JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE

March 2, 2018
10:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.
AOC Office, SeaTac WA

Minutes

Members Present:
Chief Justice Mary Fairhurst, Chair
Mr. Larry Barker
Judge Jeanette Dalton - Phone
Ms. Callie Dietz – Phone
Judge John Hart
Mr. Rich Johnson
Judge J. Robert Leach
Mr. Frank Maiocco
Judge G. Scott Marinella
Ms. Barb Miner
Chief Brad Moericke - Phone
Ms. Brooke Powell
Ms. Paulette Revoir
Judge David Svaren
Mr. Bob Taylor - Phone
Mr. Jon Tunheim - Phone

Members Absent:
Ms. Lynne Campeau

AOC Staff Present:
Mr. Kevin Ammons
Ms. Vicky Cullinane
Ms. Vonnie Diseth
Mr. Curtis Dunn
Mr. Brian Elvin
Mr. Brady Horenstein
Mr. Mike Keeling
Ms. Keturah Knutson
Mr. Dirk Marler
Mr. Ramsey Radwan
Ms. Maribeth Sapinoso
Mr. Mike Walsh
Ms. Aimee Vance
Mr. Kumar Yajamanam

Guests Present:
Mr. Tom Boatright
Mr. Othniel Palomino
Mr. Allen Mills

DRAFT

Call to Order

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

March 2, 2018 Meeting Minutes

Chief Justice Fairhurst advised the Committee she had submitted edits to the March 2, 2018 meeting minutes and asked if there were any additional changes to be made. Hearing none, Chief Justice Fairhurst deemed the minutes approved.

JIS Budget Update

Mr. Ramsey Radwan reported on the 17-19 budget, presenting the green sheet which contains the budget for identified projects, expenditures, and forecast of expenditures. Concerning the Expedited Data Exchange, the first line indicates there is $4.3 million allotted with approximately $4.2 million identified to be expended, leaving a $70,000 dollar variance. However, Mr. Radwan reported the $70,000 variance is expected to be to be expended between now and June 30, 2019. He is currently

working with Mr. Kevin Ammons to find out which line item it should go towards—whether it be staff or contracts, etc. Mr. Radwan reported the Superior Court Case Management System project (SC-CMS) is allotted $12 million, with $10.5 million expended or contracted and about $1.5 million leftover. Mr. Radwan stated he is waiting until the current session is over (hopefully March 8th), at which time he will take a look at the expenditures. He anticipates the balance will be spent by the end of the biennium. The Courts of Limited Jurisdiction Case Management System project (CLJ-CMS) contains $10 million allotted with approximately $4.4 million identified expenditures. This was based upon the previous estimate of the staffing levels between December 2017 and June 30, 2019, including estimated amounts for the CLJ-CMS contract as well as maintenance costs. Mr. Radwan informed the Committee those numbers will change and have not been reduced at this time due to not knowing what that snapshot will look like. However, the allocated amount of $10 million will stay the same, but the amount anticipated to be expended between today and June 30, 2019 will be substantially reduced.

Mr. Radwan then turned the Committee's attention to the next tab containing the budget process. This was the budget process approved by the BJA at the February 16, 2018 meeting. This budget process is essentially the same as the budget process in the past, with the addition of the Court Funding Committee (CFC), a new review and prioritization recommendation committee. This committee will be comprised of five members from the Supreme Court Budget Committee, three members of the BJA Budget and Funding Committee (BFC) and three judicial members from the JISC Executive Committee. This body will be making the final recommendation concerning funding levels and priorities to the full court towards the end of the process. Mr. Radwan drew the Committee's attention to the second page containing the key dates. Mr. Radwan gave a brief explanation of the attached schedule, and pointed out key dates regarding decision packages, as well as the April JISC meeting where this Committee will review and approve IT budget requests. During this process, the BFC of the BJA will be vetting the packages and asking questions preparing for the May 18, 2018 BJA meeting where the packages will be presented. This will be what the BFC has gathered in addition to the information provided through the decision packages, and will provide their recommended priorities to the BJA.

Chief Justice Fairhurst clarified that this is a general fund budget request that flows through AOC to the BJA. JIS requests using JIS monies will be approved by the JISC and that is what will be passed on for approval. Chief Justice Fairhurst stated the main change is the addition of the CFC, where previously only the Supreme Court Committee heard the presentations. Chief Justice Fairhurst stated she felt it was important for the BJA, Supreme Court, and JISC to hear the information together as all are now seeking general fund money due to the lack of funds in the JIS account. This ensured the sharing of information and the sharing of the different roles people are playing. Thus, all having heard the information will then be able to make adjustments as needed. However, the Supreme Court will not be giving away their ultimate authority, as the CFC is providing only recommendations but can brief the BFC as much as possible to ensure they are comfortable with the information they are receiving. Chief Justice Fairhurst stated that in her view, this is a small step ensuring everyone has the same information at the same time who can understand the competing demands for general fund money. JISC will still give its approval; however, if more money is needed from the general fund to back fill into the JIS account or if technology has become so imperative that it is now competing with other budget items that would otherwise be general fund and AOC money. Chief Justice Fairhurst clarified that this process is helping complete the work earlier, which allows a larger body to hear the presentations

together. This helps to elevate the roles the JISC and BJA play in their respective areas of governance in working with the Supreme Court. The Chief Justice noted that the BJA has not abdicated its responsibilities for their AOC governance and the JISC has not abdicated it's authority for the JIS fund, but now they will be together and hear all branch requests, which will then allow all parties to move forward. This is being done with the goal of relationship building and information sharing amongst all parties involved. Mr. Radwan added that at the May or June Branch Stakeholders Presentation Meeting all parties present to the CFC, including: JIS requests, general fund request, Office of Public Defense (OPD), Office of Civil and Legal Aid (OCLA), as well as the Supreme Court and Court of Appeals, should they have any. Then from June forward there will be final prioritization, setting processes, and then submitting to the Legislature for final consideration. Further discussion was held on clarification of the composition of CFC and the BFC.

Mr. Radwan reported on the blue sheet, which is a snapshot of the 2018 Supplemental Budget as it stands. Mr. Radwan alerted the Committee there have not been many changes since mid-February and it only represents AOC's budget, not OCLA or OPD. Mr. Radwan drew the Committee's attention to the first page, containing the Non-IT General State Fund Requests. Mr. Radwan briefly expounded on these requests, pointing out the variances between the AOC requested amounts and the House and Senate Proposals. Mr. Radwan then turned the Committee to the second page, containing the AOC Information Technology General Fund State Request and the AOC JIS Requests. Mr. Radwan briefed the Committee on the EDE Carryover and EDE Fund Shift. Mr. Radwan explained the Legislature has acknowledged there is a fund problem regardless of the source of the problem. While not identifying the problem, they have provided approximately $2.6 million to backfill. While the House and Senate approaches differ, the end result is the same with AOC receiving the same monies.

Mr. Radwan summarized by stating everything is okay at the moment with the general funds to supplement the account. He believes the Legislature recognizes that revenues are going down and AOC is not spending money needlessly. In addition, the success of SC-CMS has helped them be less skeptical. Chief Justice Fairhurst added she believes the hard work and coordination between AOC and King County on the EDE project helps as well, because if it was not going well or the Legislature was hearing rumblings, they would be more skeptical. With the good reviews and good marks on multiple projects, Chief Justice Fairhurst pointed out AOC is one of the few agencies that have had significant and consistent success.

Legislative Update

Mr. Brady Horenstein gave the Legislative Update and provided a handout at the meeting. The handout outlined a few of the big bills that remain which Mr. Horenstein considers significant and/or have extraordinary court impact. Mr. Horenstein also pointed out the handout contained a report behind the memo with a number of bills being tracked with less court impact. Mr. Horenstein reminded the Committee if they have any questions to please contact him, as over 1,500 bills have been introduced this session (which is close to a record). Mr. Horenstein pointed to bill E2SHB 1783 Legal Financial Obligations (LFO), which has passed the House and Senate with slight variations. The next step will send it back for concurrence in the House with the expectation that it will pass with little significant changes from its current form. Mr. Horenstein summarized the bill as reducing interest from 12% to 0% on non-restitution and also requiring prioritization or sub-prioritization of restitution. While

DRAFT

restitutions are already prioritized, this would prioritize victims above other entities (such as an insurance company). Mr. Horenstein described this as the technical piece that the AOC has looked at on how to avoid legacy system work as it will affect a small number of cases in limited jurisdiction courts, where there are different types of restitution recipients. A lot of the court community, as well as the Minority Justice Commission and others, have been very involved in 1783 as this is a very significant policy reform that is expected to be implemented shortly.

Next, Mr. Horenstein drew the Committee's attention to E2SSB 6160 Exclusive Adult Jurisdiction, another piece of significant policy, especially for the Juvenile Courts. For a number of crimes, if committed by someone under age 18, they auto decline or are moved into adult court. This bill changes that. E2SSB 9160 extends juvenile court jurisdiction over a number of crimes to age 25, and modifies conditions when a person is subject to exclusive adult jurisdiction. Mr. Horenstein alerted the Committee this bill has already passed the House and Senate with minor variation. Mr. Horenstein stated the Superior Court judges supported this bill as well as a number of other members of the community.

Mr. Horenstein then pointed to 2SSB 6189 Driving While License Suspended Decriminalization. In addition to the decriminalization provisions, this bill in its most recent form would increase traffic infractions by $2 for DOL IT systems and reduce General Fund and local government distributions. A number of groups have worked on this legislation, including the ACLU, with the support of Seattle City Attorneys as well as sheriffs and police chiefs. Currently, this bill has a ways to go and has not passed the Senate, but is still creating a lot of work for AOC. This is due to the advocates saying $1.5 billion has been spent by state and local government to prosecute these offenses, since 1992. Consequently, some key legislators have looked at this and would like to recapture some of the savings that will come from the policy change. This in turn has led to a fairly complicated set up to hold back or change the distribution of traffic infractions. Mr. Horenstein described the bill as having a 50/50 chance of passing at this time. While generally bills this complicated have a hard time passing, this bill has a lot of key groups interested it, and it may turn into something else with AOC continuing to watch its progress.

Mr. Horenstein mentioned a few other large IT bills that died in session that AOC has seen before, such as HB 2035 and SB 5694. HB 2035 would have required AOC to remove parking information from its online records portal, and SB 5694 dealt with juvenile record sealing. Another area to watch is ESB 6617, which has been getting a lot of media attention and relates to the Legislative Branch public records disclosure, SHB 2282, which regards net neutrality in Washington, and a series of firearms-related bills.

JIS Priority Project #1 (ITG 2): SC-CMS Update

Ms. Maribeth Sapinoso provided an update for the SC-CMS project, beginning with a summary of the last implementation for Event #6 Go Live: Clallam, Island, Jefferson, Kitsap, San Juan, Skagit, and Whatcom counties. All tasks and major milestones for Event #6 implementation were met as scheduled, including three Link-Only integrations, Lessons Learned, and advanced financial and forms training. Ms. Sapinoso also reported the recent and upcoming activities completed for Event #7 Go Live: Adams, Benton, Chelan, Douglas, Ferry, Grant, Kittitas, Lincoln, Okanogan, Pend Oreille, Stevens, and Walla Walla counties. Also reported was the successful implementation of the audit functionality for Odyssey Case Manager in December 2017 and the pre on-boarding activities for Event

DRAFT

#8: Spokane and Clark County. Also discussed was the ongoing collaborative effort of representatives from the Odyssey court community, AOC, and Tyler to address Odyssey support process improvements.

JIS Priority Project #4 (ITG 102): CLJ-CMS Project Update

Mr. Michael Walsh presented the project update on the CLJ-CMS project. While evaluating remaining procurement options, the Steering Committee asked the Project Team to assemble a meeting between Tyler Technologies, the RFP evaluators, and Steering Committee members to take a second look at the Odyssey solution proposal. This meeting goal was to focus on parts of the proposal where concerns were raised or clarifications requested.

A facilitated session was conducted the week of January 22, 2018, followed by a briefing with the court, probation and AOC staff in attendance. After considering the feedback, and additional research provided by the Project Team on large municipal courts and probation solutions implemented in other states, the Steering Committee reached a conclusion on the status of Tyler's Odyssey proposal.

The Steering Committee requested a decision from the JISC. In the decision point was the motion that the JISC approve the Committee's recommendation that the AOC should close the current CLJ-CMS RFP and re-evaluate our other options for a JIS (DISCIS) system replacement.

Motion: Mr. Larry Barker

I move that the JISC approve the CLJ-CMS Steering Committee's recommendation that the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) should close the current CLJ-CMS RFP (ACQ-2016-0701-RFP CLJ-CMS) and re-evaluate our options for a JIS (DISCIS) system replacement.

Second: Ms. Paulette Revoir

Voting in Favor: Chief Justice Mary Fairhurst, Mr. Larry Barker, Judge Jeanette Dalton, Ms. Callie Dietz, Judge John Hart, Mr. Rich Johnson, Judge J. Robert Leach, Mr. Frank Maiocco, Judge G. Scott Marinella, Ms. Barb Miner, Chief Brad Moericke, Ms. Brooke Powell, Ms. Paulette Revoir, Judge David Svaren, Mr. Bob Taylor, Mr. Jon Tunheim

Opposed: None

Absent: Ms. Lynne Campeau

AOC Expedited Data Exchange (EDE) Pilot Implementation Project Update

Ms. Barb Miner presented the King County Clerk's Office (KCCO) update. Ms. Miner reported, that following discussions with their vendor, KCCO would not be making the April 2nd implementation date for their new Case Management System. Presently, a new date has not been determined; KCCO will let the Committee know when a new date is set. The setback is due to the need for some configuration rework to be done on the vendor's side. The question was asked if it was known how long the delay would be, and Ms. Miner let the Committee know they would have a better idea next week when the vendor will be on site.

DRAFT

Another question was asked if the data was still being sent to AOC. Ms. Miner deferred to Mr. Ammons for the answer. Mr. Ammons stated that in terms of the data from KCCO to AOC, back in December KCCO sent the first batch of approximately 1,000 cases. There were some problems in the data and AOC worked with the KCCO Program Manager, Mr. Shuyi Hu, and King County's IT department (KCIT). The 1,000 cases were then resent. Additional progress had been made in multiple areas (e.g. charges, conversion details, etc.), and KCCO sent about 1,700 cases. This was the original 1,000 plus 700 additional cases, which KCCO plans on resending this week. In terms of testing, it allows AOC to do basic sanity checks while a lot of what AOC is doing is helping Mr. Hu by looking at what is coming across. In the very first batch, there were some strange middle names that appeared to be addresses, so this helps in getting some of the basics done. However, things where we are relying on the data—such as for the Washington State Patrol disposition—it is not changing data, so you cannot see a case go from unresolved to resolved where it is triggered. This will still require a great amount of testing later on. Mr. Michael Keeling asked Mr. Ammons if the data AOC is receiving is still just converted data or newly created data. Mr. Ammons replied that to this point AOC has only received converted data. Mr. Rich Johnson followed up, reporting there has been talk about the impact, specifically to Appeals, in King County if the Expedited Data Exchange (EDE) is not in place. There have been follow up discussions since, and they have developed an interim solution; however, the solution has not been tested.

Mr. Othniel Palomino presented the King County District Court (KCDC) update. In terms of what has happened since the last report, KCDC has gone live with Phase 1 of the Civil Implementation and has been live for about four months. In addition, mandatory eFiling for attorneys has gone live while pro se are still not subject as yet. The Public Portal is live and in place with KCDC working on the rest of the implementation. In light of the other issues and scheduling issues surrounding the EDE project, KCDC has decided not to go live in two phases, as previously reported. KCDC will now combine two phases into one phase in order to reduce the overhead for all parties involved in the EDE program. Currently, normal project activities continue. KCDC will be starting the development of training materials on Monday and continue work on the configuration, which is still on schedule.

Chief Justice Fairhurst asked Mr. Palomino if KCCO is not ready when KCDC's combined go-live event is planned, would KCDC go live without KCCO or wait and go live at the same time as KCCO. Mr. Palomino replied that a detailed discussion has not been held nor a decision made at this time. Mr. Palomino stated KCDC technical staff are starting to work with the EDE team as they will need access to the standard queries in order to start building their side of the project. Mr. Palomino described it as a parallel development effort with a lot of complexity surrounding it; more information will be known next week.

Mr. Ammons presented the update on the Expedited Data Exchange (EDE) Project. Mr. Ammons began by stating that this update was prepared with a focus on the readiness of the EDE Program for KCCO's planned April 2nd, 2018 implementation of their new case management system. As the implementation has been delayed for a yet-to-be-determined amount of time, the presentation focuses on a hypothetical go-live at the beginning of April. He emphasized that the program continues to work to mitigate and minimize those impacts.

DRAFT

Mr. Ammons then went through an application by application review of the integration status and readiness for the go-live. He also identified the applications that were likely to experience the most significant impacts. Those applications were the partner Data Exchanges, JABS, and ACORDS.

After discussion, Mr. Ammons then presented information on the EDE Program's plan for communicating changes and events to the stakeholders statewide. He emphasized that planning for communications is continuing as an integral part of the overall project.

Ms. Barb Miner asked what the plan was, with CLJ-CMS being up in the air, whether AOC planned to directly connect the CLJ-CMS to EDR or to use replication through JIS. Mr. Ammons responded that it would not be replication through JIS but building a proxy. Mr. Ammons described this as pulling data from the new system and sending it straight into the EDR. Ms. Miner stated it appeared EDR completion was really essential the CLJ-CMS coming online. Mr. Ammons replied in the affirmative.

Proposal for Statewide Data Quality Governance Committee

Mr. Kumar Yajamanam gave a presentation on the proposal for a Statewide Data Quality Governance Committee. Mr. Yajamanam started by stating his objective was to present the Committee with very simple proposal that emphasizes the need to form a data governance body. Mr. Yajamanam stated the Committee has heard information on new activities, statewide systems being changed, and in addition King County has procured their own case management system. All of these components are leading to a complex environment where data quality governance is going to be critical to the future to ensure the quality of the data. Mr. Yajamanam drew the Committee's attention to slide two of his presentation, which outlined the complexity of the data. Mr. Yajamanam stated the number of stakeholders are increasing, as are the number of players that are touching the systems. The producers and consumers of information are expanding, as well as the different owners of information, in addition to changes in the sources and targets of the information. Mr. Yajamanam pointed to the chart on slide three showing an illustration of the different areas where data is touched. As technology grows, new capabilities such as eFiling, probation, and document management systems create new areas that touch the data. Courts with a different data management system may choose to convert their documents in a certain way. All the data is shared through the data integration process with the public and viewers downstream in the process. One of the biggest factors in the causation of high risk is each of the touch points impact the way the data changes. For example, business processes in each of the individual courts has an impact on what data is collected, how data is gathered and shared. A Legislative mandate may require a change with one court manually implementing the change and another doing a system wide change, leading to changes in what data is captured and what data is shared. The stakeholders are looking for complete and accurate information. Judges want to make decisions based on the best possible available information, complete case history, person information is backed up by the data in background checks.

Mr. Yajamanam stated older rules are currently in place, based on the existing JIS Standard and existing JIS systems. Generalizing the rules for data would then allow the rules to be applicable to all systems statewide. The same piece of information will mean the same thing across all systems. For example: eye color B will mean *brown* for all courts and not *blue* for some. This would look at

standardizing reference data management as well. AOC should be able to coach courts making these decisions, based on a consistent set of policies and guidelines.

The goal would be a governance structure which would be enhanced through tools and technologies where some automation is possible. This would also mean a very large amount of coordination in order to clean up data and bring all data into one standard. Chief Justice Fairhurst clarified for the Committee that at this time this is not an action item but a concept presentation. After the blessing of the JISC a charter could be drafted. Another step would be looking at making a JISC by-law amendment due to the addition of a committee should the data quality governance policy proceed. Chief Justice Fairhurst, in hearing no objections, deemed the concept blessed and decided AOC should continue the exploration of a data quality governing body.

Data Dissemination Committee Report (DDC)

Judge J. Robert Leach reported on the Data Dissemination Committee (DDC) which met this morning with a full agenda. The first issue before the DDC dealt with providing a method for Odyssey users who are registered or using the lobby portal to obtain birthdate years and financial information. The birthdate year is a way of confirming the identity of the person that is currently not displayed, including non-chronological information about an individuals that would allow the user to verify they were dealing with the person they thought they were dealing with. Providing the year information to register users was approved, but not for the lobby portal. The lobby portal was not approved due to security concerns. Concerning the financial information, currently a user cannot login and see how much they owe on a judgement or another legal financial obligation. Odyssey has the capability built in and it was approved by the DDC to use this feature.

Next the DDC dealt with a previous request from bail bondsmen to allow some JIS LINK users to have access to addresses. AOC staff were asked to provide an estimate on the amount of work required to provide this access. The estimate required a large amount of work on existing systems as well as a large amount of hours, and would require a long wait or the reprioritization of something else. The DDC ruled it was not feasible at this time. There is no money in the budget for it, and the bail bondsmen requesting the change did not want to put up the money, therefore it was denied.

The next issue dealt with judgments in juvenile cases in Odyssey, in particular the LFOs, which are not accessible to registered users. This presents a problem as registered users have been deemed to have constructive access to some financial judgments, but have no way of learning about those judgments. AOC has internally discussed creating a judgment search webpage rather than modifying Odyssey or giving backdoor access to the information. This would create one place people would be able go to find judgment information. The Committee was asked if they thought it was worth exploring further and replied in the affirmative.

Due to the concern that people acknowledge their obligation on how they are supposed to use data they have access to, new JIS LINK agreements have been prepared. This will confirm their acknowledgement to keep the information confidential and the entity employing them will be responsible for ensuring their users are following the rules. The DDC had indicated they wanted agreements with more “teeth” than what was presented and is currently in place. They will be receiving

some revised drafts back next month. Rather than auditing and verifying individual compliance, the idea is to have the entities that are contracting with us commit to auditing and verifying their compliance.

The next issue came up when it came to the DDC's attention that people who have agreements to access court data have in their contracts an obligation to preview with the courts their reports to ensure they are not misusing our data or disclosing data they are not supposed to. However, that has not been taking place. Ms. Stephanie Happold has spoken with contracted administration staff and we are now getting compliance with some of them. Further discussion is being held to ensure compliance happens elsewhere.

The DDC has been asked to present at the Fall Conference on expunging and sealing of cases. This would be for both the Superior Courts and Courts of Limited Jurisdiction level. Further discussions are being held on the type of presentation.

The last issue was the report promised by Judge Leach concerning the Legal Voices request under the Violence Against Women's act which limited internet access to protection order information. Judge Leach delivered a memo to the Legal Voices council in draft form requesting comment. Nothing has been received in return at this time.

Discussion was held as to whether it would be beneficial to have the DDC agenda included in the JISC packet or a handout if there were time constraints. It was agreed to be beneficial and the DDC agenda will be provided at each JISC meeting in the packet if ready at print or by handout at the meeting.

Board for Judicial Administration Report (BJA)

Chief Justice Fairhurst turned the Committee's attention to the BJA minutes in the JISC packet. The BJA and JISC reciprocally provide the minutes of their meetings so both committees are aware of the other's activities. Chief Justice Fairhurst stated she would be happy to answer any questions JISC members have.

Adjournment

Chief Justice Fairhurst reminded the Committee the next meeting will be taking place on April 27, 2018 and declared the meeting adjourned at 12:30pm.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be April 27, 2017, at the AOC SeaTac Facility from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Action Items

	Action Items	Owner	Status

DRAFT

DRAFT