

JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE

Sept 06, 2013
9:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.
AOC Office, SeaTac, WA

Minutes

Members Present:

Mr. Larry Barker
Chief Robert Berg
Judge Jeanette Dalton (phone)
Ms. Callie Dietz
Justice Mary Fairhurst, Chair
Judge James Heller
Mr. William Holmes
Mr. Rich Johnson
Judge J. Robert Leach
Ms. Marti Maxwell
Mr. Steward Menefee
Ms. Barb Miner
Judge Steven Rosen
Ms. Aimee Vance
Ms. Yolande Williams
Judge Thomas J. Wynne

Members Absent:

Ms. Joan Kleinberg

AOC/Temple Staff Present:

Mr. Kevin Ammons
Ms. Kathy Bradley
Ms. Vicky Cullinane
Ms. Vonnie Diseth
Ms. Stephanie Happold
Mr. Martin Kravik
Ms. Kate Kruller
Mr. Dirk Marler
Ms. Pam Payne
Mr. Ramsey Radwan
Ms. Maribeth Sapinosa
Justice Debra Stephens
Mr. Mike Walsh
Ms. Heather Williams (phone)
Mr. Kumar Yajamanam

Guests Present:

Ms. Lea Ennis
Ms. Vanessa Torres Hernandez (phone)
Ms. Jill Mackie
Mr. Frank Maiocco
Mr. Brian Rowe
Mr. Phil Talmadge
Mr. Roland Thompson
Mr. Cliff Webster
Mr. Kyle Wicherts
Mr. John Woodring
Mr. David Zeeck

Call to Order

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

July 19, 2013 Meeting Minutes

Justice Fairhurst asked if there were any additions or corrections to the July 19 meeting minutes, hearing none, Justice Fairhurst deemed them approved.

JIS Budget Update (13-15 Biennium)

Mr. Ramsey Radwan provided the budget update for the 2013-2015 biennium. The green sheet, representing the amount allocated for projects listed, shows only the expenditures for the month of July, due to the new biennium beginning with that month. The allotments have been completed, pending some minor adjustments that will have no immediate impact. Additional funding from vacancy savings will be added if they come available over the next several months. The annual trend in revenue generated from traffic infractions has continued to decline, although July showed a slight increase.

JIS Supplemental Budget Decision Packages

Ms. Vonnie Diseth presented to the committee the proposed 2014 Supplemental Budget requests. Requests include funding for SC-CMS project, Appellate Court ECMS project, Infrastructure Maintenance costs and IT Security Enhancements.

Motion: Ms. Marti Maxwell

I move that the JISC approve the 2014 Supplemental Decision Packages for the Superior Court Case Management System, Appellate Court Enterprise Document Management System, IT security improvements, and infrastructure maintenance.

Second: Mr. Larry Barker

Voting in Favor: Mr. Larry Barker, Chief Robert Berg, Judge Jeanette Dalton (phone), Ms. Callie Dietz, Judge James Heller, Mr. William Holmes, Judge J. Robert Leach, Ms. Marti Maxwell, Judge Steven Rosen, Judge Thomas J. Wynne, Mr. Stew Menefee, Ms. Barb Miner, Justice Fairhurst, Mr. Rich Johnson, Ms. Aimee Vance, and Ms. Yolande Williams.

Opposed: None

Absent: Judge Jeanette Dalton, Ms. Joan Kleinberg

Draft 2014 Schedule and JISC Meeting Start Time

The draft schedule for 2014 was presented to the committee for approval. The new schedule accommodates for the Data Dissemination Committee (DDC) to meet prior to the JISC meetings.

The new schedule will adopt a JISC meeting time of 10:00 am to 2:00 pm. Which will allow for the DDC to meet from 8:30 am to 10:00 am.

Justice Mary Fairhurst confirmed by way of agreement the JISC meeting will meet from 10-2 with the option of a 9:00 start time if decisions needing to be made warrant additional time.

Justice Mary Fairhurst asked if this was acceptable to the body. The new start time will begin for the December 6, 2013 meeting.

JISC Bylaw Change for Data Dissemination Committee

Judge Thomas Wynne presented a proposed amendment to the JISC Bylaws for the Data Dissemination Committee (DDC). The amendment would look to add an administrator for the Courts of Limited Jurisdiction (CLJ) to the DDC. The language change would provide allow for superior court or juvenile court administrators, and a CLJ Court administrator. A recommendation was made by Ms. Aimee Vance for the language to be altered to a member of the District and Municipal Court Management Association (DMCMA). This would allow active members of the association, including court managers in addition to court administrators, to serve on the DDC. Justice Fairhurst clarified that the proposed amendment not only would add a CLJ administrator to the DDC, but would alter the language from "a trial court administrator" to "a superior court or juvenile court administrator," and any motion would need to account for this change in language.

Motion: Judge Thomas Wynne

I move to approve an amendment to the JISC Bylaws to indicate that either a superior court or juvenile court administrator can be appointed, as well as a member of the District and Municipal Court Management Association to the membership of the Data Dissemination Committee.

Second: Judge J. Robert Leach

Voting in Favor: Mr. Larry Barker, Chief Robert Berg, Ms. Callie Dietz, Judge James Heller, Mr. William Holmes, Judge J. Robert Leach, Ms. Marti Maxwell, Judge Steven Rosen, Judge Thomas J. Wynne, Mr. Stew Menefee, Ms. Barb Miner, Justice Fairhurst, Mr. Rich Johnson, Ms. Aimee Vance, and Ms. Yolande Williams. Judge Jeanette Dalton (phone)

Opposed: None

Absent: Ms. Joan Kleinberg

JIS Data Dissemination Policy Amendment

Judge Wynne presented the JISC with a proposed policy amendment for the DDC. The proposed amendment would relate to the dissemination of information relating to juvenile court records. The Legislature had previously established a joint legislative taskforce on juvenile records and sealing. There was significant interest from the Legislature regarding the status of juvenile records as public records. AOC staff was involved in a wide-ranging discussion on juvenile records. The fiscal impact of the proposed legislation was over \$1 million dollars. From a JIS and AOC standpoint, the legislation would impact AOC and ongoing projects in a significant manner. The funding required to enact the proposed legislation would remove funds from the SC-CMS and AC-ECMS projects, and AOC staff would need to be dedicated to enacting the changes and pulled away from other work. The proposed legislation did not pass the Legislature this session, with Representative Ruth Kagi the lead legislator pushing for passage of the juvenile records bill. Ms. Callie Dietz noted the BJA and AOC are not taking a position on the policy, only providing background on the fiscal and personnel impact of the legislation. The estimate for work needed to update the current systems is between 8,000 and 12,000 hours. A meeting with members of the House of Representatives is scheduled to provide an overview of the systems and the degree of difficulty in enacting requirements set forth in the legislation. Ms. Dietz notes the completion of the SC-CMS Odyssey system would provide an easier solution, but the time necessary could be an issue. Judge Wynne noted King County Superior Court has a rule in place that prohibits the electronic dissemination of juvenile or family court records from the Clerk's office. Records would still be available through JIS Link. Bulk distribution of records would be prohibited. Electronic records would still be available, but a limit on the manner of distribution would be imposed. Letters submitted to the JISC have been included in the meeting materials for review.

Ms. Barb Miner discussed the letter the Washington State Association of County Clerks submitted in opposition to the proposed change, and felt the change would be contrary to GR 31. Ms. Miner felt the change would result in more need for people to physically travel to courthouses, and the public would think of this change as an attempt to obfuscate the records. The opposition is about the policy of access, and making record access more difficult goes against the intent of GR 31.

Mr. Phil Talmadge, representing the Rental Housing Association of Washington (RHA), noted realtors and landlord groups use the data generated in JIS. Mr. Talmadge reviewed some of the history behind the Juvenile Justice Act of 1979 (Act), and the implementation issues of the Act. Questions about juvenile records and their confidentiality has been a legislative issue for quite some time. If the Legislature wants to restrict access to records from AOC, it is a matter for the Legislature, not the DDC. Juvenile records are public records, and should remain so until decreed otherwise. The proposed amendment has implications not only to GR 31, but also implications under Article 1 Section 10. The RHA asks the JISC not to adopt the policy, as it has a substantive effect, and to allow the Legislature to enact any changes of this nature. Judge Steven Rosen asked if dockets were listed on the public website for juvenile courts, or only case numbers. The response was some information is available, depending on case types and archiving. In follow-up, Judge Rosen asked Mr. Talmadge about his opposition, considering the RHA utilizes JIS Link to access records, and that will not be affected by the proposed policy change. Mr. Talmadge noted they rely on bulk dissemination of records, and that service provides them background information that includes these records amongst other information on potential tenants. Judge Rosen noted this forces those desiring the information to have current and correct information directly from JIS as opposed to sites that may not update frequently, which is a step in the right direction.

Mr. John Woodring, representing the RHA, noted they provide a tenant screening service that depends on information provided from credit bureaus that disseminate information in a large expeditious manner. Mr. Woodring expressed attempts to control the ability to gather information and provide it to their members would be problematic for the RHA. The RHA has a responsibility under the Residential Landlord Tenant Act, and under common law court cases to protect the health, safety, and welfare of their tenants and members.

Mr. Cliff Webster, representing Consumer Data Industry Association, expressed objections to the proposed amendment. If companies are obtaining information in violation of bulk-use contracts, the appropriate remedy should be to enforce the provisions of the contract. Restricting the manner of access to the information proposed is inappropriate and may be unconstitutional due to discrimination against users who get information. The Consumer Data Industry Association believes the Legislature is the proper venue to determine restrictions to records access.

Mr. Roland Thompson of the Allied Daily Newspapers of Washington spoke in opposition to the proposed amendment. Mr. Thompson felt the amendment disenfranchises the public, be it realtors, employers, or families. Only those with the financial resources to hire someone to research the needed information will have access to the justice system. In the past, when bulk distribution was instituted, the system was slowed due to crawlers, and if the proposed changes are implemented, the system could crash as a result of similar data searches. There will be more subscribers, but the system will suffer. The policy does not delineate between what is a records request and what is a bulk distribution. There has been no discussion of the rules for requests. The stream of information will be diverted from the public sites to the offices of the court clerks. Those who currently desire the information will still be looking to acquire the records, and will be attempting to get it in some fashion. The contracts in place for bulk distribution affords some sort of legal means to control the companies seeking the records, but there will be zero control if they come to the courts with records requests. A letter was sent to the DDC seeking clarification on how clients can access the records, along with a legal analysis. Judge Wynne noted a request was made of the AOC on if the proposal would clog up the JIS

Link system and was told this would not be an issue, and there was sufficient capacity to handle the changes.

Ms. Stephanie Happold, the AOC's Data Dissemination Administrator, noted increased JIS Link and JIS-SCOMIS data will not be a challenge from a performance standpoint. Coding for the index would have to be modified, which would probably take less than 100 hours to complete, and coding for the public website would need modifications with a similar time requirement.

Mr. Rich Johnson asked for clarification on the costs related to the proposed amendment. Ms. Miner responded the time estimates provided in the 8,000 to 12,000 hour range related to fiscal notes prepared for legislative proposals over the last several years that had a broader scope than the proposal before the committee that would require less time to implement. Mr. Johnson followed up inquiring if a cost analysis had been conducted for the proposal from the DDC. Judge Wynne responded it would amount to between 200 and 300 hours.

Judge J. Robert Leach asked about if this would establish a two-tier system for bulk information, those who can afford it will get it and those who cannot afford a bulk transfer through a private crawler will not have access. Mr. Radwan noted the bulk transfer data goes to a reseller company that has a JIS Link contract. Judge Leach clarified, asking if this will prevent a purveyor of bulk information from getting the information by adopting this process, or does this just make it more expensive so that only some people have access to that bulk information. Mr. Thompson felt this was a fair assessment of his stance, and added that if there is incomplete or inaccurate information in the system, and other sources are available to complete the information, then there will be people stuck with incomplete information due to lack of resources and finances. Judge Leach asked if the proposed amendment may result in an increase in the dissemination of incomplete information, to which Mr. Thompson expressed doubt as to the final outcome. Under the current system, there are controls on what bulk information is available for dissemination, but if this stops, there may not be the same levels of control of information gathering. Judge Rosen was unsure if he could answer the concerns completely. He noted access would still be available through commercial companies for clientele needing specific information, and these companies would likely utilize JIS Link in addition to other information gathering systems to acquire a profile. Judge Rosen also noted juvenile records are the most likely to change over time. Ms. Miner sought to clarify that online records accuracy and completeness could be overstated in the current discussion. The value of the index is that it lists each case and the offenders who have a case, and while some do not have a document listing, it is not incomplete. With or without crawlers, it will cost you more to come in to a courthouse, both in terms of time and money.

Ms. Vanessa Hernandez of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Washington expressed concern with relying on the index as a record for case activity, as it is not updated as frequently and includes cases that were dropped, associated with a different individual, or proceed to trial.

Mr. William Holmes noted his experience working with the juvenile justice system, and his view that the record use has less to do with the existence of the record, rather the interpretation and misapplication of the information that other people have. The ability to control this aspect of the records, and this allows for making those records more comprehensive and individual, which is a positive thing. Mr. Holmes expressed his support for moving forward in restricting juvenile records.

Judge Wynne referenced the materials submitted made reference to GR-15, which will not be affected in any way by the proposed amendment before the committee.

Mr. Brian Rowe, with Access to Justice, noted there is a challenge for end users to access information and get a complete file of information that is used by third parties. It is not like going to the court system where you can get access to all of the information about your own record and easily get it updated. There is a strong concern for keeping accurate files and providing individuals direct access to those files so they can be updated.

Motion: Judge Wynne

I move to adopt the Data Dissemination Committee's proposed amendment to the Data Dissemination Policy limiting dissemination of juvenile offender court records.

Second: Ms. Marti Maxwell

Voting in Favor: Mr. Larry Barker, Chief Robert Berg, Judge Jeanette Dalton (phone), Ms. Callie Dietz, Judge James Heller, Mr. William Holmes, Judge J. Robert Leach, Ms. Marti Maxwell, Judge Steven Rosen, Judge Thomas J. Wynne

Opposed: Mr. Stew Menefee and Ms. Barb Miner

Abstain: Justice Fairhurst, Mr. Rich Johnson, Ms. Aimee Vance, and Ms. Yolande Williams

Absent: Joan Kleinberg

JIS Priority Project #3 (ITG 45) Appellate Court ECMS

Mr. Martin Kravik presented a status update on the AC-ECMS project. He reported that contract negotiations with ImageSoft Inc. had been ongoing from May through August 2013.

On August 20, 2013, the Project Executive Steering Committee met and approved a review draft of the contract and the recommendation that was carried forward to the JISC.

During discussion, Yolande Williams asked if the JISC-approved budget amount is enough to cover implementation. Mr. Kravik replied that with sales tax on contracted services and anticipated training costs the amount was just enough.

Significant next steps include contract execution, project kickoff, development of the project implementation schedule, and the initiation of analysis and design by the vendor.

Motion: Stew Menefee

I move to adopt the Appellate Court ECMS Project Executive Steering Committee recommendation to execute a contract with ImageSoft Inc. to acquire and implement an Appellate Court Enterprise Content Management System.

Second: Chief Robert Berg

Voting in Favor: Mr. Larry Barker, Chief Robert Berg, Judge Jeanette Dalton (phone), Ms. Callie Dietz, Judge James Heller, Mr. William Holmes, Judge J. Robert Leach, Ms. Marti Maxwell, Judge Steven Rosen, Judge Thomas J. Wynne, Mr. Stew Menefee, Ms. Barb Miner, Justice Fairhurst, Mr. Rich Johnson, Ms. Aimee Vance, and Ms. Yolande Williams

Opposed: None

Absent: Joan Kleinberg

ITG #2 - SC-CMS Update

Ms. Maribeth Sapinoso provided an update to the committee on the SC-CMS project. She began by welcoming and recognizing Mr. Mike Walsh PMP, as the new Deputy Project Manager. Ms. Sapinoso shared the contract was signed on July 25, 2013.

Work began with a joint meeting with Tyler Technologies' Technical staff and AOC Technical Teams from SC-CMS, INH, and COTS Prep. AOC provided an overview of our architecture, infrastructure and our recommendation for the integration. Tyler Technologies presented an overview of their infrastructure, methodologies and approach.

The Project Steering Committee has finalized the revised charter that was originally created for the RFP Development and Acquisition Phase. The new charter will take the project from the Planning and Implementation stages to project completion. Ms. Vonnice Diseth will present the revised charter, which by legislative proviso requires JISC approval.

The SC-CMS project team has been working with Tyler to coordinate activities for the upcoming Project Kick-Off meetings.

Ms. Sapinoso recognized the Court User Workgroup (CUWG) for the work in preparing for project implementation. The CUWG has been working diligently on Business Process Flows. There are approximately 120 current flows of which 50 have been validated and approved by the CUWG. They are currently reviewing 30. Tyler has reported they have enough information from the completed flows thus far to conduct the Business Fit Analysis.

One of the major activities completed was requesting Counties' interest to participate as Pilot candidates. We received a total of 10 responses, a very exciting 25% of total counties in the state. Each candidate was asked to complete a Readiness Checklist that will be scored and ranked. This information will be provided to the Steering Committee to aid in the selection of the Pilot Sites. The Steering Committee will meet Tuesday, September 10 to complete the selection. The Readiness Checklist focused on three main categories; resource availability for communications and training, for data and reporting and from the technical side. Each candidate was contacted to ask about their IT governance process, how quickly decisions can be made, and process and ability to handle policy changes. This information will also be provided to the steering committee to help finalize a decision on who the pilot site(s) will be.

Ms. Sapinoso shared the High Level Implementation Schedule that is now in line with Tyler's phased project plan.

Ms. Sapinoso answered the question to what does it mean to be a pilot court v's an early adopter:

Pilot Courts – are sites that will establish the state wide configuration for the “Pilot Release”.

Early Adopters – are sites that will test the roll out of the implementation. This will fine tune the implementation process through the early adopters

Ms. Vonnice Diseth presented the committee with Project Steering Committee's recommended revised charter. She pointed out the highlights of difference from the original charter for the RFP. This charter is focused on the remainder of the whole implementation through the five

years of the project. The members remain the same, with the exception of Kevin Stock coming back on committee. On the previous charter Ms. Callie Dietz and Ms. Diseth were limited voting members that has changed for them to have full voting rights.

Motion: Mr. Rich Johnson

I move that the JISC approve the revised SC-CMS Project Steering Committee Charter, v1.0, dated August 20, 2013.

Second: Judge Thomas J. Wynne

Voting in Favor: Mr. Larry Barker, Chief Robert Berg, Judge Jeanette Dalton (phone), Ms. Callie Dietz, Judge James Heller, Mr. William Holmes, Judge J. Robert Leach, Ms. Marti Maxwell, Judge Steven Rosen, Judge Thomas J. Wynne, Mr. Stew Menefee, Ms. Barb Miner, Justice Fairhurst, Mr. Rich Johnson, Ms. Aimee Vance, and Ms. Yolande Williams

Opposed: None

Abstain: Ms. Marti Maxwell

Absent: Joan Kleinberg

Mr. Frank Maiocco addressed the issue for establishing criteria for local court implementation costs. After the previous JISC meeting, the SC-CMS Steering Committee spent time discussing the issue and shared the concerns of the JISC about the possibility of a blank check. On the other side of the issue, it is difficult to get a thorough understanding of the true costs of local court implementation. A single-page draft was included in the meeting materials that details criteria for consideration and approval. These criteria have been established over the past year and a half. The JISC had previously approved conceptually the notion of providing funding for local court implementation costs, and there was a very rough estimate on the costs. The draft document provides an update on those costs, and includes items that may once have been deemed out-of-scope that are now relevant, and financials would be one of the significant items here. The Steering Committee feels clerks will now be spending more time involved in the planning and implementation of the financial portion of the new system. There may be some local decisions regarding document management systems and the desire to maintain legacy systems or adopt Tyler Technologies' solution. The difficulty in trying to come up with a thorough cost analysis has included trying to address all the potential decisions courts may wrestle with, and the needs for some courts to bring in a project manager to assist in implementation. Justice Fairhurst noted this item was included as a discussion point to provide feedback for the Steering Committee, and no final decision is intended at this meeting.

Mr. Radwan wished to clarify the point that the draft presents costs/functional categories, not criteria by which the categories and costs would flow through. A lot of work remains on the percentage of funding provided by the JISC or through other funding. The current budget allocation for local court implementation costs are \$1.9 million and that is over a 6-year period, which will likely be an inadequate fund as time progresses. Mr. Radwan warned the body needs to be careful as to what is agreed to regarding the criteria of the costs or functional categories. Is it 100% funding for everything or some sort of different filter the costs would have to proceed through? This is a caution from a dollars standpoint, not necessarily a policy standpoint.

Ms. Miner noted the language is specific to divide areas into specific categories, and that expenses would probably be in paying a pro tem to do court work while a judge, administrator, or clerk is completing work on the implementation of the new system.

Justice Fairhurst asked if the JISC should be anticipating the need for a supplemental budget request to assist with the local court implementation costs, and that those present should be thinking on this issue and the manner in which to present such a request to the Legislature. Mr. Radwan noted work is always being done to ensure positive relations with the Legislature, and if the costs allocated in the current budget are too low when the implementation begins, a supplemental request will be made after being brought back to the JISC.

Ms. Miner sought clarification about whether the criteria was relevant to the motion that was passed at the previous JISC meeting on July 19? Mr. Radwan felt that this would not represent 100% of the items on a list for costs, and would be leery of approving these categories in the event something missed needs to be added. There should be a list of possible costs that could be covered by the JIS, and then the criteria that need to be applied would be rated accordingly. Ms. Miner stated this was not clear to the Steering Committee, and represented a significant change from previous assumptions. Mr. Radwan felt the criteria would be used to get to a certain percentage dollar amount, and Ms. Miner felt the criteria would be categories, and the disconnect could be due to the description given compared to the work the Steering Committee has been performing.

Judge Leach asked if the thought was, if an expense meets certain criteria, then the JISC has approved 100% funding up to a cap. Ms. Miner responded that this is part of what needs to be determined and made clear. The question remains on what percentage of funding will be approved, and what dollar amount constitutes the cap, neither of which have been voted on by the JISC. Ms. Miner noted the Steering Committee might be working under different assumptions, and the category discussion would cover what was voted on during the July 19 meeting, with the JISC covering local expenses if they fall under certain criteria.

Mr. Johnson agreed with Mr. Radwan's refinement of criteria versus categories, and noted categories may not be the same as criteria. The difficulty in developing the proposed categories is to be respected, but the level of detail is lacking and some may be budget busters if interpreted in a broad sense. While the local courts could view the lack of funding as a potential deal breaker, and that is what prompted the vote previously to provide said funding, the potential costs could be a deal breaker in the other direction.

Judge Wynne noted this would be brought back to the JISC at some point in the future, and would like a more in-depth discussion to occur before that point which should include Mr. Radwan's views.

Ms. Yolande Williams asked about documents regarding the clarification of local court implementation costs, and Mr. Maiocco responded that not all the documentation was recorded, but a summary could be generated that reflects the development of the proposed costs. Ms. Miner noted there are several categories included that could change from large values to nothing, depending on what Tyler Technologies brings to the table, and why estimates are not set in stone.

Ms. Diseth noted a decision is before the JISC for the entire project based on information that is not available yet, and there are two pilot courts to get running, and the early adopter courts, so if

the costs could be focused on the two pilot courts and King County. If this requires some sort of cap or not is undetermined, and will provide needed information about how the configuration will play out. Then, broad-based decisions can be answered for the roll-out to all the counties.

Mr. Johnson presented an example of criteria that may qualify for local court implementation costs, and an example that may not, depending on the existing systems of the courts and the desire to keep or discard previous systems. If the functionality of a desired side-system is inherent in the new Odyssey system, the costs to keep the side-system and integrate with Odyssey should not be covered by the local court implementation costs and the JISC. Ms. Miner felt this would be extremely problematic, as many offices already have significant document management systems and the offices would likely not want the system included in Odyssey. The policy decisions associated with document management for each court would be significant, and having to pay their own costs would be a major point of contention.

Justice Fairhurst expressed concern that having most courts keeping their individual systems would be counterproductive to bringing in the new system in the first place. There is a core case management system that needs to be the focus.

Ms. Diseth asked about having Tyler Technologies provide a presentation at the next JISC meeting as part of their kick-off. This would allow better information access and the chance to ask questions. Justice Fairhurst was interested, as were others, and a vote was conducted to determine the level of interest. The agenda would be set by Ms. Diseth, Ms. Dietz, and the Steering Committee to determine what information would be beneficial for the JISC to be briefed on.

Ms. Marti Maxwell described her experience with side-systems. Some definition of what would qualify as a side-system may be needed prior to a decision being made. Ms. Miner noted there are a lot of side-systems, especially in King County, and Tyler Technologies does not necessarily have an equivalent system built that would be comparable. Justice Fairhurst noted that King County needs to be set aside in their own scope, as the number of systems and their needs is different than the needs of many smaller counties. The focus should be on the pilot courts.

Justice Fairhurst requested the Steering Committee work on refinements of the criteria/categories, coming back next month to clarify the anticipated needs for the courts.

ITG #121 Superior Court Data Exchange Update

Mr. Mike Walsh presented the update on the Superior Court Data Exchange (SCDX) Project. Mr. Walsh informed the JISC that Pierce County is continuing their efforts to implement the six data exchanges they have committed to completing. AOC deployed a small modification to SCOMIS which corrected a dual docket entry issue that had arisen. Mr. Walsh also reported that Pierce County was working to correct two issues they had encountered during their testing. If Pierce County is able to resolve the issues quickly, Mr. Walsh reported that the exchanges may start being used by Pierce County during the month of September. Mr. Walsh also reported that King County had begun some efforts to utilize three services, but no target date has been set by King County to complete development and testing.

ITG #41 Remove CLJ Archiving and Purge Certain Records

Ms. Kate Kruller, ITG 41 Project Manager, updated the JISC on project activity. A great deal of progress occurred since the last report, along with some schedule adjustments as well.

Key Milestone Achieved - In early June, ITG 41 Project completed the bulk restoration of Courts of Limited Jurisdiction (CLJ) court cases from archive tapes to the active tables. This was a vital aspect of the first stage of the ITG 41 Project. This achievement means that local courts now have access to all cases without making an archive retrieval request.

Every effort was made to minimize impacts to the production system during regular business hours. This included processing cases between 5 p.m. and 8 a.m. – along with working on weekends. The Project Team restored seven (7) million active cases from 1,080 archive tape volumes in just **100** days.

Current Project Status - The ITG 41 Project is now in the Development phase. There are two iterations of development: (1) Re code JIS to apply current destruction rules, plus eTicket and VRV compliance rules (the Project Team calls these ‘Current and Preliminary Rules”) and (2) Apply any new record retention and destruction rules per the outcome of JISC policy determinations (the Project Team calls these “New Rules”).

Iteration 1 Development is still underway. Progress to date is that the code has been submitted for Code Review. Then there will be an intensive Unit Testing and Quality Assurance Testing.

Project Team planning sessions are underway to size up how this Iteration 1 code set will be applied in Production environment – placed out into the daily business activity area of the local courts. January, 2014 is targeted for this step. This means the ITG 41 Project is taking more time than originally scheduled to complete this work. Primarily, some resource availability issues and a real interest in providing an optimal code set when we deploy, are driving the schedule downstream somewhat.

Iteration 2 Development will begin when the policy is set on new record retention and destruction rules per the outcome of JISC determinations. The ITG 41 Project continues to assist, by providing project information as needed, to aid the JISC, JISC Work Group or DDC in any policy draft update determinations or efforts to refine the proposed changes.

INH Data Exchange Initiative

Mr. Dan Belles, Project Manager, provided a status update on the Information Networking Hub (INH) Project. Mr. Belles began by stating the INH project continued to make good progress building and testing INH services in the last month. Mr. Belles stated that the project was finishing work on the final set of data exchanges for Release 1 that would support the SC CMS pilot court. Mr. Belles stated that the project team had also been working on a presentation to Tyler to explain the INH strategy and get their feedback. Mr. Belles said the presentation went well, and that Tyler understood the reasoning for the current INH strategy and did not have any major concerns. Mr. Belles said that Tyler did have some questions and ideas about how the strategy could be implemented, but those questions would be resolved during the “integration fit analysis” starting late in October and November. Mr. Belles stated that work on the Enterprise Data Repository (EDR) had slowed quite bit as the team was involved in preparing for the presentation to Tyler, but that work was expected to resume in September.

Mr. Belles then provided an overview of the project schedule including the individual timelines for the INH Middleware and EDR subprojects and the data quality automation effort. Mr. Belles stated that a new timeline was added to show the integration work with Tyler that was starting in September of 2013 and running through November 2014.

Mr. Belles then reviewed current project risks, issues and mitigation strategies. Mr. Belles stated that there were no new risks other than those expected with the integration with Odyssey. Mr. Belles stated that integration risks included the unknown interactions with the systems using the data exchanges, not having processes in place to make technical decisions quickly and not having the right resources to make the changes needed in a timely manner. Mr. Belles concluded his presentation by covering the next steps in the project, which he said would focus on completing work on the middleware services and the EDR.

Committee Reports

Data Dissemination Committee:

Judge Thomas Wynne reported the Data Dissemination Committee is working on GR 15, and an update on this work will take a significant amount of time at the next JISC meeting.

Data Management Steering Committee:

Mr. Rich Johnson stated work is being done with AOC staff to look at the existing charter and determine what if any changes in the charter need to be made as things move forward.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Justice Fairhurst at 12:10 p.m.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be October 25, 2013, at the AOC SeaTac Facility; from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Action Items

	Action Item – From October 7th 2011 Meeting	Owner	Status
1	Confer with the BJA on JISC bylaw amendment regarding JISC communication with the legislature.	Justice Fairhurst	