

# Examples of Statewide Criminal Justice Data Repositories

Mirroring the relative dearth of criminal justice data, there is little accounting of statewide initiatives to move toward a centralized criminal justice data repository. Complicating this issue is a lack of standards and definitions in determining what a centralized data repository looks like, and what its capabilities should be. There are states who have undergone efforts to improve the exchange of criminal justice information between agencies, but have fallen short in establishing the collection of aggregate criminal justice data that can be used for the purposes of high-level analysis. Hawaii, Vermont, Maine, and Colorado are good examples of these efforts.<sup>1</sup> Further, there are states such as Illinois that have electronic, automated disposition reporting systems which has the ability to collect aggregated sentencing data, which are not reported here.<sup>2</sup> Also note, states can collect and report aggregate statewide criminal justice data without a centralized data repository. Measures for Justice offers a comprehensive national scan of each state's data reporting infrastructure for a variety of metrics.<sup>3</sup>

The states profiled below – Iowa, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Florida, California, New Mexico, Utah, Idaho, and Connecticut represent a broad but not exhaustive list of government initiatives to fully integrate criminal justice data, with focus on the best state models. Note that while Iowa, Pennsylvania, Florida, and California have established or are in the process of establishing a centralized data repository that would allow for research and analysis, Tennessee and North Carolina have not built their systems toward that end. These systems exist solely as information exchanges in their current state. Keep in mind, however, these states have very different challenges and opportunities compared to Ohio.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.ojbc.org/files/VermontOJBCspotlight.pdf>; <https://www.ojbc.org/files/HawaiiOJBCspotlight.pdf>; <http://www.ojbc.org/files/MaineOJBCspotlight.pdf>; <https://www.colorado.gov/pacific/cicjis/about-cicjis>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.luc.edu/media/lucedu/criminaljustice/pdfs/Illinois%20Criminal%20Justice%20Data%20Guide.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> <https://measuresforjustice.org/state-of-the-data>

State Repository	Description	Development	Cost/Funding	Notes
<p><b>Iowa Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS)</b></p>	<p>A “system of systems” that integrates and shares criminal justice information among Iowa’s criminal justice agencies in a seamless, real-time, and secure manner. <sup>4</sup> It connects law enforcement, attorneys, state agencies, courts, and criminal histories. The Justice Data Warehouse holds data on all case filings and dispositions in adult criminal court and juvenile delinquency court.</p>	<p>The project began receiving grants in 2002 and launched in 2007. Major updates continue to be made and project completion is slated for 2022.</p>	<p>Total project cost from initiation in 2001 through 2017 is ~\$15 million dollars, or less than \$1 million a year. The expected cost for 2018 is \$1.55 million. Initially a mix of 10 state and federal grants were used for the development, but now annual funding is done through state appropriation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Protection orders available to law enforcement 12-36 hours sooner than previously</li> <li>▪ Exchange used 18,000 times a day by law enforcement increasing safety</li> <li>▪ Elimination of information errors and redundant data entry, allowing for improved and more immediate decision-making</li> <li>▪ Statewide Consolidated Charge Code Table – exchange sends information from a centralized table that manages all criminal charge codes to the Judicial Branch DPS, DOC, DOT, county attorneys, and local</li> </ul>

<sup>4</sup> <https://humanrights.iowa.gov/cjip/criminal-justice-information-systems-integration>

State Repository	Description	Development	Cost/Funding	Notes
				law enforcement, ensuring all entities are using the same charge codes.
<b>North Carolina Criminal Justice Law Enforcement Automated Data Services (CJLEADS)<sup>5</sup></b>	Database of comprehensive information about criminals that can be accessed via an online portal. It integrates data including warrants; prison and jail records; court records; probation and parole status; sex offender registration; driver records; and concealed handgun permits. It provides up-to-date information about offenders in a centralized location via a secure connection for use by state and local government criminal justice professionals.	Launched in 2010 as a joint effort managed by the Department of Information Technology and various state agencies.	The initial development cost was \$25.5 million, with an annual cost of \$9 million thereafter. The North Carolina State Government estimates time savings and increased productivity saves \$19.5 million annually.	Usage: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 28,000 federal, state, and local CJ professionals</li> <li>▪ 12,407 users access CJLEADS in an average week</li> <li>▪ 19.9 million searches in an average year</li> </ul>

<sup>5</sup> <https://files.nc.gov/ncdit/documents/files/GBICC-Legislative-Report-June-2013.pdf>

State Repository	Description	Development	Cost/Funding	Notes
<b>Tennessee Integrated Criminal Justice (ICJ) Web Portal<sup>6</sup></b>	A secure browser-based interface into state criminal justice agency databases, which provides the ability to query many available databases in one place. It connects the Tennessee Bureau of Investigation, Department of Correction, Board of Parole, Department of Safety, and Department of Revenue.	Development began in 2006 and now it is used by 150 agencies and 3,000 individuals including law enforcement and district attorneys.	It cost \$200,000 to develop and is now supported by \$75 agency fees. Tennessee reports that this has resulted in significant savings for many smaller agencies because they no longer have to rely on more expensive 3 <sup>rd</sup> party systems to access data on the ICJ web portal.	
<b>Pennsylvania Justice Network (JNET)<sup>7</sup></b>	It began with a 1995 report from the Pennsylvania Improved Management Performance and Cost Control Task Force as a means to reduce cost, increase accountability, and improve service. JNET currently has the best ability to use aggregate criminal justice data for the purposes of research and analysis. Its users include 38 state organizations, 44 federal agencies, 8	It began in 1995 as a collective project among several state agencies and grew to include counties, municipalities, and local PDs.	The cost in FY 2018 was \$4.9 million.	It is housed in the Public Safety IT Delivery Center and staffed by JNET, Pennsylvania State Police, Corrections, Probation/Parole, and the Commission on Crime and Delinquency.

<sup>6</sup> Virginia Office of the Secretary of Public Safety and Homeland Security, “Interim Report on the Feasibility of Implementing an Integrated Criminal Justice System Web Portal”

<sup>7</sup> [https://www.pajnet.pa.gov/Documents/jnet\\_annual\\_report.pdf](https://www.pajnet.pa.gov/Documents/jnet_annual_report.pdf)

State Repository	Description	Development	Cost/Funding	Notes
	business partners, 67 counties, and 1,692 local agencies including police. The system collects and reports information on offenders from law enforcement all the way through post-sentence supervision.			

## Recent State Legislative Efforts

State	Description	Funding	Status
Florida	Florida passed landmark legislation in 2018 to ensure the collection and public release of criminal justice data. <sup>8</sup> The bill requires that every county collect and report the same robust set of data elements and for the state to maintain a new centralized, public data clearinghouse. The data includes pretrial release, sentencing, indigence, demographic variables, and post-conviction.	The state legislature appropriated \$1.67 million for its implementation. In 2019, another \$5.7 million was appropriated. <sup>9</sup>	There was initially a pilot program, but it is reported full rollout was expected in January 2020. <sup>10</sup> Currently, the data exchange is not fully implemented, but the Criminal Justice Data Transparency dashboard is up and running with aggregate data on convictions, dispositions, registrations, and dismissals. <sup>11</sup>

<sup>8</sup> <https://measuresforjustice.org/news/2018-03-11.html>

<sup>9</sup> <https://www.governing.com/gov-institute/voices/col-criminal-justice-transparency-florida-legislation.html>

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.abajournal.com/web/article/liberating-criminal-justice-data-how-a-florida-law-offers-a-blueprint-for-the-nation>

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.fdle.state.fl.us/FSAC/CJDT/CJDT>

State	Description	Funding	Status
<p><b>California</b></p>	<p>In Fall 2019, California passed a bill that mandated greater transparency in the criminal justice system. The bill requires agencies that submit data to the California Department of Justice to include criminal identification and other variables.<sup>12</sup> In 2016, California passed the Open Justice Data Act which led to the creation of a criminal justice data platform available to the public. This new legislation significantly improves upon the gaps that exist within the platform.<sup>13</sup> The Open Justice data platform mainly contains crime statistics from law enforcement agencies.</p>	<p>No funding is attached to this bill.</p>	<p>California’s Open Justice data platform has been running since 2016.<sup>14</sup> The recent criminal justice transparency bill is still being implemented.</p>
<p><b>New Mexico</b></p>	<p>In 2019 the New Mexico Legislature authorized the Crime Reduction Grant Act under HB0267. This legislation directed local Criminal Justice Coordinating Councils to "facilitate sharing of criminal justice information between agencies" and directed the New Mexico Sentencing Commission to create and maintain a data-sharing network for information sharing among criminal justice</p>	<p>A \$125,000 Local Criminal Justice Coordinating Council grant funded the development and launch of the data exchange. The New Mexico State Legislature Finance Committee and Department of Finance and Administration have recommended providing</p>	<p>The data exchange is currently being piloted among New Mexico’s criminal justice partners.</p>

<sup>12</sup> <https://measuresforjustice.org/news/2019-09-12.html>

<sup>13</sup> <https://techcrunch.com/2019/09/16/california-bill-looks-to-close-data-gaps-in-the-criminal-justice-system/>

<sup>14</sup> <https://openjustice.doj.ca.gov/resources/about-openjustice>

State	Description	Funding	Status
	agencies. <sup>15</sup> The data exchange will include notice of hearing information, warrants, release orders, domestic violence restraining orders, and disposition/sentencing data. In the next three years, the project hopes to build toward publicly accessible bulk datasets on criminal justice agency websites.	\$500,000 in FY 2021 to continue the project. <sup>16</sup>	
<b>Utah</b>	Utah House Bill 288, Prosecutor Data Collection Amendments, requires prosecutorial agencies, the Administrative Office of the Court, and jails throughout the state to provide specific data to the Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice. Among other data points, agencies will have to at a minimum report: defendant's name, offense tracking number, date of birth, zip code, referring agency, charges filed, charges dismissed, diversion program, and the case number and court in which charges were filed. <sup>17</sup>	The fiscal note on the bill notes that the bill could have a net General Fund cost of about \$221,200 in 2020, \$274,100 in 2021, and \$124,900 in 20200 for data storage, collection, and reporting costs for the state government.	H.B. 288 was signed into law in March of 2020, and so far no data has been publicly released from the Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice.
<b>Idaho</b>	House Bill 432: Criminal Justice Integrated Data System Act creates a centralized data repository called The Criminal Justice Integrated Data	The fiscal note on this bill estimates an ongoing fiscal impact of \$298,800 on the General Fund, consisting of	This bill was signed into law in March of 2020 and is still in the process of implementation.

<sup>15</sup> <https://www.nmcourts.gov/Self-Help/nm-datexchange.aspx>

<sup>16</sup> [https://www.santafenewmexican.com/news/local\\_news/new-mexico-courts-to-launch-criminal-justice-data-sharing-network/article\\_99e2a510-438f-11ea-a702-8318c5a0422f.html](https://www.santafenewmexican.com/news/local_news/new-mexico-courts-to-launch-criminal-justice-data-sharing-network/article_99e2a510-438f-11ea-a702-8318c5a0422f.html)

<sup>17</sup> <https://legiscan.com/UT/bill/HB0288/2020>

State	Description	Funding	Status
	System,” designed to link criminal justice data across state agencies and local governments for the purposes of research and analysis. <sup>18</sup>	\$100,00 in operating expenses and \$198,800 in personnel expenses for two fulltime employees.	
<b>Connecticut</b>	Connecticut’s Senate Bill 880, An Act Increasing Fairness and Transparency in the Criminal Justice System, establishes new data collection reporting requirements for prosecutorial agencies. The act requires the Division of Criminal Justice to collect disaggregated, case-level data on adult defendants and annually provide it to the Office of Policy and Management. Data covers arrests, citations, arraignments, continuances, diversion programs, contact between victims and prosecutorial officials, dispositions, non-judicial sanctions, demographic data, cases going to trial, fines and fees, and restitution ordered. <sup>19</sup>	The fiscal notes specify the cost of collecting data for the Division of Criminal Justice at \$976,085 in FY 2020 and \$1,028,384 in FY 2021. <sup>20</sup>	This bill was signed into law in 2019, and reporting requirements begin on February 1, 2021.

<sup>18</sup> <https://legislature.idaho.gov/wp-content/uploads/sessioninfo/2020/legislation/H0432.pdf>

<sup>19</sup> <https://www.cga.ct.gov/2019/BA/pdf/2019SB-00880-R01-BA.pdf>

<sup>20</sup> <https://www.cga.ct.gov/2019/FN/pdf/2019SB-00880-R000836-FN.pdf>