

**APPROVED MINUTES  
JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE  
RETREAT**

**May 26, 2000**

**Members Present:**

Chief Justice Richard Guy, Chair  
Justice Bobbe Bridge, Supreme Court  
Judge C. Kenneth Grosse, Vice Chair  
Judge Dale B. Ramerman  
Judge Thomas C. Warren  
Judge Clifford L. Stilz  
Judge Thomas J. Wynne  
Ms. Mary McQueen  
Mr. Michael Planet  
Ms. Siri Woods  
Mr. David Ponzoha  
Ms. Virginia Kirk  
Mr. David Reynolds  
Mr. Gary Riesen

**Members Absent:**

Judge James R. Heller  
Mr. John Klei  
Ms. Cathleen M. Grindle

**Staff Present:**

Dr. Tom Clarke  
Mr. Brian Backus  
Ms. Jennifer Peters  
Ms. Jean Du  
Ms. Kathy Kuriyama  
Mr. Alan Erickson

**Guests Present:**

Judge Michael Trickey  
Mr. Rich Johnson, Court of Appeals  
Ms. Bev Hempleman, OFM  
Mr. Rowland Thompson, Allied Daily Newspapers  
Mr. Laird Hail, Seattle Municipal Court  
Mr. Dale Putnam, Washington State Patrol  
Ms. Diana Kramer, Washington Newspaper Publishers Association  
Mr. Mike Killeen, Davis, Wright, Tremaine  
Mr. Tom Boyer, Seattle Times  
Mr. Dave Cuillier, Everett Herald

**Call to Order**

Judge Grosse called the retreat to order at 8:10 a.m.

The minutes of the March 31, 2000 meeting were approved as written.

**Committee/Subcommittee Reports**

**Data Dissemination Subcommittee**

Proposed Change to GR 15:

Judge Ramerman presented a brief history of the need to change GR15 and highlighted the specific changes. The committee discussed the proposed changes. It was recommended that the words "or redacted versions of them" be added after the word "documents" in line 116. The committee accepted the addition to line 116. Judge Grosse asked the committee if the proposed rule change should be submitted to the Supreme Court Rules Committee with a recommendation that it be adopted on an emergency basis. **There was a motion to: Submit the proposed changes with the additional language to line 116 to the Supreme Court Rules Committee and ask that the changes be adopted on an emergency basis. This motion was seconded and approved.**

Chief Justice Guy suggested that there needs to be an explanation of how the proposed changes went to the JIS Committee and why the rule should be adopted on an emergency basis. He also indicated that the Supreme Court Rules Committee might be reluctant to act without the support of the Washington State Bar Association, Superior Court Judges Association, and Clerks. If the Supreme Court Rules Committee accepted the proposed changes, the matter could be presented to the en banc Supreme Court on July 13, 2000.

The committee discussed modifying the prior motion to change from asking the Supreme Court to adopt the proposed rule on an emergency basis to an expedited basis. **There was a motion to ask the Supreme Court to adopt the rule change on an expedited basis. This motion was seconded and approved.**

It was suggested that (c) (2) be expanded to also include Anti-Harassment cases. The committee discussed this suggestion but no formal action was taken.

Revised Data Dissemination Policy: Judge Grosse reported that the committee will recommend funding for an enterprise data warehouse to meet JIS data access needs. He also reported that the Data Dissemination Subcommittee is working on a stand alone rule for Public Access to Court Records based upon the old Data Dissemination Policy and the Vermont proposed Rule on Public Access to Court Records. A draft proposal should be ready for the next JISC meeting.

Data Elements: Mr. Backus reported that the subcommittee received several requests for data fields not contained in the proposed standard public index. The requested data fields are not specifically authorized for an Index in the current Data Dissemination Policy.

Ms. Kuriyama reviewed technical problems with some of the requested data fields. The committee discussed some of the technical problems and concerns about inconsistency or unreliability of certain requested data fields. Concerns were also raised regarding budgetary and resource impact of trying to provide the requested additional data fields.

The committee discussed the policy issues. From a policy standpoint the committee did not have any issues with the requested additional data fields except for the Criminal Defendant Address data field. Concern was raised whether this information should be released. There was also concern that domestic violence victim addresses might be released. The committee asked the Data Dissemination Subcommittee to look at the Criminal Defendant Address issues and discuss the alternatives.

**There was a motion to: Include in the Proposed Standard Public Index all the requested additional data fields except:**

- 1. Criminal Defendant Address data field, and**
- 2. Data fields that cannot be easily extracted from the database without significant additional programming.**

**The motion was seconded and approved.**

## **Legislative Report**

Dr. Clarke reported that the legislature appropriated the full \$1.4 million requested in the supplemental budget.

## **Old Business**

### **Court Supplies**

Mr. Backus reported that the proposal to shift responsibilities to the courts is withdrawn. The OAC will pursue more efficient internal procedures.

### **JIS Strategic Plan Approval**

**MOTION: Motion to approve the JIS Strategic Plan was seconded and approved.**

### **New Architecture Primer**

Dr. Clarke presented a primer on the new JIS architecture in response to concerns expressed at the last meeting about technical risk and stability. He outlined a standards-based approach that seeks to systematically control technical risk and insure project success.

### **Committee Role**

In response to a request from Judge Grosse at the last meeting, Dr. Clarke described the role of the committee as historically understood. The issues of how best to avoid over-commitment of JIS resources and provide adequate strategic guidance were not resolved.

### **Project Plan and Budget Preview**

Although it is too soon to provide a detailed budget package with a recommended project plan, Dr. Clarke reviewed a number of proposed projects to elicit input on relative priorities. Judge Grosse expressed the need to provide firm numbers and a coherent project plan before the committee can provide meaningful feedback. Justice Bridge suggested that Dr. Clarke provide such a budget package to the Budget Committee in July. Dr. Clarke agreed to do so.

## **Future Meetings**

The next JIS Committee meeting will be on September 8, 2000, at Two Union Square, Room 1606, Seattle, WA.

The next JIS Data Dissemination Subcommittee meeting will be on June 30, 2000, at Two Union Square, Room 1606, Seattle, WA.

The next JIS Advisory Committee meeting will be on August 17, 2000, at Two Union Square, Room 1606, Seattle, WA.