PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE
AGENDA

Friday, May 13, 2005
1:30 to 3:30 p.m.
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- DRAFT REGIONAL PUBLIC SAFETY NEEDS ASSESSMENT REPORT
- STATUS OF THE COPLINK PROJECT

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES DURING THE MEETING
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Public Safety Committee on any item at the time the Committee is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker’s Slip, which is located in the rear of the room, and then present the slip to Committee staff. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Committee on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Speakers are limited to three minutes. The Public Safety Committee may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

This agenda and related staff reports can be accessed at www.sandag.org under meetings on SANDAG’s Web site. Public comments regarding the agenda can be forwarded to SANDAG via the e-mail comment form also available on the Web site. E-mail comments should be received no later than noon, two working days prior to the Public Safety Committee meeting.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see www.sdcommute.com for route information.
**PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE**  
Friday, May 13, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>ROLL CALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2.</td>
<td>APPROVAL OF APRIL 8, 2005 MEETING MINUTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Public Safety Committee on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Committee. Speakers are limited to three minutes each and shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the Clerk prior to speaking. Committee members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

**CONSENT**

+4.  ALLOCATION OF ARJIS RESERVE FUNDS (Pam Scanlon) | APPROVE

To date, the Public Safety Committee has approved the use of $428,000 in ARJIS reserve funds for priority projects. At its May 4, 2005, meeting the Chiefs’/Sheriff’s Management Committee recommended that the Public Safety Committee approve the use of ARJIS reserve funds for two additional priority projects. One project involves creating an automated program (E-Cars) for all agencies to review, modify, and automatically upload California Department of Justice mandated reports ($40,000). The second project (CASS Uniform Crime Report Classification Quality Control Review) would provide funding to the Criminal Justice Research Division ($50,000) to conduct a quality control study to measure the accuracy of crime data produced by ARJIS. The Public Safety Committee is asked to approve the allocation of $90,000 ARJIS reserve funds to these two projects. If approved, $120,000 of the $638,000 in the ARJIS reserve would remain available.

5.  EMERGENCY TRANSPORTATION OPERATIONS PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE WORKSHOP MATERIALS (Cynthia Burke) | INFORMATION

In October 2004, SANDAG, the California Highway Patrol, Caltrans, and the Federal Highway Administration sponsored a two-day workshop on emergency transportation operation preparedness and response. This workshop was designed to assist local transportation and emergency response officials in the San Diego region in improving approaches to response and recovery of critical transportation functions in response to catastrophic events, including potential terrorist attacks. The workshop packet, including workshop materials and other pertinent information, will be handed out at the meeting.
6. REPORT FROM CHIEFS’/SHERIFF’S MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE (Chief Zoll)  

Chief Zoll will report on the May 4, 2005, meeting of the Chiefs’/Sheriff’s Management Committee.

+7. DRAFT REPORT ON THE REGIONAL PUBLIC SAFETY NEEDS ASSESSMENT  
(Ted Middleton)  

A regional public safety needs assessment is currently being completed to help establish short- and long-term goals for SANDAG’s Public Safety Committee. Information for this needs assessment was collected through interviews with members of the Committee and key stakeholders. The Public Safety Committee should review and discuss the draft report, which summarizes the findings and describes opportunities and possible roles for the Committee, for final approval in June.

+8. COPLINK: A NEW INVESTIGATIVE CRIME TOOL FOR THE SAN DIEGO REGION  
(Pam Scanlon)  

One of the deliverables of the Department of Homeland Security-funded BorderSafe Project is the implementation of COPLINK, a software application utilized as an investigative tool for solving crimes and identifying offenders. The ARJIS COPLINK node will also be able to access other COPLINK nodes in Phoenix, Tucson, and Orange County as part of the information-sharing component of the BorderSafe Project. This report provides a status of the COPLINK Project; highlights the features of the COPLINK software that includes suspect identification, link analysis, and mapping; and identifies next steps. Staff will also provide a demonstration of ARJIS COPLINK.

9. UPCOMING MEETINGS  

The next Public Safety Committee meeting is scheduled for June 10, 2005, at 1:30 p.m.

10. ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
Meeting of April 8, 2005

1. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order by Chair Steve Padilla (South County). Chair Padilla welcomed new members Councilmember Anthony Young (City of San Diego) and Councilmember Jillian Hanson-Cox (East County Alternate). See last page for attendance.

2. APPROVAL OF JANUARY 14, 2005 MEETING MINUTES

Upon a motion by Mayor Mark Lewis (East County) and a second by Chairwoman Pam Slater-Price (County of San Diego), the Public Safety Committee unanimously approved the minutes of January 14, 2005.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Sandra McBrayer, representing The Children’s Initiative, provided an update on the Juvenile Justice Information Act. The group is finishing the first phase (identification) related to disproportionate minority confinement and she will be coming back again with more updates.

CONSENT

4. ALLOCATION OF ARJIS RESERVE FUNDS (APPROVE)

Upon a motion by Chairwoman Slater-Price and a second by Mayor Lewis, the Public Safety Committee unanimously approved the allocation of ARJIS reserve funds for the four priority projects identified.

REPORTS

5. REPORT FROM CHIEFS'/SHERIFF’S MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE (INFORMATION)

Chief Tom Zoll (County Chiefs'/Sheriff’s Association) stated the Management Committee met on April 6, 2005, and discussed and approved the ARJIS and Criminal Justice Research Division overall work plan and budget for FY 2006 and the allocation of ARJIS reserve funds for priority projects. These items are being discussed today at this meeting. Chief Zoll
commented that after attending the SANDAG retreat, he feels confident that the SANDAG Board endorsed and supports the activities of the Public Safety Committee and that the major priority has been identified as communications and operability.

6. PRELIMINARY FY 2006 CRIMINAL JUSTICE RESEARCH DIVISION AND ARJIS WORK PROGRAM AND BUDGET (Cynthia Burke & Pam Scanlon)

Cynthia Burke (Director Criminal Justice Research) stated that there is one new Criminal Justice Research Division project since reporting to the Public Safety Committee in January 2005. The new project is #2004400 (Hoover High School Coordinated Health Project). Pam Scanlon (Director of ARJIS) stated the major change for ARJIS is the inclusion of the San Diego Data Processing Corporation (SDDPC) savings this year ($442,000) to be applied to priority projects.

Mayor Lewis made a motion for approval with a second by Chairwoman Slater-Price. The Public Safety Committee unanimously approved recommending to the SANDAG Board the inclusion of the Criminal Justice Research Division and ARJIS work elements and budgets into the SANDAG Overall Work Program (OWP).

7. SANDAG RETREAT UPDATE AND PROPOSED PUBLIC SAFETY INTEROPERABILITY AND COMMUNICATIONS INITIATIVE (Chair Padilla)

Chair Padilla and Chief Zoll updated the Committee on the public safety presentation that was made at the SANDAG Board Retreat in February. Both agreed that the information was well-received and that the Board agreed that the issue of interoperability and communications was very important. Chair Padilla noted that the Public Safety Committee is being asked to approve the interoperability and communication initiative and direct staff to return by June 2005 with a work program and budget to carry it out.

Chairwoman Slater-Price made a motion for approval with a second by Mayor Lewis. The Public Safety Committee unanimously approved the interoperability and communication initiative and directed staff to bring back a work program for carrying it out.

8. CRIME IN THE SAN DIEGO REGION 2004 (Cynthia Burke) (INFORMATION/POSSIBLE ACTION)

Cynthia Burke gave a PowerPoint presentation on the highlights from the first 2004 Crime Bulletin. Regional crime data, as well as data by jurisdiction, are compiled by SANDAG through a cooperative agreement with local law enforcement agencies.

Compared to other large U.S. cities over 500,000 population, the City of San Diego had the fourth lowest violent crime and property crime rates in 2003. The region’s 2004 violent crime rate was the lowest in 20 years and the property crime rate decreased slightly after three years of increases. Around half of larcenies in 2004 were thefts from vehicles and half of burglaries involved no forced entry. Motor vehicle theft has increased more than other property crimes over the past five years.
Mayor Lewis stated that El Cajon had a reduction in both violent and property crime. El Cajon encourages people to report crimes. He suggested seeing the clearance rates because he would like people to know that the region is doing something about crime. He also expressed that perhaps the jurisdictions do things differently in that some may take reports and others do not.

Cynthia Burke stated every jurisdiction should be reporting the same way.

Chairwoman Slater-Price stated she was curious to why Del Mar’s crime rate was so high.

Cynthia Burke stated that Del Mar is a small jurisdiction and the crime rate is based on the number of people who live there. The higher property crime could be attributed to daily influx of non-residents visiting the race track, fairgrounds, and beaches.

Chairwoman Slater-Price said it would be interesting to see actual numbers. Cynthia Burke stated that Criminal Justice staff will provide these to her.

Councilmember Dave Druker (North County Coastal Alternate) stated the population in Del Mar is 4,500 and there are a lot of part-time people who live there. There is the daytime population of the beach and race track. Del Mar has over a million people visiting at the beach and fairgrounds. Cynthia Burke commented that she is looking at daytime population rates and plans to do additional analysis in the future.

Vice Chair Chris M. Guerin (North County Coastal) stated that Del Mar is not the only city impacted by daytime population increases. For example, there is LEGOLAND in Carlsbad. Councilmember Ron Newman (North County Inland) suggested putting some extra data as footnotes.

Chair Padilla stated the crime rate is per capita. It is a one dimensional way to report crime. There may be some other ways to examine crime and crime trends that may impact criminal crime rates.

Chairwoman Slater-Price would like to see peaks and valleys. She is interested in a report that would show any seasonal differences.

Upon a motion by Chairwoman Slater-Price and a second by Councilmember Newman, the Public Safety Committee unanimously accepted the 2004 Crime Report.

9. BORDERSAFE PROJECT STATUS REPORT (Dave Decker)  

   Dave Decker (ARJIS) and Bob Younger (Department of Homeland Security) reviewed the BorderSafe Project and did a PowerPoint presentation. As part of this project, ARJIS is working with the Tucson Police Department and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) in sharing data.

   The BorderSafe Project is currently in Phase II, with Phase III scheduled to begin this fall. Some of the significant project accomplishments to date include 1) providing field access to ARJIS data using wireless technology and PDAs; 2) ARJISNet Agency Access expansion (e.g. with the California Highway Patrol); 3) mutual data sharing with the Tucson Police Department.
Department through COPLINK (an investigative crime solving tool); 4) data sharing with DHS (including the ARJIS officer notification system and DHS license plate reader data); and 5) the development of a privacy impact assessment (a position paper that addresses the issue of privacy rights when law enforcement data are shared between agencies).

Dave Decker noted that BorderSafe has provided a positive impact on field operations and described numerous success stories of the apprehension of criminals made possible by field access of ARJIS information. The ARJIS governance structure embodied in the Public Safety Committee is a model that may be useful for expanded data sharing efforts across interstate regions. In pursuit of this goal, there is a need to work on governance, a business model, funding and resources, and an integration of the regional concept with a new national intelligence plan.

Mayor Lewis expressed his pleasure at knowing that ARJIS has knowledgeable staff people. He inquired about handhelds and would like El Cajon to participate in the program, which in turn could further lower crime rates. He suggested that perhaps agencies can get the handhelds with a lower price working through ARJIS. Mayor Lewis believes it would help in positively identifying gang members in the streets.

Pam Scanlon (Director of ARJIS) wanted to clarify that the test with federal data and local data was a proof of concept only. ARJIS is still unable to get federal data on an on-going basis, and will be coming back to the Public Safety Committee with options for addressing this issue. Pam Scanlon also stated there is a new product available that will allow officers to enter information in the field and GPS and track locations so that officers and team members will know where each other are. Because ARJIS represents a large number of agencies and partners, it was able to get very competitive rates for monthly network services and the costs of devices. ARJIS is developing an implementation and production plan for expanded roll out of wireless devices. This plan will be vetted through the ARJIS Technical Committee, Chiefs'/Sheriff’s Management Committee, and Public Safety Committee.

Marshal David Bejarano (Federal Public Safety) inquired if the license plate reader information was taken in both directions and where the information was collected.

Dave Decker replied that the information is taken when crossing from either side from five border crossing areas in California/Mexico.

Bob Younger stated that the Tucson Police Department is sharing license plate reader information with DHS.

Gary Gallegos (Executive Director of SANDAG) stated that the Borders Committee is about to complete work on an economic model to look at cross border travel. SANDAG received a grant to develop a model that will estimate the impact of border wait times. He suggested that staff from the Borders Committee come to the Public Safety Committee to share this information.

Chair Padilla stated that the Public Safety Committee would like to have a presentation from the Borders Committee.
Vice Chair Guerin asked about the governance proposed for BorderSafe and stated the Public Safety Committee could add valuable input to the BorderSafe governance.

Bob Younger stated that governance will be required from the federal (DHS) level.

Vice Chair Guerin stated we need to expand the technologies and lessons learned from BorderSafe. Officer safety is helped when officers know what they’re dealing with. She, however, does not want us to lose the local benefit and emphasized the need to be very hands on.

Pam Scanlon stated that local participation from all disciplines of public safety is critical to the success of an expanded BorderSafe initiative.

10. UPCOMING MEETINGS (APPROVE)

The suggestion was made to start the Public Safety Committee meeting at 1:00 p.m. and move the meeting day to the third Friday of the month. Gary Gallegos commented that the Borders Committee agreed to move their meeting date to the 4th Friday following the SANDAG Board business meeting. This will help the Public Safety Committee in not competing with other meetings on the same day. Chairwoman Slater-Price motioned for approval, with a second by Assistant Sheriff Bill Gore (San Diego County Sheriff), the Public Safety Committee unanimously approved the new meeting day of the third Friday of the month and start time of 1:00 p.m. This change will take effect at the beginning of the fiscal year (July 2005). The next meeting will be held on Friday, May 13, 2005 at 1:30 p.m.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Padilla adjourned the meeting at 3:02 p.m.

JEFF TAYMAN
Director of Technical Services

Key Staff Contacts: Pam Scanlon, (619) 699-6971; psc@sandag.org
Cynthia Burke, (619) 699-1910; cbu@sandag.org
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ALLOCATION OF ARJIS RESERVE FUNDS

Introduction

Through actions by the Public Safety Committee (PSC) and SANDAG Board, in January 2005, the ARJIS reserve was increased by $638,000 due to a reduction in costs from San Diego Data Processing Corporation (SDDPC) realized through consolidation of mainframe servers and software and network savings. Those actions also specified that the Chiefs'/Sheriff’s Management Committee should recommend to the PSC how these funds be used for priority projects on a case-by-case basis. To date, the PSC has approved the use of $428,000 for priority projects.

At its May 4, 2005 meeting, the Chiefs'/Sheriff’s Management Committee recommended that the PSC approve the use of ARJIS reserve funds for two additional priority projects. One project involves creating an automated program (E-Cars) for all agencies to review, modify, and automatically upload California Department of Justice (DOJ) mandated reports ($40,000). The second project (CASS Uniform Crime Report Classification Quality Control Review) would provide funding to the Criminal Justice Research Division ($50,000) to conduct a quality control study to measure the accuracy of crime data produced by ARJIS. If approved, $120,000 in the ARJIS reserve would remain available.

Recommendation

The Public Safety Committee is asked to approve the allocation of $90,000 ARJIS reserve funds for the creation of the E-Cars program to provide regional crime data to the California Department of Justice and the implementation of a quality control study to measure the accuracy of crime data produced by ARJIS.

Discussion

The two identified priority projects are described below.

E-Cars

The E-Cars project will improve the manner that ARJIS agencies review, edit, submit, and adjust their monthly crime and arrest statistics reported. Currently, San Diego Data Processing Corporation (SDDPC) mails hardcopies of reports to each agency, revisions are made on these hardcopies, and reports are mailed or faxed to DOJ. Through E-Cars, reports will arrive via the Web, with agencies reviewing and editing these reports on-line. In addition to meeting the DOJ requirement for electronic submission of data, this project will also result in more efficient use of resources and greater data accuracy.
CASS Uniform Crime Report Classification Quality Control Review

As part of this project, which was requested by the Crime Analysis Statistical System (CASS) Committee, SANDAG would conduct the third in a series of quality control studies to measure the accuracy of crime data produced by ARJIS. Focus would be placed on documenting errors in crime reporting, classification, and clearance information and also on determining the source of inaccuracies. Based on the information collected, a final report would be prepared that would include recommendations for improvement. Benefits of this project will include the provision of information that will ensure the continued validity of crime statistics in the region and provide a foundation for both the E-Cars and Enterprise ARJIS projects.

JEFF TAYMAN
Director of Technical Services

Key Staff Contact: Pam Scanlon (619) 699-6971; psc@sandag.org
DRAFT REPORT ON THE REGIONAL PUBLIC SAFETY NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Introduction

A regional public safety needs assessment is currently being completed to help establish short- and long-term goals for SANDAG’s Public Safety Committee (PSC). Information for the needs assessment was collected through interviews with members of the Committee and key stakeholders. A copy of the draft report (Attachment 1), which is included for the Committee’s review, contains significant narrative describing the consensus of opinion obtained through the interviews. Priority initiatives the respondents felt were most appropriate for the PSC include identifying and establishing additional funding sources, providing effective lobbying efforts, promoting continued inter-agency collaboration, and supporting educational efforts pertaining to interoperability and communications. In addition, a number of other areas (e.g., composition and role of the PSC, desire to explore further regional consolidation) that were commonly identified are presented.

Recommendation

The Public Safety Committee is asked to review and discuss the draft report for final approval in June.

Discussion

The public safety needs assessment is the first regional study to identify a common agenda of priorities and potential initiatives. A key objective of this study is to help the PSC clarify its role and develop a set of specific objectives and projects. It is anticipated that the many suggestions, observations, and initiatives obtained from across the region provide both a broad and deep cross-section of opportunities for the PSC to achieve a significant positive impact on public safety services in the region.

Background

The needs assessment focused on four priority areas identified by the Chiefs'/Sheriff’s Management Committee and the PSC at their October retreats: (1) the creation of a Regional Information Center; (2) communications and interoperability; (3) regional technology procurement and maintenance; and (4) training. As part of this study, interviews with key local, state, and federal agency stakeholders were conducted in December 2004 and January 2005. Key topic areas discussed included issues and concerns facing the various agencies; level of satisfaction with existing regional efforts and suggestions for improvement; the requirements to support the four key study areas; budget and funding issues; and specific expectations and potential contributions from the PSC.
Overview of Assessment Findings

Responses to many of the questions were consistent, demonstrating a high level of awareness of both local and regional issues, as well as confirming the high levels of interagency cooperation enjoyed in the region. Those interviewed also agreed that regional cooperation is important, opportunities for consolidation of services where appropriate should be identified for economies of scale, and the PSC could successfully facilitate partnerships, resulting in improved service delivery for the region. Although communications and interoperability was the number one priority, there was also significant support for the Information Center concept and the need for more assistance in regional technology acquisition and support. The PSC reviewed these initial findings at their January meeting and identified a number of initial priorities.

Potential Initiatives

The following significant program areas were commonly identified as the greatest opportunities for PSC involvement.

- Provide a regional forum to coordinate, advocate, and support key public safety initiatives such as:
  - Interoperability and communications that includes radio spectrum, public safety priority, programmable radios, commercial services, and legislative initiatives; documentation of local efforts to assist in the development and promotion of standards, operating agreements and procedures; and the identification of funding sources or alternatives for the modernization and improved interoperability of the region’s voice and data wireless communications infrastructure.
  - Homeland Security that includes leveraging local resources in support of activities to enhance the security of the region; and sponsoring forums to raise the awareness and understanding of federal, state, and local Homeland Security activities and opportunities for funding.
- Develop regional applications that provide public safety information to the community such as a regional eWatch, a Web-based crime mapping notification system; and on-line crime statistics.
- Create a regional clearinghouse for technology evaluation, procurement, and implementation.
- Direct new research efforts such as:
  - A comprehensive study of the cost of public safety services and potential funding mechanisms.
  - Analyzing the effectiveness of prevention, diversion, enforcement and interdiction programs used within the region and the impacts of these programs on public safety.
Next Steps

The final report scheduled for June 2005 will incorporate: 1) additional interviews conducted with representatives from Fire and Emergency Services; 2) feedback from the PSC; and 3) estimates of the time and cost requirements for key initiatives. Staff will also develop a work plan, timeline, and budget for those initiatives the Committee would like to pursue.

JEFF TAYMAN
Director of Technical Services

Attachment

Key Staff Contact: Pam Scanlon (619) 699-6971; psc@sandag.org
Regional Public Safety Needs Assessment Draft Report

Prepared for SANDAG’s Public Safety Committee by Silvereye Technologies, Inc.
May 2005
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the recommendation of the SANDAG Public Safety Committee (PSC), in November 2004, SANDAG contracted with a consultant to conduct a regional public safety needs assessment to help establish short- and long-term goals for the PSC that will enhance public safety and benefit member jurisdictions and public safety agencies, while respecting the roles and responsibilities of other regional organizations.

While individual public safety agencies and departments had undertaken such efforts, they had not been regional in scope. The assessment focused on four priority areas identified by the Chiefs'/Sheriff's Management Committee and the PSC at their October retreats:

1. The creation of a Regional Information Center;
2. Communications and interoperability;
3. Technology procurement and maintenance; and
4. Training.

Interviews with key stakeholders were conducted in December 2004 and January 2005. The consensus from these interviews is that regional cooperation is important and opportunities for consolidation of services where appropriate should be identified for effectiveness and economies of scale. In addition, there was agreement that the PSC could successfully facilitate partnerships, resulting in improved service delivery for the region as a whole. The Chiefs'/Sheriff's Management Committee and the PSC reviewed these initial findings at their January meetings and identified the following priorities:

- Negotiate public/private partnerships to provide cost-effective state of the art technologies for the region, such as wireless communications.
- Educate and engage elected officials and the public to gain support for critical public safety initiatives and priorities.
- Develop policies and protocols that facilitate the development of public safety technologies, information sharing agreements (e.g., between local, state, and federal entities), and privacy policies.
- Establish a Public Safety legislative program built on agreed upon regional priorities.
- Define public safety standards for the region to improve communication standards for interoperability and emergency and event management protocols and processes.
- Ensure coordination of homeland security related grants and initiatives to ensure compatibility and enhanced value to the region.
- Identify and obtain funding sources for both the development and sustainment of systems and programs. Particular areas recommended
include the regional information center and interoperable communication systems (approximately $200 to $300 million dollars).

NEEDS ASSESSMENT BACKGROUND AND APPROACH

This Needs Assessment was comprised primarily of face-to-face interviews with the Consultant and a broad cross-section of senior Public Safety administrators as well as elected officials from local, state, and federal agencies. The Consultant and staff developed a set of questions (Appendix D) intended to explore the following subjects:

- Issues and concerns facing the various agencies
- Level of satisfaction with existing regional efforts and suggestions for improvement
- Thoughts on the requirements to support the 4 key study areas identified by the Chief’s and Sheriff’s Management Committee
- Budget and funding issues
- Specific expectations and potential contributions from the PSC

These questions were distributed to interview candidates (Appendix C) in advance and interviews were conducted over a period of 4 week during November and December 2004. Some additional follow-up interviews were conducted in January 2005.

Initial Observations were presented to both the Chief’s and Sheriff’s Management Committee and the Public Safety Committee in January 2005 in order to solicit feedback in preparation for presenting a summary position paper to the full SANDAG Board at the February Retreat.

While this Needs Assessment represents one of the more comprehensive regional fact-finding efforts conducted on these high-level issues, it was initially representative of input primarily from Law Enforcement agencies. The intent is to obtain additional input from Fire, EMS and other Emergency Services oriented agencies as well and incorporate that input into the final draft of this report.

RANKING OF PRIMARY STUDY AREAS

In order to gauge the perceived importance of the 4 key subject areas proposed as the basis of this study, respondents were asked to “rank the following subjects in order of importance”. This question was asked after significant discussion and
detail had been solicited on each individual topic. Therefore, there was significant context available on which each participant could base their preferences. The following table indicates the number of “votes” each particular focus area received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communications &amp; Interoperability</td>
<td>8 5 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Center</td>
<td>4 4 5 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Acquisition &amp; Support</td>
<td>4 3 5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>1 5 5 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some discussion was also typically held regarding the ranking responses and some clear patterns did emerge:

Communications & Interoperability was clearly the number one priority of interviewees. People who did not choose this topic as the #1 area of focus typically gave the response that they felt that this area was already fairly well addressed and/or that the scale of accomplishing further enhancement in this area represented such a huge investment of resources and money that it was unlikely to represent a short-term achievable goal. But, they clearly felt that it was an important long-term objective to be addressed.

The responses to many of the questions were similar throughout the region, demonstrating a high level of awareness of both local and regional issues among participants as well as confirming the high levels of inter-agency cooperation enjoyed in the region.

The ranking of the other 3 subject areas is less dramatically clear. In examining the number of votes and the distribution of votes across the remaining priorities, it is difficult to quantitatively determine a clear preference. But, when factored against the other questions and qualitative feedback from the surveys, there is a clear indication of support for both the Information Center concept and the need for more assistance in the Technology Acquisition and Support arenas. Training had the least consistent responses and the least clear “vision” for what needed to be done. Hence, the rankings are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Communications &amp; Interoperability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Information/Intelligence Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Technology Acquisition &amp; Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REGIONAL COMMUNICATIONS & INTEROPERABILITY

In most agencies, communications and interoperability issues are focused around radio communications. However, this topic could also include issues such as wireless and traditional data networking, and information sharing. As most agencies make significant use of ARJIS for information sharing and there are numerous other regional, state, and federal criminal justice information systems, most of the responses to questions on this subject area revolved around the need for improved radio interoperability.

Most agencies in the County use the Regional Communications System (RCS) for their radio communications service. All of the agencies surveyed reported a very high degree of satisfaction with the service. The ability to communicate with the other agencies in the county was seen as sufficient in normal operating conditions, with the exception of being able to communicate with San Diego PD. At least one additional agency, National City Police Department, has received funding and will be migrating to the RCS in the upcoming year.

Primary Communications & Interoperability Issues

**Interoperability between RCS and SDPD** - The most frequent interoperability concern raised by respondents is that the San Diego Police Department is not able to broadly inter-communicate with most other agencies in the region. Since they are on their own system and do not currently have substantial or transparent interconnect capability, agencies can not easily intercommunicate on a daily basis without exchanging radios. This is in the process of being addressed on a limited basis (see below). But a more robust solution is anticipated to require substantial replacement of radio system infrastructure.

**SDPD/RCS Patching Capability** - SDPD and RCS are currently working together to implement a patching capability between their respective radio systems. This combination of system hardware and procedures will allow for a connection or patch to be established on specific channels between the two systems in the event of a critical incident. This connection will have limited bandwidth and will not be a “permanently on” situation. Rather it would be enabled when the need arises and with the coordination of both parties. While not offering the kind of “seamless” interoperability that represents the ideal long-term solution sought, it will allow for a link to be established when operational management determines that a need exists to do so.

**Interoperability with state, federal, and non-local agencies** - The second most frequent concern is that Federal, State and outside mutual-aid agencies can not inter-communicate with RCS or SDPD users. This issue is not easily
solved due to the competing requirements of the local interoperability these agencies would like to have for their normal operations within the region, and their often broader geographical coverage responsibilities. These issues are further compounded by the fact that these agencies are subject to larger statewide or nationwide technology standards and procurement regulations. For other extreme mutual aid situations, such as the recent fires in 2004, it is difficult if not impossible to solve the interoperability issue without substantial additional coordination at the state or federal level – as agencies from throughout the western United States (and possibly beyond) would be involved.

**Replacement of Major Radio System Infrastructure** – Both RCS and SDPD anticipate major initiatives in the short- to medium-term to replace aging and inadequate radio system infrastructure. SDPD desires to replace their equipment immediately as it is no longer meeting their own operational needs adequately, does not offer sufficient expansion/upgrade capability, and is not interoperable with other regional systems. SDPD anticipates an approximately $100 million project cost. RCS projects a longer term replacement horizon of 7-10 years with a projected (current dollar value) cost of $100-150 million. The fact that both of these systems will require substantial investments over the next several years provides both a challenge in funding such an effort, and an opportunity to address some of the fundamental interoperability challenges facing the region, such as providing seamless interoperability among all public safety agencies. It will be imperative, however, to closely coordinate the efforts of both agencies in order to ensure that the broader regional need is kept at a high project priority while allowing the various agencies involved to best meet their operational needs. The PSC could provide invaluable assistance in helping to identify a long-term funding solution and provide appropriate governance and support for interoperability requirements.

**Wireless Data** – Wireless data is an increasingly important fundamental technology for a variety of public safety applications. Whether they be voiceless dispatch, access to operational databases, or enabling field reporting, wireless data is a fundamental need. A number of existing pilot applications are leveraging both the traditional low-speed and emerging broadband wireless technologies. There are several Wireless Data Initiatives in progress throughout the region.

- SDSD/SDPD are currently conducting a joint broadband wireless backbone pilot project which will provide very high speed (115Mbps+) wireless connectivity in certain parts of the region. Over time, and assuming operational success and ongoing funding, coverage would be increased and the service could eventually be made available to other agencies.
Carlsbad PD is implementing wireless data infrastructure for field data access.

ARJIS is piloting a universal query capability which will use public wireless services to allow querying of ARJIS and other data sources (DMV, CLETS) in a single integrated query from a mobile or handheld device.

Critical Incident Emergency Radio Coverage – In addition to agency interoperability there are occasions when capacity and reach of current radio & communications infrastructure are challenged. The large scale response to the fires of 2004 exemplify the burden of providing adequate “peak” capacity for critical incidents without over-provisioning resources required during normal operating conditions. Recent research has been conducted into special coverage enhancement alternatives (inter-system patching capability) that could be deployed in the kind of large scale event represented by the recent fires; where units deployed throughout the county could not talk due to range limitations. These tests involve deploying a portable patch kit with radios from the various departments in a small aircraft which could then orbit the affected area and provide an on-demand antenna/re-transmitter.

In the more distant future, further research could also be conducted into commercializing military hardware for these and other uses. For example Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) have emerged in the military and research domains and are now widely used in military deployments as tactical communications, surveillance and engagement platforms. Certainly the first two applications would have suitability in the public safety marketplace. Perhaps as the operational track record of such technologies becomes stable, there will be opportunities to explore the economics and logistics of exploiting such capabilities. San Diego’s cooperation with local military branches and private military contractors would encourage such privatization efforts.

Governance of RCS

Smaller agencies expressed some concern about the nature of the operating agreement for RCS being an MOU with the Sheriff, as opposed to RCS being more of a true JPA with equal voting rights for all member agencies. While no respondents had specific criticisms or examples of issues that they felt were critical to address immediately, there was a shared sense of smaller agencies being “at the mercy of the Sheriff’s Department’s decisions” and that long-term this might become more of an issue. On this topic, ARJIS was often cited as an example of a governance structure that allowed both small and large agencies to contribute equal amounts of influence over strategic and operational decisions and policies.
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A concern was raised during discussions with representatives of the Sheriff’s Department who pointed out that the RCS is dependent upon additional communications infrastructure owned and operated by the County and that an attempt to make the RCS an independent entity has substantial technical as well as political implications that make such a concept a potentially complex and costly undertaking.

However, with the need to provide interoperability between all of the current RCS member agencies, the SDPD, and the stated objective of both the County and SDPD of replacing much of their communications infrastructure over the next decade, there may be an opportunity to evaluate different governance structures as well as formulate plans that would make both the County and the PD more comfortable jointly participating in investments in radio system infrastructure improvements.

Communications Center Consolidation

Another common desire expressed by respondents was to investigate the concept of consolidating communications center facilities. Currently, most municipal police agencies operate their own dispatch centers. Police agencies expressed an almost universal concern with the cost and overhead of maintaining redundant facilities among so many departments. Furthermore, there are costs that are often compounded by the fact that agencies often compete for qualified dispatchers from the same candidate pool and that one agency may invest the significant time and expense of recruiting, backgrounding, and training a candidate, only to have that candidate depart to an adjacent agency in pursuit of higher salary, benefits, or lower call volumes after a short tenure.

It is interesting to note that while Communications Center consolidation was almost universally ranked high on the list of potential areas of focus for the Committee, there does not appear to be substantial action taking place in this area, and several previous discussions among agencies on the subject have not resulted in any serious exploration of the specific benefits, costs, and risks of such an effort. Specifically agencies such as Coronado, Chula Vista, and National City have held high-level discussions considering the concept. These discussions were well received by law enforcement executives and political officials, but were apparently met with resistance by trade union representatives, and the discussions were subsequently dropped.

In addition, several agencies recently passed local bond measures for the construction of new public safety facilities such as police stations, fire stations, and animal control facilities. Two of these agencies are adjacent jurisdictions who have both expressed a belief that Communications Center consolidation
would be a potentially significant cost savings and potential service improvement for their agencies. However, it also appears that while some discussion has been held on this subject, that the implementation timelines will not allow for the amount of research, analysis, and negotiation that a consolidation effort would require in this particular case. This highlights the need for some additional research into the feasibility of actually implementing such a practice.

The Committee may wish to consider sponsoring a more detailed investigation of the specific potential costs, savings, advantages, and limitations of pursuing consolidation of Communications Center facilities. Such a study would provide a baseline of qualitative and quantitative data upon which to base such discussions, rather than the discussions being based on assumptions, speculation, and emotional reactions. This would help agencies make better-informed decisions about whether consolidation was actually an ultimate benefit to public safety for the region or not. It would also allow for future facilities construction decisions to be made in the context of a strategic vision for long-term consolidation plans if that is the ultimate strategy chosen.

It is also of interest to note that Fire agencies have made greater progress in consolidation of dispatch facilities, currently operating a number of sub-regional centers within the County that dispatch for multiple fire districts/departments. This may in part be due to some of the inherent differences in the way Fire & Law Enforcement dispatch procedures are typically established.

**Desire for Increased Electronic Information Exchange**

One of the more traditional information technology concepts that were discussed by a number of agencies was the need to expand the ability of agencies to exchange information electronically as opposed to printing, copying, faxing, and mailing paper-based forms. Due to the number of different forms required by various agencies and mandated by reporting and records retention policies, there is still a tremendous amount of paperwork involved in the public safety industry. Many agencies have various forms of information storage and retrieval systems (databases, document imaging systems, etc). However, when it comes to sharing the information in these systems, often the easiest method is to print a report and send it to the requesting agency/officer. Many respondents, particularly those dealing with the longer-term processing of cases as they proceed through the justice system, expressed a desire to do more electronic information sharing.
Opportunities for Involvement of the Public Safety Committee

- Identify funding sources for upgrading and replacing communications infrastructure.

- Encourage individual departmental initiatives specifically those of the largest agencies (RCS, SDPD) to specify interoperable technologies.

- Conduct research into the issues and collect statistics that would enable an informed discussion and decision-making process regarding potential Communications Center consolidation.

- Encourage the development and implementation of processes, standards, and technologies that allow for a greater exchange of data, documents, images, and reports via electronic means.

- Develop and encourage regional procurement and support opportunities for agencies to acquire technology equipment and services.

Specific Suggested Project & Initiative Opportunities

- Request presentations from RCS and SDPD providing an orientation to the Committee on the specific challenges and current plans for addressing long-term interoperability issues.

- Develop a plan and policy agenda to assist with the identification of potential funding sources within the region and via grant or other extra-regional sources. Begin the process of evangelizing this agenda.

- Work in conjunction with various existing technical committees and working groups to ensure that political objectives are aligned with technical requirements, and that the overall goal of advancing interoperability is maintained as a strategic vision for all agencies.
REGIONAL PUBLIC SAFETY INFORMATION CENTER

There exists almost universal support for the creation of a Regional Information Center (RIC). This concept includes support from local, state and federal agencies. There has already been substantial discussion and information gathered regarding charter, governance, organization, technology, and operational requirements for such a center by High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (HIDTA), the FBI and other participating agencies. HIDTA is an agency within the Executive Branch of the Federal Government that focuses federal funding and resources in regions identified as high-volume drug trafficking corridors. Such concepts are already in varying degrees of implementation in other regions around the country. However, there are a number of factors that require additional clarification and this presents an opportunity for the PSC to help champion greater coordinated involvement from regional participants to complete the tasks of getting an initial implementation of this concept started.

Staffing Potential

Most justice agencies have some level of internal Crime Analysis and/or Intelligence functions. In larger agencies this is typically a dedicated resource or a team of analysts or investigators. It is not uncommon that Crime Analysis is a civilianized position that also shares some oversight responsibility for record keeping, data entry or other functions related to information collection within the agency. Intelligence functions tend to be comprised of sworn staff and are sometimes associated with the Detective/Investigation function within an organization, although in larger agencies there is often a dedicated intelligence team.

Due to these differences in staffing levels and focus, it is apparent that smaller agencies would be less likely to dedicate resources to be housed exclusively at a centralized information center, however they would encourage participation in the center by their staff to the extent possible. Larger agencies and several of the state and federal agencies would staff such a facility on a full-time basis with crime analysis and/or intelligence analysis resources. In particular, the FBI plans to staff such a center with upwards of 70 intelligence analysts and other support staff.

Clarification of Needs and Roles – Intelligence vs. Crime Analysis

There appears to be some difference in the perceived functions and benefits of such a center depending on whether the agency is a local, state or federal agency. In particular, local agencies tend to focus on crime analysis, providing statistics, and proactive identification of crime trends that would allow for local
intervention of problem areas. The largest stated contributor to the center, the FBI, is very heavily focused on anti-terrorism intelligence gathering and analysis. This difference in agency focus is likely to require some clarification of the charter of a regional center as well as of the different logistical needs of these two types of functions. There are also potential political and legal sensitivities involved in co-locating resources from all of these agencies and the sharing of criminal and intelligence information across agency and functional boundaries.

Most agencies report that they get reasonably good internal information on crime trends, patterns, and series as well as basic crime statistics both from within their organizations, as well as on a regional basis from the work of the Criminal Justice Research function provided by SANDAG (e.g. annual Crime in the San Diego Region Report). However, respondents often reported a desire for greater “proactive” analysis and reporting. In other words, information was available if asked for but because of workloads was often not produced proactively. Also, information is often shared between agencies participating in task forces, etc. However, sharing of operational information and intelligence is often not regularly shared at the patrol level. There could be significant operational benefit if some fairly basic levels of information sharing were occurring such as exchanging and reviewing daily briefing log information between agencies (specifically adjacent agencies).

Needs Beyond Law Enforcement?

The focus of a regional Information/Intelligence Center has so far centered on Law Enforcement needs. While intelligence and other functions are relatively exclusive to law enforcement, there may be as yet undefined opportunities to expand the participation and purview of such an Information Center to accommodate the needs of other types of public safety agencies. Certainly the Information Center would produce materials, and information that would be shared as appropriate with agencies of all kinds throughout the region. But further thought might be given to how and if such a center might more formally include other public safety functions.

Opportunities for Involvement of the Public Safety Committee

- Assist in identification, selection and procurement of a suitable location for the Regional Intelligence/Information Center.
- Assist in the identification of additional long-term funding sources for ongoing operations and potentially for augmenting participation of local agencies.
- Promote the advantages of centralized information collection and analysis within the RIC among various political and legislative bodies.
• Continue to sponsor the development of information sharing systems and technologies that can be leveraged by participants of a regional center.

Specific Suggested Project & Initiative Opportunities

• Request a series of presentations/workshops to the PSC on the proposed roles, charter, governance, and operational requirements currently being considered to provide an educational foundation for additional involvement in Regional Information Center initiatives.

• Solicit specific site requirements identified by participating agencies to assist in any site selection or lobbying activities which PSC members might pursue.

• Develop a PSC “position paper” describing the PSC’s endorsement or other positions on the creation and ongoing operation of a Regional Information Center.

• Develop an estimation of specific ongoing funding and staffing requirements for the represented regional agencies, and use this estimate to develop a regional funding plan.
TECHNOLOGY EVALUATION, PROCUREMENT & SUPPORT

Technology Evaluation & Procurement

The concept of promoting improved standardization of technical procurement and support as well as helping enhance the ability to share research and procurement-related information is a long-standing priority. This appears to be due to a common sense that:

- Technology continues to proliferate in almost every aspect of public safety operations.
- The pace of technology change is outpacing the ability of organizations to assess, plan for, and implement new technologies. Often, due to the long budget planning and procurement lifecycles required of government agencies, technologies have evolved and in some cases moved toward obsolescence before they can be fully implemented.
- Technology projects are paradoxically both cheaper and more expensive. While the technology itself is becoming commoditized and less expensive, the costs of managing technology projects and of absorbing their impacts on the organization (i.e. process change, job function change, training, overtime, etc) is becoming increasingly expensive.
- Information Technology staffs tend to be overloaded. Between ongoing maintenance of existing technologies which span from office PCs and networks, to specialized dispatching equipment, to in-unit mobile computers, the increasing quantities and types of technologies deployed in public safety are stretching the resources of many agencies. Compounding this issue is the fact that in some smaller agencies, IT support and management is often a part-time function or secondary function of individuals with multiple responsibilities, or for whom IT is a “secondary” career.
- There should be more opportunity to leverage previous procurement efforts. Since operational aspects of public safety agencies are very similar, it is often surprising that technologies are not more standardized. This is often based on the fact that, while many agencies share common functional requirements, different preferences such as technology platform, interface requirements, vendor relationship, and “look-and-feel” often influence an evaluation/procurement team more than the basic fundamental requirements or the consideration of regional information sharing. Information sharing is sometimes either an afterthought or a secondary requirement to the perceived operational needs of the specific department. Hence, there is a tendency for agencies even within the
same geographic region to have strong preferences for or against different technologies, systems, or even vendors even when the overall system capabilities are often remarkably similar. This can lead to significant duplication of technology evaluation and procurement overhead. Rather than a single set of overriding functional requirements that are common to the region being established, it is up to each agency to identify their own requirements, hopefully with an eye toward regional information sharing, and evaluate the marketplace based on their own perceived needs.

**Regional Information Technology Support**

The concept of a regional IT help desk was also proposed in the original list of potential priorities submitted. While this concept is interesting from the service consolidation and economies-of-scale perspective, there are some logistical challenges that might preclude such a concept at this point in time.

Interview participants in general liked the concept of such a service, but had a difficult time identifying tangible types of assistance that the service could/would provide. Specifically, the degree of dissimilarity between agencies’ IT infrastructure, applications, and specific uses would make it all but impossible to provide much specific troubleshooting assistance for all but a few specific applications (such as ARJIS). It is possible, that future evolution toward more similar and compatible infrastructure and applications might enable the consideration of a regional technology help-desk when there is enough of a “critical mass” of common technologies to allow a centralized support staff.

Certainly, continued sharing of both procurement and support-related information is in the best interest of the region and of the individual agencies within the region.

**Opportunities for Involvement of the Public Safety Committee**

- Continue to encourage regional technology planning.
- Sponsor the creation of high-level regional technology standards.
- Create a clearinghouse for technology research and procurement information. This could consist of the designation of a more formalized process and a contact point for agencies to contribute gathered information to. The functions of such a clearinghouse would be:
  - To provide a repository of documentation generated by various agencies.
  - To provide a contact point where agencies can “report” active research needs or procurement activities.
• To provide a contact point where agencies could inquire as to the existence of current or prior research or procurement activity being conducted throughout the region.

• Encourage basic interoperability standards through high-level interoperability requirements and specific technical requirements. Working with existing technical committees and working groups, encourage the development of a document defining regional technical interoperability guidelines.
REGIONAL TRAINING

The topic of regional training elicited the least consistent set of responses. While the general consensus certainly appeared to be that improvements in training could be made, there was not clear agreement on a set of specific ideas about how to implement improvements. There also appeared to be different levels of awareness regarding existing efforts to augment, replace, or relocate various training facilities. The following topics were the most consistently mentioned:

- The current Academy POST Basic Officer Training is sufficient and agencies see tremendous advantages in having a regional academy.
- Supervisory Training is not as widely available but is not as regularly needed (i.e.; needs are often dependent on irregular promotion cycles, etc).
- Some facilities are not convenient for all agencies. Some newer facilities have been created at non-central locations that create hardships for agencies at the edges of the region to attend regularly (i.e. increased overtime use, etc).
- There is support for the concept of a regional training center with improved facilities and more complete training regimen, however there is not clear agreement on where it should be located and/or what other facilities should be consolidated there if one were to be created.
- There is confusion or lack of complete awareness of the current state of efforts to leverage the former Naval Training Facility location to establish a regional training facility. In addition, during the deliberations on the use of this site, the location has seen “encroachment” from other uses and may now have suitability limitations given the reduced size of available land and various plans for facilities renovation/demolition. There is a formal site evaluation process underway with architectural and engineering plan reviews in progress. A status meeting was held in February from which some updated information was obtained and shared with Public Safety representatives.
- There is limited training for ARJIS and other regional systems available county-wide. Most training is performed within individual agencies and is based on “word-of-mouth” training from current employees to new-hires.
- There was a consistent desire for more accessible and capable facilities for operational training and recertification such as driving courses and simulators, firearms and tactics training/simulators, etc.
Opportunities for Involvement of the Public Safety Committee

- Develop improved consensus regarding training issues and desired improvements.

- Influence site selection and facilities development of any new regional training center that is created according to priorities identified by constituents.
OTHER FINDINGS & OBSERVATIONS

Observations on the Public Safety Committee

The Needs Assessment identified a number of questions among the participants about the role of the PSC, particularly in the context of all of the various regional cooperative efforts that exist within the San Diego region. Most participants understood the stated role of the PSC to assist in improving communication and visibility of public safety issues within the region, and to elevate the political impact of the public safety community through participation within the broader SANDAG board and committee structures. However, there was less consistent understanding of the specific charter of the committee and how it would go about fulfilling these expectations. The most frequent thoughts communicated were:

**Clarification of the PSC Charter** – most respondents felt that the PSC had not yet established or communicated a clear, formalized charter and statement of objectives. Certainly, the establishment of a specific agenda of initiatives and objectives is what prompted the Needs Assessment itself, so that is not necessarily surprising. Most participants viewed the primary roles of the PSC as those of:

- Education of the SANDAG Board and other political peers at the local, State, and Federal level on issues facing public safety agencies.
- Evangelism of the importance of public safety needs and recommended solutions as they are identified.
- Assistance in obtaining stable funding sources for the potentially significant investments required to make the improvements identified by the Committee.

**Committee Membership & Representation** – While the PSC’s stated scope is public safety in the general sense, the current composition of the committee is heavily oriented toward law enforcement and criminal justice. It may be desirable to broaden representation of other public safety related disciplines, while balancing the need to keep the overall size of the Committee manageable and productive.

**Relationship to other regional bodies** – Due to the long history of inter-agency cooperation in the San Diego region, there are a number of Committees, Associations, Task Forces, and other standing bodies that provide coordination and information sharing oversight. Some respondents thought that the PSC could benefit from clarifying how it will augment these
existing programs while not duplicating efforts or applying additional overhead.

**Resources and Staffing** – Concerns were raised that the PSC currently does not have significant staff resources to perform additional research or to actively manage any initiatives which it may choose to sponsor. Therefore, there is some degree of concern over the ability of the Committee to be able to accomplish goals in the strategic areas it identifies. Currently ARJIS and Criminal Justice Research staff are supporting the PSC’s efforts. Given the work plans identified for both of these Divisions, some attention may need to be given to how the PSC will acquire the resources required to make progress on any specific projects identified as a result of this Needs Assessment or other initiatives. This issue will also require the PSC to be highly selective in the number of initiatives it chooses to work on at one time in order to demonstrate tangible progress.

**Regional PSC membership turnover and succession planning** – One consideration mentioned repeatedly was the concept that “much of the cooperation that exists in the region is based on the strength and character of the people in key leadership positions and their willingness to champion cooperation and mutual respect”. Impending turnover within local agencies particularly among senior leadership staff will have an effect on membership of various interagency boards, task forces, and the PSC itself. It will be important for these bodies to have appropriate succession-planning measures in place, as well as to encourage local agencies to ensure that continued regional cooperation is emphasized in future recruiting and promotional criteria. This can be particularly important when recruiting senior leadership staff from agencies outside the region, where inter-agency cooperation and communication might not be as normative a behavior as it is within the San Diego region.

**Role of ARJIS in the region**

The interview results also pointed the need to continue to define and potentially re-define the role of ARJIS in the region. As agencies continue to pursue new technologies and develop enhanced information tracking and sharing capabilities, it will be important for ARJIS to 1) consider the changing technology landscape in defining additional services and interfaces, and 2) be considered in the local agency technical/functional requirements for new technology procurements.

Some of the frequently cited issues related to ARJIS in interview discussions were:
Timeliness of information posting in ARJIS – many agencies have a significant backlog of data to be entered into ARJIS – particularly for certain types of reports/documents. This is not likely to improve with additional pressures on staffing/budgets. ARJIS may wish to focus research on technologies that could reduce data entry requirements for participating agencies. This could take the form of additional interfaces to local systems, field-oriented data entry forms, scanning/OCR technologies, etc.

State and Federal data not in ARJIS - ARJIS currently contains only regional data contributed by local law enforcement. Currently none of the State or Federal participating ARJIS agencies submit data to ARJIS. (e.g., 200 federal arrests per month by US Marshals are not reported in ARJIS; State and Federal watch lists are not cross referenced with the ARJIS Officer Notification System). The President's Intelligence Sharing Plan stresses the need for local, state, and federal data to be shared among public safety agencies. The PSC can assist in advocating the need for more comprehensive information sharing.

ARJIS’ role in the context of local RMS implementations – More agencies are implementing local Records Management Systems. As such ARJIS’ role as pseudo-RMS for a number of agencies, and as repository for detailed report data may evolve toward more of an index or pointer system enabling inter-system queries and information sharing. Or, perhaps ARJIS will continue to collect even more detailed information and provide a centralized warehouse/repository for records from a variety of local RMS systems that have been transformed into a single, searchable regional standard (based on JusticeXML, or other currently emerging standards). Whatever form ARJIS adopts in the future, it is clear that some extensive assessment of functional requirements will need to be developed with the integration of several different RMS data sources a primary consideration. Some of the key comments from interviews supporting this perception are:

- Many agencies are currently using ARJIS as their RMS
- The current RMS project being conducted by the Sheriff's Department may result in a broader adoption of a traditional RMS by a number of agencies.
- What should the demarcation points be between ARJIS and local RMS systems?
- ARJIS’ need to evolve technologically presents opportunities and requirements to evolve its role.
Need for regional coordination of new information systems development – Several interviewees mentioned the need for a more formal process for “bubbling” projects to ARJIS for regional review. Several individuals believed that ARJIS (specifically the ARJIS Technical Committee) currently provides the best regional “forum” for consideration of regional standardization when new information systems are developed. For example, the concept of a regional Pawn Shop interface/system was mentioned several times. There appears to be interest in such a system and research/work already underway to define/develop such a system. Potential inclusion of such a system under the ARJIS umbrella would maximize the effectiveness of regional information sharing needs.

While citing this need for coordination and accessibility to such systems on a regional basis, it was also pointed out that occasionally, individual agencies will identify important enforcement priorities or allocate budgets for specific projects that, while potentially more universal if performed under an umbrella such as ARJIS, may not meet specific local time-to-market, cost of operation, or functionality requirements if developed on a region-wide basis. There was occasional feedback that bigger projects almost always require larger overall budgets and resources, and that running certain projects under a regional umbrella like ARJIS has not always been seen as cost- or time-effective.

Other Opportunities for Service Consolidation

In addition to specific discussions about Communications Center consolidation, a number of other services were commonly cited as being prime candidates for potential consolidation. This study does not attempt to identify all of the potential advantages and disadvantages of such consolidation, nor does it advocate for consolidation in general. Discussions regarding consolidation obviously raise organizational and political sensitivities and consolidation is not without both advantages and potential disadvantages which require careful planning and consideration. However, one of the more prevalent themes of the interviews conducted was the ever increasing cost of providing public safety service and the desire to search for economies of scale through consolidated operations and facilities wherever it made sense. The following areas were most commonly discussed:

Air Support

Only the two largest local law enforcement agencies have air support capabilities. SDPD has 4 helicopters and SDSD has 6 helicopters. Additional air
support resources are available from other state and federal agencies (CHP, FBI, etc) but these resources serve a broader role, can not be as easily redirected for spontaneous or planned events, and often serve a larger geographic region than strictly San Diego County – making routine, patrol support-oriented, regional participation unlikely. These resources do often participate in special operations oriented roles (surveillances, etc).

It was also noted that SDPD is in the process of procuring additional airships although it was unclear whether that will be immediate due to budgetary pressures. It was unclear whether this will result in an augmentation of the available fleet, or if they will strictly be replacements for existing airships.

The most common perceived advantages of Air Support consolidation were:

- Economy of scale – the high cost of deploying, operating, and maintaining air support makes it prohibitive for all but the largest organizations.
- Supplemental Funding – while smaller agencies are not able to obtain their own air support due to the high entry cost, they might be able to contribute funding toward a truly regional, JPA-based air support unit.
- Better coverage – through consolidation it is thought that greater coverage of the geographic region can be maintained on a broader time-coverage basis (closer to 24x7 support). Currently there are periods of time during which air support is not readily available (i.e. SDPD does not operate 24x7 Air Support coverage).
- Improved response times – Agencies have reported occasions where air support is either unavailable or is out of position to provide timely assistance to tactical situations. A higher number of airships deployed in a coordinated, region-wide manner could improve both the coverage and response time aspects of air support operations.
- Alternatives to pursuit tactics – with the noticeable increase in both the quantity and public visibility of high-speed pursuits air support is an important and well-recognized addition to potential pursuit and containment situations.

In order to provide a basis for evaluation of the potential benefits and disadvantages of increased regional air support consolidation or cooperation, some of the following metrics might prove useful as a starting point for discussion:

- Inventory of assets: quantity, type, configuration, capabilities, age and expected life of airships in various agency fleets. Quantity, credentials/certifications, special training of air support crews.
Operational & Maintenance Costs: costs of maintenance (annual average), costs of operation ($ per flight hour), costs of downtime ($ per non-flight hour)

Staff Costs – costs to recruit, retain, train, certify flight crew and maintenance staff.

Operational Metrics: Time deployed by type of support; % of time spent supporting outside agencies; arrests & apprehensions attributed to air support, etc.

K9 Support

Many of the agencies surveyed operate K9 units of varying sizes. They also currently work closely together for training and mutual aid assistance. The most common rationales provided for investigating consolidation were:

- Augment capabilities and/or coverage for smaller agencies with fewer or no K9 capabilities.
- Provide even greater regional consistency and standardization of training, practices, record-keeping.
- Provide better economies of scale.
- Potentially provide better response times for K9 support throughout the region.

Prisoner Transport/Booking

One city (Oceanside PD) reported an interesting use of privatization for prisoner transport. By using less expensive resources they are able to reduce the overall cost of handling arrestees, and increase the availability of officers in the field. They reported that this allowed them to redeploy the equivalent of 3 officers who would otherwise have been "lost" to the overhead of booking and transport. This is potentially a model that could be scaled up to provide for increased officer availability and potential cost reductions for many agencies. Further metrics should be gathered and studied to determine if this approach would be feasible.

SWAT/Tactical Response Teams

All agencies interviewed reported operating a SWAT/tactical team. There was some discussion of the potential to further coordinate SWAT activities. However, while SWAT was mentioned as a possible area for consolidation study, most agencies seemed satisfied with the status quo and questioned whether a regional SWAT team might actually degrade the regions overall ability to respond to multiple events or provide the highest levels of responsiveness to local jurisdictions. The general sense was that SWAT was an area that would benefit
from the continued mutual aid support and shared training exercises, but was not among the primary candidates for consolidation.

**Regional Crime Lab**

A number of participants mentioned several crime lab facilities available within the region, with varying degrees of technical capability. As expected, the larger agencies have significant facilities and help serve the needs of smaller agencies. Crime Lab capabilities can span from basic evidence processing, photo developing, blood typing, latent print analysis, hair/fiber analysis, ballistics, to specializations such as DNA analysis, computer forensics, etc. However, no one set of facilities has all of the staff, expertise, technology, or forensic capabilities required for the region. Even the large agencies would like to see enhancements within the region in the scope and types of services that could be conducted “in-house”. The concept of a regional crime lab with consolidated staffing, facilities, and training capabilities appears popular. In addition, many respondents who favor enhancing the Crime Lab capabilities of the region also favor enhancing collaboration with regional research and academic institutions to promote improved education and development of new techniques and analysis capabilities for the future.

**Homeland Security Related Funding and Procurements**

Several common themes were apparent in response to questions about Homeland Security-related expenditures:

- **The process is perceived to be heavily weighted toward Fire-related expenditures and equipment** - This is consistent with the Federal mandate to use Homeland Security grants to better equip and train “first responders” to deal with major incidents – with a predominant focus on terrorism-oriented incidents. All grant expenditure coordination is performed in conjunction with the Unified Disaster Council, which includes representation of all public safety and emergency service agencies in the region.

- **Significant restrictions on how money can be spent** - Most agencies surveyed felt that the application of these funds have not resulted in particularly effective improvements in the ability to respond to a major homeland security event. Specifically, the types of equipment typically being procured are geared toward hazmat types of incidents (Chem/Bio/Nuclear). Furthermore, in such an event, specialized responders primarily from Fire and the larger regional, state and Federal agencies would likely provide primary response once such a determination
was made, and that in the case of such a major incident, many of the original first responders would therefore be in a position of requiring decontamination or other assistance by an appropriately equipped “second wave” of emergency response personnel. More thought needs to be given to how responses to large-scale events would unfold, and how such types of equipment should be allocated and staged to provide maximum effectiveness.

- **Numerous levels of regulation and bureaucracy exist before money reaches local agencies** - There is not sufficient awareness of when funds are available, how they will be spent, and what the regional priorities are. A number of agencies referred to Orange County as an example of a more effective regional approach to utilization of Homeland Security funding by identifying the procurement priorities and ensuring that agencies were obtaining compatible equipment. (e.g.; replacement filters, etc). However, it was also clear that there is a defined organizational structure and methodology for allocating and dispersing funds, so perhaps there is simply a need for more proactive communications to participating agencies. The development of a legislative program by the PSC, coupled with the identification and coordination of regional priorities could have a significant impact on Homeland Security funding, and result in successfully implemented programs and initiatives.

- **Grant performance periods are short and administrative allowances too small** - For smaller equipment-related procurements this may not be an issue, but for larger "systems"-related procurements, there is often not enough time to execute the numerous procurement, approval, and implementation tasks within the grant timelines. Additionally many grants have a 3% administrative allowance. Agencies familiar with grants pointed out that the actual costs of administration of grant-related paperwork, approvals, and reviews are typically higher than 3%, particularly since Homeland Security grants have multiple levels of review and oversight.

- **Homeland Security expenditures have not resulted in significant improvements to public safety service** – Respondents were virtually unanimous in their perceptions that, although well intentioned, federal homeland security grants were not resulting in significant, tangible improvements to either the ability to prevent certain types of major incidents or to enhance normal, everyday public safety services. There is general agreement that increased focus and training has lead to some better preparedness and recognition throughout all levels of government of the potential impacts of a large scale public safety response and the need for interagency cooperation. But, most agencies felt that providing
improved services to the public on a daily basis would be a more effective use of limited funding sources, and that previous programs such as the COPS/MORE program provided more direct and more flexible funding for local needs.

Border Issues

There is substantial cooperation between local, state, and federal agencies in areas such as organized crime and narcotics trafficking. These are both significant “border” issues which continue to receive substantial attention. With San Diego being one of the primary border entry points for both legal and illegal activity, this area represents a potential strategic area of policy attention for the PSC for some time to come.

Specific areas of interest related to border proximity issues raised by survey respondents were:

- Property Crime enforcement – specifically auto-theft and its relationship to border proximity. It was stated perhaps better coordination with Mexican authorities and increased enforcement in Mexico could result in increased recovery, prosecution, and prevention rates.
- Unlicensed and uninsured driving – some agencies reported significant issues with dangerous driving behaviors and issues related to uninsured and unlicensed drivers.

Potential Integration with Traffic System Initiatives

One of SANDAG’s core areas of focus is in Transportation Planning and Improvement. A number of key projects have potential integration opportunities for Public Safety. Several potential ideas have emerged through a combination of the interviews conducted and additional collaboration and information sharing with SANDAG staff managing a number of these initiatives. It is interesting to note that “traffic issues” were a significant source of concern and visibility to a large number of agencies surveyed. Specifically, agencies whose boundaries included common “congestion bypass” routes (i.e. corridors between major freeways and arterials) often reported significant public concerns over speeding in residential areas, traffic congestion, failure to yield, and other safety issues related to the primary commuting corridors being stressed beyond their capacity. Potential opportunities for enhanced cooperation with public safety are:

Joint Operations Centers
Regional Public Safety Needs Assessment
Draft Report

SANDAG is coordinating the creation of a number of Operations Centers which will provide monitoring, control, and event management/response to transportation-related issues throughout the region. These centers will consolidate both personnel and systems and provide enhanced coordination among agencies responsible for transportation-related infrastructure and services. Specific technological capabilities will include:

- Sensors – a variety of sensing devices allow collection and display of traffic flow/direction, speed, volume, vehicle types, etc.
- Signaling/Signage – ability to remotely control automatic signals and signage such as ramp metering, traffic lighting, message boards, etc.
- Cameras – ability to provide a combination of static (snapshot) and motion video feeds in real-time at key locations.
- Event Management – Ability to detect potential unplanned events (accidents, hazards, etc) and anticipate planned events (construction, special events, etc). Ability to adapt metering/signage in response to events both manually and automatically.
- Statistics and Metrics – Ability to obtain short- and long-term planning information and metrics from historical data.

There are also potential opportunities to leverage such operations centers as facilities for further consolidation (e.g.; communications center, emergency operations, etc).

Traffic Information Systems

SANDAG and other regional transportation and infrastructure agencies are implementing substantial automation. Upcoming versions of these systems will allow better access and potential integration with other public safety systems. At a minimum, public safety agencies may be able to gain access to many of the sources mentioned above (camera feeds, aggregated sensor data, etc), via web-based applications. Additional capabilities could also enable system-to-system integration with computer-aided dispatch (CAD) or other systems used in public safety dispatch or emergency operations centers. These could provide substantial improvements in:

- **Providing enhanced real-time visibility** – cameras and sensor data can provide visibility of areas within a jurisdiction without deploying staffed units to a location.

- **Improving emergency response to incidents** – by using available information to anticipate traffic issues, responding units could potentially avoid congested routes and improve response times. Additionally, such information would certainly allow improved tactical response to major...
incidents by assisting with perimeter establishment and control, routing of public and emergency responder traffic, etc. In the future, technologies could be used to expedite responses by altering traffic flow patterns via signaling, signage, etc.

- **Providing additional investigative information** – camera feeds are increasingly providing valuable information in substantiating crimes and/or providing identifying evidence of potential suspects or subjects involved.

- **Identifying problem or special enforcement areas** – both real-time and historical data can be used to identify areas requiring special enforcement, deployment of additional resources, or other preventative actions by various agencies.

**Traffic Enforcement**

A few agencies either have implemented or are planning to implement “red light camera” traffic enforcement systems. Those agencies that have tried them report mixed results. They do tend to reduce certain traffic offenses, but operational issues and public perception issues result in varying degrees of acceptance. The use of this type of enforcement will most likely remain a local decision based largely on local political climate.

Agencies have also reported collaborations in traffic enforcement that serve as another example of outstanding inter-agency collaboration. In some cases, traffic units from a number of jurisdictions will patrol designated special enforcement zones and create a high degree of impact for a period of time in specific problem areas. It was pointed out that this has in some cases created a need for education of the public and of the elected official community. For example, there have been questions about why an officer from one agency was issuing citations in another agency’s jurisdiction.

**Other Miscellaneous Observations & Ideas**

**Future issues of criminal detention vs. diversion** - Desire to move toward offender risk assessment as opposed to the current “level of offense” based diversion. Need to provide for improved standardization of diversion programs and tracking of them. Need for a Regional Plan updated annually focusing not only on crime trends but on results/efficacy of prevention & diversion programs (i.e. which efforts do and do not have an effect on public safety from all of the various prevention, diversion, sanctioning, and policing programs).

**Evaluation of the cost of public safety service** – Conduct a study assessing the cost of deploying an officer today, and project costs over a 10 year period.
Create a methodology for measuring costs of providing public safety services, and indicate an ROI on various investments.

**Staffing Issues** - Some departments are “smaller” today than prior to 9/11/2001. One major contributing factor is unfilled, authorized positions. This can be caused by budgetary pressures, unfillable positions (injured/disabled officers, etc). Some departments have seen increases in authorized staffing levels due to homeland security funding changes, however not all of these “authorizations” have actually been fully funded. Examples include: 500 additional Federal Marshals, 10000 additional Border Patrol agents over 5 years.
APPENDIX A: SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT “TOP 3” OBJECTIVES FOR THE PSC

Respondents were asked to provide “3 specific objectives you would like to see the PSC accomplish or make significant progress on in the next year”. The responses below represent the major concepts commonly communicated. Several concepts below were mentioned repeatedly. They are not presented as verbatim quotes, but paraphrased themes derived from across all the interviews conducted.

- Establish a regional vision of public safety in the region for agencies to begin evolving towards.
- Help consolidate funding efforts - larger projects require larger budgets and a regional funding source would allow for progress on major initiatives.
- Help promote regional standardization of policies (e.g.; use of force, pursuits, etc).
- Leverage political capital to move initiatives forward that tend to languish for lack of funding or resources.
- Establish a clear identity, role, charter for the PSC that is accepted and recognized by all constituents. Quickly develop an agenda of priorities and projects to lead/sponsor.
- Help with the creation of the Regional Intelligence Center and assist with finding a suitable location.
- Promote a regional approach to evaluating technology and conducting evaluations and research.
- Promote consolidation of duplicative services where sensible.
- Lobby local, state and federal agencies to get funding flowing more directly to agencies. Streamline funding approvals and disbursements.
- Promote better coordination with Mexican authorities on border issues.
- Help ensure alignment between ARJIS and SDPD/S.O. RMS systems. Ensure that they maintain compatibility and meet expectations of stakeholders.
- Take 4 proposed subject areas, rank them, identify 1 or 2 initiatives to work on, and establish a timeframe for completion, and set benchmarks/objectives for success.
• Creation of an Annual Research Plan indicating Crime Statistics and results of prevention, diversion, and sanctioning programs. Could be enhancement of data already in the annual “Crime in the San Diego Region” report produced by SANDAG.
APPENDIX B: SUMMARY OF CHALLENGES FACING AGENCIES

The following list summarizes the major challenges identified by respondents when asked to list “the most important issues facing your organization”.

- Stable, Adequate funding sources
- Technology Changes
- Facilities Construction
- Traffic Issues – enforcement, accidents, congestion, speeding in residential/arterial areas by freeway “bypass” commuters.
- Increasing Cost of providing public safety services
- Desire higher level of electronic exchange of documentation vs paper documents
- Drug enforcement and the push to decriminalize drugs
- Youth population increase and impact of “prime crime” years.
- Impact of increasing criminal population and the push to weaken 3-strikes legislation, reduce sentencing, and implement early release programs, etc.
- Would like to perform regular reviews of “what’s working and what’s not working”, and collect measurements to assess outcomes of projects and approaches to law enforcement and crime prevention.
- Impending consolidation of Fire Districts
- Probation Dept does not have radios for all necessary employees.
- Probation would like to be more involved in regional crime analysis and link analysis efforts
- Probation does not currently have Crime Analysis staff. Future budget calls for a position for Crime Analysis.
APPENDIX C: LIST OF INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Position</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Iaria</td>
<td>Chief Probation Officer</td>
<td>County of San Diego Probation Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Davis</td>
<td>Chief of Police</td>
<td>City of El Cajon Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Poehlman</td>
<td>Chief of Police</td>
<td>City of El Cajon Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Zoll</td>
<td>Chief of Police</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Ott</td>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>City of Solana Beach Public Safety/Fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Dzwileski</td>
<td>Special Agent in Charge</td>
<td>Federal Bureau of Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolfo Gonzales</td>
<td>Chief of Police</td>
<td>City of National City Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Emerson</td>
<td>Chief of Police</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Lansdowne</td>
<td>Chief of Police</td>
<td>City of San Diego Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Hutton</td>
<td>Chief of Police</td>
<td>City of Coronado Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Gore</td>
<td>Assistant Sheriff</td>
<td>County of San Diego Sheriff’s Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Bejarano</td>
<td>U.S. Marshal</td>
<td>U.S. Marshals Service, Southern District of California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Mark Lewis</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>City of El Cajon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Smith</td>
<td>Field Director</td>
<td>U.S. Immigration &amp; Customs Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliff Resch</td>
<td>Chief of Police</td>
<td>City of La Mesa Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Christy Guerin</td>
<td>Councilmember</td>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Drummy</td>
<td>Director of Administrative Services</td>
<td>San Diego Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Ron Newman</td>
<td>Councilmember</td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duane White</td>
<td>Chief of Police</td>
<td>City of Escondido Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert “Skip” Carter</td>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>California Highway Patrol, Border Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Gorman</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Southwest Border HIDTA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Organization Overview

1.1 What are the most important issues your organization is facing, primarily but not necessarily exclusively, related to public safety?

1.2 What are the most significant changes you anticipate affecting your organization over the next 5 - 10 years?

1.3 Does your organization have a formal strategic plan? Does that strategic plan include components focusing on regional issues?

1.4 Does your organization actively participate in regional or extra-regional organizations, committees, standards bodies, or other institutions?

Assessment of Regional Opportunities

2.1 What types of public safety services most lend themselves to a regional approach, if any, and why?

2.2 What types of public safety services should not be regionalized, if any, and why?

2.3 What are the best examples of successful regionalization efforts, either within the San Diego region or elsewhere?

2.4 Do you feel that the current governance structures for regional public safety initiatives are working effectively? What changes/optimizations should be made, if any?

2.5 What barriers do you see affecting broader cooperation on regional efforts?

2.6 Which, if any statements below would you attribute to regionalization efforts/initiatives. Include specific examples where applicable.
   • Enable opportunities my organization would not be able to achieve on its own
   • Provide economies of scale
   • Help enhance/augment my organization’s internal expertise
   • Provide support resources my organization does not have
   • Take too much time of my organization’s staff
   • Are too slow to produce results
   • Are too bureaucratic
   • Are too controlled by larger agencies
   • Cost too much
   • Reduce local control and/or flexibility

2.7 What opportunities do you see for the PSC to enhance the participation and education of the public in public safety matters?

Budget & Funding Sources, Challenges, and Opportunities
3.1 Does your organization actively pursue alternate funding sources (grants, matching funds, bonds, etc)?

3.2 How could the region be more effective at:
- Cooperating with the private sector in joint initiatives?
- Seeking alternative funding sources?
- Utilizing available funds?

3.3 Has your organization received funding for Homeland Security initiatives? Specify.

3.4 Do you feel that funding for Homeland Security initiatives is being allocated appropriately throughout the region?

3.5 Have Homeland Security initiatives to date resulted in effective improvements? In what ways could Homeland Security initiatives be improved? How have regionalization issues affected these initiatives either positively or negatively?

3.6 What types of models do you think are best suited to your organization for helping fund regionalization initiatives:
- Pay-per-use - member agencies pay for services on an incremental "per transaction/per use" style.
- Pay-for-service-level - member agencies subscribe to desired service levels that are tiered by cost/priority
- Relative contribution - membership fees based on population size or other demographic factors
- In-kind contribution – member agencies can contribute facilities, resources, staff as an alternative to capital contributions.
- External sources – self-governed entity with legislated or otherwise mandated funding sources not provided directly by participating agencies (bonds, assessments, etc).

3.7 What are the opportunities for the Public Safety Committee to assist in improving regional communications and interoperability?

Regional Communications & Interoperability

4.1 What are the 3 most important issues for your organization with respect to communications needs (e.g., channel/frequency congestion, data transmission speed/bandwidth, system reliability, coverage, interoperability)?

4.2 How satisfied are you with current radio/communications infrastructure?

4.3 Does your organization participate in RCS committees, working groups, etc?

4.4 What issues, if any, do you perceive in regionalization of communications infrastructure? What suggestions do you have to improve these issues?

4.5 What are the opportunities for the Public Safety Committee to assist in improving regional communications and interoperability?

Regional Technology Acquisition, Maintenance & Support
5.1 What is your perception of your organization’s ability to procure and implement technology?

5.2 What specific areas could your organization use assistance with related to technology procurement and support?

5.3 Do you perceive any advantages or disadvantages of regional assistance to your organization in the area of Technology Acquisition, Maintenance, or Support?

5.4 What are the barriers to expanding regional involvement in this area? Do you have suggestions of how to overcome these obstacles?

5.5 What are the opportunities for the PSC to participate in the area of Technology Acquisition, Maintenance & Support?

Regional Information Center

6.1 Do you receive sufficient information related to public safety within the region to make informed decisions? What specific gaps in information exist, if any?

6.2 Do you perceive any advantages or disadvantages in the creation of regional crime analysis and intelligence sharing capabilities?

6.3 Given the post-9/11 environment and increased focus on inter-agency coordination, what specific opportunities do you see for consolidating information and promoting greater information sharing?

6.4 Would you perceive any significant value from physically co-locating a team of analytical resources together in order to promote regional sharing of data and research?

6.5 What are the barriers to expanding regional involvement in this area? Do you have suggestions of how to overcome these obstacles?

6.6 What are the opportunities for the Public Safety Committee to improve the collection, sharing and analysis of public safety related information?

Regional Training

7.1 Are there subjects or disciplines for which training is not readily available within the region that you feel are critical to providing improved public safety services?

7.2 What recommendation(s) would you make regarding implementation of additional training for public safety agencies within the region?

7.3 What kinds of inter-disciplinary training would improve public safety and/or safety of first responders?

7.4 Are there areas of expertise within your organization that you feel could provide an example of a regional “best practice”? If so, specify (i.e. specific program areas, personnel, resources, practices/procedures, documentation, etc.).
7.5 Do you perceive any advantages or disadvantages of regionalization to your organization in regards to Training?

7.6 What are the barriers to expanding regional involvement in this area? Do you have suggestions of how to overcome these obstacles?

7.7 What are the opportunities for the Public Safety Committee to improve training within the region?

Summary

8.1 How would you rank the importance of the major subject areas reviewed:
- Regional Technology Acquisition & Support?
- Regional Communication & Interoperability?
- Regional Training?
- Regional Information Center?
- Other, specify?

8.2 What are the potential areas of collaboration between Public Safety and other regional disciplines:
- Emergency Services?
- Transportation?
- Public Works?
- Local Planning?

8.3 What is the value of regional coordination in the following areas of activity:
- Incident Response/First Responders?
- After-action Information Analysis?
- Prevention/Intervention Initiatives?

8.4 List three specific objectives you would like to see the PSC accomplish in the next:
- 1 year
- 5 years
- 10 years
COPLINK: A NEW INVESTIGATIVE CRIME TOOL FOR THE SAN DIEGO REGION

Introduction

One of the deliverables of the Department of Homeland Security-funded BorderSafe Project is the implementation of COPLINK, a software application utilized as an investigative tool for solving crimes and identifying offenders. The ARJIS COPLINK node will also be able to access other COPLINK nodes in Phoenix, Tucson, and Orange County as part of the information-sharing component of the BorderSafe Project. This report provides a status of the COPLINK Project; highlights the features of the COPLINK software that includes suspect identification, link analysis, and mapping; and identifies next steps. Staff will also provide a demonstration of ARJIS COPLINK.

Recommendation

The Public Safety Committee is asked to receive this information and give direction where appropriate.

Discussion

The BorderSafe grant included $343,000 toward the purchase, installation, and rollout of the COPLINK software and associated hardware and network components. COPLINK is an investigative tool that provides an automated Web-based approach to collecting, processing, and organizing law enforcement-specific knowledge to support the functions, actions, and decisions made by ARJIS users. ARJIS provides a variety of other applications, such as Cal-Photo, Global Query, and ARJIS in the Field, that offer real-time tactical queries to users. COPLINK compliments these applications by providing the ability to do more complex searches.

One technique used by investigators to solve criminal incidents is to associate the known elements of a crime with each other, as well as be able to take small bits of information such as a partial license plate, vehicle description, nickname, or phone number, and be able to reconstruct a crime or identify a suspect. COPLINK automates this process by consolidating information from disparate data sources and packaging it into a single response for investigators. The application also has mapping and link analysis capabilities, so investigators can automatically and visually link suspects, vehicles, and crimes.

In addition, COPLINK has the ability to connect to other COPLINK nodes throughout the nation. As part of the BorderSafe project, Phoenix, Tucson and smaller surrounding cities in Arizona have also acquired and installed COPLINK. An initial test of information sharing between San Diego and Tucson resulted in hits on a gang member and sex offender within 24 hours of Tucson having access to San Diego data. Although the data had yet to be in COPLINK, this small demonstration
underlines the significance of locating critical justice data in neighboring jurisdictions and/or states. Orange County also recently executed a contract with COPLINK to provide a regional node for the agencies within Orange County. Initial meetings have already been held with Orange County to ensure a connection is made with San Diego once their system is installed.

Critical to the COPLINK information-sharing project are metrics and success stories. Staff will be providing the Public Safety Committee (PSC) with regular updates about the use and successful “hits” of the COPLINK system. Also critical to successful information sharing are policies and procedures for access and use of both inter-county and inter-state information. As Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) are executed between participating nodes and data sharing policies are developed, the PSC will play a significant role in providing policy approval and guidance.
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