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Executive Summary

Lewis and Clark County is located in the western part of Montana and has a land mass of 3,498 square miles and a population of 67,773 people according to the U.S. Census. Population growth is at approximately 1% per year. There is one main city located in Lewis and Clark County which is the county seat, Helena, which has 46.4% of the population. One main town is also within Lewis and Clark County, East Helena, which has a population of 2,067 people which is 3% of the population of the county.

In 2017, Lewis and Clark County had 284 incidents of major violent crime and 1,918 incidents of major property crime. Major violent crime has stayed stagnant while property crime has increased by 7% in the last four years. In 2017, the crime rate for Lewis and Clark was 4.19 crimes per 1,000 people for violent crime and 28.30 crimes per 1,000 people for property crime. The crime rate is slightly higher than the U.S. average for both property and violent crime which was 3.86 and 24.5, respectively, in 2016.

Introduction

Lewis and Clark County commissioned the Justice Management Institute to conduct a comprehensive review and assessment of the criminal justice data collection systems. Project objectives include the following:

- **Assess the existing information technology environment.** The assessment is provided in all three chapters of the report. Chapter 1, Existing Data Systems summarizes the existing applications in agency or court. Chapter 2, Criminal Justice Data Integration, identifies the ways in which information and data are shared across the system; and Chapter 3, City and County Technology Platform, provides a technical framework for the study.

- **Identify high-level data sets by functional group for each stakeholder and or process.** This is the central focus of Chapter 2, Criminal Justice Data Integration.

- **Recommend a data system or systems.** This is the focus of Chapter 3, City and County Technology Platform. Recommendations are based on types or classes of systems integration platforms. The county may already have the tools to provide a systems integration platform.

- **Recommend a long-range plan for data collection and analysis.** Chapter 3, City and County Technology Platform also provides an implementation plan and timeline with specific steps to develop both a shared criminal justice information system and a data warehouse for reporting and managing information.
Existing Data Systems
Data systems are organized into four basic categories, with variations for different agencies’ unique or targeted functions:

- Core Mission
- Public Access Technologies
- Scheduling and Calendaring
- Enterprise and Shared Services

The study identifies 18 separate core mission applications, which also may include standalone scheduling and calendaring systems. Public access technologies are defined as any public-facing website or tool designed for the community and other users. As an example, the jail provides access to an online tool to find a family member or friend who may be housed at the jail. Enterprise and shared services include state or city and county-wide applications such as payroll, human resources, and procurement; and shared services such as file and print services, email, Internet access, and telephones.¹ The focus of this report is core mission applications. The analysis is structured around criminal justice system workflow processes. While case processing is linear, many processes are parallel or include feedback loops. Diagram ES1 below illustrates at a high level the process-driven, analytical structure of the criminal justice stakeholders.

**Diagram ES1 – High Level Criminal Justice System Processes**

![Diagram of criminal justice system processes]

Data Integration Principles
Key principles and objectives when assessing data systems and opportunities for data integration are the following:

**Principle 1  Data Ownership**
The owner of a data system (application) and the electronic data that the system generates are responsible for defining the rules for data sharing and for data integrity.

¹ The list is not exhaustive. Many shared services are also subsets or shared between groups of agencies.
Principle 2 Data Sharing Rules
  i. Who can use the data that my agency/court generates;
  ii. What data they can use; and
  iii. How they can use that data.

Principle 3 Data Integrity
Electronic data integrity is best realized when the owner of the data is the author of the data and enters data into a system as close to the event as possible, where close is defined as timely.

These principles were utilized to document 32 integration touchpoints (ITPs), or sets of data or information that are shared between criminal justice system agencies or courts. The basic structure of the ITPs is always defined by the source agency(ies) or court(s). Many ITPs are common data sets between multiple agencies and courts. As an example, electronic citations may be filed by multiple law enforcement agencies with multiple courts. The same datasets apply to each of these transactions.

ITPs are not electronic data interchanges (EDIs); many are hardcopy or proxy technologies such as email. For both ITPs and EDIs, though, the integration is typically bi-directional. In the non-electronic world, this is simply an acknowledgement that a document or other type of information has been received. In the electronic world, these are referred to as handshakes, or confirmations that the transmission is successful, where successful is defined by logical rules for the type of transmission.

County Technology Platform
The Lewis and Clark County and Helena City technology platform is unified under the Information Technology and Services (IT&S) Department (ITSD) and Steering Committee. The ITSD was unified under a 1999 memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the county and the city and a 2004 amendment to the agreement, including the formation of a steering committee. The steering committee is co-chaired by the County Administrative Officer and City Manager and consists of the following communities of interest, with the focus of this report on criminal justice and public safety:

1. Citizens Services
2. Criminal Justice/Public Safety
3. Public Infrastructure
4. Financial Planning
5. Health and Welfare
6. Land Management
7. Internal Support

While the ITSD network is unified across the city and county, the most common form of information sharing is simply to provide users with access to multiple systems, even within the same agency. An example of this is the access to multiple sources of information in police squad cars. An officer can communicate via radio communications with dispatch to get information about probationers and warrant histories, see local records of a suspect, enter notes into a field reporting system, and enter a citation that is filed with the courts. None of these operations or functions are electronically linked for the purposes of sharing data. The ITSD wide area network (WAN) diagram is not illustrated in the report for confidentiality purposes. Chapters 1 and 3 include diagrams of existing data systems.
The following summary of recommendations correlates to each chapter of the report.

**Summary of Recommendations**

Study recommendations are organized into four global recommendations, which also correlate with implementation steps. The implementation steps may and should overlap, but the steps within each category are typically linear or iterative. This means that implementation is designed to be iterative and agile in order to build solutions in an expanding and learning environment, and especially to reduce risk.

1.0 **Build capacity with existing systems and opportunities (Years 1-2)**

The criminal justice system in Lewis and Clark County includes 18 separate core mission applications across distributed agencies and courts. As an example, the city and county have three courts and two prosecutor agencies. Not all of the existing applications are being leveraged to their capacity. In addition, the city and county have a vital role to advocate for implementation of new state applications (e.g. FullCourt Enterprise and OMIS) that will make systems integration and data sharing significantly easier to achieve. This is because the newer systems are typically built on web-based platforms, are typically compliant with standard data sets, and have enhanced operability with web services and other networking tools, such as email and text messaging. Advocacy begins with organizational cohesion, across the city and county stakeholders.

1.1 Form a Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) steering committee
1.2 Develop master agreements between agencies and courts to define data ownership, sharing, and confidentiality rules, and standards for terminology and data
1.3 Advocate for FullCourt Enterprise as soon as possible
1.4 Leverage the full capacity of FullCourt
1.5 Broaden use of JustWare to leverage full functionality
1.6 Expand WatchGuard functionality and capacity
1.7 Advocate and support OMIS implementation
1.8 Automate numerous Excel tools
1.9 Encourage all service providers to use the CONNECT Referral System

2.0 **Electronically share data for simple integration touchpoints (Years 1-2)**

These are integrations that are easy-to-achieve and will help reduce duplicate data entry and reduce errors and cost. Key integration touchpoints (ITP) that can be automated are characterized by targeted information between two agencies/courts that will likely not be included in the e-filing implementation by the OCA. In addition, these opportunities may include the use of email and document exchanges that include smart forms that are easily imported without having to build an application program interface (API). Easy-to-achieve integrations include the following:

- ITP 2.4 Booking - Smart form booking sheet
- ITP 2.5 Affidavit (Complaint) - Smart form booking sheet
- ITP 2.7 Evidence - Evidence repository
- ITP 4.1 Case data/documentary evidence - Evidence repository
- ITP 5.1 PSA and recommendations – Existing AutoMon EDI
- ITP 5.2 Supervision reports – Existing AutoMon EDI
ITP 5.1 and 5.2 are closely related to efforts identified in global recommendation 1.0. The state owns both the AutoMon and FullCourt systems. Pretrial Services in Lewis and Clark County can lead this effort by building and demonstrating the use of smart forms that would easily adapt into both FullCourt and the AutoMon application.

3.0 **Develop a shared criminal justice information system (CJIS) platform (Years 3-5)**

Every integration touchpoint is an opportunity to build an electronic data interchange (EDI). Historically, many networked organizations have built complex, point-to-point exchanges of targeted data sets. Managing these interfaces is both complex and cumbersome. This global recommendation is designed to provide a CJIS platform that can grow component data sets that can be shared across multiple justice system stakeholders. The lead data set, identified as the pilot, is Persons or person identifiers. The unique characteristics of this data set are its utility to almost any function in city and county government, as a repository for many different types of applications.² Recommended steps include the following:

3.1 Develop detailed functional and technical specifications.
3.2 Secure a developer with specific expertise using the specified systems integration platform. Mobilize a stakeholder team with a city/county lead to work with the developer throughout the process.
3.3 Build a systems integration application and database,³ using a single data set, Person Identifiers (IDs), as an integration pilot.
3.4 Build incremental integrations over a multi-year period to include the following data sets, each with its own set of rules and restrictions about ownership, sharing, and use of information. Almost every integration touchpoint is an opportunity to map to one of the data sets.
   - Case data: defendant, charges, shared booking data
   - Bond and release data
   - Evidence
   - Shared calendars
   - Bench warrants and detainers
   - Disposition data
   - Probation and supervision data
3.5 Build attorney and defendant portals.

---

² A number of jurisdictions have built a Persons ID database that is used by all city/county applications. Gwinnett County, Georgia, built a separate persons ID database in the early 2000’s, managed and controlled by the county IT department. The database includes the ability to build aliases and other identifiers and to also associate specific incident, case, or transaction IDs with an individual.

³ Many systems integration platforms are available. The primary distinctions are between proprietary and independent or open source systems. Open source systems are the cheapest initially, but the life cycle costs are extremely high, largely because the city/county will need to develop ITSD technical expertise. Proprietary systems include BizTalk Server (Microsoft), Oracle GoldenGate, and IBM InfoSphere. Note that Microsoft SQL includes an integrator suite in the database platform. Independent or open source applications include Starfish ETL and Cleo.
4.0  Develop and build a data warehouse for reporting and managing information (Years 4-6)
A data warehouse is a database that has been configured to produce management reports. Management reports are often used to report on outcome measures that are pre-determined by the stakeholder agencies and courts, or they are used to provide working tools to decision-makers and practitioners about their cases and workload. The latter objective provides a powerful link between outcome measures and the decisions that judges, attorneys, and law enforcement make on cases for which they are responsible. A shared CJIS database in combination with a data warehouse will enable reports to be built specifically associated with the workload of each decision-maker or user of the system. Recommended steps include the following:

4.1  Establish outcome measures useful to each stakeholder.
4.2  Build requirements for production and management reports (dashboards) customized for each stakeholder and agreements about the type and use of public-facing dashboards.
4.3  Engage a developer to build a data warehouse and to map, design, and build reports using the shared CJIS database.
4.4  Build primary production and workload reports initially. Use reports to refine and inform existing applications and data entry.
4.5  Build outcome reports based on performance measures, both internal and public-facing.

Methodology
The JMI project team, Robin Wosje and Tim Dibble, initiated the project with a kickoff meeting with the Lewis and Clark County project managers (PMs) from the Department of Criminal Justice Services, Director Kellie McBride and Program Assistant Gloria Soja. With the assistance of the county PMs, the project team collected information and data about criminal justice system processes and supporting technology and applications. Information and data collection have been ongoing throughout the process.

Within two months of project initiation, the JMI project team conducted site visits and met with most of the agencies and courts and with stakeholder committees such as the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council. Significant feedback and follow up have helped to validate information and build the findings and recommendations.

The entire project has required approximately five months to complete. Please see Appendix 1 for a list of study participants.
Chapter 1 – Existing Data Systems

Existing data systems in Lewis and Clark County primarily utilize the county technology platform. Many of the systems or applications are hosted on county servers, although a number of core mission technologies are hosted by state agencies or by third parties typically in the Cloud or at state agencies outside the county. For a technical analysis of the county technology platform, see Chapter 3.

Each section below is a summary and description of the data systems for each agency or court in Lewis and Clark County. It is not an exhaustive list, in part, because many enterprise and shared service technologies are not included in each section, in order to maintain study focus. For many functions, though, data integration may be more efficient and effective through selective shared services. Examples of these include electronic document management (EDM) and user identification (ID). Where applicable, the study highlights or recommends these opportunities.

Chapter 1 sections are primarily organized by agency or court. Section 1.1 below, though, is a summary of public-facing technologies that are owned by the county or agencies/courts in the county. Where applicable, they may be duplicative.

1.0 Build capacity with existing systems and opportunities (Years 1-2)
The criminal justice system in Lewis and Clark County includes 18 separate core mission applications across distributed agencies and courts. As an example, the city and county have three courts and two prosecutor agencies. Not all of the existing applications are being leveraged to their capacity. In addition, the city and county have a vital role to advocate for implementation of new state applications (e.g. FullCourt Enterprise and OMIS) that will make systems integration and data sharing significantly easier to achieve. This is because the newer systems are typically built on web-based platforms, are typically compliant with standard data sets, and have enhanced operability with web services and other networking tools, such as email and text messaging. Advocacy begins with organizational cohesion, across the city and county stakeholders.

1.1 Form a Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) steering committee.
The city and county have already established a foundational Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (CJCC). If the CJCC decides to proceed with the implementation of systems integration leading to better reporting and management information, a steering committee will need to focus on the important steps and tasks of building a CJIS platform. These steps include:

- Refining and defining the mission, goals and objectives
- Identifying possible funding sources, such as local agencies, state and federal grants, and other revenue sources
- Setting up the communication and reporting protocols

1.2 Develop master agreements between agencies and courts
The goal of master agreements will be to define data ownership, sharing, and confidentiality rules, and standards for terminology and data.
1.1 Criminal Justice System Public Access Technologies

The vast majority of public access technologies are informational, often accessed through county, agency, or court websites. These are listed below and are identified as passive information. Any service that enables the user to seek information or to conduct business over the Internet or other technology is identified as active information.

**Reporting Crime**

911 Call Center (active)

*Smart911* is an online service the city and county uses to help its citizen and the law enforcement agencies be able to respond, quickly and efficiently, in case of an emergency. Residents sign up and provide emergency planning and preparedness information about their own family. Smart911 also provides alerts to residents.

Citizen complaint (passive): Helena Police Department has a webpage with information about filing a citizen complaint. The webpage includes a link to where you can complete an online citizen complaint form.

Violence Against Women (passive): Helena Police Department contains information about family violence, sexual assault, and crimes against children.

Helena Area Crime Stoppers (active): The Helena Area Crime Stoppers website includes a place where a crime tip can be submitted and tracked. There is also an app that citizens can download and reach the same functionality as the website.

**Jury Duty**

First District Court (active): The First District Court’s webpage contains some information about jury duty on its website within the Lewis and Clark County website including a link to complete the jury questionnaire online.

Helena Municipal Court (active): The Helena Municipal Court webpage also contains some information about jury duty on its website within the City of Helena website including a link to complete the jury questionnaire online.

**Criminal Justice Information**

a. Ticket Citations (passive): Both the Helena Municipal Court and the Lewis and Clark County Justice Court contain information about ticket citations on their websites. However, neither website provides for online payment of fines.

b. Roster of Inmates (passive): The Lewis and Clark County website provides the current roster of inmates who are housed at its Detention Center.

c. Sexual and Violent Offender Registry (active): The Montana Department of Justice maintains the Sexual or Violent Offender Registry which provides an up-to-date list of registered sexual and violent offenders. It includes statistics of how many offenders there are by County/City and search engines where one can look up by offender name or seek a list of offenders by neighborhood.
d. **Active Warrants** (passive): The City of Helena website includes a list of people with active arrest warrants as part of the Helena Municipal Court webpage. If someone is on the list, s/he is asked to contact the Municipal Court to make arrangements to appear in court.

e. **Police Report** (active): The City Attorney’s office’s webpage includes a link to complete and submit an online form to request a police report. Once completed, submitted, and verified, the police report can be transmitted back to the requestor via email, mailed to the requestor’s address, or picked up at the City Attorney’s office.

f. **Driver History Records** (active): Within the Montana Department of Justice website is also the Motor Vehicle Division which includes access to the Driver History Records Service. This service allows Montana citizens to search for specific driving records.

**Community Service Providers**

[Montana 211](#) is a website that helps connect people to resources. Resources include food and housing, medical assistance, employment support, among others. The website has a search function where a user can input for what s/he is looking and the location where s/he is looking and the website will generate a list of potential resources. Citizens in Lewis and Clark County can also call for assistance using the telephone number 2-1-1 which will connect them to the Central Region of Montana 211 which is managed by Voices of Hope.

**Criminal Justice System Data**

a. **Crime Data** (active): On the Montana Board of Crime Control website users are able to search the Montana Incident-Based Reporting System (MTIBRS) which holds crime data that law enforcement agencies report to the FBI. The Board also periodically creates reports as well. For example, the Board authored the report *Crime In Montana, 2016* which provides a statistical overview of crime data in Montana.

b. **Traffic Incidents and Traffic Fatality Statistics** (active): The Montana Highway Patrol webpage, located within the Montana Department of Justice website, posts traffic incident information and fatality statistics. It also posts public opinion survey results.

c. **Court Performance Measures and Statistics** (passive): The Montana Judicial Branch website contains performance measures and statistics for the courts. Much of what it reports is by court jurisdictional level rather than by specific courts, but it does provide some relevant information about the courts, as a whole. The current State of the Judiciary as well as the previous years are also accessible on the website.

d. **Public Defender Statistics** (passive): The Office of State Public Defender (OPD) website contains statistics about the cases that OPD handles and the clients it represents. OPD also posts its yearly report to the Montana governor. Also, available on the website is the Application for Court Appointed Counsel form which defendants can print and fill out to show indigency.4

---

4 The Application for Court Appointed Counsel can also be completed online, but that feature is only available for defendants who are seeking a public defender in Flathead, Sanders, Lake, and Lincoln counties.
e. **Detention Center Data** (passive): The Detention Center webpage within the Lewis and Clark County’s website contains some Detention Center data and analytics. However, it is over five years old.

### 1.2 Law Enforcement

Lewis and Clark County is supported by law enforcement from the Helena Police Department, the Lewis and Clark County Sheriff’s Office, the Montana Highway Patrol, and the East Helena Police Department. The Helena Police Department serves the city of Helena, the Lewis and Clark County Sheriff’s Office serves the county areas not in Helena or East Helena, the East Helena Police Department serves East Helena, and the Montana Highway Patrol serves the highways that are in Lewis and Clark County. In 2014, Helena Police Department had 1565 arrests, the Lewis and Clark County Sheriff’s Office had 499 arrests, and East Helena Police Department had 19 arrests.5

The Lewis and Clark County Sheriff’s Office, Helena Police Department, and East Helena Police Department (collectively “the Lewis and Clark law enforcement community”) all use the same records management system (RMS) which is from the vendor Logistic Systems, Inc. (“LogiSYS”). Patrol officers use the RMS to generate police reports and it can also be used for reporting. The Lewis and Clark law enforcement community uses one dispatch center which uses NorthStar as its computer-assisted dispatch (CAD) system. NorthStar CAD works with MobileTrak which is the squad car CAD system. These two products are both from LogiSYS and integrate with the RMS. Patrol officers make notes in MobileTrak including the location and time of the incident, who is involved in the incident, and other pertinent information about the incident. A desk reference number is generated and the information is transferred to the RMS.

For management of video evidence generated from law enforcement officers’ dash cams and body cams, the Lewis and Clark law enforcement community uses a software platform from WatchGuard. The County Attorney’s office and City Attorney’s office have access to WatchGuard and with the software can edit the videos, as needed. The videos are also shared with defense counsel via a secure temporary link where defense counsel can access and download the videos.

The Helena Police Department also uses an eTicket system for citations. Helena Police Department uses digiTICKET which is a product of Saltus Technologies, LLC. The digiTICKET software includes a web browser where the data is stored and can be pulled into reports. The e-tickets are automatically transmitted to the court. The eTicket software is not integrated with the RMS.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lewis and Clark County Sheriff’s Office (LCSO) and Helena Police Department (HPD) Technologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Technology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Mission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5 Data is from the Bureau of Justice Statistics Arrest Data Analysis Tool accessed on February 1, 2019.
**RMS** Records Management System (Vendor: Logistic Systems “Logisys”).
RMS generates the police report

**Body Cam/Dash Cam**: WatchGuard (Vendor: WatchGuard Technologies, Inc.)

**e-Tickets (HPD only)**: digiTICKET (Vendor: Saltus) Not connected to RMS. Automatically transmitted to the court.

**Probable Cause Affidavit (HPD only)**: Completed in Word within the next day after an arrest.

**Search Warrants (HPD only)**: Moving to SecureWarrant (Vendor: Law Enforcement Support Services, Inc.). Sends email to on-call judge and judge approves electronically.

---

**Public Access Technologies**

**Smart911** is an online service for citizens to provide valuable information about themselves to assist first responders in case of an emergency.

---

**Scheduling and Calendaring**

**Planit (LCSO)**: scheduling software

**Schedule Anywhere (HPD)**: an electronic schedule of the officers is shared with the Municipal Court. District Court and Justice Court do not use it when scheduling hearings/trials

---

**Enterprise and Shared Services**

**Office 365** is provided and supported by Lewis and Clark County.

---

**The Montana Highway Patrol**

The Montana Highway Patrol (MHP) collaborates with the Lewis and Clark law enforcement community, as needed, but primarily operates as a separate state entity under the Montana Department of Justice. MHP is comprised of eight districts. Lewis and Clark County is part of District 3 which also includes the counties of Granite, Powell, Deer Lodge, Silver Bow, Beaverhead, and Jefferson. In 2017, Patrol officers in MHP, District 3 issued 9,083 citations. The number of citations issued decreased by 10% from the previous two years.

MHP has a separate dispatch center and uses SmartCOP for its CAD system. Caliber Public Safety, a business unit of the Harris Operating Group of Constellation Software Inc., acquired SmartCOP in 2016. MHP uses SmartCOP as its records management system as well as for its electronic ticketing. The e-tickets are transferred via computer to the Justice Court every morning.

---

**Table 1.2**

**Montana Highway Patrol (MHP) Technologies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Technology</th>
<th>System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Core Mission | **Dispatch**: SmartCOP  
| | **RMS**: SmartCOP  
| | **E-filing – Citations**. Electronic tickets are transferred to the court every morning. The tickets from the previous day are routed electronically to the Justice Court.  |
Public Access Technologies | Fatality statistics and public opinion survey results are on the MHP webpage.
---|---
Scheduling and Calendaring | **WhenToWork**: scheduling software
Enterprise and Shared Services | MT Department of Justice, Justice Information Technology Services Division provides enterprise and shared services like email, Microsoft Office products, and file transfer service.

### 1.3 First Judicial District

The State of Montana has 22 judicial districts. Lewis and Clark County and Broadwater County make up the First Judicial District. Within the First Judicial District are the district court with four district court judges, the Lewis and Clark Justice Court with one judge and the Helena Municipal Court with one judge. Additionally, there are two city courts, one in East Helena and one in Townsend (Broadwater County).

In the district court there were 904 criminal case filings in 2017. The number of case filings for criminal cases has stayed consistent for the district court over the last four years. In Lewis and Clark Justice Court and Helena Municipal Court, there were a total of 5930 and 5720 filings, respectively. These numbers are a combined total of criminal filings and ordinance and traffic violations. In the last four years filings in Lewis and Clark Justice Court have dropped 6% and in Helena Municipal Court filings have dropped 20%.

| First Judicial District Criminal Case Filings |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Criminal Case Filings** | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | Change from 2014 to 2017 |
| Lewis & Clark District Court | 904 | 935 | 844 | 905 | 0% |
| Lewis & Clark Justice Court | 2055 | 2177 | 1943 | 2099 | 6% |
| Criminal | 212 | 37 | 38 | 84 | 6% |
| Ordinance | 3663 | 3575 | 4159 | 4133 | 6% |
| Traffic | 5930 | 5789 | 6140 | 6316 | 6% |
| Helena Municipal Court | 1537 | 1420 | 1551 | 1584 | 6% |
| Criminal | 464 | 593 | 689 | 979 | 6% |
| Ordinance | 464 | 593 | 689 | 979 | 6% |
| Traffic | 3719 | 3114 | 4035 | 4554 | 6% |
| Totals | 5720 | 5127 | 6275 | 7117 | 6% |

Beginning in the mid-1980s, Montana began to explore court unification as a way to facilitate administrative coordination of personnel management, case scheduling, and the gathering and correlation of statistical information. Included in that unification was the unification of the judicial case management system. The Montana Office of Court Administration (OCA), Information Technology (IT) Division is responsible for supporting the case management system of the district courts and the courts of limited jurisdiction. The First Judicial District Court, Lewis and Clark Justice Court, and the Helena Municipal Court are all supported by the Montana OCA, IT Division with the use of FullCourt. FullCourt is case management software developed by Justice Systems, Inc. (JSI), a wholly owned subsidiary of Ontario Systems. Each FullCourt component is separate from each other. In other words, District Court is
not able to view Justice Court or Municipal Court records and vice versa. This becomes particularly troublesome with felony cases where the initial hearing occurs in Justice Court as the District Court Judge is unable to view the bond conditions ordered by the Justice Court Judge or review the probable cause affidavit. However, even in other cases, it is helpful for all the judges to be able to access all parts of FullCourt to be aware of other active pending cases that a defendant may have.

FullCourt is JSI’s outdated case management software and has many limitations. However, the Montana Judicial Branch Commission on Technology began discussions about upgrading to FullCourt Enterprise. In 2015, these discussions elevated to a transition plan with Flathead County and Missoula County serving as the pilot locations for the transition from FullCourt to FullCourt Enterprise. Flathead County and Missoula County have both implemented FullCourt Enterprise with Missoula County beginning to use FullCourt Enterprise in the summer of 2018. FullCourt Enterprise includes a Judges Dashboard and a Clerk of Court Dashboard. These dashboards assist in running important analytics about case processing.

Montana OCA plans to expand FullCourt Enterprise to all the courts in Montana. In tandem with the case management system, the Montana Judicial Branch Commission on Technology also began a project to provide for e-filing in Montana courts. In 2012, Thomson Reuters Court Management Solutions (formerly LT Court Tech) was selected as the vendor for Montana’s e-filing system called C-Track E-Filing. District courts and courts of limited jurisdiction in the 4th, 10th, and 13th Judicial Districts are already piloting the e-filing system and Montana OCA, IT Division is expected to expand e-filing statewide. There is currently no e-filing in the First Judicial District Court and the COLJ also do not have e-filing except for traffic tickets.

Recommendation 1.3 – Advocate for FullCourt Enterprise as soon as possible
Request from Montana OCA to be the next county to transition from FullCourt to FullCourt Enterprise. This request should include the implementation of e-filing.

Recommendation 1.4 – Leverage the full capacity of FullCourt
Until implementation of FullCourt Enterprise, a number of reports will assist the courts with case evaluation and decision making.

- **Build in-custody felony cases report.** Collaborate with the Montana OCA to create a report in FullCourt or FullCourt Enterprise that tracks felony cases of in-custody defendants.
- **Ensure judge access to docket reports.** Request that all judges and their staff of each level of court have access to each of the court’s records on FullCourt, and future FullCourt Enterprise.

### Table 1.4
**First Judicial District Technologies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Technology</th>
<th>System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Mission</td>
<td><strong>Case management</strong>: FullCourt (Vendor: Justice Systems, Inc.). MT OCA is upgrading courts to FullCourt Enterprise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Public Access Technologies</strong></th>
<th><strong>Jury Duty</strong>: The First District Court’s and Helena Municipal Court’s webpages both contain information about jury duty.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DMV Reporting (Municipal and Justice Courts)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ticket Citations</strong>: The Helena Municipal Court and the Lewis and Clark County Justice Court webpages contain information about ticket citations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Court Performance Measures</strong>: The Montana Judicial Branch website contains performance measures and statistics for the courts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Scheduling and Calendaring</strong></th>
<th><strong>TBD</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enterprise and Shared Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>Office 365</strong> is provided and supported by the MT OCA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1.4  Prosecutors**

**Lewis and Clark County Attorney’s Office**

The Criminal Division of the Lewis and Clark County Attorney’s Office prosecutes felonies that occur in Lewis and Clark County and misdemeanors which occur in the county, but outside of the City of Helena. The county attorney’s office works closely with law enforcement officers from the Helena Police Department, East Helena Police Department, Lewis and Clark Sheriff’s Office and Montana Highway Patrol to prosecute the cases which are presented to it by those agencies. There are seven attorneys who handle the felony caseload. When an attorney is assigned a case, s/he keeps that case until it concludes.

The Lewis and Clark County Attorney’s Office uses JustWare, a product of Journal Technologies, Inc., to maintain basic case information and calendar hearing and trial dates. The County Attorney’s Office uses Microsoft Word for most of its pleadings which are then printed and filed with the court and served on the defense attorney. Except for body cam and dash cam video, the defense attorneys obtain discovery by reviewing the hard copy files at the county attorney’s office. The attorneys use email to exchange plea deals and share memoranda.

**Recommendation 1.5 – Broaden use of JustWare to leverage full functionality**

Ensure the Lewis and Clark County Attorney’s Office is using JustWare to its fullest capacity. Also, there should be reports built that provide pending case/caseload, age of active pending case, and disposition information which can be shared and/or checked with FullCourt Enterprise.

**Recommendation 1.6 – Expand WatchGuard functionality and capacity**

Ensure sufficient data storage to maintain large volume of digital files; improve shielding and redacting software; and provide an instance of WatchGuard to the Office of Public Defender so that video files can be easily reviewed and edited.
Table 1.5
Lewis and Clark County Attorney’s Office Technologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Technology</th>
<th>System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Mission</td>
<td><strong>Case management:</strong> JustWare (Vendor: Journal Technologies, Inc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pleadings:</strong> Microsoft Word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Evidence:</strong> Body Cam/Dash Cam videos are accessed via WatchGuard or links from WatchGuard’s evidence library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Access Technologies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling and Calendaring</td>
<td><strong>JustWare</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise and Shared Services</td>
<td><strong>Office 365</strong> is provided and supported by Lewis and Clark County.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helena City Attorney
The City Attorney’s Office prosecutes misdemeanors, traffic violations and city code violations committed within the city limits. This includes driving under the influence (DUI) offenses, first through third offenses. Helena Municipal Court is the court of record for these charges. In cases where there are also felony charges as part of an incident, those cases are filed by law enforcement in Justice Court and after initial appearance and filing of formal charges by the prosecutor are bound over to the First District Court.

The City Attorney is appointed by the city manager and mayor. The office includes a total of four attorneys, all of whom are part-time (?). The City Attorney’s Office uses FullCase for its case management system. Key case information is captured in it as well as links to folders on the file server. FullCase includes a plea module, but it is cumbersome to use. It can also be used to send emails and generate pre-configured forms with captions.

The City Attorney’s Office receives a digital fax each week with the current week’s batch of police reports. The police reports are redacted, as necessary, before proving them as discovery to defense counsel. In addition, the City Attorney’s Office has access to WatchGuard which is the evidence program where dash cam and body cam evidence is stored. Helena Police Department can also provide links to WatchGuard’s Evidence Library.

Table 1.6
Helena City Attorney’s Office Technologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Technology</th>
<th>System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Mission</td>
<td><strong>Case management:</strong> FullCase (Vendor: Justice Systems, Inc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pleadings:</strong> Microsoft Word and FullCase forms generator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Evidence:</strong> Body Cam/Dash Cam videos are accessed via WatchGuard or links from WatchGuard’s evidence library.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1.5 Office of the State Public Defender (OPD), Region 4

The Office of the State Public Defender is a state office with 11 regions. OPD, Region 4 represents indigent defendants in Broadwater, Jefferson, and Lewis and Clark Counties. The majority of cases that OPD, Region 4 handles, however, are in Lewis and Clark County (90%).

There are 13.5 attorneys who handle cases in Region 4. In FY 2018 in Lewis and Clark County, the OPD, Region 4 was assigned 747 new felony cases in District Court, 471 new misdemeanor cases in Justice Court, 886 new misdemeanor cases in Municipal Court, and 20 new misdemeanor cases in East Helena City Court. If there is a conflict on a case, the OPD Conflict Defender Division is assigned the case.

The Office of the State Public Defender has been hosting JustWare as its case management software since 2006 and just upgraded to JustWare 6.0. All the regional offices have access to JustWare and use it to manage their cases. The calendar feature is used to alert attorneys to upcoming hearings and trials and all the case files are uploaded into JustWare for easy access by the attorneys. JustWare 6.0 has a more robust task assignment feature which allows attorneys to assign tasks among the staff. The reporting features in JustWare are used to keep track of caseload assignments, outcomes, and case age. Also, reports are used to help ensure cases are closed timely. There isn’t a way to track or run a report on continuances in JustWare although that would be helpful. There are file generators in JustWare which are used sometimes, but they are generally quite cumbersome and have to be reformatted to use after the files are generated.

OPD, Region 4 receives links from the Helena Police Department where OPD can download relevant dash cam and body cam videos from the evidence library of WatchGuard. These links are time sensitive and, thus, OPD’s officer manager has a system for download and saving the videos once an emailed link is received.

OPD, Region 4 also has read only access to FullCourt on one computer, but it is difficult to use. Most information with the courts is acquired via paper. Runners go to court to file relevant documents and pick up notices of appointment, orders, minute entries, and other relevant documents.

Generally, plea offers are made and accepted via email, but also occur during discussions between counsel. Evidence is exchanged in person or via email. The Office of the State Public Defender determines indigency of the defendant via an application which is completed while the defendant is in jail or included in a letter to the defendant if s/he is out of custody.

See Recommendation 1.6 on page 16 for expanded WatchGuard (body-worn camera digital evidence) functionality.
Table 1.6
Office of the State Public Defender, Region 4 Technologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Technology</th>
<th>System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Mission</td>
<td><strong>Case management:</strong> JustWare 6.0 (Vendor: Journal Technologies, Inc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pleadings:</strong> Microsoft Word and, sometimes JustWare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Access Technologies</td>
<td>The application ** is available for download on OPD’s website. Also,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the website contains statistics of the cases OPD handles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling and Calendaring</td>
<td>Justware 6.0 is used for upcoming hearings and trials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise and Shared Services</td>
<td>OPD, Region 4 receives enterprise and shared services like email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from its state office. These services include JustWare.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.6 Department of Criminal Justice Services

The Lewis and Clark County Department of Criminal Justice Services (CJS) began as a new department in December 2017. The CJS oversees Lewis and Clark County’s Criminal Justice Coordinating Council and its Citizen Advisory Council. Further, in June 2018 it began a pretrial services program for Lewis and Clark County by hiring two pretrial services officers and two program assistants. The pretrial services program began as part of a State of Montana project to begin using the John and Laura Arnold Foundation’s Public Safety Assessment (PSA) tool to assist judges in making decisions about releasing or detaining individuals at pretrial.

As of October 24, 2018, the Pretrial Services Program had 215 clients as follows:

Table 1.7
Pretrial Services Program Clients 215 Total – 10/24/18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervision Level</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 (Court reminders and initial check-in)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 (Check-in one time per month)</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3 (Check-in two times per month)</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending assessment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity of Charge</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanor charges</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony charges</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Montana OCA receives information about defendants who have been arrested and booked into the Detention Center and inputs it into software purchased and customized by AutoMon. Once the initial
PSA data is entered, Lewis and Clark County pretrial services can input additional information and provide recommendations to the judge to help inform his decision on whether to release or detain each individual. The software is also used to keep track of upcoming court dates for each defendant. Then, the software uses SMS to send court reminders to defendants. Currently, the upcoming court dates are manually entered by pretrial services staff into AutoMon. The system is still relatively new and there are still glitches to work out in the system.

Integration recommendations related to Pretrial Services and the use of Automon are provided in Chapter 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Technology</th>
<th>System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Mission</td>
<td><strong>Case management</strong>: AutoMon – populated by MT OCA completes PSAs. Dept. of Criminal Justice Services enters additional information, notes, and upcoming court dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Access Technologies</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling and Calendaring</td>
<td><strong>AutoMon</strong> for defendants’ court dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise and Shared Services</td>
<td><strong>Office 365</strong> is provided and supported by Lewis and Clark County.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.7 Lewis and Clark Detention Center

The Lewis and Clark Detention Center was built in 1985 and has a current jail capacity of 80 people. Jail population, however, often fluctuates over 80 people. Lewis and Clark County is in the process of renovating the Detention Center in order to add more beds. Once the renovation is complete the detention center will be able to house 156 people. The average daily population of the detention center is 100 people and there were 2847 inmates booked into the Detention Center during the year of 2018 which was a 7% increase from 2017 with 2644 bookings.

The Detention Center’s records management system is called Offender Management System (OMS). It is a browser-based system created by GTL. Unfortunately, it is not integrated with the RMS that the Lewis and Clark law enforcement community uses. Further, the Detention Center uses Excel for some of its records management needs including population counts and the booking sheet. However, there have been discussions for the Detention Center to migrate to OMIS which is a Montana Department of Corrections’ product. OMIS would be customized for use by the Detention Center. The added benefit would be that it would easily integrate with the OMIS that the Montana Department of Corrections uses and likely add much more flexibility and ease of use allowing the detention center to eliminate using Excel and having redundant data entry.

**Recommendation 1.7 – Advocate and support OMIS implementation**

Migrate from the OMS to the OMIS and ensure that OMIS is robust enough to provide quality information about who is in the Detention Center.
Recommendation 1.8 – Automate numerous Excel tools
Eliminate or minimize the use of Excel to manage day-to-day record keeping.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Technology</th>
<th>System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Mission</td>
<td><strong>Offender management</strong>: Offender Management System (OMS) (Vendor: GTL) used for classification and offender management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Booking and Population Counts</strong>: Microsoft Excel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoner Transport</td>
<td>The transport staff keep separate data on transported inmates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reentry</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Access Technologies</td>
<td>The webpage of the Lewis and County Detention Center includes a current roster of inmates housed at the Detention Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise and Shared Services</td>
<td><strong>Office 365</strong> is provided and supported by Lewis and Clark County.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.8 Montana Department of Corrections, Probation and Parole Division

The Probation and Parole Division ("Probation and Parole"), within the Montana Department of Corrections ("DOC"), has 23 field offices which are divided into six regions. Region II includes Lewis and Clark County as well as Park County, Gallatin County, and Beaverhead County. Currently, Region II is supervising approximately 1030 probationers.

The Application Development Bureau of the Information Technology Division of the Montana Department of Corrections maintains, supports, and updates the department's information management systems with its focus on managing the Offender Management Information System (OMIS), the records management system of the Montana DOC. Currently, Montana DOC is running OMIS 3.0. This update is from 2012. It is a robust system that captures which officers are assigned which cases. It also tracks chronological notes that pertain to direct supervision and collateral contacts and it is able to generate reports needed for day-to-day management of cases and of the department.

Court orders and Presentence Investigation (PSI) report deadlines are tracked in OMIS. Probation and Parole is informed by the county attorney when a case needs a PSI report and reports are generally not requested in cases where the defendant will be placed on probation. OMIS had a feature where the PSI report was generated from it. However, it is currently not being used as it was difficult to keep up with the legislative changes impacting the PSI. Now, PSI reports are generated through Microsoft Word. Probation and Parole officers attend all law and motion hearings in order to be informed of who is being sentenced to probation.

The Montana Department of Corrections also has a program services database. This will be added to OMIS this year. Probation and Parole provides a weekly list via email to Dispatch of who is on probation. If there is a call for service, Dispatch is able to reference the list to determine if someone is on probation and then is able to contact the on-call probation officer.
Table 1.10  
Montana Department of Corrections, Probation and Parole Division Technologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Technology</th>
<th>System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Mission</td>
<td><strong>Case management</strong>: Offender Management Information System (OMIS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PSI risk assessment</strong>: Microsoft Word Template</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling and Calendaring</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Treatment Services</td>
<td>Program services database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise and Shared Services</td>
<td>MT Department of Corrections provides enterprise and shared services to each of its regional offices. This includes Outlook for email and the other Microsoft Office products. MT Department of Corrections also provides a file share service for confidential documents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.9  Community Service Providers

The CONNECT Referral System, developed by Noble Software Group, is an electronic referral system with bi-directional flow of information for service providers in Lewis and Clark County. Those entities who refer and those who receive referrals are both part of the system. Service referrals available through CONNECT include social services agencies, medical providers, veteran services, housing program, food banks, among others. The referral process through CONNECT Referral System significantly increases the rate of client connection by providing the referral information to the perspective client and to the agencies receiving the referral. CONNECT Referral System also contains tracking features which increases accountability of the agencies receiving referrals. The only drawback to CONNECT Referral System is agencies have to opt into the system and actively use it for it to be successful. Many of Lewis and Clark County’s criminal justice agencies are currently not members of CONNECT Referral System.

**Recommendation 1.9**  
Encourage all agencies who refer people for services and all service providers to use the **CONNECT Referral System**
Encourage all criminal justice agencies who refer defendants for services to sign up to use CONNECT Referral System. Invite service providers to participate in the development of the shared CJIS database and reporting and management information tools.
Chapter 2 – Criminal Justice Data Integration

Criminal justice information or data sharing in Lewis and Clark County is structured sequentially in a linear process, illustrated in Diagram 3A below. The process may also have feedback loops, most often characterized by a return to a review or adjudicatory process for a defendant that is not in compliance with terms of release under probation supervision. Each step of the process involves advancing a case to adjudication and ultimately to reentry of an offender into the community. Adjudication is the central step in criminal case processing.

Diagram 3A – Criminal Justice Case Processing in Lewis and Clark County

The narrative in this chapter is structured by this sequence of processes and includes the following:

1.0 Response
2.0 Law Enforcement
3.0 Prosecution
4.0 Defense
5.0 Pretrial Services
6.0 Adjudication
7.0 Alternative Dispute Resolution
8.0 Detention
9.0 Enforcement Supervision

Criminal justice data integration in Lewis and Clark County is organized by three primary categories: primary data that are used across multiple processes, agencies, and courts; secondary or transactional data that are typically between two stakeholders using specialized tools; and confidential data that require additional safeguards and processes. Each agency and court will also have substantial data that are not shared with other stakeholders in the justice system or the public. The third category is typically not integrated with other stakeholders and is not the focus of this study, although the narrative will distinguish these data sets when clarification is needed. All integration recommendations are associated with the agency or court that is the data owner.
Primary data include defendant and witness (e.g. police witnesses) identifiers, and many categories of case-related data, including charges, evidence, warrants and detainers, court calendars, dispositions, and conditions of release. Other primary data are non-case specific and include statutory charge or infraction codes, person identifiers (e.g. attorneys), and sentencing guidelines. These data may be confidential or public at various stages of the process. As an example, evidence that is subject to an investigation is typically not available to the public, unless personal identifiers and other confidential information have been shielded.

Core Case Information
The phrase “core case information” will be used throughout the report for primary case data. Primary case data is typically shared by all criminal justice stakeholders and includes, at minimum, the following:

- Defendant name and identifiers
- Date of citation or arrest
- Name of issuing or arresting officer
- Agency case identifiers (e.g. booking numbers, case numbers)
- Charges and amended charges

A number of other data integration opportunities are secondary and often transactional between two parties. While these may have relevance they are often addressed through shared services (e.g. email or text). Examples include leave and vacation information about judges and attorneys, notification of victims and witnesses, and plea negotiation between the prosecution and defense. Data integration opportunities are subject to the type of approach that is implemented.

Many primary and secondary information exchanges may also be highly confidential, although the confidentiality of a transaction is not prohibitive for data integration. Information exchanges about personal and medical information and identifiers must comply with state and federal laws and statutes. Other transactions involve the use of highly specialized technologies that do not easily integrate into a broader platform. Examples of these include body-worn camera and other video evidence that may be central to an investigation.

E-Filing
The submission of all charging documents, pleadings, motions, and plea agreements to the court encompasses the technical term-of-art, “e-filing.” E-filing is bi-directional, meaning that it would also encompass any notices, orders, or judgments issued by the court back to attorneys on a case. The Montana OCA is expected to launch FullCourt Enterprise as a new case management solution in Lewis and Clark County in the near future. This launch is expected to include e-filing through a separate vendor, Thomson Reuters.6 Currently, e-filing is piloted in six other counties, includes the filing of an information on Justice and Municipal Court appeals for criminal cases.7

---

6 The JMI team has not yet received documentation of a plan for simultaneous implementation of FullCourt Enterprise and Thomson Reuters e-filing.
1.0 Response

Response is the ways in which law enforcement responds to the public when assistance is sought or to a crime or infraction upon view. See Diagram 3B below. The public report crime to law enforcement in two ways: 1) 911 emergency calls or calls for assistance; and 2) criminal complaints typically filed at a local police station or at the Sheriff’s office. In addition to the public reporting crime, law enforcement in the community also arrest or issue citations to offenders on view, without public intervention or requests for assistance. This is most commonly associated with traffic offenses.

Diagram 3B – Response by Law Enforcement

The primary integration touchpoints are listed in Table 3.1 below. Response is the only process for which law enforcement is the consumer of all listed integrations. This is largely because most ITPs are provided by sources external to the city/county system and are highly restricted. The Montana DOC Probation and Parole emails to county dispatch a list of defendants on probation. The list is updated on a weekly basis. The criminal histories and warrants and detainers integrations (ITP 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3) are regulated by the state and the FBI and are highly restricted. The most efficient way to manage state and federal criminal histories and warrant data is through dispatch. Dispatch notifies the officer on patrol via radio communications/digital notifications. No data integration between crisis responders and law enforcement is currently available. All communication is through dispatch. Examples of possible responders include emergency rooms and crisis intervention.

Table 3.1
Response Integration Touchpoints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Datasets</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Integration Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITP 1.1</td>
<td>Criminal history</td>
<td>MBCC</td>
<td>MHP</td>
<td>SmartCOP</td>
<td>Application/dispatch bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCC</td>
<td>HPD/Sheriff</td>
<td>Northstar CAD</td>
<td>Application/dispatch bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITP 1.2</td>
<td>Warrants and detainers (MT+surrounding states)</td>
<td>MBCC</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>SmartCOP</td>
<td>Application/dispatch bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCC</td>
<td>HPD/Sheriff</td>
<td>Northstar CAD</td>
<td>Application/dispatch bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITP 1.3</td>
<td>Warrants and detainers (national)</td>
<td>NCIC</td>
<td>MHP</td>
<td>SmartCOP</td>
<td>Application/dispatch bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NCIC</td>
<td>HPD/Sheriff</td>
<td>Northstar CAD</td>
<td>Application/dispatch bridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lists of defendants on probation should be provided by the source of probation revocation orders, the court. The exception to this rule is when a defendant had completed probation, for which the source should be Probation and Parole. A defendant may not check in with probation until one or two days after an order has been issued. In addition, the data should include defendants with a probation revocation. Because the data may be useful to other stakeholders, and is being provided to multiple law enforcement agencies, a shared CJIS database is optimum. This approach mitigates the need to build multiple point-to-point integrations.

**ITP 1.1 Court orders – warrants and detainers CJIS EDI**

Court orders are optimum for data integration using a shared CJIS database. These may include warrants, detainers, and stay-away or protection orders. Warrants and detainers, issued by the court, are immediate, whereas a data entry lag time may occur when updating the state or FBI systems.

### 2.0 Law Enforcement

Law enforcement includes the seeking from the court of arrest warrants and summons to appear, the issuance of citations, and the arrest and booking of suspects at the Detention Center. Law enforcement officers may seek arrest warrants or summons to appear after an investigation or the filing of a complaint by a citizen.

Law enforcement officers may also arrest or issue citations to offenders, without public intervention or requests for assistance and without seeking a warrant or summons from the court. This occurs most frequently on traffic citations or misdemeanor cases. For arrest cases, an affidavit of probable cause must be reviewed and granted by the court to hold a defendant in the Detention Center.

The documentation of a citation or arrest, booking sheets, affidavits, and an arrest report are treated as evidence and submitted to the prosecutor. In addition, law enforcement may also investigate crimes and gather evidence to support a prosecution.
The primary law enforcement integration touchpoints are listed in Table 3.2 below. Notices to appear, ITP 2.1, and search and arrest warrants, ITP 2.2, are provide by the Justice or Municipal Court\(^8\) to law enforcement at a determination of probable cause upon the filing of a complaint by a citizen, law enforcement, or the prosecutor. These may be transmitted by paper, fax, telephonic, or in person.

Once a traffic stop has been made, the officer may issue a citation to the defendant or arrest and book the defendant into the Detention Center. Law enforcement will submit a citation to the court, ITP 2.3, via digiTICKET or by paper citation via fax or in person. Upon arrest, law enforcement completes a booking sheet at the Detention Center via computer into an Excel document and the affidavit of probable cause (affidavit) is separately submitted in hardcopy to the court via an RMS printout. Note that this is the point of case initiation in the Municipal and Justice Courts.

Documentary evidence is provided by law enforcement to the prosecutor and subsequently to the defense via hardcopy transmittal and/or fax (ITP 2.6). Audio-video and digital images evidence is provided to the prosecutor via access to WatchGuard and subsequently to the defense via an Internet cloud repository, WatchGuard (ITP 2.7). The repository enables the prosecutor to manage, edit, shield, or redact evidence, based on a number of criteria. Evidence that is being used in an ongoing

\(^8\) The District Court also has the authority to issue notices and warrants.
The integration recommendations below are designed to address short-term integration opportunities and to contemplate the use of a shared CJIS database solution (i.e. a criminal justice information system – CJIS) and an e-filing solution with FullCourt Enterprise, a new case management system that will be rolled out in Lewis and Clark County in the next few years. The CJIS and FullCourt solutions are not mutually exclusive. See the Executive Summary for a full narrative about these two overlapping solutions.

---

9 Information is not available about the scheduled implementation of FullCourt Enterprise in Lewis and Clark County.
ITP 2.4 Booking Sheet
At booking the initial information about the arrest, the defendant, and charges are typed onto a booking form that is not integrated into the Offender Management System (OMS) at the Detention Center or the Records Management System (RMS) at the Helena Police Department, nor linked to the court’s case management system, FullCourt. The Detention Center anticipates upgrading to the OMIS system in the near future (see Chapter 1). Ultimately, best practice is for law enforcement to enter case information into their own system (RMS) and share that information with authorized stakeholders.

*Smart form booking sheet.* Develop, using MS Word or PDF forms tools, a smart form for use by the Police to enter booking information that will be directly captured by the RMS.

*CJIS EDI.* A CJIS database will be configured to capture all relevant, shared information from arrest through disposition about each case and defendant.

*E-filing solution through FullCourt Enterprise.* An alternative approach will be to integrate the complaint and booking information through FullCourt Enterprise, after it is rolled out by the Montana OCA. This approach will likely utilize direct integration via a module of FullCourt. The challenge of this approach is that it will require the Police or the Detention Center to reenter the information into FullCourt unless a direct integration is built.

ITP 2.5 Affidavit (Complaint)
Currently, the booking information is then re-entered into RMS and transmitted via hardcopy to the court for data entry into FullCourt. At booking the initial information about the arrest, the defendant, and charges are typed onto a booking form that is not integrated into the OMS, nor linked to the court’s case management system, FullCourt. Currently, the booking information is then re-entered into OMS and transmitted via hardcopy to the court for data entry into FullCourt.

*Smart form affidavit.* Transmit via email RMS or OMS smart form to the courts for data entry into the existing FullCourt system. The booking sheet and the complaint could then be cross-checked for accuracy.

*CJIS EDI and FullCourt Enterprise integration.* This recommendation would combine both steps. At booking, the incident, defendant, and charging information would populate FullCourt Enterprise.

ITP 2.7 Evidence
As hardcopy evidence is collected by law enforcement, or other documentary evidence is provided by third parties, such as laboratories, the evidence is shared on an as-needed basis.

*Evidence repository.* Implement an evidence repository solution on the shared CJIS database or that is cloud-based, similar to the WatchGuard solution for audio-video evidence. A licensed application is very simple to implement and would enable law enforcement to enter evidence into their own system and share that information with authorized stakeholders.

---

10 The linked file identifies the current e-filing counties in Montana. For criminal, e-filing includes the information, and Justice and Municipal Court appeals to the District Court. [https://courts.mt.gov/portals/189/efile/docs/crt-policy.pdf](https://courts.mt.gov/portals/189/efile/docs/crt-policy.pdf)
enforcement, the prosecutor, and the defense to share evidence as authorized by the prosecutor.

**CJIS EDI.** This solution would only be used for evidence that is submitted to the court as exhibits. It is congruent with e-filing, except that the exhibits would be made available to the court at an evidentiary hearing or trial for inclusion in an electronic case file.

### 3.0 Prosecution

Prosecution of traffic and misdemeanor cases within the City of Helena is provided by the City Attorney. Prosecution of traffic and misdemeanor cases in the unincorporated areas of Lewis and Clark County and for all felony cases in the County is provided by the County Attorney. Prosecution can be formally organized into two primary functions.

1. **Investigation, screening and charging.** This function may overlap with trial case management. It includes the following sub-functions:
   - 3.1 Screening/Charging
   - 3.2 Evidence
   - 3.3 Assignment/Calendar
   - 3.4 Charges/Information

2. **Trial case management** – prosecuting cases at trial. This function includes the following sub-functions:
   - 3.5 Case Management
   - 3.6 Plea Negotiation

Prosecution is a critical path function in criminal case processing. They have primary decision-making authority over charging defendants and representing the city or state at trial. Primary data exchanges for the prosecutor are described in Diagram 3D and Table 3.3 below.

![Diagram 3D – Prosecution](image-url)
The primary integration touchpoints for which the prosecutor is the owner are listed in Table 3.3 below. Typically, law enforcement files citations directly with the court without prosecutor review unless contested. Core case information received from law enforcement as a complaint may be screened prior to filing charges as an information on misdemeanor and felony cases. For each of these case types, the core case information must be entered into JustWare for the County Attorney and FullCase for the City Attorney. In addition, discovery is provided by law enforcement to the prosecutor. Most documentary evidence is shared by hardcopy. Physical evidence is rarely transmitted. Audio-visual evidence is shared by an Internet Cloud solution, WatchGuard.

Charging documents on serious traffic and misdemeanor cases may be submitted (ITP 3.1) by the City Attorney to the Municipal Court after the Police have filed affidavits of probable cause, often concurrent with negotiated plea offers. This approach is designed to formalize a charging document that may include amended or dismissed charges. Charging documents and informations are typically submitted (ITP 3.1) by the County Attorney to the District Court at the start of a case.

Discovery packets are provided to defense counsel upon a motion for discovery (open discovery?). These are typically hardcopy (ITP 3.2). Audio video evidence is shared (ITP 3.3) with the defense as soon as it is received by the prosecutor, generally without shielding, unless the case is still under investigation and a defendant has not yet been charged and arrested or summoned. Audio video evidence is Cloud based and is shared by link to digital files that enable the defense to download and shield confidential information prior to their use as exhibits at trial or an evidentiary hearing.

Plea negotiations from the prosecutor to the defense may be oral (telephone or in person) or by written offer (ITP 3.4). Typically, even if oral, a plea agreement must be drafted and signed by the defendant, prior to submission to court (ITP 3.6). All pleadings and motions are typically submitted (ITP 3.5) in hardcopy by the prosecutor to the court.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Datasets</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Integration Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITP 3.1</td>
<td>Charging/information</td>
<td>City Attorney</td>
<td>Municipal Court</td>
<td>JustWare/MS Word</td>
<td>Hardcopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County Attorney</td>
<td>Justice Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>District Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITP 3.2</td>
<td>Discovery</td>
<td>City Attorney</td>
<td>Defense Counsel</td>
<td>FullCase/MS Word</td>
<td>Hardcopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County Attorney</td>
<td>Defense Counsel</td>
<td>JustWare/MS Word</td>
<td>Hardcopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITP 3.3</td>
<td>Audio-video evidence</td>
<td>City Attorney</td>
<td>Defense Counsel</td>
<td>WatchGuard</td>
<td>Login/Email link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County Attorney</td>
<td>Defense Counsel</td>
<td>WatchGuard</td>
<td>Login/Email link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITP 3.4</td>
<td>Subpoenas</td>
<td>City Attorney</td>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>Adobe PDF</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County Attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITP 3.5</td>
<td>Plea negotiation</td>
<td>City Attorney</td>
<td>Defense Counsel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oral/hardcopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ITP 3.2 Discovery/documentary evidence

The purpose of this recommendation is to build a repository for the prosecutor to provide discovery and evidence to defense counsel. See ITP 2.7 above.

**Evidence repository.** Implement an evidence repository solution that is managed as part of the shared CJIS database or is cloud-based, similar to the WatchGuard solution for audio-video evidence. A licensed application is very simple to implement and would enable law enforcement, the prosecutor, and the defense to share evidence as authorized by the prosecutor.

**CJIS EDI.** This solution would only be used for evidence that is submitted to the court as exhibits. It is congruent with e-filing, except that the exhibits would be made available to the court at an evidentiary hearing or trial for inclusion in an electronic case file.

### ITP 3.4 Subpoenas CJIS EDI

Subpoenas for court appearance are provided by the prosecutor to law enforcement on a daily/weekly basis. These could be automated by direct subpoenas authorized from FullCourt through the prosecutor’s office. Subpoenas for court appearances would be generated and sent by email/digital link/text message to individual police officers. The mechanism would include aggregating the name of the arresting/citing officer, the date and time of the docket, and the courtroom number.

### ITP 3.6 Pleadings/motions

#### ITP 3.7 Plea offers

The purpose of this recommendation is to build a repository for the prosecutor to submit pleadings, motions, and negotiated pleas to defense counsel and subsequently to the court. This would function similarly to an evidence repository. In many jurisdictions, the court requires that counsel provide joint motions (such as for agreed-upon reset dates or pretrial statements). The exchange of documents could happen prior to submission (e-filing) with the court. This would also function similarly to third-party exchanges on civil cases and would be most useful on cases with complex discovery and motions practice.

**Case document repository.** Implement a case-based repository solution for pleadings, motions, and plea offers on the shared CJIS database.

**CJIS EDI.** This solution would only be used for e-filing of pleadings, motions, and plea offers with the court.
4.0 Defense

The Public Defender is the primary agency assigned criminal cases for indigent defenders. In addition, some defendants hire private defense counsel, or the Office of Public Defenders Conflict Defender Division appoints conflict counsel where two defendants may be charged on the same case, or where the Public Defender may otherwise have a conflict. JustWare case management software is utilized by the Public Defender, but not private counsel. Primary data exchanges for the defense are described in Diagram 3E and Table 3.4 below. The case processing steps for the defense include assignment by the court or retainer by the defendant (4.1), the gathering of evidence (4.2) (bi-directional) case management (4.3) – representing a defendant throughout a court case – and possible plea negotiation with the prosecution (4.4)

The primary integration touchpoints for which the defense is the owner are listed in Table 3.4 below. All other integration touchpoints illustrated on the diagram below originate from another agency or the courts.

In addition to requesting and receiving evidence from the prosecution upon a motion for discovery, the defense is obliged to provide to the prosecutor probative evidence they have gathered (ITP 4.1). This is done primarily through the use of hardcopy or digital storage media.

Defense counsel may also submit to the court pleadings and motions and answers to pleadings and motions by the prosecutor (ITP 4.2). This type of data exchange is encompassed under e-filing. See the introduction to this chapter.
Table 3.4  
Defense Integration Touchpoints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Datasets</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Integration Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITP 4.1</td>
<td>Case data/documentary evidence</td>
<td>Public Defender, Private Defense</td>
<td>City Attorney, County Attorney</td>
<td>Case files, JustWare/case files</td>
<td>Hardcopy/digital storage media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITP 4.2</td>
<td>Pleadings/motions (e-filing)</td>
<td>Public Defender, Private Defense</td>
<td>Municipal Court, Justice Court, District Court</td>
<td>JustWare/case files</td>
<td>Hardcopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITP 4.3</td>
<td>Plea counter-offers</td>
<td>Public Defender, Private Defense</td>
<td>Municipal Court, Justice Court, District Court</td>
<td>JustWare/case files</td>
<td>Hardcopy/in person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ITP 4.1 Case data/documentary evidence CJIS EDI  
The purpose of this recommendation is to provide a solution for defense counsel to share evidence with the prosecution. See ITP 2.7 above.

Evidence repository. Implement an evidence repository solution that is cloud-based, similar to the WatchGuard solution for audio-video evidence. A licensed application is very simple to implement and would enable law enforcement, the prosecutor, and the defense to share evidence as authorized by the prosecutor.

CJIS EDI. This solution would only be used for evidence that is submitted to the court as exhibits. It is congruent with e-filing, except that the exhibits would be made available to the court at an evidentiary hearing or trial for inclusion in an electronic case file.

ITP 4.2 Pleadings/motions CJIS EDI  
ITP 4.3 Plea counter-offers CJIS EDI  
The purpose of this recommendation is to build a repository for defense counsel to submit pleadings, motions, and negotiated pleas to the prosecutor and subsequently to the court. This would function similarly to an evidence repository. In many jurisdictions, the court requires that counsel provide joint motions (such as for agreed-upon reset dates or pretrial statements). The exchange of documents could happen prior to submission (e-filing) with the court. This would also function similarly to third-party exchanges on civil cases and would be most useful on cases with complex discovery and motions practice.

Case document repository. Implement a case-based repository solution for pleadings, motions, and plea counter-offers on the shared CJIS database.

CJIS EDI. This solution would only be used for e-filing of pleadings, motions with the court.
5.0 Pretrial Services

Pretrial services provides two primary criminal justice functions. These two functions are organized by the four sub-functions illustrated in Diagram 3F below.

1. Risk assessment
   5.1 Risk Assessment

2. Supervision of pretrial defendants released by court order prior to trial or disposition of their case
   5.2 Assignment
   5.3 Supervision
   5.4 Reporting

Pretrial services is not a critical path function in criminal case processing, because their decisions and work are not predicates for the case moving forward or being resolved. Risk assessment using the PSA tool is provided by the Montana OCA and shared with the county pretrial services program in order to prepare a pretrial report for a judge early in a case. If a judge orders the defendant to be released under the supervision of the pretrial services program, the agency is responsible for reporting back to the court on a regular basis, or to report violations when they occur. The two most serious events occurring while a defendant is under pretrial supervision are a failure to appear at a court hearing or trial or the commission of another crime and the subsequent arrest or citation to appear in court for that crime. Both events will likely impact the release of the defendant.

Diagram 3F – Pretrial Services

The number of integration touchpoints and exchanges of data for pretrial services are considerable. Immediately after case initiation, case data is exported from FullCourt at the Montana OCA (ITP 6.0) and combined with criminal history data processed by AutoMon, the software that generates the risk assessment score using the PSA tool. Once a risk score has been generated, pretrial services makes to the judge a recommendation about a release decision and the conditions of supervision.

11 The criminal history data exchange is not included as a touchpoint because it occurs at the OCA and not locally in the county.
Table 3.5 identifies the two Pretrial Services integration touchpoints for which they are the owner, the parties to each exchange and the technology underlying the data. In addition, ITP 6.0, Core case information, is fundamental to providing the risk assessment (PSA score) and recommendations to the court (ITP 5.1). This integration between FullCourt and AutoMon at the OCA is the only fully automated exchange. ITP 5.1, PSA and recommendations, is a hardcopy report provided by Pretrial Services to the court. The report is generated in AutoMon. Pretrial supervision orders (see ITP 6.3 above) are the assignment of the defendant to pretrial supervision and the orders and conditions issued by the court. Court hearing dates (ITP 6.1) are provided to Pretrial Services but are reentered into AutoMon in order to send text notices to defendants about upcoming hearing dates. ITP 5.2, Supervision reports are the reports that are generated by Pretrial Services and AutoMon and presented to the court. The reports are issued as requested by the judge, or when violations have occurred. These reports may also be used to recommend changes in supervision levels or other conditions of release.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Datasets</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Integration Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITP 5.1</td>
<td>PSA and recommendations</td>
<td>Pretrial Service</td>
<td>Municipal Court</td>
<td>AutoMon report</td>
<td>Hardcopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Justice Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>District Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITP 5.2</td>
<td>Supervision reports</td>
<td>Pretrial Services</td>
<td>Municipal Court</td>
<td>AutoMon report</td>
<td>Hardcopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Justice Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>District Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ITP 5.1 PSA and recommendations EDI**
Pretrial services submits the PSA score and recommendations to the court in hardcopy, created using a forms tool in AutoMon. This form is not integrated with FullCourt. The recommendation is to ensure an EDI with FullCourt and in the future, with FullCourt Enterprise. AutoMon is already integrated with FullCourt for other information. The addition of this EDI should be a simple add-on and could be recommended and implemented in the first year of the project.

**ITP 5.2 Supervision reports EDI**
Similarly, pretrial services officers submit supervision reports to the court in hardcopy, using forms in AutoMon. This ITP should be automated. AutoMon is already integrated with FullCourt for other information. The addition of this EDI should be a simple add-on and could be recommended and implemented in the first year of the project.

**6.0 Adjudication and Alternative Dispute Resolution**

Adjudication encompasses all court functions from filing to disposition and post-adjudication matters. These functions are consistent for the Municipal, Justice, and District Courts. Core case information from law enforcement and prosecutors at filing drive case initiation and case processing. The Justice and District Courts utilize FullCourt case management system that supports assignment, calendars, orders and judgments. As described in Chapter 1, the OCA is planning on replacing FullCourt with FullCourt Enterprise (FCE), which will enable the two courts to go paperless and to integrate more easily with
other systems in the justice system. Diagram 3G below illustrates only touchpoints that originate from the courts. A large number of touchpoints originate with each of the criminal justice system stakeholders.

Court case management will become much more easily networked with the shift to FCE. See Chapter 1 for a full description of this effort. From the perspective of data integration, FCE should include standardized XML data (Global XML), based on NIEM standards for justice information. These standards enable simpler data integration or the use of a CJIS database to share data asynchronously (not directly agency to agency).

The existing FullCourt system has very few data integration touchpoints with other systems, although large amounts of information are exchanged with multiple stakeholders on almost every case. See Table 3.6 below for a full listing of these. The narrative below refers to integration touchpoints originating from other stakeholders, as well as those for which the primary source is the courts.

### Case Initiation

The primary existing automated data (ITP 2.3) enables citations to be electronically transmitted by law enforcement to the Municipal Court and Justice Court. This integration does not apply to all police and sheriff citations, especially from jurisdictions outside of Helena or other towns. Many traffic citations continue to be hardcopy. All arrests result in the filing of affidavits by law enforcement or the subsequent filing of charging documents (informations) by the County Attorney on felony cases. These are hardcopy. A key component of case initiation is noticing defendants and counsel about the first appearance and subsequent hearings (ITP 6.1) and the appointment of an attorney (ITP 6.2). The court is also responsible for making a pretrial release determination and the appointment of pretrial services to supervise a defendant (ITP 6.2). This is also considered an order for pretrial supervision and could be one of many orders the court may issue (ITP 6.3).
### Table 3.6
### Adjudication Integration Touchpoints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Datasets</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Integration Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITP 6.1</td>
<td>Hearings and notices</td>
<td>Municipal Court</td>
<td>Prosecutors</td>
<td>FullCourt</td>
<td>Hardcopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Justice Court</td>
<td>Defense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>District Court</td>
<td>Litigants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pretrial Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Probation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITP 6.2</td>
<td>Appointment of attorney</td>
<td>Municipal Court</td>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>FullCourt</td>
<td>Hardcopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Justice Court</td>
<td>Private Defense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITP 6.3</td>
<td>Court orders</td>
<td>Municipal Court</td>
<td>Prosecutors</td>
<td>FullCourt</td>
<td>Hardcopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Justice Court</td>
<td>Defense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>District Court</td>
<td>Litigants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pretrial Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Probation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITP 6.4</td>
<td>Bench warrants/detainers</td>
<td>Municipal Court</td>
<td>MBCC</td>
<td>FullCourt</td>
<td>Reentry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Justice Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>District Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITP 6.5</td>
<td>Commitment/release orders</td>
<td>Municipal Court</td>
<td>Detention Center</td>
<td>FullCourt</td>
<td>Hardcopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Justice Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>District Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITP 6.6</td>
<td>Probation orders</td>
<td>Municipal Court</td>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>FullCourt</td>
<td>Hardcopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Justice Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>District Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITP 6.7</td>
<td>Final judgments</td>
<td>Municipal Court</td>
<td>MBCC</td>
<td>FullCourt</td>
<td>Reentry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Justice Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>District Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pretrial**

During pretrial case processing, a large number of data sets are exchanged with the parties and counsel. These are generally classified as e-filing and include calendars and notices of upcoming hearings (ITP 6.1) and the issuance of orders (ITP 6.3). Additional data integrations include the issuance of bench warrants or detainers for defendants (ITP 6.4) and commitment or release orders to the detention center (ITP 6.5). These types of orders are specialized. Bench warrants must also be sent to the Montana Bureau of Crime Control (MBCC) to be included in a statewide database.

**Adjudication and Post-Adjudication**

The primary integration touchpoints at and after adjudication are the judgments, verdicts, and sentences (ITP 6.7) and probation orders (ITP 6.6) as part of the judgment. In addition, post-adjudication matters may include additional hearings, notices, orders, and event bench warrants, the entire range of touchpoints prior to adjudication.

**ITP 6.1 Hearings and notices CJIS EDI**

Provide case and user-indexed court calendars to all criminal justice system stakeholders. Notices for upcoming hearings and trials are ubiquitous in the courts. They are needed and used by every...
stakeholder for different purposes. A shared CJIS database is the recommended solution. Each updated calendar would populate the database indexed to a case number, which is further indexed to parties, attorneys, and witnesses (e.g. police witnesses, where known).

**Law enforcement.** Court calendars are provided to law enforcement on a regular basis in order to map out summons to appear in court at first appearances on citations. These should be configured as a table of docket numbers (courtrooms and judges, and dates and times) that will become the future dates included on summons provided to defendants who receive a citation. In addition, the court calendars are an effective way for law enforcement to manage police witness schedules for court hearings and trials.

**Attorneys.** Court calendars and hearing notices should populate the CJIS database, indexed to case numbers and assigned attorneys, where a specific attorney has entered their appearance. Each office or individual attorney should be able to consume case and attorney-specific calendars and notices.

**Defendants.** Hearing notices should be indexed to case numbers and defendant names by a unique identifier. Long term, this will enable the city and county to build defendant portals to access targeted information for each defendant.

**ITP 6.2 Appointment of attorney CJIS**
**ITP 6.3 Court orders CJIS**
**ITP 6.5 Commitment/release orders CJIS**
**ITP 6.7 Final judgments CJIS**
Each of these touchpoints is a type of court order that is broadly required by most attorney and defendant stakeholders and targeted other agencies. It is critical that the courts populate a shared CJIS database so that parties can consume the information as data. Orders appointing attorneys should be targeted to defense counsel. Commitment and release orders should be targeted to the Detention Center.

**FullCourt Enterprise e-filing.** An e-filing solution will likely push these data sets to attorneys registered on a case. Most of these will be emails or other form of electronic transmission with digitized documents/orders attached. While very useful, this solution is typically limited to attorneys and to digitized forms.

**ITP 6.4 Bench warrants/detainers**
The method for transmission of bench warrant/detainer information to MCCC is unknown. As these orders are generated, they should automatically be sent to the State.

**ITP 6.6 Probation orders CJIS EDI**
Integrate FullCourt and OMIS to provide probation orders and populate the CJIS database. Since these are both state systems, the primary focus is the push of probation orders to the CJIS database in order to notify law enforcement. While this could be done with a flag, the benefit of the integration will include the sharing of case-specific conditions of release (e.g. stay-away orders). In addition, the integration will provide a link for service providers that could then reach out to probation to enroll a defendant for services.
Chapter 3 – City and County Technology Platform

The Lewis and Clark County and Helena City technology platform is unified under the Information Technology and Services (IT&S) Department (ITSD) and Steering Committee. The ITSD was unified under a 1999 memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the county and the city and a 2004 amendment to the agreement, including the formation of a steering committee. The steering committee is co-chaired by the County Administrative Officer and City Manager and consists of the following communities of interest, with the focus of this report on criminal justice and public safety:

1. Citizens Services
2. Criminal Justice/Public Safety
3. Public Infrastructure
4. Financial Planning
5. Health and Welfare
6. Land Management
7. Internal Support

This joint structure was in part the result of recommendations made by a *City of Helena and the County of Lewis and Clark Information Technology Strategic Plan, June 1999*, with technical assistance provided by KPMG. Since the strategic plan was written, comprehensive changes have been made to the networks, enterprise applications, and most other applications that utilized the network supported by ITSD in the city and county. In addition, a plethora of other applications and services have been added, especially to the criminal justice/public safety technology environment, including the adoption of several cloud-based services, the applications and databases for which do not reside on local servers.

Since 1999, the number of core mission applications in the criminal justice system has substantially increased from 7 to 18 applications in 2019. See Appendix 4 for an illustration of the justice system applications in 1999. A map of the justice system/public safety applications is provided in Diagram 3a on the following page. The diagram illustrates five primary electronic data interfaces (EDIs) between primary applications. EDIs are a type of integration touchpoint (ITP) as defined earlier in the report. ITPs are quite often hardcopy of other type of non-electronic transfer of information.

Core mission applications do not include the numerous enterprise applications and shared services supported by ITSD and the state for agencies and courts locally. Enterprise applications include human resources, procurement, payroll, electronic document management, and asset management. Shared services include email, telephone, office automation, file and print services, and web servers linked to Internet service providers (ISPs).

The most common form of information sharing is simply to provide access to multiple systems, even within the same agency. An example of this is the access to multiple sources of information in police squad cars. An officer can communicate via radio communications with dispatch to get information about probationers and warrant histories, see local records of a suspect, enter notes into a field reporting system, and enter a citation that is filed with the courts. None of these operations or functions are electronically linked for the purposes of sharing data.
Diagram 3A – Lewis and Clark County and Helena City Applications Map – Criminal Justice and Public Safety

- **Scheduling**
  - PlanIt
    - LCCSO – ITSD
  - Schedule Anywhere
    - HPD – ITSD
  - WhentoWork
    - MHP – ITSD

- **Dispatch**
  - NorthStar CAD
    - HPD, EHPD, LCCSO – ITSD
  - Caliber CAD
    - MHP - State

- **Records Management**
  - RMS
    - HPD, EHPD, LCCSO – ITSD

- **Field Reporting**
  - MobileTrak
    - HPD, EHPD, LCCSO – ITSD

- **Digital Evidence**
  - WatchGuard
    - HPD, EHPD – Cloud

- **E-Filing**
  - DigiTicket
    - HPD, EHPD – ITSD

- **Warrants**
  - SecureWarrant
    - HPD, EHPD – ITSD

- **Offender Management**
  - OMS
    - LCCSO – ITSD

- **Probation Management**
  - OMIS
    - MDOC - State

- **Pretrial Risk Assessment**
  - Automon
    - Pretrial Supervision
      - State

- **Defender Case Management**
  - JustWare
    - OPD – ITSD

- **Prosecutor Case Management**
  - JustWare
    - LCCA – ITSD
  - FullCase
    - HCA – ITSD

- **Court Case Management**
  - FullCourt
    - LCCDC, LCCJC, HMC
      - State

- **Jail & Probation**

- **Law Enforcement**

- **Case Management**
County Wide Area Network (WAN)

The County WAN is not reproduced in this report in order to maintain confidentiality. ITSD hosts local applications, and file and print services on local virtual machines (VM) servers, primarily located in the City County Building. The courthouse and law enforcement center are served by a Gigabit fiber optic connection. High-speed wireless transmitters provide connectivity to the dispatch center and to many other agencies and departments, as well as to provide redundant network links.

Systems Integration

The objective of developing an integrated system, referred to as a criminal justice information system, was identified as a goal in the 1999 Strategic Plan. The Plan identifies many of the shortcomings that persist to this day, even with the broad replacement of new core mission applications in criminal justice. One excerpt identifies redundant and duplicative data entry of basic defendant identifiers.

A study found that as an individual moves from arrest to trial and then incarceration, his name, date of birth and address are entered on paper and into computers as many as 17 different times.¹²

Duplicative data entry persists for all categories of shared data and information across the criminal justice system, except for newly targeted functions. The key function that has overcome these barriers is the implementation of e-filing by law enforcement of traffic citations (DigiTICKET) to the Municipal and Justice Courts’ system, FullCourt.

A model for a shared CJIS database is provided on the following page. Recommendation 3.3, below, identifies the Persons data set as a pilot. A Persons data repository is useful for every application, city and county-wide. All other data sets are primarily indexed to a unifying case identifier, although a number of categories (e.g. warrants, probation) should be indexed to a person without having to look up a specific case.

¹² City of Helena and the County of Lewis and Clark, Information Technology Strategic Plan, 1999, p4-51.
Diagram 3B – Shared CJIS Database Map

- **Persons**
  - Bond & Release Information
  - Bench Warrants & Detainers
  - Pretrial and Probation Supervision
  - Evidence

- **Case**
  - Shared Calendars
  - Disposition Data
  - Pretrial Risk Assessment

- **Warrants**
  - SecureWarrant
    - HPD, EHPD – **ITSD**

- **Offender Management**
  - OMS
    - LCCSO – **ITSD**

- **Pretrial Risk Assessment**
  - Automon
    - Pretrial Supervision
      - **State**

- **Digital Evidence**
  - WatchGuard
    - HPD, EHPD – **Cloud**

- **Probation Management**
  - OMIS
    - MDOC - **State**

- **Service Providers**
  - Connect
    - Local service providers
      - **State**

- **Records Management**
  - RMS
    - HPD, EHPD, LCCSO
      - **ITSD**

- **Caliber CAD**
  - MHP - **State**

- **Field Reporting**
  - MobileTrak
    - HPD, EHPD, LCCSO
      - **ITSD**

- **E-Filing**
  - SmartCOP
    - MHP – **State**
  - DigiTicket
    - HPD, EHPD – **ITSD**

- **Scheduling**
  - PlanIt
    - LCCSO – **ITSD**
  - Schedule Anywhere
    - HPD – **ITSD**
  - WhenToWork
    - MHP – **ITSD**

- **Defender Case Management**
  - JustWare
    - LCCA – **ITSD**
  - FullCase
    - HCA – **ITSD**

- **Court Case Management**
  - FullCourt
    - LCCDC, LCCJC, HMC
    - **State**

- **Prosecutor Case Management**
  - JustWare
    - LCCA – **ITSD**

- **Records Management**
  - ITSD

- **Field Reporting**
  - HPD, EHPD, LCCSO
    - **ITSD**

- **E-Filing**
  - HPD, EHPD, LCCSO
    - **ITSD**

- **Scheduling**
  - PlanIt
    - LCCSO – **ITSD**
  - Schedule Anywhere
    - HPD – **ITSD**
  - WhenToWork
    - MHP – **ITSD**

- **Digital Evidence**
  - WatchGuard
    - HPD, EHPD – **Cloud**

- **Probation Management**
  - OMIS
    - MDOC - **State**

- **Service Providers**
  - Connect
    - Local service providers
      - **State**
Implementation Recommendations

The following recommendations are phased and system-wide. Many of the recommendations throughout the report are to these recommendations.

**Phases 1 and 2 – Years 1-2
Implement Recommendations**

1.0 **Build capacity with existing systems and opportunities (Years 1-2)**

The city and county criminal justice system includes 18 separate core mission applications across distributed agencies and courts. As an example, the city and county have three courts and two prosecutor agencies. Not all of the existing applications are being leveraged to their capacity. In addition, the city and county have a vital role to advocate for implementation of new state applications (e.g. FullCourt Enterprise and OMIS) that will make systems integration and data sharing significantly easier to achieve. This is because the newer systems are typically built on web-based platforms, are typically compliant with standard data sets, and have enhanced operability with web services and other networking tools, such as email and text messaging. Advocacy begins with organizational cohesion, across the city and county stakeholders.

1.1 Form a Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) steering committee
1.2 Develop master agreements between agencies and courts to define data ownership, sharing, and confidentiality rules, and standards for terminology and data.
1.3 Advocate for FullCourt Enterprise as soon as possible
1.4 Leverage the full capacity of FullCourt
1.5 Broaden use of JustWare to leverage full functionality
1.6 Expand WatchGuard functionality and capacity
1.7 Advocate and support OMIS implementation
1.8 Automate numerous Excel tools
1.9 Encourage all service providers to use the CONNECT Referral System

2.0 **Electronically share data for simple integration touchpoints (Years 1-2)**

These are integrations that are easy-to-achieve and will help reduce duplicate data entry and reduce errors and cost. Key integration touchpoints (ITP) that can be automated are characterized by targeted information between two agencies/courts that will likely not be included an e-filing implementation by the OCA. In addition, these opportunities may include the use of email and document exchanges that include smart forms that are easily imported without having to build an application program interface (API). Easy-to-achieve integrations include the following:

ITP 2.4 Booking - Smart form booking sheet
ITP 2.5 Affidavit (Complaint) - Smart form booking sheet
ITP 2.7 Evidence - Evidence repository
ITP 4.1 Case data/documentary evidence - Evidence repository
ITP 5.1 PSA and recommendations – Existing AutoMon EDI
ITP 5.2 Supervision reports – Existing AutoMon EDI
ITP 5.1 and 5.2 are closely related to efforts identified in global recommendation 1.0. The state owns both the AutoMon and FullCourt systems. Pretrial Services in Lewis and Clark County can lead this effort by building and demonstrating the use of smart forms that would easily adapt into both FullCourt and the AutoMon application.

### Phase 3 – Years Three to Five (2-5)

#### 3.0 Develop a shared criminal justice information system (CJIS) platform (Years 2-5)

Systems integration platforms combine web services, application programming interfaces (APIs), and data mapping to share data across an enterprise. The project should be structured using agile and incremental development to reduce risk and to amortize cost.

Every integration touchpoint is an opportunity to build an electronic data interchange (EDI). Historically, many networked organizations have built complex, point-to-point exchanges of targeted data sets. Managing these interfaces is both complex and cumbersome. This global recommendation is designed to provide a CJIS platform that can grow component data sets that can be shared across multiple justice system stakeholders. The lead data set, identified as the pilot, is Persons or person identifiers. The unique characteristics of this data set are its utility to almost any function in city and county government, as a repository for many different types of applications.

Recommended steps include the following:

**3.1 Develop detailed functional and technical specifications**, including the adoption of data standards and definitions and a systems integration platform. Data definitions should at a minimum leverage NIEM XML standards for justice. Functional and technical specifications should be written by a separate contractor than the developer. If a developer turnkey solution is sought, critical oversight measures and regulations must limit scope creep. (Year 1)

**3.2 Secure a developer** with specific expertise using the specified systems integration platform. Mobilize a stakeholder team with a city/county lead to work with the developer throughout the process. The stakeholder team should include technical specialists from ITSD and representatives from all criminal justice stakeholders. (Year 2)

**3.3 Build a systems integration application and database**, using a single data set, Person Identifiers (IDs), as an integration pilot. A Person ID database would be developed as a single source for all city/county applications with potential for single-source logins, including levels for professional, and personal access. The challenge of Person IDs will be to craft a toolkit to match persons using other identifiers and aliases and to build rules about incident or case-level information, as a subset of ongoing or future IDs for each person. The public sector business model will seek a commitment from each local agency to integrate applications with a Person ID.

---

13 A number of jurisdictions have built a Persons ID database that is used by all city/county applications. Gwinnett County, Georgia, built a separate Persons ID database in the early 2000’s, managed and controlled by the county IT department. The database includes the ability to build aliases and other identifiers and to also associate specific incident, case, or transaction IDs with an individual.

14 Many systems integration platforms are available. The primary distinctions are between proprietary and independent or open source systems. Open source systems are the cheapest initially, but the life cycle costs are extremely high, largely because the city/county will need to develop ITSD technical expertise. Proprietary systems include BizTalk Server (Microsoft), Oracle GoldenGate, and IBM InfoSphere. Note that Microsoft SQL includes an integrator suite in the database platform. Independent or open source applications include Starfish ETL and Cleo.
database. State applications (Montana Highway Patrol, courts, and probation) would be invited to integrate applications through the CJIS platform. As the integrated platform grows, the source of most defendant and e-filing (e.g. e-citations) data will be from the CJIS. (Year 3)

### 3.4 Build incremental integrations

Over a multi-year period to include the following data sets, each with its own set of rules and restrictions about ownership, sharing and use of information. A significant hurdle for this step is data and information from state systems, including FullCourt or FullCourt Enterprise (future) at the Office of Court Administration. While FullCourt Enterprise will include e-filing, the timeliness and level of data will be critical to city/county goals. These factors include almost real-time data (each evening) and the transmission of defendant and case data beyond electronic documents (e.g. paper orders or notices without smart data). (Years 4-5)

- **Case data:** defendant, charges, shared booking data.
- **Bond and release data**
- **Evidence:** Consistent with the existing WatchGuard platform, evidence will be highly restricted and targeted to police, prosecutor, and defense requirements. Digital data should still reside on the WatchGuard platform, but could be embedded in a restricted evidence portal.
- **Shared calendars:** primarily the court calendar, with targeted shared (agency/service providers/defendant) calendars for pretrial supervision and probation
- **Bench warrants and detainers**
- **Disposition data, including acquittals, dismissals, and sanctions – incarceration, probation, alternative sanctions, fines, and fees, and conditions of release**
- **Probation and supervision data**

### 3.5 Build attorney and defendant portals

Integrated data will enable the implementation of attorney and litigant portals to push calendars, hearing notices, orders, obligations, and other key case-level information to attorneys and their clients.\(^{15}\)

**Phase 4 – Years Four to Six (4-6)**

### 4.0 Develop and build a data warehouse for reporting and managing information (Years 4-6)

A data warehouse is a database that has been configured to produce management reports. Management reports are often used to report on outcome measures that are pre-determined by the stakeholder agencies and courts, or they are used to provide working tools to decision-makers and practitioners about their cases and workload. The latter objective provides a powerful link between outcome measures and the decisions that judges, attorneys, and law enforcement make on cases for which they are responsible. A shared CJIS database in combination with a data warehouse will enable reports to be built specifically associated with the workload of each decision-maker or user of the system. Recommended steps include the following:

\(^{15}\) The County Commissioners Association of Pennsylvania has built a system using this model, including the integration of nightly hearing and disposition data from the Administrative Office of the Pennsylvania Courts, and the enabling of defendant portals across multiple cases and obligations. See [https://www.pacounties.org/TechnologyServices/UCM/Pages/default.aspx](https://www.pacounties.org/TechnologyServices/UCM/Pages/default.aspx).
4.1 Establish outcome measures useful to each stakeholder.

4.2 Build requirements for production and management reports (dashboards) customized for each stakeholder and agreements about the type and use of public-facing dashboards.

4.3 Engage a developer to build a data warehouse and to map, design, and build reports using the shared CJIS database.

4.4 Build primary production and workload reports initially. Use reports to refine and inform existing applications and data entry.

4.5 Build outcome reports based on performance measures, both internal and public-facing.

A template for judicial decision-making is illustrated below. In addition, some jurisdictions are also linking both justice system and community data produced by law enforcement and health and human services agencies. These data are not linked to individual patient-level data. Examples are illustrated below.

Table 3.1 – Template for Case-Based Management Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases and Workload</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Pending Cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Active Pending Cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Filings &amp; Dispositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to Disposition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pretrial Decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond Ordered and Revoked by Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defendants in Jail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defendants Diverted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Events Per Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Trial Settings Per Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Continuances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detail of Continuances by Reason</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanctions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fines &amp; Fees Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fines &amp; Fees Detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail as a Sanction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16 See Allegheny County (Pittsburgh), Pennsylvania. [https://www.alleghenycountyanalytics.us/](https://www.alleghenycountyanalytics.us/).
Probation as a Sanction
Violations of Probation

**Outcomes & Causes – Public Facing Dashboard**
Recidivism Rates - All Cases
Specialty Court Recidivism
Poverty - Indigent Defendants
Homelessness & Criminal Justice
Mental Health & Criminal Justice
Substance Abuse and Criminal Justice

**Implementation Schedule**

The following schedule assumes implementation phases that overlap, build on prior work, and are designed to be agile and grow over time. The integration tool should be sufficiently robust and simple to use that the county should develop the capacity to add data interchanges without extensive technical assistance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>One</th>
<th>Two</th>
<th>Three</th>
<th>Four</th>
<th>Five</th>
<th>Six</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Build capacity with existing systems and opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Electronically share data for simple integration touchpoints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Develop a shared criminal justice information system (CJIS) platform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop detailed functional and technical specifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hire a developer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Build a systems integration application and database (pilot)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Build incremental integrations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Develop and build a data warehouse for management information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish outcome measures useful to each stakeholder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Build requirements for production and management reports (dashboards)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engage a developer to build a data warehouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Build primary production and workload reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Build outcome reports based on performance measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cost Ranges**

The estimated cost ranges for the project are based on a number of optional strategies. Due to scope limitations, these costs are based on a 2012 study that was conducted for Clayton County, GA, for a very similar project. The full study is available upon request.
The Justice Management Institute (JMI) project team recommends that the first step in the development of a CJIS system is to build a database and web services to enable networked linkage to systems and applications and to enable web-based applications built directly on CJIS.¹⁷

**What Web Services Are, Why Web Services**

Web services are a communication method between two different systems or devices, which uses the language XML (extended markup language) to exchange data. Web services are a type of software that runs over the web, using a Remote Procedure Call (RPC).

A server, where the web services are made available, publishes the messages and the expected structure. The client (the remote system or device) encodes a request using the structure previously agreed, and sends the request over the web to the running server. In return, the server after processing the request, encodes an XML message with the answer.

The following are the advantages of web services:
- Low cost to implement, utilizing existing Web infrastructures better;
- It has an open standard architecture for linking different applications types on different servers;
- It doesn't require proprietary tools, software or code for implementation;
- More support is available from vendors in tooling and runtime environments;
- It connects applications written in different languages easily; and
- It saves money in development/maintenance by promoting application reuse.

The disadvantages of setting up the web services layer are not many. One disadvantage is that the performance might be slightly lower than integrating point-to-point. But point to point integration cannot even be considered, as CJIS will have to integrate with different systems and be available to the public. This means that the performance of the web services framework must/should be considered when designing it.

The following is an illustration of a request exchanged between a client and a server:

---

¹⁷ CJIS is an industry acronym for Criminal Justice Information System.
Step 1

Public

WEB

File Complaint XML Message

<Message>
  <operations>New Case</operations>
  <case_type/>
  <participants/>
  <pleadings/>
  <attachments/>
</Message>

Server

Step 2

Server

Create Case on CJIS

Receive Request

Returns Request

Step 3

Server

Public

WEB

HTTP Message

<Message>
  <case_number>0014758</case_number>
  <error_code>Success</error_code>
</Message>
Web Services Approach for Lewis and Clark County

While outlining and designing the architecture for Lewis and Clark County, the following keywords should frame the discussion:

**Adequate flexibility**
The key to a flexible, yet, efficient system is to clearly distinguish between what needs to be flexible, and what needs to be written on stone. If all functionalities are flexible, the system will be more open to human errors, and less efficient. Nevertheless, working with the public, and especially with the law, involves many manual decisions, and the system should never block an end user.

**Adaptability**
Adaptability refers to the use of standards and non-proprietary systems. This will allow the county to communicate, integrate and operate with a wider range of applications and external systems. This will also allow the county to add new internal applications that can easily be integrated in the new framework, as long as the new applications also adopt the standards.

**Non-disruption of the current operations/functionalities**
When creating new functionalities, replacing existing ones on CJIS, or integrating with external systems, the impact on the public and on internal operations must be minimized. This means that it must at times be considered to have two systems in parallel, or keep some manual operations, during a time frame where the new functionalities are being completely stabilized. Also sometimes it might be considered to deploy in production small sets of functionalities (pilot projects) to allow the public and county end users to adjust.

**Scalability**
The recommended immediate road map for Clayton County includes E-Filing, law enforcement integration, Plea Application, and ADR Application. For sure the near future will bring new demands, preparing the current system architecture to grow, both in quality and in number of end users/operations; it is very important.

In sum, building web services on top of the CJIS system will ensure:
- Adaptability, as it will enable CJIS to integrate and grow;
- Non disruption, as all the current functionalities won’t be affected; and
- Scalability, as long as a proper framework is used

Adequate flexibility should be guaranteed through the end user applications, and visible in the new process designs.

**Budget**
The budget is always the main driver when choosing tools and a strategy on how to improve current systems and processes. Although budgets can be seen as a limitation, they also guarantee a pursuit of efficiency.

Based on initial price, many organizations opt for open source solutions, but we must highlight the following:
• Open source solutions have a quite a few hidden costs: more time of development, more resources required;
• For open source, maintenance for the following years can become expensive, even as expensive as the project first year, if many updates, small changes, small new requests are expected in the coming years;
• For open source, always look for open source versions that guarantee support, or even offer expert services (this usually means an annual fee);
• Open source solutions tend to demand better and more expensive hardware, and usually performance is unpredictable and highly dependent on the developer. Generally, proprietary software performance is proven or demonstrable a priori;
• For open source, the upgrades and patches can become a maintenance nightmare, requiring existing developments and customizations to be re-written, modified, code to be re-written and retested;
• Several researchers and studies claim that free products can cost more during a three-to five-year period than proprietary software;

The studies that defend proprietary software always extend their analyses for a period of 5 years. On the opposite side, the open source software only shows the Total Cost Ownership (TCO)\(^\text{18}\) for a period of two years, to show the immediate cost, and to show that for the first two years open source is less expensive.

The evidence and data confirm that in the long run, certainly after 5 years, proprietary software becomes cheaper than open source. This would be true if the reality was that simple, but it never is. And the reality, variables and particularities of each organization are the ones that should determine the choice and how much money it is worthwhile to invest.

These studies tend to focus on the price of the software as if they were directly comparable, but this is not completely true. The proprietary software vendors know that the price is where the clients start from, and that’s why they invest in comparing the TCO\(^\text{19}\) of the software on the long run, but in fact, the proprietary software is more expensive in the short term because you are actually buying more: more functionalities out-of-the-box, more support, more performance, more stability, less variables for the client, and more confidence in the long run.

As an example, three comparable options are IBM Web Sphere (highest cost), JBoss (lowest proprietary cost) and Tom Cat (free). IBM Web Sphere is the most expensive of all, but it is the one that offers more functionality out-of-the-box. JBoss (now called WildFly) is the least expensive proprietary software, but one that offers the least functionality. Tom Cat is completely free, but additional costs result from the people and effort required to implement the system.

\(^{18}\text{Total Cost of Ownership (TCO)}\): is a financial estimate whose purpose is to help consumers and enterprise managers determine direct and indirect costs of a product or system. It should include: network required costs, opportunity costs, downtime costs, hardware, software, upgrades, development, maintenance, risks, warranties, and all other costs directly or indirectly related with the new system.
\(^{19}\text{IBID.}\)
In sum, the key is to understand:

1. Is the tool within a client budget?
2. How much will it cost to develop the features needed by Lewis and Clark County not offered by the tool?
3. How much it will cost to maintain the adopted software?
4. How many people and how do the required skills cost?
5. What are the risks involved, if open source is adopted, and how much it will cost to minimize the risks?

Please find below comparison tables for the prices of the software, prepared/sponsored by one non-free vendor. The study is defended by Oracle, comparing Web Logic with JBoss (now called WildFly) over Five Years\(^{20}\) The study also does not specify the number and complexity of data interchanges, but is a representative example.


"Cost of Ownership Analysis" - this paper was released by Oracle.
### Appendix 1 – Study Participants

#### Pretrial Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kellie McBride</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Lewis and Clark County, Department of Criminal Justice Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria Soja</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Lewis and Clark County, Department of Criminal Justice Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### County IT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Pembroke</td>
<td>Director of Information Technology &amp; Services</td>
<td>Lewis and Clark County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Law Enforcement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steven Hagen</td>
<td>Assistant Chief of Police</td>
<td>Helena Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott O’Connell</td>
<td>Public Safety Systems Administrator</td>
<td>Helena Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Knapp</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>Montana Highway Patrol</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### First Judicial District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike Menahan</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>District Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angie Sparks</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>District Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Kallio</td>
<td>Deputy Clerk</td>
<td>District Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael G. Swingley</td>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Justice Court</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Attorneys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leo Gallagher</td>
<td>County Attorney</td>
<td>Lewis and Clark County Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Jodoin</td>
<td>City Attorney</td>
<td>Helena City Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Seburn</td>
<td>Regional Deputy Public Defender</td>
<td>Office of the Public Defender, Region 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandy Morrison</td>
<td>Office Manager</td>
<td>Office of the Public Defender, Region 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Detention Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alan Hughes</td>
<td>Jail Captain</td>
<td>Lewis and Clark Sheriff’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn Wittmer</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>Lewis and Clark Sheriff’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clair Swain</td>
<td>Detention Sergeant</td>
<td>Lewis and Clark Sheriff’s Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Department of Corrections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jason Nelson</td>
<td>Development Bureau Chief</td>
<td>Information Technology Division</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Lewis and Clark County Criminal Justice System**

**Data Sharing and Reporting Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ryan Johns</th>
<th>Software Developer</th>
<th>Information Technology Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christin Thennis</td>
<td>Chief Adult Probation Officer</td>
<td>Probation and Parole Division, Region II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Service Providers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Megan Grotzke</th>
<th>Referral Coordinator</th>
<th>Lewis and County Public Health Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brandy Vail</td>
<td>Clinical Supervisor</td>
<td>Western Montana Mental and Journey Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Belling</td>
<td>Executive Assistant</td>
<td>St. Peter Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Tenney</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Boyd Andrew</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**County Commission**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Andy Hunthausen</th>
<th>Commission Chair</th>
<th>Lewis and Clark County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Citizens Advisory Council***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curt Chisholm</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Lewis and Clark County, Citizens Advisory Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*The JMI study team also presented to and met with members of the Citizens Advisory Council and Criminal Justice Coordinating Council, who are not represented in the list above.*
# Appendix 2 – Data Integration Touchpoints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Datasets</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Integration Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1.0</strong> Response - Dispatch and Field Reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ITP 1.1</td>
<td>Defendants on probation</td>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>HPD/Sheriff</td>
<td>MS Word/PDF/email</td>
<td>Paper/fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ITP 1.2</td>
<td>Criminal history</td>
<td>MBCC</td>
<td>MHP</td>
<td>SmartCOP</td>
<td>Application/dispatch bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ITP 1.3</td>
<td>Warrants and detainers (MT + surrounding states)</td>
<td>MBCC</td>
<td>HPD/Sheriff</td>
<td>Northstar CAD</td>
<td>Application/dispatch bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ITP 1.4</td>
<td>Warrants and detainers (MT + surrounding states)</td>
<td>MBCC</td>
<td>MHP</td>
<td>SmartCOP</td>
<td>Application/dispatch bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ITP 1.5</td>
<td>Warrants and detainers (national)</td>
<td>NCIC</td>
<td>HPD/Sheriff</td>
<td>Northstar CAD</td>
<td>Application/dispatch bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ITP 1.6</td>
<td>Warrants and detainers (national)</td>
<td>NCIC</td>
<td>MHP</td>
<td>SmartCOP</td>
<td>Application/dispatch bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2.0</strong> Law Enforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ITP 2.1</td>
<td>Notice to appear</td>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>Municipal Court</td>
<td>MS Word</td>
<td>Paper/fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Justice Court</td>
<td>partial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>District Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ITP 2.2</td>
<td>Search/arrest warrants</td>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>Municipal Court</td>
<td>Secure Warrant</td>
<td>Telephonic/fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Justice Court</td>
<td>future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>District Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ITP 2.3</td>
<td>Citations</td>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>City Attorney</td>
<td>DigiTICKET - Full Court</td>
<td>Data integration/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>District Attorney</td>
<td>partial</td>
<td>paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Municipal Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Justice Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ITP 2.4</td>
<td>Booking</td>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>Detention Center</td>
<td>Excel/OMS</td>
<td>Paper/data entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Datasets</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Integration Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ITP 2.5</td>
<td>Affidavits</td>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>City Attorney</td>
<td>RMS – booking sheet</td>
<td>Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County Attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Municipal Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>District Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ITP 2.6</td>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>City Attorney</td>
<td>MS Word</td>
<td>Paper/manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County Attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ITP 2.7</td>
<td>Audio-video evidence</td>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>City Attorney</td>
<td>WatchGuard</td>
<td>Digital cloud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County Attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.0 Prosecution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Datasets</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Integration Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ITP 3.1</td>
<td>Charging/information</td>
<td>City Attorney</td>
<td>Municipal Court</td>
<td>FullCase/MS Word</td>
<td>Hardcopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County Attorney</td>
<td>District Court</td>
<td>JustWare/MS Word</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>ITP 3.2</td>
<td>Discovery</td>
<td>City Attorney</td>
<td>Defense Counsel</td>
<td>FullCase/MS Word</td>
<td>Hardcopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County Attorney</td>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>JustWare/MS Word</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>ITP 3.3</td>
<td>Audio-video evidence</td>
<td>City Attorney</td>
<td>Defense Counsel</td>
<td>WatchGuard</td>
<td>Email/Cloud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County Attorney</td>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>ITP 3.4</td>
<td>Subpoenas</td>
<td>City Attorney</td>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>Adobe PDF</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County Attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>ITP 3.5</td>
<td>Plea negotiation</td>
<td>City Attorney</td>
<td>Defense Counsel</td>
<td>FullCase/MS Word</td>
<td>Oral/hardcopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County Attorney</td>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>JustWare/MS Word</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>ITP 3.6</td>
<td>Pleadings/motions</td>
<td>City Attorney</td>
<td>Municipal Court</td>
<td>FullCase/MS Word</td>
<td>Oral/hardcopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County Attorney</td>
<td>District Court</td>
<td>JustWare/MS Word</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ITP 3.7</td>
<td>Plea offer</td>
<td>City Attorney</td>
<td>Municipal Court</td>
<td>FullCase/MS Word</td>
<td>Oral/hardcopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County Attorney</td>
<td>District Court</td>
<td>JustWare/MS Word</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.0 Defense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Datasets</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Integration Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>ITP 4.1</td>
<td>Case data/documentary</td>
<td>Defense Counsel</td>
<td>City Attorney</td>
<td>Case files</td>
<td>Hardcopy/digital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>evidence</td>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>County Attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td>storage media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Datasets</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Integration Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>ITP 4.2</td>
<td>Pleadings/motions (e-filing)</td>
<td>Defense Counsel Public Defender</td>
<td>Municipal Court Justice Court District Court</td>
<td>JustWare/case files</td>
<td>Hardcopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>ITP 5.1</td>
<td>PSA and recommendations</td>
<td>Pretrial</td>
<td>Municipal Court Justice Court District Court</td>
<td>AutoMon report</td>
<td>Hardcopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>ITP 5.2</td>
<td>Supervision reports</td>
<td>Pretrial</td>
<td>Municipal Court Justice Court District Court</td>
<td>AutoMon report</td>
<td>Hardcopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>ITP 6.1</td>
<td>Hearings and notices</td>
<td>Municipal Court Justice Court District Court</td>
<td>Prosecutors Defense Litigants Pretrial Services Probation</td>
<td>FullCourt</td>
<td>Hardcopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>ITP 6.2</td>
<td>Appointment of attorney</td>
<td>Municipal Court Justice Court District Court</td>
<td>Public Defender Defense Counsel</td>
<td>FullCourt</td>
<td>Hardcopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>ITP 6.3</td>
<td>Supervision orders</td>
<td>Municipal Court Justice Court District Court</td>
<td>Pretrial Services</td>
<td>FullCourt</td>
<td>Hardcopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>ITP 6.4</td>
<td>Orders/Judgments</td>
<td>Municipal Court Justice Court District Court</td>
<td>Prosecutors Defense Litigants Pretrial Services Probation</td>
<td>FullCourt</td>
<td>Hardcopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>ITP 6.5</td>
<td>Bench warrants/detainers</td>
<td>Municipal Court Justice Court District Court</td>
<td>MBCC</td>
<td>FullCourt</td>
<td>Reentry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Datasets</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Integration Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>ITP 6.6</td>
<td>Commitment/release orders</td>
<td>Municipal Court Justice Court District Court</td>
<td>Detention Center</td>
<td>FullCourt</td>
<td>Hardcopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>ITP 6.7</td>
<td>Probation orders</td>
<td>Municipal Court Justice Court District Court</td>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>FullCourt</td>
<td>Hardcopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>ITP 6.8</td>
<td>Final judgments</td>
<td>Municipal Court Justice Court District Court</td>
<td>MBCC</td>
<td>FullCourt</td>
<td>Reentry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.0 Enforcement Detention

| 31 | ITP 7.1  | Release reports           | Detention Center | Municipal Court Justice Court District Court | OMS | Hardcopy |

### 8.0 Enforcement Supervision

| 32 | ITP 8.1  | Supervision/violations reports | Probation & Parole | Municipal Court Justice Court District Court | OMIS | FullCourt - hardcopy |
Appendix 3 – 1999 County and City Applications Map