WASHINGTON COURTS	**JISC DATA DISSEMINATION COMMITTEE** **Data Dissemination Policy Work Session** **Thursday, October 6, 2016 (1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.)** **Administrative Office of the Courts** **SeaTac Office Building** **18000 International Blvd. Suite 1106, Conf Rm #2** **SeaTac, WA 98188** **Call-in Number: 1-877-820-7831, Passcode 797974**

DRAFT - MEETING MINUTES

Members Present	**AOC Staff Present**
Judge Thomas J. Wynne, Chair	Stephanie Happold, Data Dissemination Administrator
Judge J. Robert Leach	Keli Beck, Senior System Support Analyst
Judge G. Scott Marinella (telephonically)	Charlotte Jensen, Court Business Information Coordinator (telephonically)
Judge David A. Svaren (telephonically)	Michael Keeling, Operations Manager
Ms. Barbara Miner	Elaine McLaughlin, Court Records Access Coordinator
Ms. Brooke Powell	Dexter Mejia, Court Business Office Manager
Ms. Cynthia Marr, Pierce County District Court, appearing on behalf of Ms. Aimee Vance	Maribeth Sapinoso, SC-CMS Project Manager
	Trina Wendel, Business Process Engineer
Members Not Present	
Judge Jeannette Dalton	**Guests Present**
Ms. Aimee Vance	Ms. Sonya Kraski, Snohomish County Clerk
	Mr. Mark Allen, Snohomish County Clerk's Office
	Mr. Paul Farrow, Senior Project Manager Tyler Technologies
	Ms. Dena Marley, Snohomish County Clerk's Office

1. Call to Order, Purpose of Work Session:

The October 6, 2016, Data Dissemination Committee (DDC) work session was called to order at 1:00 pm by Committee Chair Judge Wynne.

Judge Wynne informed attendees the purpose of the work session was to come to a consensus regarding the following issues so the Data Dissemination Policy (DD Policy) could be completed:

- Understand how party addresses are entered and displayed in the case management systems; and
- How confidential address information is used in the JIS and Odyssey systems.

Ms. Miner inquired if the Confidential Information Form (CIF) would be discussed during the meeting as well. DDA Happold indicated the Law Enforcement Information (LEI) was one of the forms Judge Wynne asked her to provide for the meeting and that she also had an answer to Judge Wynne's question he posed to her before the meeting as to why there were two different CIF forms being used. She suggested she provide a summary of the documentation contained

in the work session binders prior to discussing individual documents so the Committee members knew what they had before them

2. Background from DDA Happold

Prior to the work session, Judge Wynne requested DDA Happold collect specific documentation and case screen shot examples from the different case management systems for the Committee members to review. He also requested that certain subject matter experts attend the meeting to answer any questions necessary to finalize proposed amendments to the current DD Policy.

DDA Happold commented that the decisions today needed to include not only JIS and Odyssey and how the data is displayed between the two systems, but also how the data is transferred into the AOC data warehouse and in BOXI reports that are also used by the courts.

3. Review of Binders

DDA Happold reviewed the contents of each binder tab, explaining why Judge Wynne asked for each item.

Tab 1. Draft DD Policy Amendments, with tracked changes.

Tab 2. Draft DD Policy Amendments, clean version.

Tab 3. JIS Person Business Rules for entry of addresses.

Tab 4. Examples of how addresses are entered into JIS. Includes PER and ADH screen shots.

Tab 5. Examples of how addresses are entered into Odyssey.

Tab 6. Examples of addresses used in case type 7s and tied to a PER record. Example is an individual with case types 7 and 8.

Tab 7. Example of Case Type 3 with WIP Minors.

Tab 8 Example of Sexual Assault Protection Order Case with Minor.

Tab 9 Example of Case with Offender and Victim are both Minors.

Tab 10 Law Enforcement Information form.

Tab 11 JIS Security for JIS LINK users.

Tab 12 Statutes and Court Rules.

4. Discussion

Ms. Miner inquired about Tab 10, Law Enforcement Information (LEI) form and its similarities to the Confidential Information Form (CIF) that was not included in the binder. Ms. Miner expressed concerns about courts using these forms interchangeably and asked why there were

DRAFT

no examples of the CIFs included. DDA Happold explained that Judge Wynne did not request for a copy of the CIF to be included, but instead asked her to answer the question of why there were two different CIFs being used by the courts. DDA Happold contacted Merrie Gough, the staff attorney for the Pattern Forms Committee, prior to the work session and asked about the two different CIFs. Ms. Gough conveyed that there was no reason for two different versions, that she would make the recommendation to the Pattern Forms Committee to use just one, and she thanked the DDC for bringing it to her attention.

The DDC continued to discuss how the LEA and CIF are filled out by parties during case initiation and are not meant to be entered into JIS. The LEI form includes two fields for Protected Parties to enter their address information: one for confidential address information and a separate box for non-confidential address information. The members discussed how this form should be a pass-through form and not kept in the court file.

Ms. Miner and Ms. Marley explained how the forms are used in their offices and that they do not enter any LEA or CIF information into JIS. Ms. Marr commented that there is some information on those forms that may be used by the courts while inputting the cases into JIS. Judge Leach noted both forms imply to the petitioner that the information will be confidential, therefore information from forms should not be entered into any system where it might be publicly viewable.

DDA Happold wanted to remind the group that as information passes between JIS and Odyssey and goes to the AOC data warehouse, there is no indicator or flag in place to differentiate whether addresses are marked public or confidential.

Ms. Kraski discussed how this is an issue as during her county's Odyssey implementation she was notified that confidential names, addresses, and birthdates that were in a public case type were being displayed in Odyssey Portal. After learning of this, Ms. Kraski notified the AOC SC-CMS team to immediately turn off all addresses and birthdates in Odyssey Portal to prevent the information being displayed.

DDA Happold then reviewed *Tab 3, the JIS Person Business Rules for Entry of Addresses (PBR)*, which provides additional detail regarding the Secretary of State's Confidential Program for Victims of Crimes. She highlighted a PBR requirement that:

> *'At no time should the word CONFIDENTIAL be added to the Name or Address Fields of the person record.'*

DDA Happold then reviewed *Tab 4, Examples of how addresses are entered into JIS - Includes PER and ADH screen shots.* The screens provided were training screens. She explained the status codes contained in the ADH screen, how they relate to the addresses entered into the system, and that the status code CA stands for Confidential Address when the Secretary of State (SOS) confidential address program is being used by the party. DDA Happold noted that JIS Link level 1 users do not have access to the ADH and the PER screens, and that Public Defenders have access to the ADH screen but not the PER screen. DDA Happold was not sure if the CA address is flagged at the data warehouse and suggested they ask Ms. Jensen when she is able to call into the meeting.

Ms. Marr stated Tab 4 was not an accurate example of the SOS Confidential Address as the screen shot showed a residential address and the SOS address is a Post Office Box. DDA

Happold agreed that the training data was not the most accurate example and that it should be a PO Box.

DDA Happold then presented tab 5 and how addresses are entered into Odyssey. Judge Leach asked if a box on the CIF is checked then how did the information become confidential. DDA Happold responded that the check box is not conveyed in JIS/Odyssey as those parties are well identified parties/persons and an address is needed to complete the person's case management information. Judge Leach expressed concern over the implied privacy in the current version of the CIF language.

DDA Happold then explained that the Status Code in JIS and the Source Code in Odyssey have the same function and illustrated the differences of how information is inputted into the two systems. She also pointed out that the Odyssey confidential address check box is only for the SOS address program per the PBRs and not for any other purpose. Ms. Kraski commented that this is not known by the clerks using Odyssey. Ms. Powell stated that Odyssey makes it easy to make this mistake and Ms. Marley agreed. Ms. Sapinoso indicated AOC educators are now aware of these issues and will update training materials and online manuals about how to use this screen.

DDA Happold also described how Odyssey address entries require another source code when the confidential address is checked, whereas JIS considers the CA a source code on its own. Mr. Keeling asked Mr. Farrow if there is a way the Odyssey field can be updated. Mr. Farrow said yes, but that it would cost the project in development hours.

DDA Happold stated that the AOC Person Maintenance Team reviews replication errors and then updates records to ensure JIS information is accurate, including address issues between the two systems. During this process JIS and Odyssey status and source codes are mirrored.

Judge Leach asked Mr. Farrow if the Odyssey DMS has the capability to differentiate whether an address originated from a specific case type, giving criminal or domestic violence cases as examples. Mr. Farrow said Odyssey can be configured that way, but Odyssey Portal cannot.

Judge Leach asked what is possible as far as specifying information as confidential. DDA Happold stated that JIS limits access internally by protecting some screens, but the data warehouse has no way to interpret or differentiate these confidential settings so information in the data warehouse can include confidential addresses.

Judge Leach asked DDA Happold how the expansion of JABS access to Law Enforcement Agencies might affect access to confidential information. DDA Happold indicated she would follow up and report back. Judge Leach also inquired who at the courts are granting access to JABS and questioned if anyone really knew who had this access. Ms. Miner asserted that AOC should be administering the access, not court staff which is the current process. Mr. Keeling indicated that AOC has the ability to run reports to show who currently has JABS access.

Ms. Jensen then joined the meeting telephonically. DDA Happold asked Ms. Jensen to elaborate on how the SOS address gets into the data warehouse. Ms. Jensen explained the address follows the person record that does not show the confidential residential address but the SOS PO Box. The same SOS PO Box information displays for each person in the program.

Ms. Miner indicated the SOS address shows in the PER screen, but the ADH has the SOS PO Box listed as well as all other addresses and asked how much protection does the SOS PO Box offer if all the other addresses are still listed.

The Committee Members asked what JIS LINK users had access to the ADH screen. DDA Happold responded that it was level 20 Public Defenders, Level 22 Law Enforcement, Level 25 Prosecutors, and Level 30 Non-JIS Courts. Committee members discussed whether or not public defenders should have access to the ADH screen if it lists all addresses as there is a possibility that public defenders may share this confidential information with their clients.

Ms. Miner asked why the PER history screen is confidential; DDA Happold answered that the screen displays personal identifiers.

The DDC members continued to discuss whether or not public defenders should have access to confidential information screens. Ms. Powell asked if it is realistic to find a way to filter the information with the current system(s) constraints. Judge Wynne and Judge Leach both agreed that the discussion should be moved toward an all or nothing alternative rather than trying to find a 'sweet spot' that is not currently attainable.

The concern was raised again that prohibiting all addresses from being disseminated would affect the county clerks and the court staff in completing their work. It was suggested that the addresses would be prohibited from dissemination unless a court order allowed for it. Ms. Miner responded that this did not satisfy the county clerks' needs and suggested changing the policy to state that exemptions are allowed for conducting court and county clerk business. Judge Leach also mentioned that the DDC would continue to allow address dissemination for research purposes.

The Committee then asked DDA Happold to go through the examples provided in Tabs 6-9. The tabs illustrated that even if an address is marked confidential in one scenario, if an individual is tied to other cases as a WIP it is not hard to piece together the individual's address from other cases or applications. Also the data warehouse has no way to limit the information.

Judge Wynne asked Mr. Keeling if it is possible to remove all addresses from the data warehouse. DDA Happold indicated that addresses are currently not disseminated in public bulk data requests and they provide at most the county. Judge Leach asked if the zip code could be provided instead and DDA Happold stated it could.

Judge Leach asked if the data warehouse can be structured to allow courts to have information, but block the information for everyone else. Mr. Keeling indicated AOC will be moving away from the data warehouse management structure and using the EDR in its place. Mr. Keeling went onto explain that JABS can be controlled by rules and that should not be a huge impact on the data warehouse. The courts would be responsible for adopting address dissemination practices after AOC makes system changes for all of this to be successful.

The Committee then discussed if the CIF could be sealed in Odyssey via a docket code so it would not display in Odyssey Portal. Tyler Technologies is working to use guidance from GR 22 as a driver for how information is displayed in Portal. DDA Happold asked if the term 'sealed' would be confusing to future users. Some DDC members thought the term 'restricted' was good. Mr. Mejia volunteered to take the verbiage discussion to the SC-CMS CUWG to discuss and settle upon a mutually agreeable term. Mr. Allen suggested using the CNRC code.

The Committee then discussed if a comment was needed in the proposed DD policy to mention that addresses are not disseminated due to technical limitations and cost.

The Committee also discussed what participants/parties should be added to the list in Section III.G.1. The Odyssey/JIS WIP is different than a civil person because of the three required

personal identifiers that includes an address; therefore any person that was considered a WIP would need to be added to the list. It was suggested that DDA Happold add a definition of a WIP in the DD policy to also cover any participant that was not mentioned in Section III.G.1. Ms. Miner and Ms. Kraski also mentioned victims eligible for restitution and asked that either the WIP definition be written to include them or they are added specifically to Section III.G.1.

The Committee also agreed on language for Sections III.G.4-6 that would allow for courts and county clerks to continue to dissemination addresses for their work without impediment.

Next, the Committee agreed that the ADH screen needs to be removed for the JIS-LINK level 20 Public Defender access. This will be voted on at the next DDC meeting.

DDA Happold asked if addresses and dates of birth can be turned back on in the Odyssey Portal for law enforcement and prosecutor roles. The Committee agreed that they should and would officially vote on it at the next meeting. Ms. Beck asked if that included confidential SOS addresses and the Committee confirmed that it did.

Judge Wynne asked DDA Happold to set up a meeting with Ms. Gough and the Chair of the Pattern Forms Committee to discuss the CIF confidential address check box.

Ms. Powell expressed concern over how the Confidential Address Box in Odyssey Client is being misused. Ms. Sapinoso indicated she would work with BPEs and trainers to make sure the Odyssey training materials clearly explain the purpose of the box. Ms. Powell asked if it would be possible to include a prompt or warning screen when the box is selected by the user. Mr. Farrow indicated that was a sizable request.

5. Conclusion

Judge Wynne indicated he would reach out to Ms. Vance to make sure her previous concerns about Section III.G.6 were properly addressed.

DDA Happold will notify the SC-CMS CUWG about the DDC decision to allow prosecutors and law enforcement agencies the ability to view addresses and dates of birth in the Odyssey Portal.

The DDC will vote to finalize the amended DD policy on October 28, 2016, and then bring the recommendation to the JISC. No changes, such as those proposed for the public defender access, will be made until the DD policy is implemented.

6. Meeting Adjourned

There is no other business, Judge Wynne adjourned this working meeting.

DRAFT