JUSTIS Executive Council Meeting
Date and Time: August 30, 2022, at 2:00 PM
Location: Virtual Meeting via Teams

PRESENT:
Carmen Chu, Chair
Ivy Lee
Linda Gerull
MaryEllen Carroll
Paul Miyamoto
Mark Culkins

Raju Manohar
William Scott
Maria McKee for Katherine Miller
Donald Dubain for Brooke Jenkins

ABSENT: Kimberly Ellis, Cristel Tullock, Brooke Jenkins, Katherine Miller

OTHER PRESENTERS: Karen Hong, Martin Okumu, Jason Cunningham, Joe Siegel

OTHER ATTENDEE: City Attorney Sara Crowley

1. Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at 2:03 pm.
Roll call performed. A quorum was present

2. Resolution Making Findings to Allow Teleconferenced Meetings under California Government Code Section 54953(e) for discussion and action item.
The Council will consider adoption of a resolution making findings that newly enacted Government Code Section 54953(e) requires to allow the Committee to hold meetings remotely, as currently required under local law, without complying with infeasible Brown Act requirements.

Ivy Lee entered a motion to adopt the resolution. Linda Gerull seconded. The members voted and passed the resolution.

Public Comment
There was no public comment.

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes
There were no amendments to the minutes. Chief William Scott moved the motion to approve the minutes. Dir. MaryEllen Carroll seconded. A roll call was performed, and the minutes were approved by the members.

4. General Public Comment
There was no public comment.
5. Executive Sponsor Update: City Administrator
Chair Carmen Chu started by welcoming and recognizing the new district attorney, Brooke Jenkins to the executive committee, as well as the interim Superior Court CEO Mark Culkins. Mr. Michael Yuen who has served with the superior courts is moving on to a different opportunity. Chair Chu stated that an overview of the go-live for the Superior Court and Justis hub will be discussed. Chair Chu said we will be talking about the remaining work, items to complete this phase plus the future of the project. Part of the launch of the Justis hub has really been to enable a shared platform and create opportunities for visibility, and better information sharing amongst our public safety entities. There is much work that still needs to happen, including our data governance, and next work plans for the committees. Chair Chu welcomed the committee’s inputs and hoped to have a strong dialogue on meeting the needs to become the system that we need to fulfill our work.

6. JUSTIS Program Status
a. Next Actions
Ms. Karen Hong, Justis Program Manager gave an update of the current state of the project. Ms. Hong stated that Justis is now live. To summarize, Sheriff received approval on the DOJ applications for the Justis platform on June 14. The migration activities started on June 24 at noon and went through the weekend of June 26 at 6:30 pm. Level II queries were operational as of June 24 at 6:13pm. There were no issues. C-track and Justis were operational as of June 26 at 6:30pm. In summary, 7 million records migrated on 2.4 million cases which was a lot of data that took approximately 36 hours to migrate. The C track, Justis C-track API, new Justis hub and Level II were in full production on June 27. Already on the 10th week of production and moving along. The Justis team is really getting to know and understand C track and the new production environment and the behaviors, and the outcomes of the new transactions. Ms. Hong said that they are continuing to monitor the system performance and resolving issues as they ran across them. Also, developing change management and release management processes to keep all systems synchronized and operational. They are also planning to work on Phase 2 priority items. The Gartner RAP sheet analysis report is available and has been shared to the council members.

Ms. Hong showed the Post go live workplan and discussed what they are currently working on. Ms. Hong showed the list of items that are still on development or planning stages. Resiliency is at the top of the list. There are a couple of C-track API items that they are going to finish up. Ms. Hong stated there were issues that they are working on i.e., arrest charges as shown on the list. They are going to come up with new consolidated list among all the agencies and said they are making good progress on the development and testing. They are working on the 8800 charge codes.
Ms. Hong showed the application support lifecycle process. This is the model they plan to implement in the coming months.

Ms. Hong discussed in detail the next action i.e., change control management that will establish the JUSTIS Change Advisory Board (CAB), provide production change guidelines and categorize the changes such as joint changes, exclusive changes, emergency changes, and preapproved changes.

b. Gartner Update by Joe Siegel, Gartner

Going forward, Ms. Hong stated that the focus is now on building the data center of excellence. Working with the committees to define the strategy and priorities. Taken the first step on the items that they need to work on. Posted a position to hire a Data Center of Excellence (DCOE) Project Manager expert in justice data and systems on August 19, 2022.

Mr. Joe Siegel, Gartner provided the JUSTIS background and listed the key challenges and various barriers back in the 2018, 2019 timeframe.

Mr. Siegel showed a more simplified architecture diagram to make data accessible and facilitate easy access to information for both tactical decisions important to criminal justice reform.

The roadmap envisioned 3 mechanisms on how agencies will be able to access data. There are predefined reports, self-reporting and data center of excellence. Have seen progress on the pre-defined reports and want to focus now on self-reporting and data center of excellence.

The Data Center of Excellence is a concept of providing specialized staff and resources to facilitate access to data for strategic needs across the city:

- Aim for data accessibility, consistent interpretation of data and provide a consistent source of information.
- Being able to present data in meaningful ways.
- Ensure that as data is made available, that security regulations, laws, and other policies are always adhered to, as directed by both regulations and by data governance.

Mr. Siegel discussed some of the items that were noted in the original roadmap where better access to data, reporting, visualization will support topics of interests to the committee and residents in San Francisco. Mr. Siegel talked about in detail the community driven and policy impact topics.

Mr. Siegel said that the committee’s input and support are needed for the new center of excellence to be launched in a successful way that will align with their priorities. Mr. Siegel showed the Justis Operating model that will provide organizational, resource and change management structures to ensure continuous Justis service level to all stakeholder agencies and provide an operating model for the Justis technology support team with necessary capacity, access and support. Mr. Siegel discussed the circular diagram which is from the roadmap again. Mr. Martin Okumu will talk about the specific tasks within the data and
architecture committee. It is important to carefully review the data governance charter to ensure that the agencies needs are met and each of your agencies are represented. And that will directly drive the activities of the data center of excellence and assure that it maintains alignment with the priorities of the agencies. Later, a discussion about some of the specific implementation work plans to get this thing launched and running over the coming months.

**Question:**
Chief Scott asked how this executive committee will tackle or process if department needs to approve or navigate internal change that will impact other parts of the system? Chair Chu clarified the question to how will this executive committee handle changes in data that might be driven in individual departments because those have impact on other organizations in terms of the data they are used to receiving or if there is a change in definition that might impact their operation?
Chief Scott clarified it's the change that might impact the data i.e., change in the Police Department that will impact other parts of the Justis hub. Will that go to the committee for approval or the departments can implement changes? Chair Chu said this is a critical question and this item will be covered by the data governance piece. Need to talk when those changes occur, what are the communication protocols that might need to occur so we are all on the same page. Provide opportunities for departments that might be impacted by your changes, provide feedback to mitigate negative effect of those changes. The governance will discuss the executive council decision on data that process departments that we all rely on.
Director Gerull said that the teams have demonstrated that we can work thru these challenges and to wit, when C-track went live there were some data changes, made adjustments and move forward. A lot of times it is for the better as the data is more precise and specific.

**Public Comment**
There was no public comment.

7. **Advisory Committee Updates – Data & Architecture, Performance & Strategy**
   - FY 22-23 Committee Workplans (Discussion and Action)
   - Data Governance Charter (Discussion and Action)

**Architecture and Data Sharing – Chair Martin Okumu**
The committee’s work is focused on progressing and completing data-related activities and deliverables to develop the Data Center of Excellence (DCOE). Mr. Okumu said the FY22-23 committee workplan and data governance charter are up for discussion and vote. The next step is to create an operational plan. Gave a breakdown of the workplan i.e., develop inter-agency data strategy, build modern data infrastructure which is critical. Chair Okumu said that the architecture and data sharing committee is not a stand-alone subcommittee and listed in detail their work in collaboration with the Performance and Strategy committee. It’s a challenge and they are looking for your help. Gartner is assisting with facilitating the discussion and standards identification.
Chair Chu thank Mr. Okumu for their work. Chair Chu said their idea is to develop a governance policy that this executive body will review to make sure there is an operational plan and figure out the interdepartmental communications and make sure we are documenting the information to provide a baseline where current data is and what they mean for different entities. This requires a level of commitment to be successful within your team. Chair Chu told Mr. Okumu that the plan is ambitious and the plan may span from FY 23 to 24. Is it a reasonable plan? Chair Okumu said he is extremely worried and optimistic. Any help they can get is helpful especially with the hiring of the DCOE Project Manager.

**Performance and Strategy – Chair Jason Cunningham**

Chair Cunningham talked about the quorum issue citing the JUSTIS charter established 11 voting members for the executive and sub committees, making 6 voting members to be present per meeting to have a quorum. Since January 2021, have not made a quorum that hampered the ability to provide consensus-based recommendations for action. Recommending a vote to amend the JUSTIS charter to reduce sub committee membership by 2 to 3 agencies, or leadership assistance in identifying attendees and providing guidance and space for attendance. Chair Cunningham showed the FY 22-23 draft workplan namely, cross system benefits, custody holds, high user analysis ad DCOE scoping. The FY21-22 work is complete pending quorum i.e., recidivism dashboard scope of work, FY 22-23 workplan, Justis system KPIs and meeting minutes.

**Workplans and Data Governance Charter (Discussion and Action)**

Linda asked the committee to vote on both the workplans and data governance charter. Carmen opened the table for questions and motion. On the FY22-23 committee workplans, Mark Culkins moved to approve the workplans as presented and seconded by Ivy Lee.

On data governance charter, Ivy Lee moved to approve the data governance charter and Mark Culkins seconded.

**Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

Roll call was performed. Some of the members have already left the meeting as it was past the 3PM schedule. There were not enough members to pass the workplans and data governance charter. Only gathered 5 votes vs. 6 that needs to pass. Ms. Gerull proposed to send these for approval via email as has been done in the past.

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 PM. Next meeting is on December 6, 2022.

**Addendum**

Via vote by email, 2 additional votes gathered (7 total yes votes) to pass the workplans and data governance charter.