	1.03	24		X
CT	3,117	1.46	24	31,348	1.34	19		
DE	582	.27	47	9,844	.42	35		
DC	702			1,044	.05			
FL	8,421	3.94	8	149,479	6.39	3	X	
GA	4,970	2.32	14	86,009	3.68	7		
HI	887	.41	40	8,013	.34	38		
ID	831	.39	41	4,914	.21	43		
IL	11,229	5.25	5	133,675	5.71	4	X	
IN	5,302	2.48	12	19,828	.85	25		
IA	2,870	1.34	25	17,638	.75	28		X
KS	2,310	1.08	31	17,395	.74	29		
KY	3,428	1.60	23	15,725	.67	32		
LA	3,841	1.80	20	43,690	1.87	14		
ME	1,070	.50	38	3,238	.14	47		
MD	4,144	1.94	18	70,810	3.03	9		
MA	5,809	2.72	10	18,979	.81	26		
MI	9,104	4.26	7	58,166	2.49	11	X	
MN	3,965	1.85	19	10,265	.44	34	X	
MS	2,354	1.10	29	8,516	.36	37		
MO	4,778	2.23	15	37,524	1.61	15		
MT	753	.35	43	3,729	.16	45		
NB	1,553	.73	35	7,729	.33	39	X	
NV	610	.29	46	17,741	.76	27		
NH	822	.38	42	3,412	.15	46		
NJ	7,336	3.43	9	96,225	3.94	6		X
NM	1,168	.55	37	16,443	.70	30		
NY	18,084	8.45	2	301,326	12.88	2		X
NC	5,469	2.56	11	36,667	1.57	16	X	
ND	643	.30	45	1,297	.06	49		
OH	10,690	5.00	6	68,897	2.94	10	X	
OK	2,766	1.29	27	16,281	.70	31		
OR	2,329	1.09	30	27,428	1.17	21		X
PA	11,862	5.54	4	74,940	3.20	8		
RI	927	.43	39	5,167	.22	42		
SC	2,848	1.33	26	43,925	1.88	13	X	
SD	686	.32	44	5,610	.24	41		
TN	4,214	1.97	17	32,484	1.39	17		
TX	12,487	5.84	3	123,243	5.27	5	X	
UT	1,228	.57	36	11,991	.51	33		X
VT	476	.22	48	1,046	.05	50		
VA	5,032	.95	13	53,524	2.29	12	X	
WA	3,612	1.69	22	32,086	1.37	18		X
WV	1,821	.85	34	4,059	.17	44		
WI	4,609	2.15	16	25,719	1.10	23		
WY	390	.18	49	2,883	.12	48		
PR	3,210							
		100.00			100.00			

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Representative Viewpoints
of State Criminal Justice Officials
regarding
the Need for a
Nationwide Criminal Justice
Information Interchange Facility

March 6, 1978

Highlights

- All of the state officials agreed that the convenient and rapid acquisition of out-of-state data pertaining to wanted persons, wanted properties, and prior criminal offenses was essential to the proper discharge of their statewide responsibilities.
- All arrest fingerprints sent to state identification bureau.
- Only first offender fingerprints forwarded to FBI.
- State would establish fingerprints forwarded to FBI.
- Nationwide index would show if multiple states hold data on a person.
- Each state would decide whether to release data in response to an interstate request.

NCIC Advisory Policy Board

CCH Operating Committee

A Proposed Concept for a

Decentralized

Criminal History Record System

April 12, 1978

Highlights

- There must be a National Fingerprint File and an Interstate Identification Index.
- The National Fingerprint File would not contain any criminal history record information.
- State Bureaus of identification would be the sole contributors of fingerprints emanating from state, county and local agencies.
- Only non-idents at the state level would be submitted to the National Fingerprint File.
- The Interstate Identification Index would indicate the state containing the criminal history record information.
- Criminal history record information would only be stored at the state level.
- Each state would decide whether to release criminal history record information.

SEARCH Group, Inc.

A Framework for Constructing

an Improved National

Criminal History System

April 1978

Highlights

- There will be a national Criminal Identification Fingerprint File.
- The national Criminal Identification Fingerprint File will receive fingerprint cards from state identification bureaus only.
- State identification bureaus will submit to the national Criminal Identification File only those fingerprint cards relating to subjects not previously identified at the state level or not previously submitted to the national level.
- There will be a national Criminal Identification Name File associated with, and created and maintained as a by-product of, the national Criminal Identification Fingerprint File.
- The national Criminal Identification Name File will contain only identification data limited to names, physical descriptors, and identification numbers including all applicable state identification numbers.
- Substantive criminal history records will be created, modified, kept current, and disseminated only at the state level, not at the national level.

NATIONAL CRIMINAL HISTORY

POSITION ANALYSIS

	U.S. Dept. of Justice March 6, 1978	NCIC Advisory Policy Board April 12, 1978	SEARCH Group, Inc. April 1978
Interstate CCH worthwhile?	YES	YES	YES
Should be a National Fingerprint File	YES	YES	YES
Should be a National Name Index	YES	YES	YES
National File should contain only ID data	YES	YES	YES
Substantive data should be held at state level	YES	YES	YES

END