ITG Request 041 – Remove CLJ Archiving and Purge Certain Records

Presented to the JISC for
Authorization decision

IT GOVERNANCE REQUEST DECISION

Recommend Decision (4th step) From Court Level User Group (CLUG)

Court Level User Group	**Courts of Limited Jurisdiction**
Chair of Group	Cynthia Marr

IT Request - #41 Remove CLJ Archiving and Purge Certain Records								
Date of Decision - January 11, 2011								
Decision to Recommend for Approval	☒ **Approve** *(unanimously)* ☐ **Decline** *(unanimously)* ☐ **Split Vote:** *moves forward to JISC with pros & cons*							
Prioritization of Request	**# 2**							
Importance of Request	☒ High ☐ Medium ☐ Low							
Scoring of Request	**Business Value** (0-10, 10=high)	**Relative Priority** (0-10, 10=high)	**Cost** (0-5, 5=low)	**Complexity/ Level of Effort** (0-10, 10=low)	**Risk** (0-5, 5=low)	**Benefit/ Impact** (0-5, 5=broad)	**Impact of Doing Nothing** (0-5, 5=high impact)	**Request Total Score** (0-50)
	8	**8**	**1**	**3**	**1**	**4**	**3**	**28**
Pros & Cons *(if vote is not unanimous)*								
Additional Statements *(attachments from other groups in support or additional information that should go to the JISC for consideration)*	☒ **No =** additional statements/attachments ☐ **Yes =** additional statements/attachments							
Additional Notes								

Analysis of IT Governance Request #041 (Part 1)
Revise CLJ Destruction Business Rules for Certain Records

Summary of Proposed Solution:
The Administrative Office of the Courts proposes to update the business rules for certain CLJ case types to comply with the current CLJ case destruction schedule. CLJ probable cause and criminal felony case types would be destroyed after three years. CLJ criminal traffic and non-traffic would be destroyed after 10 years if the case is either dismissed or vacated. The tasks in Part 1 of this analysis would be completed before work begins on Part 2 of the analysis.

Sizing:
The following estimate is based upon the best available information and does not include cost or effort estimates for on-going maintenance of the enhancement. This analysis was approved by AOC's Operations Control Board on December 16th, 2010.

This enhancement would be accomplished by AOC's internal resources. The systems affected by the change would be: JIS.

AOC estimates that this project would take 2-3 months to complete. This is an estimate of the duration of the project from the date work would begin on the project until final implementation.

Group	Hours	Tasks
Court Education	20	Update documentation.
Business Analysis	5	Gather and document requirements.
Architecture	0	
Maintenance (Legacy)	120	Analysis, coding, first testing.
Data Warehouse	0	
Quality Assurance	20	Testing and validation.
Project Management	15	
Total	**180 hours**	

ISD staff costs average $76 per hour. Contractor staff generally costs $120 - $150 per hour.

Request:
This request was generated based on the JISC adopting the recommendations of the JISC Public Case Search Workgroup on August 18th, 2010. This work detailed in this request will partially fulfill Recommendation # 3 from the report.

This request addresses business rule changes for three types of closed, aged CLJ cases.

1. Destroy CLJ probable cause case type records after 3 years
2. Destroy CLJ criminal felony case type records after 3 years
3. Destroy CLJ criminal traffic and non-traffic cases after 10 years, if the case is either dismissed or vacated

Business Impacts:
This request would impact CLJ staff and the general public. The specified cases would be physically destroyed, so they would no longer be present in JIS or on the public case search web site.

Proposed Solution:

The technical staff will modify the existing CLJ Destruction of Records job to comply with the revised business rules. This effort is a resumption of the previous implementation effort, which was put on hold in March 2009 at the direction of the DMCJA and JSD Court Services.

Assumptions:

1. There is no requirement to preserve a copy of the destroyed CLJ cases on archive tapes or by any other means.

Risks:

1. If requirements are not clear and/or there is not a consensus among the users, we risk physically deleting CLJ cases that should still be in the JIS database and that cannot be recovered.

Analysis of IT Governance Request #041 (Part2)
Discontinue CLJ Archiving

Summary of Proposed Solution:
The Administrative Office of the Courts proposes to adopt a phased approach to discontinue archiving for Courts of Limited Jurisdiction (CLJ). Under the phased approach, AOC will first develop destruction programs for Electronic Ticket Processing (ETP) cases, then Vehicle Related Violations (VRV)/Parking cases, and lastly all other CLJ cases affected by this request. AOC will then remove the obsolete archiving and destruction modules from JIS. The tasks in Part 1 of this analysis would be completed before work begins on Part 2 of the analysis.

Sizing:
The following estimate is based upon the best available information and does not include cost or effort estimates for on-going maintenance of the enhancement. This analysis was approved by AOC's Operations Control Board on December 16th, 2010.

This enhancement would be accomplished by AOC's internal resources. The systems affected by the change would be: JIS.

AOC estimates that this project would take 15 months to complete. This is an estimate of the duration of the project from the date work would begin on the project until final implementation.

Group	Hours	Tasks
Court Education	80	Update documentation and materials.
Business Analysis	160	Work with user community to create and document requirements.
Architecture	0	
Maintenance (Legacy)	2800	Analysis, coding, first testing.
Data Warehouse	0	
Quality Assurance	980	Functionality verification and validation.
Project Management	500	Oversight and coordination.
Total	**4520 hours**	

AOC staff costs average $76 per hour. Contractor staff generally costs $120 - $150 per hour.

Request:
This request was generated based on the JISC adopting the recommendations of the JISC Public Case Search Workgroup on August 18th, 2010. The work detailed in this request will partially fulfill Recommendation # 3 from the report.

This request is to discontinue archiving of CLJ cases. Part 1 of this solution changes the rules for destruction of records, but the archiving process would still be in place. The work detailed in this part of the solution would discontinue archiving of all cases and removal of obsolete modules from JIS.

Business Impacts:
This request would have several impacts on CLJ staff and the general public. Once this project is complete, no CLJ cases would be archived in JIS. This would reduce the staff effort required to restore cases when requested, and the public or court staff would not have to wait for a case to be restored to view the record.

Proposed Solution:
AOC's proposed solution is to create a new destruction process that would review the active tables and identify eligible (closed, aged) cases and destroy them from the active tables, rather than from the inactive (archived) tables. Currently, the destruction process evaluates cases in the inactive tables, so a case cannot be destroyed if it isn't first archived.
This new destruction process would be implemented as a phased approach. The phases would be ordered to allow software developed in the earlier phases to be reused in later phases to facilitate efficient project completion.

Because the current JIS Archiving and Destruction processes are integrated, AOC would modify the existing Destruction processes incrementally, e.g., for each case type individually, before the JIS archiving process could be eliminated.

Within the project scope the technical staff proposes to change the software's hard-coded business rules to table-driven rules. This change will make future changes to these business rules much less labor intensive.

The phases would be:

Phase 1: Destruction of Electronic Ticket Processing (ETP) Cases: Create a new destruction process that identifies eligible ETP cases and destroys them from the active JIS tables. The ETP project did not include CLJ Archiving/Destruction within the project's scope. Therefore, as of Spring 2010 JIS is out of compliance in the archiving/destruction of ETP cases. This first phase will focus on ETP case destruction.

Phase 2: Destruction of Vehicle-Related Violations (VRV)/Parking cases: Extend the new ETP destruction process, so it also identifies eligible VRV cases and destroys them from the active JIS tables. The VRV project did not include CLJ Archiving/Destruction within the project's scope. JIS will soon be out of compliance in the archiving/destruction of VRV cases. This second phase will focus on VRV case destruction.

Phase 3: Destruction of all other eligible CLJ cases: Extend the ETP/VRV destruction process, so that it identifies all other eligible cases and destroys them from the active JIS tables. The order in which the processes for specific case types are created will be prioritized by the court community. During this period the current CLJ Destruction process will continue to identify eligible cases and destroy them from the active and inactive JIS tables. As part of implementation, this phase will include restoration of all archived data back into the active JIS tables.

Phase 4: Delete all obsolete archiving and destruction modules from JIS. Re-catalog cartridges that contained obsolete archived data.

Assumptions:

2. There is no requirement to preserve a copy of the destroyed CLJ cases on archive tapes or by any other means.
3. As long as the SMC data continues to reside in the inactive tables, the current "archived case" logic in JIS screen and report software will need to be retained.

Risks:

1. If all phases of this project are not completed, the developers will not be able to remove the archiving of CLJ records from JIS.

2. If requirements are not clear and/or do not have a consensus among the users, we risk physically deleting CLJ cases that should still be in the JIS database and that cannot be recovered.

Remove CLJ Archiving and Purge Certain Records

Request Detail

Requestor Name:
Alfasso, Lynne

Origination Date:
10/04/2010

Requestor Email:
kevin.ammons@courts.wa.gov; lynne.alfasso@courts.wa.gov

Requestor Phone:
705-5315

Recommended Endorser:
AOC (endorses for other communities)

Request Status: Awaiting CLUG Recommendation
Request Type: Change or Enhancement
Which Systems are affected? Judicial Information System (JIS)
Other affected Systems / Business Processes
Business Area: Records Management
Communities Impacted: CLJ Judges
CLJ Managers
Public and Other Users
Impact if not Resolved: Medium

Impact Description:

If these records are not purged they will continue to appear on the public case search website.

What is the Business Problem or Opportunity

JISC directs that AOC remove the archiving requirement for certain courts of limited jurisdiction records and, by extension, remove archiving of these records from the JIS applications. This request would see the records in the JIS applications “destroyed” at the same time the records are listed for destruction by the courts.

Attached as Appendix 2 is a policy memorandum adopted by the JISC on April 25, 2008, which required that certain records in the courts of limited jurisdiction be purged after a period of time: probable cause hearings (three years), records of criminal felonies in the courts of limited jurisdiction (three years), and criminal cases that are either dismissed or have the judgments vacated (except for domestic violence and driving under the influence cases) (ten years). Purging of these records would take them off the public website display.

This ITG request is a consolidation of requests 14, 15, 16, and 17. The requests were consolidated based upon analysis by ISD technical experts.

Expected Benefit:

Purging of these records would take them off the public website. Removal of the archiving requirement will reduce eliminate the need for court staff to unarchive records.

Any Additional Information:

This request was generated based on the JISC adopting the recommendations of the JISC Public Case Search Workgroup on August 18th, 2010. This work detailed in this request will fulfill Recommendation #3 from the report.

Endorsement Detail

Endorsing Committee
AOC (endorses for other communities)

Endorser Name:
Ammons, Kevin

Origination Date:
10/04/2010

Endorser Email:
kevin.ammons@courts.wa.gov

Endorser Phone:
704-4085

Endorsing Action: Endorsed

Endorser’s Explanation and Comments

This request is a combination of four earlier requests: 14, 15, 16, and 17. It is being resubmitted in a combined request on the advice of the technical team.

AOC Analysis Detail

Remove CLJ Archiving and Purge Certain Records

Analysis Date:	12/17/2010
Request Rationale	
Aligns with JIS Business Priorities, IT Strategies & Plans:	Yes
Aligns with applicable policies and with ISD Standards:	Yes
Breadth of Solution Benefit:	Wide
Cost Estimates	
Cost Benefit Analysis Complete?	
Cost to Implement?	4700 hours
Positive Return on Investment?	
Projected Maintenance cost?	$0
Feasibility Study needed?	No
Court Level User Group	
Courts of Limited Jurisdiction	

Key Business Objectives:

The request seeks to discontinue archiving for all CLJ cases. In addition, it seeks business rule changes for three types of closed, aged CLJ cases.

1. Destroy CLJ probable cause case type records after 3 years
2. Destroy CLJ criminal felony case type records after 3 years
3. Destroy CLJ criminal traffic and non-traffic cases after 10 years, if the case is either dismissed or vacated

Benefits and Business Value:

This request would impact CLJ staff and the general public. The specified cases would be physically destroyed, so they would no longer be present in JIS or on the public case search web site.

AOC Analysis - Proposed Solution

The Administrative Office of the Courts proposes to update the business rules for certain CLJ case types to comply with the current CLJ case destruction schedule. CLJ probable cause and criminal felony case types would be destroyed after three years. CLJ criminal traffic and non-traffic would be destroyed after 10 years if the case is either dismissed or vacated. For discontinuing archiving, AOC will use a phased approach. AOC will first develop destruction programs for Electronic Ticket Processing (ETP) cases, then Vehicle Related Violations (VRV)/Parking cases, and lastly all other CLJ cases affected by this request. AOC will then remove the obsolete archiving and destruction modules from JIS.

AOC Analysis - Proposed Approach

AOC's proposed solution is to create a new destruction process that would review the active tables and identify eligible (closed, aged) cases and destroy them from the active tables, rather than from the inactive (archived) tables. Currently, the destruction process evaluates cases in the inactive tables, so a case cannot be destroyed if it isn't first archived.
This new destruction process would be implemented as a phased approach. The phases would be ordered to allow software developed in the earlier phases to be reused in later phases to facilitate efficient project completion.

Because the current JIS Archiving and Destruction processes are integrated, AOC would modify the existing Destruction processes incrementally, e.g., for each case type individually, before the JIS archiving process could be eliminated.

Within the project scope the technical staff proposes to change the software's hard-coded business rules to table-driven rules. This change will make future changes to these business rules much less labor intensive.

Additional Systems Affected

Remove CLJ Archiving and Purge Certain Records

Addtional Court Communities Affected

AOC Analysis Attachments

CLJ Records Retention Request.pdf
FinalReport(Aug.18).pdf
ITG Request 041-Remove CLJ Archiving and Purge Certain Records.docx

Confirmation of Endorsing Action Detail

Endorsing Committee
AOC (endorses for other communities)

Endorser Name:
Ammons, Kevin

Origination Date:
12/17/2010

Endorser Email:
kevin.ammons@courts.wa.gov

Endorser Phone:
360-704-4085

Endorsing Action: Endorsed

Endorser's Explanation and Comments

Appendix 2

February 22, 2008

TO: Judge Ken Grosse, Chair
Data Dissemination Committee

FROM: Judge Jim Heller, Chair, CLJ Records Retention Workgroup

RE: Retention Schedule

At the request of Justice Bobbe Bridge, former chair of the JISC, and Judge Grosse the Courts of Limited Jurisdiction Retention Work Group was formed to address a number of issues that have arisen with regard to retention of certain criminal court records in courts of limited jurisdiction that are readily accessible by the public. As you know, the Supreme Court has issued a number of holdings that require court records to be open and accessible to the public. Also, the adoption of GR 31 and the amendments to GR 15 support this open and accessible policy.

Currently, courts of limited jurisdiction follow retention guidelines promulgated by the Secretary of State, although there is some limited oversight by the Records Management Advisory Committee (RMAC). While there has always been a question whether the courts are bound by these guidelines, the courts have followed these guidelines for years so this work group used the guidelines as a model when drafting a retention policy.

There are certain court records that are "essential" and cannot be removed from JIS. For example, all criminal judgments and sentences should remain in the system. CrRLJ 7.2(e)(3) says:

> Notwithstanding any other statute or rule to the contrary, each judgment and sentence form, either electronic or hard copy, shall be preserved by the court in perpetuity.

There are other court records that are recognized for public policy and safety reasons to be "essential" records. These involve domestic violence and anti-harassment case files. We agree that these records should never be destroyed or placed on a retention schedule.

The workgroup concluded, however, that there are other court records that may not have been intended to be open to the public for long periods of time, especially now with remote accessibility of electronic court records. For example, the work group raised issues regarding the retention of non-conviction information for long periods of time. Such court records can be misleading, especially when it is on AOC's name/case search "public view" website, which provides very limited and specific information. Extended retention of these records serves no public purpose and may be a disservice to the public and the subject of the records.

Appendix 2

I have attached the workgroup's recommended retention schedule which is based on AOC's current guidelines for retention, archiving and destruction. Just in case you are unfamiliar with the case type abbreviations in this attachment they mean the following:

PR -- Parking
PC -- Probable Cause
IN -- Civil Infraction
IT -- Traffic Infraction
CF -- Criminal Felony
CN -- Criminal Non- Traffic
CT -- Criminal Traffic
CV -- Civil
SC -- Small Claims

Proposed changes:

1. **Remove Archiving Requirement**

The clerks have requested that the archiving requirement be removed. A number of clerks have complained that they spend a great amount of time unarchiving records for the public. A simple way to avoid this is to simply not archive the court records, but remove them from the records at the same time the records are listed for destruction. It should be noted that at the time of this report a new case management system was scheduled to be implemented in the foreseeable future. This case management system does not allow for archiving.

2. **Computer Purge of Probable Cause Hearing after Three Years**

Currently, records of probable cause hearings remain on court records indefinitely. Any subsequent charge or filing of information is recorded under different case numbers. The record of probable cause hearing serves no purpose after a period of time. Either the case was filed and the record of this filing and subsequent actions remain on the record or no action was ever taken. The fact that there was a probable cause hearing loses its value after a period of time has passed. The work group chose a retention period of three years.

3. **Computer Purge of Criminal Felony after Three Years**

Similar, to probable cause hearings, records of criminal felonies in courts of limited jurisdictions lose their value after a period of time. The cases are either bound over to Superior Court for filing or dismissed and filed as a misdemeanor in the court of limited jurisdiction. The history of the case is maintained in a subsequent filing, not in the current filing of felony. The record of a criminal felony in courts of limited jurisdiction serves no purpose after a period of time and simply causes confusion.

4. Computer Purge of traffic and non-traffic criminal cases if case is either dismissed or vacated.

Most complaints from the public come from people who had their case dismissed or vacated, but the record of the case still remains available. While it is important to keep a record of these cases for a long period of time in order to have a clear picture of how a particular court is handling a specific case or certain types of cases (e.g. DUIs), the importance of maintaining these records diminishes over time and after a certain period of time becomes a disservice to the subject of the records. Several people have claimed that they have been turned down for better jobs or worse, remain unemployable, because an arrest record where no conviction resulted remained publicly accessible. The removal of these records would be consistent with the legislative intent and supported by the reasoning set forth in *State v. Breazeale*, 144 Wn.2d 829, 31 P.3d 1155 (2001).[1] The workgroup chose a retention period of 10 years.

[1] The legislature has recognized that law enforcement records that contain unproven allegations ("non-conviction data") can be "deleted" under RCW 10.97.060.

DESTRUCTION OF RECORDS REPORT (COURTS OF LIMITED JURISDICTION)

Introduction **2**
Computer Records ~~Archiving~~ Destruction and Retention 2
~~When A Case Listed For Destruction Is Restored From Archive ..... 4~~
Use **4**
Report Preparation **4**
Selection Criteria **4**
Sort Order **4**
Field Names and Sources **5**
Destruction Of Records Report Sample **5**

Introduction

The Destruction of Records Report lists cases that can have the court's paper records destroyed. Destruction of the computer records is an automated Database Management process that provides ongoing management of the JIS Case and Person Databases. See the Database Management Processes section for more information.

Computer Records ~~Archiving~~ Destruction and Retention

The computer records for cases are retained according to the State Archivist's Records Retention Schedule for District and Municipal Courts as summarized in the chart below.

Case Type*	Cause/Charge	~~Archived~~	Listed on Destruction of Records Report	Computer Record Purged
PR	All	~~2 yrs after case disposition date~~	3 years after case disposition date.	3 years after case disposition date
PC	All	~~2 yrs after case disposition date~~	3 years after case disposition date.	~~Never~~ 3 years after probable cause hearing
IN	No charges with a deferred finding	~~2 yrs after case disposition date~~	3 years after case disposition date.	3 years after case disposition date
IN	Any charge with a deferred finding	~~2 yrs after case disposition date~~	3 years after case disposition date.	7 years after case disposition date
IT	No charges with a deferred finding	~~2 yrs after case disposition date~~	3 years after case disposition date.	3 years after case disposition date
IT	Any charge with a deferred finding	~~2 yrs after case disposition date~~	3 years after case disposition date.	7 years after case disposition date
CF	All	~~2 yrs after case disposition date~~	3 years after case disposition date. Cases with vacated judgments are not reported.	~~Never~~ 3 years after case dismissed, bound over, or vacated.
CN	All	~~2 yrs after case disposition date~~	3 years after case disposition date. Cases with vacated judgments are not reported.	Never if conviction. If charge is dismissed or vacated, 10 years after entry of dismissal or vacation.
CT	All non-DUI charges	~~2 yrs after case disposition date~~	3 years after case disposition date. Cases with vacated	Never if conviction. If charge is dismissed or

			judgments are not reported.	vacated, 10 years after entry of dismissal or vacation.
CT	All DUI charges	~~Never~~	No - if conviction or deferred prosecution. If charge is not a deferred prosecution and dismissed, 10 years after entry of dismissal.	Never if conviction or deferred prosecution. If charge is not a deferred prosecution and dismissed, 10 years after entry of dismissal.
CV	DVP and HAR	~~2 yrs after case disposition date~~	3 years after case disposition date.	Never
CV	PUB and PRI	~~2 yrs after case disposition date~~	3 years after case disposition date.	10 yrs + 4 months after case disposition date
CV	All other causes	~~2 yrs after case disposition date~~	3 years after case disposition date.	10 years + 4 months after case disposition date
SC	All	~~2 yrs after case disposition date~~	3 years after case disposition date.	3 years after case disposition date

Notes:

*** Acronyms**
PR -- Parking
PC -- Probable Cause
IN -- Civil Infraction
IT -- Traffic Infraction
CF -- Criminal Felony
CN -- Criminal Non- Traffic
CT -- Criminal Traffic
CV -- Civil
SC -- Small Claims

Deferred Findings
To support RCW 46.63.070(5) computer records for infraction cases with a deferred finding are retained for seven (7) years past the deferral date. The deferred finding date is entered on the Plea/Sentencing Update screen (PLS).

Seattle Municipal Court Cases
Seattle Municipal Court (SMC) uploads limited criminal charge information to JIS. This uploaded information is similar to the information that is retained on-line for archived

cases. SMC cases are reported on the Destruction of Records Report.

~~**When A Case Listed For Destruction Is Restored From Archive**~~
~~If a case is restored from archive after it has been listed on the Destruction of Records Report and the case is updated in JIS, the aging process for archiving and Destruction of Records begins again. Eventually, the case will be re-archived and re-listed on the Destruction of Records Report so that any additional paper records can be destroyed.~~
~~If a case is restored from archive after it has been listed on the Destruction of Records Report and the case is NOT updated in JIS, it will NOT reappear on the Destruction of Records Report.~~

Use

Courts use the Destruction of Records Report as a records management tool for paper case records.

Report Preparation

The Destruction of Records Report is automatically generated each month and routed to the courts primary print domain.

Selection Criteria

A case is listed on the Destruction of Records report when ALL of the following conditions are met:

- ~~The case is archived or is a Seattle Municipal Court (SMC) case.~~
- ~~The most recent update to the case is at least one year before the first day of the current month.~~
- The case disposition date is at least three years before the first day of the current month. If the case disposition date was backdated, it must have been entered at least one year before the first day of the current month.
- For a criminal case (CN, CT, CF), none of the charges have a V (vacated) finding/judgment recorded on the Plea/Sentence (PLS) screen.
- None of the ~~charges the~~ cases involve DUI convictions, deferred prosecutions, or other dispositions adverse to the subject as defined in RCW 10.97.030(4) ~~on the case are DUI as identified in approved list of DUI laws.~~
- None of the cases are DVP or HAR.

Sort Order

The Destruction or Records Report may be sorted either alphabetically by defendant name/case title or numerically by LEA/case number. A court sets the desired sort order as on the Court Profile Maintenance screen (CPFM).

Field Names and Sources

Defendant Name / Case Title	For non-civil cases the name of the defendant. For civil and small claims cases the case title is derived from the name of the first plaintiff/petitioner/old participant vs. the name of the first defendant/respondent/new participant. For parking cases, this field is blank.
LEA	The code for the law enforcement agency that filed the citation or complaint. This field will be blank for Civil (CV) and Small Claims (SC) cases.
Case Number	The number assigned by the court to this case followed by the case type.
Cause	The Cause Code recorded on the filing screen for Civil (CV) and Small Claims (SC) cases.

Destruction of Records Report Sample

The sample below is a name sort.

```
DQ9170PD·ADC····Destruction·of·Records·for·EASTSIDE·DISTRICT·(JXH)·····Page:·····1¶
05/30/2002·02:40:17·PM¶
¶
Defendant·Name·/·Case·Title·····************************************·LEA·Case·Number·Cause¶
¶
Civil(report):05/01/1999,(delete):05/01/1992;·Criminal:05/01/1999¶
Infraction:05/01/1999,·Deferred·Finding(report):05/01/1999,(delete):05/01/1994¶
Parking:05/01/1999;·Small·claim:05/01/1999¶
¶
.....·EPD·P000120···PR·¶
.....·EPD·P000121···PR¶
ARCHER,·JOM·····************************************·WSP·C00000025·CT¶
ARCHER·VS.·ARCHER·····************************.*****99-123017··CV·BRE¶
BARLOW,·RONALD·····*********************************·EPD·I00001····IN¶
CARTER,·JONATHAN·G·····*********************************·WSP·I00001····IT¶
DUGAN,·ELMER·····************************·WSP·I011234···IT¶
MYERS,·RACHEL·····************************************·WSP·C00000121·CT¶
STEWART,·RODNEY·····************************************·WSP·C00000119·CT¶
ZARCHER·VS·ABEL·····99-0012345··SC·AUT¶
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------¶
Number·of·cases·eligible·for·destruction:·********·10¶
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------¶
End·of·report·for·EDC¶
```