



**DISTRICT AND MUNICIPAL
COURT JUDGES' ASSOCIATION**

BOARD MEETING

March 8, 2019

**AOC SEATAC OFFICE
SEATAC, WASHINGTON**

DISTRICT AND MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGES' ASSOCIATION SCHEDULE OF BOARD MEETINGS

2018-2019

<i>DATE</i>	<i>TIME</i>	<i>MEETING LOCATION</i>
<i>Friday, July 13, 2018</i>	12:30 – 3:30 p.m.	AOC SeaTac Office Center
<i>Friday, Aug. 10, 2018</i>	12:30 – 3:30 p.m.	AOC SeaTac Office Center
<i>Sunday, Sept. 23, 2018</i>	9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.	2018 Annual Judicial Conference, Yakima, WA
<i>Friday, Oct. 12, 2018</i>	12:30 – 3:30 p.m.	AOC SeaTac Office Center
<i>Friday, Nov. 9, 2018</i>	12:30 – 3:30 p.m.	AOC SeaTac Office Center
<i>Friday, Dec. 14, 2018</i>	12:30 – 3:30 p.m.	AOC SeaTac Office Center
<i>Friday, Jan. 11, 2019</i>	12:30 – 3:30 p.m.	AOC SeaTac Office Center
<i>Friday, Feb. 8, 2019</i>	12:30 – 3:30 p.m.	AOC SeaTac Office Center
<i>Friday, March 8, 2019</i>	12:30 – 3:30 p.m.	AOC SeaTac Office Center
<i>Friday, April 12, 2019</i>	12:30 – 3:30 p.m.	AOC SeaTac Office Center
<i>Friday, May 10, 2019 & Saturday, May 11, 2019</i>	May 10: 12:00-5:00 p.m. May 11: 9:00-1:00 p.m.	2019 DMCJA Board Retreat, Location: Olympia, WA
<i>June 2, 2019</i>	9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.	2019 DMCJA Spring Conference, Location: Skamania Lodge, Stevenson, WA

AOC Staff: Sharon Harvey

Updated: October 30, 2018

Persons with a disability, who require accommodation, should notify Sharon Harvey at 360-705-5282 or sharon.harvey@courts.wa.gov to request or discuss accommodations. While notice five days prior to the event is preferred, every effort will be made to provide accommodations, when requested.



DMCJA BOARD MEETING
FRIDAY, MARCH 8, 2019
12:30 PM – 3:30 PM
AOC SEATAC OFFICE
SEATAC, WA

PRESIDENT REBECCA C. ROBERTSON

AGENDA

PAGE

Call to Order

General Business

- A. Minutes – January 11, 2019
- B. Treasurer's Report
- C. Special Fund Report
- D. Standing Committee Reports
 - 1. Legislative Committee – *Judge Meyer*
 - 2. Diversity Committee - The DMCJA Diversity Committee approved the sponsorship of the 2019 Judicial Institute Workshop
 - 3. Rules Committee
 - a. Minutes for November 28, 2019
 - b. Minutes for January 3, 2019
- E. Judicial Information System (JIS) Report – *Ms. Cullinane*

1-4

5

6-7

8-9

Liaison Reports

- A. Administrative Office of the Courts (**AOC**) – *Ms. Dawn Marie Rubio*
- B. Board for Judicial Administration (**BJA**) – *Judges Ringus, Jasprica, Logan, and Johnson*
- C. District and Municipal Court Management Association (**DMCMA**) – *Ms. Margaret Yetter*
- D. Misdemeanant Probation Association (**MPA**) – *Ms. Stacie Scarpaci*
- E. Superior Court Judges' Association (**SCJA**) – *Judge Kitty-Ann van Doorninck*
- F. Washington State Association for Justice (**WSAJ**) – *Rachel Hamar, Esq.*
- G. Washington State Bar Association (**WSBA**) – *Kim E. Hunter, Esq.*

Discussion

- A. CCJ/COSCA Western Region Summit Invitation "Improving the Court and Community Response to those with Mental Illness" – Request for DMCJA to Sponsor Judge to Attend
- B. DMCJA Rules Committee Request for Board to Oppose WACDL Proposed Rules Amendments
 - 1. Suggested New Criminal Rule CrRLJ 3.7, Recording Interrogations
 - 2. Suggested New Criminal Rule CrRLJ 3.8, Recording Eyewitness Identification Procedure
 - 3. Suggested New Criminal Rule CrRLJ 3.9, In-Court Eyewitness Identification
 - 4. Suggested Amendment to CrRLJ 4.11, Recording Witness Interviews

10-12

13-24

<p>C. DMCJA Rules Committee Request for Revision of Rules Committee Charges and Inclusion in DMCJA Bylaws</p> <p>D. Council on Independent Courts (CIC) – Proposals Received</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whether to Contribute to Legal Fees Related to Judicial Independence Matters 2. Whether to Fund the CIC <p>E. CLJ-CMS Project Status Update and White Paper – <i>Judge Kimberly Walden</i></p> <p>F. Joint Judicial Legislative Reception: Whether it should occur immediately following State of the Judiciary Address</p>	<p>25</p> <p>28-33</p>
<p>Information</p> <p>A. 2019-2020 DMCJA Slate of Candidates</p> <p>B. Board members are encouraged to apply for DMCJA representative positions. Available positions include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. JIS CLJ “CLUG” User Group 2. Presiding Judge & Administrator Education Committee <p>C. DMCJA Board members are encouraged to submit Board agenda topics for monthly meetings.</p> <p>D. DMCJA Letter to DSHS regarding Moral Reconation Therapy</p> <p>E. Washington Citizens’ Commission on Salaries for Elected Officials will meet on February 4, 2019, from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., at the Hotel Red Lion, in Olympia, WA. For more information, please select the following web link: https://salaries.wa.gov/sites/default/files/public/Agenda.pdf</p> <p>F. The DMCJA sent flowers to Chief Justice Mary Fairhurst after receiving news of her illness.</p> <p>G. The DMCJA Board voted to support the New Hope Act, House Bill 1041, with amended language that non-restitution legal financial obligations must be paid before a person may vacate a record or conviction.</p> <p>H. The Pretrial Reform Task Force has prepared a Final Report, Bench Card, and Press Release that include best practices and recommendations regarding pretrial practices in Washington State. Please select respective web links to review the documents.</p>	<p>34-38</p> <p>39</p>
<p>Other Business</p> <p>A. The next DMCJA Board Meeting is April 12, 2019, 12:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m., at the AOC SeaTac Office, SeaTac, WA.</p>	
<p>Adjourn</p>	



DMCJA Board of Governors Meeting
Friday, January 11, 2019, 12:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
AOC SeaTac Office
SeaTac, WA

MEETING MINUTES

Members Present:

Chair, Judge Rebecca Robertson
Judge Scott Ahlf
Judge Linda Coburn
Judge Michael Finkle
Judge Michelle Gehlsen
Judge Robert Grim (by phone)
Judge Drew Ann Henke
Commissioner Rick Leo
Judge Aimee Maurer (by phone)
Judge Samuel Meyer
Judge Charles Short
Judge Jeffrey Smith

Guests:

Judge Mary Logan, BJA(non-voting)(by phone)
Judge Kevin Ringus, BJA (non-voting)
Ms. Tarra Simmons
Ms. Melanie Stewart
Ms. Margaret Yetter, DMCMA

AOC Staff:

Ms. J Benway (by phone)
Ms. Vicky Cullinane
Ms. Sharon R. Harvey
Ms. Genie Paquin

Members Absent:

Judge Jennifer Fassbender
Judge Damon Shadid

CALL TO ORDER

Judge Robertson, District and Municipal Court Judges' Association (DMCJA) President, noted a quorum was present and called the DMCJA Board of Governors (Board) meeting to order at 12:32 p.m. Judge Robertson asked attendees to introduce themselves.

GENERAL BUSINESS

A. Minutes

The Board moved, seconded, and passed a vote (M/S/P) to approve the Board Meeting Minutes for December 14, 2018.

B. Treasurer's Report

M/S/P to approve the Treasurer's Report. The Treasurer's report was provided for the Board's review by Judge Gehlsen on behalf of Judge Fassbender.

Special Fund Report

Judge Robertson reported that the Special Fund reports are no longer available to the bookkeeper so we are working on adding signatures in March 2019 in order to receive the reports again.

C. Standing Committee Reports

1. Legislative Committee

Judge Meyer introduced Ms. Melanie Stewart, the longtime lobbyist for the DMCJA. Judge Meyer reported on the Legislative Committee and let us know they have assembled their Executive Legislative Committee (Committee). The Legislative Session officially starts on Monday, January 14, 2019. The Committee will start their Legislative conference calls on Monday and

Ms. Harvey has already routed an agenda for this meeting with a list of about 30 bills on it. Judge Meyer further reported that in regard to the Legislative agenda from the DMCJA, Ms. Melanie Stewart is in the process of getting bills drafted, and two of the bills have already been drafted, numbered, pre-filed, and set for hearing. Additional bills with hearing dates are: (a) House Bill (HB) 1047/Senate Bill (SB) 5622 - CLJ Commissioners being allowed to perform marriages and General Powers of Commissioners, and (b) SB 1048- Small Claims, which will be held the first week of Legislative Session. The other three bills: the Discover Pass, Notice of Disqualification/Affidavit of Prejudice, and the Anti-Harassment bills are still having work done by Ms. Stewart. Ms. Stewart provided additional information regarding the Anti-harassment bill. She let us know that Representative Christine Kilduff is officially our sponsor as of yesterday. It has been requested by the chair to find a freshman to sponsor the Affidavit of Prejudice bill and Ms. Stewart is waiting for a freshman to physically get to Olympia to get someone to sign it, in light of not having the capabilities to procure electronic signatures with sponsorships.

D. Judicial Information Systems (JIS) Report

Ms. Cullinane reported that the firm Gartner, which was selected to do the Courts of Limited Jurisdiction Case Management System (CLJ-CMS) project Options Analysis, started work on Monday. They have been busy already conducting interviews with stakeholders. Gartner is aware that we want to have the analysis done quickly therefore, they expect to be done by the first week in April which is good timing before all the spring conferences start. She reminded the members that Gartner will be analyzing three options: Best of Breed (combining systems with different functions into a single operating system); Modernizing JIS (modernize JIS and add missing functions through custom development), and a Hybrid system (modernizing JIS and adding off-the-shelf software for missing functions, or another option that Gartner may suggest). She further reported that the firm will be reporting their results to the CLJ-CMS Steering Committee along the way, in addition to the final report, which should give the CLJ-CMS Project Steering Committee enough time to make a decision on the best option before spring conferences take place.

LIAISON REPORTS

A. Board for Judicial Administration (BJA)

Judge Kevin Ringus reported on the BJA and let the members know that the group did not meet in December and will also be taking January off to work on other tasks. The BJA will meet again in February, 2019 and he will provide information following that meeting. Judge Ringus further reported that the BJA Legislative Committee will begin their phone meetings this coming Monday, and thanked Judge Meyer for his commitment to be involved in two of the phone conferences. He also noted that some of the DMCMA Mangers will also participate in the phone conferences to talk about the items of interest coming up in that week.

Judge Robertson reported on the Policy and Planning Committee. We are currently working on communications and strategies between all the different entities and Judiciary so we have a plan in place. The goal is to build framework between each other for clearer communication and to help keep everyone on the same page. Secondly, we have the new Trial Court Security Taskforce ramping up. We still need a small District Court Jurisdiction Judge to come forward, as Judge Marinella declined the invitation. Please let the BJA know if you are aware of anyone's interest or if anybody has ideas to offer. Additionally, two other taskforces on the BJA, Education and Interpreters, are developing their funding packages. Judge Robertson along with Judge Douglass Fair and Justice Steven Gonzalez met with a Senator to discuss this and draw awareness to these funding requests.

District and Municipal Court Management Association (DMCMA)

Ms. Yetter reported that the DMCMA is working on upcoming education. Their regional education for line staff is scheduled for April. The Association is also hoping to host a session on implicit bias which will be sponsored by the Minority and Justice Commission. Ms. Yetter further reported that they are also planning their education for the annual management conference in May. Ms. Jeanne Englert from AOC provided a presentation from

the BJA Interpreter and Education funding taskforces and Ms. Angie Autry, AOC Business Process Engineer, discussed the Pot Pardon that will be coming to the Courts next week based on the Governor's decision.

B. Superior Court Judges' Association (SCJA)

Judge van Doorninck submitted SCJA Minutes and a written report that are included in the materials.

ACTION

A. The New Hope Act, House Bill 1041

M/S/P to support the concept of The New Hope Act, House Bill 1041, and defer to the Executive Legislative Committee whether the DMCJA should support the actual bill.

DISCUSSION

A. The New Hope Act, House Bill 1041

Ms. Tarra Simmons submitted a report on The New Hope Act, House Bill 1041 which can be found in the materials. Ms. Simmons introduced herself and informed the members that she is an attorney with the Public Defenders Association and Executive Director of a nonprofit organization that is led by formally incarcerated people trying to help other people with re-entry following incarceration and to re-build their lives. In addition, she is co-chair to the Washington Statewide Reentry Council along with Dan Satterberg. Ms. Simmons explained that this bill is important for District Court judges because currently people with even 20 plus years of rehabilitation can only vacate one misdemeanor conviction, which limits people's ability to obtain housing, employment, and professional licenses, sometimes for a lifetime. This bill will expand judicial discretion by giving a judge the option in deciding whether a person has earned a second chance at life or not. Ms. Simmons further added that the SCJA is currently considering support of the bill thus far, along with the Washington Association of Prosecuting Attorneys (WAPA) and other organizations. The Board had concerns regarding decoupling provisions and whether a person could vacate a record prior to paying non-restitution legal financial obligations (LFOs). M/S/P to move this topic to an action item.

B. Paid Family and Medical Leave Insurance Program – Payroll Deduction

Judge Robertson included emails in the materials that she received from Judge Susan Mahoney and reported on the concerns of the County not wanting to be an employee and be taxed by way of payroll deduction, because they believe they cannot get the benefit. Judge Robertson further added that her bench mate, whom is a Municipal Court employee, will get the benefit from the payroll deduction, so no reason to fight the tax. Judge Robertson opened the topic up to discussion from the members. There was comment that no government entity would see the benefit of this program, but our money is needed so no one will be left out of the pool. It was further noted that most government employees within their jurisdiction probably already have a benefit package as good as what they are trying to make us pay for. Judge Robertson added that she thought King County had already filed a lawsuit or grievance regarding the issue. It was mentioned that If every governmental entity pulls out of the pool then they probably will not get the money they need to fund the program as intended. Further comment was that this program is designed to benefit employees that are not offered benefit packages like the government and state employees are presented with.

C. DMCJA National Leadership Grant Presentation – Judge Marilyn Paja

Judge Paja provided a written report and further presented via teleconference on her national leadership experience. She explained the leadership grant in general terms and her particular use of it. She also emphasized that the DMCJA leadership grant is unique among the trial court organizations in Washington

State and maybe also unique for the nation. She noted that the grant has been a budget line item for almost twenty-five years.

INFORMATION

A. Board members are encouraged to apply for DMCJA representative positions. Available positions include:

1. JIS CLJ "CLUG" User Group
2. Presiding Judge & Administrator Education Committee

Judge Ahlf added that the information regarding the DMCJA Board representative positions was sent out and needs to be returned to Ms. Susan Peterson by January 15, 2019, to be considered to be an Officer, or if you know of someone else that wants to be on the Board.

B. DMCJA Board members are encouraged to submit Board agenda topics for monthly meetings.

C. A Legislative Reception sponsored by the BJA, SCJA, and DMCJA will be held on January 16, 2019, 5:30 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., at the Temple of Justice, Foyer, in Olympia, WA.

D. DMCJA Support Letter for SCJA Proposed Amendments to Code of Judicial Conduct 2.9

E. Judge Jeffrey Goodwin, Snohomish County District Court, is the new DMCJA liaison for the WSBA Court Rules and Procedures Committee

OTHER BUSINESS

Judge Robertson and Judge Ahlf discussed the work of the Council on Independent Courts (CIC). There was further discussion regarding Judicial Education topics to consider covering at the Spring Conference. Judge Ahlf and Ms. Harvey concurred that the next DMCJA CIC meeting is on January 24, 2019 and, therefore, the topic will be added to the CIC meeting agenda, with the approval of CIC Committee Chair, Judge David Steiner.

The next DMCJA Board Meeting is scheduled for February 8, 2019, from 12:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m., at the AOC Office in SeaTac, WA.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:43 p.m.

2019 Judicial Fellows Clinic Sponsorship Response Form
March 22-23, 2019
Seattle University School of Law

To receive maximum publicity and exposure for your organization,
please respond by February 15, 2019.

Contact Name: Cynthia Delostrinos

Business Name: District and Municipal Court Judges' Association – Diversity Committee

Address: 1112 Quince St SE, Olympia, WA 98504

Email: Cynthia.Delostrinos@courts.wa.gov Phone: 360-705-5327

Sponsorship Amount: \$500

☐

Check Enclosed (Please pay to the order of "The Judicial Institute")

☐

Please invoice us (please provide contact information and mailing address if different from above).

☐

We will provide our logo for Judicial Institute marketing purposes.

Please be sure to send us a high-resolution JPEG, PDF, TIFF, or EPS of your logo and website link (if applicable) ASAP so we may list you in all upcoming publications and ads.

Marketing contact name: District and Municipal Court Judges' Association – Diversity

Committee

Marketing contact info: Judge Willie Gregory (Willie.Gregory@Seattle.gov), DMCJA Diversity Committee Chair

Please return form and payment to:

The Judicial Institute
c/o Debra M. Akhbari
1001 Fourth Avenue, Ste. 4200
Seattle, WA 98154
info@judicialinstitute.org



DMCJA Rules Committee

Wednesday, November 28, 2018 (12:00 - 1:00 p.m.)

Via Teleconference

MEETING MINUTES

Members:

Chair, Judge Goodwin

~~Judge Buttorff~~

~~Judge Dacca~~

~~Judge Eisenberg~~

~~Commissioner Hanlon~~

Judge Oaks

Judge Samuelson

Judge Steiner

~~Ms. Patti Kohler, DMCMA Liaison~~

~~Ms. Melanie Conn, DMCMA Liaison~~

~~(Alternate)~~

AOC Staff:

Ms. J Benway

Judge Goodwin called the meeting to order at 12:04 p.m.

The Committee discussed the following items:

1. Welcome & Introductions

Judge Goodwin welcomed the Committee members in attendance.

2. Approve Minutes from the September 27, 2018 Rules Committee meeting

It was motioned, seconded, and passed to approve the minutes from the September 27, 2018 Rules Committee meeting (Judge Steiner abstained).

3. Discuss Proposal to Amend GR 22

Judge Eisenberg was unavailable to participate in today's meeting. He is working with the Therapeutic Courts Committee regarding how to protect sensitive information presented to therapeutic courts. This item was tabled until a future meeting.

4. Discuss Proposal to Amend CrRLJ 8.9 and CRLJ 40

Judge Goodwin stated that a legislative proposal regarding notices of disqualification was being considered by the DMCJA Board. The Committee decided to table this item until the result of the legislative proposal was known.

5. Discuss IRLJ 2.6 and IRLJ 6.6

6. Discuss Notices of Appearance under IRLJ 3.3

Judge Portnoy requested review of these rules, which the Committee discussed. Judge Steiner stated that he would work with Judge Portnoy and would consider incorporating these suggestions into the review of the IRLJ that he is conducting. Judge Steiner stated that he is working through the comments from the WSBA's IRLJ Subcommittee members that were previously received. When his revisions are complete, he will distribute the IRLJ proposals to the Committee.

7. Tribal State Court Consortium rule request

The DMCJA Board sent this request back to the Rules Committee, as upon first consideration the Rules Committee did not think that the draft rule should be added to the CLJ rules. Judge Oaks agreed to review the proposal and provide a recommendation to the Rules Committee. Ms. Benway stated that she would provide him with information regarding the matter.

8. Discuss Rules Committee Charges and Scope

Judge Goodwin stated that the "Charges" for the Rules Committee are included on the Committee roster. He proposed updating the Charges to confirm that they are consistent with actual practice. He distributed some draft changes to the Charges. Judge Goodwin also noted that the Rules Committee is one of the few standing DMCJA committees that is not contained in the Bylaws. The Committee determined that they wanted to review the Charges, and potentially have the Charges included in the Bylaws like the other standing committees. Ms. Benway agreed to put together a draft Bylaws amendment for the Committee's review. This item was tabled until a future meeting.

9. Other Business and Next Meeting Date

Judge Goodwin stated that a liaison to the WSBA Rules Committee was still needed. He agreed to check with Judge Robertson regarding the magnitude of this commitment.

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, December 27 at noon via teleconference.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:53 p.m.



DMCJA Rules Committee

Thursday, January 3, 2019 (12:00 - 1:00 p.m.)

Via Teleconference

MEETING MINUTES

Members:

Chair, Judge Goodwin
Judge Buttorff
Judge Dacca
Judge Eisenberg
~~Commissioner Hanlon~~
Judge Oaks
Judge Samuelson
~~Judge Steiner~~
Ms. Patti Kohler, DMCMA Liaison
~~Ms. Melanie Conn, DMCMA Liaison~~
(Alternate)

AOC Staff:

Ms. J Benway

Judge Goodwin called the meeting to order at 12:01 p.m.

The Committee discussed the following items:

1. Welcome & Introductions

Judge Goodwin welcomed the Committee members in attendance.

2. Approve Minutes from the November 28, 2018 Rules Committee meeting

It was motioned, seconded, and passed to approve the minutes from the November 28, 2018 Rules Committee meeting.

3. Discuss Proposal to Amend GR 31

Judge Eisenberg stated that he had reached out to the Therapeutic Courts Committee regarding a rule amendment to protect from public disclosure sensitive information that is often presented to therapeutic courts. Judge Dacca stated that he would like more input on the proposal. Judge Goodwin stated that he would reach out to the Chair of the DMCJA Therapeutic Courts Committee to discuss the matter. This item was tabled until a future meeting.

4. Discuss Proposal to Amend CrRLJ 8.9 and CRLJ 40

The DMCJA Board has approved a legislative proposal regarding amending the statutes pertaining to notices of disqualification. The Board requested that the Legislative Committee and the Rules Committee work together to make sure that the statute and rules remain consistent. The Committee voted to table this item until the result of the proposed bill is known.

5. Discuss WACDL Rule Amendment Proposals

The Washington State Supreme Court has published for comment rule amendments and new rules proposed by the Washington Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers (WACDL), primarily related to discovery and witness identification. The deadline for comment is April 30, 2019. Judge Goodwin requested that Committee members each take a proposal to review and provide a report to the Committee at the next Committee meeting. The assignments are: CrRLJ 3.7, Judge Buttorff; CrRLJ 3.8, Judge Eisenberg; CrRLJ 3.9, Judge Samuelson; CrRLJ 4.7, Judge Steiner [Judge Goodwin will notify Judge Steiner of his assignment]; and CrRLJ 4.11, Judge Goodwin. Judge Goodwin suggested that Committee members consider the following types of questions when making their review: The potential impact on courts of limited jurisdiction; whether there is a potential conflict with other CLJ rules; and if the proposal requires the judge to comment on the evidence.

6. Tribal State Court Consortium Rule Request

Judge Oaks stated that he is continuing to study the matter before providing a recommendation to the Rules Committee. This topic was tabled to a future meeting.

7. Discuss Rules Committee Charges and Potential Bylaws Amendment

Judge Goodwin provided revised draft "Charges" for the Rules Committee, which are included on the Committee roster. The Rules Committee is one of the few standing DMCJA committees that is not addressed in the Bylaws. The Committee reviewed a draft Bylaws amendment and motioned, seconded and passed for it to be referred to the DMCJA Board with a recommendation to update the Committee Charges and amend the Bylaws to reflect the status of the Rules Committee as a Standing Committee of the Board. Ms. Benway will facilitate sending the proposal to the Board.

8. Other Business and Next Meeting Date

Judge Goodwin stated that a liaison to the WSBA Rules Committee was still needed. Judge Goodwin agreed to serve in a temporary capacity to the extent he can depending on the magnitude of this commitment.

Judge Goodwin noted that Judge Portnoy has withdrawn her suggestions for rules amendments.

It was noted that this is Judge Dacca's last Committee meeting as he has retired from the bench. The Committee thanked Judge Dacca's for his service.

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 23 at noon via teleconference.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:03 p.m.



Conference of
CHIEF JUSTICES



2019 CCJ/COSCA Western Region Summit

Improving the Court and Community Response to those with Mental Illness

May 22-24, 2019 | Sun Valley Resort | Sun Valley, Idaho

Agenda

Draft
1/9/19

Wednesday, May 22, 2019

3:00 PM – 7:00 PM

Registration

6:00 PM – 7:00 PM

Welcome and Reception

Summit Hosts:

Co-Chairs, CCJ/COSCA Western Region

Hon. Matthew B. Durrant, Chief Justice, Utah Supreme Court

Mr. Rodney A. Maile, Administrative Director of the Courts, Hawaii Judiciary

Idaho Hosts:

Hon. Roger S. Burdick, Chief Justice, Idaho Supreme Court

Ms. Sara Thomas, Administrative Director of the Courts, Idaho Administrative Office of the Courts

Evening

Dinner on Your Own

Thursday, May 23, 2019

7:30 AM – 4:30 PM

Registration

7:30 AM – 8:30 AM

Breakfast

8:30 AM – 8:45 AM

Welcome and Opening Remarks

8:45 AM – 10:00 AM

Plenary Session – *Judicial Leadership: The Story of Miami Dade County, Florida*

Judge Steve Leifman will open the Summit with an inspiring keynote address of what judicial leadership can accomplish to improve the community and court response to those with mental illness. Miami Dade County with a population of 2.8 million is the seventh largest county in the nation and is a leader in addressing the complex community challenges involving law enforcement, behavioral health and the justice system, and in devising evidence-based, cost effective solutions for those with mental illness.

Speaker:

Hon. Steve Leifman, Judge, Miami Dade County, Florida

10:00 AM – 10:15 AM	Break
10:15 AM – 11:30 AM	<p>Plenary Session – Chief Justices Leading Reforms: Challenges, Approaches, and Strategies</p> <p>A panel of chief justices and other court leaders from the Western Region will describe the challenges experienced in their respective states, and the various approaches and strategies they are employing to improve the court and community responses to those with mental illness. Statewide multidisciplinary strategies combined with community by community action is required to meet the complex challenges facing state courts and communities.</p> <p><i>Moderator:</i> Mr. David K. Byers, Administrative Director of the Courts, Arizona Supreme Court</p> <p><i>Panelists:</i></p>
11:45 AM – 1:00 PM	Lunch
1:15 PM – 2:30 PM	<p>Plenary Session – Early Intervention, Deflection, and Diversion: From the Public Health System to Intercepts 0 (Community Services) and 1 (Law Enforcement)</p> <p>Using the Sequential Intercept Model (SIM) as a framework, this multidisciplinary panel will share practical solutions and evidence-based practices pre-arrest in the public health system and communities in the Western Region, including law enforcement, and involving civil commitment practices and assisted outpatient treatment. Early intervention with and diversion from the criminal justice system are the preferred strategies for as many persons with serious mental illnesses as feasible.</p> <p><i>Moderator:</i> Dr. Michael Champion, Forensic Chief, Adult Mental Health Division, Hawaii Department of Health</p> <p><i>Panelists:</i></p>
2:45 PM – 4:30 PM	State Team Meetings (see room assignment list in the conference folder for team meeting locations)
6:30 PM – 8:30 PM	Reception and Dinner for State Teams, Faculty and Guests

Friday, May 24, 2019

7:30 AM – 1:30 PM	Registration
7:30 AM – 8:30 AM	Breakfast
8:30 AM – 8:45 AM	Welcome and Morning Announcements
8:45 AM – 10:00 AM	Plenary Session – After Arrest: From Intercept 2 (Initial Detention) to Intercept 5 (Community Corrections) Building on the earlier panels, and again using the SIM as a framework, this panel will highlight effective practices and models within the justice system if a defendant with mental illness is arrested, ranging from behavioral health assessments in the jail, pretrial release programs, to competency determinations and restoration treatment, to community-based alternatives and treatment. <i>Moderator:</i> Dr. Debra A. Pinals, Director of the Program in Psychiatry, Law, and Ethics, University of Michigan <i>Panelists:</i>
10:00 AM – 10:30 AM	Break
10:30 AM – 12:30 PM	State Team Meetings and Working Lunch (see room assignment list in the conference folder for team meeting locations)
12:30 PM – 1:30 PM	State Team Reports Each of the state teams will report back to the full group on action plans. <i>Facilitators:</i> <i>Co-Chairs, CCJ/COSCA Western Region</i> Hon. Matthew B. Durrant, Chief Justice, Utah Supreme Court Mr. Rodney A. Maile, Administrative Director of the Courts, Hawaii Judiciary
1:30 PM – 1:45 PM	Closing Remarks and Adjourn

Team Discussion and Planning: Time for the state teams to meet and discuss challenges and solutions and develop concrete action steps will be a key component of the Summit. In advance of the Summit, discussion questions will be developed and approved by the Summit planning team.

State Profiles and Advance Readings: As State Justice Institute funding becomes available, state profiles will be developed including the following elements: (1) challenges and solutions; (2) pilot projects; (3) effective programs and practices; (4) data and metrics available; (5) relevant statutes and court rules; (6) recent legislation; (7) funding mechanisms and appropriations; (8) status of any litigation (i.e. competency delays); and (9) research studies.

In addition to the state profiles, advance readings will be recommended, including: 2017 COSCA policy paper, the Arizona Guide for Presiding Judges, and key trends identified in the Western Region.

TO: Judge Rebecca Robertson, President, DMCJA Board
FROM: Judge Jeffrey Goodwin, Chair, DMCJA Rules Committee
SUBJECT: WSSC Published for Comment: WACDL Proposed Amendments
DATE: January 30, 2019

As directed by the DMCJA Board, the DMCJA Rules Committee reviewed proposals for new rules that were published for comment by the WSSC. The new rules, which were requested by the Washington Association of Criminal Defense Attorneys (WACDL), have a comment deadline of April 30, 2019. They are:

- New Rule CrRLJ 3.7, Recording Interrogations
- New Rule CrRLJ 3.8, Recording Eyewitness Identification Procedure
- New Rule CrRLJ 3.9, In-Court Eyewitness Identification
- New Rule CrRLJ 4.11, Recording Witness Interviews

An additional proposal, to amend CrRLJ 4.7, is still under consideration by the Committee.

In addition to reviewing the GR 9 Cover Sheets and proposed new rules, Committee members also considered the comments made on the proposals by members of the legal profession. I would like to emphasize that the Committee did not examine the policy behind the rules, but rather the potential impact on courts of limited jurisdiction operations and whether the rules would be workable in practice.

Following a robust discussion about the proposals, the Rules Committee has two primary concerns: (1) The proposed new rules are inconsistent with existing court rules, including the Rules of Evidence, and (2) the procedures required by the rules would necessitate new hearings, which could prove onerous for courts of limited jurisdiction. In addition, the Committee found the proposals in general to be poorly worded; the drafting is unartful and would make application challenging. For these reasons, the Committee recommends that the proposals not be adopted.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter. Please let me know if you have any questions. I can be reached through 425-744-6800 or jeffrey.goodwin@snoco.org.

CC: DMCJA Rules Committee

Attachments: WACDL GR 9 Cover Sheets and New Rule Proposals

GR 9 COVER SHEET

Suggested New Criminal Rule CrRLJ 3.7 Recording Interrogations

Date: February 23, 2018

Proponent: Washington Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers
1511 Third Ave., Suite 503
Seattle, WA 98101
Ph. (206) 623-1302
Fax. (206)623-4257

Spokesperson: Kent Underwood, WACDL Court Rules Committee Co-chair

Purpose: The purpose of the rule is to improve the reliability of interrogation evidence by having a full record of the entire interrogation.

Public Hearing: Not Requested.

Expedited Consideration: Not Requested.

SUGGESTED NEW CRIMINAL RULE CrRLJ 3.7
CrRLJ 3.7 RECORDING INTERROGATIONS

(a) In General. Custodial and non-custodial interrogations of persons under investigation for any crime are to be recorded by an audiovisual recording made by use of an electronic or digital audiovisual device.

(b) Exceptions.

(1) A spontaneous statement not made in response to a question;

(2) The person requests prior to making the statement that an electronic recording not be made, and the request is electronically recorded;

(3) Malfunction of equipment, provided due diligence has been met in maintaining the recording equipment;

(4) Substantial exigent circumstances exist which prevent the recording;

(5) Statements made as a part of routine processing or “booking”; when the interrogation takes place in another jurisdiction.

The State has the burden to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that an exception is applicable.

(c) Consequences of Failure to Record. If the court finds by a preponderance of the evidence that a person was subjected to custodial or non-custodial interrogation in violation of this rule, then any statements made by the person during or following that non-recorded custodial interrogation, even if otherwise in compliance with this section, are presumed to be inadmissible in any criminal proceeding against the person, except for purposes of impeachment.

The presumption of inadmissibility may be overcome by clear and convincing evidence that the statement was voluntarily given and is reliable, based on the totality of the circumstances.

(d) Preservation. Recordings are to be preserved until the conviction is final and all direct and habeas corpus appeals are exhausted, or until the prosecution is barred by law.

GR 9 COVER SHEET

Suggested New Criminal Rule CrRLJ 3.8 Recording Eyewitness Identification Procedure

Date: February 23, 2018

Proponent: Washington Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers
1511 Third Ave., Suite 503
Seattle, WA 98101
Ph. (206) 623-1302
Fax. (206)623-4257

Spokesperson: Kent Underwood, WACDL Court Rules Committee Co-chair

Purpose: The purpose of the rule is to create a more reliable evidence of eyewitness identification by recording the eyewitness identification procedure, allowing for subsequent review.

Public Hearing: Not Requested.

Expedited Consideration: Not Requested.

SUGGESTED NEW CRIMINAL RULE CrRLJ 3.8

CrRJI 3.8 RECORDING EYEWITNESS IDENTIFICATION PROCEDURE

(a) Recording. An out-of-court identification procedure resulting from a photo array, live lineup, or show-up identification procedure conducted by a law enforcement officer shall not be admissible unless a record of the identification procedure is made.

(b) Documenting the Procedure.

(1) All interviews and identification procedures conducted with any victim/witness should be fully documented. Video-recording should be used when practicable. Audio recording is the preferred alternative. If neither video- nor audio-recording is possible, administrators should produce a detailed written report of the interview or identification procedure immediately following completion of the procedure.

(2) A confidence statement should be obtained immediately after the victim/witness makes a decision. The exact words used by the victim/witness in expressing his/her degree of confidence should be documented.

(c) Contents. The record of an out-of-court identification procedure is to include details of what occurred at the out-of court identification, including the following:

(1) The place where the identification procedure was conducted;

(2) The dialogue between the witness and the officer who administered the procedure;

(3) The results of the identification procedure, including any selection, or lack of selection, made by the witness/victim;

(4) If a live lineup, a photo of the lineup; if the identification procedure includes movements, a video of the identification procedure; if the identification procedure includes speaking, an audio recording of the speaking and a photo of the identification procedure;

(5) If a photo lineup, the photographic array, mug books or digital photographs used, including an unaltered, accurate copy of the photographs used, and an accurate copy upon which the witness indicated his or her selection;

(6) The identity of persons who witnessed the live lineup, photo lineup, or showup, including the location of such witnesses and whether those witnesses could be seen by the witness;

(7) The identity of any individuals with whom the witness has spoken about the identification, at any time before, during, or immediately after the official identification procedure, and a detailed summary of what was said. This includes the identification of both law enforcement officials and private actors who are not associated with law enforcement.

(c) **Remedy.** If the record that is prepared is lacking in important details as to what occurred at the out-of-court identification procedure, and if it was feasible to obtain and preserve those details, the court may, in its sound discretion and consistent with appropriate case law, declare the identification inadmissible, redact portions of the identification testimony, admit expert testimony, and/or fashion an appropriate jury instruction to be used in evaluating the reliability of the identification.

GR 9 COVER SHEET

Suggested New Criminal Rule CrRLJ 3.9 In-Court Eyewitness Identification

Date: June 5, 2018

Proponent: Washington Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers
1511 Third Ave., Suite 503
Seattle, WA 98101
Ph. (206) 623-1302
Fax. (206)623-4257

Spokesperson: Kent Underwood, WACDL Court Rules Committee Co-chair

Purpose: The purpose of the rule is to exclude in-court identification of an accused where the perpetrator is unknown to the witness and there has been no prior out-of-court eyewitness identification procedure. Such in-court eyewitness identifications are suggestive, often unreliable, unduly prejudicial, burden shifting and improper opinion evidence. This rule is not intended to presume that in-court identifications are admissible if there has been an out-of-court identification procedure.

Public Hearing: Not Requested.

Expedited Consideration: Not Requested.

SUGGESTED CRIMINAL RULE CrRLJ 3.9

CrRLJ 3.9 IN-COURT EYEWITNESS IDENTIFICATION

In-Court Identifications. In-court eyewitness identifications are inadmissible where the perpetrator is unknown to the witness and there has been no prior out-of-court eyewitness identification procedure.

GR 9 COVER SHEET

Suggested Amendment to Criminal Rule CrRLJ 4.11 Recording Witness Interviews

Date: February 23, 2018

Proponent: Washington Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers
1511 Third Ave., Suite 503
Seattle, WA 98101
Ph. (206) 623-1302
Fax. (206)623-4257

Spokesperson: Kent Underwood, WACDL Court Rules Committee Co-chair

Purpose: The purpose of the rule is to improve the reliability of evidence by permitting the recording of pretrial interviews, thereby having a more accurate record of the interview.

Public Hearing: Not Requested.

Expedited Consideration: Not requested.

SUGGESTED NEW CRIMINAL RULE CrRLJ 4.11

CrRLJ 4.11 RECORDING WITNESS INTERVIEWS

(a) Recording of Witness Interviews. Counsel for any party, or an employee or agent of counsel's office, may conduct witness interviews by openly using an audio recording device or other means of verbatim audio recording, including a court reporter. Such interviews are subject to the court's regulation of discovery under CrRLJ 4.7(g). Any disputes about an interview or manner of recording shall be resolved in accordance with CrRLJ 4.6(b) and (c) and CrRLJ 4.7(g). This rule shall not affect any other legal rights of witnesses.

(b) Providing Copies. Copies of recordings and transcripts, if made, shall be provided to all other parties in accordance with the requirements of CrRLJ 4.7. If an interview is recorded by a court reporter, and is discoverable under CrRLJ 4.7, any party or the witness may order a transcript thereof at the party's or witness's expense. Dissemination of audio recordings or transcripts of witness interviews obtained under this rule is prohibited except where required to satisfy the discovery obligations of CrRLJ 4.7, pursuant to court order after a showing of good cause relating solely to the criminal case at issue, or as reasonably necessary to conduct a party's case.

(c) Preliminary Statement. At the commencement of any recorded witness interview, the person conducting the interview shall confirm on the audiotape or recording that the witness has been provided the following information: (1) the name, address, and telephone number of the person conducting the interview; (2) the identity of the party represented by the person conducting the interview; and (3) that the witness may obtain a copy of the recording and transcript, if made.

(d) Witness Consent. A witness may refuse to be recorded. In the event that a witness refuses to be recorded, and there is a dispute regarding any statement made by the witness, the jury should be instructed to examine the statement carefully in the light of any reasons for the refusal and other circumstances relevant to that witness's testimony, including, but not limited to, bias and motive.

TO: Judge Rebecca Robertson, President, DMCJA Board
FROM: Judge Jeffrey Goodwin, Chair, DMCJA Rules Committee
SUBJECT: Revision of Rules Committee Charges and Inclusion in DMCJA Bylaws
DATE: January 23, 2019

In my new role Chair of the DMCJA Rules Committee, I have sought to familiarize myself with the guiding Charges of the Committee, which are contained in the Committee Roster. It appeared to me that the current Charges insufficiently capture the work of the Rules Committee, so I worked with the Committee to draft new language to better reflect the Committee's duties. The Committee unanimously approved the revised Charges, contained in the attached Committee Roster, and respectfully requests that the DMCJA Board approve the new Charges.

As part of my review, I also realized that unlike the other standing committees of the DMCJA, the Rules Committee does not have a section in the Bylaws describing its purpose. This seems like an oversight given the role of the Rules Committee and the inclusion of other Board committees. The Rules Committee agreed that it would be appropriate to have the Committee included in the Bylaws and unanimously approved the attached Bylaws amendment for the Board's review.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter. Please let me know if you have any questions. I can be reached through 425-744-6800 or jeffrey.goodwin@snoco.org.

CC: DMCJA Rules Committee

Attachments:

Revised DMCJA Rules Committee Roster and Charges

Proposed Bylaws Amendment re Court Rules Committee

2018-2019 District and Municipal Court Judges' Association Rules Committee

Listserv Address: DMCJA-Rules@listserv.courts.wa.gov

Members

**Judge Jeffrey D. Goodwin,
Chair (as of 10/2018)**

SCDC South Division
20520 68th Avenue West
Lynnwood, WA 98036-7406
425-774-8803
jeffrey.goodwin@snoco.org

**Judge Franklin L. Dacca
(Chair until 9/2018)**

~~Pierce County District Court
930 Tacoma Ave S, Rm 239
Tacoma, WA 98402-2115
253-798-7712
frank.dacca@piercecountywa.gov~~

Judge Karla E. Buttorff

Pierce County District Court
930 Tacoma Ave S, Rm 239
Tacoma, WA 98402-2115
253-798-6332
karla.butterff@piercecountywa.gov

Judge Adam Eisenberg

Seattle Municipal Court
Seattle Justice Center
600 5th Ave
PO Box 34987
Seattle, WA 98124-4987
206-684-8709
adam.eisenberg@seattle.gov

Comm. Tamara A. Hanlon

Yakima Municipal Court
200 S 3rd St
Yakima, WA 98901-2830
509-575-3050
tamara.hanlon@yakimawa.gov

Judge Lloyd D. Oaks

Pierce County District Court
930 Tacoma Ave S, Rm 239
Tacoma, WA 98402-2115
253-798-7485
lloyd.oaks@piercecountywa.gov

Judge Wade Samuelson

Lewis County District Court
Law and Justice Center
345 W Main, Fl 3
Chehalis, WA 98532-0650
360-740-1203
wade.samuelson@lewiscountywa.gov

Judge David A. Steiner

KCDC, East Division
1309 114th Ave SE, Ste 100
Bellevue, WA 98004
206-477-2102
david.steiner@kingcounty.gov

Judge Michael S. Turner

~~Raymond & South Bend Muni
4102 W 1st St
South Bend, WA 98586
360-942-8183
turnerlaw.mike@gmail.com~~

DMCMA Liaison

Patti Kohler
KCDC, South Division - MRJC
401 4th Ave N Rm 1A
Kent, WA 98032-4429
206-477-0482
patricia.kohler@kingcounty.gov

DMCMA Liaison, Alternate

Melanie Conn
Training Coordinator
KCDC, South Division – Burien
601 SW 149th St
Burien, WA 98166
(206) 477-2023
melanie.conn@kingcounty.gov

AOC Staff

J (Jennifer) Benway
Admin. Office of the Courts
PO Box 41174
Olympia, WA 98504-1174
360-357-2126
jennifer.benway@courts.wa.gov

Charges

1. Review existing court rules and recommend changes.
2. Evaluate and report on proposed rules and amendments:
 - (a) published for comment by the Washington State Supreme Court;
 - (b) requested by DMCJA members; or
 - (c) originating from non-DMCJA entities and referred by the DMCJA Board.
3. Assist DMCJA members with development of Local Rules.
4. Submit written report to DMCJA President and Board monthly.

Budget

Budget: \$500

Updated JAB 1/03/2019

ARTICLE X – Committees

Section 1. [unchanged]

Section 2. Committee Functions:

[(a) – (i) unchanged]

(j) Rules Committee:

(1) The Rules Committee will review existing court rules and recommend changes.

(2) The Rules Committee will evaluate and report on proposed rules and amendments:

(a) published for comment by the Washington State Supreme Court;

(b) requested by DMCJA members; or

(c) originating from non-DMCJA entities and referred by the DMCJA Board

(4) The Rules Committee will assist DMCJA members with development of Local Rules.

(5) The Rules Committee will submit a written report to the DMCJA President and Board monthly.

From: [Fred Gillings](#)
To: [Rebecca Robertson](#); [Steiner, David](#)
Cc: [Harvey, Sharon](#)
Subject: FW: DMCJA Board of Governors/ Request for Funding / Action Item
Date: Friday, November 16, 2018 11:56:38 AM

Judge Robertson – I am writing to you today in your capacity as President of the District and Municipal Court Judges Association (DMCJA), with a CC to Judge Steiner as Chair of the Council for Independent Courts (CIC). I am asking the DMCJA Board to provide Funding to the CIC, and thus more fully empower the CIC to fulfill it's mandate of working to ensure Judicial Independence.

By way of background, I have suggested (informally) in the past to former DMCJA President Scott Ahlf that I believe the CIC should be funded. The work being done by the CIC is "highly dynamic". By that I mean that the CIC is faced with a wide variety of Scenarios, and often must respond on short notice to issues of critical concern. I would hope that the CIC would utilize funding to access legal counsel as needed, to address the issues that are at hand. The Volunteer Judges on the CIC are already busy judges with long Court dockets. The CIC judges may find it invaluable to have legal resources available, especially to respond to issues with little advance notice and Deadlines to respond.

As Judicial officers, we are used to hearing ourselves tell Court participants "you need to talk to a Lawyer". Well, I think the CIC needs to be able to "talk to a Lawyer" from time to time, to properly address issues that are before the CIC. Funding from the DMCJA will give the CIC additional tools to work with.

I am attaching this to a prior string Email, because I thought it would be helpful, but am not sure that the other Judges on the string were aware of my intent, so apologies to them if they wanted their comments "off the record"

Fred Gillings
Marysville Municipal Court

From: Fred Gillings
Sent: Thursday, August 16, 2018 3:13 PM
To: 'David A. Larson' <David.Larson@cityoffederalway.com>; Harvey, Sharon <Sharon.Harvey@COURTS.WA.GOV>; Steiner, David <David.Steiner@KINGCOUNTY.GOV>
Cc: Scott Ahlf (sahlf@ci.olympia.wa.us) <sahlf@ci.olympia.wa.us>; Rebecca Robertson <Rebecca.Robertson@cityoffederalway.com>; James Docter <James.Docter@ci.bremerton.wa.us>; 'Linda Portnoy' <lportnoy@CI.LAKE-FOREST-PARK.WA.US>
Subject: RE: DMCJA - Judicial Independence Committee/ Thank You

Thank you Judge Larson for the kindness of a quick reply. I appreciate the fact that the Committee carefully considered the proposed Guidelines, and I accept that. Again, appreciate the hard work that went into this – I consider my issue Closed - no further reply needed

Fred

From: David A. Larson <David.Larson@cityoffederalway.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 16, 2018 12:45 PM
To: Fred Gillings <FGillings@marysvillewa.gov>; Harvey, Sharon <Sharon.Harvey@COURTS.WA.GOV>; Steiner, David <David.Steiner@KINGCOUNTY.GOV>
Cc: Scott Ahlf (sahlf@ci.olympia.wa.us) <sahlf@ci.olympia.wa.us>; Rebecca Robertson <Rebecca.Robertson@cityoffederalway.com>; James Docter <James.Docter@ci.bremerton.wa.us>
Subject: RE: DMCJA - Judicial Independence Committee



Judge Gillings: None of this is “enforceable” in the strictest sense. The paragraph in question is not intended to stop endorsements; it is in the “course of their official duties” language that is the key modifier. It is the type of issue the PDC might also be interested in if it arose. The abuse we are trying to stop is the use of official power to influence the election, not fair campaign support or opposition that is undertaken by someone that happens to hold office or a position. I will not bore you with the details, but it has happened before that someone used their position of power to undermine the judge.

Thanks.

Dave

From: Fred Gillings [<mailto:FGillings@marysvillewa.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, August 15, 2018 3:42 PM
To: Harvey, Sharon; Steiner, David; David A. Larson
Cc: Scott Ahlf (sahlf@ci.olympia.wa.us); Rebecca Robertson; James Docter
Subject: RE: DMCJA - Judicial Independence Committee

Chairman Steiner and other participants of the Workgroup:

Thank you for the work that has been put into the Final Report. When I started as a part-time, appointed Municipal Judge 14 years ago, I was blissfully unaware about the concept of judicial Independence and Integrity. Now, at this point of my career, I would have to say that Judicial Independence and Integrity is probably the single most important issue that we face in DMCJA. It is important that we, as an Association, be prepared to defend our colleagues who are facing intimidation tactics from other branches. By that, I mean we should have a contingency plan that involves funding legal responses to abrupt termination of Judges in our Association. It should become an Association issue, not a personal issue confined to one Judge.

Upon first reading, all of the proposed guidelines (which I believe may have originated with Judge Larson) are valid, substantive, and deserve to be adopted. I do have “Just One Question” though, on this topic:

III. Guidelines for Action – 2 (b) “Local public officials from other branches should not attempt to influence judicial elections in the course of their official duties”

Would this be subject to a broad interpretation that a public official could not make an “endorsement” in a contested judicial election? If that is the Workgroup’s intention, what, if any, enforcement mechanism would exist to correct a violation? What about a Scenario where a sitting Judge in a contested race purposely avoids seeking endorsements, because of the proscribed behavior in your Guidelines, but his/her opponent is actively seeking endorsements from other electeds? Wouldn’t the effect of this Guideline be to Punish the Observant, and Reward the Violator? If you have thought of the ramifications, but still endorse the guideline, I can accept that fully.

Those are my thoughts, I appreciate you reading this all the way to the end, and no reply is requested. It’s a Smoky Day here in Merrytown.....

From: District and Municipal Court Judges’ Association – subject to public disclosure

<PUBLCDMCJA@LISTSERV.COURTS.WA.GOV> **On Behalf Of** Harvey, Sharon

Sent: Wednesday, August 15, 2018 12:54 PM

To: PUBLCDMCJA@LISTSERV.COURTS.WA.GOV

Subject: [PUBLCDMCJA] DMCJA - Judicial Independence Committee



The following message is sent on behalf of Judge David A. Steiner, Council on Independent Courts Chair.

Greetings Colleagues:

On October 13, 2017, the DMCJA Board of Governors (Board) voted to create a Workgroup on Judicial Independence (Workgroup) to develop ideas and create a system of responses for judicial independence related matters. The Workgroup has finished its work and submitted a Final Report to the Board. *See attached* Workgroup on Judicial Independence Final Report.

On August 10, 2018, the Board approved the following recommendations from the Workgroup:

1. Approved the final report of the workgroup;
2. Approved the name change of the Committee from the Judicial Independence Fire Brigade to the Council on Independent Courts (CIC);
3. Forwarded proposed GR 29 Amendments to the DMCJA Rules Committee for approval and their eventual return to the Board for later consideration;
4. Approved the CIC Policy and Procedure Manual;
5. Forwarded proposed DMCJA Bylaws amendments to the Bylaws Committee for approval and their eventual return to the Board for later consideration and possible consideration at the DMCJA Spring Conference;
6. Disbanded the Workgroup on Judicial Independence and approved the Council on Independent Courts as a special committee (pending the proposed Bylaws change, which would designate the CIC as a standing committee).

For more information regarding the Council on Independent Courts, please contact me or Sharon

Harvey at Sharon.Harvey@courts.wa.gov or 360-705-5282. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Judge David A. Steiner
David.Steiner@kingcounty.gov

This e-mail has been sent to everyone in the PUBLCDCMCJA@LISTSERV.COURTS.WA.GOV mailing list. To reply to the sender, click Reply. To reply to the sender and the mailing list, click Reply All.

You can remove yourself from this mailing list at any time by sending a "SIGNOFF PUBLICDCMCJA" command to LISTSERV@LISTSERV.COURTS.WA.GOV.

**SEATAC MUNICIPAL COURT
JUDGE ROBERT W. HAMILTON**

**4800 S. 188Th Street
SeaTac, WA 98188**

November 29, 2018

Judge Rebecca Robertson
33325 8th Ave S.
Federal Way, WA 98003

RE: Litigation Expenses

I am writing this letter on behalf of the entire staff of SeaTac Municipal Court. We have concluded our dispute with the City of SeaTac. The City has withdrawn its consideration to close the Court and contract with King County. I have enclosed a copy of the invoice showing payments made to our attorney Phil Talmadge to challenge the City of SeaTac's decision to close the Court. In the past, it was expressed to me the Committee on Judicial Independence had set aside the sum of \$50,000 in 2018 in anticipation of legal costs to oppose court closures. This stance enhances protection for all our members and their respective staff.

We would very much appreciate the committee's consideration of our request for reimbursement of legal costs. It is my belief that it is important that each judge take a firm stand and zealously challenge these proposed court closures and strongly challenge each and every attempted closure. This position enhances unity and protection for all our members and their respective staff.

We also wish to express our gratitude for the Committee's assistance in supporting our opposition to this Court Closure. It is our belief your input had a significant, if not, dramatic effect on City Council's decision to keep our Court open. If I may be of assistance to any Court facing closure, I am more than willing to assist and work with your committee in support of your future endeavors.

Very truly yours,



Robert W. Hamilton

Talmadge/Fitzpatrick/Tribe
 2775 Harbor Avenue SW, 3rd Fl
 Seattle, WA 98126
 Tax ID Number 91-2104980

Statement

Date
10/11/2018

To:
Judge Robert Hamilton SeaTac Municipal Court buckleylaw2001@msn.com

				Amount Due	Amount Enc.
				\$0.00	
Date	Transaction			Amount	Balance
10/31/2017	Balance forward				0.00
06/01/2018	INV #12290.			1,190.00	1,190.00
06/11/2018	PMT			-1,190.00	0.00
07/02/2018	INV #12366.			382.50	382.50
07/10/2018	PMT			-382.50	0.00
08/01/2018	INV #12436.			595.00	595.00
08/06/2018	PMT			-595.00	0.00
09/04/2018	INV #12528.			255.00	255.00
09/10/2018	PMT			-255.00	0.00
10/01/2018	INV #12550.			637.50	637.50
10/11/2018	PMT			-637.50	0.00



District and Municipal Court Judges' Association

President

JUDGE REBECCA C. ROBERTSON
Federal Way Municipal Court
33325 8th Ave S
Federal Way, WA 98003-6325
(253) 835-3000

President-Elect

JUDGE SAMUEL G. MEYER
Thurston County District Court
2000 Lakeridge Dr SW, Bldg 3
PO Box 40947
Olympia, WA 98504-0947
(360) 786-5562

Vice-President

JUDGE MICHELLE K. GEHLEN
Bothell Municipal Court
10116 NE 183rd St
Bothell, WA 98011-3416
(425) 487-5587

Secretary/Treasurer

JUDGE JENNIFER FASSBENDER
Spokane County District Court
1100 W Mallon Ave
Spokane, WA 99210-2352
(509) 477-2901

Past President

JUDGE SCOTT K. AHLF
Olympia Municipal Court
900 Plum St SE
PO Box 1967
Olympia, WA 98507-1967
(360) 753-8312

Board of Governors

JUDGE LINDA COBURN
Edmonds Municipal Court
(425) 771-0210

JUDGE MICHAEL FINKLE
King County District Court
(206) 477-2121

JUDGE ROBERT W. GRIM
Okanogan County District Court
(509) 422-7170

JUDGE DREW ANN HENKE
Tacoma Municipal Court
(253) 591-5357

COMMISSIONER RICK LEO
Snohomish County District Court
(360) 435-7700

JUDGE AIMEE MAURER
Spokane County District Court
(509) 477-2961

JUDGE SAMUEL G. MEYER
Thurston County District Court
(360) 786-5562

JUDGE DAMON G. SHADID
Seattle Municipal Court
(206) 684-8709

JUDGE CHARLES D. SHORT
Okanogan County District Court
(509) 422-7170

JUDGE JEFFREY R. SMITH
Spokane County District Court
(509) 477-2959

January 24, 2019

Department of Social and Health Services
c/o Babette Roberts
Community Services Division
PO Box 45440
Olympia, WA 98504-5440

Washington State Attorney General's Office
c/o Joseph Christy Jr.
PO Box 40124
Olympia, WA 98504-0124

RE: COURT CONDUCTED MORAL RECONATION THERAPY

To Whom It May Concern:

The Department of Health and Human Services (DSHS) recently informed the District and Municipal Court Judges' Association (DMCJA) that they believe court-conducted Moral Reconciliation Therapy (MRT) should be certified by DSHS under RCW 26.50.150.

The DMCJA does not believe court-conducted Moral Reconciliation Therapy is subject to DSHS control, and takes the position that an attempt to do so runs afoul of principles of judicial independence and is based on an inadequate understanding of court-run programs. I have enclosed the DMCJA's position statement on the issue. Courts can understand and appreciate DSHS wanting to ensure that providers of domestic violence treatment meet a minimum standard so that judges can be confident when ordering defendants to participate in domestic violence treatment. In fact, one of the actions DSHS takes when a program does not meet its certification requirements is to "[n]otify, in writing, the presiding judge and chief probation officer of each judicial district from which the treatment program receives court referrals." Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 110-60A-0530.

Presiding judges in courts of limited jurisdiction oversee the probation officers in their courts and are well aware of the programs that the probation departments offer. These probation officers must meet minimum qualifications pursuant to statutes and court rules and the programs they present are approved by the Judge of the court. The judicial branch has the

Department of Social and Health Services
Washington State Attorney General's Office
January 24, 2019
Page 2

obligation to do its part in supervising and trying to rehabilitate its probationers. Court-run MRT programs do not fit within the confines of WAC 110-60A and therefore are not subject to DSHS certification and supervision. Courts are in the best position to determine which evidence based programs work for the rehabilitation of offenders and whether or not those programs will be used in a particular jurisdiction.

The DMCJA recognizes the necessity for DSHS to monitor private programs to certify compliance with the WAC. However, these programs are not available in all areas and are cost prohibitive for many participants. Courts are not willing nor required to have our programs reviewed or certified by an executive branch agency. We trust that DSHS understands judicial independence and will cease trying to exert unauthorized control over court programs.

I will be sending this letter to all judges in our association, as well as all managers and probation officers, advising them that that courts do not have to "certify" their own court programs with the executive branch. Courts already have the authority pursuant to statutes and court rules to offer such programs.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Rebecca Robertson".

Judge Rebecca C. Robertson
DMCJA President

Enclosure



District and Municipal Court Judges' Association

President

JUDGE REBECCA C. ROBERTSON

Federal Way Municipal Court

33325 8th Ave S

Federal Way, WA 98003-6325

(253) 835-3000

January 24, 2019

President-Elect

JUDGE SAMUEL G. MEYER

Thurston County District Court

2000 Lakeridge Dr SW, Bldg 3

PO Box 40947

Olympia, WA 98504-0947

(360) 786-5562

Vice-President

JUDGE MICHELLE K. GEHLEN

Bothell Municipal Court

10116 NE 183rd St

Bothell, WA 98011-3416

(425) 487-5587

Secretary/Treasurer

JUDGE JENNIFER FASSBENDER

Spokane County District Court

1100 W Mallon Ave

Spokane, WA 99210-2352

(509) 477-2901

Past President

JUDGE SCOTT K. AHLF

Olympia Municipal Court

900 Plum St SE

PO Box 1967

Olympia, WA 98507-1967

(360) 753-8312

Board of Governors

JUDGE LINDA COBURN

Edmonds Municipal Court

(425) 771-0210

JUDGE MICHAEL FINKLE

King County District Court

(206) 477-2121

JUDGE ROBERT W. GRIM

Okanogan County District Court

(509) 422-7170

JUDGE DREW ANN HENKE

Tacoma Municipal Court

(253) 591-5357

COMMISSIONER RICK LEO

Snohomish County District Court

(360) 435-7700

JUDGE AIMEE MAURER

Spokane County District Court

(509) 477-2961

JUDGE SAMUEL G. MEYER

Thurston County District Court

(360) 786-5562

JUDGE DAMON G. SHADID

Seattle Municipal Court

(206) 684-8709

JUDGE CHARLES D. SHORT

Okanogan County District Court

(509) 422-7170

JUDGE JEFFREY R. SMITH

Spokane County District Court

(509) 477-2959

RE: DISTRICT AND MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGES' ASSOCIATION
POSITION REGARDING MORAL RECONATION THERAPY
AS
COURT ADMINISTERED PROGRAM

Many people who come through our courts are in need of services. Often, these are indigent defendants who do not have the ability to pay for treatment/services that insurance will not cover. It is this very reason, why several courts have sent their probation officers to be trained in how to be a facilitator in the MRT program. These probation officers are to be commended for their interest and willingness to do the extra work to try and rehabilitate those who come through our courts.

CLJs have the legal authority to have MRT programs. Our legislature recognized the ability of CLJs to have probation officers and to refer defendants to probation for evaluation and services. Every judge of a court of limited jurisdiction shall have the authority to levy upon a person a monthly assessment not to exceed one hundred dollars for services provided whenever the person is referred by the court to the misdemeanor probation department for evaluation or supervision services. The assessment may also be made by a judge in superior court when such misdemeanor or gross misdemeanor cases are heard in the superior court.

RCW 10.64.120(1) (emphasis added). The legislature granted the administrative office of the courts (AOC) to define a probation department and adopt rules for the qualifications of probation officers.

For the purposes of this section the administrative office of the courts shall define a probation department and adopt rules for the qualifications of probation officers based on occupational and educational requirements developed by an oversight committee. This oversight committee shall include a representative from the district and municipal court judges' association, the misdemeanor corrections association, the administrative office of the courts, and associations of cities and counties. The oversight committee shall consider qualifications that provide the training and education

necessary to (a) conduct presentencing and post-sentencing background investigations, including sentencing recommendations to the court regarding jail terms, alternatives to incarceration, and conditions of release; and (b) provide ongoing supervision and assessment of offenders' needs and the risk they pose to the community.

RCW 10.64.120(2).1 AOC has, in fact, adopted rules governing probation departments that again acknowledge that such departments are at the direction of the presiding judge of the local court.

A misdemeanor probation department, if a court elects to establish one, is an entity that provides services designed to assist the court in the management of criminal justice and thereby aid in the preservation of public order and safety. This entity may consist of probation officers and probation clerks. The method of providing these services shall be established by the presiding judge of the local court to meet the specific needs of the court.

ARLJ 11.1. The rules explain a probation officer's qualifications, which include the ability to motivate offenders and counsel them on a variety of problems including domestic violence.

(a) Probation Officer Qualifications.

- (1) A minimum of a bachelor of arts or bachelor of science degree that provides the necessary education and skills in dealing with complex legal and human issues, as well as competence in making decisions and using discretionary judgment. A course of study in sociology, psychology, or criminal justice is preferred.
- (2) Counseling skills necessary to evaluate and act on offender crisis, assess offender needs, motivate offenders, and make recommendations to the court.
- (3) Education and training necessary to communicate effectively, both orally and in writing, to interview and counsel offenders with a wide variety of offender problems, including but not limited to alcoholism, domestic violence, mental illness, sexual deviancy; to testify in court, to communicate with referral resources, and to prepare legal documents and reports.
- (4) Anyone not meeting the above qualifications and having competently held the position of probation officer for the past two years shall be deemed to have met the qualifications.

ARLJ 11.2 (emphasis added). The legislature recognized that the practice of a profession who is regulated under the laws of this state are exempt from requirements mandated in Chapter 18.19 regulating counselors.

Nothing in this chapter may be construed to prohibit or restrict:

- (1) The practice of a profession by a person who is either registered, certified, licensed, or similarly regulated under the laws of this state and who is performing services within the person's authorized scope of practice, including any attorney admitted to practice law in this state when providing counseling incidental to and in the course of providing legal counsel;

RCW 18.19.040(1). The legislature also recognized the benefits of peer counseling and that the practice of peer counseling also is exempt from the training and certification requirements of Chapter 18.19 regulating counselors.

Nothing in this chapter may be construed to prohibit or restrict:

.....

(7) The practice of counseling by peer counselors who use their own experience to encourage and support people with similar conditions or activities related to the training of peer counselors;

RCW 18.19.040(7).

MRT is not a domestic violence treatment program. It is a program that allows the probation officer to act as a facilitator for peer to peer counseling. Despite the workbook being titled a "Domestic Violence Treatment Program," the actual program is in fact not what is contemplated in RCW 26.50.150, but is in fact peer to peer counseling run through the court, not the executive branch.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Rebecca Robertson".

Judge Rebecca C. Robertson
DMCJA President

Corporate Gifts Store Locator International Delivery 

Enter Keyword or Product Number

SEARCH

Sign In ▾ My Orders (0) Cart

LIMITED
TIME ONLY!

Save 15% SITEWIDE

on Your Next Purchase of Flowers & Gifts!

SHOP NOW

Order Confirmed

Thank you for your Order #W00825242540304

placed on January 30, 2019 12:17 PM

 [Print page](#)**Billing Address**

JUDGE JENNIFER FASSBENDER
COURTHOUSE
1208 S LUNDSTROM ST
AIRWAY HEIGHTS, WA, 99001
3607055282
SHARON.HARVEY@COURTS.WA.GOV

Payment Information

Master Card
*****6977

Order Payment Summary

Merchandise:	\$74.99
Service Charge:	\$14.99
Total Before Tax:	\$89.98
Estimated Tax:	\$8.00
Order Total:	\$97.98

Recipient 1 of 1: Send To: Chief Justice Fairhurst

**Gift Details**

**Fields of Europe™ Bliss-
Extra Large**
Item # 161272XL

Quantity: 1
Price: \$74.99

Shipping Address

Chief Justice Fairhurst
Washington State Supreme Court
415 12th Ave SW
OLYMPIA, WA 98501-2314 USA
Tel: 360-357-2054 

Delivery Options

Delivery Date:
on Thursday, Jan 31, 2019
Delivery Time:

Gift Message

Card Message
Thinking of you and believing
in Miracles. -DMCJA

Let Them Know
It's On The Way! >

Register today and enjoy these benefits:**Online Order Tracking**

Check the delivery status of your order on our website in a few simple steps.

Check Out Faster

As a registered member, all of your information is stored for you. You can click through checkout with ease.

Address Book

Store your frequently used addresses to save time at checkout.

E-mail Sign Up

Sign up to receive our e-mails and catalogs. We will keep you updated on great deals, what's new and what's hot!

Secure Credit Card Storage

Store your credit card information securely for faster and easier checkout.

* Required

* First Name: JUDGE JENNIFER

* Last Name: FASSBENDER

* E-mail: SHARON.HARVEY@COURTS.WA

* Confirm E-mail:

* Password:

* Verify Password:

create account

Introducing
Harry & David
MAISON, REGION
P.A.
One of Our Great
Gourmet Food Brands!

Have another celebration coming up?
Make it even more memorable with fresh handpicked
fruits & gourmet treats from Harry & David!

Shop HarryandDavid.com >


MORE WAYS TO SHOP

Valentine's Day Flowers
Flowers Arrangements
Same-Day Flower Delivery
Sympathy Flowers & Gifts
Roses
Birthday Flowers & Gifts
Plants
Gift Baskets & Food
International Flower Delivery
Find a Local Florist

CUSTOMER SERVICE

Customer Service
eGift Cards
Contact Us
Funeral/Sympathy Advisors

THE STEVIE AWARDS

 Top Rated In Floral
Customer Service

OUR STORES

Store Locator

ACCOUNT LOGIN

Sign In to Your Account

CHAT & SHOP WITH US

Apple Business Chat

CORPORATE

Smile Guarantee
About Us
Careers
Investor Relations

AFFILIATE PROGRAM

Become an Affiliate

OUR BLOG**COMMUNICATIONS**

Sign Up To Receive Special Offers
And Promotions From 1-800-
FLOWERS.COM

Email Address 

FOLLOW US



DMCJA BOARD MEETING
FRIDAY, MARCH 8, 2019
12:30 PM – 3:30 PM
AOC SEATAC OFFICE
SEATAC, WA

PRESIDENT REBECCA C. ROBERTSON

SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA

PAGE

Call to Order

General Business

- A. Minutes – January 11, 2019
- B. **Treasurer's Report**
- C. Special Fund Report
- D. Standing Committee Reports
 - 1. Legislative Committee – *Judge Meyer*
 - 2. Diversity Committee - The DMCJA Diversity Committee approved the sponsorship of the 2019 Judicial Institute Workshop
 - 3. Rules Committee
 - a. Minutes for November 28, 2019
 - b. Minutes for January 3, 2019
- E. Judicial Information System (JIS) Report – *Ms. Cullinane*

X1-X18

Liaison Reports

- A. Administrative Office of the Courts (**AOC**) – *Ms. Dawn Marie Rubio*
- B. Board for Judicial Administration (**BJA**) – *Judges Ringus, Jasprica, Logan, and Johnson*
- C. District and Municipal Court Management Association (**DMCMA**) – *Ms. Margaret Yetter*
- D. Misdemeanor Probation Association (**MPA**) – *Ms. Stacie Scarpaci*
- E. **Superior Court Judges' Association (SCJA) – Judge Kitty-Ann van Doorninck**
 - 1. **Washington Judicial Workload Proposal – Superior Courts**
 - 2. **Washington Judicial Workload Proposal – All Courts**
- F. Washington State Association for Justice (**WSAJ**) – *Rachel Hamar, Esq.*
- G. Washington State Bar Association (**WSBA**) – *Kim E. Hunter, Esq.*

X19-X44
X45-X70

Discussion

- A. CCJ/COSCA Western Region Summit Invitation "Improving the Court and Community Response to those with Mental Illness" – Request for DMCJA to Sponsor Judge to Attend
- B. DMCJA Rules Committee Request for Board to Oppose WACDL Proposed Rules Amendments
 - 1. Suggested New Criminal Rule CrRLJ 3.7, Recording Interrogations
 - 2. Suggested New Criminal Rule CrRLJ 3.8, Recording Eyewitness Identification

<p>Procedure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Suggested New Criminal Rule CrRLJ 3.9, In-Court Eyewitness Identification 4. Suggested Amendment to CrRLJ 4.11, Recording Witness Interviews <p>C. DMCJA Rules Committee Request for Revision of Rules Committee Charges and Inclusion in DMCJA Bylaws</p> <p>D. Council on Independent Courts (CIC) – Proposals Received</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whether to Contribute to Legal Fees Related to Judicial Independence Matters 2. Whether to Fund the CIC <p>E. CLJ-CMS Project Status Update and White Paper – Judge Kimberly Walden</p> <p>F. Joint Judicial Legislative Reception: Whether it should occur immediately following State of the Judiciary Address</p>	<p>X71-X77</p>
<p>Information</p> <p>A. 2019-2020 DMCJA Slate of Candidates</p> <p>B. Board members are encouraged to apply for DMCJA representative positions. Available positions include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. JIS CLJ “CLUG” User Group 2. Presiding Judge & Administrator Education Committee <p>C. DMCJA Board members are encouraged to submit Board agenda topics for monthly meetings.</p> <p>D. DMCJA Letter to DSHS regarding Moral Reconation Therapy</p> <p>E. Washington Citizens’ Commission on Salaries for Elected Officials will meet on February 4, 2019, from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., at the Hotel Red Lion, in Olympia, WA. For more information, please select the following web link: https://salaries.wa.gov/sites/default/files/public/Agenda.pdf</p> <p>F. The DMCJA sent flowers to Chief Justice Mary Fairhurst after receiving news of her illness.</p> <p>G. The DMCJA Board voted to support the New Hope Act, House Bill 1041, with amended language that non-restitution legal financial obligations must be paid before a person may vacate a record or conviction.</p> <p>H. The Pretrial Reform Task Force has prepared a Final Report, Bench Card, and Press Release that include best practices and recommendations regarding pretrial practices in Washington State. Please select respective web links to review the documents.</p>	<p>X78-X79</p>
<p>Other Business</p> <p>A. The next DMCJA Board Meeting is April 12, 2019, 12:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m., at the AOC SeaTac Office, SeaTac, WA.</p>	
<p>Adjourn</p>	

Christina E Huwe
Pierce County Bookkeeping
1504 58th Way SE
Auburn, WA 98092
Phone (360) 710-5937
E-Mail: piercecountybookkeeping@outlook.com

SUMMARY OF REPORTS

**WASHINGTON STATE
DISTRICT AND MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGES' ASSOCIATION**

For the Period Ending February, 2019

Please find attached the following reports for you to review:

- Statement of Financial Position
- Monthly Statement of Activities
- Bank Reconciliation Reports
- Transaction Detail Report (year-to-date)
- Current Budget Balance

Please contact me if you have any questions in regards to the attached.

PLEASE BE SURE TO KEEP FOR YOUR RECORDS

Washington State District And Municipal Court Judges Assoc.
Statement of Financial Position
As of February 28, 2019

	Feb 28, 19
ASSETS	
Current Assets	
Checking/Savings	
Bank of America - Checking	28,827
Bank of America - Savings	168,815
US Bank - Savings	70,766
Washington Federal	50,628
Total Checking/Savings	319,037
Total Current Assets	319,037
Fixed Assets	
Accumulated Depreciation	(703)
Computer Equipment	579
Total Fixed Assets	(124)
Other Assets	
Prepaid Expenses	15,333
Total Other Assets	15,333
TOTAL ASSETS	334,246
LIABILITIES & EQUITY	
Equity	
Unrestricted Earnings	(63,521)
Unrestricted Net Assets	305,296
Net Income	92,471
Total Equity	334,246
TOTAL LIABILITIES & EQUITY	334,246

Washington State District And Municipal Court Judges Assoc.

Statement of Activities

For the Eight Months Ending February 28, 2019

	Jul 18	Aug 18	Sep 18	Oct 18	Nov 18	Dec 18	Jan 19
Ordinary Income/Expense							
Income							
Interest Income	5	5	5	1	1	1	1
Membership Revenue	500	0	0	0	0	0	97,025
Other Revenue	0	370	0	0	0	0	0
Total Income	<u>505</u>	<u>375</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>97,026</u>
Gross Profit	505	375	5	1	1	1	97,026
Expense							
Prior Year Budget Expense	2,635	(70)	4,493	1,655	0	0	0
Board Meeting Expense	1,222	916	1,003	2,138	722	1,213	1,328
Bookkeeping Expense	312	345	345	918	318	318	318
Conference Calls	0	0	6	82	0	74	0
DMCJA/SCJA Sentencing Alt.	0	0	0	0	0	612	0
DMCMA Liaison Committee	0	0	0	0	31	0	32
Education Committee	0	0	0	905	233	0	0
Educational Grants	0	0	0	1,000	0	0	1,000
Judicial Assistance Committee	19	0	1,066	(3,103)	2,508	617	0
Judicial Community Outreach	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,600
Legislative Pro-Tem	195	0	0	0	0	0	150
Lobbyist Contract	5,833	5,833	5,833	5,833	5,833	5,833	5,833
National Leadership Grants	0	0	0	2,099	0	0	0
President Expense	0	38	0	0	80	0	335
Pro Tempore (Chair Approval)	0	0	0	0	0	0	163
Public Outreach (ad hoc workgrp	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SCJA Board Liaison	0	0	0	0	0	0	178
Therapeutic Courts Committee	0	0	0	0	0	200	0
Treasurer Expense and Bonds	0	0	10	0	0	0	31
Total Expense	<u>10,216</u>	<u>7,062</u>	<u>12,756</u>	<u>11,528</u>	<u>9,725</u>	<u>8,867</u>	<u>10,968</u>
Net Ordinary Income	<u>(9,711)</u>	<u>(6,687)</u>	<u>(12,751)</u>	<u>(11,527)</u>	<u>(9,724)</u>	<u>(8,867)</u>	<u>86,058</u>
Net Income	<u><u>(9,711)</u></u>	<u><u>(6,687)</u></u>	<u><u>(12,751)</u></u>	<u><u>(11,527)</u></u>	<u><u>(9,724)</u></u>	<u><u>(8,867)</u></u>	<u><u>86,058</u></u>

Washington State District And Municipal Court Judges Assoc.**Statement of Activities****For the Eight Months Ending February 28, 2019**

	<u>Feb 19</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Ordinary Income/Expense		
Income		
Interest Income	2	20
Membership Revenue	76,525	174,050
Other Revenue	0	370
Total Income	<u>76,527</u>	<u>174,440</u>
Gross Profit	76,527	174,440
Expense		
Prior Year Budget Expense	0	8,713
Board Meeting Expense	820	9,362
Bookkeeping Expense	477	3,350
Conference Calls	39	201
DMCJA/SCJA Sentencing Alt.	321	933
DMCMA Liaison Committee	0	63
Education Committee	0	1,138
Educational Grants	0	2,000
Judicial Assistance Committee	900	2,007
Judicial Community Outreach	0	1,600
Legislative Pro-Tem	433	778
Lobbyist Contract	7,833	48,667
National Leadership Grants	0	2,099
President Expense	0	453
Pro Tempore (Chair Approval)	0	163
Public Outreach (ad hoc workgrp	8	8
SCJA Board Liaison	0	178
Therapeutic Courts Committee	0	200
Treasurer Expense and Bonds	16	57
Total Expense	<u>10,847</u>	<u>81,969</u>
Net Ordinary Income	<u>65,680</u>	<u>92,471</u>
Net Income	<u><u>65,680</u></u>	<u><u>92,471</u></u>

Washington State District And Municipal Court Judges Assoc.

Reconciliation Detail

Bank of America - Savings, Period Ending 02/28/2019

Type	Date	Num	Name	Clr	Amount	Balance
Beginning Balance						108,813.09
Cleared Transactions						
Deposits and Credits - 2 items						
Transfer	02/25/2019			X	60,000.00	60,000.00
Deposit	02/28/2019			X	1.80	60,001.80
Total Deposits and Credits					60,001.80	60,001.80
Total Cleared Transactions					60,001.80	60,001.80
Cleared Balance					60,001.80	168,814.89
Register Balance as of 02/28/2019					60,001.80	168,814.89
Ending Balance					60,001.80	168,814.89

3:09 PM
03/04/19

**Washington State District And Municipal Court Judges Assoc.
Reconciliation Detail**

Bank of America - Checking, Period Ending 02/28/2019

Type	Date	Num	Name	Clr	Amount	Balance
Beginning Balance						19,650.49
Cleared Transactions						
Checks and Payments - 11 items						
Transfer	02/05/2019			X	-335.09	-335.09
Check	02/06/2019		Melanie Stewart	X	-2,000.00	-2,335.09
Check	02/06/2019		Susanna Neil Kanth...	X	-900.00	-3,235.09
Check	02/06/2019		Pierce County Book...	X	-477.00	-3,712.09
Check	02/06/2019		Jennifer L. Fassben...	X	-15.51	-3,727.60
Check	02/14/2019		AOC	X	-1,188.21	-4,915.81
Check	02/14/2019		Upper Kittitas County	X	-500.00	-5,415.81
Check	02/14/2019		Snohomish Co. Distr...	X	-420.00	-5,835.81
Check	02/19/2019		Thurston County Dis...	X	-12.69	-5,848.50
Transfer	02/25/2019			X	-60,000.00	-65,848.50
Check	02/28/2019		Melanie Stewart	X	-2,000.00	-67,848.50
Total Checks and Payments					-67,848.50	-67,848.50
Deposits and Credits - 3 items						
Deposit	02/01/2019			X	12,250.00	12,250.00
Deposit	02/01/2019			X	30,250.00	42,500.00
Deposit	02/22/2019			X	34,525.00	77,025.00
Total Deposits and Credits					77,025.00	77,025.00
Total Cleared Transactions					9,176.50	9,176.50
Cleared Balance					9,176.50	28,826.99
Register Balance as of 02/28/2019					9,176.50	28,826.99
New Transactions						
Checks and Payments - 1 item						
Check	03/01/2019		The Judicial Institute		-500.00	-500.00
Total Checks and Payments					-500.00	-500.00
Total New Transactions					-500.00	-500.00
Ending Balance					8,676.50	28,326.99

Washington State District And Municipal Court Judges Assoc. Transaction Detail by Account

July 2018 through February 2019

Type	Date	Num	Name	Memo	Amount	Balance
Bank of America - Checking						
Check	07/17/2018		Pierce County Bookkeeping	Pierce County Bookkeeping Bill Payment	(312.00)	(312.00)
Deposit	07/23/2018			Thomas W. Cox	500.00	188.00
Check	07/25/2018		Chelan County	Memo:Chalan County Treasurer Bill Payment	(2,635.47)	(2,447.47)
Check	07/26/2018		Kevin Ringus	Board Meeting Expense	(21.80)	(2,469.27)
Check	07/26/2018		Rick Leo	Board Meeting Expense	(23.38)	(2,492.65)
Check	07/26/2018		Michelle Gehlsen	Board Meeting Expense	(30.52)	(2,523.17)
Check	07/26/2018		Drew Henke	Board Meeting Expense	(30.52)	(2,553.69)
Check	07/26/2018		Samuel G. Meyer	Board Meeting Expense	(54.50)	(2,608.19)
Check	07/26/2018		Scott Ahlf	Board Meeting Expense	(54.50)	(2,662.69)
Check	07/26/2018		City of Bothell	Legislative Pro-Tem	(195.00)	(2,857.69)
Check	07/26/2018		Charles Short	Board Meeting Expense	(260.51)	(3,118.20)
Check	07/26/2018		Robert Grim	Board Meeting Expense	(272.50)	(3,390.70)
Check	07/26/2018		Ingallina's Box Lunch	Ingallina's Box Lunch Bill Payment	(383.13)	(3,773.83)
Check	07/26/2018		Melanie Stewart	July Payment	(2,000.00)	(5,773.83)
Check	07/27/2018		Michelle Gehlsen	Board Meeting Expense	(30.52)	(5,804.35)
Check	07/27/2018		Michael Finkle	Board Meeting Expense	(26.16)	(5,830.51)
Check	07/30/2018		Mary C. Logan	Judicial Assistance Committee	(18.72)	(5,849.23)
Check	07/30/2018		Linda Coburn	Board Meeting Expense	(33.79)	(5,883.02)
Transfer	08/13/2018			Funds Transfer to Credit Card	(38.13)	(5,921.15)
Check	08/13/2018		Pierce County Bookkeeping	July bookkeeping	(344.50)	(6,265.65)
Deposit	08/15/2018			bank of america cash reward	369.81	(5,895.84)
Deposit	08/15/2018			Reimbursement from Rebecca Robertson	169.96	(5,725.88)
Check	08/16/2018		Judy Jasprica	Board Meeting Expense	(139.42)	(5,865.30)
Check	08/16/2018		Drew Henke	DMCJ Board Meeting 8/10/18	(27.25)	(5,892.55)
Check	08/18/2018		Kevin Ringus	DMCJ Board Meeting 8/10/18	(21.80)	(5,914.35)
Check	08/16/2018		Michael Finkle	DMCJ Board Meeting 8/10/18	(19.62)	(5,933.97)
Check	08/16/2018		Michelle Gehlsen	DMCJ Board Meeting 8/10/18	(28.34)	(5,962.31)
Check	08/16/2018		Rick Leo	DMCJ Board Meeting 8/10/18	(26.09)	(5,988.40)
Check	08/16/2018		Samuel G. Meyer	DMCJ Board Meeting 8/10/18	(54.50)	(6,042.90)
Check	08/16/2018		Scott Ahlf	DMCJ Board Meeting 8/10/18	(54.50)	(6,097.40)
Check	08/17/2018		Melanie Stewart	August payment	(2,000.00)	(8,097.40)
Check	08/21/2018		Jennifer L. Fassbender	DMCJ Board Meeting 8/10/18	(21.57)	(8,118.97)
Check	08/21/2018		Dan B Johnson	DMCJ Board Meeting 8/10/18	(407.66)	(8,526.63)
Check	08/21/2018		Robert Grim	DMCJ Board Meeting 8/10/18	(115.46)	(8,642.09)
Check	08/31/2018		Superior Court Judges Association	Prior Year	(99.50)	(8,741.59)
Check	09/05/2018		Melanie Stewart	September payment	(2,000.00)	(10,741.59)
Check	09/05/2018		AOC		(1,009.19)	(11,750.78)
Check	09/05/2018		4imprint		(1,312.05)	(13,062.83)
Check	09/05/2018		Judith Anderson		(16.00)	(13,078.83)
Check	09/06/2018		AOC		(3,181.27)	(16,260.10)
Check	09/07/2018		Pierce County Bookkeeping		(344.50)	(16,604.60)
Transfer	09/10/2018			Funds Transfer	10,000.00	(6,604.60)
Transfer	09/17/2018			Funds Transfer Credit Card payment	(10.00)	(6,614.60)
Check	09/17/2018		Susanna Neil Kanther-Raz		(1,050.00)	(7,664.60)
Check	10/02/2018		Kevin Ringus		(139.42)	(7,804.02)
Check	10/04/2018		Kevin Ringus		(36.00)	(7,840.02)
Check	10/04/2018		Administrative Office of the Courts	April, Invoice	(1,515.08)	(9,355.10)
Check	10/04/2018		Ingallina's Box Lunch	Memo:Ingallina's Box Lunch Bill Payment	(333.80)	(9,688.90)
Check	10/04/2018		Rebecca Robertson		(46.00)	(9,734.90)
Check	10/04/2018		Michael Finkle		(141.42)	(9,876.32)
Check	10/04/2018		Michelle Gehlsen		(141.42)	(10,017.74)
Check	10/04/2018		Linda Coburn		(141.42)	(10,159.16)
Check	10/12/2018		Dino W Traverso, PLLC		(600.00)	(10,759.16)
Check	10/12/2018		Pierce County Bookkeeping	September invoice 767	(318.00)	(11,077.16)
Check	10/12/2018		Dan B Johnson	9/23	(36.00)	(11,113.16)
Check	10/12/2018		City of Olympia	9/23 Board meeting	(105.42)	(11,218.58)
Deposit	10/12/2018			Deposit	7,000.00	(4,218.58)
Check	10/17/2018		Scott Ahlf		(36.00)	(4,254.58)
Check	10/17/2018		Judy Jasprica		(141.42)	(4,396.00)
Check	10/18/2018		Melanie Stewart	October payment	(2,000.00)	(6,396.00)
Check	10/19/2018		Ingallina's Box Lunch	Ingallina's Box Lunch Bill Payment	(270.82)	(6,666.82)
Check	10/19/2018		Jennifer L. Fassbender	9/23 board meeting	(136.91)	(6,803.73)
Check	10/19/2018		Bruce Weiss	JASP Meeting 10/5/18	(44.69)	(6,848.42)
Check	10/19/2018		Claire Sussman	JASP Meeting 10/5/18	(21.80)	(6,870.22)
Check	10/19/2018		Douglas Fair	JASP Meeting 10/5/18	(32.70)	(6,902.92)
Check	10/19/2018		Douglas B. Robinson	JASP Meeting 10/5/18	(473.62)	(7,376.54)
Check	10/19/2018		James Doctor	JASP Meeting 10/5/18	(64.95)	(7,441.49)
Check	10/19/2018		Mary C. Logan	JASP Meeting 10/5/18	(18.72)	(7,460.21)
Check	10/19/2018		Marybeth Dingley	JASP Meeting 10/5/18	(39.24)	(7,499.45)
Check	10/19/2018		Michael Finkle	JASP Meeting 10/5/18	(31.61)	(7,531.06)
Check	10/19/2018		Timothy Jenkins	JASP Meeting 10/5/18	(59.81)	(7,590.87)
Check	10/19/2018		Administrative Office of the Courts	10/2018 invoice	(827.06)	(8,417.93)
Check	10/19/2018		Marilyn Paja	NAWJ Annual Meeting	(2,099.00)	(10,516.93)
Check	10/19/2018		Chris Culp	JASP meeting 10/5/18	(304.80)	(10,821.73)
Check	10/19/2018		Jackie Shea-Brown	JASP meeting 10/5/18	(364.32)	(11,186.05)
Check	10/19/2018		Susan Woodard	JASP meeting 10/5/18	(340.02)	(11,526.07)
Check	10/19/2018		Jennifer L. Fassbender	10/12/18	(7.50)	(11,533.57)

Washington State District And Municipal Court Judges Assoc. Transaction Detail by Account

July 2018 through February 2019

Type	Date	Num	Name	Memo	Amount	Balance
Check	10/19/2018		Michael Finkle	Board meeting 10/12/18	(19.62)	(11,553.19)
Check	10/22/2018		G. Andrew H. Benjamin	Memo:G. Andrew H. Benjmin Bill Payment	(750.00)	(12,303.19)
Check	10/22/2018		Samuel G. Meyer		(54.50)	(12,357.69)
Check	10/22/2018		Charles Short		(374.54)	(12,732.23)
Check	10/24/2018		Douglas Fair	Ed. Comm meeting 10/18	(32.70)	(12,764.93)
Check	10/24/2018		James Doctor	Ed. Comm meeting 10/18	(64.95)	(12,829.88)
Check	10/24/2018		Roy Fore	Ed. Comm meeting 10/18	(166.77)	(12,996.65)
Check	10/24/2018		Timothy Jenkins	Ed. Comm meeting 10/18	(9.81)	(13,006.46)
Check	10/24/2018		Tom Verge	Ed. Comm meeting 10/18	(85.02)	(13,091.48)
Check	10/25/2018		Charles Short	10/18/18	(369.43)	(13,460.91)
Deposit	10/25/2018			Online Banking transfer from SAV 7604 Co...	5,000.00	(8,460.91)
Check	10/25/2018		Thurston County District Court	NAPCO Conference	(1,000.00)	(9,460.91)
Check	10/26/2018		Ingallina's Box Lunch	10/18/18	(176.66)	(9,637.57)
Check	10/29/2018		Susanna Neil Kanther-Raz	10/5/18 Training	(721.26)	(10,358.83)
Deposit	10/30/2018		Linda Coburn	RETURNED BILL PAYMENT FROM Linda ...	33.79	(10,325.04)
Check	10/30/2018		Linda Coburn	7/13/18 DMCJA Board Meeting	(33.79)	(10,358.83)
Check	11/01/2018		Melanie Stewart	November invoice	(2,000.00)	(12,358.83)
Check	11/05/2018		Susanna Neil Kanther-Raz	4th quarter, 2018	(900.00)	(13,258.83)
Check	11/05/2018		Michael Evans		(48.19)	(13,307.02)
Transfer	11/08/2018			Funds Transfer	5,000.00	(8,307.02)
Check	11/09/2018		Cave B	Deposit	(1,559.55)	(9,866.57)
Check	11/09/2018		Pierce County Bookkeeping	October services invoice 776	(318.00)	(10,184.57)
Check	11/16/2018		Samuel G. Meyer	Board meeting 11/9/18	(54.50)	(10,239.07)
Check	11/16/2018		Michelle Gehlsen	Board meeting 11/9/18	(30.52)	(10,269.59)
Check	11/16/2018		Rick Leo	Board meeting 11/9/18	(25.54)	(10,295.13)
Check	11/16/2018		Linda Coburn	Board meeting 11/9/18	(16.89)	(10,312.02)
Check	11/21/2018		Jeffery Smith	11-5-18 - 11-8-18	(233.00)	(10,545.02)
Check	11/21/2018		Jeffery Smith	11/9/18	(216.85)	(10,761.87)
Check	11/21/2018		Michelle Gehlsen	11/8/18	(30.52)	(10,792.39)
Check	11/21/2018		Michael Finkle	11/9/18	(21.80)	(10,814.19)
Check	11/21/2018		Jennifer L. Fassbender	11/9/18	(7.50)	(10,821.69)
Check	11/21/2018		Ingallina's Box Lunch	11/9/18 board meeting	(348.65)	(11,170.34)
Check	12/03/2018		Melanie Stewart	December services	(2,000.00)	(13,170.34)
Transfer	12/04/2018			Funds Transfer	(79.86)	(13,250.20)
Transfer	12/07/2018			Funds Transfer	5,000.00	(8,250.20)
Check	12/07/2018		Pierce County Bookkeeping		(318.00)	(8,568.20)
Check	12/07/2018		AOC	October charges MS111918-03	(2,523.72)	(11,091.92)
Check	12/17/2018		Drew Henke		(14.17)	(11,106.09)
Check	12/17/2018		Kevin Ringus		(21.80)	(11,127.89)
Check	12/17/2018		Linda Coburn		(16.89)	(11,144.78)
Check	12/17/2018		Michelle Gehlsen		(30.52)	(11,175.30)
Check	12/17/2018		Samuel G. Meyer		(54.50)	(11,229.80)
Check	12/17/2018		Scott Ahlf		(54.50)	(11,284.30)
Check	01/02/2019		Melanie Stewart	January Invoice 4598	(2,000.00)	(13,284.30)
Check	01/02/2019		Ingallina's Box Lunch	01-470202	(370.59)	(13,654.89)
Check	01/02/2019		Washington YMCA Youth & Gove...		(1,600.00)	(15,254.89)
Check	01/02/2019		Jennifer L. Fassbender	Postage for dues sent to bookkeeper	(15.51)	(15,270.40)
Transfer	01/02/2019			Funds Transfer	4,000.00	(11,270.40)
Check	01/04/2019		Jennifer L. Fassbender		(10.00)	(11,280.40)
Deposit	01/04/2019			Deposit	21,750.00	10,469.60
Deposit	01/08/2019			Deposit	750.00	11,219.60
Check	01/14/2019		Pierce County Bookkeeping		(318.00)	10,901.60
Check	01/14/2019		AOC		(329.24)	10,572.36
Check	01/14/2019		Spokane Municipal Court	Washington DC	(1,000.00)	9,572.36
Deposit	01/18/2019			Deposit	25,000.00	34,572.36
Deposit	01/18/2019			Deposit	11,000.00	45,572.36
Deposit	01/18/2019			Deposit	18,000.00	63,572.36
Check	01/18/2019		Jennifer L. Fassbender	Postage for dues sent to Bookkeeper	(15.51)	63,556.85
Check	01/18/2019		Ingallina's Box Lunch	01-473478	(302.56)	63,254.29
Check	01/18/2019		Charles Short	DMCJA Meeting 1/11/19	(103.45)	63,150.84
Check	01/18/2019		Linda Coburn	DMCJA Meeting 1/11/19	(35.96)	63,114.88
Check	01/18/2019		Michelle Gehlsen	DMCJA Meeting 1/11/19	(32.48)	63,082.40
Check	01/18/2019		Rick Leo	DMCJA Meeting 1/11/19	(27.43)	63,054.97
Check	01/18/2019		Samuel G. Meyer	DMCJA Meeting 1/11/19	(58.00)	62,996.97
Check	01/18/2019		Scott Ahlf	DMCJA Meeting 1/11/19	(58.00)	62,938.97
Check	01/18/2019		Samuel G. Meyer	SCJA Meeting 11/03/18	(54.50)	62,884.47
Check	01/18/2019		Samuel G. Meyer	SCJA Meeting 1/11/19	(65.40)	62,819.07
Check	01/18/2019		Samuel G. Meyer	SCJA Meeting 1/5/19	(58.00)	62,761.07
Check	01/18/2019		City of Bothell	AOC meeting Seatac 1/10/19	(162.50)	62,598.57
Check	01/18/2019		Michelle Gehlsen	DMCMA meeting 1/10/19	(32.48)	62,566.09
Transfer	01/22/2019			Funds Transfer	(50,000.00)	12,566.09
Deposit	01/23/2019			Deposit	20,525.00	33,091.09
Check	01/25/2019		Thurston County District Court	1/15/19	(150.00)	32,941.09
Transfer	01/28/2019			Funds Transfer	(30,000.00)	2,941.09
Deposit	02/01/2019			Deposit	12,250.00	15,191.09
Deposit	02/01/2019			Deposit	30,250.00	45,441.09
Transfer	02/05/2019			Funds Transfer	(335.09)	45,106.00
Check	02/06/2019		Melanie Stewart		(2,000.00)	43,106.00

Washington State District And Municipal Court Judges Assoc. Transaction Detail by Account

July 2018 through February 2019

Type	Date	Num	Name	Memo	Amount	Balance
Check	02/06/2019		Jennifer L. Fassbender	Postage for dues sent to Bookkeeper	(15.51)	43,090.49
Check	02/06/2019		Pierce County Bookkeeping		(477.00)	42,613.49
Check	02/06/2019		Susanna Neil Kanther-Raz		(900.00)	41,713.49
Check	02/14/2019		AOC		(1,188.21)	40,525.28
Check	02/14/2019		Upper Kittitas County		(500.00)	40,025.28
Check	02/14/2019		Snohomish Co. District Court		(420.00)	39,605.28
Check	02/19/2019		Thurston County District Court	1/15/19	(12.69)	39,592.59
Deposit	02/22/2019			Deposit	34,525.00	74,117.59
Transfer	02/25/2019			Funds Transfer	(60,000.00)	14,117.59
Check	02/28/2019		Melanie Stewart		(2,000.00)	12,117.59
Total Bank of America - Checking					12,117.59	12,117.59
Bank of America - Savings						
Deposit	07/31/2018			Interest	0.98	0.98
Deposit	08/31/2018			Interest	0.98	1.96
Transfer	09/10/2018			to general checking	(10,000.00)	(9,998.04)
Deposit	09/30/2018			Interest	0.84	(9,997.20)
Deposit	10/25/2018			Online Banking transfer from SAV 7604 Co...	(5,000.00)	(14,997.20)
Deposit	10/31/2018			Interest	0.79	(14,996.41)
Transfer	11/08/2018			Funds Transfer	(5,000.00)	(19,996.41)
Deposit	11/30/2018			Interest	0.64	(19,995.77)
Transfer	12/07/2018			Funds Transfer	(5,000.00)	(24,995.77)
Deposit	12/31/2018			Interest	0.57	(24,995.20)
Transfer	01/02/2019			Funds Transfer	(4,000.00)	(28,995.20)
Transfer	01/22/2019			Funds Transfer	50,000.00	21,004.80
Transfer	01/28/2019			Funds Transfer	30,000.00	51,004.80
Deposit	01/31/2019			Interest	0.83	51,005.63
Transfer	02/25/2019			Funds Transfer	60,000.00	111,005.63
Deposit	02/28/2019			Interest	1.80	111,007.43
Total Bank of America - Savings					111,007.43	111,007.43
Washington Federal						
Deposit	07/31/2018			Interest	4.30	4.30
Deposit	08/31/2018			Interest	4.30	8.60
Deposit	09/30/2018			Interest	4.16	12.76
Total Washington Federal					12.76	12.76
Prepaid Expenses						
Genera...	07/31/2018	CEH		1/12 of Contract	(3,833.33)	(3,833.33)
Genera...	08/15/2018	CEH		1/12 of Contract	(3,833.33)	(7,666.66)
Genera...	09/17/2018	CEH		1/12 of Contract	(3,833.33)	(11,499.99)
Genera...	10/31/2018	CEH		1/12 of Contract	(3,833.33)	(15,333.32)
Genera...	11/30/2018	CEH		1/12 of Contract	(3,833.33)	(19,166.65)
Genera...	12/31/2018	CEH		1/12 of Contract	(3,833.33)	(22,999.98)
Genera...	01/31/2019	CEH		1/12 of Contract	(3,833.33)	(26,833.31)
Genera...	02/28/2019	CEH		1/12 of Contract	(3,833.33)	(30,666.64)
Total Prepaid Expenses					(30,666.64)	(30,666.64)
Bank of America C. C.						
Credit ...	08/07/2018		Budd Bay Cafe Olympia		(38.13)	(38.13)
Transfer	08/13/2018			Funds Transfer	38.13	0.00
Credit ...	09/17/2018		Secretary of State		(10.00)	(10.00)
Transfer	09/17/2018			Funds Transfer	10.00	0.00
Credit ...	11/30/2018		1-800-Flowers.com		(79.86)	(79.86)
Transfer	12/04/2018			Funds Transfer	79.86	0.00
Credit ...	01/18/2019		Anthony's Homeport		(237.11)	(237.11)
Credit ...	01/30/2019		1-800-Flowers.com		(97.98)	(335.09)
Transfer	02/05/2019			Funds Transfer	335.09	0.00
Total Bank of America C. C.					0.00	0.00
Interest Income						
Deposit	07/31/2018			Interest	(0.98)	(0.98)
Deposit	07/31/2018			Interest	(4.30)	(5.28)
Deposit	08/31/2018			Interest	(4.30)	(9.58)
Deposit	08/31/2018			Interest	(0.98)	(10.56)
Deposit	09/30/2018			Interest	(0.84)	(11.40)
Deposit	09/30/2018			Interest	(4.16)	(15.56)
Deposit	10/31/2018			Interest	(0.79)	(16.35)
Deposit	11/30/2018			Interest	(0.64)	(16.99)
Deposit	12/31/2018			Interest	(0.57)	(17.56)
Deposit	01/31/2019			Interest	(0.83)	(18.39)
Deposit	02/28/2019			Interest	(1.80)	(20.19)
Total Interest Income					(20.19)	(20.19)

Washington State District And Municipal Court Judges Assoc. Transaction Detail by Account

July 2018 through February 2019

Type	Date	Num	Name	Memo	Amount	Balance
Membership Revenue						
Deposit	07/23/2018		Thomas W. Cox	Garfield County	(500.00)	(500.00)
Deposit	01/04/2019	1777...	Robin R. McCroskey	Pend Oreille County	(1,000.00)	(1,500.00)
Deposit	01/04/2019	1031...	Patti Connolly Walker	County of Spokane	(1,000.00)	(2,500.00)
Deposit	01/04/2019	1031...	Jennifer L. Fassbender	County of Spokane	(1,000.00)	(3,500.00)
Deposit	01/04/2019	1031...	Debra Hayes	County of Spokane	(1,000.00)	(4,500.00)
Deposit	01/04/2019	1031...	Patrick Johnson	County of Spokane	(1,000.00)	(5,500.00)
Deposit	01/04/2019	1031...	Richard M. Leland	County of Spokane	(1,000.00)	(6,500.00)
Deposit	01/04/2019	1031...	Aimee N. Maurer	County of Spokane	(1,000.00)	(7,500.00)
Deposit	01/04/2019	1031...	Jeffrey R. Smith	County of Spokane	(1,000.00)	(8,500.00)
Deposit	01/04/2019	1031...	Donna Wilson	County of Spokane	(1,000.00)	(9,500.00)
Deposit	01/04/2019	1031...	Eric Dooyema	County of Spokane	(800.00)	(10,300.00)
Deposit	01/04/2019	0033...	Douglas B. Robinson	City of Colfax	(250.00)	(10,550.00)
Deposit	01/04/2019	7942	David M. Kenworthy	Associate/retired	(25.00)	(10,575.00)
Deposit	01/04/2019	456	Paul Treyz	Associate/retired	(25.00)	(10,600.00)
Deposit	01/04/2019	3403...	John E. Hart	Whitman County	(1,000.00)	(11,600.00)
Deposit	01/04/2019	9201...	Tyson R. Hill	Grant County	(1,000.00)	(12,600.00)
Deposit	01/04/2019	9201...	Janis Whitener-Moberg	Grant County	(1,000.00)	(13,600.00)
Deposit	01/04/2019	9201...	Brian D. Barlow	Grant County	(1,000.00)	(14,600.00)
Deposit	01/04/2019	9201...	Anna Gigliotti	Grant County	(800.00)	(15,400.00)
Deposit	01/04/2019	5534...	Amy Kaestner	City of Everett	(1,000.00)	(16,400.00)
Deposit	01/04/2019	5534...	Laura Vanslyck	City of Everett	(1,000.00)	(17,400.00)
Deposit	01/04/2019	4204...	John O. Knowlton	Walla Walla County	(250.00)	(17,650.00)
Deposit	01/04/2019	1772...	Mindy Walker	Jefferson County	(1,000.00)	(18,650.00)
Deposit	01/04/2019	8157	Dale A. McBeth	Chehalis Municipal Court (personal check)	(250.00)	(18,900.00)
Deposit	01/04/2019	9839...	Dave Neupert	Clallam County	(1,000.00)	(19,900.00)
Deposit	01/04/2019	5008	John Curry	Orting Municipal Court (Curry & Williams, P...	(250.00)	(20,150.00)
Deposit	01/04/2019	3708...	Scott Ahlf	City of Olympia	(1,000.00)	(21,150.00)
Deposit	01/04/2019	22713	Rich Fitterer	Associate/Retired	(25.00)	(21,175.00)
Deposit	01/04/2019	7669	Stephen R. Buzzard	Associate/Retired	(25.00)	(21,200.00)
Deposit	01/04/2019	1448...	Elizabeth Penoyar	Pacific County	(500.00)	(21,700.00)
Deposit	01/04/2019	1448...	Nancy R. McAllister	Pacific County	(500.00)	(22,200.00)
Deposit	01/04/2019	13050	Victoria Meadows	Mason County Associate	(25.00)	(22,225.00)
Deposit	01/04/2019	7845	Mark A. Chmielewski	Associate	(25.00)	(22,250.00)
Deposit	01/08/2019	78977	Linda S. Portnoy	City of Lake Forest Park	(500.00)	(22,750.00)
Deposit	01/08/2019	0001...	C. Scott Sage	City of Oean Shores	(250.00)	(23,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	1527...	Virginia M. Amato	King County District Court	(1,000.00)	(24,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	1527...	Marcine Anderson	King County District Court	(1,000.00)	(25,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	1527...	Joe Campagna	King County District Court	(1,000.00)	(26,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	1527...	Arthur Chapman	King County District Court	(1,000.00)	(27,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	1527...	Mark Chow	King County District Court	(1,000.00)	(28,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	1527...	David Christie	King County District Court	(1,000.00)	(29,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	1527...	D. Mark Eide	King County District Court	(1,000.00)	(30,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	1527...	Michael Finkle	King County District Court	(1,000.00)	(31,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	1527...	Laurel Gibson	King County District Court	(1,000.00)	(32,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	1527...	Nathaniel B. Green, JR.	King County District Court	(1,000.00)	(33,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	1527...	Corinna Harn	King County District Court	(1,000.00)	(34,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	1527...	Anne C. Harper	King County District Court	(1,000.00)	(35,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	1527...	Gregg Hirakawa	King County District Court	(1,000.00)	(36,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	1527...	Rhonda Laumann	King County District Court	(1,000.00)	(37,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	1527...	Susan Mahoney	King County District Court	(1,000.00)	(38,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	1527...	Peter Nault	King County District Court	(1,000.00)	(39,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	1527...	Marcus W. Naylor	King County District Court	(1,000.00)	(40,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	1527...	Lisa O'Toole	King County District Court	(1,000.00)	(41,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	1527...	Lisa Paglisotti	King County District Court	(1,000.00)	(42,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	1527...	Jason Poydras	King County District Court	(1,000.00)	(43,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	1527...	Ketu Shah	King County District Court	(1,000.00)	(44,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	1527...	David A. Steiner	King County District Court	(1,000.00)	(45,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	1527...	Elizabeth D. Stephenson	King County District Court	(1,000.00)	(46,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	1527...	Donna Tucker	King County District Court	(1,000.00)	(47,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	1527...	Matthew York	King County District Court	(1,000.00)	(48,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	4100...	Damon G. Shadid	Seattle Municipal Court	(1,000.00)	(49,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	4100...	Adam C. Eisenberg	Seattle Municipal Court	(1,000.00)	(50,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	4100...	Faye R. Chess	Seattle Municipal Court	(1,000.00)	(51,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	4100...	Anita M. Crawford-Willis	Seattle Municipal Court	(1,000.00)	(52,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	4100...	Willie Gregory	Seattle Municipal Court	(1,000.00)	(53,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	4100...	Andrea Chin	Seattle Municipal Court	(1,000.00)	(54,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	4100...	Edward McKenna	Seattle Municipal Court	(1,000.00)	(55,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	4100...	Park D. Eng	Magistrate Seattle Municipal Court	(800.00)	(55,800.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	4100...	Robert Chung	Magistrate Seattle Municipal Court	(800.00)	(56,600.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	4100...	Mary Lynch	Magistrate Seattle Municipal Court	(800.00)	(57,400.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	4100...	Jennifer Cruz	Magistrate Seattle Municipal Court	(800.00)	(58,200.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	4100...	Jerome Roache	Magistrate Seattle Municipal Court	(800.00)	(59,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019		Michael Bobbink	Personal check (no check number on check)	(500.00)	(59,500.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019		Vance Peterson	Spokane County District Court (Western uni...	(25.00)	(59,525.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	0016...	Stephen E. Moore	Lynnwood Municipal Court	(1,000.00)	(60,525.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	1532...	Kelley Olwell	Yakima Municipal Court	(1,000.00)	(61,525.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	0015...	Susan Adams	Yakima Municipal Court	(1,000.00)	(62,525.00)

Washington State District And Municipal Court Judges Assoc. Transaction Detail by Account

July 2018 through February 2019

Type	Date	Num	Name	Memo	Amount	Balance
Deposit	01/18/2019	0907...	Andrea Vingo	Hoquiam Municipal Court	(500.00)	(63,025.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	8590	Elizabeth E. Verhey	Retired	(25.00)	(63,050.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	2654...	David A. Larson	Federal Way Municipal Court	(1,000.00)	(64,050.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	2654...	Rebecca Robertson	Federal Way Municipal Court	(1,000.00)	(65,050.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	0005...	Debra Lev	Bellingham Municipal	(1,000.00)	(66,050.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	0005...	Pete Smiley	Bellingham Municipal	(800.00)	(66,850.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	1082	David Ebenger	Winthrop, Twisp, Omak & Brewster	(250.00)	(67,100.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	0107...	Anthony Parise	Whatcom County Dist	(800.00)	(67,900.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	0107...	Matt Elich	Whatcom County Dist	(1,000.00)	(68,900.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	0107...	David Grant	Whatcom County Dist	(1,000.00)	(69,900.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	17576	G. Scott Marinella	Columbia County District	(500.00)	(70,400.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	1008...	Wade Samuelson	Lewis County District	(1,000.00)	(71,400.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	1008...	R. W. Buzzard	Lewis County District	(1,000.00)	(72,400.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	1008...	Wendy S. Tripp	Lewis County District	(200.00)	(72,600.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	0015...	Tamara A. Hanlon	Yakima Municipal Court	(400.00)	(73,000.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	9840...	Erik S. Rohrer	Clallam county District Court	(500.00)	(73,500.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	53516	Christopher L. Bates	Montesano Municipal Court	(250.00)	(73,750.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	0806...	George Steele	Mason County District Court	(1,000.00)	(74,750.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	3708...	Terry Jurado	Renton Municipal Court	(1,000.00)	(75,750.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	0002...	Rick L. Hansen	East District Court Klickitat	(500.00)	(76,250.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	84181	Roger Bennett	City of Battle Ground	(500.00)	(76,750.00)
Deposit	01/18/2019	35117	Joseph Mano	Napavine Municipal	(250.00)	(77,000.00)
Deposit	01/23/2019	0019...	Wayne Stewart	City of Mercer Island	(500.00)	(77,500.00)
Deposit	01/23/2019	4204...	Kristian E. Hedine	Walla Walla District	(1,000.00)	(78,500.00)
Deposit	01/23/2019	8103...	Darrel R. Ellis	Kittitas County	(1,000.00)	(79,500.00)
Deposit	01/23/2019	0017...	N. Scott Stewart	Issaquah Municipal Court	(500.00)	(80,000.00)
Deposit	01/23/2019	2022...	Douglas Fair	Snohomish County	(1,000.00)	(81,000.00)
Deposit	01/23/2019	2022...	Jeffery Goodwin	Snohomish County	(1,000.00)	(82,000.00)
Deposit	01/23/2019	2022...	Elizabeth A. Fraiser	Snohomish County	(1,000.00)	(83,000.00)
Deposit	01/23/2019	2022...	Rick Leo	Snohomish County	(1,000.00)	(84,000.00)
Deposit	01/23/2019	2022...	Jenn Rancourt	Snohomish County	(1,000.00)	(85,000.00)
Deposit	01/23/2019	2022...	Patricia L. Lyon	Snohomish County	(1,000.00)	(86,000.00)
Deposit	01/23/2019	2022...	Steven Clough	Snohomish County	(1,000.00)	(87,000.00)
Deposit	01/23/2019	2022...	Tam Thi-Dang Bui	Snohomish County	(1,000.00)	(88,000.00)
Deposit	01/23/2019	2022...	Tony Howard	Snohomish County	(1,000.00)	(89,000.00)
Deposit	01/23/2019	9910...	Dan LeBeau	Town of Colton	(250.00)	(89,250.00)
Deposit	01/23/2019	50713	Therese Murphy	Zillah Municipal Court	(250.00)	(89,500.00)
Deposit	01/23/2019	31861	Michael L. Everett	Wapato Municipal Court (Associate Member	(25.00)	(89,525.00)
Deposit	01/23/2019	2124...	John A. Miller	Fircrest Municipal Court	(250.00)	(89,775.00)
Deposit	01/23/2019	03725	Robert Grim	Okanogan Co. District Court	(1,000.00)	(90,775.00)
Deposit	01/23/2019	03725	Charles Short	Okanogan Co. District Court	(1,000.00)	(91,775.00)
Deposit	01/23/2019	3225...	Eric C. Bigger	Douglas County District	(1,000.00)	(92,775.00)
Deposit	01/23/2019	51351	Chancey C. Crowell	East Wenatchee Municipal Court	(500.00)	(93,275.00)
Deposit	01/23/2019	0633...	Susan L. Solan	Aberdeen Municipal Court	(500.00)	(93,775.00)
Deposit	01/23/2019	64769	Sandra L. Allen	Milton Court	(250.00)	(94,025.00)
Deposit	01/23/2019	75993	Timothy A. Dury	Port Orchard Municipal Court	(500.00)	(94,525.00)
Deposit	01/23/2019	1097...	Kevin Ringus	Fife Municipal Court	(1,000.00)	(95,525.00)
Deposit	01/23/2019	6048...	Thomas Copland	Grays Harbor County	(1,000.00)	(96,525.00)
Deposit	01/23/2019	6048...	Kyle Imler	Grays Harbor County	(1,000.00)	(97,525.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	0160...	Darrel R. Ellis	City of Roslyn (Mailed from Judge Robertson)	(250.00)	(97,775.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	2057...	Michelle Gehlsen	City of Bottell (Mailed from Judge Robertson)	(1,000.00)	(98,775.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	1416...	Kristen L. Parcher	Clark County	(1,000.00)	(99,775.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	2867...	Jeffrey J. Baker	Klickitat County	(500.00)	(100,275.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	1499...	Brett Buckley	Thurston County	(1,000.00)	(101,275.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	1499...	Kalo Wilcox	Thurston county	(1,000.00)	(102,275.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	1499...	Paul Wohl	Thurston County	(800.00)	(103,075.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	1499...	Samuel G. Meyer	Thurston County	(1,000.00)	(104,075.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	2270...	Craig Stilwell	City of Pasco	(500.00)	(104,575.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	0494...	Warren Gilbert	Skagit County	(1,000.00)	(105,575.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	0494...	Diane Goddard	Skagit County	(1,000.00)	(106,575.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	0494...	Thomas L. Verge	Skagit County	(1,000.00)	(107,575.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	0494...	Jenifer Howson	Skagit County	(800.00)	(108,375.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	59433	Robert Freeby	City of Buckley	(200.00)	(108,575.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	2196...	James M.B. Buzzard	City of Centralia	(500.00)	(109,075.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	1471...	Terri K. Cooper	City of Cheney	(200.00)	(109,275.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	1142...	Adalia A. Hille	Adams County	(500.00)	(109,775.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	1362	Eric Weston	Raymond Municipal/South Bend Municipal	(250.00)	(110,025.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	6729	Nancy A. Harmon	chelan County (retired)	(25.00)	(110,050.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	2697...	Heidi Heywood	Wahkiakum County	(500.00)	(110,550.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	0135...	Dan B Johnson	Lincoln County	(500.00)	(111,050.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	2434...	Andrea Beall	City of Puyallup	(1,000.00)	(112,050.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	2349...	Linda Coburn	City of Edmonds	(1,000.00)	(113,050.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	1142...	Carolyn J. Benzel	Adams County	(1,000.00)	(114,050.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	1181	Richard White	Retired	(25.00)	(114,075.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	1478...	Lizanne Padula	Pierce County	(1,000.00)	(115,075.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	1478...	Karl Williams	Pierce County	(1,000.00)	(116,075.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	1478...	Lloyd Oaks	Pierce County	(1,000.00)	(117,075.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	1478...	Jeanette Lineberry	Pierce County	(1,000.00)	(118,075.00)

Washington State District And Municipal Court Judges Assoc. Transaction Detail by Account

July 2018 through February 2019

Type	Date	Num	Name	Memo	Amount	Balance
Deposit	02/01/2019	1478...	Kevin McCann	Pierce County	(1,000.00)	(119,075.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	1478...	Claire Sussman	Pierce County	(1,000.00)	(120,075.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	1478...	Karla Buttorff	Pierce County	(1,000.00)	(121,075.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	1478...	Judy Jasprica	Pierce County	(1,000.00)	(122,075.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	1297...	Lorrie Towers	Marysville Municipal Court	(1,000.00)	(123,075.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	1297...	Fred L. Gillings	Marysville Municipal Court	(1,000.00)	(124,075.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	2371	Terrance G. Lewis	Lynden Municipal Court (personal check)	(250.00)	(124,325.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	84605	Kristopher Kaino	City of Long Beach	(250.00)	(124,575.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	47114	Krista White Swain	City of Black Diamond	(250.00)	(124,825.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	5569...	Michael Valerien	City of Spokane	(800.00)	(125,625.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	5569...	Gerald A. Caniglia	City of Spokane	(800.00)	(126,425.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	5569...	Tracy A. Staab	City of Spokane	(1,000.00)	(127,425.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	5569...	Matthew W. Antush	City of Spokane	(1,000.00)	(128,425.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	5569...	Mary C. Logan	City of Spokane	(1,000.00)	(129,425.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	5569...	Kristin O'Sullivan	City of Spokane	(800.00)	(130,225.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	5569...	Howard F. Delaney	City of Spokane	(200.00)	(130,425.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	2855...	Tina Kernan	Asotin County	(1,000.00)	(131,425.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	2099...	Carolyn Jewett	San Juan County	(1,000.00)	(132,425.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	89260	Zenon P. Olbertz	Gig Harbor	(500.00)	(132,925.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	7522...	Kevin Eilmes	Yakima County	(800.00)	(133,725.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	7522...	Brian Sanderson	Yakima County	(1,000.00)	(134,725.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	7522...	Kevin Roy	Yakima County	(1,000.00)	(135,725.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	7522...	Donald W. Engel	Yakima County	(1,000.00)	(136,725.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	7522...	Alfred G. Schweepe	Yakima County	(1,000.00)	(137,725.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	1694...	Ronald Reynier	Skamania County	(500.00)	(138,225.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	0055...	William H. Hawkins	Island County	(1,000.00)	(139,225.00)
Deposit	02/01/2019	0055...	Ronald Andrew M Costeck	Island County	(800.00)	(140,025.00)
Check	02/14/2019		Upper Kittitas County	Dues refund for Judge Ellis	500.00	(139,525.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	1416...	John O. Knowlton	Clark County District Court	(1,000.00)	(140,525.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	1416...	Sonya L. Langsdorf	Clark County District Court	(1,000.00)	(141,525.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	1416...	Abigail Bartlett	Clark County District Court	(400.00)	(141,925.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	1416...	Darvin Zimmerman	Clark County District Court	(1,000.00)	(142,925.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	1416...	Kelli E. Osler	Clark County District Court	(1,000.00)	(143,925.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	1416...	Chad E. Sleight	Clark County District Court	(1,000.00)	(144,925.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	1416...	Todd George	Clark County District Court	(800.00)	(145,725.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	0537...	Arthur Blauvelt III	Elma & Oakville Municipal Courts	(250.00)	(145,975.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	34123	Susan Arb	Moxee Municipal Court	(250.00)	(146,225.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	7034...	Michael J. Lambo	Kirkland Municipal	(1,000.00)	(147,225.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	7034...	John Olson	Kirkland Municipal	(400.00)	(147,625.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	1869...	Katharine Butler	Benton County District	(1,000.00)	(148,625.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	1869...	Daniel Kathren	Benton County District	(1,000.00)	(149,625.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	1869...	Steven T Osborn	Benton County District	(1,000.00)	(150,625.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	1869...	Terry Tanner	Benton County District	(1,000.00)	(151,625.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	1869...	John S Ziobro	Benton County District	(1,000.00)	(152,625.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	3829...	James Doctor	Bremerton Municipal	(1,000.00)	(153,625.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	3829...	Shane Seaman	Bremerton Municipla	(200.00)	(153,825.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	45283	Gregory J. Tripp	Airway Heights Municipal Court	(250.00)	(154,075.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	3770...	Jeffrey J. Jahns	Kitsap County	(1,000.00)	(155,075.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	3770...	Claire Bradley	Kitsap County	(1,000.00)	(156,075.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	3770...	Kevin P Kelly	Kitsap County	(1,000.00)	(157,075.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	3770...	Marilyn Paja	Kitsap County	(1,000.00)	(158,075.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	34455	Thomas M. Ellington	Roy Municipal Court	(250.00)	(158,325.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	9216	Douglas K. Garrison	Wapato Municipal Court	(250.00)	(158,575.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	0407...	Darrel R. Ellis	Cle Elum Municipal Court	(250.00)	(158,825.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	8103...	Paul R Sander	Lower Kittitas County District Court	(1,000.00)	(159,825.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	1381...	Randall L. Hansen	Tacoma Municipal Court	(400.00)	(160,225.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	1381...	Dennis H. Ball	Tacoma Municipal Court	(800.00)	(161,025.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	1381...	David B Ladenburg	Tacoma Municipal Court	(1,000.00)	(162,025.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	1381...	Drew Henke	Tacoma Municipal Court	(1,000.00)	(163,025.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	1381...	Dwayne L. Christopher	Tacoma Municipal Court	(1,000.00)	(164,025.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	0034...	Gerald F. Roach	Franklin County	(1,000.00)	(165,025.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	8353...	Roy Fore	Chelan County	(1,000.00)	(166,025.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	3800...	Kimberly Walden	Tuckwila Municipal Court	(500.00)	(166,525.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	1235...	Robert Hamilton	SeaTac Municipal Court	(500.00)	(167,025.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	1003...	Jeffrey L. Tolman	Poulsbo Municipal	(500.00)	(167,525.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	1179	John H. Doherty	Clallam District Retired	(25.00)	(167,550.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	1000...	John A Hays	Cowlitz District	(1,000.00)	(168,550.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	1000...	Debra L. Burchett	Cowlitz District	(1,000.00)	(169,550.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	1000...	M. Jamie Imboden	Cowlitz District	(1,000.00)	(170,550.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	3327...	Thomas Brown	Ferry County	(500.00)	(171,050.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	19665	Stephen D Greer	Shelfon Municipal Court	(500.00)	(171,550.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	1566...	Lisa Leone	Des Moines Municipal Court	(500.00)	(172,050.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	90347	Susan Adams	Lakewood Municipal Court	(1,000.00)	(173,050.00)
Deposit	02/22/2019	2158	Gina Tveit	Stevens County District (personal Check)8	(1,000.00)	(174,050.00)
Total Membership Revenue					(174,050.00)	(174,050.00)

Washington State District And Municipal Court Judges Assoc. Transaction Detail by Account

July 2018 through February 2019

Type	Date	Num	Name	Memo	Amount	Balance
Other Revenue						
Deposit	08/15/2018			bank of america cash reward	(369.81)	(369.81)
Total Other Revenue					(369.81)	(369.81)
Prior Year Budget Expense						
Check	07/25/2018		Chelan County	Education Security	2,500.00	2,500.00
Check	07/25/2018		Chelan County	Education Committee	135.47	2,635.47
Deposit	08/15/2018		Rebecca Robertson	reimbursement to the DMCJA for one night...	(169.96)	2,465.51
Check	08/31/2018		Superior Court Judges Association	Prior Year	99.50	2,565.01
Check	09/05/2018		4imprint	President Expense	1,312.05	3,877.06
Check	09/06/2018		AOC	Board Meeting Expense	2,698.86	6,575.92
Check	09/06/2018		AOC	Conference Calls	76.65	6,652.57
Check	09/06/2018		AOC	Education Committee	81.15	6,733.72
Check	09/06/2018		AOC	Judicial Indep Fire Brigade	81.15	6,814.87
Check	09/06/2018		AOC	Legislative Committee	81.16	6,896.03
Check	09/06/2018		AOC	Rules Committee	81.15	6,977.18
Check	09/06/2018		AOC	Therapeutic Courts Committee	81.15	7,058.33
Check	10/02/2018		Kevin Ringus	board	139.42	7,197.75
Check	10/04/2018		Administrative Office of the Courts	Board	857.02	8,054.77
Check	10/04/2018		Administrative Office of the Courts	Long Range Planning Committee	581.20	8,635.97
Check	10/04/2018		Administrative Office of the Courts	conference Calls	76.86	8,712.83
Total Prior Year Budget Expense					8,712.83	8,712.83
Board Meeting Expense						
Check	07/26/2018		Kevin Ringus	Board Meeting Expense	21.80	21.80
Check	07/26/2018		Rick Leo	Board Meeting Expense	23.38	45.18
Check	07/26/2018		Michelle Gehlsen	Board Meeting Expense	30.52	75.70
Check	07/26/2018		Drew Henke	Board Meeting Expense	30.52	106.22
Check	07/26/2018		Samuel G. Meyer	Board Meeting Expense	54.50	160.72
Check	07/26/2018		Scott Ahlf	Board Meeting Expense	54.50	215.22
Check	07/26/2018		Charles Short	Board Meeting Expense	260.51	475.73
Check	07/26/2018		Robert Grim	Board Meeting Expense	272.50	748.23
Check	07/26/2018		Ingallina's Box Lunch	Ingallina's Box Lunch Bill Payment	363.13	1,131.36
Check	07/27/2018		Michelle Gehlsen	Board Meeting Expense	30.52	1,161.88
Check	07/27/2018		Michael Finkle	Board Meeting Expense	26.16	1,188.04
Check	07/30/2018		Linda Coburn	Board Meeting Expense	33.79	1,221.83
Check	08/16/2018		Judy Jasprica	Board Meeting Expense	139.42	1,361.25
Check	08/16/2018		Drew Henke	DMCJ Board Meeting 8/10/18	27.25	1,388.50
Check	08/16/2018		Kevin Ringus	DMCJ Board Meeting 8/10/18	21.80	1,410.30
Check	08/16/2018		Michael Finkle	DMCJ Board Meeting 8/10/18	19.62	1,429.92
Check	08/16/2018		Michelle Gehlsen	DMCJ Board Meeting 8/10/18	28.34	1,458.26
Check	08/16/2018		Rick Leo	DMCJ Board Meeting 8/10/18	26.09	1,484.35
Check	08/16/2018		Samuel G. Meyer	DMCJ Board Meeting 8/10/18	54.50	1,538.85
Check	08/16/2018		Scott Ahlf	DMCJ Board Meeting 8/10/18	54.50	1,593.35
Check	08/21/2018		Jennifer L. Fassbender	DMCJ Board Meeting 8/10/18	21.57	1,614.92
Check	08/21/2018		Dan B Johnson	DMCJ Board Meeting 8/10/18	407.66	2,022.58
Check	08/21/2018		Robert Grim	DMCJ Board Meeting 8/10/18	115.46	2,138.04
Check	09/05/2018		AOC		1,003.03	3,141.07
Check	10/04/2018		Kevin Ringus		36.00	3,177.07
Check	10/04/2018		Ingallina's Box Lunch	Memo:Ingallina's Box Lunch Bill Payment	333.80	3,510.87
Check	10/04/2018		Rebecca Robertson	9/23/18	46.00	3,556.87
Check	10/04/2018		Michael Finkle	9/23/18	141.42	3,698.29
Check	10/04/2018		Michelle Gehlsen	9/23/18	141.42	3,839.71
Check	10/04/2018		Linda Coburn	9/23/18	141.42	3,981.13
Check	10/12/2018		Dan B Johnson	9/23	36.00	4,017.13
Check	10/12/2018		City of Olympia	9/23 Board meeting	105.42	4,122.55
Check	10/17/2018		Scott Ahlf		36.00	4,158.55
Check	10/17/2018		Judy Jasprica	9/23/18	141.42	4,299.97
Check	10/19/2018		Ingallina's Box Lunch	Ingallina's Box Lunch Bill Payment	270.82	4,570.79
Check	10/19/2018		Jennifer L. Fassbender	9/23/18	136.91	4,707.70
Check	10/19/2018		Administrative Office of the Courts	10/2018 invoice	115.62	4,823.32
Check	10/19/2018		Jennifer L. Fassbender	10/12/18	7.50	4,830.82
Check	10/19/2018		Michael Finkle	Board meeting 10/12/18	19.62	4,850.44
Check	10/22/2018		Samuel G. Meyer	Board Meeting	54.50	4,904.94
Check	10/22/2018		Charles Short		374.54	5,279.48
Deposit	10/30/2018		Linda Coburn	RETURNED BILL PAYMENT FROM Linda ...	(33.79)	5,245.69
Check	10/30/2018		Linda Coburn	replaced uncashed check	33.79	5,279.48
Check	11/16/2018		Samuel G. Meyer	Board meeting 11/9/18	54.50	5,333.98
Check	11/16/2018		Michelle Gehlsen	Board meeting 11/9/18	30.52	5,364.50
Check	11/16/2018		Rick Leo	Board meeting 11/9/18	25.54	5,390.04
Check	11/16/2018		Linda Coburn	Board meeting 11/9/18	18.89	5,408.93
Check	11/21/2018		Jeffery Smith	11/9/18	216.85	5,623.78
Check	11/21/2018		Michael Finkle	11/9/18	21.80	5,645.58
Check	11/21/2018		Jennifer L. Fassbender	11/9/18	7.50	5,653.08
Check	11/21/2018		Ingallina's Box Lunch	11/9/18 board meeting	348.65	6,001.73
Check	12/07/2018		AOC	October charges MS111918-03	1,020.92	7,022.65
Check	12/17/2018		Drew Henke	Board Meeting 12/14/18	14.17	7,036.82

Washington State District And Municipal Court Judges Assoc.

Transaction Detail by Account

July 2018 through February 2019

Type	Date	Num	Name	Memo	Amount	Balance
Check	12/17/2018		Kevin Ringus	Board Meeting 12/14/18	21.80	7,058.62
Check	12/17/2018		Linda Coburn	Board Meeting 12/14/18	16.89	7,075.51
Check	12/17/2018		Michelle Gehlsen	Board Meeting 12/14/18	30.52	7,106.03
Check	12/17/2018		Samuel G. Meyer	Board Meeting 12/14/18	54.50	7,160.53
Check	12/17/2018		Scott Ahlf	Board Meeting 12/14/18	54.50	7,215.03
Check	01/02/2019		Ingallina's Box Lunch	December Board meeting	370.59	7,585.62
Check	01/04/2019		Jennifer L. Fassbender	Board Meeting	10.00	7,595.62
Check	01/14/2019		AOC	December, 2018 MS121418-02	329.24	7,924.86
Check	01/18/2019		Ingallina's Box Lunch	01-473478	302.56	8,227.42
Check	01/18/2019		Charles Short	DMCJA Meeting 1/11/19	103.45	8,330.87
Check	01/18/2019		Linda Coburn	DMCJA Meeting 1/11/19	35.96	8,366.83
Check	01/18/2019		Michelle Gehlsen	DMCJA Meeting 1/11/19	32.48	8,399.31
Check	01/18/2019		Rick Leo	DMCJA Meeting 1/11/19	27.43	8,426.74
Check	01/18/2019		Samuel G. Meyer	DMCJA Meeting 1/11/19	58.00	8,484.74
Check	01/18/2019		Scott Ahlf	DMCJA Meeting 1/11/19	58.00	8,542.74
Check	02/14/2019		AOC		819.64	9,362.38
Total Board Meeting Expense					9,362.38	9,362.38
Bookkeeping Expense						
Check	07/17/2018		Pierce County Bookkeeping	Pierce County Bookkeeping Bill Payment	312.00	312.00
Check	08/13/2018		Pierce County Bookkeeping	July bookkeeping	344.50	656.50
Check	09/07/2018		Pierce County Bookkeeping	Aug. Invoice 759	344.50	1,001.00
Check	10/12/2018		Dino W Traverso, PLLC	Tax return	600.00	1,601.00
Check	10/12/2018		Pierce County Bookkeeping	September invoice 767	318.00	1,919.00
Check	11/09/2018		Pierce County Bookkeeping	October services invoice 776	318.00	2,237.00
Check	12/07/2018		Pierce County Bookkeeping	November 2018 Invoice	318.00	2,555.00
Check	01/14/2019		Pierce County Bookkeeping	December Bookkeeping Service	318.00	2,873.00
Check	02/06/2019		Pierce County Bookkeeping	January Services	477.00	3,350.00
Total Bookkeeping Expense					3,350.00	3,350.00
Conference Calls						
Check	09/05/2018		AOC		6.16	6.16
Check	10/19/2018		Administrative Office of the Courts	10/2018 invoice	81.73	87.89
Check	12/07/2018		AOC	October charges MS111918-03	73.85	161.74
Check	02/14/2019		AOC		38.17	200.91
Total Conference Calls					200.91	200.91
DMCJA/SCJA Sentencing Alt.						
Check	12/07/2018		AOC	October charges MS111918-03	611.80	611.80
Check	02/14/2019		AOC		321.40	933.20
Total DMCJA/SCJA Sentencing Alt.					933.20	933.20
DMCMA Liaison Committee						
Check	11/21/2018		Michelle Gehlsen	11/8/18	30.52	30.52
Check	01/18/2019		Michelle Gehlsen	DMCMA meeting 1/10/19	32.48	63.00
Total DMCMA Liaison Committee					63.00	63.00
Education Committee						
Check	10/24/2018		Douglas Fair	Ed. Comm meeting 10/18	32.70	32.70
Check	10/24/2018		James Doctor	Ed. Comm meeting 10/18	64.95	97.65
Check	10/24/2018		Roy Fore	Ed. Comm meeting 10/18	166.77	264.42
Check	10/24/2018		Timothy Jenkins	Ed. Comm meeting 10/18	9.81	274.23
Check	10/24/2018		Tom Verge	Ed. Comm meeting 10/18	85.02	359.25
Check	10/25/2018		Charles Short	10/18/18	369.43	728.68
Check	10/26/2018		Ingallina's Box Lunch	10/18/18	176.68	905.34
Check	11/21/2018		Jeffery Smith	11-5-18 - 11-8-18	233.00	1,138.34
Total Education Committee					1,138.34	1,138.34
Educational Grants						
Check	10/25/2018		Thurston County District Court	NAPCO Conference	1,000.00	1,000.00
Check	01/14/2019		Spokane Municipal Court	Washington DC	1,000.00	2,000.00
Total Educational Grants					2,000.00	2,000.00

Washington State District And Municipal Court Judges Assoc. Transaction Detail by Account

July 2018 through February 2019

Type	Date	Num	Name	Memo	Amount	Balance
Judicial Assistance Committee						
Check	07/30/2018		Mary C. Logan	Judicial Assistance Committee	18.72	18.72
Check	09/05/2018		Judith Anderson	Certificate frame	16.00	34.72
Check	09/17/2018		Susanna Neil Kanther-Raz	3rd Qtr payment and Session	1,050.00	1,084.72
Deposit	10/12/2018			Deposit	(7,000.00)	(5,915.28)
Check	10/19/2018		Bruce Weiss	JASP Meeting 10/5/18	44.69	(5,870.59)
Check	10/19/2018		Claire Sussman	JASP Meeting 10/5/18	21.80	(5,848.79)
Check	10/19/2018		Douglas Fair	JASP Meeting 10/5/18	32.70	(5,816.09)
Check	10/19/2018		Douglas B. Robinson	JASP Meeting 10/5/18	473.62	(5,342.47)
Check	10/19/2018		James Doctor	JASP Meeting 10/5/18	64.95	(5,277.52)
Check	10/19/2018		Mary C. Logan	JASP Meeting 10/5/18	18.72	(5,258.80)
Check	10/19/2018		Marybeth Dingley	JASP Meeting 10/5/18	39.24	(5,219.56)
Check	10/19/2018		Michael Finkle	JASP Meeting 10/5/18	31.61	(5,187.95)
Check	10/19/2018		Timothy Jenkins	JASP Meeting 10/5/18	59.81	(5,128.14)
Check	10/19/2018		Administrative Office of the Courts	10/2018 invoice	629.71	(4,498.43)
Check	10/19/2018		Chris Culp	JASP meeting 10/5/18	304.80	(4,193.63)
Check	10/19/2018		Jackie Shea-Brown	JASP meeting 10/5/18	364.32	(3,829.31)
Check	10/19/2018		Susan Woodard	JASP meeting 10/5/18	340.02	(3,489.29)
Check	10/22/2018		G. Andrew H. Benjamin	10/5/18 Peer Counselor Training	750.00	(2,739.29)
Check	10/29/2018		Susanna Neil Kanther-Raz	10/5/18 Training	721.26	(2,018.03)
Check	11/05/2018		Susanna Neil Kanther-Raz	4th quarter, 2018	900.00	(1,118.03)
Check	11/05/2018		Michael Evans	10/05/2018 meeting	48.19	(1,069.84)
Check	11/09/2018		Cave B	Deposit	1,559.55	489.71
Check	12/07/2018		AOC	October charges MS111918-03	617.21	1,106.92
Check	02/06/2019		Susanna Neil Kanther-Raz	1st quarter, 2019	900.00	2,006.92
Total Judicial Assistance Committee					2,006.92	2,006.92
Judicial Community Outreach						
Check	01/02/2019		Washington YMCA Youth & Gove...		1,600.00	1,600.00
Total Judicial Community Outreach					1,600.00	1,600.00
Legislative Pro-Tem						
Check	07/26/2018		City of Bothell	Legislative Pro-Tem	195.00	195.00
Check	01/25/2019		Thurston County District Court	1/15/19	150.00	345.00
Check	02/14/2019		Snohomish Co. District Court	House committee meeting	420.00	765.00
Check	02/19/2019		Thurston County District Court	1/15/19	12.69	777.69
Total Legislative Pro-Tem					777.69	777.69
Lobbyist Contract						
Check	07/26/2018		Melanie Stewart	July Payment	2,000.00	2,000.00
Genera...	07/31/2018	CEH		1/12 of Contract	3,833.33	5,833.33
Genera...	08/15/2018	CEH		1/12 of Contract	3,833.33	9,666.66
Check	08/17/2018		Melanie Stewart	August payment	2,000.00	11,666.66
Check	09/05/2018		Melanie Stewart	September payment	2,000.00	13,666.66
Genera...	09/17/2018	CEH		1/12 of Contract	3,833.33	17,499.99
Check	10/18/2018		Melanie Stewart	October payment	2,000.00	19,499.99
Genera...	10/31/2018	CEH		1/12 of Contract	3,833.33	23,333.32
Check	11/01/2018		Melanie Stewart	November invoice	2,000.00	25,333.32
Genera...	11/30/2018	CEH		1/12 of Contract	3,833.33	29,166.65
Check	12/03/2018		Melanie Stewart	December services	2,000.00	31,166.65
Genera...	12/31/2018	CEH		1/12 of Contract	3,833.33	34,999.98
Check	01/02/2019		Melanie Stewart	January Invoice 4598	2,000.00	36,999.98
Genera...	01/31/2019	CEH		1/12 of Contract	3,833.33	40,833.31
Check	02/06/2019		Melanie Stewart	February Invoice 4607	2,000.00	42,833.31
Check	02/28/2019		Melanie Stewart	March Invoice 4629	2,000.00	44,833.31
Genera...	02/28/2019	CEH		1/12 of Contract	3,833.33	48,666.64
Total Lobbyist Contract					48,666.64	48,666.64
National Leadership Grants						
Check	10/19/2018		Marilyn Paja	NAWJ Annual Meeting	2,099.00	2,099.00
Total National Leadership Grants					2,099.00	2,099.00
President Expense						
Credit ...	08/07/2018		Budd Bay Cafe Olympia		38.13	38.13
Credit ...	11/30/2018		1-800-Flowers.com	Retirement for Callie Dietz	79.86	117.99
Credit ...	01/18/2019		Anthony's Homeport		237.11	355.10
Credit ...	01/30/2019		1-800-Flowers.com	Chief Justice Fairhurst Special will refund to...	97.98	453.08
Total President Expense					453.08	453.08
Pro Tempore (Chair Approval)						
Check	01/18/2019		City of Bothell	AOC meeting Seatac 1/10/19	162.50	162.50
Total Pro Tempore (Chair Approval)					162.50	162.50

Washington State District And Municipal Court Judges Assoc.

Transaction Detail by Account

July 2018 through February 2019

Type	Date	Num	Name	Memo	Amount	Balance
Public Outreach (ad hoc workgrp)						
Check	02/14/2019		AOC		8.00	8.00
Total Public Outreach (ad hoc workgrp)					8.00	8.00
SCJA Board Liaison						
Check	01/18/2019		Samuel G. Meyer	SCJA Meeting 11/03/18	54.50	54.50
Check	01/18/2019		Samuel G. Meyer	SCJA Meeting 1/11/19	65.40	119.90
Check	01/18/2019		Samuel G. Meyer	SCJA Meeting 1/5/19	58.00	177.90
Total SCJA Board Liaison					177.90	177.90
Therapeutic Courts Committee						
Check	12/07/2018		AOC	October charges MS111918-03	199.94	199.94
Total Therapeutic Courts Committee					199.94	199.94
Treasurer Expense and Bonds						
Credit ...	09/17/2018		Secretary of State	Corp renewal	10.00	10.00
Check	01/02/2019		Jennifer L. Fassbender	Postage for dues sent to bookkeeper	15.51	25.51
Check	01/18/2019		Jennifer L. Fassbender	Postage for dues sent to Bookkeeper	15.51	41.02
Check	02/06/2019		Jennifer L. Fassbender	Postage for dues sent to Bookkeeper	15.51	56.53
Total Treasurer Expense and Bonds					56.53	56.53
TOTAL					0.00	0.00

Other current information not included in reports

DMCJA 2018-2019 Adopted Budget			
ITEM COMMITTEE	Beginning Balance	Total Costs	Ending Balance
Access to Justice Liaison	\$100.00		\$100.00
Audit	\$2,000.00		\$2,000.00
Bar Association Liaison	\$1,500.00		\$1,500.00
Board Meeting Expense	\$30,000.00	\$9,362.00	\$20,638.00
Bookkeeping Expense	\$3,500.00	\$3,350.00	\$150.00
Bylaws Committee	\$250.00		\$250.00
Conference Calls	\$250.00	\$201.00	\$49.00
Conference Planning Committee	\$4,000.00		\$4,000.00
Conference Incidental Fees For Members Spring Conference 2019	\$40,000.00		\$40,000.00
Diversity Committee	\$2,000.00		\$2,000.00
DMCJA/SCJA Sentencing Alternatives aka "Trial Ct Sentencing & Supervision Comm"	\$1,000.00	\$933.00	\$67.00
DMCMA Liaison	\$500.00	\$63.00	\$437.00
DOL Liaison Committee	\$200.00		\$200.00
Education Committee	\$14,500.00	\$1,138.00	\$13,362.00
Educational Security	\$2,500.00		\$2,500.00
Education-Grants	\$5,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$3,000.00
Judicial Assistance Committee*	\$14,000.00	\$9,007.00	\$4,993.00
Judicial College Social Support	\$2,000.00	\$1,600.00	\$400.00
Judicial Community Outreach	\$4,000.00		\$4,000.00
Judicial Independence Fire Brigade	\$1,000.00		\$1,000.00
Legislative Committee	\$4,000.00		\$4,000.00
Legislative Pro-Tem	\$2,500.00	\$778.00	\$1,722.00
Lobbyist Contract	\$70,000.00	\$62,000.00	\$8,000.00
Lobbyist Expenses	\$1,500.00		\$1,500.00
Long-Range Planning Committee	\$750.00		\$750.00
MPA Liaison	\$1,000.00		\$1,000.00
Municipal/Dist. Ct Swearing-in 4 yrs. (12/2017)			\$0.00
National Leadership Grants	\$5,000.00	\$2,100.00	\$2,900.00
Nominating Committee	\$400.00		\$400.00
President Expense	\$5,000.00	\$453.00	\$4,547.00
Pro Tempore (committee chair approval)	\$10,000.00	\$163.00	\$10,000.00
Professional Services	\$5,000.00		\$5,000.00
Public Outreach (ad hoc workgroup)	\$2,500.00	\$8.00	\$2,492.00
Rules Committee	\$500.00		\$500.00
SCJA Board Liaison	\$1,000.00	\$178.00	\$822.00
Therapeutic Courts Committee	\$2,500.00	\$200.00	\$2,300.00
Treasurer Expense and Bonds	\$250.00	\$57.00	\$193.00
Trial Court Advocacy Board	\$500.00		\$500.00
Uniform Infraction Committee	\$1,000.00		\$1,000.00
TOTAL	\$241,700.00	\$93,591.00	\$148,272.00
TOTAL DEPOSITS MADE	\$175,419.81		
CREDIT CARD (balance owing)	\$0.00		

*includes \$7,000 from the SCJA
Balance as of 2-28-2019



WASHINGTON STATE

JUDICAL WORKLOAD STUDY

PROPOSAL

FEBRUARY 2019

**SUBMITTED BY
NATIONAL CENTER FOR STATE COURTS
COURT CONSULTING SERVICES**

**Daniel J. Hall, Vice President
Laura Klaversma, Court Services Director**

**707 SEVENTEENTH STREET, SUITE 2900
DENVER, COLORADO 80202-3429
PHONE: (303) 293-3063
FAX: (303) 308-4329**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Organizational Experience.....	1
2.	Organizational References	15
3.	Mandatory Specifications	17
4.	Judicial Workload Study Task Plan.....	18
5.	Cost Proposal	24

Washington State Judicial Workload Study

PROPOSAL

The National Center for State Courts (NCSC) is pleased to present this proposal to the Washington Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) to conduct a workload assessment for judges in the Superior Court Judges' Association. The NCSC proposes to assist the superior court in completing this statewide workload study by developing an empirically based workload model for judges using a comprehensive workload assessment strategy that incorporates a time study, employs a qualitative decision-making process to analyze all results, and recommends a final workload model for Washington superior court judges.

1. Organizational Experience

a) Relevant Experience

National Center for State Courts Qualifications

Widely recognized as the national and international leader in developing weighted caseload formulas for judges and court staff, the NCSC is uniquely suited to handle the challenges of establishing workload models for the Washington superior court. The NCSC pioneered the “what is/ what should be” approach to workload assessment that is based on an empirical time study in conjunction with the use of surveys and focus groups to obtain critical qualitative information regarding “what should be.” The NCSC’s workload assessment methodology and data collection instruments have been continuously refined over the course of more than 75 studies spanning over 20 years. The NCSC project team is adept at balancing divergent stakeholder interests, securing cooperation and support for workload assessments, and facilitating advisory committee meetings. The NCSC’s transparent, empirically driven, and highly participatory workload assessment process helps to build a perception of ownership among study participants, as well as to establish strong credibility for the final workload model among judges, staff, and legislators.

The NCSC’s proprietary Web-based timekeeping system is user-friendly, designed to minimize the burden of data collection on time study participants, and easily customized to suit the unique needs of each individual workload assessment. On average, time study participants typically spend less than ten minutes per day tracking and entering their time; in some studies, the daily average is as low as five minutes. Real-time participation monitoring enables project staff and advisory committees to encourage participation on a targeted basis. Statewide time studies conducted by the NCSC uniformly achieve participation rates in excess of 95 percent. These near-universal participation rates are critical to the reliability and credibility of the final workload models.

National Center for State Courts Project Team Qualifications

The NCSC project team will consist of Suzanne Tallarico (project director), John Douglas (project team member), and Shannon Roth (project team member). Brief biographical abstracts for NCSC project team members are provided below with resumes at the end of this section.

Suzanne K. Tallarico, M.A., has been a Principal Court Management Consultant with the NCSC since 2005. She focuses on criminal and juvenile justice entities in areas related to criminal justice system functioning, workload assessment, policy analysis, data analysis, program evaluation and performance, judicial performance, strategic planning and other court and criminal justice related projects. Areas of expertise include workload analysis and staffing needs, system performance assessment, judicial performance evaluation, criminal and juvenile justice system studies, adult and juvenile probation issues, and probation case processing, evidence-based practices and management. Ms. Tallarico has conducted well over 60 statewide or limited jurisdictional workload assessment studies since 2005. She also serves as NCSC staff to the Conference of Chief Justices/ Conference of State Court Administrators Problem Solving Court Committee and the Midwest Regional Committee.

Prior to joining the NCSC, Ms. Tallarico was the Director of Research and Evaluation for the Colorado State Court Administrator's Office of Probation Services. Preceding her employment with the Colorado Judicial Branch, she served for twelve years as a senior research analyst for the Colorado Department of Public Safety, Division of Criminal Justice. In these positions, she has had extensive experience in program evaluation, policy analysis, judicial and probation staffing and workload assessment, correctional population forecasting, program and performance review, and collection and dissemination of statistics and statistical reports.

John Douglas, Principal Court Management Consultant, joined the NCSC in 1997. Mr. Douglas has directed or participated in over fifty statewide staffing/workload assessment projects to determine the need for the appropriate number for judges, clerk staff, or probation personnel through the identification and analysis of specific case type metrics and activities. Included in those projects are limited and general jurisdiction courts, courts of appeal, and parole and probation officer workload assessments.

Mr. Douglas' previous employer was the National Treasury Employees Union (NTEU), where he was responsible for representing the interests of Federal Employees in federal arbitration cases in Los Angeles, Orange County, and San Diego.

Mr. Douglas earned a B.B.A. from Texas State University in Economics and has received additional training in employment issues from the National Labor College, George Meany Center for Labor Studies. He is also a Fellow of the Institute for Court Management's Court Executive Development Program (CEDP). Most recently, in 2015, Mr. Douglas completed the certification program by the International Institute of Business Analysis (IIBA) and has become a Certified Business Analysis Professional (CBAP).

Shannon Roth is Business Analyst with Court Consulting Services at the NCSC. Her experience ranges from court performance and culture to staffing/workload assessment. Some recently completed projects include the Georgia Judicial Workload Assessment, Virginia Judicial Workload Assessment, Maryland Court Culture, Effective Criminal Caseflow Processing, and Examining the Effectiveness of Indigent Defense Team Services: A Multisite Evaluation of Holistic Defense in Practice, and supporting and providing technical support for the High Performance Courts Framework (www.ncsc.org/hpcf), *CourTools* and *Appellate CourTools* (www.courttools.org). Ms. Roth is currently serving as staff for several workload assessments. In addition, she creates and maintains multiple surveys using the survey software ConfrmIt for Court Consulting Services.

Resumes follow on the next page

SUZANNE KRAUS TALLARICO

Principal Court Management Consultant



EDUCATION

M.A. in Sociology, University of Denver, Denver, Colorado, 1985

B.A. in Sociology, Aquinas College, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1983

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

National Center for State Courts 2005 – Present

Principal Court Management Consultant. Serves as a consultant to courts and other criminal and juvenile justice entities in areas related to criminal justice system functioning, workload, policy, program evaluation and performance, judicial performance, strategic planning and other court and criminal justice related projects. Areas of expertise include workload analysis and staff need, system performance assessment, judicial performance evaluation, criminal and juvenile justice system studies, adult and juvenile probation issues, and probation case processing and management. Ms. Tallarico has facilitated several strategic planning retreats and meetings for state agencies, boards and commissions. Ms. Tallarico is an active member of the American Probation and Parole Association and is an ongoing member of the ongoing *Effective Facilitator* e-learning group.

Recently completed NCSC *weighted caseload* projects include: King County (Washington) District Court Staff (2015), South Dakota Court Staff (2015), West Virginia Circuit Court Judges (2014), Colorado Probation (2014), Colorado Parole (2014), Pennsylvania Court of Common Pleas Judges (2014), Montana District Court Judges (2014), Tennessee District Court Judges (2013), Louisiana Court of Appeals Judges (2014), North Dakota Judges and Clerks (2012), Kansas Judges and Court Clerks (2011), Massachusetts IV-D Registry Staff (2011), Yuma County, Arizona Judges (2010), North Dakota Court Services Officers (2010), Oregon Court of Appeals Staff and Judges (2010), Colorado District Court (2010) and County Court (2010), New York Law Guardians (2009), Tennessee District Court (2009), Alabama Court Clerks (2009), South Dakota Court Services Officers (2007), Maricopa County, AZ, Justice Court Clerk Staff (2008), Iowa District Court (2008), Colorado Probation (2008), Missouri Circuit Court Judges (2007), New Mexico Judges, (2007), Washoe County, Nevada Judges, King County, Washington Court Staff (2007); Montana Judges (2006); Nebraska Judges (2006), Maryland Judges (2006), Massachusetts Probation Support Staffing (2005).

Facilitation projects include: Strategic planning with the Guam Judiciary's Criminal Sexual Conduct Management Committee, strategic plan development for Maricopa County Juvenile Probation Department (2011), Colorado Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Council (2011), Conference of Chief Justices and Conference of State Court Administrators' Drug Court Summit (2009 and 2011), Mesa County Criminal Justice Council (2009), Colorado Justice Assistance Grant Board (2009), Colorado Interagency Committee on Adult and Juvenile Correctional Treatment (2007).

Additional completed projects include: Judicial Performance Evaluation in Illinois and Idaho, Pennsylvania Adult Probation and Parole Agency Assessment, Research study on Wisconsin's Effective Justice Strategies (2011), Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands Supreme and Superior Court Consolidation of Administrative Functions (2008), Okaloosa County, Florida Jail Crowding and Criminal Justice System Study (2007); Evaluation of Diversified Dockets in Arapahoe County, Colorado (2006); Feasibility Study for Alternative Court Scheduling Techniques in Chesterfield County, Virginia (2006); Improving the Organization and Performance of Courts and Probation in Lake County, Indiana (2006); Performance Audit of the Davidson County, Tennessee, Juvenile; Arrest to Filing Assessment in Tarrant County, Texas (2005); Kern County (CA)

Jail Crowding System Analysis (2006); and Court Clerk's Office Collections Assessment Study in Knox County, Tennessee (2005).

Colorado State Court Administrator's Office of Probation Services, 1998 – 2005

Director of Research and Evaluation. Ms. Tallarico (then Ms. Pullen) developed and managed all adult and juvenile workload and staffing needs projects, was responsible for the office's policy analysis and development, program evaluation, program and performance review, collection and dissemination of statistics and statistical reports and was the liaison for the office and federal grant administrators. Additionally, this position required a substantial amount of strategic planning with various groups, entities and agencies, throughout the juvenile and criminal justice system and in other governmental branches and departments.

Colorado Department of Public Safety, Division of Criminal Justice, 1985 – 1997

Senior Research Analyst/Research Analyst. Areas of responsibility included managing all of the Division's evaluation projects, co-principal investigator on several federally funded research projects, including the NIJ-funded research project on adult sex offenders management, which resulted in the publication of the book *Managing Adult Sex Offenders: A Containment Approach*. Ms. Tallarico also developed the state's prison population projections, which were used in setting policy and making prison expansion and construction decisions. In this position, she had primary responsibility for policy analysis requests in the division.

The URSA Institute, San Francisco, California, 1984 – 1985

Research Assistant. Participated in a two year research study investigating case processing of youth in the Colorado Juvenile Justice System. Responsibilities included primary data collection in four geographic regions of the state and data collection instrument development.

The University of Denver, Department of Sociology, 1983 – 1984

Research Assistant. Duties included research instrument development, data collection, conducting interviews, conducting literature searches and reviews, and performing teaching and administrative tasks. Work was primarily conducted in the juvenile justice system – juvenile arrests, prosecutor decision-making, judicial decision-making and sentencing.

Pertinent Experience

Center for Sex Offender Management, Silver Spring, Maryland. Frequent consultant and trainer for CSOM efforts, including program development, evaluation strategies, curriculum development, and other efforts related to sex offender management. Ms. Tallarico worked with the Yankton Sioux Tribe to facilitate the development of a coordinated response to managing convicted sex offenders.

Strengthening the Capacity of the Maricopa County (Phoenix, Arizona) Juvenile Probation Department.

This strategic planning project was designed to help the Department develop a plan to implement the essential elements of evidence-based practices throughout all phases of juvenile probation assessment and supervision. The strategic planning process will assisted the Department in identifying essential areas in which changes needed to occur, state the goals to be addressed, and develop the steps necessary to achieve those goals.

Wisconsin State Level Strategies. The scope of this project is to conduct research that will identify court centered evidence-based strategies that enhance public safety, reduce recidivism and address criminal and addictive behaviors and develop recommendations related to the court systems role in fostering state-wide support and replication of these strategies. Specifically, the NCSC team is conducting research and developing recommendations centered on the questions of:

- What is currently being done in Wisconsin Courts?

- What works and how do we measure it?
- What should be the statewide strategy and plan of action?

Yuma County, Arizona Workload Assessment and Caseload Assignment Tool. This workload assessment study determined the workload demands for judicial officers in Yuma County, Arizona. A second product associated with this project, and a new tool that had not previously developed, was a caseload assignment tool which can be used to ensure equal workload demands for all judicial officers in the County. Another Arizona County, Mohave County, embarked on a similar study in 2011.

New York Law Guardians Workload Assessment Study. This workload assessment study conducted with attorneys who represent children in the state of New York generated average attorney case processing times for child welfare cases in the State of New York. The project relied on the use of Delphi methodology to generate consensus on the average case processing times.

Tennessee Trial Court Judicial Workload Assessment Study. This workload assessment study was an update to a 1999 study. A time study and adequacy of time survey were conducted to generate data. Focus groups were held across the state, and all judges were invited to attend. The focus group process provided judges with an opportunity to review preliminary findings and make commentary regarding the face validity of the findings.

Missouri Circuit Court Judicial Workload Assessment Study. The workload assessment study in Missouri was the first ever to be completed in this state of elected judges. Judges were extremely skeptical that the workload study would not adequately assess their needs and that the results would be used to eliminate judges. A time study was conducted and the results were shared with focus groups of judges across the state. The process included several opportunities for judges to ask questions of the project staff and provide feedback along the way. In the end, the results were widely accepted across the state.

North Dakota Court Services Officers Workload Study. This study was conducted for Court Services Officers, or Probation Officers in North Dakota. Workload assessment for probation officers is different from workload assessment for judges or court staff because supervision cases are typically seen on a monthly basis, as opposed to court cases, which have a clear beginning and ending. This workload study updated case weights that were originally generated in 2005. Case weights were developed for adult and juvenile investigations and adult and juvenile supervision cases - at all levels.

South Dakota Unified Judicial System Court Services Officers Workload Study. This study was conducted for Court Services Officers, or Probation Officers in South Dakota. This workload study updated case weights that were originally generated in 1998. Case weights were developed for adult and juvenile investigations and adult and juvenile supervision cases - at all levels.

Washoe County, Nevada (Reno) District Court Workload Assessment Study. A workload assessment study was conducted for the district court in Reno, Nevada. The court, which had 19 judicial officers at the time of the study, is separated into a family court and a general jurisdiction court. The workload assessment study indicated a need for an additional 7.5 judicial officers.

New Mexico Judicial Workload Assessment Study. The judicial workload study conducted in New Mexico was part of an overall study to determine the needs for judges, prosecuting attorneys and public defenders. The judicial portion of the study included three levels of judicial officers: district court judges (including a separate study for Bernalillo Metro Courts), magistrates and hearing officers. The assessment of workload included a time study and an adequacy of time survey. Project staff worked with an advisory committee, which guided all three pieces of the study, as well as working groups representing each court level included in the study.

King County, Washington Court Staff Workload Assessment Study. This study included both a time-in-motion based workload assessment of court line staff and a staffing analysis of non-line staff and the organization of the court as a whole. The court will use this study as the basis for planning ongoing changes and staffing requests for the next five years.

Montana and Nebraska Judicial Workload Studies. These separate time-in-motion studies assessed judges' work and workload needs in the states of Montana and Nebraska. Both studies included the use of Advisory Committees made up of judiciary and court administration representatives to guide the specific needs and details of the study. Both studies culminated in a final report of judicial need and a model that can be used to develop future judicial need assessments.

Okaloosa County, Florida Jail and Criminal Justice System Study. The study was conducted for the Board of County Commissioners to help them and the criminal justice system leaders to better understand the dynamic nature of the offender jail population and its propensity to grow and change in the future. The JCI-NCSC team significantly reduced the jail population during the ongoing study and made recommendations to continue to maintain reduced populations. Ms. Tallarico's focus was on the needs of judges relative to jail facilities.

Arrest to Filing Assessment in Tarrant County, Texas. This system study was driven largely by recent statewide policy changes that impacted all levels of the criminal justice system, including the clerk of court, the courts and the Sheriff's Department because of jail crowding issues. The study involved an analysis of the current processes in place across agencies and made recommendations for improvement and change in a number of arenas. The study was conducted on behalf of the County Administrator's Office, so the recommendations addressed a range of agencies.

Jail Crowding System Analysis Kern County, California. The focus of this ongoing study is on jail crowding in Kern County, California. The JCI-NCSC team has mapped out the system in terms of functions and processes and is currently in the data analysis phase of developing jail need projections. My area of focus on this project is to determine the jail space needs of the courts as well as to determine any alternatives to incarceration that judges would be willing to use in lieu of jail space.

Arapahoe County, Colorado Court Docketing and Case Management System Study. This study is pertinent to the proposed project because it involves the court that is the primary user of the Arapahoe County jail. The project has allowed me to develop relationships with the judges, court administrator, prosecutor, public defenders and Sheriff's Department staff in the county as well as to gain insight into the issues and concerns experienced across each of these groups.

Feasibility Study for Alternative Court Scheduling Techniques in Chesterfield County, Virginia. This study directly addresses the needs of a quickly growing community and is designed to develop options to delay court expansion. The project includes a study of the anticipated and current space needs of the various court occupants (judges, court clerks, sheriff's department, probation) as well as the study of the processes used to conduct their work. The final report will include recommendations for alternative uses of current space, short- and long-term expansion options and alternatives to current case processing that could result in the more efficient use of space resources.

JOHN W. DOUGLAS

Principal Court Management Consultant

jdouglas@ncsc.org



Work Experience & Expertise

Since joining the NCSC in 1997, Mr. Douglas has specialized in over forty statewide staffing/workload assessment projects to determine the need for the appropriate number for judge, clerk staff and probation, personnel through the identification and analysis of specific case type metrics and activities. Included in those projects are limited and general jurisdiction courts, courts of appeal, and probation officer workload assessments.

Mr. Douglas' previous employer was the National Treasury Employees Union (NTEU) in California where he was responsible for representing the interests of Federal Employees in Los Angeles, Orange County and San Diego in federal arbitration cases. In addition, as a federal union representative John investigated, researched and presented briefs in support of the legal arguments due to personnel performance and or disciplinary actions taken by management and, when appropriate, negotiated with management, the potential terms for settlement prior to arbitration hearings. Prior to working for the NTEU Mr. Douglas held the position of Associate Director for AFSCME in Austin Texas, where he represented and negotiated the labor interests of approximate 300 employees working for the city of Austin Texas and Travis County.

John earned a BBA from Texas State University in Economics and has received additional training in employment issues from the National Labor College, George Meany Center for Labor Studies. Mr. Douglas is also a Fellow of the Institute for Court Management's Court Executive Development Program (CEDP). Most recently (2015) Mr. Douglas has completed the certification program by the International Institute of Business Analysis (IIBA) and has become a Certified Business Analysis Professional (CBAP).

Education

Certified Business Analysis Professional (CBAP) 2015

Graduate Institute for Court Management, Fellow, 2007

Justice Information Exchange Model Program Certificate, 2004

George Meany Center, Arbitration & Labor Relations Education, 1986

B.B.A., Texas State University, Economics, 1981

Highlights of NCSC Workload/ Staffing Projects

- Judicial Workload Analysis, Court of Appeals, Oregon
- Judicial Workload Analysis Pennsylvania
- Judicial Workload Analysis Vermont
- Judicial Workload Analysis West Virginia
- Judicial Workload Analysis Kansas
- Judicial Workload Analysis, Maryland
- Judicial Workload Analysis, Puerto Rico
- Judicial Workload Analysis, Maine
- Judicial Workload Analysis, North Carolina

- Judicial Workload Analysis , Iowa
- Judicial Workload Analysis, Wyoming
- Judicial Workload Analysis, Tennessee
- Judicial Workload Analysis, 8th Judicial District, Nevada
- Judicial Workload Analysis, Georgia
- Judicial Workload Analysis, North Dakota
- Judicial Workload Analysis, Vermont
- Judicial Workload Analysis, South Dakota
- Judicial Workload Analysis, Guam
- Judicial Workload Analysis, Salt Lake City Utah
- Clerical Staff Workload Analysis, Iowa
- Clerical Staff Workload Analysis, Missouri
- Clerical Staff Workload Analysis, Maryland
- Clerical Staff Workload Analysis, Kansas
- Clerical Staff Workload Analysis, New Mexico
- Clerical Staff Workload Analysis, New Hampshire
- Clerical Staff Workload Analysis, Oregon
- Clerical Staff Workload Analysis, North Dakota
- Clerical Staffing Model, California
- Clerical Staffing Model, Salt Lake City, Utah
- Clerical Staffing Model Analysis, Colorado
- Clerical Staffing Model Analysis, Vermont
- Juvenile Probation Staffing Model Alabama
- Juvenile Probation Staffing Model North Dakota
- Juvenile Probation Staffing Model South Dakota
- Probation Staffing Model Colorado
- Probation Staffing Model South Dakota
- Department of Corrections Staffing Model Colorado
- IV-D Staffing Model Massachusetts
- IV-D Staffing Model Maine

Presentations

- Institute for Court Management Training: "Customer Service in the Courts," Territorial Courts of the Virgin Islands, 2005
- Nebraska Court Clerks Association, CourTools, 2008

Publication

- Examination of NCSC Workload Assessment Projects and Methodology: 1996 – 2006., (Principal author, 2007)
- Impact of Budget Shortfalls on Labor Relations, Trends Article (2009)

Shannon E. Roth
Business Analyst
Email: sroth@ncsc.org

Work experience

5/05 – present National Center for State Courts Williamsburg, VA

Business Analyst

Responsible for survey design, data collection, data analysis for a variety of project type including workload assessment and court performance, presentation of data to clients, and for assisting project directors and managers with all aspects of the projects, monitoring all grant requirements and regulations, monitoring and updating project budgets, organizing and maintaining project documents/files, and coordinating administrative tasks for all project staff, including travel arrangements, coordination with clients, meetings, and filing and creating proposal budgets and assist with preparation and writing of proposals and final project reports.

Administrative Manager

Responsible for providing assistance to the Director of Research with divisional management and duties and providing back-up support to the Senior Administrative Manager, including assistance with the division operation budget and assisting with the management and training of Program Specialists

Administrative Specialist

Previous responsibilities include reserving booths for exhibitors, processing payments, and tracking exhibitor agreements. Other duties include sending correspondence to exhibitors and speakers, gathering materials to be used at the conference, and tracking attendance and booths reserved for the conference.

2/14 – present La Tienda Retail Store Williamsburg, VA

Retail/Server

Part time work for La Tienda doing wine tastings, assisting customers, cashiering, and closing out the register. Additionally, working as a server in the restaurant and assisting as a hostess when needed. Additional duties include stocking the retail store and wine room

Previous Experience

1/00 – 8/03 Basic Construction Co. Newport News, VA

Payroll Administrator/ HR Assistant

Responsible for entry, maintenance, and disbursement of hourly payroll, certified payrolls, and payroll related reports. Accept and track employment applications, maintain employee database, monitor employee benefit eligibility, verify and authorize benefit payments. Secretary for company Affirmative Action Committee. Assist with accounts payable, invoicing, and purchase orders and light bookkeeping. Other administrative duties include filing, correspondence, and data entry.

Software

Windows 2007/2010, Microsoft Office (Excel, Word, PowerPoint), SPSS, Confront Survey Design, Costpoint/Deltek Financial, Project Online, PPM Project Management, Quickbooks, and Concentric Financial Services Platform.

Publications

Ostrom, Brian, Matthew Kleiman, and Shannon Roth. *Continuous Improvement in Ottawa County, Michigan Circuit and Probate Courts: A High Performance Court Framework Perspective* Court Review, Spring 2015

Ostrom, Brian, Matthew Kleiman, and Shannon Roth. *DUI Case Management in the Scottsdale City Court: Applying the High Performance Court Framework*. Court Manager, Spring 2015.

Reports

Ostrom, Brian J., Matthew Kleiman, Cynthia G. Lee, and Shannon Roth. "Virginia Judicial Workload Assessment." November 2017. A report to the Office of the Executive Secretary.

Ostrom, Brian J., Matthew Kleiman, Cynthia G. Lee, and Shannon Roth. "Texas Child Protective Services Workload Assessment." September 2016. A report to the Texas Office of Court Administration.

Ostrom, Brian J., Matthew Kleiman, Cynthia G. Lee, and Shannon Roth. "Florida Judicial Workload Assessment." May 2016. A report to the Florida Office of State Courts Administrator.

Ostrom, Brian J., Shannon Roth, and Alicia Davis. "The High Performance Court and Divorce Case Triage." December 2014. A report to the State Justice Institute.

Ostrom, Brian J., Matthew Kleiman, Alicia Davis, and Shannon Roth. "Continuous Improvement in Ottawa County, Michigan Circuit and Probate Courts: A High Performance Court Framework Perspective." June 2014. A report to the Ottawa County Circuit and Probate Courts and the State Justice Institute.

Ostrom, Brian J., Matthew Kleiman, and Shannon Roth. "DUI Case Management in the Scottsdale City Court: Applying the High Performance Court Framework." May 2014. A report to the Scottsdale City Court and the State Justice Institute.

Ostrom, Brian J., Matthew Kleiman, Cynthia G. Lee, and Shannon Roth. "Virginia Judicial Workload Assessment." November 2013. A report to the Office of the Executive Secretary.

Ostrom, Brian J., Matthew Kleiman, and Shannon Roth. "Wells County Caseflow Management: Review and Recommendations." May 2013. A report to the Wells County Circuit Court.

Ostrom, Brian J., Matthew Kleiman, Alicia Davis, and Shannon Roth. "The Application of the High Performance Court Quality Cycle in the Superior Court of Arizona in Maricopa County." March 2013. A report to the Maricopa County Superior Court and the State Justice Institute.

Ostrom, Brian J. and Shannon Roth. "Examining Texas County Courts at Law Civil Court Reorganization". December 2012. A report to the Texas Office of Court Administration and the State Justice Institute.

Ostrom, Brian J., Matthew Kleiman, Roger A. Hanson, and Shannon Roth. "Assessing Court Culture in the 4th Judicial District, Colorado." 2012. A report to the 4th Judicial District, Colorado.

Ostrom, Brian J., Matthew Kleiman, Shannon Roth. "California Judicial Workload Assessment." 2011. A report to the California Administrative Office of the Courts.

Ostrom, Brian J., Matthew Kleiman, Shannon Roth. "California Superior Court Staff Workload Assessment." 2011. A report to the California Administrative Office of the Courts.

b) Number of Workload Studies

The NCSC has played a preeminent role in judicial and staff workload assessment studies and has pioneered the methodologies used in these studies to help states develop meaningful and easily-understood criteria for determining overall resource needs, taking into account both case-specific and non-case-specific needs. These studies have involved judges, quasi-judicial officers, administrative and clerical staff, court clerks, and parole and probation officers. All studies are anchored by a “weighted caseload” model that directly measures the variations in time required to manage different case types within the appropriate context. The methodology employed by the NCSC has been honed over the years and has been enhanced by Web-based technologies that permit direct entry of time study data. These improvements have enhanced the level of participation. Weighted caseload studies, an NCSC specialty, are now deemed a “best practice.”

The NCSC has performed approximately 23 workload studies in the last two years:

- Iowa Judicial and Court Staff Workload Study, 2018
- Maine Title IV-D Caseload Study, 2018
- South Dakota Court Services Workload Assessment, 2018
- Booz Allen, Executive Office for Immigration Review, Case Processing Study, 2017
- Colorado Court Staff Weighted Caseload Study, 2017
- Delaware Family Court Workload Study, 2017
- Iowa Judicial Officer Workload, 2017
- Iowa Court Staff Workload, 2017
- Kosovo Judicial Workload Assessment, 2017
- Maryland Judiciary Workload Assessment, 2017
- Maryland Clerical Workload Assessment, 2017
- Missouri Clerical Weighted Caseload Study, 2017
- Texas Family Court Workload Assessment, 2017
- Virginia Judicial Workload Assessment, 2017
- Florida Judicial Workload Assessment, 2016
- Gwinnett County, Georgia, Workload Study, 2016
- Indiana Judicial Workload Study, 2016
- Kentucky Judicial Workload Assessment Boundary Realignment, 2016
- Montana Juvenile Probation Workload Study, 2016
- Oregon Juvenile Judges and Staff Workload Study, 2016
- South Dakota Judicial Workload Assessment, 2016
- Vermont Judicial and Clerical Weighted Caseload Study, 2016
- Wisconsin Judicial Needs Assessment, 2016

2. *Organizational References*

- a) Client name: Iowa Administrative Office of the Courts
 - b) Project description: The Iowa Administrative Office of the Courts contracted with the NCSC to perform workload assessment studies of the district court judges, and court clerk and support staff.
 - c) Project dates (starting and ending): July 2016 – March 2017
 - d) Technical environment (i.e., software applications, internet capabilities, data communications, network, hardware): The primary means of data collection during the time study phase of this project was a web-based data entry tool designed by the NCSC. Additionally, a series of web-based trainings recorded by NCSC staff was used for training time study participants. A series of webinars conducted by NCSC staff were used to train time study participants for project references that used webinars.
 - e) Staff assigned to reference engagement that will be designated for work per this RFP: Suzanne Tallarico, John Douglas
 - f) Client project manager name, telephone number, fax number, and email address: John Goerdts, (551) 348-4880 (telephone), (515) 242-0014 (fax), john.goerdts@iowacourts.gov
-
- a) Client name: Kentucky Administrative Office of the Courts
 - b) Project description: The Kentucky Administrative Office of the Courts contracted with the NCSC to developing a weighted caseload system to measure the workload of judges in Kentucky's trial courts.
 - c) Project dates (starting and ending): September 1, 2015 – December 31, 2015
 - d) Technical environment (i.e., software applications, internet capabilities, data communications, network, hardware): The primary means of data collection during the time study phase of this project was a web-based data entry tool designed by the NCSC. Additionally, a series of web-based trainings recorded by NCSC staff was used for training time study participants. A series of webinars conducted by NCSC staff were used to train time study participants for project references that used webinars.
 - e) Staff assigned to reference engagement that will be designated for work per this RFP: Shannon Roth
 - f) Client project manager name, telephone number, fax number, and email address: Laurie Dudgeon, (502) 573-2350 (telephone), (502) 782-8707 (fax), LaurieDudgeon@kycourts.net
-
- a) Client name: Missouri Office of State Courts Administrator
 - b) Project description: The Missouri Office of State Courts Administrator contracted with the NCSC to provide a clerical weighted workload study in the state's circuit courts.
 - c) Project dates (starting and ending): July 2016 – May 2017
 - d) Technical environment (i.e., software applications, internet capabilities, data communications, network, hardware): The primary means of data

collection during the time study phase of this project was a web-based data entry tool designed by the NCSC. Additionally, a series of web-based trainings recorded by NCSC staff was used for training time study participants. A series of webinars conducted by NCSC staff were used to train time study participants for project references that used webinars.

- e) Staff assigned to reference engagement that will be designated for work per this RFP: Suzanne Tallarico, John Douglas
 - f) Client project manager name, telephone number, fax number, and email address: Paul Buckley, (573) 526-8807 (telephone), (573) 751-5540 (fax), Paul.Buckley@courts.mo.gov
-
- a) Client name: South Dakota Unified Judicial System
 - b) Project description: The South Dakota Unified Judicial System contracted with the NCSC to conduct a judicial workload assessment for the state and to perform an update to the existing court clerk weighted caseload system.
 - c) Project dates (starting and ending): September 2013 – July 2015 (court clerks); August 2015 – November 2016 (judges)
 - d) Technical environment (i.e., software applications, internet capabilities, data communications, network, hardware): The primary means of data collection during the time study phase of this project was a web-based data entry tool designed by the NCSC. Additionally, a series of web-based trainings recorded by NCSC staff was used for training time study participants. A series of webinars conducted by NCSC staff were used to train time study participants for project references that used webinars.
 - e) Staff assigned to reference engagement that will be designated for work per this RFP: Suzanne Tallarico, John Douglas
 - f) Client project manager name, telephone number, fax number, and email address: Jill Gusso, (605) 773-3474 (telephone), (605) 773-8437 (fax), jill.gusso@ujs.state.sd.us

3. *Specifications*

Concern with financial and resource accountability at all levels of government is a strong stimulus to develop systematic methods for assessing the need for judges. The best approach for assessing judicial need is weighted caseload. Simply stated, weighted caseload is used to translate court caseload into workload. Cases vary in complexity, and different types of cases require different amounts of time and attention from judges and court. A weighted caseload study requires two basic sets of information: (1) statistical data that describe the type and volume of cases handled by judges, and (2) time data needed to generate the case weights. As discussed below, the NCSC proposes to use a time study to assemble the time data. However, prior to the time study, the first step is to determine what data is available statewide that describes the type and volume of work being handled by judges. Accurate and consistent counts of case filings by case type category and by every court location supplemented by key case event data (e.g., trial rates) are primary drivers of the weighted caseload models. The NCSC will work closely with the Advisory Committees to assess current data collection practices within and among the trial courts. The primary goal will be to determine the case type categories for which case weights will be developed and to evaluate the accuracy and validity of the data that is collected statewide and within each court.

The foundation of the workload assessment will be a time study of four weeks in duration, during which judges will record all their working hours by case and functional area, or by non-case administrative matters. The time study will provide an empirical foundation for the case weights. Time study data will be collected using the NCSC's customizable on-line timekeeping system. Prior to the time study, participants will receive on-line training in how to track and record their time. The workload assessment further will incorporate a multi-step quality adjustment process incorporating quality adjustment meetings with the advisory committee, and if desired by the AOC, an adequacy of time survey and site visits. The adequacy of time survey will provide an opportunity for judges to rate how often they have sufficient time to perform specific case-related tasks and functions. During the site visits, the NCSC project team will hold focus groups with judicial officers in representative regions to identify challenges to the effective handling of different types of cases. The final project deliverables will include a set of tools for determining existing judicial need and for projecting future judicial using the workload model, as well as a written report (or reports) summarizing the project methodology and results.

The project timeline that follows is based on best information at this time and represents a reasonable estimate of time sequences that the NCSC will follow. The NCSC proposes a project start date in May 2019 (assuming a contract is executed by that time) to run for a 12-month timeframe but understands that the Washington AOC, Superior Court Judges' Association (may have an estimated timeline in mind and has some flexibility in adjusting task completion dates. The NCSC will do its best to accommodate the AOC's needs.

Task	Months from Project Start											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1.1. Project Scope Planning Meetings	X											
1.2. Formation of JNAC	X											
1.3. Initial Project Meeting	X	X										
2.1. Design Data Collection Tools			X									
2.2. On-site Training				X	X							
2.3. Data Collection and Support					X	X						
3. Data Analysis						X	X					
4. Second Meeting of JNAC								X				
5. Focus Group Site Visits								X	X			
6. AOT Survey								X	X			
7. Final Meeting of JNAC										X		
8.1. Draft Report											X	X
8.2. Final Report											X	X

4. Judicial Workload Study Task Plan

a) Project Planning and Advisory Committee

Task 1. Project Preparation and Planning with Advisory Committee

1.1. Project Scope Planning Meetings

The NCSC project team (including Suzanne Tallarico, John Douglas, and Shannon Roth) will meet with Washington Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), Superior Court Judges' Association within the first month of the project to finalize the scope and design of the project. Deliverables that will be considered are:

- Determining the availability of accurate and consistent caseload data for all participating study courts
- Inclusion focus groups site visits for each of the included study groups.
- Inclusion of the Adequacy of Time Survey for each of the included study groups.

1.2. Formation of the Judicial Needs Advisory Committee

The NCSC will work with the AOC to form a Judicial Needs Advisory Committee (JNAC) to provide project oversight and guidance, and review project plans and materials. The size and composition of the JNAC will be determined by the AOC. The AOC will be responsible for arranging and coordinating the participation of all JNAC members. JNAC sessions will be jointly facilitated by the NCSC and AOC.

1.3. Initial Project Meeting

The NCSC project team (including Suzanne Tallarico, John Douglas, and Shannon Roth) will meet with the JNAC within the first or second month of the project to review the overall study design and discuss specific aspects of the design, including:

- Case types for which workload standards are sought.
- Judge-day and judge-year values.
- Design of the time study, including:
 - The scope of data to be collected.
 - The method of time study data collection instruments and instructional materials.
 - The participants in the time study.
 - The data collection timeline (anticipated to be one to two months).
 - The availability of automated data on filings and dispositions, and the consistency of statewide counting practices.
- Schedule for conducting the focus groups.

The AOC's collection and delivery of several key pieces of information to the NCSC project team is critical to the initial phases of the project:

- First, an essential component in every workload study is the complete compilation of a set of **accurate, reliable, and consistent counts of the number of cases that are filed and/or disposed of in each type of court by case type category**, for every superior court jurisdiction.
- Second, the AOC will need to provide an accurate census of the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) judges in each jurisdiction, including email addresses, physical address and phone number, if possible, and court location. Data collected during the study will be analyzed in the aggregate and will not identify specific judges, except to indicate which courts and judges participated in the study.
- Finally, the NCSC will assign a unique identifier (e.g., e-mail user name) to each individual included in the census in order to permit the NCSC to assess participation levels during the study period and ultimately accommodate for any missing data. The results of this phase will serve as a framework for the overall workload assessment in terms of the key case types handled by judges, the current level of resources and caseloads, and the key functions performed by judges.

b) Data Collection

Task 2. Time Study

The NCSC will conduct an event-based time study of judicial workload over the course of a four-week period in order to obtain a reliable and valid snapshot of judicial activity (including all pre-trial, disposition, post-disposition, and non-case-related activities). Leading up to the time study, the NCSC project team will work with the JNAC and AOC to finalize statewide practices of counting filings, test all data collection instruments, and ensure that the research design has been reviewed and approved.

Basic features of the time study strategy include:

- (1) Collecting the data from all judicial officers statewide, unless deemed logistically unreasonable, in which case a representative sample of officers will be asked to provide data.
- (2) Sending the data directly to the NCSC for analysis.
- (3) Reporting weekly participation rates in the time study to the AOC.

Specific responsibilities for the time study tasks include:

2.1. Design of Data Collection Instruments/Preparation of Training Materials

The NCSC project team will work in collaboration with the JNAC and AOC to design the most effective and efficient way to collect time study information. Typically, data collection involves the use of a paper time tracking form and a web-based data entry system, both of which are designed by the NCSC.

The NCSC project team will also prepare a PowerPoint presentation and written training materials that clearly explain the data collection process for all participants engaged in the study in order to assure that all time is recorded comprehensively, accurately, and consistently according to an established set of rules. The JNAC and/or AOC will review and approve the final design of the data collection instruments and the instruction materials.

2.2. On-site Training and Dissemination of Data Collection Materials

The NCSC project team will provide training either via on-site sessions at various locations across the state or via webinar (or via a combination of both) in order to acquaint participants with the workload concept, the proposed project design, and the data collection requirements, and answer any questions related to the study and its implications. Possible additional training locations will be determined with the assistance of the JNAC. NCSC trainers will use their best efforts to personally train all judicial officers who will participate in the study; if needed, training will be provided by alternate methods, including recorded training sessions. Written instructions will also be provided to all study participants.

2.3. Data Collection and Support

An AOC-designated staff person will work with the NCSC project team to support the collection of time study data. Throughout the data collection process, the AOC-designated staff person and the NCSC project team will remain available to answer questions from time study participants, e.g., login questions, questions about revisions to submitted time, and general questions regarding the reporting and entry of data. Such support is invaluable because it ensures reliability in the time study data collection as well as its timely completion.

At the very early stages of the time study period, the NCSC will begin monitoring the submitted data on a weekly basis in order to ascertain the levels of participation by court and individual. Each week, the NCSC will prepare a report showing the participation rates of individual judicial officers by court location.

c) Data Analysis

Task 3. Data Analysis

After the NCSC cleans, verifies, and compiles the data, the NCSC project team will analyze and synthesize all of the data received during the data collection period. From this information, the analysis will focus on:

- Time required to process each case type studied, including average times for each case event measured.
- Time required for non-case-related work (e.g., administration, travel, committee attendance, general legal research).
- Average travel time required by judicial officers in each jurisdiction.

The JNAC may identify specific analytical issues that it would like the NCSC to glean from the data. Any special analyses requested will be conducted during this phase.

The time study results documenting the current work practices of judges across the state will be a springboard to discuss the linkage between workload and measured court performance and enable the Washington State Judiciary and the AOC to evaluate qualitative considerations that affect the effective resolution of cases.

Task 4. Second Meeting of the JNAC

The NCSC project team will meet with the JNAC after the time study and before the focus groups to report the initial findings from the time study to determine whether additional information needs to be collected.

Task 5. Focus Group Site Visits

After the time study concludes, if the AOC desires and for appropriate additional cost, the NCSC project team (possibly along with AOC staff) will conduct a series of focus groups at representative superior court locations with judicial officers who handle different types of cases. The NCSC will participate in three one-day site visits during which multiple focus groups will be held at different court locations.

The focus groups will help identify challenges to the effective handling of different types of cases as well as proven efficient and effective case processing policies and strategies. The narratives produced from the focus group site visits will complement the results of the Adequacy of Time survey to be administered under Task 6.

Task 6. Adequacy of Time Survey

Following the time study, if the AOC desires and for appropriate additional cost, the NCSC will develop a web-based Adequacy of Time survey for use statewide to measure opinions on whether judges believe they have sufficient time to reasonably complete all their judicial responsibilities within current resource levels. All judicial officers in the participating study groups will be invited to participate in the survey.

This forum provides the opportunity for all judges across the state to give their views on current case processing practices and identify where the preliminary case weights may need to be modified to take into account areas where additional time is required to enhance the quality of the justice delivered.

Generally, there are three parts to this assessment:

- (1) Whether judges need more or less time in the identified phases of case resolution to complete the job (the JNAC may also identify specific tasks they wish to have addressed in this survey).
- (2) Whether there is sufficient time available for judges to perform the non-case-related aspects of the work of the court.
- (3) Whether there are other areas where more or less judicial time is needed to complete the job.

Task 7. Final Meeting of the JNAC

The JNAC will reconvene for a meeting to examine and reconcile results from all phases of the study, including results from the focus groups and site visits, the time study, and the Adequacy of Time survey. The goal of the meeting will be to reach consensus on a set of final case weights.

d) Draft Initial Report(s)

Task 8. Final Report

8.1. Draft Report

The NCSC project team will draft a preliminary report that includes the project methodology and the workload standards for case-related and non-case-related activities. The report will also include the analysis and derivation of case weights and average time needed for specific functions, the results of the weighted caseload study, focus groups, site visits and adequacy of time survey, and an executive summary and will present the draft report to the JNAC for review and comment. The AOC will be responsible for coordinating the review process with the JNAC and other stakeholders.

e) Final Report

Task 8.2. Final Report

Following the final meeting of the JNAC, the NCSC project team will incorporate any corrections, comments, and suggestions, as appropriate, and finalize the report in an electronic format. The NCSC will submit bound copies, if requested, in a number to be determined in consultation with the AOC.

5. Cost Proposal

The NCSC is pleased to present this cost proposal to the AOC for “Washington State Judicial Workload Study.”

The cost for this project as proposed in the tasks above will be a firm fixed price of \$150,000. This cost includes professional and administrative time, travel, and indirect costs. An example of some of the costs included in the NCSC’s indirect cost rates are equipment, supplies, telephone, printing/photocopying, postage, audits, and other items. The indirect costs are based on federal government (GSA) approved rates used for all contracts.

Judicial Workload Study Tasks	Total Estimated Cost	Total Estimated Consulting Hours	Estimated Travel
1.1. Project Scope Planning Meetings	\$21,692	96	3 Consultants 4 days
1.2. Formation of JNAC	\$2,332	13	
1.3. Initial Project Meeting	\$11,459	48	3 Consultants 2 days
2.1. Design Data Collection Tools	\$8,528	48	
2.2. On-site Training	\$11,075	48	1 Consultant 5 days
2.3. Data Collection and Support	\$9,592	56	
3. Data Analysis	\$11,192	64	
4. Second Meeting of JNAC	\$11,459	48	3 Consultants 2 days
5. Focus Group Site Visits	\$26,808	120	3 Consultants 5 days
6. AOT Survey	\$4,528	28	
7. Final Meeting of JNAC	\$11,459	48	3 Consultants 2 days
8.1. Draft Report	\$14,331	80	
8.2. Final Report	\$5,545	30	
TOTAL COST	\$150,000	727	50 days



WASHINGTON STATE

JUDICAL WORKLOAD STUDY

PROPOSAL

FEBRUARY 2019

**SUBMITTED BY
NATIONAL CENTER FOR STATE COURTS
COURT CONSULTING SERVICES**

**Daniel J. Hall, Vice President
Laura Klaversma, Court Services Director**

**707 SEVENTEENTH STREET, SUITE 2900
DENVER, COLORADO 80202-3429
PHONE: (303) 293-3063
FAX: (303) 308-4329**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Organizational Experience.....	1
2.	Organizational References	15
3.	Mandatory Specifications	17
4.	Judicial Workload Study Task Plan.....	18
5.	Cost Proposal	24

Washington State Judicial Workload Study

PROPOSAL

The National Center for State Courts (NCSC) is pleased to present this proposal to the Washington Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) to conduct a workload assessment for judges in the Washington trial courts, which include the superior courts, district courts and magistrate courts. The NCSC proposes to assist the trial courts in completing this statewide workload study by developing an empirically based workload model for judges using a comprehensive workload assessment strategy that incorporates a time study, employs a qualitative decision-making process to analyze all results, and recommends a final workload model for Washington trial court judges.

1. Organizational Experience

a) Relevant Experience

National Center for State Courts Qualifications

Widely recognized as the national and international leader in developing weighted caseload formulas for judges and court staff, the NCSC is uniquely suited to handle the challenges of establishing workload models for the Washington trial courts. The NCSC pioneered the “what is/ what should be” approach to workload assessment that is based on an empirical time study in conjunction with the use of surveys and focus groups to obtain critical qualitative information regarding “what should be.” The NCSC’s workload assessment methodology and data collection instruments have been continuously refined over the course of more than 75 studies spanning over 20 years. The NCSC project team is adept at balancing divergent stakeholder interests, securing cooperation and support for workload assessments, and facilitating advisory committee meetings. The NCSC’s transparent, empirically driven, and highly participatory workload assessment process helps to build a perception of ownership among study participants, as well as to establish strong credibility for the final workload model among judges, staff, and legislators.

The NCSC’s proprietary Web-based timekeeping system is user-friendly, designed to minimize the burden of data collection on time study participants, and easily customized to suit the unique needs of each individual workload assessment. On average, time study participants typically spend less than ten minutes per day tracking and entering their time; in some studies, the daily average is as low as five minutes. Real-time participation monitoring enables project staff and advisory committees to encourage participation on a targeted basis. Statewide time studies conducted by the NCSC uniformly achieve participation rates in excess of 95 percent. These near-universal participation rates are critical to the reliability and credibility of the final workload models.

National Center for State Courts Project Team Qualifications

The NCSC project team will consist of Suzanne Tallarico (project director), John Douglas (project team member), and Shannon Roth (project team member). Brief biographical abstracts for NCSC project team members are provided below with resumes at the end of this section.

Suzanne K. Tallarico, M.A., has been a Principal Court Management Consultant with the NCSC since 2005. She focuses on criminal and juvenile justice entities in areas related to criminal justice system functioning, workload assessment, policy analysis, data analysis, program evaluation and performance, judicial performance, strategic planning and other court and criminal justice related projects. Areas of expertise include workload analysis and staffing needs, system performance assessment, judicial performance evaluation, criminal and juvenile justice system studies, adult and juvenile probation issues, and probation case processing, evidence-based practices and management. She also serves as NCSC staff to the Conference of Chief Justices/Conference of State Court Administrators Problem Solving Court Committee and the Midwest Regional Committee.

Prior to joining the NCSC, Ms. Tallarico was the Director of Research and Evaluation for the Colorado State Court Administrator's Office of Probation Services. Preceding her employment with the Colorado Judicial Branch, she served for twelve years as a senior research analyst for the Colorado Department of Public Safety, Division of Criminal Justice. In these positions, she has had extensive experience in program evaluation, policy analysis, judicial and probation staffing and workload assessment, correctional population forecasting, program and performance review, and collection and dissemination of statistics and statistical reports.

John Douglas, Principal Court Management Consultant, joined the NCSC in 1997. Mr. Douglas has directed or participated in over fifty statewide staffing/workload assessment projects to determine the need for the appropriate number for judges, clerk staff, or probation personnel through the identification and analysis of specific case type metrics and activities. Included in those projects are limited and general jurisdiction courts, courts of appeal, and parole and probation officer workload assessments.

Mr. Douglas' previous employer was the National Treasury Employees Union (NTEU), where he was responsible for representing the interests of Federal Employees in federal arbitration cases in Los Angeles, Orange County, and San Diego.

Mr. Douglas earned a B.B.A. from Texas State University in Economics and has received additional training in employment issues from the National Labor College, George Meany Center for Labor Studies. He is also a Fellow of the Institute for Court Management's Court Executive Development Program (CEDP). Most recently, in 2015, Mr. Douglas completed the certification program by the International Institute of Business Analysis (IIBA) and has become a Certified Business Analysis Professional (CBAP).

Shannon Roth is Business Analyst with Court Consulting Services at the NCSC. Her experience ranges from court performance and culture to staffing/workload assessment. Some recently completed projects include the Georgia Judicial Workload Assessment, Virginia Judicial

Workload Assessment, Maryland Court Culture, Effective Criminal Caseflow Processing, and Examining the Effectiveness of Indigent Defense Team Services: A Multisite Evaluation of Holistic Defense in Practice, and supporting and providing technical support for the High Performance Courts Framework (www.ncsc.org/hpcf), *CourTools* and *Appellate CourTools* (www.courttools.org). Ms. Roth is currently serving as staff for several workload assessments. In addition, she creates and maintains multiple surveys using the survey software ConfrmIt for Court Consulting Services.

Resumes follow on the next page

SUZANNE KRAUS TALLARICO

Principal Court Management Consultant



EDUCATION

M.A. in Sociology, University of Denver, Denver, Colorado, 1985

B.A. in Sociology, Aquinas College, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1983

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

National Center for State Courts 2005 – Present

Principal Court Management Consultant. Serves as a consultant to courts and other criminal and juvenile justice entities in areas related to criminal justice system functioning, workload, policy, program evaluation and performance, judicial performance, strategic planning and other court and criminal justice related projects. Areas of expertise include workload analysis and staff need, system performance assessment, judicial performance evaluation, criminal and juvenile justice system studies, adult and juvenile probation issues, and probation case processing and management. Ms. Tallarico has facilitated several strategic planning retreats and meetings for state agencies, boards and commissions. Ms. Tallarico is an active member of the American Probation and Parole Association and is an ongoing member of the ongoing *Effective Facilitator* e-learning group.

Recently completed NCSC *weighted caseload* projects include: King County (Washington) District Court Staff (2015), South Dakota Court Staff (2015), West Virginia Circuit Court Judges (2014), Colorado Probation (2014), Colorado Parole (2014), Pennsylvania Court of Common Pleas Judges (2014), Montana District Court Judges (2014), Tennessee District Court Judges (2013), Louisiana Court of Appeals Judges (2014), North Dakota Judges and Clerks (2012), Kansas Judges and Court Clerks (2011), Massachusetts IV-D Registry Staff (2011), Yuma County, Arizona Judges (2010), North Dakota Court Services Officers (2010), Oregon Court of Appeals Staff and Judges (2010), Colorado District Court (2010) and County Court (2010), New York Law Guardians (2009), Tennessee District Court (2009), Alabama Court Clerks (2009), South Dakota Court Services Officers (2007), Maricopa County, AZ, Justice Court Clerk Staff (2008), Iowa District Court (2008), Colorado Probation (2008), Missouri Circuit Court Judges (2007), New Mexico Judges, (2007), Washoe County, Nevada Judges, King County, Washington Court Staff (2007); Montana Judges (2006); Nebraska Judges (2006), Maryland Judges (2006), Massachusetts Probation Support Staffing (2005).

Facilitation projects include: Strategic planning with the Guam Judiciary's Criminal Sexual Conduct Management Committee, strategic plan development for Maricopa County Juvenile Probation Department (2011), Colorado Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Council (2011), Conference of Chief Justices and Conference of State Court Administrators' Drug Court Summit (2009 and 2011), Mesa County Criminal Justice Council (2009), Colorado Justice Assistance Grant Board (2009), Colorado Interagency Committee on Adult and Juvenile Correctional Treatment (2007).

Additional completed projects include: Judicial Performance Evaluation in Illinois and Idaho, Pennsylvania Adult Probation and Parole Agency Assessment, Research study on Wisconsin's Effective Justice Strategies (2011), Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands Supreme and Superior Court Consolidation of Administrative Functions (2008), Okaloosa County, Florida Jail Crowding and Criminal Justice System Study (2007); Evaluation of Diversified Dockets in Arapahoe County, Colorado (2006); Feasibility Study for Alternative Court Scheduling Techniques in Chesterfield County, Virginia (2006); Improving the Organization and Performance of Courts and Probation in Lake County, Indiana (2006); Performance Audit of the Davidson County, Tennessee, Juvenile; Arrest to Filing Assessment in Tarrant County, Texas (2005); Kern County (CA)

Jail Crowding System Analysis (2006); and Court Clerk's Office Collections Assessment Study in Knox County, Tennessee (2005).

Colorado State Court Administrator's Office of Probation Services, 1998 – 2005

Director of Research and Evaluation. Ms. Tallarico (then Ms. Pullen) developed and managed all adult and juvenile workload and staffing needs projects, was responsible for the office's policy analysis and development, program evaluation, program and performance review, collection and dissemination of statistics and statistical reports and was the liaison for the office and federal grant administrators. Additionally, this position required a substantial amount of strategic planning with various groups, entities and agencies, throughout the juvenile and criminal justice system and in other governmental branches and departments.

Colorado Department of Public Safety, Division of Criminal Justice, 1985 – 1997

Senior Research Analyst/Research Analyst. Areas of responsibility included managing all of the Division's evaluation projects, co-principal investigator on several federally funded research projects, including the NIJ-funded research project on adult sex offenders management, which resulted in the publication of the book *Managing Adult Sex Offenders: A Containment Approach*. Ms. Tallarico also developed the state's prison population projections, which were used in setting policy and making prison expansion and construction decisions. In this position, she had primary responsibility for policy analysis requests in the division.

The URSA Institute, San Francisco, California, 1984 – 1985

Research Assistant. Participated in a two year research study investigating case processing of youth in the Colorado Juvenile Justice System. Responsibilities included primary data collection in four geographic regions of the state and data collection instrument development.

The University of Denver, Department of Sociology, 1983 – 1984

Research Assistant. Duties included research instrument development, data collection, conducting interviews, conducting literature searches and reviews, and performing teaching and administrative tasks. Work was primarily conducted in the juvenile justice system – juvenile arrests, prosecutor decision-making, judicial decision-making and sentencing.

Pertinent Experience

Center for Sex Offender Management, Silver Spring, Maryland. Frequent consultant and trainer for CSOM efforts, including program development, evaluation strategies, curriculum development, and other efforts related to sex offender management. Ms. Tallarico worked with the Yankton Sioux Tribe to facilitate the development of a coordinated response to managing convicted sex offenders.

Strengthening the Capacity of the Maricopa County (Phoenix, Arizona) Juvenile Probation Department.

This strategic planning project was designed to help the Department develop a plan to implement the essential elements of evidence-based practices throughout all phases of juvenile probation assessment and supervision. The strategic planning process will assisted the Department in identifying essential areas in which changes needed to occur, state the goals to be addressed, and develop the steps necessary to achieve those goals.

Wisconsin State Level Strategies. The scope of this project is to conduct research that will identify court centered evidence-based strategies that enhance public safety, reduce recidivism and address criminal and addictive behaviors and develop recommendations related to the court systems role in fostering state-wide support and replication of these strategies. Specifically, the NCSC team is conducting research and developing recommendations centered on the questions of:

- What is currently being done in Wisconsin Courts?

- What works and how do we measure it?
- What should be the statewide strategy and plan of action?

Yuma County, Arizona Workload Assessment and Caseload Assignment Tool. This workload assessment study determined the workload demands for judicial officers in Yuma County, Arizona. A second product associated with this project, and a new tool that had not previously developed, was a caseload assignment tool which can be used to ensure equal workload demands for all judicial officers in the County. Another Arizona County, Mohave County, embarked on a similar study in 2011.

New York Law Guardians Workload Assessment Study. This workload assessment study conducted with attorneys who represent children in the state of New York generated average attorney case processing times for child welfare cases in the State of New York. The project relied on the use of Delphi methodology to generate consensus on the average case processing times.

Tennessee Trial Court Judicial Workload Assessment Study. This workload assessment study was an update to a 1999 study. A time study and adequacy of time survey were conducted to generate data. Focus groups were held across the state, and all judges were invited to attend. The focus group process provided judges with an opportunity to review preliminary findings and make commentary regarding the face validity of the findings.

Missouri Circuit Court Judicial Workload Assessment Study. The workload assessment study in Missouri was the first ever to be completed in this state of elected judges. Judges were extremely skeptical that the workload study would not adequately assess their needs and that the results would be used to eliminate judges. A time study was conducted and the results were shared with focus groups of judges across the state. The process included several opportunities for judges to ask questions of the project staff and provide feedback along the way. In the end, the results were widely accepted across the state.

North Dakota Court Services Officers Workload Study. This study was conducted for Court Services Officers, or Probation Officers in North Dakota. Workload assessment for probation officers is different from workload assessment for judges or court staff because supervision cases are typically seen on a monthly basis, as opposed to court cases, which have a clear beginning and ending. This workload study updated case weights that were originally generated in 2005. Case weights were developed for adult and juvenile investigations and adult and juvenile supervision cases - at all levels.

South Dakota Unified Judicial System Court Services Officers Workload Study. This study was conducted for Court Services Officers, or Probation Officers in South Dakota. This workload study updated case weights that were originally generated in 1998. Case weights were developed for adult and juvenile investigations and adult and juvenile supervision cases - at all levels.

Washoe County, Nevada (Reno) District Court Workload Assessment Study. A workload assessment study was conducted for the district court in Reno, Nevada. The court, which had 19 judicial officers at the time of the study, is separated into a family court and a general jurisdiction court. The workload assessment study indicated a need for an additional 7.5 judicial officers.

New Mexico Judicial Workload Assessment Study. The judicial workload study conducted in New Mexico was part of an overall study to determine the needs for judges, prosecuting attorneys and public defenders. The judicial portion of the study included three levels of judicial officers: district court judges (including a separate study for Bernalillo Metro Courts), magistrates and hearing officers. The assessment of workload included a time study and an adequacy of time survey. Project staff worked with an advisory committee, which guided all three pieces of the study, as well as working groups representing each court level included in the study.

King County, Washington Court Staff Workload Assessment Study. This study included both a time-in-motion based workload assessment of court line staff and a staffing analysis of non-line staff and the organization of the court as a whole. The court will use this study as the basis for planning ongoing changes and staffing requests for the next five years.

Montana and Nebraska Judicial Workload Studies. These separate time-in-motion studies assessed judges' work and workload needs in the states of Montana and Nebraska. Both studies included the use of Advisory Committees made up of judiciary and court administration representatives to guide the specific needs and details of the study. Both studies culminated in a final report of judicial need and a model that can be used to develop future judicial need assessments.

Okaloosa County, Florida Jail and Criminal Justice System Study. The study was conducted for the Board of County Commissioners to help them and the criminal justice system leaders to better understand the dynamic nature of the offender jail population and its propensity to grow and change in the future. The JCI-NCSC team significantly reduced the jail population during the ongoing study and made recommendations to continue to maintain reduced populations. Ms. Tallarico's focus was on the needs of judges relative to jail facilities.

Arrest to Filing Assessment in Tarrant County, Texas. This system study was driven largely by recent statewide policy changes that impacted all levels of the criminal justice system, including the clerk of court, the courts and the Sheriff's Department because of jail crowding issues. The study involved an analysis of the current processes in place across agencies and made recommendations for improvement and change in a number of arenas. The study was conducted on behalf of the County Administrator's Office, so the recommendations addressed a range of agencies.

Jail Crowding System Analysis Kern County, California. The focus of this ongoing study is on jail crowding in Kern County, California. The JCI-NCSC team has mapped out the system in terms of functions and processes and is currently in the data analysis phase of developing jail need projections. My area of focus on this project is to determine the jail space needs of the courts as well as to determine any alternatives to incarceration that judges would be willing to use in lieu of jail space.

Arapahoe County, Colorado Court Docketing and Case Management System Study. This study is pertinent to the proposed project because it involves the court that is the primary user of the Arapahoe County jail. The project has allowed me to develop relationships with the judges, court administrator, prosecutor, public defenders and Sheriff's Department staff in the county as well as to gain insight into the issues and concerns experienced across each of these groups.

Feasibility Study for Alternative Court Scheduling Techniques in Chesterfield County, Virginia. This study directly addresses the needs of a quickly growing community and is designed to develop options to delay court expansion. The project includes a study of the anticipated and current space needs of the various court occupants (judges, court clerks, sheriff's department, probation) as well as the study of the processes used to conduct their work. The final report will include recommendations for alternative uses of current space, short- and long-term expansion options and alternatives to current case processing that could result in the more efficient use of space resources.

JOHN W. DOUGLAS

Principal Court Management Consultant

jdouglas@ncsc.org



Work Experience & Expertise

Since joining the NCSC in 1997, Mr. Douglas has specialized in over forty statewide staffing/workload assessment projects to determine the need for the appropriate number for judge, clerk staff and probation, personnel through the identification and analysis of specific case type metrics and activities. Included in those projects are limited and general jurisdiction courts, courts of appeal, and probation officer workload assessments.

Mr. Douglas' previous employer was the National Treasury Employees Union (NTEU) in California where he was responsible for representing the interests of Federal Employees in Los Angeles, Orange County and San Diego in federal arbitration cases. In addition, as a federal union representative John investigated, researched and presented briefs in support of the legal arguments due to personnel performance and or disciplinary actions taken by management and, when appropriate, negotiated with management, the potential terms for settlement prior to arbitration hearings. Prior to working for the NTEU Mr. Douglas held the position of Associate Director for AFSCME in Austin Texas, where he represented and negotiated the labor interests of approximate 300 employees working for the city of Austin Texas and Travis County.

John earned a BBA from Texas State University in Economics and has received additional training in employment issues from the National Labor College, George Meany Center for Labor Studies. Mr. Douglas is also a Fellow of the Institute for Court Management's Court Executive Development Program (CEDP). Most recently (2015) Mr. Douglas has completed the certification program by the International Institute of Business Analysis (IIBA) and has become a Certified Business Analysis Professional (CBAP).

Education

Certified Business Analysis Professional (CBAP) 2015

Graduate Institute for Court Management, Fellow, 2007

Justice Information Exchange Model Program Certificate, 2004

George Meany Center, Arbitration & Labor Relations Education, 1986

B.B.A., Texas State University, Economics, 1981

Highlights of NCSC Workload/ Staffing Projects

- Judicial Workload Analysis, Court of Appeals, Oregon
- Judicial Workload Analysis Pennsylvania
- Judicial Workload Analysis Vermont
- Judicial Workload Analysis West Virginia
- Judicial Workload Analysis Kansas
- Judicial Workload Analysis, Maryland
- Judicial Workload Analysis, Puerto Rico
- Judicial Workload Analysis, Maine
- Judicial Workload Analysis, North Carolina

- Judicial Workload Analysis , Iowa
- Judicial Workload Analysis, Wyoming
- Judicial Workload Analysis, Tennessee
- Judicial Workload Analysis, 8th Judicial District, Nevada
- Judicial Workload Analysis, Georgia
- Judicial Workload Analysis, North Dakota
- Judicial Workload Analysis, Vermont
- Judicial Workload Analysis, South Dakota
- Judicial Workload Analysis, Guam
- Judicial Workload Analysis, Salt Lake City Utah
- Clerical Staff Workload Analysis, Iowa
- Clerical Staff Workload Analysis, Missouri
- Clerical Staff Workload Analysis, Maryland
- Clerical Staff Workload Analysis, Kansas
- Clerical Staff Workload Analysis, New Mexico
- Clerical Staff Workload Analysis, New Hampshire
- Clerical Staff Workload Analysis, Oregon
- Clerical Staff Workload Analysis, North Dakota
- Clerical Staffing Model, California
- Clerical Staffing Model, Salt Lake City, Utah
- Clerical Staffing Model Analysis, Colorado
- Clerical Staffing Model Analysis, Vermont
- Juvenile Probation Staffing Model Alabama
- Juvenile Probation Staffing Model North Dakota
- Juvenile Probation Staffing Model South Dakota
- Probation Staffing Model Colorado
- Probation Staffing Model South Dakota
- Department of Corrections Staffing Model Colorado
- IV-D Staffing Model Massachusetts
- IV-D Staffing Model Maine

Presentations

- Institute for Court Management Training: "Customer Service in the Courts," Territorial Courts of the Virgin Islands, 2005
- Nebraska Court Clerks Association, CourTools, 2008

Publication

- Examination of NCSC Workload Assessment Projects and Methodology: 1996 – 2006., (Principal author, 2007)
- Impact of Budget Shortfalls on Labor Relations, Trends Article (2009)

Shannon E. Roth
Business Analyst
Email: sroth@ncsc.org

Work experience

5/05 – present National Center for State Courts Williamsburg, VA

Business Analyst

Responsible for survey design, data collection, data analysis for a variety of project type including workload assessment and court performance, presentation of data to clients, and for assisting project directors and managers with all aspects of the projects, monitoring all grant requirements and regulations, monitoring and updating project budgets, organizing and maintaining project documents/files, and coordinating administrative tasks for all project staff, including travel arrangements, coordination with clients, meetings, and filing and creating proposal budgets and assist with preparation and writing of proposals and final project reports.

Administrative Manager

Responsible for providing assistance to the Director of Research with divisional management and duties and providing back-up support to the Senior Administrative Manager, including assistance with the division operation budget and assisting with the management and training of Program Specialists

Administrative Specialist

Previous responsibilities include reserving booths for exhibitors, processing payments, and tracking exhibitor agreements. Other duties include sending correspondence to exhibitors and speakers, gathering materials to be used at the conference, and tracking attendance and booths reserved for the conference.

2/14 – present La Tienda Retail Store Williamsburg, VA

Retail/Server

Part time work for La Tienda doing wine tastings, assisting customers, cashiering, and closing out the register. Additionally, working as a server in the restaurant and assisting as a hostess when needed. Additional duties include stocking the retail store and wine room

Previous Experience

1/00 – 8/03 Basic Construction Co. Newport News, VA

Payroll Administrator/ HR Assistant

Responsible for entry, maintenance, and disbursement of hourly payroll, certified payrolls, and payroll related reports. Accept and track employment applications, maintain employee database, monitor employee benefit eligibility, verify and authorize benefit payments. Secretary for company Affirmative Action Committee. Assist with accounts payable, invoicing, and purchase orders and light bookkeeping. Other administrative duties include filing, correspondence, and data entry.

Software

Windows 2007/2010, Microsoft Office (Excel, Word, PowerPoint), SPSS, Confront Survey Design, Costpoint/Deltek Financial, Project Online, PPM Project Management, Quickbooks, and Concentric Financial Services Platform.

Publications

Ostrom, Brian, Matthew Kleiman, and Shannon Roth. *Continuous Improvement in Ottawa County, Michigan Circuit and Probate Courts: A High Performance Court Framework Perspective* Court Review, Spring 2015

Ostrom, Brian, Matthew Kleiman, and Shannon Roth. *DUI Case Management in the Scottsdale City Court: Applying the High Performance Court Framework*. Court Manager, Spring 2015.

Reports

Ostrom, Brian J., Matthew Kleiman, Cynthia G. Lee, and Shannon Roth. "Virginia Judicial Workload Assessment." November 2017. A report to the Office of the Executive Secretary.

Ostrom, Brian J., Matthew Kleiman, Cynthia G. Lee, and Shannon Roth. "Texas Child Protective Services Workload Assessment." September 2016. A report to the Texas Office of Court Administration.

Ostrom, Brian J., Matthew Kleiman, Cynthia G. Lee, and Shannon Roth. "Florida Judicial Workload Assessment." May 2016. A report to the Florida Office of State Courts Administrator.

Ostrom, Brian J., Shannon Roth, and Alicia Davis. "The High Performance Court and Divorce Case Triage." December 2014. A report to the State Justice Institute.

Ostrom, Brian J., Matthew Kleiman, Alicia Davis, and Shannon Roth. "Continuous Improvement in Ottawa County, Michigan Circuit and Probate Courts: A High Performance Court Framework Perspective." June 2014. A report to the Ottawa County Circuit and Probate Courts and the State Justice Institute.

Ostrom, Brian J., Matthew Kleiman, and Shannon Roth. "DUI Case Management in the Scottsdale City Court: Applying the High Performance Court Framework." May 2014. A report to the Scottsdale City Court and the State Justice Institute.

Ostrom, Brian J., Matthew Kleiman, Cynthia G. Lee, and Shannon Roth. "Virginia Judicial Workload Assessment." November 2013. A report to the Office of the Executive Secretary.

Ostrom, Brian J., Matthew Kleiman, and Shannon Roth. "Wells County Caseflow Management: Review and Recommendations." May 2013. A report to the Wells County Circuit Court.

Ostrom, Brian J., Matthew Kleiman, Alicia Davis, and Shannon Roth. "The Application of the High Performance Court Quality Cycle in the Superior Court of Arizona in Maricopa County." March 2013. A report to the Maricopa County Superior Court and the State Justice Institute.

Ostrom, Brian J. and Shannon Roth. "Examining Texas County Courts at Law Civil Court Reorganization". December 2012. A report to the Texas Office of Court Administration and the State Justice Institute.

Ostrom, Brian J., Matthew Kleiman, Roger A. Hanson, and Shannon Roth. "Assessing Court Culture in the 4th Judicial District, Colorado." 2012. A report to the 4th Judicial District, Colorado.

Ostrom, Brian J., Matthew Kleiman, Shannon Roth. "California Judicial Workload Assessment." 2011. A report to the California Administrative Office of the Courts.

Ostrom, Brian J., Matthew Kleiman, Shannon Roth. "California Superior Court Staff Workload Assessment." 2011. A report to the California Administrative Office of the Courts.

b) Number of Workload Studies

The NCSC has played a preeminent role in judicial and staff workload assessment studies and has pioneered the methodologies used in these studies to help states develop meaningful and easily-understood criteria for determining overall resource needs, taking into account both case-specific and non-case-specific needs. These studies have involved judges, quasi-judicial officers, administrative and clerical staff, court clerks, and parole and probation officers. All studies are anchored by a “weighted caseload” model that directly measures the variations in time required to manage different case types within the appropriate context. The methodology employed by the NCSC has been honed over the years and has been enhanced by Web-based technologies that permit direct entry of time study data. These improvements have enhanced the level of participation. Weighted caseload studies, an NCSC specialty, are now deemed a “best practice.”

The NCSC has performed approximately 23 workload studies in the last two years:

- Iowa Judicial and Court Staff Workload Study, 2018
- Maine Title IV-D Caseload Study, 2018
- South Dakota Court Services Workload Assessment, 2018
- Booz Allen, Executive Office for Immigration Review, Case Processing Study, 2017
- Colorado Court Staff Weighted Caseload Study, 2017
- Delaware Family Court Workload Study, 2017
- Iowa Judicial Officer Workload, 2017
- Iowa Court Staff Workload, 2017
- Kosovo Judicial Workload Assessment, 2017
- Maryland Judiciary Workload Assessment, 2017
- Maryland Clerical Workload Assessment, 2017
- Missouri Clerical Weighted Caseload Study, 2017
- Texas Family Court Workload Assessment, 2017
- Virginia Judicial Workload Assessment, 2017
- Florida Judicial Workload Assessment, 2016
- Gwinnett County, Georgia, Workload Study, 2016
- Indiana Judicial Workload Study, 2016
- Kentucky Judicial Workload Assessment Boundary Realignment, 2016
- Montana Juvenile Probation Workload Study, 2016
- Oregon Juvenile Judges and Staff Workload Study, 2016
- South Dakota Judicial Workload Assessment, 2016
- Vermont Judicial and Clerical Weighted Caseload Study, 2016
- Wisconsin Judicial Needs Assessment, 2016

2. *Organizational References*

- a) Client name: Iowa Administrative Office of the Courts
 - b) Project description: The Iowa Administrative Office of the Courts contracted with the NCSC to perform workload assessment studies of the district court judges, and court clerk and support staff.
 - c) Project dates (starting and ending): July 2016 – March 2017
 - d) Technical environment (i.e., software applications, internet capabilities, data communications, network, hardware): The primary means of data collection during the time study phase of this project was a web-based data entry tool designed by the NCSC. Additionally, a series of web-based trainings recorded by NCSC staff was used for training time study participants. A series of webinars conducted by NCSC staff were used to train time study participants for project references that used webinars.
 - e) Staff assigned to reference engagement that will be designated for work per this RFP: Suzanne Tallarico, John Douglas
 - f) Client project manager name, telephone number, fax number, and email address: John Goerdts, (551) 348-4880 (telephone), (515) 242-0014 (fax), john.goerdts@iowacourts.gov
-
- a) Client name: Kentucky Administrative Office of the Courts
 - b) Project description: The Kentucky Administrative Office of the Courts contracted with the NCSC to developing a weighted caseload system to measure the workload of judges in Kentucky's trial courts.
 - c) Project dates (starting and ending): September 1, 2015 – December 31, 2015
 - d) Technical environment (i.e., software applications, internet capabilities, data communications, network, hardware): The primary means of data collection during the time study phase of this project was a web-based data entry tool designed by the NCSC. Additionally, a series of web-based trainings recorded by NCSC staff was used for training time study participants. A series of webinars conducted by NCSC staff were used to train time study participants for project references that used webinars.
 - e) Staff assigned to reference engagement that will be designated for work per this RFP: Shannon Roth
 - f) Client project manager name, telephone number, fax number, and email address: Laurie Dudgeon, (502) 573-2350 (telephone), (502) 782-8707 (fax), LaurieDudgeon@kycourts.net
-
- a) Client name: Missouri Office of State Courts Administrator
 - b) Project description: The Missouri Office of State Courts Administrator contracted with the NCSC to provide a clerical weighted workload study in the state's circuit courts.
 - c) Project dates (starting and ending): July 2016 – May 2017
 - d) Technical environment (i.e., software applications, internet capabilities, data communications, network, hardware): The primary means of data

collection during the time study phase of this project was a web-based data entry tool designed by the NCSC. Additionally, a series of web-based trainings recorded by NCSC staff was used for training time study participants. A series of webinars conducted by NCSC staff were used to train time study participants for project references that used webinars.

- e) Staff assigned to reference engagement that will be designated for work per this RFP: Suzanne Tallarico, John Douglas
 - f) Client project manager name, telephone number, fax number, and email address: Paul Buckley, (573) 526-8807 (telephone), (573) 751-5540 (fax), Paul.Buckley@courts.mo.gov
-
- a) Client name: South Dakota Unified Judicial System
 - b) Project description: The South Dakota Unified Judicial System contracted with the NCSC to conduct a judicial workload assessment for the state and to perform an update to the existing court clerk weighted caseload system.
 - c) Project dates (starting and ending): September 2013 – July 2015 (court clerks); August 2015 – November 2016 (judges)
 - d) Technical environment (i.e., software applications, internet capabilities, data communications, network, hardware): The primary means of data collection during the time study phase of this project was a web-based data entry tool designed by the NCSC. Additionally, a series of web-based trainings recorded by NCSC staff was used for training time study participants. A series of webinars conducted by NCSC staff were used to train time study participants for project references that used webinars.
 - e) Staff assigned to reference engagement that will be designated for work per this RFP: Suzanne Tallarico, John Douglas
 - f) Client project manager name, telephone number, fax number, and email address: Jill Gusso, (605) 773-3474 (telephone), (605) 773-8437 (fax), jill.gusso@ujs.state.sd.us

3. *Mandatory Specifications*

Concern with financial and resource accountability at all levels of government is a strong stimulus to develop systematic methods for assessing the need for judges. The best approach for assessing judicial need is weighted caseload. Simply stated, weighted caseload is used to translate court caseload into workload. Cases vary in complexity, and different types of cases require different amounts of time and attention from judges and court. A weighted caseload study requires two basic sets of information: (1) statistical data that describe the type and volume of cases handled by judges, and (2) time data needed to generate the case weights. As discussed below, the NCSC proposes to use a time study to assemble the time data. However, prior to the time study, the first step is to determine what data is available statewide that describes the type and volume of work being handled by judges. Accurate and consistent counts of case filings by case type category and by every court location supplemented by key case event data (e.g., trial rates) are primary drivers of the weighted caseload models. The NCSC will work closely with the Advisory Committees to assess current data collection practices within and among the trial courts. The primary goal will be to determine the case type categories for which case weights will be developed and to evaluate the accuracy and validity of the data that is collected statewide and within each court.

The foundation of the workload assessment will be a time study of four weeks in duration, during which judges will record all their working hours by case and functional area, or by non-case administrative matters. The time study will provide an empirical foundation for the case weights. Time study data will be collected using the NCSC's customizable on-line timekeeping system. Prior to the time study, participants will receive on-line training in how to track and record their time. The workload assessment further will incorporate a multi-step quality adjustment process incorporating quality adjustment meetings with the advisory committee, and if desired by the AOC, an adequacy of time survey and site visits. The adequacy of time survey will provide an opportunity for judges to rate how often they have sufficient time to perform specific case-related tasks and functions. During the site visits, the NCSC project team will hold focus groups with judicial officers in representative regions to identify challenges to the effective handling of different types of cases. The final project deliverables will include a set of tools for determining existing judicial need and for projecting future judicial using the workload model, as well as a written report (or reports) summarizing the project methodology and results.

The project timeline that follows is based on best information at this time and represents a reasonable estimate of time sequences that the NCSC will follow. The NCSC proposes a project start date in May 2019 (assuming a contract is executed by that time) to run for a 12-month timeframe, but understands that the Washington AOC may have an estimated timeline in mind and has some flexibility in adjusting task completion dates. The NCSC will do its best to accommodate the AOC's needs.

Task	Months from Project Start											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1.1. Project Scope Planning Meetings	X											
1.2. Formation of JNAC	X											
1.3. Initial Project Meeting	X	X										
2.1. Design Data Collection Tools			X									
2.2. On-site Training				X	X							
2.3. Data Collection and Support					X	X						
3. Data Analysis						X	X					
4. Second Meeting of JNAC								X				
5. Focus Group Site Visits								X	X			
6. AOT Survey								X	X			
7. Final Meeting of JNAC										X		
8.1. Draft Report(s)											X	X
8.2. Final Report(s)											X	X

4. Judicial Workload Study Task Plan

a) Project Planning and Advisory Committee

Task 1. Project Preparation and Planning with Advisory Committee

1.1. Project Scope Planning Meetings

The NCSC project team (including Suzanne Tallarico, John Douglas, and Shannon Roth) will meet with Washington Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) within the first month of the project to finalize the scope and design of the project. Deliverables that will be considered are:

- Determining the availability of accurate and consistent caseload data for all participating study courts
- In addition to superior court, the inclusion of development of workload models for judges in districts and municipal courts.
- Inclusion focus groups site visits for each of the included study groups.
- Inclusion of the Adequacy of Time Survey for each of the included study groups.

1.2. Formation of the Judicial Needs Advisory Committee

The NCSC will work with the AOC to form a Judicial Needs Advisory Committee (JNAC) to provide project oversight and guidance, and review project plans and materials. The size and composition of the JNAC will be determined by the AOC. The AOC will be responsible for arranging and coordinating the participation of all JNAC members. JNAC sessions will be jointly facilitated by the NCSC and AOC.

1.3. Initial Project Meeting

The NCSC project team (including Suzanne Tallarico, John Douglas, and Shannon Roth) will meet with the JNAC within the first or second month of the project to review the overall study design and discuss specific aspects of the design, including:

- Case types for which workload standards are sought.
- Judge-day and judge-year values.
- Design of the time study, including:
 - The scope of data to be collected.
 - The method of time study data collection instruments and instructional materials.
 - The participants in the time study.
 - The data collection timeline (anticipated to be one to two months).
 - The availability of automated data on filings and dispositions, and the consistency of statewide counting practices.
- Schedule for conducting the focus groups.

The AOC's collection and delivery of several key pieces of information to the NCSC project team is critical to the initial phases of the project:

- First, an essential component in every workload study is the complete compilation of a set of accurate, reliable, and consistent counts of the number of cases that are filed and/or disposed of in each type of court by case type category, for every jurisdiction in each of the participating study groups.
- Second, the AOC will need to provide an accurate census of the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) judges in each jurisdiction, including email addresses, physical address and phone number, if possible, and court location. Data collected during the study will be analyzed in the aggregate and will not identify specific judges, except to indicate which courts and judges participated in the study.
- Finally, the NCSC will assign a unique identifier (e.g., e-mail user name) to each individual included in the census in order to permit the NCSC to assess participation levels during the study period and ultimately accommodate for any missing data. The results of this phase will serve as a framework for the overall workload assessment in terms of the key case types handled by judges, the current level of resources and caseloads, and the key functions performed by judges.

b) Data Collection

Task 2. Time Study

The NCSC will conduct an event-based time study of judicial workload over the course of a four-week period in order to obtain a reliable and valid snapshot of judicial activity (including all pre-trial, disposition, post-disposition, and non-case-related activities). Leading up to the time study, the NCSC project team will work with the JNAC and AOC to finalize statewide practices of counting filings, test all data collection instruments, and ensure that the research design has been reviewed and approved.

Basic features of the time study strategy include:

- (1) Collecting the data from all judicial officers statewide, unless deemed logistically unreasonable, in which case a representative sample of officers will be asked to provide data.
- (2) Sending the data directly to the NCSC for analysis.
- (3) Reporting weekly participation rates in the time study to the AOC.

Specific responsibilities for the time study tasks include:

2.1. Design of Data Collection Instruments/Preparation of Training Materials

The NCSC project team will work in collaboration with the JNAC and AOC to design the most effective and efficient way to collect time study information. Typically, data collection involves the use of a paper time tracking form and a web-based data entry system, both of which are designed by the NCSC.

The NCSC project team will also prepare a PowerPoint presentation and written training materials that clearly explain the data collection process for all participants engaged in the study in order to assure that all time is recorded comprehensively, accurately, and consistently according to an established set of rules. The JNAC and/or AOC will review and approve the final design of the data collection instruments and the instruction materials.

2.2. On-site Training and Dissemination of Data Collection Materials

The NCSC project team will provide training either via on-site sessions at various locations across the state or via webinar (or via a combination of both) in order to acquaint participants with the workload concept, the proposed project design, and the data collection requirements, and answer any questions related to the study and its implications. Possible additional training locations will be determined with the assistance of the JNAC. NCSC trainers will use their best efforts to personally train all judicial officers who will participate in the study; if needed, training will be provided by alternate methods, including recorded training sessions. Written instructions will also be provided to all study participants.

2.3. Data Collection and Support

An AOC-designated staff person will work with the NCSC project team to support the collection of time study data. Throughout the data collection process, the AOC-designated staff person and the NCSC project team will remain available to answer questions from time study participants, e.g., login questions, questions about revisions to submitted time, and general questions regarding the reporting and entry of data. Such support is invaluable because it ensures reliability in the time study data collection as well as its timely completion.

At the very early stages of the time study period, the NCSC will begin monitoring the submitted data on a weekly basis in order to ascertain the levels of participation by court and individual. Each week, the NCSC will prepare a report showing the participation rates of individual judicial officers by court location.

c) Data Analysis

Task 3. Data Analysis

After the NCSC cleans, verifies, and compiles the data, the NCSC project team will analyze and synthesize all of the data received during the data collection period. From this information, the analysis will focus on:

- Time required to process each case type studied, including average times for each case event measured.
- Time required for non-case-related work (e.g., administration, travel, committee attendance, general legal research).
- Average travel time required by judicial officers in each jurisdiction.

The JNAC may identify specific analytical issues that it would like the NCSC to glean from the data. Any special analyses requested will be conducted during this phase.

The time study results documenting the current work practices of judges across the state will be a springboard to discuss the linkage between workload and measured court performance and enable the Washington State Judiciary and the AOC to evaluate qualitative considerations that affect the effective resolution of cases.

Task 4. Second Meeting of the JNAC

The NCSC project team will meet with the JNAC after the time study and before the focus groups to report the initial findings from the time study to determine whether additional information needs to be collected.

Task 5. Focus Group Site Visits

After the time study concludes, if the AOC desires and for appropriate additional cost, the NCSC project team (possibly along with AOC staff) will conduct a series of focus groups at representative superior, district, and municipal courts with judicial officers who handle different types of cases. The NCSC will participate in nine one-day site visits during which multiple focus groups will be held at different court locations.

The focus groups will help identify challenges to the effective handling of different types of cases as well as proven efficient and effective case processing policies and strategies. The narratives produced from the focus group site visits will complement the results of the Adequacy of Time survey to be administered under Task 6.

Task 6. Adequacy of Time Survey

Following the time study, if the AOC desires and for appropriate additional cost, the NCSC will develop a web-based Adequacy of Time survey for use statewide to measure opinions on whether judges believe they have sufficient time to reasonably complete all their judicial responsibilities within current resource levels. All judicial officers in the participating study groups will be invited to participate in the survey.

This forum provides the opportunity for all judges across the state to give their views on current case processing practices and identify where the preliminary case weights may need to be modified to take into account areas where additional time is required to enhance the quality of the justice delivered.

Generally, there are three parts to this assessment:

- (1) Whether judges need more or less time in the identified phases of case resolution to complete the job (the JNAC may also identify specific tasks they wish to have addressed in this survey).
- (2) Whether there is sufficient time available for judges to perform the non-case-related aspects of the work of the court.
- (3) Whether there are other areas where more or less judicial time is needed to complete the job.

Task 7. Final Meeting of the JNAC

The JNAC will reconvene for a meeting to examine and reconcile results from all phases of the study, including results from the focus groups and site visits, the time study, and the Adequacy of Time survey. The goal of the meeting will be to reach consensus on a set of final case weights.

d) Draft Initial Report(s)

Task 8. Final Report

8.1. Draft Report(s)

The NCSC project team will draft a preliminary report that includes the project methodology and the workload standards for case-related and non-case-related activities. The report will also include the analysis and derivation of case weights and average time needed for specific functions, the results of the weighted caseload study, focus groups, site visits and adequacy of time survey, and an executive summary and will present the draft report to the JNAC for review and comment. The AOC will be responsible for coordinating the review process with the JNAC and other stakeholders. If requested and at additional appropriate cost, the NCSC project team will draft three separate reports, for each of the participating court levels – superior, district, and municipal.

e) Final Report(s)

Task 8.2. Final Report(s)

Following the final meeting of the JNAC, the NCSC project team will incorporate any corrections, comments, and suggestions, as appropriate, and finalize the report (or reports) in an electronic format. The NCSC will submit bound copies, if requested, in a number to be determined in consultation with the AOC.

5. Cost Proposal

The NCSC is pleased to present this cost proposal to the AOC for “Washington State Judicial Workload Study.”

The cost for this project as proposed in the tasks above will be a firm fixed price of \$200,000. This cost includes professional and administrative time, travel, and indirect costs. An example of some of the costs included in the NCSC’s indirect cost rates are equipment, supplies, telephone, printing/photocopying, postage, audits, and other items. The indirect costs are based on federal government (GSA) approved rates used for all contracts.

Judicial Workload Study Tasks	Total Estimated Cost	Total Estimated Consulting Hours	Estimated Travel
1.1. Project Scope Planning Meetings	\$26,808	120	3 Consultants 5 days
1.2. Formation of JNAC	\$2,332	13	
1.3. Initial Project Meeting	\$11,459	48	3 Consultants 2 days
2.1. Design Data Collection Tools	\$8,528	48	
2.2. On-site Training	\$11,075	48	1 Consultant 5 days
2.3. Data Collection and Support	\$14,920	88	
3. Data Analysis	\$13,856	80	
4. Second Meeting of JNAC	\$11,459	48	3 Consultants 2 days
5. Focus Group Site Visits	\$57,506	264	3 Consultants 11 days
6. AOT Survey	\$4,528	28	
7. Final Meeting of JNAC	\$11,459	48	3 Consultants 2 days
8.1. Draft Report(s)	\$20,524	112	
8.2. Final Report(s)	\$5,545	30	
TOTAL COST	\$200,000	975	71 days



Responsibilities and Considerations for Courts Implementing Local Case Management Systems

February 2019

CLJ-CMS Project Steering Committee

Paulette Revoir
Lynwood Municipal Court
DMCMA
Chair

Judge Kim Walden
Tukwila Municipal Court
DMCJA
Vice-Chair

Larry Barker
Adult Probation Services
Klickitat County
MPA

Margaret Yetter
Kent Municipal Court
DMCMA

Judge Glenn Phillips
Kent Municipal Court
DMCJA

Melanie Vanek
Probation Services
Issaquah Municipal Court
MPA

Dawn Marie Rubio
State Court Administrator

Vonnie Diseth
Information Services Director
AOC

Dirk Marler
Court Services Director
AOC

Introduction

As District and Municipal courts look for ways to make their court processes more efficient, some have acquired or are considering acquiring their own court case management solutions (CMS). This document describes the court's regulatory obligations for data sharing and other business obligations that a court should consider prior to deciding to implement a local case management system.

We have learned from experiences over the past several years that the complexity of implementing local CMS projects and the level of collaboration required between AOC, state, and local entities is very significant and woefully underestimated by the courts.

Jurisdictions considering implementing local case management solutions should plan for a significant investment in both business and technical resources over a long period of time to be successful in the implementation of their local system as well as the required data exchange. It has been challenging for even large court jurisdictions to commit the needed resources to do the work that is required for statewide data sharing.

Background

The Judicial Information System Committee (JISC) directs the operation of the statewide Judicial Information System (JIS).¹ Under its authority, the JISC has established minimum standards for statewide data that courts with independent automated court record systems must share with the JIS.² Local courts must satisfy these minimum standards through an electronic data exchange between the local system and the JIS or by duplicate data entry at the local court level.³

The JISC adopted these standards to ensure the integrity and availability of statewide data and information for the open, just and timely resolution of all court matters in the state.

Counties or cities that wish to implement their own automated systems must notify the JISC and AOC of the proposed purchase or development at least 90 days prior to commencement and seek their "review and approval."⁴

In early 2015, AOC began building the infrastructure and framework to establish an Enterprise Data Repository (EDR) for sharing the statewide data defined in the JIS Data Standards. Funding was allocated for the Expedited Data Exchange (EDE) Project to accelerate development of the EDR to accommodate case management implementation projects for King County District Court (KCDC) and the King County Clerk's Office (KCCO). AOC has developed the EDR and it is operational with JIS data. However, as of February, 2019, the pilot jurisdiction (KCCO) is continuing to work on critical integration issues with their data exchanges to the EDR. As a result, AOC has not been able to complete the end-to-end testing of the data exchange to validate that

¹ JISC Rule (JISCR) 1; RCW 2.68.010, RCW 2.68.050

² JIS Data Standards for Alternative Electronic Court Record Systems, <https://inside.courts.wa.gov/utilities/fileVendor.cfm?fileReq=/content/policies/pdf/AlternativeElectronicCourtRecordSystems.pdf>

³ Ibid., p. 8

⁴ JISCR 13

the exchange is working correctly. The exchanges between KCDC and KCCO and the EDR are not yet operational.

As explained in more detail below, connecting to the EDR is not a simple “plug and play” exercise. It requires a substantial commitment of business and technical resources at both the state and local level at the outset and over time to sustain the data exchange.

Local CMS Implementation Responsibilities and Considerations

Integrations with the Enterprise Data Repository (EDR)

The primary means of sending data to, or retrieving data from, the EDR is through a set of web services. It is the responsibility of the court implementing its own case management system to do the work necessary to send the required statewide data from its system to the EDR. AOC has adapted the JIS applications to read data from the EDR so that data can be shared statewide.

Technical Requirements

A local court planning to implement its own CMS must plan for the local resources with high technical expertise in order to send the required statewide data from its case management system to the EDR. Those resources must be capable of both developing the web services and providing ongoing support for them.

Data Extraction: Extracting data from a court’s independent CMS and sending the data to the EDR requires advanced technical skills at the local court. The method to extract data from the CMS will be dependent on the architecture of the court’s case management system, unique business decisions made by that court about its data, and the policies of that court’s vendor(s). Once extracted, the data will need to be sent to the EDR through web services. The court should also be aware that due to differences between CMS’s, or differences between implementations of the same CMS in different locations, the data integration may require significant logic to transform the data from the court’s independent case management system to a form that can be received by the EDR.

Testing: The court integrating to the EDR is responsible for testing their integration to the EDR, with the help of AOC. The testing is to ensure the local court data, as integrated into the EDR, represents the same information as the data presented in the local CMS. The primary method for this testing will involve sending data to the EDR via the court’s integration, and then comparing that data in the EDR to the original data and similar data from other case management systems in the EDR.

As part of AOC’s Readiness Assessment of the court’s data integration:

- AOC provides an EDR Quality Assurance/Integration region where courts can conduct integration testing
- AOC and the court review integrated data with all JIS applications and data exchanges to ensure the data continues to represent the correct business intent.

Initial implementation and ongoing support for the integration between the local CMS and the EDR, as well as support for the court’s local CMS, will require high-level technical skills which exceed those for typical desktop and system support staff. Even in jurisdictions that may have IT

staff with such skills, their time may be spread among multiple organizations within the county or city. The county/city should also have one or more additional individuals with high technical skills to back up the primary EDR integrations staff.

The court's new CMS and its integration to the EDR (data exchange) will become mission critical services for local IT. Service interruptions and errors from local CMS implementations and data exchange will affect the local court's operation and jeopardize the accuracy and availability of the court's data that is used for decision making throughout the state. Courts sometimes struggle to get their technical support needs met when in competition for limited IT resources with other parts of the county or city government. If technical staff are not dedicated solely to the court's needs, the court should have a clearly established protocol for prioritizing the court's needs for technical services to support their local CMS as well as the EDR integrations.

Capacity and Performance

The JIS Data Standards establish the minimum acceptable timeframes for sending data to the EDR. Courts must be able to extract data from their system, process the data, and then send it to the EDR within the mandatory timeframes. Extracting data at a time with high usage will negatively impact the performance of the entire system. In addition, AOC has established windows when key processes are executed. Any court sending data must have their data upload completed before the scheduled time for the execution of these processes. Finally, courts must carefully design their integration so that it is robust enough to handle their average volume as well as peak volumes which can easily be many times the average daily volume.

Data Conversion

Data conversion is the responsibility of the local court implementing its own CMS. It involves significant court-centric business analysis and business-based decisions. Successful integration to the EDR is based on two things:

1. Mapping court business data elements from the court's new CMS to the elements in the Data Standards (a local responsibility);
2. Mapping the business data elements from the Data Standards to the EDR (AOC has accomplished this through the EDR web services).

Reference data, which is unique to each local CMS implementation, must be established in the new system. Each court integrating from their local system to the EDR must map their reference data in their system, also called Source Reference data, to the Standard Reference Data used in the EDR. This allows all the applications that are consuming data from the EDR to understand the reference data provided by multiple CMS's in a unified format with a standard meaning. For example, the local case management system's source reference data may represent an eye color of blue as "BL" and it would be mapped to the standard JIS reference data of "BLU" contained in the EDR. This prevents the potential for data consumers to misinterpret the data sent from the local CMS.

The mapping of both the JIS Data Standards and reference data should occur concurrently with the development and configuration of the court's new CMS, as this activity can be a lengthy process requiring in-depth knowledge of JIS data, data structures in the court's CMS, and the structure of data in the EDR.

Integrations with Other Agencies

AOC has numerous integrations with partner agencies, including the Washington State Patrol, the Department of Licensing (DOL), the Secretary of State, and the Department of Social and Health Services, in order to comply with statutes and court rules requiring data sharing.⁵ A court with its own CMS will have to send the required information through its integration with the EDR. Partner agencies will not accept this data directly from local courts.

DOL Driver's Data Services

DOL offers three data services providing data about driver's licenses and driving records to AOC: License Search, Driver Status, and Abstract of Driver's Record. AOC has integrated these services into several JIS applications. For courts not using JIS applications, AOC makes these services available to the courts to integrate with their own case management systems via web services. The court would need to integrate with these web services to have access to this data outside the JIS applications. DOL will not provide these services directly to a local court.

Post Production and On-Going Support Considerations

Technical integration with JIS applications, considered as an on-going maintenance operation, is the responsibility of the court. Any update to the court's local case management system by its vendor, change in configuration by the court, changes to the Data Standards, or legislatively mandated changes could result in changes to the data integration processes.

Law Changes

AOC reasonably expects that every legislative session will necessitate changes to one or more of the following items: local case management systems, the EDR, the Data Standards, Standard Reference Data, or data mappings. Changes to court rules or case law will often require similar changes. AOC will communicate to the courts any changes it is making to the EDR, Data Standards, or Standard Reference Data from legislation. Each local jurisdiction is responsible for making corresponding changes to its own local system.

Each court integrated with the EDR must be capable of understanding how law changes affect its local court case management system and then updating its system and its EDR integration within the timelines established by law. This can often be an extremely short timeframe, with implementation deadlines of 90 days being common. The staff responsible for integration at each court should be part of the court's team that analyzes the impact of proposed and passed legislation on the court's CMS and the court's EDR integration.

Even though a court may contract with the same case management system vendor used in another court, each court will have unique implementations, configurations, vendor contract terms, local information technology expertise or capacity. Court processes will differ among jurisdictions, and judges in one court may choose to interpret the law in a different way than those in another court using the same product. Courts may be on different versions of the same product because they implemented at different times or due to cost or other priorities they may not have upgraded to a more recent version. As a result, each court that chooses to implement a local

⁵ Including, but not limited to: IRLJ 4.1, CrRLJ 8.12, RCW 46.63.070, RCW 46.64.025, RCW 46.20.270, RCW 9.41.040, RCW 9.41.047, RCW 43.20B.080, RCW 10.97.050, RCW 10.98.090, RCW 10.98.100, RCW 43.43.540, RCW 43.43.700, RCW 43.43.735, RCW 43.43.740, RCW 43.43.760, RCW 43.43.770, RCW 43.43.815, RCW 43.43.830-845

court case management system will be responsible for analyzing the impact of legislation on that court and on that court's integration with the EDR.

A team of lawyers and subject matter experts at AOC analyzes legislation for potential impact to the JIS systems. The volume can be staggering. In just the first two weeks of the 2019 session, AOC reviewed over 1700 bills and began actively monitoring nearly 500 of them.

AOC also prepares Judicial Impact Notes ("fiscal notes") for the legislature each session that estimate the impact of proposed legislation on the JIS applications. In the first two weeks of the 2019 legislative session, AOC submitted 111 judicial impact notes. Generally those estimates must be produced within 72 hours. Estimates for JIS system impact can range from trivial to millions of dollars.

AOC will not have the knowledge of local court case management systems to be able to analyze the impact of law changes on local systems. Each court with a local case management system will have its own support and maintenance arrangement with a product vendor which may impact cost and the timeliness of the vendor response. AOC is sometimes able to explain that a particular approach is not feasible and suggest changes that could mitigate the JIS impact. AOC will not know whether a change it suggests to mitigate an impact in JIS might have the opposite effect on a local court case management system.

Links to bills that AOC is tracking and Judicial Impact Notes are available on Inside Courts. AOC does not have the staffing capacity or knowledge of local case management systems and implementations to assist local courts with analyzing impacts to their systems. For the same reasons, Judicial Impact Notes will not estimate the impact of changes to local case management systems.

When law changes become effective, AOC's legal, court business, training, and technical staff begin implementation activities, including charge table or configuration changes, new product development projects, code changes, documentation, and training materials. Several weeks after the conclusion of each legislative session, AOC also provides a high-level summary of legislation and eService answers that describe how legislation will be implemented in the JIS systems. Although these summaries may be helpful for courts that have chosen to implement local court case management systems, they will be focused on impacts to the JIS applications, and they may arrive too late for a local court to begin analysis or implementation activities for its own system.

Each court will also be responsible for revising its documentation and training materials to reflect changes to the local court case management system.

Infrastructure

Information Security: AOC employs full-time IT security experts and follows a comprehensive JIS Information Technology Security Policy.⁶ Each county/city implementing a local CMS will be responsible for maintaining system security, data integrity and privacy by preventing unauthorized access to court data and preventing misuse of, damage to, or loss of court data.

⁶ <https://inside.courts.wa.gov/index.cfm?fa=controller.showPage&folder=policies&file=Security>

Disaster Recovery: Disaster recovery and business resumption planning are critical to ensure the court can save data, hardware, software and facilities so that it can recover from an interruption or service outage. AOC operates a rigorous disaster recovery/business resumption plan including annual testing and certification under the direction of the JISC.⁷ Cities and counties should follow similar standards to ensure continuity of local court operations.

For JIS systems, AOC provides these services, along with scheduled backups, programs patches, bug fixes, security alerts and testing. Courts planning local CMS implementations should plan to allocate resources locally for these critical roles and responsibilities.

Business Functions

Court users will require continual education and training to support refresher courses and court personnel in transition to new or added responsibilities. Courts considering a local CMS need to consider providing these services for their local user community. Vendor-supplied training and documentation is often generic and may not adequately describe local product configuration. Creation and continuous maintenance of local training and support materials should be included in the implementation and support plan.

In addition, call centers that track problem tickets from inception to resolution with carefully scripted escalation pathways and clearly defined roles and responsibilities should be added to the on-going local support organization.

AOC training and customer service support is available for statewide systems but will not be available for jurisdictions choosing to implement their own local systems.

Summary

The members of the CLJ-CMS Steering Committee strongly encourage courts to carefully study the long-term impacts on the local court and local technical resources before deciding not to use the statewide JIS systems. Implementing a local CMS is a long term commitment to perform at the local level and at local expense many business and technical services that AOC provides without cost through support of the statewide JIS systems.

The lifecycle for a case management system has many significant impacts beyond simply implementing a local CMS. As has been presented throughout this document, there are many other factors that must be considered before making a long-term commitment of this nature. If you have further questions or would like to discuss any of these topics in more detail, we encourage you to contact any of the CLJ-CMS Steering Committee members. Our goal is to ensure that courts that are considering implementation of a local CMS have all the facts necessary to make a fully informed decision.

⁷ <https://inside.courts.wa.gov/index.cfm?fa=controller.showPage&folder=policies&file=Disaster>

DISTRICT AND MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGES' ASSOCIATION SLATE FOR ELECTION

June 2019

Simple majority vote wins.

OFFICERS: 2019-2020 (1-YEAR TERM)

POSITION	NOMINATION	WRITE-IN CANDIDATE
President	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Judge Samuel Meyer Thurston District Court	<i>Write-in candidates for President are not allowed according to Bylaws.</i>
President - Elect	<input type="checkbox"/> Judge Michelle Gehlsen Bothell Municipal Court	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vice - President	<input type="checkbox"/> Judge Charles Short Okanogan District Court	<input type="checkbox"/>
Secretary/Treasurer	<input type="checkbox"/> Judge Jennifer Fassbender Spokane District Court <input type="checkbox"/> Commissioner Rick Leo Snohomish District Court	<input type="checkbox"/>
Past - President	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Judge Rebecca Robertson Federal Way Municipal Court	<i>Automatic succession according to Bylaws.</i>

BOARD OF GOVERNORS: 2019-2022 (3-YEAR TERM)

POSITION	NOMINATION	WRITE-IN CANDIDATE
#2 Full-Time District Ct	<input type="checkbox"/> Judge Tyson Hill Grant District Court	<input type="checkbox"/>
#3 Part-Time District Ct	<input type="checkbox"/> Judge Thomas Cox Garfield District Court <input type="checkbox"/> Judge Heidi Heywood Wahkiakum District Court	<input type="checkbox"/>
#4 Full-Time Municipal Ct	<input type="checkbox"/> Judge Matthew Antush Spokane Municipal Court <input type="checkbox"/> Judge Drew Ann Henke Tacoma Municipal Court	<input type="checkbox"/>

BJA REPRESENTATIVE: 2019-2023 (4-YEAR TERM)

	NOMINATION	WRITE-IN CANDIDATE
District Court Position	<input type="checkbox"/> Judge Debra Hayes Spokane District Court <input type="checkbox"/> Judge Dan Johnson Lincoln District Court	<input type="checkbox"/>

BJA REPRESENTATIVE: 2019-2023 (4-YEAR TERM)

NOMINATION

WRITE-IN CANDIDATE

Open Position #1

☐

Judge Debra Burchett

Cowlitz District Court

☐☐

Judge David Steiner

King District Court