

**PUBLIC SAFETY COORDINATING  
COUNCIL**

**DATA STANDARDS COMMITTEE  
REPORT**

**June 26, 1997**

PUBLIC SAFETY COORDINATING COUNCIL  
DATA STANDARDS COMMITTEE  
MEMBERSHIP ROSTER

Michael D. Schrunk, Chair  
Multnomah County District Attorney  
Chief Charles A. Moose, PhD.  
Portland Police Bureau

Sheriff Dan Noelle  
Multnomah County Sheriff's Office  
Don Hargrove

Chief Bernie Giusto  
Gresham Police Department  
Bonnie Brower

Chief Mark Berrest  
Troutdale Police Department  
Barbara Brower

Chief Gil Jackson  
Fairview Police Department  
Sgt. Doug Aden

James D. Hennings, Director  
Metropolitan Public Defender  
Kurtis Ball

Jerome Cooper, Administrator  
Neal Japport  
Ben Beny, CIO  
Multnomah County Information Services Div.  
Steve Baker

Elyse Clawson, Director  
Dept. of Juvenile & Adult Comm. Justice  
Jann Brown  
Cary Harkaway  
Aki Noma

Staff:  
Suzanne Riles  
Public Safety Coordinating Council

Judy Phelan  
District Attorney's Office

Tom Simpson  
District Attorneys Office

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary .....Page 1

Background.....Page 3

Public Safety Bond Technology Program .....Page 4

Policy Recommendations .....Page 7

Data Appropriate for Evaluation.....Page 9

Next Steps.....Page 10

Appendix 1 - Chronology of Data Standards Committee.....Page 12

Appendix 2 - Bond Technology Program Project Criteria .....Page 14

Appendix 3 - Bond Technology Program Proposals.....Page 15

Appendix 4 - The Contracting Process.....Page 17

Appendix 5 - Minutes.....Page 18

Appendix 6 - The Time Frame.....Page 66

## Data Standards Committee Report

### I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

#### **Charge**

The Public Safety Coordinating Council commissioned the Data Standards Committee to meet the following charge:

The Data Standards Committee is responsible for making recommendations, providing guidelines, prioritizing, and monitoring the following:

- Development and implementation of the Public Safety Bond Technology Program;
- Policy recommendations regarding data standards adopted by the PSCC; and,
- That data is appropriate for evaluation.

#### **Action**

The Committee completed its work in the following fashion:

##### 1. Development and Implementation of the Public Safety Bond Technology Program

The first charge -- development and implementation of the Public Safety Bond Technology Program -- was completed by developing criteria, reviewing proposals, and developing recommendations to the PSCC to fund 22 projects from nine Multnomah County public safety agencies, the Evaluation Committee of the PSCC, and Multnomah County Information Services Division. The Bond Technology Program was funded through the Public Safety Bond approved by voters in May, 1996. The 1996 bond issue included \$7.5 million specifically for "computer equipment and technology infrastructure for public safety and criminal records processing and tracking."

##### 2. Development of Policy Recommendations

The second charge—policy recommendations regarding data standards adopted by the PSCC—was met by developing new policy recommendations and reviewing the previously approved recommendations made by the Data Standards Working Group. The Committee determined that two of the Working Group's recommendations were not being accomplished and approved funding from the Bond Technology program to assist with the completion of the recommendations. The completed set of recommendations are included on page 7 of this report.

## Data Standards Committee Report

### 3. Data is appropriate for evaluation

The third charge—to assure data *is* appropriate for evaluation—was the driving force behind the Committee's additional policy recommendation and the funding recommendation for a data warehouse. These two recommendations will move Multnomah County closer to being able to evaluate public safety issues in a timely manner.

#### **Next Steps**

The Committee recommends that an oversight consultant or consulting firm be hired to provide external review and coordination of the many projects funded. Additionally, the Committee recommends the immediate approval of ten projects and the provisional approval of the remaining projects with full funding contingent upon the findings of the consultant's risk assessment report.

## Data Standards Committee Report

### **II. BACKGROUND**

The Data Standards Committee was established by the Public Safety Coordinating Council (PSCC) at their January 10, 1997, meeting and charged with responsibility for making recommendations, providing guidelines, prioritizing, and monitoring the following:

- Development and implementation of the Public Safety Bond Technology Program;
- Policy recommendations regarding data standards adopted by the PSCC; and
- That data is appropriate for evaluation.

The roots for the Data Standards Committee go back to the 1995 Oregon Legislative Session wherein the Local Public Safety Coordinating Councils were established by state statute. Multnomah County's Local PSCC was formed and began operation in November, 1995. Another key action took place six months later with the passage of the Public Safety Bond by Multnomah County voters in May 1996. Included in the Public Safety Bond was the technology program, \$7.5 million for computer equipment and technology infrastructure for public safety and criminal records processing and tracking. Just prior to the passage of the bond the PSCC established a Data Standards Work Group to develop standards and methods for:

1. The consistent collection and reporting of data relevant to the Council's statutory responsibilities and policy concerns;
2. For tracking offenders; and
3. Evaluating the county's criminal justice and corrections program.

Between May and October, 1996 the Data Standards Work Group identified and reviewed basic policy questions focusing on the charge and formulated policy recommendations. These were included in a final report in September 1996 which was submitted to the PSCC in October and reviewed by the group at their November 21, 1996, meeting.

As a result of the Data Standards Working Group's recommendations, the PSCC established two separate committees, the Evaluation Committee and the Data Standards Committee on January 10, 1997. Later in the month the Data Standards Committee commenced a series of meetings to fulfill their three fold charge. Phase one of the Committee's work is completed with this report. A chronology of the Data Standards Committee's work is found in Appendix 1.

### **III. PUBLIC SAFETY BOND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM**

Developing the Public Safety Bond Technology Program was the task that took the greatest amount of the Committee's time. This was due to the desire to carefully construct a program and set of projects which would accomplish both short and long term objectives for agencies and to assure the County tax payers that the funds were being spent wisely. The projects were evaluated using three steps: development of project criteria, a peer review process, and use of an oversight contractor.

#### **Project Criteria**

The first step the Committee took was to establish criteria for the projects to meet. These were developed over the course of three meetings and reviewed at each subsequent meeting. The criteria established by the Committee were:

1. Provide each criminal justice agency the foundation it needs to accomplish its mission to minimize crime as efficiently and effectively as possible and communicate with partner agencies.
2. Ensure that each agency's database is written or moving toward the CJIS standards adopted by the PSCC.
3. Link each agency with the core public safety agencies in Multnomah County. Core public safety agencies include the courts, the Public Defender, the District Attorney, the Department of Juvenile and Adult Community Justice, Multnomah County Sheriff's Office, and all public law enforcement agencies in Multnomah County.
4. Projects with a multi-agency impact will receive priority.

A list of how each proposed project meets the criteria is found in Appendix 2. The projected costs of each project can be found in Appendix 3.

#### **Peer Review**

During the development of the criteria and for the remainder of the Committee's meetings presentations were made by the criminal justice agencies. The presentations were of two types: information gathering and agency proposals. The Committee determined early in its process to schedule some presentations solely to help members learn about certain technologies or issues. Committee members heard about the following issues: data warehousing, internet firewalls and security, the Portland Police Data System (PPDS), and the State of Oregon Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS). In addition briefing materials were distributed including a Bureau of Justice Assistance monograph entitled, "System Integration: Issues Surrounding Integration of County-Level Justice Information Systems."

## Data Standards Committee Report

The agency presentations focused on proposals by criminal justice agencies for funding. They provided an opportunity for members to ask questions and seek clarification of the proposals being made. The Committee received proposals from the following agencies: Multnomah County Sheriff, Gresham Police Department, Multnomah County Juvenile and Adult Community Justice, Multnomah County District Attorney, the Multnomah County Courts, Multnomah County Information Services Division (ISD), Portland Police Bureau, Fairview Police Department, Troutdale Police Department, and the Evaluation Committee of the Public Safety Coordinating Council.

Summaries of the projects reviewed for funding follow:

**Data Standards Committee:** 1. Oversight Consultant.

**Multnomah County Sheriff:** 1. Video conferencing/video arraignment, 2. Automated inmate interview process, 3. Bar coding of inmates, 4. Scheduling program for video conferencing, and 5. Upgrade Kodak imaging system.

**Gresham Police Department:** 1. Court Coordinating System, 2. X-Imaging System (attaching to the Sheriff's system), and 3. Upgrading their records system.

**Multnomah County Courts:** 1. Advanced office automation and groupware.

**Department of Juvenile and Adult Community Justice:** 1. Juvenile Justice Information System and, 2. Adult community justice.

**District Attorney's Office:** 1. PPDS data extract, 2. Juvenile case tracking system, 3. Direct query of mainframe by PC, 4. Improve data transfer from OJIN, and 5. Community court infrastructure.

**Information Services Division:** 1. Data warehouse.

**Metropolitan Public Defender:** 1. Connection to ISD's backbone.

**Evaluation Committee:** 1. Decision Support System.

**Troutdale Police Department:** 1. Police Records Management System.

**Fairview Police Department:** 1. Police Records Interface System.

**Portland Police Bureau:** 1. Laptop MDT/Report Writing Demonstration Project, 2. Equipment for hostage negotiation and computer criminal unit.



## Data Standards Committee Report

### **Oversight Contractor**

The third step in the evaluation of projects is the use of an oversight contractor.

The Committee recognizes the public's heightened awareness of large scale public information systems' failures. In order to help assure the taxpayers of Multnomah County are receiving appropriate value for the commitment they have made with their tax dollars, it is recommended that the County hire an external oversight consultant or consulting firm to provide the following services:

1. Review of proposals to integrate projects and identify opportunities between proposed projects, current city/county/state projects and recommendations about how to tie projects together if possible.
2. Conduct a risk assessment of each of the proposed projects.
3. Identify/quantify ongoing operational costs of proposed systems.
4. Identify potential for technology transfer between agencies and with agencies which are not part of the project.
5. Conduct a post implementation review.
6. Assist agencies in turning proposals into Requests for Proposals.

It is the view of the Committee that these services are an appropriate control and assistance mechanism for the Bond Technology Program and that such an expenditure is a prudent use of bond funds. The consultant would report to the Data Standards Committee in collaboration with the full Public Safety Coordinating Council and Multnomah County Chair's Office.

Data Standards Committee Report  
**IV. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Data Standards Committee also developed policy recommendations for the PSCC. In doing so the Committee built upon the earlier work of the Data Standards Working Group. Of the six Policy Recommendations made by the Working Group on Data Standards, all but two were implemented. Upon review of those recommendations and in response to other issues which arose during committee discussions, the Data Standards Committee recommends approval of the following policies:

**Recommendation 1:** Contracts written with service providers include requirements that appropriate program data is captured and maintained in a manner designated to facilitate data sharing/exchange and evaluation.

**Recommendation 2:** Every database in use by public safety agencies adheres to CJIS standards and identifies defendants by a unique identifier, preferably their SID number, when appropriate and available.

**Recommendation 3:** Ensure that the LPSCC's Data Standards Committee make data easily available for a) evaluation research purposes, and b) broader operational use within the criminal justice system. Due consideration should be given to the following concepts:

1. Client-specific data, including history on individuals that begins from the earliest point possible and can be tracked across all agencies that serve criminal justice clients, should be provided to appropriate researchers.
2. Criminal justice practitioners should be provided with on-line access to operational data that display how past offenders profiled like a current offender have fared after being subjected to the various sentencing choices available. This will allow justice practitioners to track program and sanction performance for various categories of offenders.
3. Criminal justice practitioners should receive training in how to use data to support their decision-making processes: that is, how to use data rather than intuition and guesswork to ask questions and frame logical issues about managing offenders.
4. Client-specific criminal justice data should be made available to appropriate service providers for both operational and evaluation purposes
5. As a prerequisite to client specific data, confidentiality and access protocols must be developed to protect individual confidentiality and privileged information.
6. Allocate funding to ensure access to all relevant cross-agency data to support justice policy and program decision-making.

## Data Standards Committee Report

In addition, the Committee reiterates two policy recommendations from the Data Standards Working Group:

**Recommendation 4:** Establish minimum levels of privacy and security standards for adoption by all criminal justice agencies.

**Recommendation 5:** Prepare disaster avoidance and data recovery standards for use by criminal justice agencies.

## **V. DATA APPROPRIATE FOR EVALUATION**

This component of the charge, that data is appropriate for evaluation, was addressed in two fashions: through specific projects in the Bond Technology program and through policy recommendations. The Committee realized that it was necessary for agencies to communicate and share data for effective evaluation to occur. Such communication and data sharing can best occur when agencies have computer systems which are reliable and set up to communicate with other agencies.

The Committee believes that the adoption and use of the State CJIS standards will enable agencies to share data more effectively. This belief caused the Committee to make the use of CJIS one of the criteria for project funding and to make adherence to CJIS a policy recommendation.

The Committee also had lengthy discussions about a data warehouse which could be used solely for the evaluation of data within the criminal justice system. The data warehouse gathers data from a variety of databases (District Attorney, Sheriff, Portland Police, and Courts) and links the data together. The queries of that data could give researchers a systemic view of the data and activity within the criminal justice system.

Finally, the Committee also included in its recommendations a policy drafted by the Evaluation Committee which specifically addresses the collection and use of data for evaluation.

## VI. NEXT STEPS

### Provisional Approval

The Committee recommends to the PSCC that provisional approval be given for projects at their July 17, 1997, meeting. There are ten projects which the Committee believes should start during the summer of 1997 because they have few interagency linkages and are ready to proceed. These projects include: Oversight Consultant (Data Standards Committee), Connect to ISD Backbone (Metropolitan Public Defender), Upgrade Kodak Imaging System (Sheriff), Equipment for Hostage Negotiation and Computer Crime Unit (Portland), FY98 PC's and Networks (Multnomah County ISD), Court Coordinating System (Gresham), MCSO's X-Imaging System (Gresham), the Police Department's Records System Upgrade (Gresham); Police Records Interface System (Fairview); and the Community Court Infrastructure (District Attorney). These projects will be subject to a post implementation review by the Oversight Consultant.

The remaining projects would be given full funding contingent upon the risk assessment and allocation by the Oversight Contractor. The initial assessment will be completed in early October with the final analysis completed in early December. Projects receiving acceptable risk assessments may be eligible for funding prior to December. This pause in the progress of the program, August through December, is necessary for the consultant or consulting group to review the Bond Technology Program. It is the Committee's belief that this time is relatively short and the end product is worth the wait. The waiting period should be used to draft intergovernmental agreements between agencies, prepare RFPs and RFIs and start on the data gathering stage of many projects.

### Action Steps

The steps which are necessary are as follows:

1. Oversight Contractor begins work in early August 1997.
2. Once the projects are approved by the PSCC, each non Multnomah County agency will enter into an intergovernmental agreement (IGA) or personal service agreement (PSA) with Multnomah County ISD for the funding of their project(s). The contract process will be managed by Multnomah County ISD.
3. Beyond the standard contract language, the contracts will contain a work plan and assurance that the project meets the Data Standards Committee's criteria. Contracts will be set up on a reimbursement basis, with draws based upon the requirements of the work plan.

## Data Standards Committee Report

4. Contracts will be taken before the Board of County Commissioners for approval, even the small IGA and PSA contracts. This will allow the Board to see the broad range of projects funded (for more detail of the contracting process see Appendix 4).
5. Once the contract is approved by the Board of County Commissioners, work on the various projects can begin. Full funding is contingent upon the Oversight Contractor's approval. Work can begin immediately on the ten exception projects.
6. The Data Standards Committee will resume meeting on September 3, 1997. The meeting will consist of project status reports and an update on oversight work.
7. The first report back to the PSCC will be at the October 1997 meeting.

During the evaluation performed by the Oversight Consultant, it is possible that projects could generate savings due to linkages, economies of scale or changes to the project. It should be understood that any savings generated by project changes will go into an Opportunity Fund. This Fund will pay for additional projects or enhancements upon Committee approval.

# APPENDICES

**APPENDIX 1**

**CHRONOLOGY OF THE DATA STANDARDS COMMITTEE**

- November 1995            Multnomah County establishes the Local Public Safety Coordinating Council (PSCC).
- April 1996                PSCC established a Data Standards Work Group to develop Standards and methods for: 1) The consistent collection and reporting of Data relevant to the Council's statutory responsibilities and policy concerns; 2) For tracking offenders; and; 3) Evaluating the county's criminal justice and corrections program. PSCC appointed Mike Schrunk Chair of the Data Standards Work Group.
- May 1996                 Public Safety Bond passed by Multnomah County voters.
- May 14, 1996             First meeting of Data Standards Work Group.
- June 11, 1996  
July 16  
August 13  
September 24             Data Standards Work Group identifies and reviews basic policy questions focusing on charge and formulates a final report and policy recommendations for the PSCC.
- October 17, 1996        Data Standards Work Group report scheduled for presentation to PSCC.
- November 21, 1996      Data Standards Work Group report reviewed by PSCC.
- January 10, 1997        PSCC establishes a standing Evaluation Committee and Data Standards Committee.
- January 29, 1997        Data Standards Committee commences to meet to fulfill charge And develop recommendations for Public Safety Bond Technology Program.



## Data Standards Committee Report

### APPENDIX 1

February 12, 1997	Data Standards Committee:
February 26 March 19-26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Develops criteria for use of Public Safety Bond Technology Program funds.</li></ul>
April 9 April 23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Develops guidelines for proposals for Public Safety Bond Technology Program dollars.</li></ul>
May 28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Develops policy recommendations for PSCC.</li><li>• Reviews presentations from criminal justice system and Information Services Division representatives.</li><li>• Develops draft report for presentation to PSCC at the June 3, 1997, Executive Committee Meeting.</li></ul>
June 11, 1997	Data Standards Committee does final review of draft report.
June 19, 1997	Final report submitted to full PSCC.

Data Standards Committee Report **APPENDIX 2**  
**BOND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM PROJECT CRITERIA**

1. FOUNDATION - Provide each criminal justice agency the foundation it needs to accomplish its mission to minimize crime as efficiently and effectively as possible and communicate with partner agencies.
2. CJIS - Ensure that each agency's database is written or moving toward the CJIS standards adopted by the PSCC.
3. LINKS - Link each agency with the core public safety agencies in Multnomah County. Core public safety agencies include the courts, the Public Defender, the District Attorney, the Department of Juvenile and Adult Community Justice, Multnomah County Sheriff's Office, Corrections, and all public law enforcement agencies in Multnomah County.
4. MULTI - Projects with a multi-agency impact will receive priority.

	Foundation	CJIS	LINKS	MULTI
<u>Oversight Consultant</u>	X	X	X	X
<u>Evaluation - Decision Support</u>	X		X	X
<u>Courts Advanced office automation</u>				X
<u>DAJCI – JJIS</u>	X	X	X	X
<u>DAICJ - Sanction and Case Tracking System</u>	X	X	X	X
<u>MPD – Connect to ISD Backbone</u>	X	X	X	X
<u>DA - PPDS Data Extract</u>			X	
<u>DA - Juvenile Case Tracking</u>	X	X		
<u>DA - Direct mainframe query</u>	X			
<u>DA - OJIN data transfer</u>	X		X	
<u>DA – Community Courts</u>	X			X
<u>SO- Video conferencing</u>			X	X
<u>SO – Automate inmate interviews</u>		X	X	X
<u>SO - Bar code inmates</u>		X	X	X
<u>SO- Scheduling video conferencing</u>			X	X
<u>SO- Upgrade Kodak imaging</u>			X	X
<u>PPB - Laptop MDT Report Writing Demonstration</u>	X	X		X
<u>PPB - Equipment for Hostage Negotiation &amp; Computer Crime Unit</u>		X		
<u>Gresham - Court coordination</u>		X	X	X
<u>Gresham - X-Image</u>	X			X
<u>Gresham - Upgrade records system</u>			X	X
<u>Troutdale - Police Records Management System</u>	X	X	X	X
<u>Fairview- Police Records Interface System</u>	X		X	X
<u>ISD - Data Warehouse</u>	X	X	X	X

SO - Sheriff's Office

MPD - Metropolitan Public Defenders

DA - District Attorney

ISD - Multnomah County Information Services Division

DAJCI - Department of Juvenile and Adult Community Justice — PPB - Portland Police Bureau

**SUMMARY OF BOND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM PROPOSALS**

Data Standards Committee

• Oversight Consultant	\$350,000	
• Opportunity Fund	130,731	
• Subtotal	.....	\$480,731

Evaluation Committee

• Decision Support System	\$350,000	..... \$350,000
---------------------------	-----------	-----------------

Multnomah County Courts

• Advanced Office Automation and Groupware	\$396,024	..... \$396,024
--	-----------	-----------------

Department of Juvenile and Adult Community Justice

• Juvenile Justice Information System	\$750,000	
• Adult Community Justice, Sanction and Case Tracking Sys	902,231	
• Subtotal	.....	\$1,652,231

Metropolitan Public Defender

• Connect to ISD backbone	\$80,371*	... ..\$80,371
---------------------------	-----------	----------------

District Attorney's Office

• Improve data transfers	\$200,000	
• Juvenile Case Tracking System	807,170	
• Community Court Infrastructure	150,000*	
• Subtotal	.....	\$1,157,170

Multnomah County Sheriff

• Video conferencing/video arraignment .....	\$706,432	
• Barcode inmates .....	377,500	
• Scheduling program for video conferencing .....	20,000	
• Upgrade Kodak imaging system .....	189,034*	
• Subtotal .....		\$1,292,966

Data Standards Committee Report

..... APPENDIX 3

Portland Police Bureau

• Laptop MDT Report Writing Demonstration	\$353,375	
• Equipment for Hostage Negotiation and Computer Crime Unit		42,200*
• Subtotal	.....	\$395,575

Gresham Police Department

• Court Coordinating System	\$7,650*	
• X-Imaging System	35,650*	
• Records System	66,204*	
• Subtotal	.....	\$109,504

Troutdale Police Department

• Police Records Management System	\$54,775	.....	\$54,775
------------------------------------	----------	-------	----------

Fairview Police Department

• Police Records Interface System	\$12,400*	.....	\$12,400
-----------------------------------	-----------	-------	----------

Information Services Division

• Data Warehouse	\$815,013	.....	\$815,013
------------------	-----------	-------	-----------

Multnomah County Flat Fee Program (upgrade and expand computers and net works)

• Sheriff's Office .....	\$160,100	
• District Attorney's Office.....	38,120	
• Adult Community Justice .....	362,850	
• FY98 Flat Fee Obligations .....	262,200*	
• Subtotal .....		\$823,240

TOTAL BOND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM \$7,620,000

\*Projects recommended to receive provisional approval (\$1,195,700)

## **THE CONTRACTING PROCESS**

Awarding of information technology bond dollars will likely involve several different types of contracts. Different types of contracts have different legal and policy requirements and the routing process may vary. These contracts are broken down into classes as follows:

**Class I** - Professional service agreements (or for non-profits) greater than \$2,500 and less than \$50,000 per vendor or division annually do not require Board of County Commissioner approval, but need to be routed through Contracts. An InterGovernmental Agreement (IGA) that does not exceed \$25,000 doesn't require BCC approval but should be routed through Purchasing. Both require a Contract Approval Form (CAF), a Contractor Selection Statement and a Contract Information System (COINS) number.

**Class II** - Includes any of the following and requires a memo siting the selection process and is routed through purchasing.

- Professional service agreements (non-profits) over \$50,000 per vendor, per year and is not an IGA. A Professional Services Agreement is one performed by an independent contractor in a professional capacity. No BCC approval is required.
- Grants, except IGA's.
- Construction.
- Public Contract Review Board contracts. Are contracts for the purchase, lease or lease/purchase of goods, equipment, software licensing agreements and construction of public improvements. These must be competitively procured (ORS chapter 279) and the procurement process is administered by purchasing.
- All retroactive contracts, except IGA's
- Contracts awarded through a formal competitive process.

A CAF and COIN number are also required along with County Counsel's signature.

**Class III** - Intergovernmental Agreements (IGA's). Written agreements that exceeds \$25,000 per fiscal year between Multnomah County and another unit of government as defined in ORS 190.003. A CAF and COIN number are also required, along with County Counsel's signature. Class III Contracts require BCC approval.

**Interdepartmental Agreements** - Written agreements between Multnomah County Departments that clarify working relationships, and explicitly indicate amount of money involved, and how and when the money will be transferred and for what. A signature is required from both department heads. This action does not require BCC approval.

**THE TIME FRAME**

June 11, 1997: Data Standards Committee Meeting: Approves the report which contains the proposals, policy recommendations and next steps.

June 18: Subcommittee meets again to finalize recommendations to the PSCC.

June 24: Complete Final Draft of Data Standards Committee Report to the Public Safety Coordinating Council. Distribute to PSCC members. [DA]

June 25: Intergovernmental Agreements sent to agencies. [ISD]

June 30: RFP completed for oversight consultant or consulting group. [ISD]

July 1: PSCC Executive Council meets.

July 14: All intergovernmental agreements to Clerk of the Board by noon. [ISD]

July 17: PSCC Meeting - Approves Data Standards Committee's following action items:

1. Specific Allocation of funds for consultant or consulting group.
2. Provisional allocation of funds for projects with exceptions.
3. Approval of Policy Recommendations.
4. Approval of Timeline.

July 22: Briefing for Board of County Commissioners regarding Public Safety Bond Technology Program [DA, ISD, other committee members]

July 24: County Board of Commissioners meets to approve intergovernmental agreements and review program. [DA, ISD, other committee members]

July 25: Funds available.

August 1: Oversight services begin. Consultant or consulting group begins meeting with project managers.

September 3: -Data Standards Committee meets for update on oversight work.

## Data Standards Committee Report

### APPENDIX 6

- October 1: Data Standards Committee meets to prepare Preliminary Risk Assessment Report for Public Safety Coordinating Council meeting on October 16. At this point projects would be reviewed again by the Data Standards Committee and changes made if necessary.
- October 7: PSCC Executive Committee meets.
- October 16: PSCC Meeting. Review of Oversight Report. Approval of projects (with possible amendments).
- October 17: Funding authorized.
- November 19: Data Standards Committee meets.
- December 1: Final Risk Assessment Report delivered to Data Standards Committee.
- December 10: Data Standards Committee meets to review Final Risk Assessment Report.
- January 7, 1998: Data Standards Committee meets with oversight consultant or consulting group to review status of projects.

