

**BOARD OF THE PUBLIC SAFETY & SECURITY INFORMATION SYSTEM
(ILETS)
Meeting #142**

The Public Safety & Security Information System (ILETS) Board convened in person on October 28, 2024 at 1:00 p.m. at ISP HQ, 700 S Stratford Dr, Meridian, Idaho Conference Room 1.

Board Members Present

Sheriff Mike Hollinshead, Elmore County Sheriff's Office (Chairman)
Sheriff Shaun Gough, Gooding County Sheriff's Office
Chief Bryce Johnson, Idaho Falls Police Department
Major Matthew Smith, Idaho State Police (ISP)
Colonel Bill Gardiner, Director, Idaho State Police (ISP)

Non-Members Present

Leila McNeill, Chief ISP Bureau of Criminal Identification (BCI)
Rachel Kolts, ISP Deputy Attorney General
Joann Hall, Administrative Assistant 1 (BCI)
Ross Houck, IT Information Security Engineer 1 (BCI)

Board Members Not Present

Chief Craig Kingsbury, Twin Falls Police Department

I. Opening

1) Call to Order

- a) Chairman Sheriff Mike Hollinshead called the meeting to order at 12:56 pm

2) Silent Roll Call of Board Members

- a) A roll call was conducted. All Board members but Chief Craig Kingsbury were present in person. Quorum achieved.

3) Introduction of new ISP ILETS Board member, Colonel Bill Gardiner

4) Approve minutes from the April 29, and May 7, 2024 meetings

- a) Action Item—Vote to approve minutes from April 29, and May 7, 2024 meetings.
 - i. Chairman Hollinshead called for a motion, Sheriff Gough moved to approve both the April 29, and May 7, 2024 minutes. Major Smith seconded the motion.

Votes in favor: 5

Votes against: 0

Motion passed

Sheriff Matt Clifford and Attorney Terry Derden from Ada County presented their research regarding the previously reported misuse case to the Board.

II. Informational - Updates on Non-ILETS Projects

1) Biometric Image Comparison functionality

- a) to make a more concerted effort to get this information out, we have included the forms for the Biometric image Comparison functionality for law enforcement investigative opportunities and identifying individuals. Please share this information with other agencies that may have a use or need for this. if there are questions, please have them contact Leila McNeill.

2) Criminal Justice Subscription Notification Service update

- a) This is the ability for Probation and Patrol to submit fingerprints on individuals who have been incarcerated and who are now released. They can keep tabs on them in the national system. They will receive an automated message from the arresting agency to the probation/parole office.
The programming is completed and should be in use at the end of November. They are currently in testing.

3) Endangered Missing Person Alert project

- a) We have two phases of this project. The first phase is updating the clearinghouse for missing persons. Up until now, it has been a very minimal, repository. We are trying to make it more user-friendly and with more information. We are putting in current amber alerts, so the public can go to the website and see the information and status of the alert. This should be done by next week.
- b) After the clearinghouse is complete, we can start on Phase 2, Endangered Missing Person Alert. This alert will have the same functionality as the AMBER alert once completed. Right now, an agency can submit missing person information into NCIC. If they click the AMBER alert box, it goes to our 24-hour helpdesk, who, in turn, contact our Missing coordinator, who will contact the investigating agency to get all the pertinent information to determine if it meets the qualification for an alert to be issued.
- c) Sheriff Hollinshead stated that the board members of the missing and endangered persons requested that the board meetings start up again. Leila stated, now that we have the staff in that position, we are more than happy for them to start again.

4) 67-3008 language update

- a) With the FBI audit this spring, it was brought to our attention that our umbrella statute did not have language that allowed private non-criminal justice entities to submit fingerprints that would allow them the ability to run criminal history records checks for agencies that serve vulnerable populations. After meeting with legal and command staff, it was agreed upon that the new language be submitted for legislative approval during the next session.

III. Old Business

1) Circuit “last mile” contract with Syringa update

- a) Fort Hall was our last one. That one was activated on October 2nd. Caldwell should be done in the next week or two. Buhl has not moved into their new building, but the circuit

is there and ready and tested.

2) Violent Person File update

- a) Last time we updated you, we had 49 records in the violent person file. We now have approximately 6000-6500 that meet the qualifications. To avoid validating 6000-6500 violent persons simultaneously, we add small chunks each month. As of October 21st, we have 271 in the violent person files. If law enforcement runs across anyone in the file, a flag will appear on the screen. We continue to train and encourage agencies to enter their violent persons. This should come up regardless of the system you are running.

3) Disaster Recovery for ILETS Decision Unit

- a) We have put in a Decision Unit in ISP's budget for the next legislative session. We are looking at cloud options for our disaster recovery. Since our switch went down in 2021 cost of replacing the hardware/firmware has dramatically increased. We feel it is more efficient and cost-effective to have the Disaster Recovery in the cloud. We have received a proposal from Nlets so far, but we don't know if they have the space. We are looking at Nlets and AWS (Amazon Web Services), Utah has its Disaster Recover through AWS. We have been speaking with Utah to ask about their experience and if they would like to share with us to save on cost. Oregon State Police is setting theirs up on Nlets right now. I am waiting to see how that goes before looking that way. We currently have backups but no backup systems if this one crashes, the agencies will have no connection. The Financial Services Office sent some questions from the legislature on how critical this is and the cloud traffic cost which we are investigating on how to determine that data.

4) ILETS Budget/fee structure review

- a) In April, we did not have any analysis on how the fees are being used. We now have the cost supported by ISP, the agencies and other sources.
 - i. Personnel to run and manage the ILETS System,
 - User Fees - 597,400.00
 - ISP - 853,000
 - ii. Operating Costs - data line, Nlets, microwave connections, etc.
 - User Fees – 989,400
 - ISP – 1,056,100
- b) Chief Johnson brought up how the Legislature spoke about the ability to opt out of this service. Law Enforcement cannot really opt out and in other states, the state covers this cost, not the county, city and state patrol. Maybe this is an opportunity for the Government to show how much they want to support law enforcement. Thank you for the transparency of the breakdown of the cost. We will have an updated cost analysis in the spring.
- c) We have put together a couple of other options. One is by city and county broken down by population, with the people counted one for one, no duplicating. We took the total population for the state and divided that by the projected total cost needed to maintain

the system, which came up to \$0.87 per person. We then applied that amount to each person within that City or County. For example, in Ada County, we removed Meridian, Boise and Garden City because they all have their own connection. We removed that population from Ada County's population. We did not touch the connection cost, only the usage costs. 15 or 18 agencies at level 1 (lowest amount) will see an increase. 7 out of 10 at level 2 will see an increase. Boise PD will be the biggest increase, which is 169,000.00, increased from 37,925.00 to 207,710.76. If we decide to go this way, there will be increases and decreases depending on population. All the state agencies, government, tribal, Sircomm and Whitcom we left alone because there is no way to figure out the populations.

- d) Another option we worked up is adding a new level 9. We can either make the current level 8 level 9 and split the difference between 7 and 8 to make the new level 8. Or leave all levels the same and just add a level 9. The first option moves four agencies down to the new level 8. Level 8 would be 3.5 – 5.1 and level 9 would be 5.1-10. This would decrease the fees by 58,628.00.
- e) It was suggested that we split levels 7 & 8 if ISP was willing to absorb the 59,000.00 shortage, but it doesn't feel it's fair to lay this on ISP. It seems that the population would be the best one, but you would have to phase these new costs over a 5-10-year period.
- f) In January, we will start our bi-annual review of the fees and will need to know which way the board would like to go, stay the same, population, or change levels. The new fee schedule will need to be available for the legislature to vote on the rule. We are on the ISA conference schedule for 20 minutes.
- g) It was pointed out that there is a big jump from levels 7-8 and if there is a different suggestion, he would like to hear it. Ross Houck pointed out that the larger counties/agencies offset the connection for the smaller counties/agencies. The board needs to keep in mind that costs continue to go up and we may want to have a set increase per year or bi-yearly. Nlets is going to review their fees every year to determine if they need to increase or not; we may want to go along these lines. The legislature likes things increased by small increments yearly or bi-yearly, so this may be a favorable option.
- h) Chief Johnson suggested we index the schedule. Leila suggested hiring a financial expert to go through this and bring up some options that would be easier for the agencies to handle, be an equitable fee schedule, and see if we need an annual increase. This would also take ISP out of the equation and show the legislature that this is not being driven by ISP but by an independent outside financial expert. Leila will research costs to have this done and get back to the board to decide if this is something you would like to have done. She will inform the board by the end of December so that we can possibly have numbers and/or options for the April meeting to vote on.
- i) Colonel Bill Gardiner asked Leila when her next ZBR is. If we are considering removing the rule, that would be the time to do that. The board agreed to have Leila start looking for a professional and the costs to have the board decide if this is something we want to do.

IV. New business

1) State Office of Information Technology modernization of ISP and effect on ILETS

- a) We are on the slate for stage 5 of the consolidated state IT Modernization for ISP. There will be some IT personnel that will be moving to ITS to some extent and some will stay here. Colonel Gardiner stated that 5 years ago, when Governor Little was still the Lt. Governor, he wanted to make a state-wide IT, and slowly have all the state agencies release their IT departments to make one big IT department for the state. ISP is the second to last to go due to CJIS and ILETS. We will keep ILETS personnel, and the rest will go to ITS. The agreement is that ITS will bill us and the legislature give us the money to pay them. We are in the process of getting their people background checked to meet our security levels now.

2) CJIS Security Policy updates from ILETS ISO Ross Houck

- a) The CJIS Security Policy, which is both guidelines and directives from the APB and FBI about how information is to be protected and modernized starting 2019. The first update was released in 2022. Some updates can be quick and easy and others are longer and more intense. One of the updates are that they added more information about cloud computing, so more law enforcement agencies are making some cloud services both for their internal systems as well as their Criminal justice functions, i.e., emails, cloud systems and atty groups are using cloud services for their tools. The key thing is that all the rules still need to be followed. The agency is still responsible for confirming that the cloud service follows the rules via audits, testing, etc. When making a contract, you need to ensure that not just the agency but also ISP and/or FBI can audit. If an agency doesn't use a .gov option, the agencies need to make sure they follow the same level of security and policies as the .gov option. Agencies usually can hit one of the three but not all three, which are policy, procedure, or how to follow through in these procedures. Our other trainers/auditors and I are doing an outreach to ask these questions to see where we can assist with training and guidance.
- b) The newest update came out in July of this year, 5.9.5. There were some sanctionable items as of October of this year.
 - i. Account management needs to be at a higher level. So, your account has to be updated annually.
 - ii. You can no longer bring your own device (BYOD) unless you have policies in place to allow it.
 - iii. Multi-factor authentication: This would be something you currently get from your bank school, which is now required to access CJI. We are working with the agencies in a supportive role to get this done.
 - iv. Based on configuration: this would be something like this is our desktops, laptops and this is the software installed, have policies for this. This allows for better security.
 - v. Least functionality: a computer with limited software like Microsoft Word, which is all it has on it and is used for. Instead of having everyone's computer has everything on it when it is not used there. This allows for better security this allows for trimming things down.
 - vi. Hardware inventory: if you don't know what's on your network, you can't protect your network.

- c) We have been talking with agencies, confirming that we will help get them compliant, work with them on each step and help validate that they are getting there or already there. What we have come up with is that EVERYONE needs MFA, an Inventory of hardware and software and cannot have access to CJI unless you have had training. This used to give a grace period of 6 months, but not anymore as per the FBI. We have found that there is no emergency response plan. This would be someone who had a cyber hack but we are not finding out from the agency but by the news. We have a responsibility to ensure we not allowing someone to get back to us and so on. We are here to help them, but they need to contact us. So anyone with access to CJI needs to have a plan and the LASO needs to contact us.

We ask that you contact us with any new employees assigned the title of LASO or TAC CJI policy update has been in the process for 5 years but 2022 was the most recent change. Some does not apply but most of it does. If there are any question please make sure to contact Ross.

V. Executive Session

1) Convene Executive Session to consider records that are exempt from public disclosure as provided in chapter 1, title 74, Idaho Code IdC 74-206(d)

- a) Chairman Hollinshead entertained a motion to enter into Executive Session at 2:26 PM, to discuss reported misuse case, Chief Johnson Moved, Sheriff Gough second.

Board voted unanimously to exit executive session and re-enter open session.

No Board action taken on ILETS reported misuse case

Adjourn Meeting. Chairman Hollinshead entertained a motion to adjourn. Sheriff Gough moved to adjourn motion was seconded by Major Matthew Smith.

Votes in Favor:5

Votes Opposed: None.

Chairman Hollinshead adjourned the ILETS Board meeting at 2:32 pm.

Meeting minutes submitted respectfully,

Joann Hall