WASHINGTON COURTS	**JISC DATA DISSEMINATION COMMITTEE** **Friday August 26, 2016 (8:15 a.m. – 9:45 a.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
Judge Thomas J. Wynne, Chair
Judge Jeannette Dalton
Judge J. Robert Leach
Judge G. Scott Marinella
Ms. Barbara Miner
Ms. Brooke Powell
Ms. Aimee Vance

Members Not Present
Judge David A. Svaren

Staff Present
Stephanie Happold, Data Dissemination Administrator
Kathy Bowman, MSD Administrative Secretary
Keli Beck, Senior System Support Analyst
Charlotte Jensen, Court Business Information Coordinator
Michael Keeling, ISD Operations Manager
Lisa Lind, Business Process Engineer
Trina Wendel, Business Process Engineer
Paul Farrow, Tyler Technologies

Guests Present (telephonically)
Ms. Sonya Kraski, Snohomish Co. County Clerk
Mr. Mark Allen, Snohomish Co. Clerk's Office
Mr. Kevin Hurtado AIRS
Ms. Luu Nguyen, U of Cal, Berkeley
Ms. Gillian Slee, Harvard University

DRAFT

1. Call to Order, Approval of Minutes

The August 26, 2016, JISC Data Dissemination Committee Meeting was called to order at 8:20 am by Judge Wynne. Judge Marinella moved to approve the Minutes of June 24, 2016, and Judge Dalton seconded. The minutes were unanimously approved as written.

Due to AOC Staff schedules, Judge Wynne called the review of the Data Dissemination Policy Draft next.

2. Review of Data Dissemination Policy Draft

Judge Wynne presented his proposed changes to Section III.G. Ms. Vance, Ms. Miner, Ms. Kraski and Mr. Allen all raised questions about how these changes would impact staff work and customer interaction within their offices, and about how confidential addresses could be protected. The Committee discussed various technical restraints between the case management systems and what can/should be driven by policy. Ms. Vance voiced concerns about prohibiting release of party addresses as it would hinder the courts' ability to disseminate

reports that are needed to efficiently conduct court business. This prohibition would exponentially increase staff counter time. She asked if exceptions could be made in the policy to allow address dissemination related to court work.

The Committee then discussed how addresses are entered into the case management systems. Questions were raised about the case source for addresses, and how a confidential address would display in JIS if the party was a defendant in a later criminal case. Committee members asked how addresses could be filtered between the case management systems and if they could be protected by case type. Mr. Farrow was asked to demonstrate how addresses are entered into the Odyssey case management system and then displayed. Mr. Farrow explained the Odyssey address screen and showed how addresses can be flagged as confidential. He also stated that if an Odyssey or Odyssey Portal user does not have certain access rights, the confidential address will not be seen.

Ms. Vance asked if there was a system-wide way to flag addresses by case type. Ms. Kraski responded that the cases of particular concern are not just confidential cases, but also those public cases with a confidential information form filled out. The document itself is confidential, but the information contained on it may possibly be entered into database to create the PER record. Committee members discussed how prior to Odyssey, documents were maintained in a separate database from the person case records. Now, documents and case management data are combined, creating difficulty. Also, once the address is added into the case management system, whether it is JIS or Odyssey, the source of the address (a confidential information form, DOL, etc.) is not linked to the information. Odyssey does provide the ability to add a source for the address, but there was confusion if source was case/court source or a code similar to the status code in the JIS ADH screen. Judge Leach asked what additional problems were created because of data transfers and/or new case data entries. Ms. Vance responded that because of not knowing the source of the address, problems would occur in both.

The Committee also discussed the relationship of the address of the person (defendant, victim, protected party) to the case type itself and that not all addresses are protected addresses.

Judge Leach asked how the systems handled data requests if multiple courts added different addresses for a party for various cases and if it could be controlled where those addresses came from, be displayed, or be disseminated. He asked if it was possible to display addresses only from non-confidential case types. Ms. Jensen explained that when running BOXI reports from JIS, the system pulls all records for the date, attaches names to it, and then the current address. The addresses would be used regardless of where it came from. The user could try to limit the addresses from confidential case types by filtering out by case types (removing adoption or juvenile dependency cases for instance.). However, if there is a protection order case and petitioner is a parent in a dependency case, the system would not report parents' name and address on dependency case, but the information would be in JIS for the protection order. Because the same party/person record is used, the report would have the name and address.

Ms. Kraski presented her concerns about allowing addresses to be displayed. Because of confidential addresses from public cases being displayed in Odyssey Portal during the Snohomish County Odyssey implementation, she had the AOC SC-CMS staff immediately shut down that access for Portal roles.

The Committee discussed splitting the policy to what can be viewed in the case management systems and what the courts could provide directly for a data dissemination request.

The Committee was concerned about making any decisions on the policy today, as not enough was known about the case management technology, how the systems interact with one another, and how addresses are entered into the systems. The Committee agreed that they should schedule an additional meeting specifically for this topic. DDA Happold will set up a meeting late September, early October for the Committee to discuss these issues further.

3. American Information Research Financial Data Request

Mr. Kevin Hurtado from American Information Research (AIRS) presented the request for an unlawful detainer report that would include financial data in judgement cases. However, after hearing the discussion about the draft data dissemination policy, Mr. Hurtado was concerned that the addresses would not be available in the system. DDA Happold reported earlier to Mr. Hurtado that if there were any addresses associated with the case, they would belong to the parties and not the address where the unlawful detainer took place. However, it was now known that respondent addresses would also not be available because the parties to unlawful detainers are not well identified parties with addresses in the system. There is a possibility that the address for a pro se would be available, but that was not assured either. DDA Happold advised that AIRS would need to research the address information by going to the individual county clerk's offices. Mr. Hurtado said without the address information, AIRS did not want the data. DDA Happold asked if it was beneficial to AIRS if AOC provide a list of unlawful detainer cases that AIRS could use to research the address information with the county clerk's offices. Mr. Hurtado responded that it was possible. DDA Happold suggested that Mr. Hurtado go through with requesting the financial data with the DDC just in case the list of unlawful detainer cases is helpful so he does not have to come back to the Committee. Mr. Hurtado agreed. DDA Happold asked the Committee for a motion to approve AIRS request for financial data, minus addresses. The motion was unanimously passed with the usual financial data request requirements that included the county clerk's office representative reviewing the reports for accuracy.

4. University of California – Berkeley Financial Data Request

Ms. Luu Nguyen presented University of California – Berkeley's request for debt collection cases including financial data. Ms. Miner asked if the request was for Superior Court and CLJ Court data; Ms. Nguyen confirmed it was for both.

It was discussed that causes of action are not always clear in the case management system and that there is no case type/specific cause code for debt collection. Debt collection could occur in numerous other causes of action and the docket coding would need to be used to draw out the information. It was asked and Ms. Nguyen confirmed that they are not looking for child support or maintenance. Judge Wynne called for a motion; Judge Svaren moved to approve the request, subject to usual requirements for financial data requests. Ms. Miner seconded and it was passed unanimously.

5. Harvard Financial Data Request

Ms. Slee presented the Harvard request for unlawful detainer case information, including financial data. Although they are looking at where evictions occur, they are prepared to do the additional research for address information as they understand it will not be available through AOC. Judge Leach made the motion to approve the request with the same requirements as previous financial data requests and Ms. Powell seconded it. The motion passed unanimously.

6. DCH Screen Recommendation Vote

DDA Happold updated the Committee on its July 22, 2016, decision to revise the DDC recommendation from removing the DCH screen from JIS to adding warning messages agreed upon by EDE Governance Committee as soon as possible. The Committee Members had held off voting on the recommendation change during the July meeting until more members were present. Ms. Vance moved and Judge Svaren seconded that the DDC revise its recommendation to AOC and the EDE Governance Committee from removing the DCH screen to instead adding warning messages, both temporary and permanent, to multiple JIS case compilation screens and reports as soon as possible. The motion passed unanimously.

7. Other Business

Dates of birth and addresses are still shut off for every Odyssey Portal Role. DDC will table this discussion for now.

Meeting adjourned 9:30 am.