

## State of Alaska Strategic Plan, Introduction and Cost/Budget

Reprinted with permission

### STATE OF ALASKA

#### Strategic Plan For Alaska's Criminal Justice

#### Information System Integration

(Version 1.1)

March 16, 1999

Alaska Criminal Justice Information Advisory Board

Ronald L. Otte, Chair

### I. INTRODUCTION

**Alaska needs federal financial assistance totaling approximately \$84 million to build a modern, integrated criminal justice information network that will dramatically improve public safety.**

**Criminal justice, juvenile justice, and social service agencies in Alaska are handicapped** by information systems that are:

- Based on outmoded technology.
- Difficult to use.
- Fragmented instead of integrated.
- Incapable of providing complete, accurate, timely data.

**Alaska's ineffective computer systems and lack of telecommunications infrastructure add to the weight of other burdens** placed on police; prosecutors; public defenders; courts; youth and adult corrections; social workers; and fingerprint, photo, and criminal history processors:

- Growing caseloads.
- State and federal mandates for more and better record keeping.
- Geographic barriers.

**Public safety and government efficiency are sacrificed when public servants are unable to rely on information systems to support critical decision-making needs.** Policy makers lack access to reliable data and statistics on which to measure the effectiveness of laws, policies, and programs. Scarce human resources are wasted on repetitive tasks that could be automated or eliminated - duplicate data entry, paper pushing, and manual research and correction of erroneous data. Alaska cannot afford to continue diverting its criminal and juvenile justice professionals from direct services to record-keeping tasks that can be done more efficiently by an integrated network of computers.

**Alaska began planning for an integrated criminal justice information system more than 5 years ago.**

Alaska's criminal justice community has laid an excellent foundation for this project by accomplishing the following steps with an investment of over \$14 million:

- Adopted model criminal justice information legislation.
- Convened a multijurisdictional policy oversight committee.
- Written needs assessments and strategic plans for some agencies.
- Upgraded basic infrastructure (workstations and network connections) for some agencies.

## Appendix B. Examples

---

- Migrated to modern fingerprint processing technology that meets national standards.
- Began replacing its correctional offender tracking system.
- Began replacing its state prosecutor case management system.
- Reached consensus on data exchange standards for criminal history record information.
- Implemented interface software allowing the largest law enforcement agency (the Anchorage Police Department) to seamlessly connect to the state's criminal history application and gateway to the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI's) national databases.

This paper articulates a strategic plan consisting of seven initiatives for successful completion of Alaska's integrated justice information system:

**Initiative 1 - Maintain multijurisdictional governance and establish a project management structure.**

**Initiative 2 - Enhance criminal justice information laws, policies, and procedures.**

**Initiative 3 - Establish technical architecture, direction, and standards.**

**Initiative 4 - Provide basic infrastructure.**

**Initiative 5 - Implement mission-critical applications for all agencies.**

**Initiative 6 - Implement automated data exchanges.**

**Initiative 7 - Develop training and technical support systems.**

## II. COST/BUDGET

### BJIS Update, Summer 1999

Reprinted with permission

### JNET Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Justice Network, Press Release, June 7, 1999

Reprinted with permission

Complete text of Press Release follows

Governor Ridge Names Savidge As Justice Network Executive Director

Office of Administration Commonwealth News Bureau Room 308, Main Capitol Harrisburg, PA 17120

HARRISBURG (June 7) R Gov. Tom Ridge today announced that he has appointed Terrill J. Savidge of Camp Hill, Cumberland County, as executive director of the Justice Network (JNET).

The JNET program uses information technology to allow criminal justice organizations across Pennsylvania to more easily share electronic information. The Justice Network, which grew out of Gov. Ridge's 1995 Special Session on Crime, currently is in the early stages of implementation.

"Terri Savidge has a proven track record of using technology to help state agencies improve their delivery of public services," Gov. Ridge said. "Her experience will be invaluable as we continue to build out the Justice Network and deploy technologies to help our criminal justice agencies keep Pennsylvania communities safe."

Savidge has 15 years of experience in information technology, taking on increasing levels of responsibility while working for three state agencies: the Public Utility Commission; the Public School Employees' Retirement System; and the Health Department. She also has worked in the private sector for Computer Resource Associates Inc. in Cumberland County.

During the past two years, Savidge worked as director of the Health Department's State Center for Health Statistics and Research. In that position, she led the design and development of local- and wide-area computer networks, interconnecting state health offices. She also worked on the department's Year 2000 computer preparations.

The Ridge Administration's JNET program is one of the most comprehensive statewide integrated criminal justice initiatives in the nation. It was conceived to overcome the challenge of sharing information between Pennsylvania criminal justice organizations that use different computer systems.

By making it possible for these groups to more easily share electronic data, information on criminal suspects and offenders will not have to be entered repeatedly into separate computer databases by police, court, and probation and parole officers. This will help speed up the processing of criminal cases and reduce costs by eliminating duplicative data entry.

Also, the sharing of information will improve the ability of public safety agencies to track potentially dangerous individuals. The five primary data repositories incorporated into the JNET system will be maintained by the Pennsylvania State Police; the Department of Corrections; the Administrative Office of the Pennsylvania Courts; the Juvenile Court Judges' Commission; and the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole.

In her position as executive director of the JNET office, Savidge will work with both the JNET Executive Council and JNET Steering Committee to ensure that the Justice Network meets its public safety objectives and implementation timeline.

The 1999-2000 state budget, which Gov. Ridge signed in May, includes \$9.3 million for JNET.

Contact: Scott Elliott (717) 772-4237 [selliott@oa.state.pa.us](mailto:selliott@oa.state.pa.us)

1999 Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Justice Network

## Minneapolis Star Tribune Opinion Editorial, September 24, 1999

Reprinted with permission of **Star Tribune**

### **Commentary: Closing this gap could save lives**

**Amy Klobuchar**

On Sept. 25 two years ago, 48-year-old Ilka Mondane was shot and killed outside her home in south Minneapolis by her ex-husband, Douglas Welch. At the time of the murder, he was out on bail after having pleaded guilty just a few weeks earlier to being a felon in possession of a gun. This gun crime carried a mandatory minimum prison sentence of 18 months (it's now five years). But the judge reduced Welch's bail to \$5,000 until his formal sentencing on the gun crime, and Welch was out on the street. Soon after his release, he murdered his ex-wife.

Unknown to the judge and the prosecutor were several important facts about Welch. Only a month earlier, he had been arrested (but not charged) for domestic assault against a girlfriend. And just a few years earlier, another girlfriend had filed a court order for protection against him because he had threatened to shoot her.

Afterward, the judge said that if he had known these facts, he never would have considered reducing Welch's bail. Based on the information available to him, the judge believed that Welch's gun possession case was an isolated incident.

This tragic story highlights the literally life-or-death consequences that can result from the serious information gaps in our criminal justice system. These gaps are caused by the multiple, often incompatible computer systems used by the 1,000 law enforcement and criminal justice agencies throughout the state. The gaps are further compounded by poor, unwieldy access to the limited information that is available.

Fortunately, there is now greater awareness and concern that something must be done because these information gaps are undermining the efficiency and accountability of the criminal justice system, while also endangering public safety.

## Appendix B. Examples

---

The dimensions of this challenge should not be underestimated. The volumes of data - from police investigation and arrest through prosecution and court disposition to incarceration and probation - are staggering.

Each year, for example, our office alone files 7,000 adult felony charges, while 45 separate municipalities in the county charge thousands of adult misdemeanor crimes. Our juvenile prosecution division charges more than 7,000 misdemeanor and felony cases each year, while also handling 12,000 lower-level juvenile cases.

What we know about the past records of people who commit crimes is very important to protecting public safety and ensuring the fair administration of justice. Judges, prosecutors and others in the criminal justice system are making fateful decisions every day about people's lives with information that we know is often sadly incomplete.

Indeed, our gaps in information are sometimes more like grand canyons. For example, Minnesota does not have a statewide database of people on probation. Nor do we have a statewide system to track misdemeanor offenders. Sometimes, our prosecutors must literally call around to local police departments to find out if defendants have misdemeanor records in other communities where they have lived.

Criminals freely cross city, county and state lines all the time. Our information about criminals needs to do the same.

The lack of comprehensive information on misdemeanor offenders and individuals on probation is a special concern because serious criminals often start out committing lower-level offenses. They can reoffend again and again, in different jurisdictions, while escaping serious attention.

There are now serious planning efforts underway to improve information access, most notably with planning for a statewide criminal justice information system. The Legislature and the governor have encouraged innovative ideas across the state. In Hennepin County, the state and the County Board are already funding a pilot project. The purpose is not to build a whole new system, but to focus on "skyways" connecting different computer systems, just as corporations do when they merge with other corporations.

In addition, a plan is underway in Hennepin County to create a countywide juvenile database. This initiative will encourage information-sharing among the county's 37 police departments and 17 school districts, as well as the County Attorney's Office, Juvenile Court, Child Protection, Probation, the Juvenile Detention Center and the County Home School. The juvenile courtrooms would be rewired to provide judges, prosecutors and defense attorneys with immediate, user-friendly access to information about offenders. Schools, human service agencies and child protection workers could also have access to more information. Keeping children in school is a top priority for our county, as well as for our schools. Real-time access and monitoring of attendance records is a key to accomplishing this goal.

Any effort that aims to integrate information from the squad car to the Supreme Court will have its work cut out for it. Implementing these plans in Hennepin County and beyond will take much expertise and a serious financial commitment. Certainly no county can do it alone, and even the state could use some help. We welcome the interest and support of Minnesota HEALS and the Minnesota Business Partnership. These corporations know how to use the enormous information-sharing capabilities of computers to enhance productivity and strengthen accountability.

The challenge is neither simply collecting more data for the sake of it, nor buying fancy new technology to store the data. The real challenge is to make sure that more complete, timely information is actually being used by the criminal justice system for the important decisions that shape people's lives and the safety of our communities.

If the information gaps had been closed two years ago, Ilka Mondane might very well be alive today.

- Amy Klobuchar is Hennepin County attorney.

Copyright 1999 Star Tribune. All rights reserved.

## "Integrated Law Enforcement" by M.J. Carraway and L.C. Miller"

Integrated Law Enforcement

Reprinted with permission of Indiana State Police

**"You mean they are not doing it now?"**

by: Melvin J. Carraway and Lester C. Miller

## Appendix B. Examples

---

Lawrenceburg Police Department Detective Stephanie Madrill had just returned from the scene of a drug-related homicide. It was a professional job-single 9 mm bullet to the side of the head, hands and feet ty-wrapped together behind victim's back, a plastic bag believed to have contained cocaine was stuffed in his mouth. The victim was suspected to have been a small time cocaine dealer.

This was not what Detective Madrill had expected to be involved with when she joined the department five years ago. Lawrenceburg had not experienced a drug killing before. She could not draw on departmental experience. Recalling recent training on fighting drugs she had received through the Integrated Law Enforcement Distance Learning Network, she logs on to the Integrated Law Enforcement Intranet and conducts a search of the unsolved crimes MO (modus operandi) database using the unique features of the crime as search terms. She gets three hits-Evansville, Jeffersonville, and Seymour. Each hit has the name of the investigating officer with phone numbers.

Then Detective Madrill searches the Indiana State Police home page looking for background and investigational tips on drug-related homicides. She downloads a five-page guide and notes that there are three references with phone numbers for additional assistance-First Sgt. Jim Lloyd, squad leader for the Indiana State Police homicide squad of the recently formed Bureau of Criminal Investigations, Lt. Chris Battison, Indianapolis Police Department Metro Homicide Task Force, and Special Agent Donna Fleetman, FBI.

Detective Madrill reviews the Indiana State Police guide, reexamines the evidence in light of what the guide says, and makes notes on what further information she needs to obtain. She then contacts the officers in Evansville and Jeffersonville and First Sgt. Lloyd on the interactive video network from a room at the Lawrenceburg campus of Ivy Tech. She shows them pictures of the crime scene using the separate digital camera, which permits zooming in on different sections of the picture and discusses the crime.

All four concur that this crime appears to fit in with the pattern seen at the other two cities and formulate a coordinated plan for tracking down the perpetrators. This includes setting up a public folder for each of them to put in information as well as posting to the Integrated Law Enforcement Council's drug and homicide bulletin board their information with a request for other agencies with similar crimes or tips to contact them. Now, every law enforcement agency in Indiana has been enlisted to help solve Lawrenceburg's homicide.

It was a dark and stormy night. A tornado has hit several cities and towns in north central Indiana. Deputy Sheriff Dan Montgomery of the Marshall County Sheriff's Department is Signal 10 to a nursing home, 10 miles outside Culver, which has been destroyed by the tornado. He is the first to arrive on the scene. A fire has broken out. Trees are blocking the roads and are tossed like match sticks on the rubble of the home. There will be many injuries tonight.

Deputy Sheriff Montgomery gets on his 800 MHz Ericsson radio to call for assistance. The dispatcher contacts: the national guard armory requesting them to provide an engineering

company to help with road clearance to get emergency aid into the home; the Culver and Plymouth Fire Departments to fight the fire and provide ambulance service; the Indiana State Police and the county emergency director. The dispatcher patches the fire departments that use a VHF radio and those state and county agencies that use 800 MHz Motorola radios together.

Now Deputy Sheriff Montgomery is in direct radio contact with the other emergency providers so he can direct them to the site and coordinate the establishment of the response. He gives on the scene accounts to the providers so that they arrive with full knowledge of what to expect- which roads need to be cleared, where the most seriously injured patients are, and what appears to be the cause of the fire. He receives a message on the CDPD laptop in his car from the State Emergency Management Agency Operations Center (EOC) in Indianapolis requesting a picture of the scene so they can evaluate what additional response may be appropriate. Dan takes out his digital camera, shoots a couple of pictures and sends them not only to the EOC but also to the other responders with laptops. Some of them are on CDPD transmission; some use 800 MHz for the transmission. Everyone responding to this disaster gets the picture.

The two scenarios described above could take place today with current technology. There are countless more examples where revamping how law enforcement and public safety agencies can perform their jobs more effectively and efficiently. The concept is called "Integrated Law Enforcement" (ILE). Law enforcement leads the integration effort, but other public safety and, in fact, other governmental agencies will benefit from the concept. This article discusses why it is needed, what integrated law enforcement is, how it can be implemented and what are the impediments to implementation. The public has certain expectations regarding how law enforcement fights crime. When they are informed of this project to integrate law enforcement, one of two responses is

invariably given: "You mean they are not doing it now?" or "Well, it's about time."

### Introduction

The face of crime is changing. It is becoming more violent, and drugs are making it more complicated. At the same time, the public expects all aspects of government, including law enforcement, to be more effective with the resources currently provided. Individual law enforcement agencies will never have all the needed resources to meet these combined demands. Law enforcement simply must change the way it does business.

Presently, there is occasional mutual engagement among the law enforcement community to integrate its services. Unfortunately, it often takes the death of an officer or some unusually high profile event to bring our varied resources together to solve problems. Mostly, law enforcement agencies tend to become isolated. For example, agencies individually purchase computers or radios, computer aided dispatch software, or other technology rather than combining with other agencies to heighten buying power. Or, in instances where specialized services are required, such as a need for qualified underwater search and recovery personnel and equipment, there is no central catalog of information relating to this service or information regarding which law enforcement agencies have it. Also, information is not readily shared because there has been no efficient and cost effective means of doing so. By encouraging the various departments to work together to integrate as many policing functions as possible, the cost of such shared systems can be reduced and specialized services can be shared easily. Such shared and open access by an increased number of departments will enhance overall expertise in crime analysis, problem solving and internal organizational change.

**At the Governor's direction, an initiative was begun to integrate law enforcement services at the state, county, local and federal level. Making this happen requires planning and buying into the concept by the state, county, local and federal law enforcement agencies and elected officials. Fortunately, the U.S. Department of Justice recently awarded the Indiana State Police a \$250,000 grant to help start the integrative process.**

When we duplicate our policing efforts, it is expensive and often unsafe and inefficient. Such examples are numerous and fail to meet the public's expectation for prudent disbursement of their tax dollars. The Indiana State Police and many law enforcement agencies in Indiana have adopted Community Oriented Policing (COP) as their method of operating. COP is designed to have the officer become more involved in the community. The nature of Community Oriented Policing (COP) insists on all segments of the community working together to share resources to solve their mutual problems.

There must be a new paradigm in law enforcement services within Indiana. This new model of law enforcement includes individual agencies continuing to have individual responsibilities, while the work they engage in and the tools available to them will be shared by all participating groups. To illustrate, if a domestic violence case is worked within a city and a case report is generated to reflect pertinent data, another officer in the same jurisdiction will likely not know anything about it. If that same domestic violence incident occurs again and a different agency is called to the scene, the responding officer would benefit from knowing what occurred previously with the other police officer. This type of activity is very common.

The first step in encouraging buy in of ILE has already occurred. The first Governor's Summit on Integrated Law Enforcement was convened on Dec. 8-9, 1997. Sheriffs, police chiefs, town marshals, mayors, county commissioners, and representatives of the FBI, U.S. Customs, state house of representatives, and other governmental agencies came together to learn about the concept and about how technology can help this process. The Integrated Law Enforcement Council, an historic coalition of the major law enforcement associations, sponsored this event.

The focus of the Summit was how Integrated Law Enforcement allows law enforcement agencies across the state voluntarily to share their information and resources to maximize effectiveness and efficiency. This means processes will be changed so that they act in a coordinated manner with technology as the enabler. Those law enforcement agencies that choose to participate will buy radios so they can communicate with one another. They will purchase computers in their agencies and cars so information about a criminal or a crime is available to other agencies around the state. Participants will share their resources, both human, such as detectives or laboratory services, and physical, such as helicopters, to ensure no criminal escapes prosecution.

The benefit of sharing was recently demonstrated in the tragic case of Kelly Eckart, who was murdered recently in Franklin. Both Indiana State Police and Indianapolis Police Department brought in their specialists in homicide investigations, and Indiana State Police provided laboratory and helicopter services. This sharing does not diminish the autonomy of the local agencies but adds capability to the smaller agencies that cannot afford to have

such expertise and resources. In addition, it can bring about significant cost savings through quantity purchases and diminish the administrative burden of purchasing technical equipment, particularly on smaller law enforcement agencies.

One key to making ILE work is the voluntary nature of the concept. No law enforcement agency is going to be forced to join. Each must examine its circumstances, consult with its governing and fiscal bodies, and make a determination if ILE is right for it. Based on the reaction at the Summit, there will be many joining in the process.

### How Does It Work?

Integrated law enforcement has two major components: process and technology. These components interact with each other in a repetitive synergistic manner. Modern integrative processes require new technology to be fully effective. Full utilization of new technology requires a change in the processes of law enforcement. For either to occur, we must change what we train our law enforcement officers to do and how we train them.

### Process Change

When Professor Kenna Davis Quinet, Assistant Professor of Criminology at IUPUI, addressed the Governor's Summit, she asked the question that forms the foundation for the need for change in how law enforcement conducts its business of the assemblage of sheriffs, marshals, and police chiefs: "Does the person sitting next to you have information (or services) to help you do your job better." The answer is "yes," and the participants said so in their response to a questionnaire prepared for the summit.

Tippecanoe County law enforcement understood the answer was "yes" before Dr. Quinet asked it. Two years ago, Tippecanoe County law enforcement changed its processes to improve its fight against drugs. The Tippecanoe Sheriff's Department, Tippecanoe Prosecuting Attorney's Office, Lafayette Police Department, West Lafayette Police Department, Purdue Police Department, and Lafayette Post of the Indiana State Police made an interlocal agreement. This model for ILE contained three unique features: when a drug raid was made, all proceeds went into a common fund for the benefit of all participating agencies regardless of who led the raid; pre-arranged investigative teams in which each agency agreed to provide a certain level of staffing to the team; and total participant access to everyone else's information. They have also gone to a centralized booking procedure. According to Sheriff Murtaugh, the two principles that drove their efforts were: "I can't do it by myself" and "I am here to serve my community."

Perhaps, the overriding process change is the elimination of "turf protection." Tippecanoe County made the change. Who can imagine a public agency agreeing to share its funds with another? Each agency that decides to become a part of this process must examine how it does business and determine if it can share some of its resources in the interest of public safety.

### Technology

As with any organization today, technology is critical to getting the job done. Police technology ranges from DNA analysis to criminal history databases and laptops in cars. Unfortunately, technology is very costly and difficult to buy. Police agencies have been buying cars and guns for a long time; purchasing hardware and software for laptops that go into cars is new. Because technology is expensive it cries out for integration efforts. Rather than every law enforcement paying large sums of money for a new communication system, why not have the agencies pool their resources and build a system that will not only enable them to talk to each other; but also save money by eliminating duplicative aspects of the system?

Many agencies want to purchase laptops for the cars to ease the overloading of voice communications and enable the officers to conduct their own criminal history and vehicle background checks. The literature is saturated with statistical and anecdotal evidence of the value of this tool. The Indiana State Police has been conducting three pilots of new technology: use of a GTE laptop in central Indiana; use of new 800 MHz voice and data communications system from Ericsson in Fort Wayne, and sharing information with Dearborn County Sheriff's Department using a Spillman run data system. This latter pilot has given Indiana State Police access to more than 32,000 names in the Dearborn County database. The pilot was the result of Dearborn County Sheriff Department coming to Indiana State Police and offering access to this information. Troopers who have used the GTE laptops said that, without the laptops, several apprehensions would not have been made. Officers involved in these pilots feel safer due to the presence of the new technology.

The cost of technology can be decreased and its effectiveness increased if proper planning occurs. A strategic plan must be developed that encompasses all of the needs at each level of Indiana government. Subsequently, an information technology architecture needs to be created. Adherence to the architecture will ensure that

agencies will be able to share information with other agencies.

For all this to be done well, a strategic planning and technology consultant must be engaged. This is being done through the Indiana State Police. This consultant will work with federal, local, county and state agencies to determine the status of their technology and their future needs. One police chief at the Summit was elated upon hearing that the Indiana State Police was going to engage such a consultant because he could never have afforded one on his own.

Integration brings significant cost and time savings. As mentioned above, the state's engaging of a consultant will be a great boon to many smaller agencies. In addition, agencies will not have to build and maintain their own communication systems. These can be centrally managed. A significant benefit of integration is that a statewide quantity purchase agreement for hardware and site licenses for software can be negotiated to dramatically lower the acquisition costs. Finally, we often do not consider the opportunity and real costs that the public sector procurement system imposes on all agencies. Integration will dramatically lessen these.

While we hope many agencies will purchase laptops and radio systems that adhere to the architecture, thus allowing them to "talk" to each other in the future, Hoosiers should not have to wait for ILE to take place. Luckily, technology vendors have developed ways for the already purchased systems to talk to each other. In fact, part of the strategic plan includes an analysis of the utility of implementing some of these technology solutions. Undoubtedly, some agencies will decide to acquire this connecting technology.

### Training

The key to instituting this sea change is training. The 11,000 sworn law enforcement officers have worked all their lives in a non-integrative environment. Technology and planning alone will not change the way they conduct their business. This aspect of implementing technology is often overlooked. Rather, everyone must be trained in this technology. This will ensure the technology produces the results for which the agencies paid. To achieve the training necessary, we will use distance learning networks already present or contemplated in Indiana. Indiana is at the leading edge of network development. Such networks have already been built primarily for connecting grade school and high school students. However, the public universities have or are also building significant networks. While there are different networks, they can "talk" to each other as was demonstrated at the Summit when officers in Fort Wayne, Columbus and Indiana conversed with the Summit participants via both Ameritech's and GTE's interactive video network. These will enable not only interactive teaching but also the transmission of documents.

The distance learning networks will save significant amounts of money currently spent on travel, lodging and overtime and will provide more officer time on the job by eliminating the need to travel long distances for specialized and recurrent training. All law enforcement officers are required to have 16 hours of in-service training per year. As a side benefit, law enforcement can provide anti-drug, anti-gang, and other curriculum to students and adults throughout the state.

### Implementation

No state has ever embarked on a vertical integration journey of this nature. However, using technology to break down organizational boundaries is perhaps the most significant trend in government today. The Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University recently held a workshop on this topic. At that workshop, we learned that every level of government is conducting some type of integration process. More than seventy-five percent of the participants reported moderate to significant experience with cross boundary technology projects. However, fifty percent felt that they were still before the knee of the learning curve when it comes to implementing such a project. Thus, there is not an exact road map for this process.

In the current road map established for Indiana Integration, the ILEC will serve as the planning body for implementing ILE. It will oversee the development of the strategic plan and will coordinate with the county, local, federal and state agencies to smooth the transitions and work out the bugs of implementation. We will use the technology consultant to provide the expertise for the technology aspects, but to move ahead will require commitment by the local governments. Governor O'Bannon has already given his commitment, and our technology consultant's strategic vision will identify the steps to be taken which may include implementing legislation. In order to facilitate communication, there will be another summit in late 1998.

### Impediments

**Technology.** The easiest part of implementing will prove to be the technology. Vendors are salivating at the prospect of doing business in Indiana. They understand the power of the ILE concept. Any vendor that is a part of



## Appendix B. Examples

---

the first statewide implementation will have an advantage on the competition when other states decide to adopt ILE which will happen if we are successful.

**Organizational change.** The second most difficult part will be convincing law enforcement to change the way it does business. However, there is hope. The fact that more than 180 law enforcement agencies registered to attend the Summit, and agencies from Dearborn County to Marion County and Indianapolis Police Department offered to share their information with the State Police demonstrates the time is ripe for ILE.

**Funding.** However, even if we can achieve organizational change, we have a very practical need and most difficult problem-money. While budgets are tight, there is money to be found. The federal government is making significant sums available for technology because they realize the benefit. We need to work with the U.S. Department of Justice and Congress to continue funding for these programs.

Community Oriented Policing did not gain wide acceptance in Indiana and other states until federal money was made available based on an agency's commitment to COP. If we can get federal money for ILE, the path will similarly be cleared for acceptance. Agencies will need to reexamine their budgets to see if money allocated for maintenance or acquisition of current technology or for unrelated items such as travel and lodging can be reallocated to integrative technology. Many local governments and the State of Indiana have funds appropriated or planned for appropriation for such items as communications. Pooling of these resources can result in the installation of a system that leads us to integrated law enforcement and brings to fruition the benefits described at the beginning of the article.

We need to look at creative funding mechanisms that eliminate the need for large single appropriations and create a revenue stream for steady funding of communication systems into the future. This would have avoided the immediate problem faced by the state of having to fund an 800 MHz voice communication system whose total infrastructure will cost over \$50 million. The actual funding mechanisms will be worked out over time through the ILEC.

### Conclusion

Madison County Sheriff Scott Mellinger, speaking at the Summit on the challenges of ILE, described the characteristics necessary for adopting ILE-courage and humility. The courage to stand up to years of tradition and resistance to change and the humility to accept that no one person or agency can handle the challenges of law enforcement alone.

We must also put our egos to one side. We take great pride in having our own radio system, data system, and training system. This is an "edifice complex." That is not the best way to fight crime today. The public does not care who owns what technology. They only care about the outcome of our efforts. How have we made it safer for that child to play in the yard in front of his or her house? Have we lowered the fear of a senior citizen walking home from the grocery store? Are there fewer funerals for homicide victims in Indianapolis or Gary? Are we able to get more drunk drivers off the road? What steps are being taken to keep drugs out of our schools? In Superintendent Carraway's 18 years as a law enforcement officer, he has never been asked who owns his radio system.

We must focus on the outcomes, not on outputs. If we do that, agencies across the state will embrace integrated law enforcement, and Indiana will be a safer place in which to live and work.

**Melvin J. Carraway has served for 18 years with and is currently the Superintendent of the Indiana State Police. He holds a Bachelor of Music degree from Heidelberg College. Lester C. Miller is special counsel to the Superintendent of the Indiana State Police. He received his J.D. from Indiana University School of Law in Indianapolis and a Masters in Public Administration from Harvard University.**