

**APPROVED MINUTES  
JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE  
September 24, 2004  
Two Union Square, Room 1606, Seattle, WA  
10:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.**

**Members Present:**

Justice Bobbe Bridge, Chair  
Judge C. Kenneth Grosse, Vice Chair  
Mr. Greg Banks  
Ms. Pat Crandall  
Ms. Cathleen M. Grindle  
Mr. William Holmes  
Mr. N.F. Jackson  
Ms. Janet McLane  
Judge Clifford L. Stilz  
Ms. Nancy Talner  
Ms. Yolande Williams  
Ms. Siri Woods  
Judge Thomas J. Wynne

**Staff Present:**

Mr. Brian Backus  
Mr. John Bell  
Dr. Tom Clarke  
Mr. Ramsey Radwan  
Ms. Kathie Smalley

**Members Absent:**

Judge Glenna Hall  
Judge James R. Heller  
Judge Michael Trickey, Ex-Officio  
Chief Denise Turner

**Guests Present:**

Ms. Bev Hempleman, OFM Criminal Justice  
Grants Coordinator  
Mr. Don Horowitz, ATJ  
Mr. Brian LeDuc, Justice Information  
Network Program Director  
Mr. Kris Passey, WNPA  
Ms. Barb Miner, King County Clerk  
Ms. Kay Newman, State Law Librarian  
Mr. Rowland Thompson, WA Allied Daily  
Newspapers  
Mr. Mark Weiss, WSBA Family Law Section

**CALL TO ORDER**

Justice Bridge opened the meeting at 10:35 a.m. Introductions were made.

**MOTION:** *The May 21, 2004 JISC Retreat Minutes were approved as written.*

**DECISIONS**

**JISC Bylaws**

Brian Backus reported that the JISC bylaws are out-of-date. AOC staff drafted a new version that reflects the JISCRs and the way the Committee currently operates, and folds in the charters for the Data Dissemination Committee and the Executive Committee. Don Horowitz suggested changing the language in Article Seven, Section 2 (1) from "Review and approve" requests for access...." to "Review and act on requests for access...."

**MOTION:** A motion was made to amend the proposed revised JISC Bylaws, Article Seven, Section 2, Subparagraph 1, to substitute “act on” for “approve,” and was seconded and **carried** by voice vote.

**MOTION:** After approving Don Horowitz’s proposed changes, there was a motion to approve the revised JISC Bylaws as presented and amended, which was seconded and **carried**.

### **Commonality Scope**

Tom Clarke introduced the topic and noted that action on three recommendations had been tabled at the May retreat. Those items were on this meeting’s agenda for decision:

Reusable Legacy JIS Functions: Cathy Grindle introduced the recommendation on reusable legacy JIS functions which are those functions available in one or more of the legacy systems which could be delivered as common functionality to more than one court level. The substantive recommendation is that they would be performed the same way in the new systems, unless there was some good business reason for them to vary, at court levels.

**MOTION:** N.F. Jackson moved approval of the recommendation; Siri Woods seconded; and the motion **carried** by voice vote.

Court Minutes: Siri Woods said she surveyed the clerks with the result that none wanted the JIS to support the court minutes. Yolande Williams asked if this would preclude any further exploration for CLJs who want minutes like those currently available in DISCIS. Tom Clarke responded that there would be no support for the Superior Courts for minutes, but there would continue to be support for the district courts, because there is support for them now in the system.

**MOTION:** A motion to not have the JIS support court minutes in the scope of commonality across court jurisdictions and/or across court levels was made, seconded and **carried** by voice vote.

Jury Management: Janet McLane stated that although this item was slated for a decision, she would like to table it and have the Committee look at jury management and the desirability of including it in the JIS. The Best Practices Committee of the BJA recently looked at performance measures that would allow courts to assess their performance in this area and has begun to talk about the desirability of JIS taking on some functionality in this area.

Siri Woods commented that the clerks are interested in standalone systems that would be supported by the state, but would have the capability of producing standard reports. They are very interested in getting commonality in a system, but not necessarily a mandated state system.

**ACTION ITEM:**

Janet McLane asked for input before the next JISC meeting, November 19, 2004.

**Proposed GR 15 and GR 22 Revisions**

Justice Bridge introduced Judge Wynne's report by stating that the item was on the agenda for discussion but it was not anticipated that the Committee would vote on the proposed revisions at this meeting.

Judge Wynne reviewed the proposed changes to GR 15 and GR 22 from his Memorandum previously sent to the Committee via email. Committee members identified possible revisions in several areas:

**ACTION ITEMS:**

Justice Bridge asked N.F. Jackson to provide proposed language for GR 15 to deal with the issues related to indications in the record of what was sealed.

Justice Bridge asked the Committee to review the proposed changes before the next meeting, so that there can be a vote on the two rules.

**JIS Budget Update**

Ramsey Radwan discussed the budget status and the 2005-2007 budget submittal for the JIS Migration and equipment replacement. There are deficits in both the current and next biennia including shortfalls in the general fund and PSEA. In addition, JIS fund revenues have fallen short of estimates. For the next biennium, we are asking for PSEA funds in addition to the JIS Fund appropriation to support the migration, but it is going to be hard to get new money from the legislature.

**JIS Security Policies**

Tom Clarke asked that, because of time constraints, this be tabled and put on the agenda for discussion at the November meeting.

**JIS Project Update**

Tom Clarke reported on plans to deal with the budget problems. First, equipment up for replacement in the next biennium will be divided into two groups. What must be replaced will be purchased in this fiscal year. The rest will be deferred to the 2007-2009 biennium if the request is not funded. Second, the original migration strategy was to proceed a court level at a time, replace entire legacy court systems for each level and then iterate through the levels, trying to maintain the commonality. To maintain the migration schedule, the plan now is to shortcut the original strategy by designing explicitly for the enterprise requirement across all the court levels. That means, instead of doing a legacy system at a time, we will do functionality for all levels at a time. Dr. Clarke also noted that means to a large extent building on the core functionality now in ACORDS and CAPS, and that the AOC has obtained a consultant's recommendation on improving the architecture and performance of ACORDS and CAPS.

**ACTION ITEM:** N.F. Jackson asked about the validity of the dates in the project status report given the change in strategy. Dr. Clarke said some of the projects have been revised and some of the dates in the report have not yet been revised. **AOC will send out a revised version with accurate dates.**

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Justice Bridge gave an update on the status of GR 31. The Supreme Court Rules Committee held a public meeting in July in which all members of the court attended. GR 31 is on the agenda for the October 6th en banc. The court continues to receive comments on the proposed rule.

## **THERE WERE NO COMMITTEE REPORTS**

The meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

## **FUTURE MEETINGS**

The next JIS Committee meeting will be on November 19, 2004, *10:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.* at Two Union Square, Room 1606, Seattle, WA.

The next JIS Data Dissemination Committee meeting will be on November 19, 2004, *9:00 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.*, at Two Union Square, Room 1606, Seattle, WA.