



Louisiana Integrated Criminal Justice Information System (ICJIS)

Integrated Criminal Justice Information System Policy Board Meeting

July 17, 2025 at 10:00am

Governor's Office Press Room

State Capitol Building, Baton Rouge, LA

APPROVED
9/16/2025

Agenda

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting of the Louisiana Integrated Criminal Justice Information Policy Board was called to order at 10:00 a.m. on Thursday, July 17, 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:

Mr. Andrew Bergeron; Mr. Thomas Carol Bickham, III; Mr. Jim Craft; Mr. Zachary Daniels; Mr. Alan Davis; Ms. Debbie Hudnall; Judge William Jorden; Deputy Chief Neal Noel; Mr. Deron Patin; Judge Scott U. Schlegel; Major JB Slaton; and Mr. Christopher Walters.

Guests in attendance:

Mr. Ernest Green, Attorney General's Office; Ms. Michelle Browne, Cott Systems; Mr. Jason Dons and Ms. Taylor Diamond, I3 Verticals; Ms. Sherie Thomas, Justice Accountability Center; Mr. Amit Chabukswar and Ms. Kathy Williams, Louisiana Department of Public Safety; Mr. Paul Allen, Louisiana State Senate; Mr. Danny Jackson, Louisiana Sheriff's Association; Ms. Jamie Baker, Mr. Chris Eskew, Ms. Shelley Scott, Lt. Markus Smith, and Ms. Kathy Williams, Louisiana State Police; Ms. Jennifer Eagan, Ms. Storm Ehlers, and Mr. James Murray, Louisiana Supreme Court; Mr. John Humphries, Metropolitan Crime Commission; Ms. Heather Pettit and Mr. Brad Smith, Mission Critical Partners; Ms. Evelina Broussard, Ms. Cassie Porche, and Mr. Tim Pyle, Office of Technology Services; Ms. Cree Matlock, Power Coalition for Equity and Justice; Ms. Cheyenne Blackburn and Mr. Michael Caheen, Promise of Justice Initiative; Mr. Dwight Hudson, Right on Crime; Mr. Yogesh Chawla and Mr. Michael Jacobson, SEARCH Group, Inc.; and Ms. Remi Abiodun, Vera Louisiana.

Staff in attendance:

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

2. Introductions

Judge Schlegel noted that Chief Justice John Weimer was in attendance.

For information: Russell Cortazzo, Louisiana Supreme Court, 504-310-2531, rcortazzo@lasc.org

3. Old Business

- a. Motion to approve meeting minutes from March 27, 2025

Judge Schlegel called for a motion to approve the March 27, 2025, Integrated Criminal Justice Information System Policy Board meeting minutes, as presented. A motion was made by Judge Jorden, seconded by Ms. Hudnall. There were no objections; the motion passed.

4. New Business

- a. Financial Report

Please see financial report attached.

Mr. Cortazzo reported that the financial status remains unchanged since the last meeting, with a current balance of \$8 million. He noted that LCLE has established a process to bill State Police on a monthly basis for broker support.

- i. Increase Chair and Vice Chair Spending Approval Limit

The Board discussed and expressed interest in increasing the spending approval limit for the Chair and Vice Chair. However, before proceeding, their initial step will be to hire a technologist to conduct a cost analysis and deliver recommendations.

- b. Pilot Interface Status
 - i. Broker Production Server Status

Judge Schlegel recalled that during the March meeting, it was agreed that vendor brokers would be connected to the ICJIS broker by the July 17th meeting. While some vendors have successfully established this connection, others are still in discussion with their respective agencies, primarily regarding costs – particularly the proposed upfront and annual fees. These cost concerns are among the factors delaying full connectivity. Several pilot programs are currently in progress, and a number of district attorneys and clerks of court are already connected to the broker.

- ii. Clerk Exception and DA Reporting; UCO Submission Status

Mr. Chawla reported that there are four pilot data exchanges that were initially agreed upon.

The first pilot exchange is the Disposition Exception Reporting. This exchange involves data from CMIS and CCH, with 13 parishes currently reporting. Mr. Chawla reported that both systems are successfully providing data related to case dispositions. Once a clerk receives the necessary data, establishing a connection to the state data broker typically takes approximately two weeks. SEARCH is being used to facilitate communication to and from the broker, ensuring the secure exchange of information.

The second pilot exchange is the District Attorney Refusal Reporting. Mr. Chawla reported that SEARCH has received 130 successful prosecution refusal dispositions, with updates now being received hourly. While the refusal data is being transmitted, there is also a focus on aligning this with charge filing and case filing workflows. The idea is that when a refusal is submitted, the associated charges or case could simultaneously be filed with the clerk of court, streamlining the process. A key question for the ICJIS Board moving forward will be whether charge and case filing should become a priority exchange. This pilot aims to establish a standardized process that will inform the implementation of a scalable and consistent model statewide.

Judge Schlegel inquired about the data flow after information is transmitted to the broker system.

Mr. Chawla responded that the data is routed to CCH. He noted that SEARCH has been actively working with the CCH team to ensure data is received and processed correctly. In addition, the SEARCH team has been collaborating with Cologik to improve system response times and data handling.

The third pilot exchange is the UCO Exchange. Mr. Chawla reported that since July 1st, Jefferson Parish has received over 45 UCOs through the exchange. These UCOs are being entered in both paper and digital formats, and each message transmitted contains all necessary information required by DOC. SEARCH is focused on minimizing barriers to entry for participating agencies by keeping the process as simple and efficient as possible.

The fourth pilot exchange is the Charge Referral Exchange. Mr. Chawla provided an overview of the fourth pilot exchange, focused on the referral of charges and cases from law enforcement agencies to district attorneys. While this exchange is currently awaiting a vender, the goal is to facilitate seamless electronic submission of incident reports and associated charges. This exchange involves significant data preparation and system integration, particularly the creation and structuring of incident reports that align with district attorney software requirements. Mr. Chawla emphasized that the initial broker-to-broker connection can require multiple iterations to stabilize and function correctly. As the Board evaluates pilot exchange priorities, it was suggested to assess where data entry errors originate and to consider the full lifecycle of the information, from the point of entry by law enforcement to final use by prosecutors. Understanding these workflow dynamics will be critical in deciding whether the charge referral exchange should become a priority initiative.

c. 2025 Legislation

- i. HB 23 – Policy Board Authority
- ii. HB 445 – Juvenile Records (JETS)
- iii. HB 479 – Vic/Wit Notification (*incl. Juvenile RS 15:909*)

Judge Schlegel noted that the 2025 Legislative Session resulted in the passage of significant legislation designed to help support ICJIS moving forward with electronic submissions, confidentiality of records, and reporting. Legislation is currently underway to establish a comprehensive victim and witness notification system, with a deadline to be created by July 1, 2026.

Mr. Walters emphasized that HB 479 represents an important milestone in advancing victims' rights within the criminal justice system. He described the bill as a foundational step – a marker – that underscores the evolving role of victims and the need for greater coordination among criminal justice agencies to ensure that victims are informed, protected, and meaningfully included throughout the process. The deadline of July 1, 2026 is contingent upon the system's ability to utilize the infrastructure and data connections currently being developed by the ICJIS Board. If it is determined that an extension is necessary, the decision will be addressed during the next regular legislative session. It was discussed that the victim/witness notification system is intended to complement the efforts of criminal justice partners. The goal is to provide registered victims with clear points of contact and access to timely information regarding their cases. The system will aim to ensure that victims know who to reach within the district attorney's office and the law enforcement agencies involved. Looking ahead, the vision includes integration with the court system, allowing judges and court personnel to verify that victims have been properly notified of upcoming hearings. This would allow courts to move cases forward with confidence that victim participation and notification requirements have been met. Additionally, there is recognition of the need for statutory cleanup and clarification to formally delegate roles and responsibilities among the justice system stakeholders involved in the notification process.

d. Next Steps

i. RFP vs State Contract

Judge Schlegel made note that the SEARCH team contract ends in September but can be extended. Judge Schlegel noted that if contracts are being initiated by vendors through the local agencies, and not directly through ICJIS, then it appears these are simply submissions from the District Attorneys, passed through their agency, to the ICJIS Board for approval when new server connections are proposed. In this case, it's up to the agencies to negotiate directly with their vendors to ensure compliance with Procurement standards.

ii. OTS Contract - Project Technical Lead

Judge Schlegel noted that he had an in-depth discussion with OTS. The next step is to hire a technologist, someone who specializes in this work daily, to collaborate with the SEARCH team and help maintain project momentum. Following that, the plan is to engage a national expert with a comprehensive understanding of similar efforts across the country, who can drive the project forward on a day-to-day basis. In partnership with OTS, this individual would also help determine the appropriate build team.

Judge Jorden stated that bringing on a technologist is a prudent step when planning for the future, as the board is not equipped to address certain technical questions. A technologist can provide guidance on the ethical implications and help clarify the full scope of anticipated costs.

Mr. Walters noted that no one at the board level has the specific expertise or awareness of developments occurring in other states. He emphasized the need for someone who operates within that space, an expert who works on behalf of the board to provide informed guidance and assist in negotiations with external vendors to ensure the best possible outcomes.

Mr. Walters inquired about whether Cott charged us for the Cott hosting broker setup.

Mr. Chawla noted that the initial setup was completed under the existing SEARCH services contract. He added that the next steps in the project will involve additional costs moving forward.

e. Call for other New Business

Judge Schlegel acknowledged that this was Mr. Bickham's final board meeting, as he is retiring. He thanked Mr. Bickham for his years of dedicated service and contributions to the board.

Judge Jorden asked Mr. Daniels to speak with the members of his association regarding post-arrest procedures. He noted that when an individual is arrested and subsequently bonds out, district attorney offices may or may not take action on accepting charges within a certain prescribed timeframe. Judge Jorden referenced a code article that outlines how much time is allowed from that date to formally bill the charges. He emphasized the need to examine the nuances between refusals and instances where no action has yet been taken.

Judge Schlegel emphasized the need for the board to establish a clear decision-making process. He raised the question of whether every major decision should require full board approval or if authority could be delegated to the Chair and Vice Chair to make decisions between meetings. He noted that relying solely on quarterly meetings can slow progress and suggested that allowing decisions via email or by leadership could help maintain project momentum.

Ms. Hudnall inquired whether the board has the authority to delegate decision-making to the Chair and Vice Chair in order to move the project forward between meetings.

Judge Jorden cautioned that placing approval authority solely on the Chair and Vice Chair could be risky, especially if it results in automatic approvals without broader board input. He suggested exploring alternatives that would not violate open meeting laws, such as holding virtual meetings with a link to the discussion, to ensure transparency and collective decision-making.

Chief Justice Weimer clarified that, under Public Records Law, virtual meetings are only permitted in the event of an emergency.

Judge Schlegel suggested holding a meeting in September, prior to the expiration of SEARCH's contract. This would allow the board to come together to make a collective decision on the next steps.

Mr. Daniels moved that the Chair and the Vice Chair, in coordination with the Office of Technology Services (OTS), consult with Procurement to determine whether the work performed by the vendors with the agencies should be classified as a Request for Proposal (RFP) or as a State Contract. Additionally, within existing budgetary constraints and prior to the next board meeting, the Chair and the Vice Chair shall secure a qualified technologist who understands the scope of the projects and is committed to serving the people of Louisiana. This technologist shall begin making initial determinations regarding the viability of continuing with SEARCH and identifying appropriate next steps. Any expenditures exceeding \$100,000 shall be subject to further approval by the Board. The motion was seconded by Judge Jorden. There were no objections; the motion passed.

Judge Schlegel and Mr. Walters will coordinate with OTS to compile a list of potential candidates who may or may not be able to fulfill the project for \$100,000. They will also collaborate with SEARCH to develop a proposal to be presented at the next meeting.

5. Next Meeting

a. Fall 2025 date and location

It was determined that the next Integrated Criminal Justice Information System Policy Board meeting will be held on September 16, 2025, at 10:00 a.m., at the Governor's Office.

Adjourn

Judge Schlegel called for a motion to adjourn. A motion was made by Mr. Daniels, seconded by Mr. Walters. There were no objections; the motion passed. The meeting of the Integrated Criminal Justice Information System Policy Board adjourned on July 17, 2025, at 11:00 a.m.

Submitted by: Tiffany Robichaux