JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE

June 24, 2011
9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.
AOC Office, SeaTac, WA

Minutes

Members Present:
Mr. Larry Barker
Ms. Linda Bell
Justice Mary Fairhurst, Chair
Mr. Jeff Hall
Judge James Heller
Mr. William Holmes
Mr. N. F. Jackson
Mr. Rich Johnson
Judge J. Robert Leach
Ms. Barb Miner
Judge Steven Rosen
Judge Michael Trickey
Ms. Yolande Williams
Judge Thomas J. Wynne

Members Absent:
Chief Robert Berg
Mr. Marc Lampson
Mr. Steward Menefee

AOC/Temple Staff Present:
Mr. Kevin Ammons
Mr. Bill Cogswell
Mr. Mike Davis
Ms. Vonnie Diseth
Ms. Kate Kruller
Ms. Vicky Marin
Mr. Dirk Marler
Ms. Mellani McAleenan
Ms. Heather Morford
Ms. Pam Payne
Mr. Ramsey Radwan
Justice Charlie Wiggins
Mr. Kumar Yajamanam

Guests Present:
Mr. Shayne Boyd
Judge Jeanette Dalton
Ms. Lea Ennis
Marion Jacobson
Mr. Frank Maiocco
Ms. Marti Maxwell
Mr. Chris Shambro
Mr. Paul Sherfey
Ms. Gail Stone
Mr. Kevin Stock
Mr. Joe Wheeler
Mr. Brent Wigen

Call to Order

Justice Mary Fairhurst called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and introductions were made.

May 6, 2011 Meeting Minutes

Justice Fairhurst asked if there were any changes to the May 6 meeting minutes. Hearing none, the minutes were voted and deemed approved.

Superior Court Case Management Feasibility Study Final Report (SCMFS)

Ms. Kate Kruller presented the SCMFS Project status report and made the introduction to the Feasibility Study Final Report.

Below is a summary of the presentation, MTG Management Consulting, LLC Principle, Joe Wheeler made regarding the Feasibility Study Report – including findings/recommendations.

In March 2010, the Superior Courts Judges Association recommended that the JISC approve the acquisition and deployment of a Superior Court Case Management System (SC-CMS). The objectives of this system are to:

- Enable Judges:
  - o Direct and monitor court case progress,

- o Schedule case events,
- o Enforce court business rules,
- o View case plans/schedule, status, progress, and case party information, and
- o Quickly and efficiently communicate court schedules and orders.
- Enable Court Administrators to:
  - o Report and view case plans/schedule, status, progress, and case party information,
  - o Quickly and efficiently schedule case events,
  - o Enforce court business rules, and
  - o Quickly and efficiently communicate court schedules and orders.
- Enable County Clerk operations:
  - o Maintain/improve current capabilities, and
  - o Leverage what solution providers offer to better support the clerks.

The acquisition and deployment of the SC-CMS is focused on meeting those objectives. It will solve a number of problems related to these objectives and enhance the service delivery of the superior courts in Washington.

Assuming acceptance of the feasibility study, AOC ISD will need to establish and manage the SC-CMS implementation program. In addition, AOC will need to expand its services to support courts with configuration and process management.

The Requirements Gap Analysis established the alternatives to be considered three leading alternatives:

- Use of the Pierce County Legal Information Network Exchange (LINX) application as an SC-CMS statewide
- Acquisition of a commercial application focused on calendaring, scheduling, and case flow management for the superior courts
- Acquisition of a full feature commercial application providing calendaring, scheduling, case flow management, and other record keeping functions for the superior courts

Only one vendor offers a commercial application that supports only calendaring, scheduling, and case management for courts. All other responding vendors in this market provide full-feature commercial applications that integrate calendaring, scheduling, and case management for courts with record keeping functions commonly employed by clerks.

At this time, neither Pierce County nor AOC are prepared to redesign, reconstruct, configure, deploy, and support LINX as a case management system for use by Washington Superior Courts statewide. LINX is a great success as an integrated justice application for Pierce County, and has the potential to be successful as an open source application. However, it will require a significant software development effort to be ready for service to the courts. In addition, significant organizational development efforts are required to provide for management, configuration, deployment, and support as a multi-tenant application serving multiple courts, counties, and communities of interest. Overall, employing LINX as the CMS for all superior courts statewide is a materially riskier alternative.

The acquisition of a full feature commercial application best met the functional, technical, and organizational requirements of the superior courts and presented the least-risk alternative. This alternative:

- Does not require significant application development and aligns with the software purchase preference outlined in the business and strategic plans approved by the JISC,
- Is supported by a relatively broad range of experienced solution providers with resources to deploy and maintain the application,
- Aligns with the planned technology architecture of the AOC,
- Is most likely to evolve with the needs of the Washington courts.

The migration to a new modern superior court system will follow a structured implementation process that configures the solution provider's application to support Washington superior court business operations, rigorously test the application, and conduct a pilot in a superior court environment. AOC and the solution provider will then implement the application in court districts, statewide.

Assuming acquisition activities begin in September 2011 (Fiscal Year 2012), configuration and validation of a commercial application will result in a solution being ready to pilot in 18-24 months. A 6-month pilot may result in a JISC decision to continue implementing statewide. Statewide rollout to the remaining counties is estimated to require 3 years of effort to implement 23 small and medium courts and 9 large courts with the new SC-CMS application.

Key decision and major milestone deliverables will assist the court community in tracking project progress. Deliverables contain the plans, designs, specifications, and certifications associated with a progressive implementation process. They will provide the basis of tracking and controlling project progress and quality.

The costs and benefits of the SC-CMS have been developed based on the alternatives, work plan, and impacts described above. This analysis considered the incremental operating costs of the SC-CMS over a 10-year period. It estimates the SC-CMS implementation costs of all phases of the project, including the costs to both the superior courts and their stakeholders. In addition to costs, this analysis considers the major quantifiable benefits of implementing the SC-CMS.

The detailed cost benefit analysis follows the Washington Department of Information Systems framework for financial analysis in feasibility studies. The detailed financial analysis is contained in APPENDIX E. It shows a net present value of the investment in the SC-CMS of $7.2 million and an internal rate of return of 11.8 percent.

Risk identification and management is critical to the successful implementation of the SC-CMS. Two risk assessments were conducted as a part of the feasibility study for the SC-CMS project. Based on the Washington Information Services Board (ISB) Information Technology Investment Risk Portfolio – Based Severity and Risk matrix, the project scored high severity and high risk. The SC-CMS project is designated as a Level 3 risk in the ISB risk rating schema.

A structured risk analysis process was applied to gain an understanding of the root causes of project risks and identify actions to mitigate those risks. It used a set of 90 quality standards, organized in 13 categories and identified 18 high risk items and 22 medium risk items. The migration strategy, budget, and project plan have been developed to mitigate these risks. The JISC, AOC, and the superior courts will need to continue to identify and mitigate high risks as the implementation of the SC-CMS application proceeds. Mr. Wheeler stated that one of the key risks centers around the lack of a shared vision between the judges, court administrators and clerks and agreement on what the application should be and do.

Recommendation

The Superior Courts should implement the SC-CMS to provide the tools and information to do so. The SC-CMS will provide the ability to:

- Manage disputes to resolution prudently and efficiently,
- Manage caseload efficiently with available facilities, resources, and staff,
- Enhance record keeping and administrative resources for the county clerks,
- Enhance services to litigants, the bar, justice partners, and others in the court community, and
- Lower court operating cost.

This implementation would enable access to well over 200 benefits accruing to the courts, the court community, and the AOC.

Ms. Kate Kruller presented the SCMFS Project Communications Plan and invited everyone to attend one of the Open In-depth briefings on the dates listed below. These briefings of the Feasibility Study Final Report will be conducted in person and online and will be the same presentation given to the JISC on June 24, along with a Q&A session. Justice Fairhurst encouraged all JISC members to take advantage of the briefings.

Feasibility Study Report Briefings:
– July 6: SCJA Board (SeaTac)
– July 13: from 9 A.M. -12 Noon Open Meeting (SeaTac/Online)
– July 20 from 8-10 A.M. Open Meeting (Online)
– July 21 from 3-5 P.M. Open Meeting (Online)

Question and Answer Period
Following the presentation by MTG, there was a 2-hour question and answer period. Joe Wheeler and Kate Kruller fielded questions and comments.   Below is a summary of the questions and answers that were asked during the meeting.

Q: What is in the Final Feasibility Report?

A: The final feasibility study report delivers a comprehensive, formal written report to determine the feasibility of a project to implement a system or service which provides the managing for calendaring and for case flow management functions, along with participant/party information tracking, case records and relevant disposition services business functions of the Superior Courts. The Feasibility Report will contain required elements as detailed in the Feasibility Study Guidelines for Information Technology Investments ISB Policy No. 202-G1. The Feasibility Report includes:

- Purpose statement and executive summary
- Project background, business case, and objectives
- Organization of the document
- Assessment approach
- Customers, stakeholders and organizational entities impacted by the project
- Best-few product analysis and alternatives considered
- Business and technical requirements documentation
- Gap Analysis
- Migration Strategy

- Integration Evaluation
- Summation of assessment
- Best-few alternatives modules, with pricing, beyond calendaring and for case flow management functions, along with participant/party information tracking, case records and relevant disposition services business functions of the Superior Courts.
- Relationship to the agency's business and IT strategic plans and IT portfolio
- Relationship to and impacts on the agency and state technology infrastructure
- Quality assurance plan
- Estimated timeline and work plan
- Cost/benefit analysis, including any assumptions used in the analysis
- Risk assessment and mitigation strategy
- Summary statement assessing the feasibility of implementing the selected alternative within the business environments of AOC and the Superior Courts.

Q: What are the costs to local courts?

A: Local court project costs are identified in Appendix E, page E-7, beginning at Line 17 which outlines the stakeholder costs for the commercial CMS alternative. Worksheet E-18 (page E-26) provides detail on what makes up the stakeholder costs and identifies local court community impacts. This was in part derived from the experience of other states and how local courts might be impacted. Worksheet E-18 (page E-26) shows the estimated hour impact. Worksheet E-18 (page E-25) shows costs in dollars.

Q: Are the annualized tangible benefits you've identified system wide?

A: Yes. All costs include SCOMIS (as it exists today) and staff. No retirement of applications in included in cost baseline. We took a conservative approach and did not take advantage of benefits we could realize if we retired SCOMIS.

Q: Is migrating to the new application required?

A: It is optional. However, the recommended alternative assumes that all courts employ SC-CMS. The commercial products that would likely be acquired provide the functions that are performed by SCOMIS. The complete rollout of SC-CMS would very likely lead to the retirement of SCOMIS to support court operations. SCOMIS retirement leads the courts to 1 of 2 options: use the new SC-CMS; or use their own system along with data exchange facilities to reports information to the statewide court data repository and justice partners.

Q: Referencing I-14, it says Information Networking Hub (INH) is essential. Where in the timeline must this be put into place?

A: Operationally, the INH capabilities will need to be fully functional by the time the first pilot court is ready to stand up which according to the sample timeline that could be within 24 months.

Q: Did you look at just the annual benefits for only courts that don't have CMS systems?

A: The report looks at benefits for all the courts including courts that currently have existing CMS applications. Look at Appendix H to see the calculations for these benefits.

Q: Is the required Data Exchange separate from what we are working on now with the Superior Court Data Exchange?

A: Yes, it is separate, but related. The current Superior Court Data Exchange (SCDX) project is the stepping stone for the Information Networking Hub (INH). The INH is part of the Enterprise Architecture strategy at AOC and AOC is building INH regardless of the CMS project. The two efforts (SCDX and INH) are related. CMS will take advantage of the work that is currently being done by the Superior Court Data Exchange project. They are however, two separate projects.

What is ultimately needed for the CMS project may prove to be around 200-300 services, depending on design decisions made in the configuration phase. The Superior Court Data Exchange project is chartered to provide 58 services.

 Q: Looking at the proposed organizational structure and workgroups, where would stand alone deputy clerks who work with juveniles be involved and/or impacted?

A: Depending upon the interest and personnel availability courts could have more or less people involved in the Court User Work Group that is described on page 67.

Q: What is the role of independent Quality Assurance (QA)?

A: All Executive Branch state projects with an ISB Risk/Severity Assessment Level 3 (this project is a level 3 risk), are required to have independent quality assurance monitoring the progress of the project. They identify risks in the project and recommend mitigation strategies for those risks. Having QA doesn't ensure success. But, if they see red flags, they raise the issues to executive and oversight groups to help prevent the project or its participants from going down a path of failure. QA has a fiduciary responsibility to independently report to the CIO, State Court Administrator, and the JISC on the status of the project.

Q: Is there a section in the report that addresses the risks?

A: Yes. Section XII identifies the major risks of this alternative. These risks and their mitigation strategies for these risks are discussed in more detail in the Migration Strategy report.

Q: How can we do a better job at mitigating the risks this time around?

A: At this point, one of the most significant risks for this project is due to the lack of a commonly held vision of what should be done. The courts need to get an agreement on the vision for SC-CMS moving forward. When people ask (as was recently the case) --- What happens if the clerks say "Stop, don't go forward"? This is a red flag showing that there is not agreement of vision. MTG's role in creating the feasibility report is to put data and information about the viable alternatives on the table, not to convince everyone to adopt SC-CMS. It is up to the county clerks, judges, administrators and other staff to

decide to use the information in the feasibility study and to come to an agreement on vision of how to move forward.

This will be difficult. This is due in part to the fact that this project will change processes, roles, responsibilities, work load, and allocation of benefits. Local communities will look at this project and see a great deal of uncertainty and unpleasant change. The experience of other states suggests that it is important to be frank about the disagreements, the shortfalls, and the strengths of this project. Each court should come to an agreement amongst the diverse members of its community.

It is important to understand that Indiana has a similar structure to Washington State and they are successfully deploying a commercially provided CMS application. For Indiana, it didn't happen overnight. It took blood, sweat and tears. Most of all it took strong leadership and unity at their AOC and in their courts and they had to come together with champions who were willing to make changes and make it work. It's encouraging that Indiana was able to overcome risks similar to those that Washington has.

Under the Legislative Budget Proviso, we need to assure the legislature that all the courts are on board. We have to address the significant concerns of the County Clerks. They have one vote on JISC. What if everyone else agrees and they don't? We need to address this as part of the process and plan for it. AOC wants to be the preferred technology provider and does not want to force courts into a system they do not want.

Q: Regarding risks and shared visions -- is this something that should be at the front-end of the project or should it be developed as we go along?

A: The courts should have a shared vision, agreement, and commitment between the county clerks, judges and administrators at the start of this project. Otherwise, the risk of failure increases.

Q: The report uses statewide continuances as a basis for ROI. If the CMS is optional, then is there a reduction in benefits if King and Pierce Counties don't participate?

A: If King and Pierce County Superior courts do not participate, it is anticipated that there will be fewer benefits and fewer costs.

Q: In Appendix I – it states that substantial customization of configurations is high risk. Is this built-in configurations or after it's installed configuring?

A: MTG recommends against substantial customization of the application. Configure, don't customize. The risk referred to in Appendix I is that the courts will want to customize the product as has be done on other development projects. This substantially increases the risk. JISC is seeking to employ an off-the-shelf product. If the core product is customized, then it is no longer an off-the-shelf product. As a result, the superior courts would not be able to easily install any upgrades to the application.

Modern applications enable clients to avoid customization, providing more facilities for configuration.

Q: How much would we have to redesign local business practices?

A: Most Washington courts are using common applications now (legacy systems). In contrast Indiana courts have not historically used common applications or terminology statewide. They had to make more changes. They had to do things like name docket codes. We have a lot of commonality already amongst our courts. There are some things that we will have to change. But, we are miles ahead of where Indiana started their efforts.

However, using Indiana as an example, 85% of the changes to business practices that Indiana made were changes that they decided to do, not because they were required by the system.

Some changes could be as a result of the changing roles for recording information in SC-CMS. With a new system the responsibilities may be shared differently than they are now - broken up more than it is now, offering more savings or new services to litigants. Pierce County experienced these types of changes with LINX and they included deputizing court personnel to enter data normally entered by clerks.

Q: Is there a comparison between LINX costs and Full Featured CMS?

A: Yes. These costs are included in the Appendices. Appendix E is cost for CMS, Appendix F is cost for LINX.

Q: Are the costs going to show that LINX is a better option?

A: No. Based on data provided by the Pierce County CIO, the costs for LINX were greater than for a full-featured CMS. These costs are based on the low range cost estimates provided by the Pierce County CIO.

Q: Is implementing LINX, more expensive than buying Off-the-Shelf?

A: Yes. LINX as it is today is not viable as a statewide application serving multiple courts. The LINX alternative does not employ LINX as it exists today. Most people don't understand the technical architecture of LINX as it is today as compared to how it must be redesigned and rebuilt to be a viable option to be implemented outside of Pierce County. The alternative employs a "new" LINX. That involves re-engineering LINX into a new platform, re-engineering rules engines and establishing contracts and agreements to enable multiple courts to use the application, conducting fit assessments, and establishing a governing process. The new re-platformed LINX is what we looked at as an alternative. While some people tend to think of LINX being "free" because it would be open-source, the LINX alternative really involves a transfer of money to pay for re-platforming the application and performing the activities described above. While there are no licensing costs for LINX, there are costs with re-engineering and setting up governance, support, and maintenance.

In addition, the AOC may be drawn into being responsible for some aspects of maintenance. The stated preference by the JISC and AOC has clearly been to move away from building new applications in-house and more towards buying off the shelf

applications whenever it makes sense to do so ---- leaning more towards integration than custom development.

Q: Some of the larger counties may not choose to use the new application, but we need their data. How will this be accommodated?

A: In the Integration Evaluation deliverable document, these scenarios are contemplated. It discusses data structures and exchanges that will be required. The data structures underneath SCOMIS would continue to survive for historical information. The counties that don't use the new CMS would have to deliver their data to AOC.

Q: How do we keep costs low?

A: The better the courts, JISC and AOC are at managing risks, the lower the costs will be.

Q: When will we know if a product meets all our needs?

A: In the acquisition phase there is an opportunity to see how vendors perform certain processes so all the stakeholders can have confidence that the product will meet their needs. The project team will setup test cases, using information directly from stakeholders and then make the vendor prove that they can do it.

Q: At what point do we look at local jurisdiction integration, like imaging applications?

A: The Integration Evaluation covers this and other aspects of local jurisdiction integration.

Q: There are great benefits to information sharing for public safety like protection orders. Is it technically possible to get all the information we need through data sharing in this new CMS?

A: It can be done. However, it depends upon the capabilities of the Information Networking Hub (INH) and manner in which the application is configured.

Q: Are the costs included for creating the Information Networking Hub (INH) and if not, where is the money coming from?

A: No, they are not included in the SC-CMS project cost estimate. AOC is already working on developing the INH as part of the Transformation & Modernization efforts and it has its own separate funding.

Q: If the CMS will require more data exchange services than we currently have planned for with the Superior Court Data Exchange project, where are the costs accounted for to develop these additional services for CMS?

A: Costs for the current Superior Court Data Exchange project are high because they have to connect to SCOMIS and that's very costly because of the older technology. We anticipate, all future services for the CMS will cost less and have been accounted for in the INH budget as part of the Transformation & Modernization efforts.

Q: Could you use a new CMS and put it on top of SCOMIS?

A: If the new CMS provides all the data for SCOMIS, then it is not cost effective to maintain SCOMIS.

Q: Was King County's CMS looked at as an option?

A: No. The project team met with King County and listened to their concerns and needs for a new CMS. It was not offered or considered as an alternative to be analyzed in the scope approved by the JISC.

Q: If we decide to move forward, do we expect to see any enhancements for COTS or JIS during the six year rollout or is saying "yes" freezing everything we are doing?

A: That depends upon the willingness to adapt. There will be a user group of stakeholders and as court ideas and concerns come up, courts could see modifications to the new CMS along with way. At some point JISC may want to freeze configurations as we add new courts.

Indiana as an example has opted to take advantage of other modules that they didn't start with. As the JISC looks towards changes in the system, it will find that many can be rolled out with a release plan. If it's something Washington Superior Courts need sooner Washington can pay for it to be developed sooner. Vendors don't like to do "one offs" but they want their customers to be able to use the product. Washington will have negotiating power because it is a large state implementation.

Q: Will the CMS share document images across counties?

A: That is a separate request moving through the IT Governance process (request #003) and is outside the scope of the CMS project.

Adult Risk Assessment Discussion (ARA)

Mr. Jeff Hall reported the Superior Court Judges Association (SCJA) for the last year or so has been talking with the legislature about funding for the development an Adult Risk Assessment Tool. ITG Request #081 was submitted by the SCJA prior to our development and implementation of the Governance process.

At the end of the last legislative session, the Legislature did not specifically make an appropriation for an adult risk assessment tool nor did they include doing so in the AOC budget proviso requiring or directing JISC to spend funds to create an ARA tool. They did in a budget note (#5) reference the ARA tool as an expectation for funding. Clearly there is expression of intent by the legislature that a portion of the funds from the mid major projects funding be used to combine data into a standardized validated risk assessment tool.

The Executive Committee decided because of the budget note to bring this forward to the committee in June for discussion rather than wait until August for the regularly scheduled ITG request review.

Mr. Hall stated: the question before the committee today – given the budget note and the clear direction from the legislature, should this project move forward now. Secondarily, this does raise concerns about the legislature being an alternative way to move a propose project through to completion as opposed to going through the governance process. It does not appear this budget note is meant to subvert or circumvent the governance process, I say that because this has been moving in a parallel process through the legislature for obvious political reasons, and there are valid reasons for this to be an exception.

Judge Thomas Wynne moved – that this project be moved directly to scheduling.

Judge J. Leach – asked to amend the motion to include language that this is not viewed as an exception to our governance policy. This request predated our process and this is a one-time exception. Judge Michael Trickey – Second

Ms. Vonnie Diseth confirmed resources are available to start on the project July 1 and completion of the project would be the end of March 2012. At this time, there are no staffing conflicts in ISD in regard to this project. Staffs are available to work on this project and are not committed to work on any other projects.

Voting Yes: Justice Fairhurst, Larry Barker, Linda Bell, Jeff Hall, Judge Heller, William Holmes, N.F. Jackson, Rich Johnson, Judge Leach, Barb Miner, Judge Rosen, Judge Tricky, Yolande Williams
Not Voting: Bob Berg, Marc Lampson, Stew Menefee

Spokane Municipal Request

Justice Fairhurst summarized her expectations; we have two aspects before us:
- Policy decision discussion
- Specific request by Spokane Municipal

Ms. Vonnie Diseth opened by reviewing the major areas for discussion: data sharing, business rules, enterprise architecture requirements, financial process, and security.

Ms. Vonnie Diseth presented the options AOC prepared for discussion:

1. Move ahead now to create a nightly file transfer with the same limited data we receive from Seattle Municipal Court.
2. Add Spokane Municipal to ITG Request #27 to expand Seattle Municipal's data transfer, and Spokane would have to do double data entry until that work is complete. The project could take up to two years to complete.
3. Spokane Municipal would wait to implement JustWare until ITG Request #27 is ready.

Mr. Jim Bledsoe, assistant city attorney for the city of Spokane presented the system Spokane City currently has and what is being proposed to implement. The outcome of this new system will enable clerk and attorney work efforts to be improved by being standardized and more efficient. Information on any case is easily accessible along with reporting and statistical information will be greatly improved. Mr. Bledsoe discussed the use of API's (Application Programming Interface) as being a benefit for future use. AOC stated that API's are not currently an option for exchanging data with JIS.

Mr. Jeff Hall stated AOC is looking for a decision on whether this is generally the standard Spokane would need to meet. The policy contains significant questions, including:

- Who bears the cost of taking the court off of JIS?
- Who bears the cost of putting the court back on if it decides to come back later?
- If there are differences of opinion as to fee splits or other things, whose opinion rules?

Justice Fairhurst: We have a motion from Mr. William Holmes, second by Judge J. Leach to continue the decision to the August 5 meeting. Motion passed unanimously among those members present.
Not voting: Bob Berg, Stew Menefee, Marc Lampson, N.F. Jackson

Jeff Hall moved that the JISC establish an ad hoc workgroup to help AOC staff flesh out the draft policy, with members to be appointed by the Chair. Judge Rosen seconded.

Voting Yes: Justice Fairhurst, Larry Barker, Linda Bell, Jeff Hall, Judge Heller, William Holmes, N.F. Jackson, Rich Johnson, Judge Leach, Barb Miner, Judge Rosen, and Judge Tricky.
Voting – No: Yolande Williams
Not Voting: Bob Berg, Marc Lampson, Stew Menefee

Justice Fairhurst appointed to the workgroup: Barb Miner, Judge Rosen, Judge Staab, Judge Dalton, Linda Bell (chair), Jeff Hall, Vonnie Diseth and staff Ms. Diseth designates.

Mr. Jeff Hall noted that the work of the group should also include the amendment to JISC Rule 13.

Budget Status Report 2009-2011

Mr. Ramsey Radwan reported on the status of the Transformation projects, the current report shows a balance of 4.7 million, left. Not reflected is the 2 million that was moved to the 11-13 biennium or the carry forward for completing transformation projects. We will expend most of the 2.7 million by prepaying maintenance agreements and if there is general fund left we will also try to put money back into the JIS account, to build it up as much as possible to keep the fund balance healthy.

Mr. Radwan presented some graphs on filings for traffic infractions. The trend is showing downward about 3% for fiscal years 2010 and 2011. We are keeping an eye on the trend as it will impact annual revenue collections, which impact a number of other areas including AOC's ability to do projects.

Mr. Radwan also presented the JIS Account budget history and what the legislative impact has been for ongoing and one-time transfers. The total increase in expenditures since 1997 has been about 28 million dollars on the JIS account.

Mr. Radwan stated that right now it is unclear if the 6 million dollar fund swap is permanent or not. If this is permanent this will fundamentally change the way we approach requesting money to the legislature.

Budget/Legislative Update 2011-2013

Mr. Jeff Hall reported on the two budget provisos relative to JIS money, the first was for the two equipment replacement fund requests they lumped together, stating that money can only be used for replacing equipment. The rest of the funding does not have a proviso; they are not directly limiting us to the use of the funds.

For the CMS acquisition there are a couple of reporting requirements, the first being the results of the Feasibility Study, a report is due by September 30. The second is a report on the Data Exchange and where we are with the procurement process for the CMS. This report is due no later than December 31.

Mr. Jeff Hall also reported on the recommendations made to the Supreme Court for the 1.5 million dollar AOC budget reduction.

Committee Reports

Mr. Rich Johnson provided updates on the Data Management Steering Committee projects. Please see "Informational Materials" section below for summaries.

Judge Thomas Wynne provided an update on the Data Dissemination Committee which met on May 20. The Committee considered a request by an attorney that the Attorney Search feature on the public website either be password-protected or else eliminated. The Committee asked for more information from staff prior to making a decision.

The Committee considered the request of Snohomish County Juvenile Court that the county mental health counselor who works with juveniles detained in Juvenile Hall have access to view JCS information on those juveniles. The Committee agreed that the court could give the counselor access to JCS for those juveniles currently in juvenile hall. The Committee further decided that if it was necessary for the request to proceed through the ITG process that the request should come back to the Committee for review if implementation would cost more than $5,000. [After the meeting it was determined that the counselor could be granted the necessary access by means of an existing security profile for the juvenile courts; therefore, implementation costs are minimal.]

Some district courts report parking tickets in a way that show the vehicle's registered owner as the "defendant" on the public case search on the website. A recommendation was made to change this as it should not be reported this way. The Committee suggested that the DMCJA court analyst who brought this to the Committee's attention file this as an ITG request and have it analyzed by the CLJ Clug to endorse this and give it priority.

Judge Wynne announced that Judge J. Leach will be joining the Data Dissemination Committee as the Appellate Court representative.

Judge Wynne reported that the JISC Executive Committee decided on June 8, 2011, that JIS users with level 22 access (law enforcement and other criminal justice agencies) should not have access to any information on the existence of sealed juvenile cases, based on the language in the juvenile records statutes.

Informational Materials

A. Superior Court Data Exchange

AOC has completed the evaluation of vendor proposals for completing the SCDX. Sierra Systems was selected as the Apparent Successful Vendor. AOC has initiated contract negotiations with Sierra Systems on scope and proposed pricing for implementing the SCDX and is continuing to work on developing SCDX functional specifications and Interface Exchange Package Documentation (IEPD) for each SCDX web service.

B. Vehicle Related Violations

Forward progress is being made on all fronts of the VRV DX project. All three tier 1 courts have lined up their technical solution provider and are either in contract negotiation or are in the process of implementing the web service. Mr. Mike Walsh and the AOC project team continue to meet regularly with Issaquah, Kirkland, and Lakewood court staff to review team progress, identify potential risks, project issues and provide on boarding assistance.

The RMS project was implemented successfully on June 12th. This has allowed DIS to refocus on the JINDEX on-boarding process and to initiate the JINDEX release cycle with the VRV tier 1 courts. Mr. Mike Walsh and the eTRIP operational team are working to finalize the JINDEX Business and Technical assessment forms. The completed forms are needed to accept VRV partners into the release schedule. The Tier 1 on boarding partners are poised to meet the August schedule and be accepted into the first post-RMS new JINDEX release schedule. The AOC VRV project team is continuing to work with the JSD Line 1 support and ISD staff on the VRV Operations Planning. The dissolution of what is currently the Department of Information Services and the reorganization of the JINDEX operations support into the new Consolidated Technical Services (CTS) may put the August Target date at risk.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be August 5, 2011, at the AOC SeaTac facility; from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Action Items:

	Action Items – From March 4th Meeting		
1	At the end of the legislative session, ask the Supreme Court Rules Committee if it wants the Data Dissemination Committee to revisit GR15 in light of *Ishikawa* and *Bone-Club*.	Vicky Marin, Justice Fairhurst	Pending end of legislative session.
2	Draft JIS Policy on comment to the BJA/Legislature reflecting JISC consensus from March 4th meeting.	Vicky Marin	*Postponed*
3	Amend JIS ITG Policy per JISC vote on 3/4/11	Vicky Marin	*Postponed*
	Action Items – From June 24th Meeting		
4	AOC staff will collect the questions and answers from the SCMFS public sessions and post them on the SCMFS web page after each session	Heather Morford	
5	AOC staff will address the risks identified by MTG in the	Kate Kruller	

	SCMFS feasibility study and bring those back for the August 5th meeting.		
6	An ad hoc workgroup will be formed and will meet at least once before the next JISC meeting on August 5. The purpose of the workgroup will be to develop the JIS draft policy on the JIS local automated court systems and also work on a proposed amendment to JISC Rule 13.	Linda Bell Chair	