

*****NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING*****
of the
NEVADA CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION SYSTEM
ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Location: Records and Technology Division
333 West Nye Lane
Training Room
Carson City, Nevada 89706
(775) 684-6262

Date: October 6, 2011

Time: 1pm-5pm

MEMBERS PRESENT

Patrick Conmay, Nevada Department of Public Safety, Chief Records and Technology Division
Scott Sosebee, Deputy Director of Information Technology, Supreme Court (via telephone)
James Earl, Executive Director of Technological Crimes Advisory Board, Attorney General's Office
John Helzer, Deputy District Attorney, District Attorney's Association
Pam DelPorto, Inspector General, Nevada Department of Corrections
Stacy Woodbury, Administration Chief, Gaming Control Board

MEMBERS EXCUSED

Assembly Member Steven Brooks
Robert Quick, Undersheriff/Lander County Sheriff's Office, Nevada Sheriff's and Chief's Association
Senate Member pending appointment

A. Call open meeting to order and roll call (action)

Chief Patrick Conmay called the meeting to order at 1:04 pm. Roll call was taken by Deborah Crews. A quorum was present. Mr. James Earl clarified his title as Executive Director of the Technological Crimes Advisory Board.

B. April 13, 2011 meeting minutes comment, revision and acceptance (action)

Chief Conmay asked if there were any additions, corrections or comments to the April 13, 2011 meeting minutes. There being none he entertained a motion for acceptance. Mr. James Earl moved to accept the minutes as submitted. The motion was seconded by Mr. John Helzer. All were in favor. Motion carries and minutes were accepted.

C. Nomination and vote on Vice Chairman (for possible action)

An effort has been made to identify the Assembly and Senator members to the committee. It is the understanding that the Assembly Member is Steven Brooks. Chief Conmay had a conversation with him and he was unable to attend today's meeting. No information has been received regarding the identity of the Senate Member. Chief Conmay noted there was a quorum present and he asked the Committee to entertain any nominations for a Vice Chairman. Mr. Earl asked that the decision be deferred. Chief Conmay didn't have concern with tabling this item. Chief Conmay has been looking at a way to get more members attending the meetings. Mr. Earl moved to defer the agenda item to the next meeting where the Committee would like to come back in on discussion. Pam DelPorto seconded the motion. In terms of attendance of members Mr. Earl has found video conferencing helpful in other board meetings he is involved with. Since the board contains members of the Legislature, the Legislature building in Carson City (as well as the Legislature building in southern Nevada) is available with video conferencing, thus allowing attendance of other members. This may provide an easier venue for attendees in Las Vegas. A transcription-ready CD can be made available as well; all for no cost since the Committee has Legislative members. Chief Conmay will entertain this solution in the future. Stacy Woodbury offered meeting rooms at the Gaming Control Board, which also have video conferencing free of charge. Chief Conmay asked for public comment. There were no other comments. All were in favor to defer nomination on a Vice-Chairman. Motion carries.

D. Steering Committee Briefing – Patti Peters, Southern NCJIS Technical Sub-Committee Chair and Teresa Wiley, Northern NCJIC Technical Sub-Committee Chair (discussion)

Teresa Wiley had no new information to share since the Steering Committee hasn't been able to meet due to ongoing projects. They are in the process of scheduling four quarterly meetings for next year. Pam DelPorto asked who is on the Northern Subcommittee. Ms. Wiley state that any agency in Northern Nevada can attend. Ms. Wiley advised that Patty Kelly from the Washoe County Sheriff's Office is the Vice Chair. Ms. DelPorto will suggest to her agency that they attend the Northern Nevada sub-committee meetings. Chief Conmay asked for public comment. There were no comments.

E. Records Bureau Status Report – Julie Butler, Records Bureau Chief, Records and Technology Division, Department of Public Safety. (discussion)

Julie Butler provided handouts of her presentation (**Exhibit A**). Her briefing was on significant legislation from the 2011 session, a federal funds update, the Nevada Offense Code update, upcoming information technology projects, and potential priorities for the 2013 Legislative Session.

In terms of significant legislation, the Records group proposed two bills during the 2011 Session. Assembly Bill (AB) 66 clarifies the process a person must follow when having their firearms rights restored. This bill became effective October 1, 2011. The bill grants authority to the Pardons Board to open a sealed criminal history record to determine whether or not an individual should have his firearms rights restored. The bill requires that if the Pardons Board does grant firearms restoration, the official pardon document must specifically state that the right to bear arms has been restored. The Brady Unit needs that explicit statement in the pardon document in order to effect the firearms transfer. AB75 was not successful, having died in committee, and has been tabled until the 2013 (or beyond) Session. This bill would have closed the loopholes in the sex offender registration statutes. AB75 would have brought back the sexual offense of unlawful contact with a minor or a person with a mental illness requiring registration. The sexual offense of "Unlawful Contact" was replaced by "Luring" in the 2003 Session and the problem with "Luring" is there is no touching involved.

E. Records Bureau Status Report – Julie Butler, Records Bureau Chief, Records and Technology Division, Department of Public Safety. (discussion) CONT.

AB282, effective July 1, 2011, makes various changes to the laws regarding carrying a concealed weapon. Most significantly for the Records and Technology Division, the bill reinstates what is known as the “Brady Exemption.” Prior to 2005, anyone with a Nevada carry concealed weapons (CCW) permit did not have to undergo a Brady background check when purchasing a firearm from a federally licensed firearms dealer. In 2005, the State lost its Brady Exemption status when the federal Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms audited Nevada and determined its concealed weapons statutes weren’t strict enough because the CCW renewal process did not require a background check, and there were no checks of Immigration and Customs Enforcement for non-resident aliens. The Department of Public Safety and the Nevada Sheriffs signed a Memorandum of Understanding in 2005 implementing background checks for CCW renewal permits and Immigration and Customs Enforcement checks for non-resident aliens. AB282 codified what the Department of Public Safety has been doing since 2005. Ms. Butler noted she was expecting to see some decline in Brady revenue in regaining the “Brady Exemption.”

SB491 would have eliminated the allocation of court assessments and diverted that money to the general fund for two years. This bill died in committee.

In terms of federal grant status, one that is significant is the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) Act Record Improvement Program (NARIP) Grant. The state became eligible for the NARIP when it enacted AB46 during the 2009 Session. This brought the state in line with federal law. There are three major efforts funded by the NARIP grant. One is the provision for system enhancements to Brady and protection order applications, which would allow for improved functionality and efficiency. It also allows for collection of data we don’t currently collect and meets future requirements for improvements to the Brady system. The second effort underway with the NARIP grant funding is to augment our contract with the Western Identification Network (WIN) for fingerprint card conversion. The WIN is the shared fingerprint system. We currently have 300,000 fingerprint images that are stored in the WIN archive, but they aren’t available in digital format. The WIN is in the process of converting everything to digital. Records staff is currently pulling cards from storage for shipment to the WIN for card conversion. This is expected to be completed in May 2012. The third effort is to fund a NARIP task force. The task force looks at ways to improve the reporting of criminal history record information to the Records Bureau and to the FBI’s NICS Office, particularly in respect to getting disqualifying mental health information in the national NICS index. The task force has had three meetings. The task force has recognized the need to develop a state-wide plan involving all the pieces of the puzzle, from law enforcement agencies, to the prosecutors and finally to the Records Bureau for final disposition.

The Administrative Office of the Courts was funded by the NARIP grant for a study to improve information reporting from Nevada courts to the Records Bureau and for improvements in the statewide protection order system. Statutes mandate Nevada’s Central Repository to keep a repository for information on incidents of domestic violence. We have a system that allows for tracking of state-wide protection orders, but it is antiquated from the technology standpoint. The Administrative Office of the Courts hired MTG Management Consultants to conduct these two studies. Draft studies for both processes are complete. Several recommendations for improvements in business processes, systems, policies and legislation were made. The studies noted a need for an overall governance body to drive the process. The work of the NARIP Task Force is far from over. Ms. Butler wondered if there is any appetite from the Committee as to a NARIP Task Force Standing Subcommittee to continue the work

E. Records Bureau Status Report – Julie Butler, Records Bureau Chief, Records and Technology Division, Department of Public Safety. (discussion) CONT.

of the task force. Scott Sosebee said from the courts perspective the subcommittee is a great idea and the Committee should continue to be a part of it. He noted this would be a good committee to use video conferencing for which would help to resolve funding issues in terms of attendance. Chief Conmay asked everyone to keep this topic in mind when governance issues are discussed later. Chief Conmay noted that governance in a lot of areas will become a critical factor for us. Pam DelPorto asked if this will be a discussion item on the next agenda. Mr. Sosebee asked if they should do a summary presentation or just provide the reports specific to providing the study reports to members. Chief Conmay suggested both formats would be good so detail can be provided. Mr. Helzer asked who represents the task force.

Julie Butler stated there isn't a subcommittee now but rather a task force which has members from various agencies. One of the requirements from the federal NICS Improvements Amendments Act is to answer a survey on records completeness which begs the need for a standing committee. Mr. Earl asked if there needs to be legislative changes. Ms. Butler answered yes and explained with scenarios like protection orders there are no clear laws regarding stalking orders. The law doesn't require that law enforcement officers actually serve the order. There is no state-wide system that stalking orders are entered into. Additionally, there are staffing and technology issues that must be looked at. Mr. Earl stated that one of the advantages of having a standing subcommittee would be to help define the issues leading to an appropriate bill draft request and follow the process of a bill draft request and how it is processed. Mr. Earl suggested that we assume the task force standing subcommittee is created and performs its intended responsibility, which is to identify present deficiencies and format something to deal with these issues. The Tech Crimes Advisory Board can be another venue to pitch ideas to regarding legislative changes since there are legislators that sit on that committee.

The Administrative Office of the Courts was a direct recipient of one grant, which was the 2009 National Criminal History Improvement Program grant. Funding was requested in order to hire a business analyst who would retain a consulting firm to study and recommend a path for electronic dispositions from the court to the Central Repository. MTG Management Consultants were hired by the Administrative Office of the Courts in May 2011. They have interviewed a cross section of law enforcement agencies, courts, etc. The interviews are expected to wrap in a couple of months and then MTG will provide some recommendations and a path forward for considering how to automate electronic dispositions. Once the study is complete, expected to be by the beginning of 2012, we will move forward with any recommendations. Mr. Helzer mentioned that this firm has asked to review past meeting minutes from the NCJIS Advisory Committee meetings. Mr. Helzer asked where the final report would go and Ms. Butler said it would go to the Administrative Office of the Courts as the grant recipient, but that it will be shared between agencies and she will provide a summary at the next NCJIS Advisory Committee meeting if the findings are ready. Ms. Butler asked Mr. Sosebee if the study can be shared with other committees and Mr. Sosebee affirmed it could.

Ms. Butler then discussed Nevada Offense Codes (NOCs), noting that every crime, whether state or local, is defined and distinguished by a specific code. Ms. Butler noted that the department is in the process of establishing a new NOC system. The old system used a 5-digit character code and the new system will use an 11-digit character code. A consultant has been retained to convert the old statutes and the new crimes from the 2011 Legislative session to the 11-character model. The same consultant is also visiting local agencies in order to convert local ordinances. Beginning in January 2012, the Department of Public Safety will again resume the responsibility of maintaining and housing the NOC

E. Records Bureau Status Report – Julie Butler, Records Bureau Chief, Records and Technology Division, Department of Public Safety. (discussion) CONT.

data base. Mr. Earl asked if it appears that currently the program is pretty well in hand and looking forward and is it likely that the Administrative Office of the Courts or the Department of Public Safety will have the funding or encounter personnel issues or will the court fees suffice? Ms. Butler believes everything is in order in terms of maintaining the NOC data base. The Division's Technology staff has done the necessary work to convert the data base from the Access format that the Administrative Office of the Courts is currently using to the SQL format the Department of Public Safety can support. Mr. Earl asked whether Court Assessments were adequate to support the Records Bureau's mission. Ms. Butler responded that they were not. Ms. Butler said the Records Bureau's allocation of Court Assessments is roughly \$2 million dollars short of what it needs to fund all criminal-history-related mandates. Fee-based revenues are offsetting this shortfall. Coincidentally, it costs \$2 million dollars per year to operate the Sex Offender Registry Unit. This unit is not funded.

It is obvious that we can no longer do business as usual; systems are large and impact a number of agencies state-wide. Efforts need to be focused on what priorities are and what it will take to run these systems in terms of funding and personnel. Chief Conmay added that new ideas come to the Department of Public Safety's attention daily. Short falls are currently subsidized, but those fees are falling. Mr. Earl stated that the importance of Nevada Offense Codes and conversion is because they tie specific offenses to a specific offender, which then ties the entire criminal process together. The problem experienced by the state is overcoming a legacy system and transitioning toward future systems. The system is complex, and we tend to talk in jargon that's not reducible to a 30 second sound bite appealing to the Legislators. Mr. Earl offered to provide additional up-front legislative exposure and support through his Tech Crimes Advisory Board. Mr. Helzer has not seen any product that can provide an overview of the concept and users. Mr. Helzer noted that people quickly grasp what a NOC is, but then the question is what type of information does it contain and the specificity of what the new codes provide, and who is accessing this information. Mr. Helzer clarified that we need a presentation to explain Nevada Offense Codes clearly. Chief Conmay said a presentation could certainly be put together. Ms. Butler stated that the Criminal History System is antiquated and cannot currently accommodate the 11-character NOC, the information, and report requests. There are three major applications that are in the current USOFT application platform and the Department of Public Safety is asking for a study to replace with this system with a new system. The Criminal History Arrest and Administration System, the Offender Tracking Information System, and the Protection Orders system are written in USOFT. We have received a grant from the Office of Criminal Justice Assistance to retain a consultant to look at the USOFT system and the three aforementioned applications and how to replace the system. We are hoping to gain approval from the Interim Finance Committee to spend the money to enter into the contract, and then have the contract go to the Board of Examiners in November. The study should be completed in early March 2012 in order to allow time to submit the necessary technology improvement requests to the Enterprise Information Technology Services for the 2014-15 budget. Similarly, our fingerprint system that we share with the seven other western states is in the process of selecting a new vendor to provide a new identification system. This may have future technology issues for staff and the Records Bureau. In addition, the Federal Bureau of Investigation is in the process of replacing its fingerprint identification system with a system that has many new features. All of these replacements are happening now and will have huge implications on the Nevada Central Repository.

The number one priority for the 2013 Session is replacing the criminal history system. Another consideration for the session is to amend NRS 179A.210 in order to add volunteers to the list of

E. Records Bureau Status Report – Julie Butler, Records Bureau Chief, Records and Technology Division, Department of Public Safety. (discussion) CONT.

entities subject to a FBI background check. The final issue for the 2013 Session is to add staff to the Sex Offender Registry Unit. The challenge is that this is a unit that is not funded.

Mr. Earl's understanding regarding the reasons to replace the current USoft system is: 1) something new is required for implementation of the 11-character NOC code, 2) a legacy system which is dilapidated is currently being utilized, and 3) Federal Bureau of Investigation wants to decentralize records of arrest. Ms. Butler stated Mr. Earl was correct in his understanding, however the main reason for replacement is the Central Repository is not able to adequately conduct its business with the current system. The system does not comply with FBI mandates for the use of its criminal history record information. Chief Conmay said that the primary talking points are security risks, inability to comply with current requirements and inability to comply with future requirements. Mr. Earl added one more reason to replace the system which is reporting statistics to the Legislature.

This ties into the general legislative objective of e-governance and open government. Mr. Earl offered support to assist at the Attorney General level after the Interim Finance Committee meeting if the Records and Technology Division emails him on where the project stands and a short explanation of the concept. Chief Conmay anticipates that this is going to be an extremely expensive proposition, the study results will need to be prioritized and requests need to be made in pieces and not as a whole. Educating the Legislators to the needs is important because many are new members with no historical knowledge of the Department of Public Safety and the respective systems.

Public Comment – Dr. Rex Reed with the Department of Corrections had two questions. First he wanted to know if E-dispositions is a general term, or does that include inmate dispositions? Ms. Butler noted that she was referring to the process from the court to the Central Repository. She is aware of past discussions in terms of bringing in Department of Correction's data, which is a need. She stated this aspect may be looked at during the upcoming study. Catherine Krause, Chief IT Manager with the Department of Public Safety Records and Technology Division, stated it hasn't been part of the current discussion, as we have focused mainly on the events directly after an arrest. With so much information and so many things that could be accomplished the potential is overwhelming. Consideration must be given to which types of information sharing would be the most beneficial and the necessary resources to support them. Secondly Dr. Rex Reed asked if when Nevada Offense Codes (NOCs) are converted, will all (active and inactive NOCs) be converted for historical research? Ms. Butler answered that the old NOCs will drop off. Dr. Rex Reed stated that may be problematic with historical research needed by the Department of Corrections. Chief Conmay noted that as we move forward this would be another issue that would need to be discussed.

There were no other public comments.

F. Nevada Supplement to the CJIS Security Policy, James Lemaire, IT Manager III, Information Security Officer, Records and Technology Division, Department of Public Safety (discussion)

Jim Lemaire followed up to the last meeting by providing a list (**Exhibit C**) of upcoming changes by the FBI CJIS Security Policy.

Item 21 was discussed first concerning the identification of vulnerabilities, which means the agencies need to perform penetration testing on their own equipment and infrastructure to make sure it is secure. This is mandated to ensure security to avoid unauthorized access. Penetration tools and the correct people to do the work are expensive. Mr. Earl explained that Senate Bill (SB) 82, which was passed in the last legislative session, requires the Enterprise Information Technology Services Division to add penetration testing to its security mandates. It allows the Enterprise Information Technology Services Division to perform penetration tests for agencies within the executive branch. The Enterprise Information Technology Services Division would perform penetration testing of systems related to NCJIS or to the Department of Public Safety (DPS) generally upon request so that the expense and limited availability of penetration testing assets are in fact available in the state. This testing is available to DPS and NCJIS at present or will be very shortly at minimal cost.

Chief Conmay added that there have been conversations with The Enterprise Information Technology Services Division about how that process is going to work and because of schedules they haven't been able to get together, but they will be determining how that process will work and how it will be worked out in the future. Pam DelPorto asked if this requirement is for Department of Public Safety and the Records and Technology Division or do the sub-agencies that use CJIS also have to do the tests? Jim Lemaire explained that the service Mr. Earl described is available for user agencies. Mr. Earl elaborated that SB82 provided a change to Enterprise Information Technology Services standards that enabled Enterprise Information Technology Services to provide Information Technology goods and services (penetration testing is a service) to all state agencies and all county and municipal agencies upon their request. Enterprise Information Technology Services is not enabled by statute to do testing for locals without a specific request and cost reimbursement but that statute was structured as such to allow the option to the local agencies, again, upon request. It allows lower state and municipalities to use the resources at a lower cost if they wish. Mr. Lemaire added that there are approximately 150 separate agencies statewide.

Item 26 regarding Security Awareness Training is no longer a "one size fits all". It now has multiple tiers. The first tier is for people that have access to terminals, the second tier is for terminal users, and the third tier is for the Information Technology personnel. Each group requires specific training as outlined in the policy. To date, this requirement has been met by using some of Enterprise Information Technology Services online training. If training that meets the CJIS Security training using a modular object-oriented dynamic learning environment (MOODLE) can be found, we can offer it online as well.

Item 30 states that sophisticated programs must be run through the network to detect intrusions. Detection means you are able to discern that someone is doing something not authorized. Detection requires running very sophisticated programs. An analysis must be run through the network. This requires very specialized hardware (called Intrusion Detection Systems), software, and personnel. This can be expensive to put in place and operate. The Department of Public Safety does have an intrusion detection system running at two critical points in our network, but we need about one dozen more points to adequately cover intrusion detection. A southern Records and Technology Division employee

F. Nevada Supplement to the CJIS Security Policy, James Lemaire, IT Manager III, Information Security Officer, Records and Technology Division, Department of Public Safety (discussion) CONT.

has been doing quite a few audits and is operating the intrusion detection system part time. Also, instead of doing on-site audits, mail-in audits are planned this year.

Item 34 requires, where feasible, automated mechanisms to assist in the reporting of security incidents. A security incident could be something as simple as someone coming into the building and plugging into our network without authorization. If staff were available to constantly monitor connections, this would be detected. Automated mechanisms would mean having scripts running constantly that look for rogue criminals and then generate a report. Currently enough staff doesn't exist to handle this. Mr. Earl interjected that this is a fairly common problem essentially shared by all state agencies. SB82 was specifically written to take into account the possibility that multiple agencies would want to procure simultaneously the type of network monitoring software that could implement this. A network administrator would be notified when an unauthorized entity connects to the system. This should be discussed at the next state security meeting for procurement possibilities. Mr. Lemaire stated that these items are not in the 2012-2013 budget. Mr. Earl said this is another opportunity for the Department of Public Safety to collaborate with Enterprise Information Technology Services.

Grant funding may be an option. Mr. Earl stated this is the first grant cycle that the Committee approved investment justifications involving cyber security. These investment justifications formed part of Nevada's grant application to the Department of Homeland Security. We do not yet know whether those grant applications have been approved. He also indicated that in addressing the Department of Homeland Security and the Governor's Crime Commission, all law enforcement agencies need to be conscious of the fact that the Nevada Criminal Justice Information System (NCJIS) is one whose data and system operations they need to protect. NCJIS ought to be considered as a high level priority for funding if reprogrammable funds become available for security.

Items 45 – 67 all refer to the generation of audit and logging information, how that information should be stored and ultimately the analysis of that audit and logging information. A multitude of events need to be audited and logged and accessible to certain entities in a separately secure system, such that only the people who need to actually review the logs and audits can get to them, not general purpose technology personnel. These are the highest protected items in the infrastructure. There is a section that references receiving e-mail or pager notification if the system goes down. All of these items cost hundreds of thousands, if not millions of dollars, to establish in our infrastructure.

Item 78 has to do with associate access mechanisms and control lists. This is a level of security that is not currently implemented and is not realistic to implement in our existing application because a major re-write would be required. This can be used as a guidepost for selecting applications going forward if those selecting choose to use this as significant criteria. The FBI should address this in next year's audit and their comments will be anticipated.

Item 112 is a requirement that public safety agencies perform checks at every site they manage. The checks are looking for rogue access points, which are particularly challenging for Technology staff. This requires specialized tools and travel and, during this audit cycle, we're using paperless audits with no plans to visit agency sites. This is a requirement for the Department of Public Safety and the outside agencies.

F. Nevada Supplement to the CJIS Security Policy, James Lemaire, IT Manager III, Information Security Officer, Records and Technology Division, Department of Public Safety (discussion) CONT.

Items 219 and 220 are regarding monitoring communications at the external boundary of the information system and at key internal boundaries within the system.

And finally, Items 229 and 230 note that the agency **shall** implement network-based and/or host-based intrusion detection tools. This would include anti-virus tools.

Mr. Lemaire concluded with what it would take to implement these requirements. He is meeting with agencies to discuss this document and clarify what their responsibilities are. Policies and procedures can be implemented with very little cost, and Mr. Lemaire is asking all agencies to complete this portion. Mr. Earl's perception is that these are all cutting edge security issues and requirements, and all are necessary and non-trivial when it comes to the demands that are placed on the agencies to undertake them. Mr. Earl just attended the National Association of State Chief Information Officers where a gentleman professed to have grant funds under a Department of Homeland Security grant program that would provide an audit and presumably take corrective action to ensure the National Information Exchange Model (NIEMs) compliance on behalf of certain types of agencies overseen by the FBI and the Department of Justice.

The gentleman's organization, totally funded by Department of Homeland Security, had done high level work for the FBI. Mr. Earl will share the information, which may assist with paperwork and provide some remedial work in some of these areas. Mr. Lemaire asked if anyone is aware of any other agencies that have experienced issues and what they have done. Mr. Earl said his only recommendation to the National Association of State Chief Information Officers was to add real-life cyber-security agency issues in its agenda. Chief Conmay stated that in the CJIS Working Group meetings he's noted that other state agencies are faced with the same challenges and no one has any viable solutions at this time because of budget issues. The security efforts concerning NCJIS and the State's systems essentially are Mr. Lemaire and one other person. The Committee should understand that not every single thing in this policy is doable. Some items will be accomplished using mail-in audits and communication with the FBI, though they continue to add further demands.

Chief Conmay asked for public comment. There were none.

G. Forum for the Board to Discuss The Role of the Advisory Board – Chief Conmay, Chief, Records & Technology Division, Department of Public Safety, Julie Butler, Records Bureau Chief, Records and Technology Division, Department of Public Safety (discussion)

Chief Conmay asked for a discussion on the role of the NCJIS Advisory Committee going forward. Regarding the Records and Technology Division future, the feeling is a need for an actual governance structure that is binding on the criminal justice community with respect to many of these systems. One idea is to pattern it after the FBI CJIS process and structure. There are too many issues with too much cost facing us and there needs to be a way to decide what systems the State of Nevada wants, needs and can afford. Currently there are many systems coming to fruition and there will be more in the future. Many of the outside components will appeal to law enforcement agencies and departments and the “want” to purchase and use these components will impact this body. The question then arises should this body take on more of a policy focus rather than an advisory focus; i.e. set policy for the state criminal justice community about where we are going, especially in terms of our budget crisis? We would like to have a discussion to transition the Committee into a policy committee that has some actual statutory authority to set policy concerning how to decide which systems will be implemented. For instance, we will listen to presentations and decide “yes we will do these things” or “no we will not do these things.” Technical subcommittees will be used to gather regional information about what the departments would like to see done in the state and then present that here for this body to make decisions.

Julie Butler referenced a FBI CJIS Advisory Policy Board Request for Topic handout (**Exhibit B**). This is the document Chief Conmay referred to regarding how the CJIS Advisory Policy Board operates. Ms. Butler explained who the CJIS Advisory Board is and how it operates. Any time there are proposed changes to any FBI CJIS systems and the policies governing those systems, all changes are vetted through a series of five regional Working Groups. A topic paper is developed by FBI staff and given to the working groups. The Working Groups then review the topic papers and vote to submit the topics for consideration by the Advisory Policy Board. Chief Conmay clarified that this would be specific to state systems.

Chief Conmay noted that there is an additional piece involved that if a police department submits an idea that is presented to this body for decision, a decision could be made by the body that a department likes an idea, but the body thinks it’s not beneficial. Stacy Woodbury asked if there would have to be legislative change. Chief Conmay stated absolutely and that changes to statute concerning how the NCJIS Advisory Committee functions would need to occur. There are now a series of governance bodies for various statewide criminal justice information systems and short of adding another member, this committee essentially has all of the affected representatives that could be the ultimate decision makers on all of these issues. Pam DelPorto noted GangNet (the Gang Intelligence Sharing System) as an example of a governance body. Chief Conmay stated that there are multiple bodies with the same members so all of those bodies could be combined into fewer entities or even into one. Mr. Earl said streamlining government efficiencies by consolidation of function and record sharing is another bullet point for the Legislative presentation. Scott Sosebee added that he is supportive of the effort for stronger governance and combined bodies. Mr. Sosebee stressed the importance of the governance body composition to ensure the entire criminal justice community is represented. Pam DelPorto noted that each sub committee task force would have the expertise to communicate to the committee. Strategic planning and vision is another suggestion from Scott Sosebee for this governance body.

G. Forum for the Board to Discuss The Role of the Advisory Board – Chief Conmay, Chief, Records & Technology Division, Department of Public Safety, Julie Butler, Records Bureau Chief, Records and Technology Division, Department of Public Safety (discussion) CONT.

Another strength mentioned by Mr. Sosebee that this type of body could form was in terms of leverage with the Legislature being a unified criminal justice community voice and not just piecemeal agencies bringing cases forward to the Legislature. He noted this would be more compelling. Stacy Woodbury suggested the board meet quickly and outline all of the groups which should be combined because the bill draft requests are due soon. Scott Sosebee is in favor of quarterly meetings and he feels this is required until the next session if the Committee moves forward with the proposal. Chief Conmay suggested completing an outline on what the structure would look like as the next step. Participants and the Department of Public Safety, Records and Technology Division could start the process here and bring it to the next meeting and put on the agenda as an action item. Mr. Earl submitted a caveat that if we end up with a broader mandate, it would be best to enlarge the board but be mindful that a larger membership is not to repeat any past problems from having more members. Chief Conmay believes no more members would need to be added, though identification a member or two that's not represented may be necessary, and that actually the governance board should include as many possible candidates for consolidation as the board can identify. Mr. Earl also posed the question as to what possible augmentation of this board might be appropriate. Mr. Helzer supports the concept and believes the members are liaisons for their respective community to bring back information from this board to their boards for decision. However, he wants to ensure there isn't a perception of this board having power over the other existing boards and their business processes. Chief Conmay asked Julie Butler and Catherine Krause to determine the timeframe for the Records and Technology Division to draft a proposal and submit it to the Committee members. Their estimate for the proposal draft completion was by the end of October of 2011. Chief Conmay suggested that then the committee can meet again in early January. Mr. Earl suggested that the meeting "adjourn at the call of the chair". This is a parliamentary procedure explained to the NV Advisory Committee by a previous legislator member. Adjourning at the call of the chair would make a later session called by the chair a continuation of the present meeting, rather than a new meeting. As a result, the Board would be getting together more than the two annual meetings; however, the two annual meetings would be spread over more than one sitting.

Chief Conmay opened the floor for any other comments from the committee or any public comments. Teresa Wiley from the Sparks Police Department asked that the outline be sent to the existing subcommittees for input. Chief Conmay stated he would do this.

There was no further public comment.

H. Disclosure and Abstention Guide (discussion)

Chief Conmay noted that he had received an e-mail from the Executive Director of the Ethics Commission reminding those that were on public meeting committees to review the Disclosure and Abstention Guide (**Exhibit D**). A copy of the guide was provided to Committee members. Chief Conmay asked if there were any questions. There were none.

There was no public comment.

I. Comments of committee members (discussion)

There were no further comments from the committee.

J. Public comment

There were no public comments.

K. Schedule next NCJIS Advisory Committee meeting (for possible action)

This will be done via email correspondence once the draft proposal for revamping this committee is ready for distribution.

L. Adjournment (for possible action)

Chief Conmay entertained a motion to adjourn. Mr. James Earl made the motion to adjourn and Ms. DelPorto seconded. All were in favor. Meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m.