



# Louisiana Integrated Criminal Justice Information System (ICJIS)

## Integrated Criminal Justice Information System Policy Board

### Meeting

March 27, 2025

10:00am

Governor's Office Press Room

State Capitol Building, Baton Rouge, LA

**APPROVED**  
**07/17/2025**

### Minutes

#### 1. Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting of the Louisiana Integrated Criminal Justice Information Policy Board was called to order at 10:01 a.m. on Thursday, March 27, 2025, by Chairman Judge Scott Schlegel.

Ms. Autumn Blache conducted the roll call and a membership quorum was present.

#### **Board members and their representatives in attendance:**

Rep. Tony Bacala; Mr. Thomas Carol Bickham, III; Mr. Jim Craft; Mr. Zachary Daniels; Mr. Alan Davis; Ms. Debbie Hudnall; Judge William Jorden; Deputy Chief Neal Noel; Maj. JB Slaton; and Mr. Christopher Walters.

#### **Guests in attendance:**

Mr. Mark Cummings, Baton Rouge Police Department; Mr. Jady Devillier, Delta Resource Group; Mr. Scott Carrington, Ms. Melissa Henry, and Ms. Dallas Osborn, 13 Verticals; Mr. Chris Kershaw, Louisiana Clerks of Court Association; Mr. John Sinefield, Louisiana Department of Justice; Mr. Dale Polozola, Louisiana District Attorney's Association; Mr. Billy Douglas and Ms. Kristy Miller, Louisiana Highway Safety Commission; Mr. Kate Tomeny Richardson, Louisiana Sheriffs' Association; Mr. Larry Badeaux, Ms. Jamie Baker, Mr. Chris Eskew, Ms. Shelley Scott, Lt. Markus Smith, and Ms. Katherine Williams, Louisiana State Police; Mr. Doug Bullock, Ms. Ramona Harris, and Mr. Francis Robinson, Louisiana Supreme Court; Mr. John Humphries, Metropolitan Crime Commission; Ms. Cassie Porche, Office of Technology Services; and Mr. Yogesh Chawla, Search Group, INC.

#### **Staff in attendance:**

Ms. Autumn Blache; Mr. Russell Cortazzo; Ms. Fredia Dunn; Ms. Linda Gautier; Ms. Tiffany Robichaux; and Ms. LaShunda Sullivan.

#### 2. Introductions

Judge Schlegel introduces Mr. Chris Walters, with the Governor's Office, as the new Co-Chair of the board.

### **3. Old Business**

- a. Motion to approve meeting minutes from December 12, 2024

Judge Schlegel called for a motion to approve the December 12, 2024, Integrated Criminal Justice Information System Policy Board meeting minutes, as presented. A motion was made by Judge Jorden, seconded by Mr. Daniels. There were no objections; the motion passed.

### **4. New Business**

- a. Data Report

It is noted that the data report is included in the board members packets and conclusively shows the numbers for reportable records, records not sent to DPS with failed specs, sent to DPS rejected, and sent to DPS successful. The report is attached.

Judge Schlegel also notes that the board was reinstituted by Judge Weimer a couple of years ago and has gotten the board to the point where the technology and the funding is now available to move the board forward in action.

- b. Financial Report

- i. Funding – Currently Available & Expected

Rep. Bacala notes that there is now \$5 million in the bank for the board to implement the next phases of integrating the ICJIS board into the criminal justice system. Judge Schlegel then commented that Rep. Bacala also got the board \$1 million and \$41 thousand in 2024 for ICJIS improvements.

Mr. Cortazzo states that there are other funds available through several federal grant funding opportunities such as 2023 and 2024 NARIP, as well as 2024 NCHIP to continue the CMIS strategic plan projects.

Judge Schlegel notes that all funds allocated to the board come to a total of \$8 million and \$200 thousand. The financial report is attached.

- ii. Spending Policy (Draft)

Judge Schlegel notes that the rules state that the policy board with the concurrent CEO of the agency involved may require additional personnel or technical assistance on a temporary basis from any unit or branch of state government. With this being said, the reason the Co-Chair was instated is so that no one person has sole authority. The Chair and the Co-Chair will counter sign any expenses, up to a certain amount, without having to call the board to a meeting. Anything over the agreed upon amount will have to wait until the next quarterly meeting to be discussed.

Judge Schlegel notes that in the current draft it states that the limit amount is set at \$50,000 but that it needs to be discussed by the board with a final agreement on what the amount should be for the Chair and Co-Chair to review and counter sign off on without going before the board.

Judge Schlegel opens the floor for discussion.

Mr. Daniels inquired about reoccurring expenses danger.

Judge Schlegel commented that, for example, the District Attorney's Office would be the first check point in which the costs would be reviewed. As the member of the board submitting the invoice, they would be responsible for the vetting of the invoice through procurement policies first. The board will never directly go into contract with a vendor, but instead, the agency requiring the services will contract with the vendor. The board member is a check in place to help prevent reoccurring expenses danger.

Rep. Bacala moves that all payments under \$250,000 be reviewed and co-signed by both the Chair and Co-Chair. Such payments must comply with procurement policies, be vetted by the submitting board member, and include a detailed contract outlining the scope of work and completion timelines prior to Chair and Co-Chair review.

After a brief discussion, Judge Jorden counter offers a motion of the payment limit to be set at \$100,000. Rep. Bacala seconded the motion. There were no objections; the motion passed.

Judge Schlegel emphasizes the importance of establishing a Financial Committee to review and vet larger projects before they are presented to the board. Judge Schlegel calls for a motion to establish the Financial Committee that shall consist of the following board members: Rep. Bacala, Mr. Daniels, Ms. Hudnall, Judge Schlegel, and Mr. Walters. A motion was made by Judge Jorden and seconded by Rep. Bacala.

Finally, Judge Schlegel calls for a motion for the spending policy to be adopted by the board. A motion was made by Mr. Bickham, seconded by Mr. Walters. There were no objections; the motion passed.

- c. Operations Report
  - i. 2024 Annual Report (Draft)

Judge Schlegel calls for a motion for the board to adopt the 2024 Annual Report. A motion was made by Mr. Bickham, seconded by Judge Jorden. There were no objections; the motion passed.

- ii. MOU with LCLE

Judge Schlegel notes that he and Mr. Craft have been working together on a memorandum of understanding (MOU). There are two items to discuss as it pertains to the completion of the MOU.

Mr. Craft explains that, since LCLE is unable to complete an interagency transfer (IAT) for the full allocated amount, LCLE will instead administer the funds on behalf of the board. It will be established in the MOU that LCLE will ensure that vendors contracted by the board adhere to procurement rules and procedures. The board will review and either approve or deny invoices submitted by the board member. If approved, the board will authorize LCLE to make the payment to the vendor. This process is intended to satisfy the legislative auditor's requirements.

Judge Schlegel comments that the first matter to discuss in the MOU would be the payment to LCLE for administrative purposes. Currently, the MOU states, "LCLE shall provide administrative support to the ICJIS board." Mr. Craft states that the costs incurred by the board from LCLE would be to cover direct labor costs associated with the processing of payments of the invoices submitted by the board. Judge Schlegel advises wording should be added to the

MOU for the ICJIS board to authorize compensation of LCLE direct labor costs associated with the administrative expenses managing ICJIS monies.”

Judge Schlegel notes that the MOU’s current mission is only including the \$1 million and \$400 thousand and it would need to be revised to be inclusive of all monies that the ICJIS board receives and also that the ICJIS board allocated funds are to be expended only for the purposes allowed pursuant to the ICJIS statute.

Judge Schlegel calls for a motion to add the following statement to the MOU: “The ICJIS board authorizes compensation of LCLE direct labor costs associated with the administrative expenses managing all monies allocated to the ICJIS board by the legislation, for the purposes allowed by the ICJIS Statute.” A motion was made by Mr. Walters, seconded by Mr. Daniels. There were no objections; the motion passed.

Judge Schlegel called for a motion to authorize LCLE to pay the invoice, in the amount of \$8,448, submitted by OTS to the State Police. A motion was made by Ms. Hudnall, seconded by Mr. Bickham. There were no objections; the motion passed.

#### d. Strategic Plan Implementation Report

Judge Schlegel remarked that at the beginning of the year, the ICJIS board, approved a broker system to be operational to work through the Clerk of Courts & CMIS error reports. This was the initial reason for the broker system.

Mr. Chawla notes that the broker system is hosted by OTS and currently is working on a parish broker to work with the ICJIS broker. Parishes currently have many different case management information exchanges. Therefore, the Parish broker will work with the ICJIS broker to connect each other to the information needed. There is no one broker, but instead, multiple brokers working together to give the ability and flexibility to work with the vendors and individual participants.

Judge Schlegel mentions that Orleans Parish, the District Attorney’s, the Clerk of Courts, and the Sheriff’s are all rebuilding their new software services reporting systems. They are creating their own broker system inside their parish to connect their data points to the various agencies that need the information. Right now, if you have point-to-point solutions between the District Attorneys (DAs), Clerks of Court, and the Sheriffs, then you are encouraged to get to a Parish Broker System. It is recommended that at least inside your own JDC to do point-to-point, this way the information is not being entered over and over, which is where the errors occur. I3 and Karpel have agreed, in concept, to create a broker system within their Clerks, for their DAs, so that if their vendors, with multiple parishes and JDCs are on I3, then the ICJIS broker doesn’t have to go to all the individual Clerks. The ICJIS broker would go to I3 for that parish, using a broker-to-broker process. This is called the ICJIS Modernization Project.

Deputy Chief Noel comments that if municipalities or other entities within the Sheriff’s jurisdiction or parish have a different RNS or a different JNS, then that vendor managing that server cannot avoid the connection to another vendor.

Rep. Bacala states that he would like a survey to be done of each judicial district to find out how much they are or are not integrated into a parish broker. Judge Schlegel comments that

SEARCH is going to build out the specs that are then going to be handed out to the chiefs of the world, to add to their contracts, when negotiating, to say that the vendor must comply with the ICJIS board standards as established through the ICJIS broker.

Rep. Bacala made a motion to adopt the broker model. Deputy Chief Noel seconded the motion. There were no objections; the motion passed.

i. Clerk Error Reporting Status – Debbie Hudnall

Ms. Hudnall reports that all errors reported weren't errors that the clerks could fix, as many were duplicated errors. She also noted that there is a need to be able to send the information back to the Supreme Court so that they may resolve the errors, which are in their control to correct. It is also noted that the pilot is now a "light" pilot and Caddo and Jefferson parish have both been receiving error reporting electronically from the DA, as they are already connected.

Judge Schlegel notes that the importance of the piloting projects is so that as the specs are being built, SEARCH is made aware of the issues that are occurring in the error reporting.

ii. DA Reporting Status – Zach Daniels

Mr. Daniels reports that District Attorneys (DAs) have developed two different templates for information reporting, as it pertains to Art. 388. Some DAs, facing budget constraints, have opted to reformat their bills of information to avoid the additional cost of printing a second page, with Lafourche Parish having already created and shared a revised format. Additionally, a "Demographics" page template under Art. 388 is currently in circulation. For the pilot phase of disposition reporting, Orleans and Calcasieu Parishes are participating. Orleans is collaborating with SEARCH, while Calcasieu has experienced delays due to existing IT commitments. A template for disposition codes, compatible with Karpel, has been distributed to provide flexibility in how offices report dispositions. The focus is on achieving consistent disposition data rather than enforcing uniform codes, though some offices may adopt standard codes. Charge mapping has also been developed to standardize data transmission to clerks despite variations in felony theft charging practices. The pilot programs have not yet reached a stage where data-driven feedback is available.

iii. Demo of Updated Clerk Error Report Process through Broker System

Judge Schlegel discusses how currently, criminal history reports (rap sheets) do not reflect the final disposition of charges, often leaving gaps in the case resolution process. A new pilot program is being developed to address this issue by ensuring that disposed cases are clearly identified in the system. Under this pilot, once a case is disposed, that information will be transmitted to the broker system and subsequently integrated into the Computerized Criminal History (CCH) system. This enhancement will allow rap sheets to accurately reflect whether charges have been disposed or resulted in convictions. For charges resulting in convictions, court clerks will update the system accordingly. This improvement ensures that when law enforcement personnel, such as state troopers, access a rap sheet, they see a fully resolved case history—providing greater clarity, accuracy, and efficiency in criminal justice operations.

SEARCH has spearheaded the development of this process by leveraging the broker system and collaborating with I3 Vertical to build the solution internally. A key component of the project involves the creation of a user-friendly dashboard for the clerks of court, eliminating the need to manually review individual PDFs. This dashboard will present all necessary case information in centralized view, highlighting any issues that need correction and enabling the clerks to make real-time updates. By integrating this functionality into the demo, the system streamlines data management, removes the need for importing or merging records, and transforms the dashboard itself into the authoritative source of record.

iv. Demo of DA Dispo Reporting Process through Broker System

Mr. Chawla notes that SEARCH is meeting with Cologix, the CCH vendor, later in the day to finalize details. SEARCH has provided specifications for how prosecution refusals should be transmitted from the broker to Cologix. The team is currently working with Crimes and Karpel to establish necessary workflows and obtain actual prosecution decisions from various vendors. Full implementation is expected to take several months as these systems come online. In the meantime, we are partnering with Orleans Parish, which offers advanced technology capabilities, to supply SEARCH with test refusal data. This will allow us to validate the workflow and observe how the refusals appear on criminal history rap sheets. Testing with Orleans Parish is expected to begin within the next few weeks.

e. 2025 Legislation

i. HB23 – point-to-point solution vs broker system

Judge Schlegel notes that the long-term objective is to ensure that all agencies are integrated with HB23, enabling electronic transmission of all relevant data through the ICJIS broker. A key component of this workflow is the Uniform Commitment Order (UCO) process, which begins at the time of conviction. Currently, the UCO is generated by the clerk, reviewed and signed by the judge, and then forwarded to the Department of Corrections (DOC).

In addition to the UCO, a jail letter outlining time calculations and a demographic sheet must be completed and provided to DOC. At present, this process is largely manual and prone to delays, which can result in transportation issues or incomplete information being sent to DOC – potentially affecting decisions regarding inmate release, continued detention, or transfer to the appropriate facility.

Once HB23 integration is complete, all documentation and data will be transmitted electronically in real time, streamlining the process and significantly reducing the risk of errors or delays.

At this time, DOC has built a system called Cypress, a software service for the UCO to be completed and signed through. The clerk would push a button and the information would be pushed through the broker, the broker then goes to DOC Cypress system, where SEARCH and DOC will build a connection point.

f. Next Steps

i. Warrants & Attachments

Judge Schlegel states that working on the implementation of the warrants and attachments process would be some of the board's future objectives. This includes verifying whether existing warrants and attachments are available within the system. The system will be configured to automatically push any new warrants or attachments from court proceedings through to the broker. The broker system will then transmit this information to the relevant state agencies, ensuring that law enforcement officers are promptly informed of active attachments. This will enable troopers to be confident that the data is up-to-date when executing arrest warrants. This would involve working with warrant vendors.

ii. LPOR

Mr. Cortazzo notes that there is an opportunity to integrate with LPOR, as far as validations they're asking the clerks to do.

iii. OMV & LA Wallet

Judge Schlegel commented that he would like to see LA Wallet integrated more with law enforcement systems. As part of this effort, to refine the notification process by adding alerts to outstanding attachments only, excluding warrants. The goal is to leverage the ICJIS broker to transmit outstanding attachment data to LA Wallet, which will then notify the individual of the status through the app. This targeted approach aims to streamline communication and ensure that users are promptly and accurately informed of any actionable items tied to their record.

iv. AFIS Upgrade - LSP

Major Slaton notified the board that they signed a contract with AFIS and are working with OTS to get the infrastructure in place. The project is anticipated to be an 18–24-month process.

g. Call for other New Business

Rep. Bacala made a motion that clear, measurable goals be established, to be the focus between now and the next meeting. These goals should then be added to the next meetings' agenda for review, ensuring a thorough discussion of their completion and current status during the meeting. Judge Schlegel has outlined the following goals for the ICJIS board to prioritize and focus on completing before the next meeting:

- i. Connect the ICJIS Broker with the Karpel Broker.
- ii. Connect the ICJIS Broker with the I3 Broker.
- iii. Connect the ICJIS Broker to Cypress Software System.
- iv. Connect the ICJIS Broker to CCH/CMIS.
- v. Conduct a Sheriffs' survey of all the vendors the Sheriffs use.

This motion was seconded by Mr. Walters. There were no objections; the motion passed.

## **5. Next Meeting**

### **a. Summer 2025 date and location**

It was determined that the next Integrated Criminal Justice Information System Policy Board meeting will be held on July 17, 2025, at 10 a.m., at the Governor's Office.

## **Adjourn**

Judge Schlegel called for a motion to adjourn. A motion was made by Judge Jorden, seconded by Mr. Daniels. There were no objections; the motion passed. The meeting of the Integrated Criminal Justice Information System Policy Board adjourned on March 27, 2025, at 11:38 a.m.

*Submitted by: Autumn Blache*

For information: Russell Cortazzo, Louisiana Supreme Court, 504-310-2531, [rcortazzo@lasc.org](mailto:rcortazzo@lasc.org)