



Regional Performance Incentive Program
Pursuant to Public Act 07-239, Section 8

Proposal for Joint Provision of Service(s) to be filed with the Secretary of the Office of Policy and Management no later than December 1, 2007.

Submit to: Office of Policy and Management, 450 Capitol Ave. MS #54 SLP,
 Hartford, CT 06108-1379, Att: RPI Program

<i>Regional Law Enforcement Data Sharing</i>

Regional Planning Organization(RPO)(s):	
Name	Capitol Region Council of Governments
Address	241 Main Street
City/State/Zip	Hartford, CT 06106
RPO Contact Person(s):	
Name	Lyle D. Wray
Title	Executive Director
Telephone	(860) 522-2217
Fax	(860) 724-1274
E-mail	lwray@crcog.org
Amount of Regional Performance Incentive Funding Requested: \$ 1,292,860.00	
Short Descriptive Title of Project: Regional Law Enforcement Data Sharing	
REQUIRED PROPOSAL ELEMENTS Items (1) through (10) :	
(1) <u>Proposed Shared Service(s):</u> Describe at least one service currently provided by a municipality or municipalities within the region, but not currently provided on a regional basis, for which this proposal is being submitted (attach additional pages as necessary):	
<p>Law enforcement records management systems are typically operated by each municipality which has a local police agency. These systems, which range in price from \$25,000 to as much as \$400,000, are operated by every police agency in Connecticut. While they vary in depth of functionality, most have basic functions involving production of management reports (UCR or NIBRS) and have a series of inquiry features such as name, event type, and location. Only in the rarest of circumstances do these systems share information with other similar systems. Indeed, data sharing is a virtual impossibility for most police agencies in Connecticut. This data sharing extends to the criminal justice system as well.</p>	

(2) Describe how such service will be delivered on a regional basis, the entity that would be responsible for the service and how the population would continue to be served (attach additional pages as necessary):

This proposal offers a new approach to law enforcement records management systems. In lieu of individual, locally served systems a browser based application suite would be made available to each participating municipal police agency that would provide equivalent or better services than previously enjoyed by local client server systems without the need for local hardware and software. The application, entitled CT:CHIEF, has been developed in conjunction with federal and state funds for the cities of Hartford, New Britain, and Bridgeport. As part of its procurement, the CRCOG developed contract language that would allow additional communities to join the regional system at very modest cost.

The system will be hosted by the city of Hartford Police Department as part of the CRCOG public safety suite. The City of Hartford Police Department operates a regional public safety server suite for CAPTAIN mobile data communications for fire and police services, a ROBIR (Regional Offender Biography and Image Repository) application for mug shots of offenders and suspects in the Capitol Region, and a public safety AVL (Automated Vehicle Location) system for homeland security purposes. These applications and services are maintained through a managed public process by the Capitol Region Council of Governments. CRCOG intends to develop redundant server sites to reduce service interruption risk and provide for disaster recovery. Under the proposal offered, the system would double in size in the first year. Since the application is designed to run in a virtualization environment, expansion is incremental rather than a replacement of existing server equipment. Users should notice no degradation of service as more communities migrate to the system.

The proposal offered by this Law Enforcement Information Sharing initiative is significant in that it is not a piecemeal approach. Every community in the Capitol Region has agreed to fully support the project. Those communities can participate in one of two ways. First, each can migrate to the browser based system and save substantial funds over a modest time frame. Second, for those that have recently invested in a new local records management system, an interface to the regional system will be developed so that they can participate without abandoning their current investment. In taking this approach the typical hurdle of dealing with asynchronous municipal procurement schedules is largely settled.

(3) Describe the amount and manner in which the service will achieve economies of scale, and the amount and manner in which each municipality will reduce its mill rate as a result of the savings realized by regionalizing the service (attach additional pages as necessary):

Centralizing information technology has a natural economy of scale. Local police departments will each have at least one less server, one less application, and one less operating system to maintain. Moreover, their user training burden can be more easily shared because more trainers can be garnered from regional sources. While local departments may require slightly larger bandwidth capacity to accommodate the new service; the reality of current information technology is that the requirement for higher bandwidth is already present. For each shared application, the burden of the local community is reduced by a maintenance percentage of at least 50%. We base this percentage on the known amounts for maintenance as expressed by a sampling of member towns. In our estimates, we have not included estimated costs for network maintenance and for the efforts of local information technology staff. Our understanding is that those costs are frequent and that local staff are often overwhelmed with service requests. Our reason for excluding them is that they could not be fully quantified on short notice as communities do not always maintain their accounts on the basis of a specific technology application.

CT:CHIEF was designed as a virtual police records management system not as a standalone system. It is built on a service oriented architecture and has open interfaces and design constructs. It was natively designed for multiple department access. While each participating community can operate as if they had a standalone RMS system, the system is unified and accessible under policy control. Savings from this proposal occurs from the avoidance of local capital outlays as well as a 50% savings on annual maintenance. In addition, the state itself will have considerable offsets in that data entry clerks will not be required to enter incident information in the courthouses or as a part of other silo oriented criminal justice information functions.

The issue of mill rate reductions for each community is a complex task with thirty three participating towns entering the system at different times. The local budget impact of the project is relatively small in each community. Whether this actually translates to a mill rate reduction in any way is a function of the local legislative body and the priorities for the town budget. What is predictable is that the collective cost avoidance to the participating communities exceeds 3.75 million dollars over a five year period. For some communities who may have been seeking to acquire a new local records management system, the replacement cost avoidance could be as much as \$200,000 in the first year. For other communities, the cost avoidance may be lower and later but it is nonetheless, just as certain.

Town	Savings	Potential Mill Rate Reduction
Avon	105,000	0.0471
Berlin	105,000	0.0625
Bloomfield	127,500	0.0750
Bridgeport	150,000	0.0404
Bristol	300,000	0.1381
Canton	55,000	0.0618
Coventry	55,000	0.0972
Cromwell	82,500	0.1167

East Hampton	55,000	0.1070
East Hartford	300,000	0.1154
East Windsor	82,500	0.1586
Enfield	212,500	0.1463
Farmington	127,500	0.0469
Glastonbury	135,000	0.0450
Granby	55,000	0.0679
Hartford	150,000	0.0394
Manchester	300,000	0.0895
Middletown	212,500	0.1143
New Britain	100,000	0.0348
Newington	127,500	0.0510
Plainville	105,000	0.0747
Plymouth	55,000	0.0700
Portland	37,500	0.0463
Rocky Hill	105,000	0.0665
Simsbury	105,000	0.0525
South Windsor	127,500	0.0607
Southington	135,000	0.0344
Suffield	55,000	0.0505
Vernon	135,000	0.1484
West Hartford	275,000	0.0630
Wethersfield	130,000	0.0684
Windsor	135,000	0.0563
Windsor Locks	82,500	0.1007

(4) Provide a cost benefit analysis for the provision of such regional service by each participating municipality and by the RPO (attach additional pages as necessary):

The cost benefit analysis for this project is straightforward:

- 1.) Each participating community can share law enforcement data on an incident record basis with every other law enforcement agency.
- 2.) Each participating community will avoid the cost of acquiring a replacement records management system and the associated hardware and operating environment.
- 3.) Each participating community can be assured that their police department has a records management system as good as their neighboring community.
- 4.) Each participating community that moves to the browser based system should save at least half of the support and maintenance costs associated with a local law enforcement records management system.
- 5.) With the concurrence of the State of Connecticut, the regional law enforcement data sharing service can serve as the basis for the initiation of criminal justice incident record entry without additional steps or expense by local police.
- 6.) System enhancements will be controlled by a committee of police representatives therefore assuring that user considerations are considered, accepted, and implemented on a timely and expected basis.
- 7.) User training in participating communities can be standardized and shared without additional expense.

The table of costs savings and avoidance collectively exceeds four million dollars over a five year period. It is illustrated in a table that is responsive to grant proposal question number six (6).

(5) Set out a plan of implementation for such regional service, include an approximate date for the beginning of the regional service and how the service will continue to be funded once service is established and grant funds are expended (attach additional pages as necessary):

This law enforcement information sharing initiative can be implemented almost immediately. The application is in final development in the three initiating communities of Hartford, New Britain, and Bridgeport. While an extensive testing process will take that development effort through the Spring of 2008, the application will then be ready to take on additional communities. To do so, is already built into the application. Second, for those users who seek to interface their incident records to the regional repository, an enabling XML schema will need to be developed. This has been done in other jurisdictions across the country and can be modified and implemented by contract extension. That XML schema will be require the consideration and approval of the Division of Criminal Justice and the Judicial Department's Information Systems Division. In offering this proposal, we respectfully suggest that this XML schema match not only the requirements of a law enforcement records management system but also the needs of the criminal justice system for incident report data. At least part of this can build upon previous work done by the Office of Policy and Management Criminal Justice Policy Division.

The records management and information sharing service would be continued in the same way that the CRCOG's mobile data system is supported. Each community would be assessed an annual user fee based on its level of usage and participation. Currently, users are charged \$350 per police car in addition to the wireless service charges. This covers all maintenance and server suite replacement costs. While this is not the ideal means of supporting these criminal justice applications, it is the only one available to local law enforcement and has enjoyed widespread acceptance. This data sharing and records management system will not be a static one. It will require changes and the changes will require support and user training. All of these improvements would be done once rather than thirty three times over in the participating towns. Moreover, this service has the opportunity to save the state money as it could channel its criminal justice initiatives in this direction and therefore limit the number of customized interfaces it would require. Those initiatives could be implemented faster and more effectively in the web based environment than in the traditional client server approaches operating today.

Timetable:

System procurement and contract: Completed

Data sharing agreement drafted: Completed awaiting signatures

Application roll out to initial three communities: May 2008

XML Interface Definition Completed: July 2008

XML Interface Implemented: September 2008

Revised Incident Report Writing Application: November 2008

(6) List the municipalities participating in the proposed shared service and estimate the savings to be realized by each municipality participating in the regionalized service.

Town	Number of Officers	Estimated Existing Maintenance Costs	Estimated New Standalone System Replacement Cost	5 Year Maintenance Savings	Total Cost Avoidance
Avon	31	12,000	75,000	30,000	105,000
Bloomfield	45	15,000	90,000	37,500	127,500
Canton	15	6,000	40,000	15,000	55,000
East Hartford	129	40,000	200,000	100,000	300,000
East Windsor	24	9,000	60,000	22,500	82,500
Enfield	92	25,000	150,000	62,500	212,500
Farmington	42	15,000	90,000	37,500	127,500
Glastonbury	55	18,000	90,000	45,000	135,000
Granby	14	6,000	40,000	15,000	55,000
Hartford	411	60,000		150,000	150,000
Manchester	114	40,000	200,000	100,000	300,000
Newington	42	15,000	90,000	37,500	127,500
Rocky Hill	35	12,000	75,000	30,000	105,000
Simsbury	33	12,000	75,000	30,000	105,000
South Windsor	43	15,000	90,000	37,500	127,500
Suffield	17	6,000	40,000	15,000	55,000
Vernon	51	18,000	90,000	45,000	135,000
West Hartford	123	30,000	200,000	75,000	275,000
Wethersfield	46	16,000	90,000	40,000	130,000
Windsor	54	18,000	90,000	45,000	135,000

Windsor Locks	24	9,000	60,000	22,500	82,500
Bridgeport	430	60,000		150,000	150,000
Berlin	38	12,000	75,000	30,000	105,000
Southington	59	18,000	90,000	45,000	135,000
Middletown	95	25,000	150,000	62,500	212,500
New Britain	164	40,000		100,000	100,000
Portland	10	5,000	25,000	12,500	37,500
Plainville	33	12,000	75,000	30,000	105,000
Bristol	119	40,000	200,000	100,000	300,000
Cromwell	24	9,000	60,000	22,500	82,500
East Hampton	14	6,000	40,000	15,000	55,000
Coventry	13	6,000	40,000	15,000	55,000
Plymouth	18	6,000	40,000	15,000	55,000
	2,457	636,000	2,730,000	1,590,000	4,320,000
Per cent of municipalities, in the RPO, participating in the proposed regional service(s): 72%					
(7) Attach hereto the following documents from participating municipalities:					
(A) A resolution by the legislative body of each municipality affected by the proposal endorsing such proposal.					
(B) Certification by each municipality that there are no legal obstacles to provision of services in the manner described in the proposal including, but not limited to binding arbitration.					
(8) Attach the following material:					
1. A site location map (if applicable)					
2. Proposed Project Schedule (Outline the Proposed Project timeline)					
3. Project cost estimates supporting the request for funding					
4. List of necessary local/state/federal permits and approvals required for the project.					
(9) Has a copy of the proposal been sent to legislators representing the participating municipalities? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> **To be mailed the week of Dec. 3, 2007.					
If YES, please attach copies of cover letters.					

(10) Certification by the Chairman of the Regional Planning Organization(s):
I do hereby certify that the information contained herein is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.
Signature:
Name: David Kilbon
Title: Chairman, CRCOG; First Selectman, Town of East Granby
Date:
(Please use following certification if more than one RPO is participating.)
(10) Certification by the Chairman of the Regional Planning Organization(s):
I do hereby certify that the information contained herein is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.
Signature:
Name:
Title:
Date:

Proposed Budget

Additional CT Chief Licenses	\$765,204
Managed Mobile Incident Writing Application	\$240,000
Enhancements to Server and Backup System	\$100,000
Integration with Criminal Justice XML	\$150,000
CRCOG Grant Administration (3%)	\$37,656
TOTAL:	\$1,292,860.00