

Utah Council on Criminal Justice Administration  
Project on Criminal Justice  
Standards and Goals

## INFORMATION SYSTEMS

### Police Information Systems

DUP  
N

35258

Approved by  
Utah Information Systems Task Force, and  
Utah Council on Criminal Justice Administration  
Room 304 State Office Building  
Salt Lake City, UT 84114



CALVIN L. RAMPTON  
GOVERNOR

STATE OF UTAH  
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR  
SALT LAKE CITY

NCJRS

October 22, 1975

AC

Dear Citizens:

This pamphlet is one of a series of reports of the Utah Council on Criminal Justice Administration. The Council's five Task Forces: Police, Corrections, Judicial Systems, Community Crime Prevention, and Information Systems, were appointed on October 16, 1973 to formulate standards and goals for crime reduction and prevention at the state and local levels. Membership in the Task Forces was drawn from state and local government, industry, citizen groups, and the criminal justice profession.

The recommendations and standards contained in these reports are based largely on the work of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals established on October 20, 1971 by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. The Task Forces have sought to expand their work and build upon it to develop a unique methodology to reduce crime in Utah.

With the completion of the Council's work and the submission of its reports, it is hoped that the standards and recommendations will influence the shape of our state's criminal justice system for many years to come. Although these standards are not mandatory upon anyone, they are recommendations for reshaping the criminal justice system.

I would like to extend sincere gratitude to the Task Force members, staff, and advisors who contributed something unknown before--a comprehensive, inter-related, long-range set of operating standards and recommendations for all aspects of criminal justice in Utah.

Sincerely,

Governor

# **POLICE INFORMATION SYSTEMS**

This report was published by the Utah Council on Criminal Justice Administration with the aid of Law Enforcement Assistance Funds.

## INFORMATION SYSTEMS TASK FORCE

Marion Hazleton, Chairman

Regnal Garff, Judge  
Second District Juvenile Court

Robert Mullins, Reporter  
Deseret News

Ivard Rogers, Director  
Utah Bureau of Criminal  
Identification

David Young, Director  
Statewide Association of Prosecutors

Art Christean  
Deputy Utah Court Administrator

Mrs. James B. Lee  
Citizen Representative

Mike Riordan, Director  
Planning and Research  
Salt Lake County Sheriff's Office

Donald Spradling, Director  
Office of Emergency Services

### Task Force Staff

Mike Stewart

Arthur Hadachko

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction .....	1
Standard 5.1 Police Information Systems .....	2
Standard 5.2 Crime Analysis Capability .....	3
Standard 5.3 Manpower Resource Allocation and Control .....	4
Standard 5.4 Police Information System Response Time .....	5
Standard 5.5 UCR Participation .....	7
Standard 5.6 Expanded Crime Data .....	8
Standard 5.7 Quality Control of Crime Data .....	10
Standard 5.8 Geocoding .....	11

## POLICE INFORMATION SYSTEMS

Law enforcement agencies require information concerning the pattern of criminal activity within their jurisdictional boundaries. This information must detail the geographical and temporal distribution of criminal activity by specific type. The information should be statistically significant and be provided to law enforcement decision makers to aid decisions concerning the allocation of law enforcement resources. This real time information must be supplied in the form most suitable to the needs of the users. Systems should be designed to support resource allocations and crime analysis, as well as other administrative needs of a police department.

The following standards define and discuss the information system requirements for police agencies, departments or other organizations which provide full-time law enforcement service to a community.

The standards address the proper functions of a police information system including crime analysis capability and utility, manpower resource allocation, minimum/maximum response time, minimum requirements of data elements, auditing, and geocoding.

## STANDARD 5.1: POLICE INFORMATION SYSTEMS

### STANDARD

Every police agency should have a well-defined information system. Proper functions of such a system include:

1. Dispatch information, including the generation of data describing the dispatch operation and data useful in the dispatching process;
2. Event information, including the generation and analysis of data on incidents and crimes;
3. Case information, including data needed during followup until police disposition of the case is completed;
4. Reporting and access to other systems which provide required data for operational or statistical purposes; and
5. Patrol or investigative support data not provided by external systems, such as misdemeanor want/warrant data, traffic and citation reporting, and local property data.

### UTAH STATUS AND COMMENTS

In 1970 development was begun, under the Utah Criminal Justice Information System (UCJIS) effort, to provide a uniform record system for small, medium, and large sized agencies throughout the State of Utah. This concept capitalized on the use of cassette tape recording devices supported by investigative cue cards. The cue cards were specialized into event categories such as burglary, robbery, homicide, auto theft, etc. and were created to support the officer in capturing data in the field.

This method of data capture was designed to provide complete event information for investigative purposes as well as pertinent statistical information

for use on the local, state, and national level. The cassette tape and cue cards concept was developed for use in both small and medium sized agencies as well as large computer-supported law enforcement agencies. The small and medium sized agency version is known as Small Agency Records System (SARS).

Implementation of the SARS system has been completed in 51 agencies with an additional 40 agencies currently in the implementation stage. It is anticipated that implementation will be completed by the end of 1975. The large agency version (RECORD-O-PORT) is being implemented in all three of the state's major law enforcement agencies. Both the RECORD-O-PORT and SARS system provide for generating dispatch information necessary to monitoring the dispatching process as well as event information necessary to support both management and operational requirements.

### METHOD OF IMPLEMENTATION

This standard has been identified for implementation through administrative policy.

## STANDARD 5.2: CRIME ANALYSIS CAPABILITY

### STANDARD

Every police department should improve its crime analysis capability by utilizing information provided by its information system within the department. Crime analysis may include the utilization of the following:

1. Methods of operation of individual criminals;
2. Pattern recognition;
3. Field interrogation and arrest data;
4. Crime report data;
5. Incident report information;

6. Dispatch information; and
7. Traffic reports, both accidents and citations.

These elements must be carefully screened for information that should be routinely recorded for crime analysis.

#### UTAH STATUS AND COMMENTS

In 1969 the development of a model management information system for use in larger law enforcement agencies in the State of Utah was developed under the Utah Criminal Justice Information System. This system is entitled "Departmental Management Information System" (DMIS) and provides for crime analysis based on crime pattern recognition, field interrogation information, crime and incident report information, and dispatch data. The use of detailed crime analysis information is more efficient in larger agencies due to the quantity of data as well as the difficulty for one individual in the agency to perceive and accurately track crime activity without statistics. All agencies require basic tracking data regarding department activity. However, the small agency administrator can monitor crime pattern activity from memory, since he is personally aware of each and every crime that occurs within the department.

#### METHOD OF IMPLEMENTATION

This standard has been identified for implementation through administrative policy.

#### STANDARD 5.3: MANPOWER RESOURCE ALLOCATION AND CONTROL STANDARD

Every large and medium sized law enforcement agency in the State of Utah should develop a manpower resource allocation and control system that will support major efforts to:

1. Identify through empirical means the need for manpower within the department;

2. Provide planning for maximum utilization of available resources;
3. Provide information for the allocation and instruction of patrol officers and specialist officers; and
4. Provide for the evaluation of the adopted plan.

#### UTAH STATUS AND COMMENTS

Resource allocation and control for police agencies in the State of Utah has been provided through the Departmental Management Information System (DMIS) developed for larger law enforcement organizations. Allocation information for small and medium sized agencies will be provided through the SARS data base for installation in agencies requiring a formal resource allocation and control system. The Small Agency Records System provides for the generation of management level reports from the state computer system. Agencies requiring resource allocation capabilities do not have a computer available at the local level will be provided this capability on the state system.

#### METHOD OF IMPLEMENTATION

This standard has been identified for implementation through administrative policy.

#### STANDARD 5.4: POLICE INFORMATION SYSTEM RESPONSE TIME STANDARD

information should be provided to users in sufficient time to affect the outcome of their decisions. The maximum allowable delay for information delivery, measured from initiation of the request to the delivery of a response, varies according to user type.

1. For users engaged in unpredictable field activity of high potential danger (e.g., vehicle stop) the maximum delay should be 120 seconds.

2. For users engaged in field activity without direct exposure to high potential danger (e.g., checking parked vehicles) the maximum delay should be 5 minutes.

3. For users engaged in investigatory activity without personal contact (e.g., developing suspect lists), the maximum delay should be 24 hours.

4. For users engaged in postapprehension identification and criminal history determinations, the maximum delay should be 4 hours.

#### UTAH STATUS AND COMMENTS

Files that are currently available to law enforcement agencies through the criminal justice information system involve a response time delay of no more than 30 seconds on the average. The exception to this general rule is when access times exceed the 30 second maximum as a result of equipment or system failure. During periods in which the system is inoperable for any number of technical reasons, information is not available to officers in the field. Limited information can be provided on a manual basis by using telephone communications if the system is inoperable for an extended period of time. To reduce the probability of system down time, it is planned to provide for a backup telecommunications front end to allow for an alternative means to switch computer messages in the event of failure of the primary system.

For users engaged in field activity without direct exposure to high potential danger, access is also below the 30-second mark for files that are contained on the UCJIS system. However, files that are maintained on a manual basis can create access delays of in excess of five minutes. Data inquiries for law enforcement users engaged in investigatory activity without personal contact ranges from 0 to 24 hours, depending on whether information is required from out-of-state. Generally, information used for investigative purposes, such as criminal history data, can be assembled in less than one hour within the state.

The identification function as related to criminal history determination is made in less than one hour on the local level; however, the identification on the state level at the Utah Bureau of Identification does not occur until more than 24 hours later when the fingerprint card is received, and a positive identification

can be made. Even though positive identification of an arrestee is not made on the state level until at least 24 hours after booking takes place, the arrestee is not affected in terms of being detained at the local level. For example, if the arrestee has been arrested previously, but not by the agency currently processing him, that agency will generate a new arrest record and complete rolled fingerprint cards which will be forwarded to UBI. UBI in turn will use the full roll fingerprint set to make positive identification and update the existing record.

#### METHOD OF IMPLEMENTATION

This standard has been identified for implementation through administrative policy.

#### STANDARD 5.5: UCR PARTICIPATION

##### STANDARD

**Every police agency should, as a minimum, participate fully in the Uniform Crime Reporting program.**

#### UTAH STATUS AND COMMENTS

When the Small Agency Records System (SARS) was developed under the Utah Criminal Justice Information System, participation in the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program was designed into the system. SARS provides that all small and medium sized agencies submit one copy of each investigative report to the Utah Bureau of Identification for the purposes of coding Uniform Crime Reporting information as well as other UCJIS required data.

Of the 51 agencies that have been implemented in the SARS program, reports have been received and reviewed for content as related to generating UCJIS and UCR information. Reports generated to date from the field were adequate to meet the statistical requirements on the state and national level and the development of coding and computer programming capabilities to generate UCR information will be completed during 1974. The UCR participation

currently is on an agency-to-FBI submission basis where data is mailed directly to the UCR representatives by the local agency.

Currently, the Utah Bureau of Identification does not receive any statistical summary information from local agencies. Full participation in the UCR program currently involves 35% of the agencies in the state. Crime data for non-reporting areas is projected statistically by the FBI based on historical information of agencies who do report. As a result, a large geographical portion of the State of Utah is not covered by agencies reporting directly to the FBI. However, the larger agencies in the state provide the majority of the reporting, and as a result, approximately 90% of the population is covered by agencies reporting UCR information to the FBI.

#### METHOD OF IMPLEMENTATION

This standard has been identified for implementation through legislative action.

### STANDARD 5.6: EXPANDED CRIME DATA

#### STANDARD

For use at the local level, or for State and regional planning and evaluation, data collected concerning an incident regarded as a crime should include as a minimum:

1. Incident definition, including criminal statute violated and data elements necessary to generate Uniform Crime Report offense classifications;
2. Time, including time of day, day of week, month, and year;
3. Location, including coded geographical location and type of location;
4. Incident characteristics, including type of weapon used, method of entry (if applicable) and degree of intimidation or force used;

5. Incident consequences, including type and value of property stolen, destroyed, or recovered, and personal injury suffered;

6. Offender characteristics (each offender), including relationship to victim, age, race, sex, residency, prior criminal record, criminal justice status (on parole, etc.), employment and educational status, apparent intent, and alcohol/narcotics usage history;

7. Type of arrest (on view, etc.); and

8. Witnesses and evidence.

#### UTAH STATUS AND COMMENTS

The field data capture systems created under the Utah Criminal Justice Information System for small, medium, and large sized agencies provides for the incident definition, time and date of occurrence, and other time-related requirements, as well as geographical location coding. In addition, the characteristics of the incident, consequences of the incident, offender characteristic information, arrest details, as well as a description of persons and property involved in the incident, are captured.

Crime classifications in the State of Utah are based primarily on state statutes and local ordinances. However, some agencies use Uniform Crime Report classifications to describe offenses. Data gathered by law enforcement agencies is primarily on two levels. One level terminates at the dispatch office where the officer returns a radio disposition, which requires no further written documentation. The second level of documentation involves the generation of investigative reports in supportive documents related to an incident in the field. Examples of crimes covered by case investigation documentation are murder, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, auto theft, and larceny.

#### METHOD OF IMPLEMENTATION

This standard has been identified for implementation through administrative policy.

## STANDARD 5.7: QUALITY CONTROL OF CRIME DATA

### STANDARD

Every police agency should make provisions for an independent audit of incident and arrest reporting. The audit should verify that:

1. Crime reports are being generated when appropriate;
2. Incidents are being properly classified; and
3. Reports are being properly prepared and submitted.

To establish an "audit trail" and to provide the basic documentation needed by management, the following key characteristics or records should be adopted:

1. The police response made to every call for police service should be recorded, regardless of whether a unit is dispatched. Dispatch records should be numbered and that number also be shown on the dispatch record.
2. All dispatches should be recorded, indicating time of dispatch and arrival on scene.
3. Dispatch records should show the field unit disposition of the event, and should be numbered in such a way as to link dispatches to arrest reports or other event disposition reports.
4. All self-initiated calls should be recorded in the same manner as citizen calls for service.

### UTAH STATUS AND COMMENTS

Currently, law enforcement agencies throughout the state provide for auditing of incident and arrest reporting. Procedures vary from non-existent in small agencies to extremely formal audit methods in larger agencies.

The provisions for establishing an audit trail are provided in the design of the Small Agency Records System. Dispatching procedures which support the

SARS system provide that case numbers are assigned at the point of dispatch, as well as a logging entry made to identify the unit assigned and the nature of the call. If the call terminates in a radio disposition and requires no further documentation, this is recorded by the dispatcher. The control numbering system established at the dispatch level provides for the control of documents in-bound from investigative units and identifies potential missing documents as not being received. Calls generated by the officer in the field, as opposed to citizen generated through the dispatch office, are handled in the same manner as are citizen generated complaints. A case number is assigned to each incident regardless of whether it is officer or citizen originated.

### METHOD OF IMPLEMENTATION

This standard has been identified for implementation through administrative policy.

## STANDARD 5.8: GEOCODING

### STANDARD

Where practical, law enforcement agencies should establish a geographical coding system that allows addresses to be located on a coordinate system as a basis for collecting crime incident statistics by grid. A grid should represent the smallest statistically significant sample of population in metropolitan areas as well as reflect geographical area and physical barriers. Grid number identification systems should be compatible to other agencies using such systems in the State to insure system data element compatibility.

### UTAH STATUS AND COMMENTS

In the development of the Departmental Management Information System (DMIS), which provides large law enforcement agencies with management information, and in the development of the Small Agency Records System, a grid system has been established for the use by all law enforcement agencies in the State of Utah. The grid system provides for identifying crime activity by specific location in small geographical areas. Even though this system will not be

of use to one or two-man agencies, the capability exists in the basic design of their record systems to provide for future use as each agency grows. The utility of geocoding becomes more pronounced as agencies expand in size.

#### METHOD OF IMPLEMENTATION

This standard has been identified for implementation through administrative policy.

Raymond A. Jackson  
Chairman

Robert B. Andersen  
Director

#### UTAH COUNCIL ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE ADMINISTRATION (MEMBERSHIP)

D. Gilbert Athay  
Attorney at Law

Gerald Bonser  
Moab City Councilman

Melvin J. Burke, Commissioner  
Uintah County Commission

Mrs. Barbara Burnett  
Citizen Representative

George Buzianis, Commissioner  
Tooele County Commission

Donald E. Chase, Commissioner  
Box Elder County Commission

Kenneth Creer, Major  
City of Springville

Judge Bryant H. Croft  
Third District Court

Edgar M. Denny, Administrator  
Department of Employment Security

Mayor Richard C. Diamond  
Wasatch Front Regional Council

Roscoe Garrett, Commissioner  
Juab County Commission

Glen Greener, Commissioner  
Salt Lake City Commission

Capt. Norman "Pete" Hayward  
Salt Lake County Sheriff's Office

Marion Hazleton  
Citizen Representative

Rex Huntsman  
Sevier County Sheriff

Chief Joseph Hutchings  
St. George Police Department

Raymond A. Jackson, Commissioner  
Department of Public Safety

S. Mark Johnson, Judge  
Bountiful City Court

Paul C. Keller, Judge  
Juvenile Court, District Five

Reverend Jerald H. Merrill  
Citizen Representative

J. Duffy Palmer  
Davis County Attorney

Dr. Sterling R. Provost  
Utah State System of Higher Educ.

Paul S. Rose, Executive Director  
Department of Social Services

Walter D. Talbot, Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

Robert B. Hansen  
Deputy Attorney General

Ernest D. Wright, Director  
Division of Corrections

James F. Yardley, Commissioner  
Garfield County Commission

## WHAT IS THE UTAH COUNCIL ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE ADMINISTRATION (UCCJA)?

In 1968 the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act was passed resulting in the creation of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) in the U.S. Department of Justice. The act required the establishment of a planning mechanism for block grants for the reduction of crime and delinquency.

This precipitated the establishment of the Utah Law Enforcement Planning Council (ULEPC). The council was created by Executive Order of Governor Calvin Rampton in 1968. On October 1, 1975, the council was expanded in size and redesignated the Utah Council on Criminal Justice Administration (UCCJA).

The principle behind the council is based on the premise that comprehensive planning, focused on state and local evaluation of law-enforcement and criminal-justice problems, can result in preventing and controlling crime, increasing public safety, and effectively using federal and local funds.

The 27-member council directs the planning and funding activities of the LEAA program in Utah. Members are appointed by the governor to represent all interests and geographical areas of the state. The four major duties of the council are:

1. To develop a comprehensive, long-range plan for strengthening and improving law enforcement and the administration of justice . . .
2. To coordinate programs and projects for state and local governments for improvement in law enforcement.
3. To apply for and accept grants from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration . . . and other government or private agencies, and to approve expenditure . . . of such funds . . . consistent with . . . the statewide comprehensive plan.
4. To establish goals and standards for Utah's criminal-justice system, and to relate these standards to a timetable for implementation.

**END**

7. 10. 1941