

SAVIN Governance Committee
Meeting Minutes

January 16, 2020
9:30 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.
Office of Prosecuting Attorney
1060 Richards St. 9th Fl. Honolulu, HI. 96813

In attendance: **Dennis Dunn, Dir, VWKS, Prosecuting Attorney Office, Chairman;** Ana Malafu, Dir, VWP- Maui Office of Prosecuting Attorney, Greg Esteban, Captain, Hawaii Police Department (HPD) – CID; Karlotta Carvalho, MADD, Edith Quintero, Sergeant, MPD – CID; Lance Marks, Sergeant, MPD; Victor Ramos, Asst Chief, MPD; Shaleigh Tice, Chief, Crime Prevention and Justice Assistance Division (CPJAD); Dayna Miyasaki, Victim Services (Judiciary); Cindy Shimomi-Saito, Exec Dir Sex Abuse Treatment Center, Juliet Sadama-Uemura, Victim Services (PSD); Garret Takahashi, SAVIN Coordinator (PSD); Suzy Ucol-Camacho, IT (PSD); Randi Barretto, CVCC; Kelly Musselman, HSCADV.

Absent: Pamela Ferguson-Brey, Exec Director, CVCC
Tommy Johnson, Paroles and Pardons Administrator – HPA
Angie Mercado, Exec Director, HSCADV
Deborah Chai, Office of Prosecuting Attorney, Big Island
Diana Gausepohl-White, Office of Prosecuting Attorney, Kauai
Paul Applegate, Kauai Police Department
Mike Lambert, Honolulu Police Department

1. Call to Order/Introductions 09:40am

The minutes, dated November 22, 2019, were reviewed. There were no amendments or changes indicated. The minutes were accepted and approved. Request to obtain minutes 2 weeks earlier for review, noted.

2. SAVIN Program Updates

a. Special Fund Collections:

- a. Correctional Industries (CI) Revenue: There was a recent deposit which is not reflected on the agenda. On January 9, 2020, \$3,934.36 was deposited for the month of November 2019.
- b. Telephone Tax Revenue: There was a recent deposit which is not reflected on the agenda. On January 10, 2020, \$22,926.10 was deposited for the month of November 2019.

Note: CI is in the process of reconciling their deposit for the month of December. Therefore, December deposits have not been received, yet. They are expected to be deposited near the end of January 2020.

b. Mandatory Notification Worksheet:

This was brought up at the last meeting and a request to update this notification worksheet based on the Hawaii Revised Statute. How did this worksheet originate? It listed events that would trigger a notification. In reviewing the original worksheet, it appears that the §353-132 statute were missing. What was the intended purpose or use of this worksheet? This was put together as a list of all of the statutory requirements, regarding notification to victims; the description of notice; who are required to provide notification; the type of notification; who must be notified; and for some, the specific amount of time prior to the commencement of the event. This was an effort to put all the notifications together. Some are being satisfied by the SAVIN program. The notification may be different in each instance. This reflects the availability of SAVIN and is probably still current unless anyone can think of additional items. One of the amendments that were made to the original document was adding elements of the §353-132 statute which wasn't there originally. If anyone has an old version, please use this as an updated version. Thank you very much. Is there anything that anyone can think of that is not included on list? Are there any additional amendments to the document? So, if there are no additional amendments to this, a recommendation to arrange for a wide distribution primarily to make sure that all restitution departments that are mandated under the statute receive a copy of this along with other agencies. Another recommendation would be to generate a formal letter to each agency and ask them to distribute to appropriate staff who may be responsible, if there are no objections. Note: It appears that PSD has a lot of responsibilities to notify. This needs to be looked more closely as if this is the case, it may need to be reflected in the departments Policy & Procedures (P&P). A request for PSD to examine P&P first, and edit, if needed.

c. Survey Monkey Update:

A recent report was generated recently which captures the questions, responses, and comments from respondents. Can this survey be explained a little more? Does the link to the survey pop up for all users? When someone registers on VINE, there is an option to complete a survey. There is an option to complete a survey for Email registrants only. The number of respondents continue to grow. In December 2019, there were 91 responses. As of January 2020, there are currently 137 responses. The survey asks questions such as, "which option best describes your interest in SAVIN?" 25% described self as victim; 37% as other family/friend; 21% as a family member of victim. Some comments were received which is more specific of the user. How were questions developed? Last year, this subject was addressed in a SAVIN Mtg and draft questions were developed. The draft survey was submitted to the members for feedback and additional comments. Initially,

this is what was developed. APPRISS assisted with the creation of the survey and subsequently provided a link through the system. Immediately, users began responding to the survey and responses were being received. The survey was released on VINE in late July or August of 2019. Where is the link to the survey? It should be on VINE when one registers, there is a link about participating in a brief survey based if interested. It basically covers questions on a registrant's interest, reasons for using VINE, being satisfied or having difficulties with the system. So, it really isn't measuring anything over time, in regards, to their level of satisfaction or can someone go back to the survey anytime? With the data being collected, is there going to be a final/annual analysis on what the findings are, changes to be made, or if there are any progress/success stories? What is it for, exactly? The intention behind creating a survey was to obtain more data or opinions from users about their experience with SAVIN, the level of satisfaction; and obtaining feedback around its' use and application. Some of the questions do allow for comments to be made. The satisfaction survey helps to identify questions users may have about the system, good/bad/or indifferent, and how to improve efficiencies or address potential gaps within Victim Notification. A survey is beneficial to get a better idea of how users perceive the system. This can further help to identify problematic or positive areas about the system. Is a goal to take this data and develop a final report/analysis? Initially, there has not been any plans about developing a final report or analysis. It was not viewed as a final instrument but more of an ongoing instrument for quality assurance with a goal of getting more people exposed to VINE. The hope is that this survey can continue to capture questions/comments people may have about the system. This would result in more problem-solving activities and defining how to improve. But, feel free to add any other ideas or comments about the instrument itself. Suggestions and feedback are welcomed. Comment: The survey is not a scientific research or a study, it is based on the registrant's perception. If the goal is to obtain more accurate data, maybe, that should be done on a face to face or individual basis, if possible. This survey reports on general raw data that provides for some direction on how to improve efficiencies. Is there a way to link more users to this survey and increase the coverage? This will be followed up on and addressed. In looking at the survey, most people did not identify themselves as Victims but more as Family/Friends. Is there a description of who or what would qualify one to fall in these respective categories? No, unfortunately there is no description of how one would fall into the various categories at this time. Therefore, it is subjective to how one perceives themselves. Is there anything that is surprising from this survey? On a positive note, Cyndi Keller's name was mentioned as being awesome! Other comments were either satisfactory or valuable ("a great system to have"). On another note, there was a phone number left in a comment box which was followed up on. Unfortunately, that number was never available or able to receive messages. The hope is that more people will take advantage of completing the survey. How often is the report viewed? Monthly. Is it

possible to have this as an ongoing agenda item and receive monthly reports? Yes, this can be a great start in generating ongoing monthly reports and highlight comments from where the previous report ended to current. Recommendation: Can a subcommittee look at the survey? There is a lot to this survey and maybe the subcommittee can determine which kind of questions are most helpful and how much information to obtain. The committee can also examine the recommendations and define ways to have it widely distributed. This information can be very valuable. Any interest from anyone to be on the survey subcommittee? How about we just examine monthly reports first because it is general data...If there are issues identified, then we can simply address it. The hope is to make things easier not harder. So, if I heard it correctly, we should review more reports first before we move forward. In the monthly report, will there be additional information provided about any corrective action taken, if any? Hopefully, the goal will be to see an upward trend. There may be some outstanding issues still that PSD needs to look at as well. Comment: As a representative for Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD), there was a candlelight vigil where a handful of victims participated, and it appeared that they did not know about the VINE program. Therefore, as an agency, more can be done about getting the word out while adding to the importance of the survey. At least for MADD, we could do more. For Sex Abuse Treatment Center (SATC), we can relate and do more by having counselors help victims register which can be helpful. The issue may be two-fold where not enough people know about it and/or may not understand the process of how it works. But, also know that if an offender is out of custody and later convicted then returns to custody, the registrant needs to register again if it has been over a year. So, people who are providing direct services need to understand the concept and constantly remind victims as the **assumption** may be, "If you register once, you are registered forever." A question that is not on the survey is, "How did you find out about this service?" This is just a suggestion here so we can begin to identify stakeholders, who are giving information out while being able to see the percentages of agencies who are making these referrals.

On behalf of the Maui's Prosecutor's Office, there appears to be a gap between when a crime occurs and when the notification is received. Typically, the notification is not received until Maui Police Department (MPD) is complete with their investigation. Once obtained, this is when the notification becomes available to the victim and their family. Sometimes, a report is not received for a month or two and the services that the victim should be receiving in between is that gap. Therefore, a goal is to reduce this gap so an agency can reach out to the family closer to when the event occurs. Luckily for Maui Prosecutors, there is a close connection with MPD, and officers usually invite us to their trainings. At that time, there are increased opportunities to share information with officers. This relationship allows for increased contact from Officers with Pros Office so critical victim information is obtained prior to the case coming to our office. So, the Maui Pros Office is

fortunate enough to reach out to some families in that way but that is not with every family. There is a listing when a crime occurs. How can this agency obtain or reach out to notify families, providing accurate information, and provide Crime Victim Compensation Commission with information at a time they need? MPD states, "that issue can be easily fixed." For MPD, because they are responding, it is just a matter of broadening that information. That is what MPD is starting to do at recall training, etc. MPD can do that and it can be easily fixed.

Comment: An important point to consider is when data is being collected, there is a plan in place to do something about the data. So, the purpose is not just to add questions to add questions to the survey. But, be mindful of being able to answer and do something about those questions.

d. Voice User Interface (VUI) Script Changes:

The verbal script changes were finalized. Previously, it was mentioned that only the written copy of recent script changes was completed. Recently, information was provided by APPRISS that the verbal changes were completed.

e. Transition Plan for New Appointments

It may be a good time to talk about what this plan would look like moving forward. In June, we are having a lot of terms that are expiring. How does the department contemplate proceeding on making appointments? Appointments are made by Director. How do we anticipate doing that? Does the nomination come from the current group? Or, does it come from the respective agency? What is the Director's intention? Is it an individual or is it the position? The statute specifies that there must be representatives from those respective agencies. Moving forward it is important to start answering those questions now, so, it may be a good time to start that process as it did take a while to get things straightened out with the initial appointments. Hopefully, by the next meeting in April, there will be more clarity on how to move forward. Therefore, a plan to meet with the Attorney General's office, talk with the Director about his intentions, etc., should be a priority before the next meeting.

3. County Police Booking Process:

Addressing the gaps in service. The Hawaii Police Department (HPD) just started this new operating system with Spillman. This system with Spillman has been challenging. The process includes inputting data that feeds the Green Box (GB). Data is transferred at arrest/booking point. What is Green Box (GB)? GB is a control device that receives data and enables users to access this data which can then be transmitted to an agency. All counties are on Green Box. How does one link data to the GB? Other County police departments may be facing the same problem because everyone has different systems. Once booked, data is transferred to CJIS. Then, data is transferred out to different agencies using their

system. The Big Island Prosecutor Office is having issues because there is restricted access to SPILLMAN. This presents a barrier. Per MPD, the court system can input data as well because MPD can pull up TRO and Protective Orders from the GB but a lot of times it takes too long time for data to be received there. Once a person is charged, data is entered then received into GB. Documents are transferred to Prosecutor's Office, and the Prosecutor's Office has their process to notify victims. One issue is assumed when a suspect is in custody, 48 hours lapsed, and he/she is not charged. At times, the assigned detective will do a manual notification especially if the charge deems necessary. But there needs to be a standard communication process where once information is transferred to GB and the suspect is Released Pending Investigation (RPI), that a notification will be sent to Victim. However, the receipt of the RPI notification is not consistent where the victim is being notified. Sometimes, the RPI at Police Department (PD) just becomes a straight release and the case does not even go to court. However, when an offender is at Court, the Judge may release the offender as well. How can there be a link to GB? This could alleviate the issue. Even if it is through GB, victim information and notification should be a common practice when patrol is dealing with victims. Instead of waiting in hope that the data will be transferred to GB, if released from PD, victim information/notification should still be made. However, there still may be that gap. That is a good point because there have been several occasions where GB has crashed. In GB, there needs to be a way to trigger a notification when released, RPI, etc., consistently. Comment: Actually, the best way to go is directly thru SAVIN because GB does not appear to be a "real time" event. For PSD, VINE is always picking up our data every 7-14 min. The problems with county police are that every few years, they are changing systems, and some are still running on WINDOWS7. Other jurisdictions do have set ups with individual counties. So, it seems that Hawaii can do it. But, once the problem with making the connections is solved, the next problem will revolve around ones' ability to provide the notification and letting victims know how this will work because there is a much shorter window than what we have now. If person in custody is scheduled for Preliminary Hearing, that will be 48 hours. If the victim does not register, the offender may bail out before the victim is signed up. There are logistical issues in terms of the sign-up process as well as difficulties in linking individuals. What about Victims who are incapacitated, will a family member or representative be able to register for that victim to receive future notifications? By statute, there is a process there that indicates such cases. It is just a matter of who is making that connection and doing it in a timely basis. It does involve another layer of educating and notifying victims. In most cases, agencies are currently doing most of the assistance in signing victims up. So, where are we at with creating that linkage between VINE & County Police booking? CJIS is through a state agency, there may be something there. However, if data goes thru CJIS and there is a problem or question, the caller will have to go back to that sending agency vs. going back thru SAVIN. Suggestion: PD should think about going directly to SAVIN.

In the interest of time, we must move on to the next subject. But, continue to think about this scenario, think about reducing those gaps in services, and define best case scenarios for all counties involved.

4. **SAVIN Operating System Update:**

The Request for Proposal (RFP) is currently in the hands of the Procurement office for review and the department will be working on developing an evaluation. However, the questions were posed, “why and why now?” There are concerns about meeting this deadline of April 30. The department is going to ask for the extension of 6 months. However, in addressing the question about, “why now, is there any evidence to support these allegations of data sharing in Hawaii?” The answer remains in question and unanswered. It appears that there is a consensus and a strong interest to move forward to another operating system due to not being satisfied with current vendor. The concern is being able to move forward with this project as the department is pressed on moving forward with their own Offender Management system. This is a huge undertaking for the department. Is it more of a timing issue or a change? Possibly a little of both. In seeking a request for extension, what is the timeline? Procurement office will ask for an extension of 6 months and the concern is that if the department does not see evidence of data sharing, they may allow this 1-year extension to run its course. Is it more to the Procurement office or Administration? Basically, there is resistance with procurement because of resources and movement on their offender management system. Therefore, more justification is needed to influence movement forward. Some members want to see some additional enhancements included with the RFP to allow other vendors to propose. What kind of additional features are people seeking? Please forward me any suggestions. Is it true that at least one of the vendors is interested in bidding for both SAVIN and Offender management? No, not to my knowledge, just for SAVIN. A lot of vendors that visited the department through their Request for Information (RFI) process have verbalized an established interface with VINE already. A few vendors did indicate that a Victim Notification module could be built. But, then again, this would be a module that is not established or tested for reliability/efficiency.

5. **Announcements:**

Please review the APPRISS, HI DPS Ticket report. These stem from those issues or resync errors that arise when there is a discrepancy between data being transmitted and an offender’s current status. If the issue needs to be researched further, a ‘ticket’ will be generated. This report reflects those outstanding items that were resolved and those that need to be resolved. Adult Client Services Branch requested a training for their Interstate Commission for Adult Offender Supervision (ICOA) officers.

Next meeting tentatively scheduled for Thurs, April 16, 2020 (9:30-11:00)

6. **Open Forum:** Not applicable

7. Meeting adjourned

11:11 am

DRAFT