JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE

April 24, 2015
10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.
AOC Office, SeaTac, WA

DRAFT - Minutes

Members Present:
Justice Mary Fairhurst, Chair
Mr. Larry Barker
Chief Robert Berg
Judge Jeanette Dalton
Ms. Callie Dietz
Ms. Delilah George – phone
Chief Ed Green
Judge James Heller
Mr. Rich Johnson
Judge J. Robert Leach
Ms. Barb Miner
Ms. Brooke Powell
Mr. Bob Taylor
Ms. Aimee Vance
Judge Thomas J. Wynne

Members Absent:
Judge Steven Rosen
Mr. Jon Tunheim
Ms. Yolande Williams

AOC/Temple Staff Present:
Mr. Kevin Ammons
Mr. Dan Belles
Ms. Kathy Bradley
Ms. Misty Butler
Ms. Marie Constantineau
Ms. Jennifer Creighton
Ms. Vicky Cullinane
Ms. Vonnie Diseth
Mr. Mike Keeling
Mr. Eric Kruger – phone
Mr. Dirk Marler
Ms. Mellani McAleenan – phone
Ms. Pam Payne
Mr. Ramsey Radwan
Ms. Maribeth Sapinoso
Ms. Heather Stoffle
Mr. Mike Walsh
Mr. Kumar Yajamanam

Guests Present:
Judge Donna Tucker
Judge Corinna Harn
Mr. Othniel Palomino
Mr. Bill Kehoe
Mr. Enrique Kuttemplon
Mr. Allen Mills
Mr. Roland Thompson

Call to Order

Justice Mary Fairhurst called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. and introductions were made.

March 06, 2015 Meeting Minutes

Justice Fairhurst asked if there were any additional corrections to the March 6, 2015 meeting minutes. Hearing none, Justice Fairhurst deemed them approved.

JIS Budget Update (13-15 Biennium)

Mr. Ramsey Radwan reported on the allocated and expenditures for the projects. One adjustment to report on the green sheet, is a 2015 supplemental budget request to move $313,000 of ECMS funding to the ensuing biennium because the project is taking a bit longer than expected. That is not reflected yet, because they have not approved the request. It is in both the House and Senate 2015 supplemental budget proposals, the report will reflect the shift upon approval of the legislature. This will cover costs approved after June 2015.

Mr. Ramsey Radwan provided a: **State Revenue & Budget Update**

- The current economic and revenue operating environment in much the same as it was in November 2014 (the previous forecast date).

- As of the February 20, 2015 forecast, general fund revenue is expected to increase by 8.7% to about $36.5 billion for the biennium ending June 30, 2017 and revenue for the biennium ending June 30, 2019 is expected to increase 9.1% to $39.8 billion ($3.3 b between biennia)
- The increase in revenue for 2015-2017 is about $2.9 billion. The increase necessary to maintain and fund new and existing programs is $2.1 billion, leaving $800 million for policy additions. Almost 75% ($2.1 billion) of the new revenue will be used to fund programs and costs previously implemented by the state legislature.
- There are definitional issues between what the Governor identifies as ongoing costs and what the Senate identifies as ongoing costs (about a $1.1 billion difference).
- McCleary still needs to be funded at $1.5b - $2.0 billion.
- Initiative 1351 is estimated to cost $2 billion during the 15-17 unless amended by the legislature.
- Even though revenue is projected to increase, costs are also increasing at an equal or greater pace.

- The House released their version of the 2015-2017 budget on March 27, 2015. The overall budget being proposed by the House is favorable for the AOC. There are no budget reductions and all but a few requests are funded in the proposal. While the Interpreter and Family and Juvenile Court Improvement Program (FJCIP) requests aren't part of the House budget proposal, they were very interested in discussing both programs-which is a good sign. The House voted their version of the budget off the floor on April 2, 2015. Amendments included an additional $4.6 million to the Office of Public Defense (over and above what was included in the initial House budget) and an additional $3 million to the Office of Civil Legal Aid (over and above what was included in the initial House budget). There were no amendments to the Supreme Court, AOC, Law Library or Court of Appeals budgets.

- The Senate released their version of the 2015-2017 budget on March 31, 2015. The Senate proposal includes a number of budget reductions, not included in the House proposal. The Senate budget proposal would, if passed as is:
  - Reduce the AOC general fund by approximately $10 million by:
    - Eliminating research,
    - Reducing judicial education,
    - Requiring $4.2 million in additional reductions
    - Eliminating LFO pass through funding to the county clerks and
    - Reduce pass through funding to Thurston County for the impact of cases that must be filed in Thurston County (superior court and county clerk).
  - Not provide funding for the initiation of the CLJ-CMS project.
  - Fund the King County data exchange solely from the JIS account rather than the state general fund.
  - Implement a $2 million fund switch between the state general fund and the JIS account (decrease state general fund, increase the JIS account).

- Not provide funding for a number of other budget request items.

- AOC has developed a list of talking points, draft letters and a strategy for courts and stakeholders to use to ensure that the Senate budget does not pass in its current form.

- There will be several more iterations of the House and Senate budget proposals over the next few weeks. The session officially ends April 26, 2015, however it is anticipated that the 2015-2017 budget will not be finalized by then necessitating one or more special legislative sessions.

Legislative Update

Ms. Mellani McAleenan provided an update on the current Legislative Session.

April 15th was the cutoff date for bills to be passed out of the opposite house or they died. The juvenile records bill is still moving, as are the clerks' bills and bills proposed by the DMCJA and SCJA. Bills with changes had to be agreed upon by the other house by *Sine Die.* Technically, all dead bills may reintroduced at the beginning of the special session, but they may not be acted on.

The plan is to adjourn on Friday 4/25 and begin a special session Wednesday 4/29.

Information Networking Hub – (INH)

Mr. Belles provided a brief status update on the Information Networking Hub (INH) Enterprise Data Repository (EDR) project. Mr. Belles stated that current activities included work being done on the database, data exchanges and recent meetings with King County court staff. Mr. Belles stated that the Enterprise Data Repository was being built to store statewide shared data in conformance with the approved JIS data standard and that local court data would remain in the local court case management systems. Mr. Belles stated that the project team was also working on an information portal that would assist courts in on-boarding and connecting to the Enterprise Data Repository. Mr. Belles stated that the rest of his report was based on the data exchange proposal developed in collaboration with King County court staff. Mr. Belles then gave an overview of the proposed timeline for completion of the Enterprise Data Repository in support of the King County Case Management System Go-Live project. Mr. Belles gave an overview of the major milestones beginning in 2015 through early 2017 including a high level chart showing the implementation of the Enterprise Data Repository in June 2016. Mr. Belles stated that the AOC was continuing to meet with the King County court staff to do planning activities and prepare for the kick-off of the project officially in July when funding becomes available.

Mr. Belles then presented the current project risks including legacy application risks, budget risks and project risks. Mr. Belles stated that there were at least eight risks identified as part of the King County data exchange proposal. He stated that the legacy risks included the risk of system failure at both AOC and King County, the budget risk included the risk of not having adequate funding for the project, and project risks that included the integration work necessary to connect AOC legacy applications to the EDR. Mr. Belles also stated that other project risks included the short timeline and the fact that adding resources would not necessarily solve the issue as some tasks could not be done by more than one or two people at a time. He also

stated that since the EDR was a new solution, there were significant unknowns in developing and implementing an EDR. Mr. Belles stated that the EDR was being built for all court levels and not just for King County. Judge Wynne asked if other courts would be able to use the EDR as built or would it have to be modified for the other courts to use it. Mr. Belles stated that yes, the EDR was being built to allow other courts to use it without making any changes to it.

Mr. Belles stated that there was one active issue, that involved resources with critical court business knowledge not being available to the project, and that it was being mitigated to the extent possible. Mr. Belles completed his project update by covering the next steps planned for the project in the coming weeks.

ITG #45 – AC-ECMS Update

Mr. Martin Kravik presented a status update on the AC-ECMS project. He reported that the third contract amendment was approved on November 11, 2014. This amendment partitioned development into four iterations: base document structure, case management and its associated workflows, judicial workflows, and the remaining Supreme Court workflows.

The first iteration was completed and accepted by the AC-ECMS Executive Steering Committee (ESC) on February 13, 2015.

On March 4, 2015 the vendor submitted a report regarding project scope. It estimated significant variance as compared to the original estimate. The report proposed a mix of scope reduction and increased cost to mitigate the issue.

Appellate court, AOC, and vendor staff met on March 11, 2015 to discuss the report. The vendor's president said the company was not walking away from the project but also declared that the functional specification they submitted to AOC was too large. The vendor stated their case for scope reduction and cost adjustment. The vendor then committed to doing a more comprehensive analysis of the specific scope issues and send a second report.

Prior to the arrival of the second report, the vendor dismissed their project manager assigned to the AC-ECMS project.

The second report was received on March 26th and detailed potential areas for scope reduction. AOC and appellate court staff met with the vendor on April 2nd and 3rd to walk through the report details. At our request, the vendor also provided a cursory look at the case management module.

The vendor president stated again that he does not want to abandon the project but does want to come to agreement on scope, design and cost. He also stated they do not do bait and switch and recognized that doing so would be damaging to their reputation.

The vendor walked through the details of dozens of individual system functionalities they feel are overdesigned. It was a thorough discussion and resulted in a better understanding of the issues. The vendor committed to refining the report based on the two-day discussion.

Following the April 2-3 meeting, the AOC/appellate court team met and discussed every item in the second vendor report and tentatively categorized them as “must have”, “nice to have”, and “can live without”.

The vendor’s third report arrived on April 20, 2015.

Next steps include developing a response the vendor’s proposals and conducting an alternatives analysis in case we can’t come to terms with the current vendor.

At this point in time work is still continuing on the project. However, the milestone dates in the April JISC Project Update represent the last approved scheduled and will likely be negatively impacted by recent events.

If we are able to come to terms with the vendor, there is a likelihood we would come back to the JISC with a request for additional funding.

Any recommendation involving significant changes to the contract cost/duration or a change in strategy will be brought before both the project Executive Steering Committee and the JISC.

ITG #2 – SC-CMS Update

Ms. Marie Constantineau began the SC-CMS Project update with a review of the Integrations Mock Go Live which was held at the AOC on March 24 – 26, 2015. A summary of the event included the review of 72 case replication development efforts and 20 party synchronization efforts. Ms. Constantineau also noted there were still 25 outstanding development efforts not yet verified. She explained that 19 of these were not scheduled to be delivered until end of April and that these efforts were identified as a result of developing the original Pilot efforts. There were no questions regarding this information.

Ms. Maribeth Sapinoso provided an update on the second Business Mock Go Live held at Lewis County on April 21-23, 2015. The first day of the Mock Go Live presented numerous challenges particularly with the noticeably slow response time while using Odyssey. The challenges provided the project to focus the remaining two days of the Mock Go Live on the issues and concerns expressed by Lewis County. The project was able to address and in some cases resolve those issues within the project’s control and ability. It opened and ended the third day of the Mock Go Live with an overall perspective that while there were configuration, training, network, and integration issues to still resolve, there was agreement between the project and Lewis County that there were no showstoppers preventing all moving forward in going live as scheduled.

Ms. Maribeth Sapinoso continued with other recent activity updates including those currently in progress and next steps. The most critical activity the project is primarily focused on for the next two months is preparation for going live as scheduled with Lewis County

Other JIS Priority Project Updates

ITG 41 Priority Project #3 - CLJ Revised Computer Records Retention/Destruction Process:

Mr. Kevin Ammons provided the update for ITG 41 – CLJ Revised Computer Records Retention and Destruction Process. Mr. Ammons reported that the project manager, Ms. Kate Kruller, was

on leave. He continued by reporting that full system testing of the preliminary destruction rules was completed in March and the four pilot courts has been successfully completed in April. Based on these results, the project team has begun the implementation of all courts. As of the JISC meeting on April 24th, 10 courts had been completed, which was ahead of the planned schedule. Mr. Ammons reported that the test team was continuing to test the results of the destruction process on a daily basis to ensure all rules are being applied consistently and correctly. To date, the project team has not found any errors during the implementation process.

ITG 102 Priority Project #4 – Courts of Limited Jurisdiction Case Management Systems:

Mr. Michael Walsh presented the project update on the Courts of Limited Jurisdiction Case Management System (CLJ-CMS) project. Recent activities included the completion of the "current state" functional analysis and the on-going requirements gathering of the "Future state" needs. The project's Organization Change Management team members are increasing CLJ-CMS project awareness by sending letters to stakeholders requesting support from their legislatures. The project team has completed their second AOC all staff general information meeting to raise awareness and support through our AOC staff. AOC's Contract Office has been assisting the project team in our procurement planning and pre-initiation work activities. We continue to keep our project web content current with our most recent accomplishments, schedules, and plans.

One new risk and one ongoing issue were reported.

1. A concern was raised that the approval the AOC integration effort with the King County District Court (KCDC) Case Management System could impact funding and/or resources planned for the CLJ-CMS project. The risk was considered of high urgency and a mitigation action was put in place. AOC requested the funding for the AOC participation in the KCDC project come from the State General Fund and not from the JIS Fund. This would mitigate the risk that the CLJ-CMS funding for INH costs and resources would be impacted.
2. A non-unified vision for the statewide case management solution may disrupt forward progress. King County District Court and Seattle Municipal Court continue to be well represented and maintain a unified vision at the CUWG meetings. The mitigation action for this risk is to continue to increase project awareness.

Committee Report

Data Dissemination Committee:

Driver History Information (DHI) presented its request for traffic infraction data with monthly updates. DDC approved with conditions similar to what was imposed on the Data Driven Safety Inc. (DDS) infraction data request.

Two media requests for financial data were approved with the AOC staff recommendations.

The Committee also reviewed the current JIS-LINK exemptions and requested AOC staff provide a draft policy at the next meeting on how to maintain the various exemptions. DDC also wants the policy to create a reapplication process for these exemptions. DDC then fielded questions from AOC staff about JIS security requirements for the various JIS-LINK users.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Justice Fairhurst at 1:45 p.m.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be June 26, 2015, at the AOC SeaTac Facility; from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 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	
	Action Item – From September 5th 2014 Meeting		
2	Find out whether individual persons' SSNs are needed for the bank account process superior courts use on the BAA and BAS screens	Vicky Cullinane	