**Minutes from the Justice Reinvestment Policy Oversight Board meeting held remotely on January 11, 2021.**

**Time of meeting: 11:00am – 12:30pm**

EOTSS Secretary Curtis Wood opened the meeting at 11:05am.

Introductions and roll call of board members and guests; review of Agenda.

**AGENDA:**

1. Roll call.
2. Review and approve meeting minutes from November 9th.
3. EOPSS updates pursuant to the FY 2020 Annual Report Recommendations of the Board:
   1. Regulations
   2. Cross-tracking system
      1. Integrated project plan with timelines, metrics, and budget
   3. Strategic planning to leverage funding highlighted in the FY21 Capital Investment Plan
   4. Public accessibility of data
4. Discussion regarding planning and strategy for upcoming meetings.
5. Matters not reasonably anticipated by Chair.

**Roll Call (Attorney Shannon Sullivan):**

Secretary Curt Wood, EOTSS

Chief Justice Paula Carey

Alicia Rebello-Pradas, AG’s office

Sue Terrey, EOPSS

Senator Brownsberger – joined after roll call

Representative Carole Fiola – joined after roll call

Kashif Siddiqi, Sheriff Koutoujian’s Office

Rahsaan Hall, ACLU

Rhianna Kohl, Governor’s Appointee

Gina Papagiorgakis, Governor’s Appointee

Brook Hopkins, Governor’s Appointee

Commissioner Carol Mici

Michael Coelho, Probation

**Review and approve meeting minutes from November 9, 2020:**

Motion to approve: moved by Commissioner Carol Mici, seconded by Chief Justice Carey

Secretary Wood: Approved

Chief Justice Carey: Approved

Alicia: approved

Sue Terrey: approved

Mike Coelho: approved

Senator Brownsberger: approved

Representative Fiola: approved

Rahsaan Hall: approved

Brook Hopkins: approved

Rhianna Kohl: approved

Gina Papagiorgakis: approved

**EOPSS updates pursuant to the FY 2020 Annual Report Recommendations of the Board: (Collins):**

Collins presented a slide deck: “Cross-Tracking System Update JRPOB”

Bulk of work has been on regulations themselves. First slide discusses purpose of cross-tracking: to report out the populations of the DOCs and HOCs and to capture all of that info. Taking all this info and anonymizing and making available to public via a visualization tool. Also for other stakeholders, policy and planning. Biggest hurdle facing: regulations themselves, and coming up with standardized regs for good data in/out. Touched upon this last meeting – how we can gather this data to create a system that the public has data they can rely upon. How do we incorporate into regs the ability for agencies to have good data? Part of that is use of SID, which can be elusive at times. Requiring/asking CJ agencies to, at point of entry, to obtain SID. Usually occurs at the booking process. With Trial Court, met to establish an MOU to enter into data sharing agreement. Just an intro meeting so far; will set up a standing meeting. MOU required because, in order to get info from Trial Court, need to enter into this agreement with them. DOC: inmate management system: will get data from Inmate Management System from DOC. Working through definitions to be more user-friendly. Sheriffs: in process of upgrading Sheriffs RMS. SOW should be signed soon; funding now in place. This SOW will also incorporate the regs, so will capture data points cross-tracking system requires. Also working with Parole Board. MSP: AFIS, One III, CCH. Trial Court can electronically connect to MSP One III to get SID. Will try to leverage this information highway. Seeking funding for visualization tool. Goal is central data repository: get data from all agencies into one central repository.

QUESTION (Carey): are DA’s included?

Collins: not now. Hope the info we get from Trial Courts are what DA’s office would already had. Not closed off to incorporating DA’s office, but difficulty is that criminal justice agencies definition does include DA’s Office. Wanted to focus first.

Carey: the Harvard Study talked about charging decisions, so how do we get to the bottom of race issues w/o having DA’s a part of this?

Collins: we did discuss this, and are struggling with our regs here as well. Need to report out on these populations while reporting out to the general public as well. Taking a phased approach: gathering info on those 2 populations and how we can move forward. Welcome the Board’s feedback on how we incorporate DA’s into cross-tracking system.

Carey: seems we want to agree upon data points, and if bring them in at the end, they don’t have the opportunity to provide info on data points.

Secretary Wood: over years, when built out electronic applications for complaint, from workflow-perspective, has been police, courts, then recipient and custodial agencies on back-end. Has always been a challenge to integrate DA’s. Now is a good time for a conversation with DA’s. Data elements are critical. Challenge with fingerprint support is that, how track charges that start one way then are reduced/adjusted through the DA’s office/final court disposition. Half is fingerprint-supported, and half is not. Having integration into system from DA’s workflow. Support working together, to help guide from funding and technology-perspective.

Tara: Brook was right – we are challenged by the DAMIEN system. Funding a few years ago for a business-needs study which is now stale. Trying to refresh this. Good time to talk about what this group wants and integrating into their workflow. But DAMIEN not equipped to be edited.

Rahsaan Hall: have been adamant about making sure DA’s are included in this process, as have significant impact on who is coming into system. No empirical data to prove or disprove race plays a part in charging decisions.

Tara: DA’s are open to providing info and to include that in any new CMS; just want to be clear that they are struggling, as have other reports due to the Legislature soon. A lot of manpower in collecting what info DAMIEN system should produce.

Carey: makes sense; we need to help. They should be part of determining what data points we are all collecting. Don’t want to establish and have DA’s come in later and want to change. Agree limitations with system, but we should support upgrade of that system/new system. Several DA’s have approached me, and some of them are asking Trial Courts for info – we have a small department of research and planning and limited resources.

Secretary Wood: we have availability of funding in Capital in order to do this; need to be strategic. Will take this as an action item, and look at how we can regroup with DA’s office.

Collins: cross-tracking system could capture the info on “green page”, as well as sentencing memos. We are looking to capture that info, but seek this Board’s guidance on how to integrate even more.

Collins continues:

Cross-Tracking system will have records that are not biometrically based, so will not have SID attached to it (ex. someone with a common name). Capturing data as-is right now, and hoping to improve later on. Hoping to have more SIDs captured at point of custody. Also have data that is non anonymized, not available to public. EOPSS and EOTSS are project sponsors and have provided guidance. Stakeholders listed – agencies that will want to access the data. Relying on current infrastructure, but need a visualization tool. Have met with two companies for a demo on taking disparate data, anonymizing and collaborating. Will need funding for this tool (“procure vendor services”). Have to establish the infrastructure, get all agencies to sign data-sharing agreements, and develop a public-facing view.

Next steps: to promulgate regulations, finalize policies and procedures, finalize MOU with Trial Court, and implement CTS plan outlined previously. Have asked EOTSS for assistance with regulation promulgation; hurdles need to overcome.

QUESTION (Carey): MOU should be close to done – let me know if any delays. Anything we can do to help with a project plan? That’s key so we have deliverables and a timeline.

Collins: would be helpful if Board would have suggestions they could send to me on what see that’s not there, including how DA’s can be involved and how we can get that info. We took our data points directly from the statute, which is somewhat silent on info we can get from DA’s office. Our group can speak to Trial Court on how can capture that info.

Carey: Trial Court does not collect DA data, so we can’t replace the DA’s data.

Collins: if someone from board can provide me the DA data want to collect that would not get from Trial Court – this is what we are struggling with.

QUESTION (Rahsaan): have my own laundry list; know from my experience as ADA. Will share list and open to a conversation with your team and members of DAA as well. On centralized data repository, is there a process being contemplated to reconcile the data (Assault and Battery Dangerous Weapon, ABDW, Assault and Battery DW)? Also, around biometric data, confused on something.

Collins: slides will be available to the public. Working on how to accord data – this is where SID is critical and trying to incorporate. No answer yet, but aware of this and discussing.

Secretary Wood: fundamentally, that’s what the Legislation speaks to – SID. Have to move towards a single source of truth. Availability of Mass Courts, and recognizing Clerk of Court is the truth holder on dispositions. Court working with EOPSS, MSP and CJIS to reconcile this. We have a bifurcated system: fingerprinted and not fingerprinted. Rely on CORI/BOP as criminal history in Mass – not fingerprinted-supported. Can’t issue SID unless fingerprint-support. To reconcile records, only way is to base on that unique identifier – establish identity/number, and associate aliases to that. Have to make sure the actual charges are recorded – when arrested/arraigned, DA’s office involved in charging: when that individual ends up with a final disposition, should be generated from Mass Courts and should be made available from there.

Collins: trying to use this system for this point as well. Know someone can show up to trial court because summons. If first point of obtaining SID is at HOC, system would work to send number back to Trial Court to become part of that record.

QUESTION (Brownsberger): linking our records to federal records for purposes of sealing and expungement: understand that there are technical barriers to what we legislated. Felt opportunity for progress despite that.

Collins: One III is trying to assist state in processing sealings and expungements in a timely fashion as required. Difficulty is that Trial Court records are in a state that makes this difficult to do electronically, and many not fingerprint-supported/no SID. A lot of manual work to identify those records. Have this on parallel path so working with trial court can also get better data quality to have sealings and expungements piece move forward as well.

Brownsberger: pushing for parcel solutions available. Formed the impression that a percentage of cases could be addressed without the full solution.

Collins: correct. When One III went live, addressed some problems but not all.

Brownsberger: is that running now? Are we held up?

Collins: One III is live and running; have a briefing this afternoon and will be able to update you further later today.

Secretary Wood: happy to set up meeting with your folks. May be an appetite here for a smaller working group, to discuss overall expectations and overall workflow. A lot there we should be more aligned on, despite disparate systems. This is about interoperability and being able to share data.

Tara: will take the action item to talk to DA’s and regroup.

Shannon Sullivan: will circulate presentation after the meeting.

Secretary Wood: EOPSS team has been making progress on cross-tracking system; infrastructure and service-related changes occurring that are/will be funded to improve the position of the criminal justice information system and reporting capabilities. Collins will provide us a Capital proposal – would consider this under contingency funding. Public Accessibility of Data: Statute states that I am responsible for making the data available, though EOPSs and EOTSS working to make this possible and make the data available sooner rather than later, and that it is a consistent set of data, and accurate.

**Discussion regarding planning and strategy for upcoming meetings:**

Next Meeting: April 12, 2021

Hopkins: seems like this is going well. Discussed at last meeting getting more concrete what people will want to use this data for. What is the best time to have a deliberate conversation about that?

Secretary Wood: any type of analytics/business intelligence, we need to understand what the business questions are that we need to ask – not just operational. Think this Board has a responsibility to consider that. Suggest that folks should let us know what they want to track. Should meet sooner rather than later, and funnel those conversations through me as Board Chair.

Rhianna Kohl: happy to meet, and to reach out to pertinent individuals. Has increased our internal request for info, but bulk of requests go to agencies. Also happy to receive questions.

Secretary Wood: appreciate that; suggest put a small group together, with Kerry Collins, Rahsaan Hall, Lee Cavanaugh from Trial Courts, Michael Coelho from probation, Brook Hopkins, Rhianna Kohl, Kris Johnson (EOTSS), Gina Papagiorgakis. Kris Johnson will facilitate the group to get together soon (on Secretary Wood’s behalf). Urge the group to reach out to the general public as well. Group should bring update back to our March meeting.

Dirck Stryker: we have a data group, and have been waiting to be engrossed. Will get together and work with Brook, Rahsaan as members of the Board, on what we think is important to add and cover.

**Matters not reasonably anticipated by Chair:**

None.

Meeting adjourned: 12:26