

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING ILLINOIS CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION AUTHORITY

March 4, 2005
120 S. Riverside Plaza, 21st Floor
Chicago, Illinois

Call to Order and Roll Call

Chairman Sorosky convened the regular meeting of the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority and asked Robert Boehmer, the Authority's Secretary and General Counsel, to call the roll.

In addition to the Chairman, other Authority members in attendance were:

Chief David Bradford
Cook County Circuit Court Clerk, Dorothy Brown
Kankakee County Sheriff Timothy Bukowski
Mr. Brad Demuzio
Cook County State's Attorney Richard Devine
Ms. Barbara Engel
State's Attorneys Appellate Prosecutor Director Norbert Goetten
DeKalb County Circuit Court Clerk Maureen Josh
Attorney General Designee Ellen Mandeltort
Mr. Eugene E. Murphy, Jr.
Mr. John Piland
Cook County Board President John Stroger
Mr. John Z. Toscas
Director Larry Trent

Approval of the Minutes of the December 3, 2004 Authority Meeting

Mr. Boehmer noted that there were three corrections to the minutes. The date was corrected to December 3rd from December 5th. State's Attorney Mudge was recorded as not attending the meeting and Director Jurkanin was recorded as attending the meeting.

{Mr. Toscas moved to approve the minutes of the regular meeting held on December 3, 2004, as amended. Director Goetten seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous voice vote.}

Chairman's Remarks

Chairman Sorosky welcomed Cook County Board President John Stroger to his first Authority meeting. He said that President Stroger would be a valuable addition to the Authority. Chairman Sorosky then called on Executive Director Levin for her comments.

Executive Director's Report

Director Levin introduced Diane Devereux as the new Associate Director of Human Resources. She also reported that Norman Mason was hired as a data processor specialist, Dorothy Lawrence was hired as a grant specialist and Ron Reichgelt to a supervisory position was promoted in the Federal and State Grants Unit. Director Levin also noted that Jan Cichowlas will be the new Associate Director for Research and Analysis.

Director Levin noted that the amount of money available from the Justice Assistance Grant Program for fiscal year 2005 is a million dollars less than last year. She said that staff was looking into what we would have left for 2004

and evaluating programs to make sure they are successful. Director Levin said that President Bush has zeroed out the JAG and JABG funds and is seeking to rescind the VOCA funds. She said that she will go to Washington, D.C. to meet with the Illinois Congressional delegation to express our concerns. She noted that if VOCA is rescinded it would affect the domestic violence and sexual assault programs, as well as the newly funded elder abuse program. She asked how the members would like to respond to the federal budget cuts. In response to a question from Clerk Brown, Director Levin said that staff would prepare materials to send to our delegation. Clerk Josh suggested that staff send boilerplate letters to the members so that they can send similar letters. State's Attorney Devine asked that staff send out a copy of the letter, a fact sheet, and a list of people to whom staff thinks it is appropriate to send the letter. He said that he thinks that each member should draft his or her own letter which may emphasize what they think is appropriate. Clerk Brown also noted that we may want to include some sort of statistics justifying the need.

{Mr. Toscas made a motion to authorize the executive director to send a letter to Congress expressing the Authority's opposition to the elimination of the Justice Assistance Grant Program and Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Program, and the transfer of reserve funds from the Crime Victim's Fund. The motion was seconded by Ms. Josh and adopted by unanimous voice vote.}

Executive Director Levin then reported on several things which were in the memo in the mailing, including county profiles, website visitors, projects staff is working on with IDOC, disproportionate minority contact, and the juvenile justice conference conducted by the Authority. She thanked Phil Stevenson and Bob Bauer for keeping the Research and Analysis Unit running after Gerry Ramker left. She also reported that staff is developing BARJ implementation guides, conducting the criminal history audit, and completed the victimization survey. She also reported on the Federal and State Grants Unit activities and the Illinois Integrated Justice Information Systems Implementation Board. She called on Clerk Brown to discuss the IIJIS Summit. Clerk Brown reported that the Summit was planned for June 9th in Lisle. The purpose is to give the various criminal justice agency stakeholders an opportunity to come together and obtain information related to integrated justice. She said that we will have exhibitors and that we will have various presentations, including sessions on strategic planning and the history of IIJIS.

Executive Director Levin then discussed the Authority's information systems. She said that we met with a Synch Solutions consultant, regarding possible convergence of ALERTS and IWIN and are awaiting a response from the users. She said that we are now reviewing the rates for services. She noted that the fund balance is dwindling and that we have not raised rates in a number of years. She said that some jurisdictions are paying different rates for the same services. She said that she will convene a meeting with the users advisory group. She indicated that she wanted to bring a proposed fee increase to the users before it is brought to the Budget Committee. She reported that we have made some budget-saving moves and have not filled some positions. Sheriff Bukowski indicated that the users are going to question why we would put more money into the fund when it gets swept out and is still short \$300,000 that was never returned. Director Levin responded that the \$300,000 was supposed to be returned in the Capital Development Bill which never passed. She said that we cannot operate in a fiscally irresponsible manner go broke. She indicated that she again will contact OMB about the fund transfer, but will also at some point need to know from the users and the Governor's Office, ISP and CMS with respect to convergence. She said that her main plan is to at least have these funds be healthy. She then called on Robert Boehmer to report on pending legislation.

Mr. Boehmer reported on several bills of interest to the Authority. He noted that Representative Millner sponsored House Bill 1151, the Authority's initiative to eliminate the requirement that the Authority set the maximum fee that local criminal justice agencies can charge for helping people with requests for conviction information under the Uniform Conviction Information. He said that the bill passed the Judiciary Committee and is on Third Reading in the House. Mr. Boehmer also reported on Senate Bill 554 which would allow the Authority to apply for and spend funds to assist counties and municipalities with reentry programs; House Bill 3518, which would provide funds for the Authority to assist MEGs in combating methamphetamine; and House Bill 3519, which would allow the Authority to apply for federal funds to assist with the meth issue. He also reported on House Resolution 151, which expressed concern about merging ALERTS and IWIN. He suggested that the Authority could schedule a Legislation and Regulations Committee meeting to discuss these bills.

Chairman Sorosky called on Budget Committee Chair Murphy to provide the Budget Committee Report. Mr. Murphy noted that details regarding the committee actions are at members' places. He indicated that, among other things, the committee dealt with lapsed funds, approved money for livescan machines for local law enforcement and designated funds for domestic violence and mental health initiatives. He indicated that the Budget Committee will meet more often – anywhere between 8-12 times per year. He said that these meetings tend to be more productive and we are more effective and efficient in our ability to get the funds out to the people that need them most. He said that funds provided by the Authority come with a very specific mandate – if you do not apply, you will not get funds, and if you don't administer the funds in a cost effective and efficient manner, you are not going to get more.

Chairman Sorosky then called on Associate Director Ted Miller to provide the financial report. Mr. Miller reported that the Authority has spent 43 percent of its operations funding and 45 percent of its grants and awards, slightly higher than last year. He reported that the Authority has already attended the Appropriation Hearing in the House and will be in front of the Senate in April. He noted that our audit will begin in May. He also reported that for the FY06 budget we received a 5 percent cut in general revenue funds. He said that this will require us to watch our expenses, but that we will still be able to supply the services in the general revenue fund that people expect from the Authority.

Victimization Survey Report

Chairman Sorosky called on Jennifer Hiselman to give a preview of the victimization survey results. Chairman Sorosky noted that Ms. Hiselman would be presenting the most salient findings of the first crime victimization survey specific to Illinois.

Ms. Hiselman began by providing background information on the ways that crime is measured, indicating that the most common way of measuring crime in Illinois is by looking at UCR data, which includes the number of offenses reported to the police. She noted the limitations of looking at this data, indicating that UCR data lacks information regarding the nature of the crime, and does not provide any information about crimes that are not reported to the police. She indicated that the number of crimes not reported to police is substantial, indicating that the Department of Justice's National Crime Victimization Survey tells us that slightly less than half of all crimes, about 48 percent, are reported to police.

Ms. Hiselman then described the second primary way for measuring crime, which is the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), which the Department of Justice has been conducting annually for more than 30 years. She indicated that the Department interviews a nationally representative sample of thousands of individuals, asking them whether they have been a victim of crime, and, if so, asking additional questions.

Ms. Hiselman indicated that while the NCVS is very informative, it does not indicate what is happening in Illinois or how Illinois differs from the rest of the nation. She indicated that NCVS data specific to Illinois cannot be extracted in a way such that it would be reliable and generalizable to the state. Because of the limitations in using the NCVS data, the Authority decided to conduct a crime victimization survey specific to Illinois.

Ms. Hiselman indicated that the three objectives of the survey included the following: to obtain statewide and regional victimization estimates; to gain a better understanding of the nature of crime victimization and to gain knowledge about public awareness of crime victim resources and how often victims receive crime victim services.

Ms. Hiselman indicated that the survey was mailed to about 5,700 Illinois adult residents, who were randomly selected from the Secretary of State's driver's license and state ID card databases. The survey questions were modeled after the NCVS, and were completed by survey respondents between January and April of 2003, on experiences that occurred to respondents during 2002.

Ms. Hiselman indicated that just over 1,600 responses were received, yielding a response rate of 28 percent. She indicated that while a higher response rate was hoped for, a comparison of the 1,600 respondents to Illinois census data showed that most demographic characteristics were fairly similar. She noted a couple of exceptions in the comparison of the data, indicating that they would have liked more representation from minority respondents and residents in more densely populated areas. She added, that statistically speaking, 1,600 respondents is enough to

generate statewide estimates with a standard error of 3 percent, and regional estimates with a margin of error of 6 percent or less.

Ms. Hiselman reported the following statewide estimates of victimization: 39 percent of Illinois residents 18 or older were a crime victim 13 percent of residents were victims of personal crimes, including robbery, assaults, aggravated assaults and sex crimes 23 percent of residents were victims of property crime, including burglary, theft, motor vehicle theft, and vandalism 16 percent were victims of computer crime, including theft during an Internet purchase, threats of harassment over the Internet or through e-mail, and computer virus attacks during personal use of a computer.

Ms. Hiselman also reported that assault, which included aggravated assault, was the most common type of personal crime victimization, experienced by 9 percent of residents. She indicated that the least common type of personal crime was sex crime, experienced by 1 percent. The most common type of property crime was theft at 14 percent, and the least common was motor vehicle theft at 1 percent.

Ms. Hiselman also reported that 3 percent of residents were victims of domestic crime, including victimization by any family or household member, and current and former dating relationships; 11 percent of residents were victimized by someone they knew and 1 percent reported they were a victim of hate crime.

Ms. Hiselman also reported on regional estimates of victimization, indicating that the margins of error are a bit larger given the smaller sample size: Chicago residents experienced the highest rate of victimization, at nearly half, or 47 percent as compared to other regions that were between 25 and 27 percent. Chicago's rate of personal crime was at 23 percent, compared to other regions that were between 8 and 12 percent. Chicago's rate of property crime was at 33 percent, compared to other regions that were between 18 and 23 percent. She reported that computer crime rates across regions were statistically similar, ranging from 12 to 18 percent.

Ms. Hiselman reported on the characteristics found to potentially increase the likelihood that a person would be a victim of crime. She reported higher victimization rates among those who live in a household with a child under 18. She also reported that students had a higher rate of victimization than non-students, but noted that age was not taken into account at this time. Since students tend to be younger, she indicated that could be a factor. She noted that more detailed analyses of crime victimization data will be released through research bulletins over the coming year, to address such questions.

Ms. Hiselman reported that the victim knew the offender in 28 percent of victimizations, and in nearly two-thirds of personal crime victimizations. She reported that most victimization occurred at or near the victim's home or within their community; property and computer crime most often occurred at home and that personal crime victimization occurred most often in commercial places within the victim's community.

She reported that personal and property crime victimizations were as likely to occur during the day as at night, and of personal crime victimization, 17 percent involved a weapon and 22 percent resulted in victim injury.

Ms. Hiselman also reported on the number of victimizations that were reported to police, which she indicated were very similar to NCVS findings. She reported that 39 percent of crimes were reported to police, with higher percentages for personal and property crimes, at 46 and 45 percent, and a lower percentage for computer crimes at 11 percent.

Ms. Hiselman indicated that the most reported property crime was vandalism at 50 percent, completed or attempted motor vehicle theft or theft from a motor vehicle was at 47 percent, and completed or attempted theft at 41 percent.

Ms. Hiselman indicated that regarding personal crime, robbery was the most likely to be reported to police at 60 percent, and sex crime was the least likely to be reported at 39 percent, though she indicated that with 14 victims of sex crime reporting, the 39 percent reporting rate should not be given much weight.

Ms. Hiselman also reported on why respondents did or did not report victimizations to police. She indicated that the most common reasons stated were as follows: they did not think it was important enough, either to them or to the police they didn't think it was likely that an offender would be caught or they felt it was a personal matter. When

asked why they did report to the police, the following reasons were reported: prevention of further crimes, catching the offender or recovering property, and feeling a sense of duty to report the crime.

Ms. Hiselman then reported on respondent's awareness, whether a crime victim or not, of crime victim resources in their community. She reported that resident awareness of domestic violence services was the highest, at 62 percent, followed closely by awareness of child abuse and neglect services and rape and sexual assault services. Fewer residents were aware of services for violent crime victims and crime victims' compensation. She also reported that residents of Cook County, combining Chicago and suburban Cook County, were less aware of crime victim resources in their communities than residents in other regions. She reported that crime victims were not more likely than non-victims to be aware of crime victim resources.

Ms. Hiselman reported that few victims and victims of personal crime reported receiving crime victim services from either the criminal justice system or a private, nonprofit agency. She said that this finding is interesting because other data sources as well as anecdotal information indicate that many victims are being provided with services. She reported that our InfoNet data base tells us that tens of thousands of victims are serviced each year by the domestic violence and sexual assault centers alone.

Ms. Hiselman noted a few conclusions which emerged from the findings. She said that first, crime happens more than we think. Although UCR data are useful for analyzing trends and learning about crime rates in large and small jurisdictions, UCR data alone do not provide a comprehensive picture of crime victimization and we need to recognize its limitations.

Next, Ms Hiselman noted that several characteristics appear to be risk factors for victimization in Illinois. She said that for some of these we have ideas as to why they are risk factors, so we should enhance efforts in response to those more established findings. And for those findings which we are not sure about, we need to try to learn a little more about why these characteristics tend to increase vulnerability.

Finally, Ms. Hiselman noted that it seems that a good number of people are aware of crime victim resources, but they could be made more aware of violence crime services. She said that we could do more to make sure victims understand how these resources can help them and exactly how they can get access to them.

In response to Ms. Engel's concerns about the limitations of a survey, Ms. Hiselman noted that although the data are limited, it is helpful to get a little extra piece of the picture with all of these methods combined. Ms. Brown commented that we need to figure out why victims in Chicago have a lower rate of knowledge about services than those in other urban areas. In response to a question from Chairman Sorosky, Ms. Hiselman noted that some of the characteristics that increased vulnerability to victimization were unexpected. For example, she noted that we found that persons with the highest level of education, being either undergraduate or some post graduate work, were more likely to be victims of crime. She said that that may be due to computer crimes and the higher rate of student victimization. She also indicated that the findings about crime victim resources were surprising as well.

New Business

Sheriff Bukowski said that it is important to bring revenue back to the state, specifically for ALERTS. He said that homeland security funds may be able to be used for that purpose and that the budget committee should be aware of that funding. In referring to Mr. Murphy's previous comments about reaching out to smaller communities, he noted that ALERTS reaches out to 30% of police agencies in Illinois, so it is an opportunity to make enhancements.

He pointed out that at a recent Sheriff's conference there was some frustration that he thought was improperly being directed at the Authority. He noted that people are frustrated by the sweeping of the ALERTS funds and with Central Management Services. He said that we may need to do a better job of public relations to repair any damage to the Authority's reputation. For example, he noted the need for a backup system and frustrations that this could not be accomplished.

Executive Director Levin noted that Synch-Solutions was hired to look into convergence of the two systems and noted that CMS approved a significant amount of funds for ALERTS base stations and a perpetual license for PIMS. She noted that she and Jay Carlson of CMS had met with the user board and indicated that Carlson

acknowledged that even if we are moving towards convergence, CMS would be more amenable to approving things. She noted that users and representatives of the Governor's Office met with Synch-Solutions and that the users were to meet to discuss convergence. She said that the executive director of the Sheriff's Association met with the Governor's Office and her regarding the issue. In addition, she indicated that the Sheriff's Association requested and received a significant amount of documentation regarding the system from the Authority. She said that we had not yet received comments from the users on the draft plan proposed by Synch-Solutions. She recommended that Authority staff meet with the users to get their ideas and officially get a response regarding convergence.

Chairman Sorosky suggested that some of the problem may be due to communications issues and the difficult financial issues facing the state. Sheriff Bukowski agreed that communication is the key, but noted that to many municipal and county agencies, the state is really just one agency and therefore, the Authority gets the blame when there is a lack of money available. The users look at the funds as their money, but cannot dictate the shape or direction where it goes. A real frustration is that the Synch-Solutions Report identified the lack of a backup system as a reason for convergence. He said that it is very difficult to explain to people that it is not the Authority that is making these sweeps.

Mr. Murphy indicated that if people have complaints, they need to bring those to the Authority's attention. Director Levin noted that she did set up a conference call of the ALERTS board, but nobody called in. She noted that she would set up another meeting to discuss the rates. She noted that the Authority needs to make sure that the rates are fair and uniform and that the systems remain financially viable. Chairman Sorosky then called on Henry County Sheriff Gib Cady and Chief Fred Clauser to comment. Sheriff Cady presented Sheriff Bukowski with a memento of appreciation for his efforts on the Authority.

Chief Clauser noted that he has been involved with ALERTS and PIMS for many years. He said that ALERTS was created with the support and assistance of the Authority. He said that the system is large, with over 300 participating agencies and is primarily available north of I-80. He said that general revenue funds were not used to build the system. He said that IWIN was created later and is cellular based and is not as reliable. He expressed his concern over the transfer of user funds. He also expressed some frustration over the inability to obtain information about the diversion of user-contributed funds and how they were being utilized. He repeated that the main issue was the diversion of user funds to make up the state's budget shortfall.

President Stroger said that the users should also work with his staff to attempt to resolve the issues. Chief Clauser indicated that they have worked with the Office of the Cook County Sheriff. Chief Clauser said that the issue is not about any particular persons or this administration, but it is a long-standing tradition of conflicting state goals. He said that IWIN may have been a good solution for the Illinois State Police, but it is not a good solution for local users. He reported that there is a potential legislative change and that they are seeking other methods of resolving the conflict because they have been unable to do so in a meaningful fashion after this many years. In response to Chairman Sorosky, Chief Clauser indicated that he believes that serious discussions need to be held between the executive director and the users. He said that one of the frustrations is that the actual system itself is threatened in its very existence. Chief Clauser said that we should convince the Governor's office should make this a priority to make sure that ALERTS is funded so that it can improve and grow. Chairman Sorosky indicated that it may not be appropriate for the Authority as a board to lobby anyone, but the individual members may want to do so.

{Upon a motion by Ms. Josh, seconded by Mr. Demuzio, and adopted by unanimous voice vote, Chairman Sorosky adjourned the meeting.}

Respectfully Submitted,



Robert P. Boehmer
Secretary and General Counsel