

# 1. Meeting Minutes



**JISC DATA DISSEMINATION COMMITTEE**  
**Friday, April 24, 2015 (8:15 a.m. – 9:45 a.m.)**  
**Administrative Office of the Courts**  
**SeaTac Office Building**  
**18000 International Blvd. Suite 1106, Conf Rm #2**  
**Call-in Number: 1-888-450-5996, Passcode 628488**

**DRAFT - MEETING MINUTES**

**Members Present**

Judge Thomas J. Wynne, Chair  
Judge James Heller  
Judge J. Robert Leach  
Ms. Barbara Miner  
Ms. Brooke Powell  
Judge Steven Rosen (Telephonically)  
Ms. Aimee Vance

**Members Not Present**

Judge Jeannette Dalton

**AOC Staff Present**

Stephanie Happold, Data Dissemination Administrator

**Guests Present**

Mr. Mike Wallis – Drivers History Information  
Mr. Paul Quinto – Drivers History Information  
Mr. Rowland Thompson – Allied Daily Newspapers

Judge Wynne called the meeting to order and the following items of business were discussed:

**1. Minutes of March 6, 2015**

Committee approved the meeting minutes.

**2. Drivers History Information Request for Traffic**

Mr. Mike Wallis presented Drivers History Information (DHI) request for one bulk traffic infractions file for the past three years and repetitive monthly update/new case files. DDA Happold informed the Committee that this request was similar to Data Driven Safety's (DDS) that was approved in 2013, including the same data fields; however, the updates would not only refresh the initial three year file as the DDS request allowed, but also contain new cases and updates each month. Ms. Vance asked if the infraction data would be removed from DHI's database after three years per retention schedules or would it be held by DHI for five years consistent with Iteration 2 of the ITG 41 project. DDA Happold responded three years. Judge Rosen asked if the contract requirements would be the same as what was required for the 2013 DDS request and DDA Happold responded it would be the exact same contract as what was agreed to for DDS. Members of the Committee voiced approval for that decision. DDA Happold also stated that the monthly requests would have to be submitted each month and charged as AOC does not provide data feeds at this time. Judge Leach made the motion to approve DHI's request with the same contract as previously approved for DDS, that DHI would have to initiate each monthly request, and that the data could only be kept for three years after disposition. Ms. Barb Miner seconded and the Committee unanimously approved the request.

**3. John Saul Request for King County District Court Financial Data**

Mr. Saul was unavailable to attend the meeting so DDA Happold presented his request for King County District Court fines collected for each year since 2010, the offenses for which the fines were assessed, the names of the collection agencies, the amount paid to the firms, and copies of the agreements. DDA Happold told the Committee that Mr. Saul was already aware that the AOC does not have information on the names of the collection agencies used, the amount paid to the firms, and the copies of the agreements. The AOC can provide the other requested data with the same conditions that were required for the ACLU request: Mr. Saul would have to meet with AOC staff to ensure that there is an understanding of the data requested and what can be reliably provided. Also the reports should be reviewed by a person delegated by the Committee. Last, the cost recovery fees should be applied and include the time spent meeting with the staff. Committee Members agreed and also directed DDA Happold to notify King County District Court about the request and let Mr. Saul know that the court was contacted. Based on these requirements, the Committee voted unanimously to approve Mr. Saul's request.

Ms. Miner asked that DDA Happold provide a weekly summary of data dissemination requests received by AOC to the courts and clerk's offices. DDA Happold suggested a monthly summary or log and will begin providing that information in July.

**4. Anthony Schick Request for Department of Fish and Wildlife Financial Data**

Mr. Schick did not call in for the meeting so DDA Happold presented his request. Mr. Schick initially asked the AOC for violations of chapter 77.15 RCW from 2000 to present. After reviewing the provided data, Mr. Schick requested the financial data for unpaid restitution and fines related to those cases. DDA Happold recommended to the Committee that the AOC provide the financial data with the same conditions that were required for the ACLU request: Mr. Schick would have to meet with AOC staff to ensure that there is an understanding of the data requested and what can be reliably provided. Also that the reports should be reviewed by a person delegated by the Committee. Last, the cost recovery fees should be applied and include the time spent meeting with the staff. Based on these requirements, Judge Leach moved to approve the request and Judge Heller seconded the motion. The Committee voted unanimously to approve Mr. Saul's request.

**5. AOC Questions Regarding JIS Security Requirements for JIS Link Users and Public Data Dissemination Requests**

DDA Happold presented questions AOC staff had regarding JIS LINK User security access and public data dissemination requests. The following Committee responses are provided with the assumption that the information is not sealed or redacted by the court under GR 15.

- Defendant date of birth. Currently it is shown on SNCI/CNCI screens but not provided in data dissemination requests. Also, Odyssey portal will allow for members of the public to search cases using date of birth. The Committee approved that defendants' date of birth can be provided in data dissemination requests and also on the AOC public website search in future versions.
- Residential address of defendants/respondents. DDA Happold stated that Washington Low Income Housing Association (WLIHA) was asking for residential addresses of respondents of unlawful detainer actions. Ms. Miner stated that the personal address in JIS/SCOMIS for the respondent may not be the residential address of the unlawful detainer action. DDA Happold told the Committee she would relay the information to WLIHA.

DDA Happold then asked about addresses of defendants being released for data dissemination requests. The Committee stated if the court file had the address listed for the public to see, than it should be available for the data requests as well. As long as the data request is not for commercial solicitation, the AOC is allowed to disseminate defendant addresses and the addresses of respondents in unlawful detainer actions.

- WSBA. DDA Happold stated that the DDC previously authorized the WSBA access to the DCH screen; however, the AOC could not provide that screen without increasing WSBA's security access level. The Committee did not want to provide that access to WSBA and instead offered the WSBA to contact the AOC and ask for a DCH on a case-by-case basis.
- Victim, witness and material witness names. The Committee stated that if victim and witness names are provided in the court file for public access, that information should be available for data dissemination requests as well. The Committee discussed that juvenile victims will be treated differently per statute.
- Defendant height, weight, gender, race, etc. The Committee stated that this information is on the citation/charging documents, and therefore, is accessible to the public. This information can be provided for data dissemination requests.
- Protection orders. The Committee stated that information contained in the official court file is public, including protection orders. Protection order information can be provided for data dissemination requests.
- Juvenile drug court and juvenile drug court mental health alternative information. The Committee stated that if the information is found in the official court file, it is public and disclosable. Anything found in the social file is confidential by statute and is not disclosable.
- Therapeutic court information contained in the AOC Data Warehouse. The Committee stated that the therapeutic court information is disclosable for public data dissemination requests per court rules and statutes.
- Transfer of sentencing and transfer of supervision for juvenile offender cases. The Committee stated that notice of transfer and related orders are in the official court file and are disclosable for public data dissemination requests.

## **6. JIS Exemptions**

Per the Committee's prior direction, DDA Happold provided the list of current JIS LINK Exceptions. As new case managements are implemented, the Committee would like for these exceptions to be reviewed. The Committee asked DDA Happold to start drafting a policy for handling current exceptions and look at the possibility of having the agencies reapply for the exceptions, implementing a RACFID limit, requiring a request for continued use be made every year, and providing FORS automatically instead of through a specialized RACFID.

At 9:45 am, the meeting was adjourned.

## **2. Measures for Justice Request**

May 29, 2015

JISC Data Dissemination Committee  
Washington State Courts

Via email to: [Stephanie.Happold@courts.wa.gov](mailto:Stephanie.Happold@courts.wa.gov)

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Gipsy Escobar, I am the Assistant Director of Research and Analytics at Measures for Justice, a research non-profit dedicated to measuring the delivery of local criminal justice services. We are working on a national study looking at the processing of criminal cases at the county level. The Washington State AOC has provided us with a considerable amount of data from the JIS-Link and SCOMIS systems but there are a few data elements they could not provide, specifically related to financial data for criminal court cases and they suggested we contact you with this special request.

The dataset we are currently working with contains all criminal adult cases filed in court between January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2009 and December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2013. We would like to gather information on financial obligations set by the court. For our purposes, this would include:

- **Court fees:** amount assessed by type of fee (or total amount assessed if type is not available), balance to date.
- **Fines and restitution:** whether the defendant was sentenced to pay a fine and/or restitution, the amount sentenced to pay, balance to date.
- **Judgments for failing to pay financial obligations to the court:** whether the defendant has received additional penalties for failing to pay financial obligations to the court.
- **Bail:** whether bail was imposed on the defendant, the set bail amount (with bail setting date), the posted bail amount (with bail posting date), and adjusted bail amounts, if applicable.

Thank you for considering this data request. I appreciate any guidance you are able to provide and I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,



Gipsy Escobar, PhD  
Assistant Director of Research & Analytics  
Measures for Justice



**June 26, 2015**

**TO:** JISC Data Dissemination Committee

**FROM:** Stephanie Happold, AOC Data Dissemination Administrator

**RE:** Measures for Justice request for financial data for CLJ and Superior Courts.

### **Issue**

Can the Washington State Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) release financial information to Measures for Justice?

### **Background and AOC Staff Comments**

In March 2014, Measures for Justice (MFJ), in conjunction with Loyola University, submitted a data request to the AOC for Courts of Limited Jurisdiction and Superior Court data regarding criminal non-traffic cases. The request was extensive and included the following data elements:

case number, county, filing date, case status, case type, defendant information, charge number, charge sequence number, charge description, charge statute, offense date, charge degree, charge modifiers, charge dismissal, plea date, pretrial release information, any attorney information, disposition and sentence information and court fees.

In providing the requested data, the AOC notified MFJ, that it could not provide:

- **Financial Information:** The AOC is not authorized to release financial information without DDC permission.
- **Indigent status:** The AOC does not have that information in the AOC Data Warehouse.
- **Attorney Type:** There is no code AOC captures that distinguishes whether the attorney is a public defender or retained attorney.
- **Pretrial Release Information:** Pretrial release is noted on the court order if there are conditions imposed, but typically they are docketed in the free form field in the CLJ system and not noted in the system for Superior Court. Docket information for CLJ cases is not captured by AOC Data Warehouse and cannot be provided.
- **Sentence Data:** There are differences between CLJ and Superior Court sentence data. The CLJ system notes jail time imposed by charge and includes cases conditions; whereas, the Superior Court simply notes incarceration time with a Y/N flag at the case level. The amount of time may be in the freeform docket section, but the AOC Data Warehouse does not capture that information.

MFJ then asked where it could go to find the data AOC could not provide. The AOC staff suggested contacting the courts and the clerks' offices as they may have more information.

However, after receiving mixed results in contacting the courts, AOC suggested MFJ sign up for JIS LINK level 1 public access and also take their request for financial data to the Data Dissemination Committee (DDC). Therefore, the request is now before the DDC to review.

The JIS Committee (JISC) authorized the DDC to act on its behalf in reviewing and acting on requests for JIS access by non-court users.<sup>1</sup> The DD Policy sets forth criteria which this Committee may use in deciding these requests:

- The extent to which access will result in efficiencies in the operation of a court or courts.
- The extent to which access will enable the fulfillment of a legislative mandate.
- The extent to which access will result in efficiencies in other parts of the criminal justice system.
- The risks created by permitting such access.<sup>2</sup>

During the past year, the Committee granted other requests for financial data, such as the ACLU and Oregon Public Broadcasting. AOC staff recommends approval of MFJ request; however, with conditions similar to those imposed on the others. MFJ shall have a telephonic meeting with AOC staff for clarifications of the request and to ensure MFJ understands what can be reliably provided by the AOC Data Warehouse. If data cannot be reliably compiled from the Data Warehouse, MFJ will be notified and the dataset will not be disseminated from the AOC. Also, the reports should be reviewed by a person delegated by this Committee; preferably someone to review the Superior Court data and a different person for the Courts of Limited Jurisdiction data. Last, the cost recovery fees should be applied and include the time spent meeting with the AOC staff to understand the desired data, including follow up questions and additional explanations that are requested from MFJ after receiving the data reports.

---

<sup>1</sup> JISC Bylaws, Article 7, Secs. 1 and 2.

<sup>2</sup> DD Policy, Sec. IX.C.



**3. Washington State  
Department of Fish and  
Wildlife Requests**



**State of Washington  
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE**

**Mailing Address: 600 Capitol Way N • Olympia, WA 98501-1091 • (360) 902-2200, TDD (360) 902-2207  
Main Office Location: Natural Resources Building • 1111 Washington Street SE • Olympia, WA**

June 3, 2015

Stephanie Happold  
Administrative Office of the Courts  
PO Box 41170  
Olympia, WA 98504-1170  
Sent via e-mail

RE: Request for data regarding Criminal Wildlife Penalty Assessments

Dear Ms. Happold,

The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Law Enforcement Program would like to submit a data request to the Data Dissemination Committee. We request any data transaction related to a Criminal Wildlife Penalty Assessment (CWPA) (see RCW 77.15.420 and 77.15.400(5)). The specific data elements requested are: violator's name, DOB, ticket/case number, date of violation, court, arresting officer, charge, charge disposition code, charge disposition date, CWPA amount, fine amount, and suspended amount.

The Department needs this information to assist in assessing how the Department is handling license suspensions for those who have unpaid Criminal Wildlife Penalty Assessments. These suspensions are mandated under RCW 77.15.420(6) and the Department is exploring better ways in which to meet its responsibilities under this mandate. This data is also necessary to assist the Department in satisfying requests from the Fish and Wildlife Commission and the Legislature on how the CWPA operates and how funds are distributed. We respectfully request any fees associated with this data query be waived.

If you have questions, please contact me at [Dawn.Gedenberg@dfw.wa.gov](mailto:Dawn.Gedenberg@dfw.wa.gov) or 360-902-2470.

Sincerely,

Dawn Gedenberg, Management Analyst  
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife



**State of Washington  
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE**

**Mailing Address: 600 Capitol Way N • Olympia, WA 98501-1091 • (360) 902-2200, TDD (360) 902-2207  
Main Office Location: Natural Resources Building • 1111 Washington Street SE • Olympia, WA**

June 9, 2015

Stephanie Happold  
Administrative Office of the Courts  
PO Box 41170  
Olympia, WA 98504-1170  
Sent via e-mail

RE: Request for data regarding Title 77 criminal violations that are charged a fine

Dear Ms. Happold,

The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Law Enforcement Program would like to submit a data request to the Data Dissemination Committee. We request any data transaction in 2012, 2013, and 2014 where a court applies a monetary penalty for a Title 77 RCW violation. The specific data elements requested are: violator's name, DOB, ticket/case number, date of violation, court, arresting officer, charge, charge disposition code, charge disposition date, fine amount, and suspended amount.

The Department needs this information to assist in assessing the impact of a potential records processing fee applied to Title 77 violations, similar to court costs, that could offset some administrative costs to the Department associated with these violations. We respectfully request any fees associated with this data query be waived.

If you have questions, please contact me at [Dawn.Gedenberg@dfw.wa.gov](mailto:Dawn.Gedenberg@dfw.wa.gov) or 360-902-2470.

Sincerely,

Dawn Gedenberg, Management Analyst  
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife



**June 26, 2015**

**TO:** JISC Data Dissemination Committee

**FROM:** Stephanie Happold, AOC Data Dissemination Administrator

**RE:** Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife Financial Data Requests

### **Issue**

Can the Washington State Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) release financial information to Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife?

### **Background and Recommendation**

The Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) submitted two requests to AOC for financial data. One is for data related to the Criminal Wildlife Penalty Assessment and the other is for data related to Title 77 RCW violations. The AOC is not authorized to release financial data from the AOC Data Warehouse; therefore, the request is being brought before the Data Dissemination Committee (DDC) to review.

The JIS Committee (JISC) authorized the DDC to act on its behalf in reviewing and acting on requests for JIS access by non-court users.<sup>1</sup> The DD Policy sets forth criteria which this Committee may use in deciding these requests:

- The extent to which access will result in efficiencies in the operation of a court or courts.
- The extent to which access will enable the fulfillment of a legislative mandate.
- The extent to which access will result in efficiencies in other parts of the criminal justice system.
- The risks created by permitting such access.<sup>2</sup>

During the past year, the Committee granted several requests for financial data housed in the AOC Data Warehouse. AOC staff recommends approval of DFW's request with similar conditions that were required for the ACLU request. DFW staff should meet with AOC personnel to ensure there is an understanding of the data requested and what can reliably be provided. Also, the reports should be reviewed by a person delegated by this Committee. Last, the cost recovery fees should be applied and include the time spent meeting with the AOC staff to understand the desired data.

---

<sup>1</sup> JISC Bylaws, Article 7, Secs. 1 and 2.

<sup>2</sup> DD Policy, Sec. IX.C.

## **4. DD Policy Draft Regarding JIS Financial Data**

### III. ACCESS TO JIS LEGAL RECORDS

- B. All access to JIS information is subject to the requirements of the criteria for release of data specified in JISCR 15(f): availability of data, specificity of the request, potential for infringement of personal privacy created by release of the information requested, and potential disruption to the internal ongoing business of the courts. JIS information provided in electronic format shall be subject to provisions contained in the electronic data dissemination contract. *(Amended February 27, 1998.)*

#### 8. Financial Data.

- a. Requestor will provide a detailed explanation of the needed financial information. Explanations will include specific codes; accounting or non-accounting needs; statewide aggregate, court aggregate or case-by-case data; and what court levels.
- b. The AOC or the court will review the requests and submit any clarifications to the requestor. Meetings between the staff and the requestor may take place so the parties know what is being asked for and what can be provided. The time taken for clarifications and meetings will be in addition to any time estimates given for compiling the data. Further, the requestor will be charged for the staff time under the approved cost recovery fees.
- c. Prior to release of the report, the data will be reviewed by delegated court and/or county clerk representatives.
- d. Due to the complexity and time in compiling financial data, express requests will not be granted unless resources are available.