



REPORT TO

THE

HONORABLE JOINT COMMITTEE

ON JUDICIARY

ON THE

ESTABLISHMENT AND

IMPLEMENTATION OF

A STATE-WIDE AUTOMATED

VICTIM INFORMATION AND

NOTIFICATION SYSTEM

January 2007



KEVIN T. KANE
CHIEF STATE'S ATTORNEY

State of Connecticut
DIVISION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

OFFICE OF
THE CHIEF STATE'S ATTORNEY

300 CORPORATE PLACE
ROCKY HILL, CONNECTICUT 06067
TELEPHONE (860) 258-5800

January 1, 2007

The Joint Standing Committee on Judiciary
Legislative Office Building
Hartford

Honorable Members of the Committee on Judiciary:

Pursuant to Public Act No. 06-100, "*AN ACT CONCERNING CRIME VICTIMS*," Section 4, please find enclosed the Chief State's Attorney's plan for the establishment and implementation of a state-wide automated victim information and notification system.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Kevin T. Kane".

Kevin T. Kane
Chief State's Attorney

Executive Summary

The Chief State's Attorney, in consultation with the Chief Court Administrator, established a Planning Group to "develop a plan for the establishment and implementation of a statewide automated victim information and notification system."

The Group reviewed the Bureau of Justice Assistance's (BJA) *Planning, implementing and operating effective Statewide Automated Victim Information and Notification (SAVIN) programs*, and determined, after consulting with other states that had adopted the document's guidelines and standards that, with Connecticut-specific modifications, adopting said guidelines would be in the best interest of crime victims in Connecticut. Included in these guidelines was the formation of a SAVIN Governance Committee, designation of a Lead Agency, designation of a Program Manager, and an 18 - 24 month planning and implementation period.

A BJA-promulgated solicitation for funding SAVIN programs was reviewed. It was determined that the solicitation's due date of December 21, 2006 did not provide a potential lead agency sufficient time to prepare an accurate submission as well as pre-dating the issuance of this report and subsequent review by the Judiciary Committee.

Discussions with other states indicated that it would be vastly more cost- and time-efficient for Connecticut to purchase and modify a vendor-based SAVIN system than to develop one on its own. Strong concerns were raised, however, regarding the seeming lack of vendor competition and the close relationship between BJA and the dominant vendor.

In consultation with Judicial Information Systems and the Department of Information Technology, it was determined that the Offender Based Tracking System, with modifications to provide for fail-safe capabilities and capacity enhancement (cost not yet determined), could "push" data in a timely manner to a centralized automated notification system.

Examination of statutes and Office of Victim Services and Department of Correction victim notification procedures indicated that a consistent, workable definition of "crime victim" as it related to victim notification was lacking and needed to be drafted and adopted. This led to further discussion and the subsequent determination that the agencies constituting the Planning Group did not at this time have a consensus opinion as to whether SAVIN system access should be open to the public.

It was strongly felt by victim constituencies that any SAVIN program should expand and enhance - not replace - current "human contact" notification procedures.

Victim representatives on the Planning Group also firmly stated that court-based events should be included in any SAVIN system. Data gathered from other states indicated that while feasible, this would be a complicated and costly endeavor.

Connecticut's Court Operations Unit seconded this statement, indicating that timely input of court-based data would require a significant but as-yet-undetermined increase in staffing.

It is recommended that Connecticut view itself as being in the early stages of BJA's 18 - 24 month SAVIN program planning period and thus should establish a Task Force to select or serve as the SAVIN Governance Committee. The Committee would in turn recommend a Lead Agency who would receive a General Fund appropriation to hire a full-time Project Manager. The Project Manager would be responsible for the provision to the Judiciary Committee of a detailed plan for the creation of a Connecticut SAVIN system, no later than July 1, 2008, for implementation in the 2009 -2011 Budget Cycle.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
The Planning Group	3
Planning Group: Areas of Exploration.....	4
Summary of Outstanding Issues	12
Conclusion	13
List of Attachments	14

Introduction

On November 27, 1996, after 79% of Connecticut voters had voted in favor of its passage, the constitution of the State of Connecticut was amended as follows:

ARTICLE XXIX.

Article seventeen of the amendments to the constitution is amended to read as follows:

a. In all Criminal prosecutions, the accused shall have a right to be heard by himself and by counsel; to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted by the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process to obtain witnesses in his behalf; to be released on bail upon sufficient security, except in capital offenses, where the proof is evident or the presumption great; and in all prosecutions by information, to a speedy, public trial by an impartial jury. No person shall be compelled to give evidence against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor shall excessive bail be required nor excessive fines imposed. No person shall be held to answer for any crime, punishable by death or life imprisonment, unless upon probable cause shown at a hearing in accordance with procedures prescribed by law, except in the armed forces, or in the militia when in actual service in time of war or public danger.

b. In all criminal prosecutions, a victim, as the general assembly may define by law, shall have the following rights: (1) the right to be treated with fairness and respect throughout the criminal justice process; (2) the right to timely disposition of the case following arrest of the accused, provided no right of the accused is abridged; (3) the right to be reasonably protected from the accused throughout the criminal justice process; (4) the right to notification of court proceedings; (5) the right to attend the trial and all other court proceedings the accused has the right to attend, unless such person is to testify and the court determines that such person's testimony would be materially affected if such person hears other testimony; (6) the right to communicate with the prosecution; (7) the right to object to or support any plea agreement entered into by the accused and the prosecution and to make a statement to the court prior to the acceptance by the court of the plea of guilty or nolo contendere by the accused; (8) the right to make a statement to the court at sentencing; (9) the right to restitution which shall be enforceable in the same manner as any other cause of action or as otherwise provided by law; and (10) the right to information about the arrest, conviction, sentence, imprisonment and release of the accused. The general assembly shall provide by law for the enforcement of this subsection. Nothing in this subsection or in any law enacted pursuant to this subsection shall be construed as creating a basis for vacating a conviction or ground for appellate relief in any criminal case.

Adopted November 27, 1996.

While many laudable efforts have been made in regard to the notification provisions of the amendment (notably the Office of Victim Services – see *OVS-Stated Protocols in Regard to Victim Notification* – Attachment A, and the Department of Corrections – see *Victim Services Manual* – Attachment B), Connecticut has not joined the District of Columbia and 41 states that have either state or county-wide automated victim information and notification systems for inmate-related (and, more rarely, court or prosecutor-level) events.

Obstacles to the creation of a Statewide Automated Victim Information and Notification system (SAVIN) in Connecticut are both traditional: identification of fiscal and human resources, determination of scope, technical capacities and capabilities, management and ownership issues – and non-traditional: definitions of “crime victim” as applied to victim notification in the field that vary in their inclusiveness (see Attachment C), and Connecticut’s centralized criminal justice system, which, while it may well ultimately prove to be advantageous, seems to preclude the piecemeal or “pilot program” approach available to other states.

Perhaps the ultimate barrier to a Connecticut SAVIN, and a close cousin to “management and ownership issues”, was the lack of an entity focused solely on bringing it into being. Thus, on June 2, 2006:

Public Act No. 06-100

An Act Concerning Crime Victims

Sec. 4. (*Effective from passage*) The Chief State's Attorney, in consultation with the Chief Court Administrator, shall develop a plan for the establishment and implementation of a state-wide automated victim information and notification system to provide automatic notice of relevant offender information and status reports to registered crime victims. Not later than January 1, 2007, the Chief State's Attorney shall submit such plan, including any recommended legislation necessary to implement such plan, to the joint standing committee of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to the judiciary, in accordance with section 11-4a of the general statutes.

The Planning Group

Pursuant to PA NO. 06-100, the Office of the Chief State's Attorney, in consultation with the Chief Court Administrator, established a Planning Group, Co-Chaired by the Division of Criminal Justice's Grants and Contracts Manager, Mitch Forman, and the Office of Victim Services' Director, Linda J. Cimino. Participants on the Planning Group included representatives of the following State agencies or other organizations:

- Patrick Hynes, Director of Offender Programs and Victim Services for the Connecticut Department of Correction (DOC);
- John Duffey, Victim Services Unit, DOC;
- Helen Santini, DOC
- Stephen Ment, Deputy Director of Legislative Affairs, Judicial External Affairs;
- Faith Arkin, Director of Judge Support Services, Judicial;
- Rick Dunion, Judge Support Services;
- Jack Brooks, Director of Administration, Court Support Services Division (CSSD), Judicial
- Michael Aiello, CSSD;
- Celia Siefert, CSSD;
- Terry Schuure, Policy Development and Planning Division, OPM
- Nicholas Cimmino, Deputy Director, Legal Services, Superior Court Operations;
- Larry D'Orsi, Deputy Director, Criminal Matters, Court Operations;
- Judith Lee, Court Operations;
- Steve Marhefsky, Court Operations;
- Sgt. Sam Izzarelli, Executive Officer, Sex Offender Registry, DPS;
- Thomas Basile, Department of Information Technology;
- Dean Myshrall, Department of Information Technology;
- Terry Walker, Manager, Criminal Justice Applications, JIS;
- Grace Futoma, JIS
- Jan Sniffin, Systems Developer, DCJ;
- Olga Mass, OVS;
- Susanne Pakele, OVS;
- Ellen Weber, Executive Director, Psychiatric Security Review Board;
- Merit Lajoie, Office of the Victim Advocate;
- Janice Heggie Margolis, Executive Director, MADD;
- Lisa Holden, Executive Director, CCADV;
- Nancy Kushins, Executive Director, CONNSACS;
- Jessica Norton, Survivors of Homicide

Planning Group: Areas of Exploration

- Federal Direction and Opportunities
- Re-inventing the Wheel/What Do Other States Do?
- Technical Capabilities and Technical Needs
- Definition "Crime Victim" – Who Gets the Information?
- What is Connecticut Doing?
- What Would Connecticut Like to Do?

Federal Direction and Opportunities

The first significant action of the Planning Group was to review the federal Bureau of Justice Assistance's (BJA) document *Planning, implementing and operating effective Statewide Automated Victim Information and Notification (SAVIN) programs* (Attachment D), which puts forth guidelines, recommendations and standards for the development and implementation of SAVIN systems. BJA objectives were to study SAVIN programs nationwide to "identify and leverage best practices...create victim-focused principles that states can adhere to when implementing SAVIN...require SAVIN programs to follow the appropriate national standards established for sharing criminal justice information." The guiding principles put forth for SAVIN programs stated that such programs must: "be victim focused...safety driven...provide for victim/survivor confidentiality...provide for the right to access or decline services..."

Structurally, BJA recommended the identification and designation of a SAVIN Lead Agency responsible for program implementation and monitoring, which would in turn hire or assign a SAVIN Program Manager accountable for day-to-day program development and operation. The Lead Agency would also establish a multidisciplinary SAVIN Governance Committee, which would provide it and the Program Manager with expertise and guidance. The Bureau suggested a planning/implementation period of 18 to 24 months.

BJA also provided suggested standards on Training ("include strategies for educating stakeholders, victims, and survivors, and other community members"), Assessment ("outcome measures, consistent with the Government Performance and Results Act...should initially be recorded and tracked monthly...SAVIN provider will be required to provide a web-based reporting tool that will track detailed statistics.."), Public Awareness ("approaches for working with the news media and other public outreach venues to inform the public about the SAVIN Program, but also to respond to media inquiries about the service"), and Technical Architecture ("architecture based on a central location for managing all of the data and communications from the remote agency systems throughout a state...this data must move in near-real time..")

The Planning Group, after its review of BJA's report and consultation with other states that had adopted the document's guidelines and standards, found that, with Connecticut-specific modifications, the standards presented in the report were in the best interest of crime victims in Connecticut and were consistent with established state practices. It was also clear that the standards would facilitate interstate access to offender data. This, coupled with the not insignificant fact that potential BJA funding for SAVIN implementation was contingent upon meeting report guidelines led the Planning Group to advocate embracing said guidelines.

A BJA-promulgated solicitation for funding SAVIN programs – *Developing and Enhancing Statewide Automated Victim Information and Notification (SAVIN) Programs* (see Attachment E) – was reviewed. It was determined that the solicitation's due date of December 21, 2006 did not provide a potential lead agency sufficient time to prepare an accurate submission as well as pre-dating the issuance of this report and subsequent review by the Judiciary Committee. The Planning Group also expressed concern that the funds available were *expensive*, requiring a dollar for dollar match.

Outstanding Issues: Identification/Selection of Lead Agency, Program Manager, and SAVIN Governance Committee; Connecticut modifications to suggested guidelines (establishment of SAVIN Governance Committee might precede selection of Lead Agency and/or Program Manager, etc.); identification of and commitment to matching funds should Connecticut apply for BJA SAVIN funds in the future.

Re-Inventing the Wheel/What Do Other States Do?

Currently, 41 states and the District of Columbia engage in some manner of automated victim notification, ranging from using solely Story County data in Iowa to DOC-only information in Montana to statewide court, County Jail and State Prison event notification in Texas (a snapshot of the Texas SAVIN as of 12/31/01, prepared by the then State Attorney General can be found in Attachment F). Twenty-three states have automated notice of varying victim-relevant events on a statewide basis (21 of them via their DOCs), eight state DOCs and the District of Columbia participate in county-wide or District-wide automated victim notification. In every instance, states have opted to purchase and modify a vendor-based SAVIN rather than develop one on their own. Based on the Planning Group's experience and expertise, it was felt that while Connecticut *could* create a SAVIN from scratch, it would be vastly more cost- and time-efficient to purchase and customize a vendor-based SAVIN. Strong concerns were raised by several agencies on the Planning Group, however, regarding the utter lack of serious vendor competition and the close, long-standing relationship between BJA and the dominant vendor.

Outstanding Issues: Determination as to whether to develop SAVIN in-house or modify available vendor package; creation of methodology to engender multiple vendor proposals if modified vendor package approach to SAVIN development is chosen.

Technical Capabilities and Technical Needs

The Offender Based Tracking System (OBTS) is a centralized repository that feeds events in near real time and includes information from criminal motor vehicle, Case Management Information System (CMIS), Paperless Rearrest Warrant Notification (PRAWN), Protective Order/Restraining Order Registry, Department of Correction (DOC), master name index (MNI), and computerized criminal history (CCH). OBTS is designed in XML format and has many offender-based events of interest (fifty-two to sixty events - see Attachment G). The program is also designed for event output. OBTS provides data as a host for other systems and its architectural design allows for expansion.

The Planning Group raised questions as to OBTS' potential for handling larger amounts of data (further court/pre-trial data, etc.) and its ability to avoid downtime due to both extraordinary circumstances and routine maintenance, as victims will come to rely on the system. Planning Group representatives from the Office of Policy and Management (OPM) and Judicial Information Services (JIS) explained that the addition of "failover" servers and other redundant servers to OBTS would minimize the possibility of system shutdown. Based on this information, with additional concurring input from the Department of Information Technology, the Planning Group found that the Offender Based Tracking System, with modifications to provide for fail-safe capabilities and, if necessary, capacity enhancement, could "push" data in a timely manner to a centralized automated notification system and thus be the "backbone" for a Connecticut SAVIN system.

Outstanding Issues: Quantification of the hardware and software (and potential staffing) requirements for capacity enhancement, "failover" security for OBTS, and connectivity with vendor- or in-house-supplied automated notification component; cost estimates for same.

Definition of Victim - Who Gets the Information?

Prior to any examination of Connecticut's current victim notification practices and their potential expansion or enhancement, the Planning Group asked a very basic question: how will "crime victim" be defined in terms of victim notification? Section 1-1k of the CGS states that crime victim means "an individual who suffers direct or threatened physical, emotional, or financial harm as a result of a crime and includes family members of a minor, incompetent individual or homicide victim..." yet OVS' stated protocols in regard to victim notification include crime victims, parents, guardians, and *relatives* of crime victims. Other statutes reviewed so far invoke the victim and "the legal representative of such a person or a member of a deceased victim's immediate family," yet DOC's Victim Services Unit procedures state that a notification request will be reviewed and processed when received from "any agency or person representing the victim" (emphasis ours). Some states, including Alaska and Kentucky, allow both victims and members of the public to use their automated system. Forty-one states and the District of Columbia subscribe to an internet-based system that will provide a varying amount of prisoner status/detail to anyone in possession of an

inmate's name. New York, for example, will allow anyone to register over the internet via email to receive email notification of a change in inmate status.

There was consensus among the Planning Group members that a consistent, workable definition of "crime victim" as it related to victim notification was lacking and needed to be drafted and adopted in order to create an effective SAVIN program. This led to further discussion and the subsequent determination that the agencies constituting the Planning Group did not at this time have a consensus opinion as to whether SAVIN system access should be open to the public.

Outstanding Issues: Determination of definition of "crime victim" for automated victim notification purposes; determination as to availability of SAVIN system to the public; determination as to whether "crime victims" and the public might have access to differing levels of offender status data.

What is Connecticut Doing?

While no fewer than nine Sections of the Connecticut General Statutes provide for statutory responsibility for victim notification (see Attachment H), agency compliance, based on lack of resources far more than on lack of will, varies, with the bulk of notification being provided by the Office of Victim Services (OVS) and the Department of Correction (DOC). *Abbreviated* versions of their respective procedures:

OVS:

OVS stated protocols in regard to victim notification:

Court-based Victim Advocacy Unit

Once a victim is identified and a case opened by the victim services advocates (VSA) a 'Notification of Victim's Rights' form (PA 03-179) is sent out informing victims of their rights. A VSA also notifies victims of important dates and the progress of their case and may contact them in regard to:

- next court date
- orders of no contact
- meeting with prosecutor
- support/object to plea agreement
- trial date or
- disposition date

Post-Conviction Notification Unit

Once a defendant is sentenced and incarcerated, OVS provides notification to eligible individuals through our 'Post-Conviction Notification Program.' (PA 91-389).

Persons who may request notification are:

- crime victims
- parents/guardians
- relatives of crime victims
- inmate family members
- State's Attorneys

OVS notifies registrants when an inmate has made an application to the:

- Board of Pardons and Paroles
- Department of Correction for release other than furlough
- Sentencing court or judge for a reduction in sentence
- Sentence Review Division for a review of sentence
- Sentencing court for exemption from the sex offender requirements of General Statutes 54-251
- Sentencing court for an order restricting the dissemination of sex offender registration

Protection Order Registry Notification Program

OVS notifies protected parties when protective orders terminate or five weeks prior to the expiration of restraining orders.

(PA 02-132).

DOC:

Victim Notification Process Procedures:

Any letter or other request received at a facility from the following will be directed to the Victim Services Unit for review and processing:

- victim of an offense
- a legal representative of the victim
- any agency or person representing the victim—
- victim advocate of the Office of Victim Services
- any representative from the Office of Victim Advocate
- any representative from the Chief's State's Attorney

The Victim Services Supervisor, upon receipt of a written victim notification request, (See Confidential Request for Notice of Inmate Release form page 27) will review the request to verify the victim. Once the verification has been made, whether the inmate is sentenced or accused, the Victim Services Unit will process the request.

Facility Notification to the Victim Services Unit:

The Unit Administrator or designee may provide notification to the Victim Services Unit, prior to inmates' discharge, release to parole, community release or any furlough, to include a re-entry furlough.

In situations such as court mandate releases, bond outs, discharges from court, the Victim Services Unit will make a telephonic notification. A letter notifying the victim of the change of inmate status will be sent to the listed victim address on the next business day. The Victim Services Unit staff members will ensure that contact or non-contact is documented and placed in the victim's file. When the inmate is sentenced with cases pending, the victim notification will be made of the discharge from the current sentence. Victim notification regarding a detainer will be determined by the Victim Services Unit Supervisor.

Notification Procedure for Escapes:

If an inmate escapes from custody or furlough and/or if an inmate is returned to custody following an escape, the facility will contact the Duty Victim Services Unit Supervisor via beeper (860) 860-3119. The Victim Services Unit Supervisor will:

- Attempt to notify the victim telephonically and will continue until contact is made or it is determined that the phone number on file is not current.
- If the Victim Services Unit Supervisor cannot contact the victim telephonically, the local Police Department of the residence of the victim will be contacted and will be requested to send a patrol car to make a "well-being check" on the victim and to inform the victim of the inmate's escape.
- Document all attempts to contact the victim including when the contact is made, as well as all contacts with the local Police Department. This information will be placed in the victim's file in the Victim Services Unit History Summary.
- The Victim Services Unit will contact the Office of Victim Services (Judicial) telephonically and inform the Office of Victim Services (Judicial) Supervisor of the event.
- The Victim Services Unit Supervisor will send a written notification via registered mail to the victim by utilizing the Victim Notification Form, Attachment C (CN4503). A copy will be forwarded to the facility Records Office, the Office of Victim Services (Judicial), and a copy placed in the Victim Services Unit file.

Notification for Parole Hearings:

The Victim Services Unit will receive, on a monthly basis, a Parole Hearing Docket List from the Board of Parole. The Victim Services Unit staff member will check the docket list for inmate's who have an active victim notification by

utilizing the (RT42) profile screen. A Victim Services staff member will send a letter 30 days in advance to the victim regarding the upcoming parole hearing.

There was a strong consensus among victim service agencies represented on the Planning Group (CONNSACS, MADD, CCADV, Survivors of Homicide, Office of the Victim Advocate) that the current victim notification actually being provided was rendered in a professional, effective, victim-centered manner, and that any SAVIN system should expand and enhance – not replace – Connecticut’s “human contact” notification procedures. A DOC member of the Planning Group relayed an instance where an out-of-state “well-being” check by Massachusetts police (performed after repeated telephone requests by DOC’s Victim Services Unit) interrupted an intended murder of a registered victim by an inmate released that day. An Office of the Victim Advocate representative flatly stated that to purchase and/or implement a SAVIN program that was intended to supplant current practice was “a waste of time and money.”

Outstanding Issues: Determination of resources required to maintain quality and quantity of current practices; determination of methodology necessary to ensure that any SAVIN program development and implementation does not replace or vitiate the current “human contact” victim notification system.

What Does Connecticut Want to Do?

Public Act 06-100 speaks of automatic victim notification of “relevant offender information” to “registered crime victims.” It soon became clear to members of the Planning Group that any SAVIN system’s size, scope, complexity, and ultimately, start-up and operational costs were dependent upon defining the universe of “relevant offender information,” and that this in turn hinged upon determining what a “crime victim” was and what type and/or level of data they would receive automated access to.

At the current level of analysis, there were many more questions than resolutions. Should Connecticut narrow its definition of “crime victim” and seek simply to automate current statutory requirements? Or, as advocated by Court Support Services Division Planning Group members, should the state offer basic inmate custody information (and, potentially, registration for more detailed notification) to any person with access to a computer? How should Connecticut’s approach to SAVIN system development be impacted by upcoming requirements under the federal Adam Walsh Act? Can victim anonymity and safety requirements be reconciled with SAVIN efficiency and the issue of victim validity? Should Habeas Corpus hearings be a notification event? Initial commitment hearings? Would a SAVIN system provide notification for both adult and juvenile offenders?

Victim services agencies providing input to the Planning Group were unanimous on one issue: the inclusion of court-based events in any Connecticut SAVIN program. This requirement generated another set of questions: is it important for court-based

events to be input into OBTS for "push" to a SAVIN system in near real time? If the answer is "yes," as it was for victim service providers, the timely input of court-based data would require a significant increase in staffing (a Court Operations Planning Group member estimated that it might be necessary to add 55 Data Terminal Operators - similar concerns would accompany automating notification required of the State's Attorneys). If staffing requirements for real time court-based data prove cost prohibitive, should Connecticut phase in SAVIN - first for current notification events then on to court-based events and eventually to data fed from on-line booking - or wait until a comprehensive booking-to-release SAVIN can be implemented?

Outstanding Issues: Determination of definition (or definitions) of "crime victim", leading to subsequent determination of delimitation of "relevant offender information" universe; subsequent determination of need for all data to be input into OBTS in real time; subsequent determination of staffing and equipment requirements and costs; subsequent determination of holistic or "phased-in" approach to a Connecticut SAVIN system.

Summary of Outstanding Issues

Federal Direction and Opportunities:

Identification/Selection of Lead Agency, Program Manager, and SAVIN Governance Committee; Connecticut modifications to suggested guidelines (establishment of SAVIN Governance Committee might precede selection of Lead Agency and/or Program Manager, etc.); identification of and commitment to matching funds should Connecticut apply for BJA SAVIN funds in the future.

Re-Inventing the Wheel/What Do Other States Do? :

Determination as to whether to develop SAVIN in-house or modify available vendor package; creation of methodology to engender multiple vendor proposals if modified vendor package approach to SAVIN development is chosen.

Technical Capabilities and Technical Needs:

Quantification of the hardware and software (and potential staffing) requirements for capacity enhancement, "failover" security for OBTS, and connectivity with vendor- or in-house-supplied automated notification component; cost estimates for same.

Definition of Victim - Who Gets the Information? :

Determination of definition of "crime victim" for automated victim notification purposes; determination as to availability of SAVIN system to the public; determination as to whether "crime victims" and the public might have access to differing levels of offender status data.

What is Connecticut Doing? :

Determination of resources required to maintain quality and quantity of current practices; determination of methodology necessary to ensure that any SAVIN program development and implementation does not replace or vitiate the current "human contact" victim notification system.

What Does Connecticut Want to Do? :

Determination of definition (or definitions) of "crime victim", leading to subsequent determination of delimitation of "relevant offender information" universe; subsequent determination of need for all data to be input into OBTS in real time; subsequent determination of staffing and equipment requirements and costs; subsequent determination of holistic or "phased-in" approach to a Connecticut SAVIN system.

Conclusion

Given the number of unresolved fundamental issues, it is recommended that Connecticut view itself as being in the early stages of BJA's 18 - 24 month SAVIN program planning period and thus should establish a Task Force to select or serve as the SAVIN Governance Committee. The Committee would in turn recommend a Lead Agency who would receive a General Fund appropriation to hire a full-time Project Manager*. The Project Manager would be responsible for the provision to the Judiciary Committee of a detailed plan for the creation of a Connecticut SAVIN system, no later than July 1, 2008, for implementation in the 2009 -2011 Budget Cycle.

*It is suggested that the Program Manager be hired as a Lead Planning Analyst (see Job Description - Attachment I) and placed at the Office of Policy and Management, Criminal Justice Policy and Planning Division. The requested appropriation is as follows:

7/1/2007 - 6/30/2008:

Personal Services	\$69,308
Other Expenses (Equipment, Furnishings, Supplies, Training, and Travel)	7,500
TOTAL Year One	\$76,808

7/1/2008 - 6/30/09:

Personal Services	\$71,731
Other Expenses (Training and Travel)	1,500
TOTAL Year Two	\$73,231

TOTAL REQUEST	\$150,039
---------------	-----------