JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE

October 26, 2018
10:00 a.m. to 1:15 p.m.
AOC Office, SeaTac WA

Minutes

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

Members Absent:
Judge Jeanette Dalton
Ms. Brooke Powell

AOC Staff Present:
Mr. Kevin Ammons
Ms. Vicky Cullinane
Mr. Keith Curry
Ms. Vonnie Diseth
Mr. Curtis Dunn
Mr. Brian Elvin
Mr. Mike Keeling
Ms. Keturah Knutson
Mr. Dennis Longnecker
Mr. Dirk Marler
Ms. Uma Nalluri-Marsh
Mr. Ramsey Radwan
Mr. Mike Walsh

Guests Present:
Ms. Jennifer Ortega
Mr. Terry Price
Mr. Sart Rowe
Judge Donna Tucker
Ms. Margaret Yetter

DRAFT

Call to Order

Chief Justice Fairhurst called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. and introductions were made. Chief Justice Fairhurst introduced the newest member to the Judicial Information System Committee (JISC), Judge Scott K. Ahlf, who will also be serving on the Data Dissemination Committee (DDC), as well as the JIS Executive Committee. Chief Justice Fairhurst also alerted the Committee that she would be appointing Ms. Margaret Yetter to the Courts of Limited Jurisdiction Case Management System Steering Committee (CLJ-CMS). Ms. Yetter will be taking the place of Ms. Cynthia Marr, who has retired. This will be the last meeting for State Court Administrator Ms. Callie Dietz; many thanks were given for her leadership, support and involvement. Next, Chief Justice Fairhurst announced the selection of a new State Court Administrator, Ms. Dawn Marie Rubio. She will be joining AOC as State Court Administrator Designate in mid-November.

June 22, 2018 Meeting Minutes

Chief Justice Fairhurst asked if there were any changes to be made to the June 22, 2018 meeting minutes. Hearing none, Chief Justice Fairhurst deemed the minutes approved.

JIS Budget Update

Mr. Ramsey Radwan reported on the 17-19 budget using the green sheet, which is a snapshot of select projects within the AOC Information Services Division budget. It identifies the amount allocated or

allotted, the amount expended to date plus projected, with the last column reflecting the estimated variances at the end of the biennium.

Mr. Radwan stated financially everything was okay with the Expedited Data Exchange (EDE) and we are expected to break even between now and the end of the biennium, June 30th 2019. The Superior Court Case Management System (SC-CMS) currently has a small positive variance. Over the next month or two Mr. Radwan will be working with Mr. Sam Knutson, AOC's new comptroller, to see if there are any additional savings or if that amount will go down. The CLJ-CMS project shows an $8 million balance, which includes projected estimates and expenditures to date, as well as the estimate for the options analysis contract and will be adjusted as soon as the Apparent Successful Vendor (ASV) is announced. Mr. Radwan reminded the Committee the balance of unexpended monies will roll over into the JIS fund balance to be used for all funding for the next biennium. In the spring, there will be a better estimate of the remaining fund balance in the account, and this will drive what the Legislature does with the AOC budget request.

Next, Mr. Radwan drew the Committee's attention to the next document, which provides a snapshot of what the Supreme Court has approved via their review process. Mr. Radwan pointed out the differences between what the JISC had approved and the document before the Committee today. Initially, there was $1.5 million for future EDR integrations; this amount was reduced to $500,000. This was done to reduce the amount and allow the funds to be moved across fiscal year lines. If on July 1, 2019 integrations are ready to go, the funding will be there. Additional changes include the Family & Juvenile Court and Finding Fathers requests have been combined, and the CASA request will not be moved forward through the AOC budget. The Supreme Court, however, is not opposed to state CASA and others lobbying for the funds through the legislative process.

External Equipment Replacement Policy

Mr. Dennis Longnecker, ISD Infrastructure Manager, reported on the External Equipment Replacement Policy and decision point. Giving a brief background, Mr. Longnecker explained that as each court was implemented with the Judicial Information System (SCOMIS, DISCIS, and JUVIS), the JIS fund provided some end user equipment to enable users to access the system. With the implementation of the IP network, and the need to replace "dumb" terminals, in 1996, AOC began supplying personal computers to courts and clerks' offices. The amount of equipment AOC supplied depended on available funds. With the rollout of DISCIS, it was noted during equipment replacement projects that district courts were getting more PCs due to the amount of people in those courts. Superior courts were getting approximately 50% whereas district courts were getting around 75%. At that time, the JISC approved JIS General Policy 1.1 that states, subject to legislative funding, the JIS fund will provide personal computers and printers at up to 75% of FTEs for courts and county clerks. Pursuant to JIS Policy 1.1.4, equipment is provided to users to enable judicial officers, clerks, court administrators, and their staff to access and update the JIS, do legal research, or for other court business purposes.

The policy according to AOC was always for computers. However, laptops were approved for judges with domestic violence caseloads; should the need arise for warrant approvals, a judge would be able to log on and look at the information while at home. Therefore, judges were provided the opportunity of requesting a laptop or a desktop while all other court staff received a desktop computer only.

More courts have been requesting the option of purchasing laptops over desktops, so that question is now being presented to the JISC. Mr. Longnecker explained that funds are appropriated on a biennial basis, so the budget request for the next biennium is already in place based on replacing desktops, not laptops. The most recent request was for courts to purchase laptops and be reimbursed at the desktop level. AOC's initial response was no, but AOC now asks the JISC to make the decision. Mr. Longnecker expounded that 80% of the courts elect to purchase their own equipment while 20% elect for AOC to purchase equipment for them. Currently, there is one superior court that elects for AOC to purchase its equipment with the remainder being smaller municipal courts without the IT staff to install and service the equipment.

Chief Justice Fairhurst asked if Mr. Longnecker had a recommendation; he responded that AOC is requesting approval that if a court should wish to purchase a laptop, it will receive reimbursement at the desktop level. Ms. Vonnie Diseth clarified that the amount budgeted for court staff is at the desktop level. Should a court wish to purchase a laptop for non-judicial staff, then they would be responsible for the difference in cost over the desktop-level reimbursement. Mr. Bob Taylor asked if the gap still existed in the marketplace for laptop versus desktop. Mr. Longnecker responded that it did and current contract prices are $790 for a desktop in comparison to $1200 for a laptop. Ms. Lynne Campeau stated that, in speaking with other municipalities, they lease their equipment rather than purchase it, and have also been turned down due to the current policy. She stated she did not see a difference between leasing versus purchasing and would like to see the motion amended to read purchase or lease of equipment. Judge J. Robert Leach asked if Mr. Longnecker knew if the lease periods coincided with replacement periods. Mr. Longnecker replied that a typical lease is three years possibly four with monthly payments, while AOC's current replacement cycle is five years. Chief Justice Fairhurst asked Ms. Campeau if it was her understanding that the motion meant that a court leasing a computer would be eligible for the $790 reimbursement to apply to the lease over the term of the lease as opposed to a one-time purchase. Ms. Campeau agreed. Ms. Diseth asked how the five-year AOC replacement cycle and the equipment leasing cycle would be reconciled. Ms. Campeau replied she did not think it would matter. When a court that is leasing a computer comes due for a five year replacement, then the dollar figure as allotted by AOC should be reimbursed to the court to apply as they wish toward leasing equipment. Chief Justice Fairhurst further stated the fact that their lease did not coincide with the replacement cycle would be a moot point because they would only be receiving the $790 reimbursement once every five years. That way, AOC would not be involved with any leases, but would allow for the specific court to decide which option works best for them and still receive reimbursement every five years. Judge Leach asked Mr. Longnecker if leased equipment was to be included in the reimbursement policy, and if he knew what the fiscal impact would be. Mr. Longnecker stated he did not know the impact, however, the money for leased equipment is not currently budgeted in the biennium.

It was clarified that AOC is not currently reimbursing courts for leased equipment. Mr. Longnecker stated AOC had researched the issue and found leasing cost 35-40% more than buying equipment. At the AOC level, the decision was made to purchase equipment due to the lower cost. Mr. Radwan stated he would recommend not adding this language at this time due to contractual obligations in giving state funds for leases. He stated he would rather look into those questions and come back with a proposal. Then the Committee would have answers to questions such as the budget impact or what would happen in *x* or *y* years when the lease renews, and how to dole out the money. He stated there could be issues

DRAFT

with a policy stating it can be done, then a court stating they would like to do it and then have an audit exception. Further discussion was held on the feasibility of reimbursements for leased equipment including the exposed risk of a lease expiring one to two years prior to the next reimbursement and funds have been exhausted. Ms. Barb Miner then made a motion, on the original decision point, allowing reimbursement to courts for laptops.

Motion: Ms. Miner

I move to modify the AOC practice, pursuant to JIS General Policy 1, to allow courts and clerks' offices to be reimbursed, up to the current budgetary allowance of $790 for the purchase of replacement laptops for court staff. In future biennia, courts and clerks' offices would be eligible for reimbursement for laptops only at that biennium's desktop rate.

Second: Mr. Johnson

A motion to amend was proffered by Ms. Campeau.

Motion: Ms. Campeau

I move to amend the motion by inserting the words "or lease" after purchase.

Second: Judge Ahlf

Chief Justice Fairhurst asked if Ms. Miner and Mr. Johnson considered the amendment friendly. Ms. Miner replied yes, while Mr. Johnson replied no.

At this time the Chair called for an up or down vote on Ms. Campeau's motion to amend.

Voting in Favor: Chief Justice Mary Fairhurst (Chair), Judge Scott K. Ahlf, Ms. Lynne Campeau, Judge John Hart, Mr. Frank Maiocco, Ms. Barb Miner, Chief Brad Moericke, Ms. Paulette Revoir, Judge David Svaren, Mr. Jon Tunheim

Opposed: Mr. Larry Barker, Ms. Callie Dietz, Mr. Rich Johnson, Judge J. Robert Leach, Mr. Bob Taylor,

Absent: Judge Jeanette Dalton, Ms. Brooke Powell

The motion to amend was passed and reads as follows:

I move to modify the AOC practice, pursuant to JIS General Policy 1, to allow courts and clerks' offices to be reimbursed, up to the current budgetary allowance of $790 for the purchase ***or lease*** of replacement laptops for court staff. In future biennia, courts and clerks' offices would be eligible for reimbursement for laptops only at that biennium's desktop rate.

At this time another motion was put forth by Judge Leach.

Motion: Judge Leach

I move to table to motion until the next meeting so we can hear from Ramsay about the concerns he expressed and his recommendations.

DRAFT

Second: Mr. Johnson

Voting in Favor: Chief Justice Mary Fairhurst (Chair), Mr. Larry Barker, Ms. Callie Dietz, Mr. Rich Johnson, Judge John Hart, Judge J. Robert Leach, Mr. Frank Maiocco, Ms. Barb Miner, Chief Brad Moericke, Judge David Svaren, Mr. Bob Taylor

Opposed: Judge Scott K. Ahlf, Ms. Lynne Campeau, Ms. Paulette Revoir, Mr. Jon Tunheim

Absent: Judge Jeanette Dalton, Ms. Brooke Powell

The motion to table the motion until the next JISC meeting was passed.

Ms. Campeau asked how this would affect the current cycle of equipment replacement, since the deadline for the courts to respond is prior to the next JISC meeting. Mr. Longnecker stated that the due date for courts to respond could be delayed as flexibility has been built into current deadlines. AOC agreed to alert the courts as to the new deadline so their decision can be based on the vote to take place at the February 22nd JISC meeting.

External Equipment Replacement Policy

Mr. Radwan stated the pages contained in tab 4 provide background context for a discussion regarding the capacity of the JIS Account. As the Committee has previously discussed many times, expenditures are outpacing revenue. The Potential Cost Savings Options are provided to begin the discussion of how we move forward regarding future funding for statewide judicial information technology projects. The options are for discussion purposes only; no recommendation is being made, nor will a decision, at this point, be required. The first document, called the sweep sheet, identifies the funds that have either been transferred from the general fund (synonymous with PSEA) into the JIS account or those funds that have been swept out of the account. The funds listed were for the last four or five biennia and were listed by fiscal year. Mr. Radwan pointed to the Total Fund Balance Shift total of $26,190,000 that has been swept out of the account. This is the total dollar amount that was taken out during harder economic times and put somewhere else for other purposes. Mr. Radwan stated that this represented 60% of biennial revenue, or in other terms, more than the ending contract amount for the SC-CMS project.

The next pages dealt with infractions filed showing a decrease of 49% in years 2009-2017. The result is more pressure on the account due to less infractions being paid. Infractions paid has also seen a downward trend of 34%, which impacts revenue. Infractions dismissed have gone down but it is unclear whether dismissals are impacting revenue at this time. The next pages show the total revenue of JIS Fines & Fees and JIS Link subscriptions. They show a dip in revenue since 2010, with variations due to increases in various assessments. While revenue is not declining at a rate that it has previously it still is not increasing at the rate AOC had hoped after the increase in assessments. To reiterate the context, Mr. Radwan summarized the above as funds that have been swept out of the account. The Legislature has said no to funding the JIS account from other sources, infractions issued are going down, infractions paid are going down, and dismissals are going down. Revenue has not been static, and with quite a bit of variability in the last four years, it has necessitated bringing this discussion to the JISC. A short discussion followed on various members' opinions on the causes of decreasing infraction numbers.

The next slide represented the external equipment replacement costs by Fiscal Year (FY) 2014 to present. Since FY 2016, expenditures have been roughly $1,000,000 a year, with the next slide representing resources available versus estimated expenditures. Mr. Radwan discussed the three bars on the graph representing estimated revenue, estimated resources including unexpended funds that rollover with the third bar representing the estimated 19-21 appropriation and resulting shortfall. Greater discussion followed on specifics concerning each of the three bars.

Mr. Radwan drew the Committee's attention to the last page of his presentation, showing four options for potential savings regarding AOC's External Equipment Replacement program for the courts. He reiterated this is a discussion only at this time to gain context and information with one potential cost saving measure revolving around external equipment replacement. Discussion followed Mr. Radwan's presentation regarding equipment replacement and other avenues of cost saving.

Access to Justice Update

Mr. Sart Rowe presented an update on the Access to Justice (ATJ) Technology Principles. Approximately eighteen months ago, a group was put together to update the ATJ tech principles. ATJ worked on them internally and then began reaching out to stakeholders for approximately six months. At the end of the six months, Mr. Rowe states minor adjustments were made to the original principles before deciding to start an entirely new process. In October 2017, a conference was held at the University of Washington (UW) with approximately 40-45 individuals to talk about how technology is helping their clients and those in the justice system and not harming them. Over the last year, the process included monthly meetings culminating in a subsequent meeting at Seattle University Law School. There, a new set of proposed court rules were drafted. Mr. Rowe states the big changes are simplifying the language, and current rules are drafted at an approximate 7th grade reading level. Multiple focus groups were put together to create new principles not previously in the principles, including one regarding cultural responsiveness—that technology should pay attention to and be responsive to the cultural needs of individuals. Another new principle, the human touch principle, states technology should increase the quality of interaction when dealing with humans. There was a great deal of concern about using technology to replace human interaction, and emphasis is now being placed on the quality of interaction. In a discussion by the ATJ board on October 12th, a number of the members were strongly in support of suggesting the use of the word "must" in some areas of the principles. However, Mr. Rowe pointed out that ATJ did take some of AOC's recommendations, including not going through an expedited process, but to continue to solicit feedback on how the principles could be improved prior to the courts deciding on them.

Mr. Rowe expressed his thanks to the UW Law School for hosting the original symposium, Seattle University Law School for hosting the second major drafting session, and the Diverse Voices Group at UW for their help in bringing in diverse stakeholders. Mr. Rowe stated this is a forward-thinking document, but he realizes that technology will continue to change rapidly. One specific way to address this is through the best practices work group, which asks for ATJ and AOC to put together a group to make suggestions to the community about recent technology, so updates can be made earlier by identifying useful emerging technologies that would be helpful to clients and the overall justice system.

DRAFT

Following the presentation, the floor was opened to questions from the Committee. Mr. Taylor wondered about the measurability of the principles and feasibility of implementation if the principles turned into requirements. Chief Justice Fairhurst started a discussion on the concept of these being principles versus rules and asked about ATJ's intentions going forward. Mr. Johnson stated he felt they read as principles, and also addressed his concern with a "must" statement. He questioned how he would know if he did it, or who would get to decide it was completed or completed at a level that is sufficient, acceptable, and responsive to the rule. Currently, there is disagreement with ATJ and AOC as to the principles staying principles versus ATJ's desire they become rules. Ms. Diseth stated there also was disagreement concerning various places where AOC feels the language needs to be changed to "should" instead of "must" for many reasons, including financial constraints.

Chief Justice Fairhurst asked after the initial reviews, where will subsequent feedback come from? Mr. Rowe replied that after the Diverse Voices project and the last year of drafting, ATJ is willing to engage others but does not have a specific plan of outreach at this time. Mr. Rowe stated ATJ is happy to engage specific stakeholders if the court has any in mind. Trying to ascertain the status, Chief Justice Fairhurst clarified with Mr. Rowe as to whether ATJ is waiting for the Rules Committee, which will be revisiting the discussion in November. At that time, does he expect the Rules Committee to ask ATJ to vet it with specific groups, or if they decide to move forward, will ATJ likely publish it and see what comments come in prior to taking action? Mr. Rowe stated they would be willing to do either scenario based on the Rules Committee review. Additionally, Mr. Rowe stated he felt the Board would be willing to look into rewriting in a more traditional rules format if that is what the Rules Committees wishes.

Ms. Miner commented that in previous years the Clerks Association as a group had been invited to participate in more ways than has currently been offered. Ms. Miner stated she encourages more vetting, as the only way she knows about the principles update is due to her being on the JISC. Once she received the materials via the Committee, she sent them out to the association board, which has concerns with the principles becoming rules. Mr. Rowe responded to some of Ms. Miner's concerns and stated Ms. Miner should have received invitations to the meetings held in October 2017 and reiterated their willingness to dialogue with the Clerks Association. Chief Justice Fairhurst stated the principles were ready to go in August and submitted to the Rules Committee, however, this is the first time the JISC is seeing them. After hearing from those in the room, Chief Justice Fairhurst suggested that it may be a good idea to hear feedback from the associations so the Committee can have time to read and digest the information. Or, should ATJ wish to pursue them as rules, then seeing them in rule form would be beneficial. It was decided that ATJ would reach out to the associations represented by JISC members for feedback. Then JISC members would be able to respond with input from their respective associations at the next JISC Meeting.

JIS Priority Project #1 (ITG2): SC-CMS Project Update

Mr. Keith Curry presented the project update on the Superior Courts Case Management System (SC-CMS) project. He provided status on preparations for final Odyssey implementation event, Event 8 on November 5, 2018. In addition Mr. Curry discussed phase 2 of the link only implementation. The discussion was centered on the Link Only Summit that took place on July 27, 2018. Additionally AOC and Tyler are offering counties to switch to Odyssey Document Management system if they desire, provided it can be accomplished before the end of the project. Mr. Curry presented the project close

DRAFT

out activities that will take place prior to December 31, 2018. Finally, Mr. Curry presented the Odyssey stabilization activities that would be taking place between January and June of 2019.

JIS Priority Project #1 (ITG102): CLJ-CMS Project Update

Mr. Michael Walsh presented the project update on the CLJ-CMS project. AOC published a Request for Quotes and Qualifications (RFQQ) for the procurement of professional services for an options analysis on potential solutions in August 2018. Eight vendors submitted proposals. An AOC evaluation team scored the proposal documents and interviewed the top qualified vendors. The selection of the apparent successful vendor (ASV) will be announced the week of October 29th. Contract negotiations with the ASV will follow debriefs with the vendors who were not selected. The project plans on a December 2018 contract start date.

AOC DRIVES Successful Go-Live Report

Mr. Kevin Ammons presented the project update on AOC's preparations for the Department of Licensing (DOL) Driver and Vehicle System project (DRIVES) Project. This entailed AOC supporting DOL with their go-live. Last year DOL replaced their vehicle licensing system; this is the second phase of DOL's licensing modernization, which replaces the driver licensing system. AOC needed to update all systems that read data from DOL regarding driver records or drivers licenses. Updates were also needed for AOC services that pulled data from DOL so it would be as seamless as possible. There were significant changes to some of the services, in particular DOL changed how they were going to produce their PDFs for the abstract of driving records. Due to this, AOC made the decision to produce their own. AOC updated services that are used for Electronic Ticketing Process (ETP), Judicial Access Browser (JABS), and Odyssey, including the legacy systems. DOL went live on September 4th with a few problems, such as adjudication system for failure to appear was not working but was fixed after only a couple of hours. Subsequently, AOC continues to find minor issues with data conversion and abstracts of driving records, but overall, considering the size of the system it replaced and the volume of day to day use, both DOL and AOC are extremely pleased with the success.

AOC Expedited Data Exchange (EDE) Pilot Implementation Project Update

Mr. Kevin Ammons presented the update on the Expedited Data Exchange (EDE) Project. Mr. Ammons then went through an applications by application review of the integration status and readiness for KCCO's implementation. Mr. Ammons concluded by emphasizing that the EDE program continues to work to mitigate any potential impacts to the statewide system.

Ms. Barb Miner presented King County Clerk's Office's (KCCO) Project update. Ms. Miner stated KCCO is planning to go live after Veteran's Day weekend on November 13th. She also stated things are all wrapping up and coming together. Ms. Miner told the Committee that KCCO will be starting the process for external communications, together with AOC, to make sure everybody is aware of the go-live. Ms. Diseth followed up to make sure all parties understood that the data exchange with AOC will not be live when KCCO goes live on November 13th. KCCO has agreed to do double data entry for a two month period of time to enable AOC to fully test the integrations.

DRAFT

Mr. Othniel Palomino presented King County District Court's (KCDC) project update. As an overview, KCDC is replacing their entire technology infrastructure. Approximately one year ago, KCDC went live with the first phase of the case management system (CMS) implementation replacing the case management functionality for three limited civil court locations. One recent report shows they were able to scan and index 550,000 fewer documents over the last year due to the new CMS e-filing component. In the first quarter of next year, KCDC is getting ready for phase two for the rest of their courts. Mr. Palomino briefed the Committee that just last week they were able to convert 2.1 million cases from the District and Municipal Court Information System (DISCIS) into eCourt, and are close to being finished with the configuration process of the system. This will be followed by three months of training. During this time each court location will have at least two days where they will only run essential counters in order to train judges and staff at each location. Mr. Palomino stated KCDC is essentially on schedule to deliver the new system in the first quarter of next year.

Data Dissemination Committee Report (DDC)

Judge Leach reported on the Data Dissemination Committee (DDC) meeting held directly before the JISC.

Judge Leach reported on the requests per the agenda in the JISC packet, starting with the Non-Court IT Personnel JIS Access Policy. AOC has an access policy for non-IT persons. Several years ago, a problem was encountered where municipalities and other local jurisdictions needed quicker access than the application process would permit. To alleviate this concern, AOC began authorizing six-month temporary access. This became an issue when they continued to renew the six month temporary access rather than going through the process of attaining permanent access as outlined in the policy. At today's meeting, the DDC instructed their staff to redraft the rule and limit temporary passes to one-time only with no renewal option. If access is needed for longer than six months, a permanent application must be submitted, thereby eliminating the multiple applications for temporary access.

Next, the DDC was presented with a first draft of the Data Dissemination manual. Ms. Stephanie Happold presented the update to the fourteen-year-old policy manual. All committee members will be provided a Word version so they may review and collaboratively provide comments and suggestions. In addition, the DDC will be asking the Clerks' Association and several of the superior courts and CLJ courts to weigh in on any suggestions.

The DDC also received a request from Versus Research Inc. to gain access to Odyssey in order to screen information by date of birth. They are an anonymous portal user and that level of user does not have access to birthdate data. At the moment, the DDC does not authorize birthdate data to any users because Odyssey currently does not discriminate between juvenile and adult birthdates. Any access to birth date data would provide juvenile DOB which is not permitted.

Next, the DDC was presented with updates on JIS LINK and public index contracts for users in the form of simple amendments. They were approved by the DDC. The DDC reviewed proposed changes to the AOC data agreements that AOC enters with researchers and public users. After review they will be discussed in greater length at the next DDC meeting.

DRAFT

The next topic dealt with auditing. It was brought to the DDC's attention that it did not comply with Court Rule GR 15 in terms of sealed cases. Currently, if a court enters an order sealing a case, the case disappears from the index. However GR 15 requires that the existence, the names of the parties, and the type of case remain available in the index. AOC has been negotiating with Tyler Technologies to implement a correction or amendment to the software with the ball currently in Tyler Technologies' court to determine the scope of the request and what is required. After that is determined, it will come back to AOC and the decision on who will implement the changes will be made. Funding is currently available for this, the question is where it will go and why. Another issue regarding GR 15 came in the form of a question concerning the scope of GR 15 and the requirement that cases still appear in the index, and how that applies to cases that are sealed by virtue of statute rather than court order. This is an issue of interpreting the existing language in GR 15 and the Committee agreed with AOC's interpretation that the index requirement only applies to cases that are sealed by virtue of court order. For cases such as adoption, where a statute requires the file to be sealed, there is no requirement under GR 15 that the existence of the file be available by searching the index.

Judge Leach alerted the Committee that Ms. Happold will be moving on to another position with AOC. AOC is looking for a new liaison for the DDC. Judge Leach thanked Ms. Happold for her service and expressed the DDC's thanks as well.

Board for Judicial Administration Report (BJA)

Chief Justice Fairhurst reminded the Committee that the BJA minutes are contained in the JISC packet behind Tab 10. The BJA and JISC reciprocally provide the minutes of their meetings so both committees are aware of the other's activities. Chief Justice Fairhurst also serves on the Policy and Planning Committee and briefed the Committee about a strategic initiative request that the JISC be under the Board for Judicial Review (BJA). The Policy and Planning Committee is not advancing that strategic initiative forward as the BJA as it is currently formulated is just the levels of the court with the other players in the judicial process serving as liaisons. The JISC is a statutorily created body with representation from a wide variety of stakeholders.

Chief Justice Fairhurst also alerted the Committee that the December 7th JISC meeting has been cancelled by the JIS Executive Committee. If issues arise before the February 2019 JISC meeting, Chief Justice Fairhurst will call a special meeting (presumably held by teleconference).

Adjournment

Chief Justice Fairhurst adjourned the meeting at 12:52pm

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be February 22nd, 2019, at the AOC SeaTac Facility from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Action Items

	Action Items	Owner	Status

DRAFT