

Meeting Minutes
JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE
April 25, 2008, 10:30 a.m. to 11:10 p.m.
SeaTac Office Center, SeaTac, WA

Members Present:

Justice Mary Fairhurst, Chair
Judge C. Kenneth Grosse, Vice Chair (via phone)
Mr. Greg Banks
Ms. Cathy Grindle
Judge Glenna Hall
Judge James Heller
Mr. William Holmes
Mr. N. F. Jackson
Mr. Richard Johnson
Mr. Marc Lampson
Judge Glenn Phillips
Judge Michael Trickey (Ex-Officio)
Ms. Siri Woods
Judge Thomas J. Wynne

Members Absent:

Mr. Robert Berg
Ms. Yolande Williams

Guests Present:

Mr. Larry Barker
Ms. Lea Ennis
Ms. Lorena Hollis
Judge Elaine Houghton
Mr. David Martinez
Ms. Barbara Miner
Mr. Sam Kurlle
Ms. Sharon Paradis
Ms. Amy Ridgeway
Mr. Gary Robinson
Mr. Paul Sherfey
Mr. Paul Embley (facilitator)
Mr. Larry Murphy (facilitator)

Staff Present:

Mr. Jeff Hall
Mr. Gregg Richmond
Mr. John Bell
Ms. Denise Dzuck

CALL TO ORDER

Justice Fairhurst called the meeting to order at 10:35 a.m., and introductions were made.

Motion: Approval of the February 22, 2008 meeting minutes as written.

DATA DISSEMINATION COMMITTEE

Judge Thomas Wynne spoke about the collection of social security numbers and commented that committee members thought the issue had been laid to rest but the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) was still collecting social security numbers. He said the Data Dissemination Committee recommended that the AOC no longer collect social security numbers and should do away with the corresponding data field.

Judge Wynne said there was a request from district court clerks regarding print access for prosecutors for the Judicial Information System (JIS). He said it was the recommendation of the Data Dissemination Committee to amend the JIS Security Rule 4.1.3 to state "*courts and county clerks may assign user ID's to their employees only, except a prosecutor or public defender can be assigned a user ID for print only access to JIS Calendars only.*"

Judge Wynne talked about an issue brought up by Lexis regarding parent conflicts between the Data Dissemination policy and some of the contract language in GR31. He said that after a discussion the committee determined that the Data Dissemination policy was to be superseded by GR31; however, a new draft of the Data Dissemination policy consistent with GR31 was not completed. He said they also needed to clean up some of the contract language to make it consistent with GR31. He added that Mr. John Bell was going to undertake the rewriting of that

Data Dissemination policy and take it back to the Data Dissemination Committee, and that they did not require any action by the Judicial Information System Committee (JISC) at that time.

Judge Wynne said there were two actions; the JISC Security Rule and the Social Security Number collection.

Justice Fairhurst asked if the information was provided for the JISC.

Mr. John Bell said that the information was not provided, as they did not believe the action would go before the JISC on that day. He said it would be touched on at the next JISC meeting.

Justice Fairhurst asked if the information regarding the social security issue would be brought back to the Committee.

Mr. Bell said yes, they would come back with the social security issue at the next meeting.

Mr. N.F. Jackson asked Judge Wynne if Data Dissemination talked about the printing of confidential case types to which the attorney may not be a party.

Judge Wynne said that they did discuss that and they will only be printing calendars in which they were a party.

DATA MANAGEMENT STEERING COMMITTEE

Mr. Richard Johnson said that since the last JISC meeting the Data Management Steering Committee had been concentrating on data exchange and other projects under the Committee. He said there were status reports provided to the JISC about the Data Warehouse, the Architecture program, and the Enterprise Architecture. He said there was a planning and reassessment effort going on. He said some of the projects were moving forward and others were having difficulty. Mr. Johnson said they were retooling the Enterprise Service Bus (ESB) approach. He said it was recorded at the last meeting that changes needed to be made and would have an impact on when some of the first exchanges could be delivered. He added that there was a delay on the accounting end of the data warehouse. He said they were trying to manage the project plan by starting at a high level and then developing project plans for each one of the programs under the Committee.

Ms. Cathy Grindle said she was disappointed that the Enterprise Data Warehouse was still not up and running. She added that she and other court personnel had been trained in the Fall to use the new data warehouse with the expectation that it would be done in January.

Mr. Richmond said that the contract for the data warehouse was deliverables-based for the vendor, VIP. He said the vendor had underestimated the amount of data that needed to be moved into the data warehouse, but they were moving forward.

Ms. Siri Woods said that the ESB that was purchased originally was not going to work because they would need an Oracle database to run it. She said they were going to move to Biz Talk instead of the Oracle product. She added that if they were going to do "service enabling" then they would need to look at changing the way they did security and auditing in the system by moving that from each application to one place where all of the data goes through to holistically do some of the security and audit of the data. She said that it would enable them to change applications in the future much more easily.

Mr. Jackson asked how soon a court user would be able to query the database.

Mr. Jeff Hall said they do not know a date that the data warehouse will be accessible. He added that they do not know if the vendor will be able to deliver, under the current contract, a warehouse they are willing to accept. He said if the vendor was able to put the resources to the project, they were probably another 6-8 weeks out, assuming that it was done correctly and passed user acceptance testing. He said if the vendor was unable to deliver then they would have to look at hiring additional help and doing work in-house to complete the warehouse. He said the vendor did try to deliver the warehouse on time, in December, but it did not pass the user acceptance testing. He said they were waiting to see if the vendor would be able to deliver on time or not.

Ms. Woods added that that was not what the Data Management Committee had heard. She said they thought the warehouse was ready.

Mr. Richmond said yes, that the delay had just occurred.

Mr. Hall said that it had been developing over the last couple of weeks, working with the vendor trying to get them to assign resources to finish the project and talking with their management about where they are at and how they were going to move forward.

OTHER BUSINESS

Judge James Heller said a letter was drafted by Mr. Bell in regards to the retention schedule. He said the Data Dissemination Committee added the information and Mr. Bell converted it into actual specifics. He said what they were looking at was how long to keep information rising out of certain types of data from Courts of Limited Jurisdiction. He said it was limited to everything in which there had been no conviction (infractions, criminal cases where there had been no conviction, dismissal, or vacation and dismissal) after a period of time set forth under the computer record purge column. He said there were a number of reasons why the committee felt strongly about this: 1) people coming before the court who were never involved in anything and there was a dismissal (i.e. identity theft), 2) the Department of Licensing and infractions, and 3) deferred sentencing and people being told the issue would be dismissed. He said that in every case, it was not a short time period, but it was 10 years after dismissal or vacation. He said the recommendation of the committee had been conservative. He said they had been through the Data Dissemination Committee, received unanimous approval, and moved to have the JISC review for approval.

Ms. Woods asked if the request would go to the Secretary of State for approval or for the retention schedule.

Judge Heller said that they were dealing with the electronic record and the committee did not feel that it needed to go anywhere in terms of the approval.

Mr. Bell said that the request follows the Secretary of State's policy but it was still the courts' record and they set the parameters for that.

Mr. Jackson said that the removal of the electronic archiving was a burden for his staff also; he asked what removing that requirement would do to the speed of the production database.

Ms. Grindle said that the district court levels un-archive thousands of cases a day across the state.

Mr. Greg Banks asked what the start date of the retention periods were, particularly the criminal cases that were either dismissed or vacated. He asked if the ten-year period began on the date

it was vacated/dismissed or the date of filing. Judge Heller said they were going by the date of dismissal/vacation.

Motion: Judge Heller moved that the JISC adopt the recommendation regarding retention and destruction of records. Judge Wynne seconded the motion. Motion unanimously passed.

Ms. Woods reported on the electronic transmission of the Jury Questionnaire. She said for information purposes the Jury Questionnaire memo related to the fact that a lot of the new jury programs that are out have a piece with them that includes the ability for jurors to sign on remotely and fill out the questionnaire and then transmit it to the court. She said there was a problem with complying with the electronic signature requirements that were in the statute.

She said the county clerks were trying to get a consensus from the judicial community to support the clerks in legislation that would amend the statute (that requires the signature) to allow for the acceptance of a person's intent to sign by doing something on the computer that says the juror agrees and wants to sign, that is their jury questionnaire, which would be acceptable to the court without a written signature. She added that there was already a requirement under GR30 that says "no signatures are required on court pleadings," but that one was not a court pleading because it was a jury questionnaire. She said one question that came up was the transfer of personal data and there was a recommendation in past years that the jury questionnaire be amended to require jurors to fill out the qualification questions, rather than personal data. She said she thought that the electronic version would only require qualifications and not personal data.

Justice Fairhurst said that Ms. Woods had taken on the project last year and it would be going out to all of the groups for their input. She said there was also a juror survey that was being finalized.

Mr. Jackson mentioned that GR31 had a juror privacy subsection and the only thing that was public information was the juror name, so they need to address the security of the eligibility criteria. He said he was wholly in favor of electronic juror surveys.

Mr. Hall said that he had been in contact with Ms. Marti Maxwell in Thurston County about the same issue and she was committed to provide Mr. Hall with an analysis of the vendor's process relative to current electronic signature statute so that he can weigh what the actual software product does relative to the jury questionnaire.

Justice Fairhurst asked where the proper place for the discussion to be continued should be.

Ms. Woods said that the JISC was the group to present to but the BJA may have to consider it. She added that Judge Grosse had wanted it to go back to the Data Dissemination Committee because they have dealt with other signature issues.

Justice Fairhurst said the JIS portion should stay with Data Dissemination but in light of the conversation, they need to loop in with BJA and Jeff Hall.

Ms. Woods said that they would like AOC to agree with the process to amend the statute and have it as a joint recommendation from the courts and the clerks.

Judge Grosse said that Data Dissemination did not need to look at it again.

Ms. Woods said she thought it should go through BJA.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 11:10 a.m.