WASHINGTON STATE JUDICIAL BRANCH
2013-2015 BIENNIAL BUDGET REQUEST
Preliminary Decision Package

Agency **Administrative Office of the Courts**
(Please choose one judicial branch agency from the dropdown list.)

Decision Package Title: **Superior Court Case Management System (SC-CMS)**

Budget Period: **2013-2015 Biennial Budget Request**

Budget Level **Policy Level**
(Please choose policy or maintenance level from the dropdown list.)

Agency Recommendation Summary Text
(100 words or less)
This is a request for funds to continue with the implementation of the new Commercial Off The Shelf (COTS) Case Management system for the superior courts. Funding is needed to complete Phase 2 (Statewide Configuration and Validation), start Phase 3 (Local Implementation Preparation), start Phase 4 (Pilot Implementation) and start Phase 5 (Statewide Rollout) of the project.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures		**FY 2014**		**FY 2015**		**Total**
Estimated sum of all costs		**$ 4,794,824**		**$ 6,503,654**		**$ 11,298,478**
Staffing		**FY 2014**		**FY 2015**		**Total**
FTEs (estimated number of staff requested)		22.0		22.0		22.0

*** Dollar amounts should not be entered in the row titled "FTEs." Please enter only the percentage of staff time being requested. 1.0 is one full time staff person, 0.5 is one half-time staff person, etc.**

Package Description

Organizations supporting this request
Judicial Information System Committee (JISC), Superior Court Judges Association (SCJA), Association of Washington Superior Court Administrators (AWSCA), Washington State Association of County Clerks (WSACC), and Administrative Office of the Courts

Background
(This is a continuation fo the existing decision package from Phase 1.)
Under the direction of the JISC, the Superior Court Case Management System (SC-CMS) project is to procure and implement a software application that will support the business functions of state superior courts and county clerks by acquiring and deploying a SC-CMS to all 39 Superior Courts in the state. The SC-CMS will specifically support calendaring and caseflow management functions, along with participant/party information tracking, case records and relevant disposition services functions in support of judicial decisionmaking, scheduling, and case management.

Current situation
Project has been underway since July 2011. Changes in project schedules for the RFP have resulted in some small differences for the next biennium relative to the original feasibility study prepared by MTG Consultants.

Proposed solution
Purchase of a Commercial Off the Shelf (COTS) solution for courts case management. Configure the solution to support standardized courts processes.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

Reason for change
The current Superior Court Management Information System (SCOMIS) was implemented in 1977 and is 35 years old. While it does what it was designed to do and considered state of the art technology at the time, court business and technology needs have evolved. The vision of the SC-CMS provides a number of desired functions that are intended to address the needs of the courts for business improvement. Improved and expanded capabilities will help the courts meet their business needs by providing improved capabilities involving data management, access, and distribution; more robust calendar management and statistical reporting capabilities; enhanced business process automation and management; and improved service to partners and the public. Funding also is included to cover preparation work to infrastructure and applications in anticipation of installing a COTS system.

Impact on clients and services?
In addition to serving as the statewide court case management system, the existing Judicial Information System (JIS) provides essential information to several state agencies, local law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, criminal justice partners, and the public. The JIS is also responsible for accurately tracking, recording and distributing over $240 million per year in state and local revenues (excluding restitution and other "trust" monies).

Implementation of a new Superior Court calendaring and case management system will provide:

•Enhanced data sharing capabilities.
•Cost avoidance through the elimination of redundant data entry.
•Error reduction through training, standardization of business practices, and value-limited data entry fields.
•Flexibility to meet new and emerging business needs.
•Improved tracking and analysis capabilities..

Impact on other state programs?
Other state programs will benefit indirectly through AOC's enhanced efficiency and effectiveness. These impacts are intangible.

What alternatives were explored and why was this alternative chosen?
A formal feasibility study led to a recommendation for a commerically available centrally hosted off the shelf system. The JISC chose this recommendation because it compared favorably to other alternatives in terms of risk, rate of return, technical alignment, functional alignment and no custom application development is required. Other major alternatives considered included: use and expansion of the Pierce County CMS application known as "LINX"; Court Management applications without court records; Commercial CMS, locally hosted.

What are the consequences of not funding this package?
• Delay or elimination in productivity gains made by replacing legacy software.
•Additional functionality, such as new or modified case types, would not be incorporated into the legacy system.
•Sentence and disposition information would remain at the case level.
•Human resource scheduling would remain a manual effort.
•Maintenance costs will continue to increase.
•Individual courts will pursue stand-alone systems, thereby further fragmenting the system and increasing costs statewide..

What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?
None

Expenditure Calculations and Assumptions
(Rationale for costs shown)

Object Detail	FY2014	FY2015	Total
Staff Costs	$2,262,139	$2,227,398	$4,489,537
Non-Staff Costs	$2,532,685	$4,276,156	$6,808,941
Total Objects	**$4,794,824**	**$6,503,654**	**$11,298,478**

WASHINGTON STATE JUDICIAL BRANCH
2013-2015 BIENNIAL BUDGET REQUEST
Preliminary Decision Package

Agency **Administrative Office of the Courts**
(Please choose one judicial branch agency from the dropdown list.)

Decision Package Title: **JIS Multi-Project Funding**

Budget Period: **2013-2015 Biennial Budget Request**

Budget Level **Policy Level**
(Please choose policy or maintenance level from the dropdown list.)

Agency Recommendation Summary Text
(100 words or less)
This is a request for funds to continue to provide the Judicial Information Systems Committee (JISC) with flexibility to allocate funding to small projects as authorized and prioritized by the JISC through the IT Governance process. This will allow JISC to respond quickly to small and medium requests to provide new or enhanced functionality to the Washington Courts.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures		**FY 2014**		**FY 2015**		**Total**
Estimated sum of all costs		**$ 820,000**		**$ 1,180,000**		**$ 2,000,000**
Staffing		**FY 2014**		**FY 2015**		**Total**
FTEs (estimated number of staff requested)		0.0		0.0		0.0

*** Dollar amounts should not be entered in the row titled "FTEs." Please enter only the percentage of staff time being requested. 1.0 is one full time staff person, 0.5 is one half-time staff person, etc.**

Package Description

Organizations supporting this request
JISC, all levels of Washington Courts, Customer User Groups and Associations, Administrative Office of the Courts.

Background
The JISC needs to have some funds available to enable them to be responsive to the IT needs of the courts. This money would allow them to allocate funding to

small or medium size IT efforts based on the IT Governance process that prioritizes the IT needs of the Washington Courts.

Current situation
The JIS Multi-Projects Fund was used during the 2011-2013 biennium to develop the Electronic Document Management System (EDMS) for the Appellate Courts, and the Adult Static Risk Assessment (ASRA) for the trial courts, as well as other small to medium sized IT projects.

Proposed solution
Funding the JIS projects fund for the 2013-2015 Biennium will provide stability for JISC to continue to authorize short term governance requests for system upgrades and changes. The JISC will prioritize IT Governance requests and allocate funding based on priorities established within the IT Governance process. This funding will be used for small to medium, short duration projects that can be completed in one year or less or to begin the first stages of major approved project efforts. This funding could be used for projects such as a feasibility study to replace the Judicial Receipting System, integration between the current Judicial Information Systems and a juvenile risk assessment tool, and providing the ability for courts to view documents from all other state courts. These funds could also be used to cover any cost overruns from projects such as the Electronic Document Management System for the appellate courts.

Costs for project management oversight from the ISD Project Management Office (PMO) will be absorbed at current ISD staffing levels. Existing FTEs will be directed as necessary to provide resources associated with management of this funding source.

<u>Narrative Justification and Impact Statement</u>

Reason for change
Specific projects will be requested by the Washington court community and selected by JISC under the IT Governance process.

Impact on clients and services?
Allows for expedient funding cycle and ability to start projects quickly. This provides the flexibility to address the business needs of the Washington Courts with small projects to rapidly deliver improvements to the systems used by court staff.

Impact on other state programs?
None

What alternatives were explored and why was this alternative chosen?

What are the consequences of not funding this package?

Overall project delivery delay will occur without the availability of this source funds to be allocated by the JISC. Having this available has allowed us to begin the preliminary work required with some complex projects.

What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?

Expenditure Calculations and Assumptions

(Rationale for costs shown)

Object Detail	FY2014	FY2015	Total
Staff Costs	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0
Non-Staff Costs	$820,000	$1,180,000	$2,000.000
Total Objects	**$820,000**	**$1,180,000**	**$2,000,000**

WASHINGTON STATE JUDICIAL BRANCH
2013-2015 BIENNIAL BUDGET REQUEST
Preliminary Decision Package

Agency **Administrative Office of the Courts**
(Please choose one judicial branch agency from the dropdown list.)

Decision Package Title: **Information Networking Hub (INH)**

Budget Period: **2013-2015 Biennial Budget Request**

Budget Level **Policy Level**
(Please choose policy or maintenance level from the dropdown list.)

Agency Recommendation Summary Text
(100 words or less)
This is a request for funds to continue with the development and implementation of the Information Networking Hub (INH) that will provide 1) a comprehensive set of bi-directional, real time data exchanges to meet the data exchange needs of the courts, and 2) a central data repository of court data. These data exchanges will improve standardization of court business and technology processes and data quality through the use of the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) standards. By providing access to real time justice information across the state from a central repository, judicial information will be improved.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures		**FY 2014**		**FY 2015**		**Total**
Estimated sum of all costs		**$ 850,000**		**$ 650,000**		**$ 1,500,000**
Staffing		**FY 2014**		**FY 2015**		**Total**
FTEs (estimated number of staff requested)		0		0		0

*** Dollar amounts should not be entered in the row titled "FTEs." Please enter only the percentage of staff time being requested. 1.0 is one full time staff person, 0.5 is one half-time staff person, etc.**

Package Description

Organizations supporting this request
This request is supported by the Judicial Information Systems Committee (JISC), all levels of Washington Courts, and the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC).

Background

Data exchanges supporting court business processes can best be accomodated through the development of a secure, centralized messaging hub and shared data repository accessible to courts across the state.

Current situation
There is no existing unified architecture to exchange messages and share data between disparate court information systems across the state. There is no single statewide data repository for sharing judicial information.

Proposed solution
The INH will develop and implement an enterprise data exchange solution that will use modern technologies to support a comprehensive set of data exchanges and provide a single central data repository for storing statewide shared justice data among multiple court systems and other judicial partners.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

Reason for change
The INH data exchange capability was requested by the Washington court community. Other court system modernization efforts are dependent on the availability of the INH platform to support data exchanges and establish the capability to share data across all courts and judicial partners. It will create the technical infrastructure to provide optimal data exchange development, deployment and operations. It will ensure the security of information and data quality provided in near real time.

Impact on clients and services?
The INH will provide a data exchange capability that can respond to court customer needs for increased data sharing of justice information in a more secure, responsive and effective manner.

Impact on other state programs?
The INH will ensure the AOC's ability to sustain current service levels to provide data exchanges to external justice organizations, including:
Department of Licensing (DOL) - To provide case updates to driver records
Department of Corrections (DOC) - To provide case disposition information
Washington State Patrol (WSP) - To provide case disposition information
Office of the Secretary of State (OSOS) - To provide case history information

What alternatives were explored and why was this alternative chosen?
Direct point-to-point data exchanges were explored and determined to be costly to build and difficult to maintain for a large number of data exchanges eminating from multiple system interfaces across the state. By developing a central data exchange hub and data repository, court systems can be connected with far fewer integration points, thereby increasing the capacity, reliability and performance of the data exchanges.

What are the consequences of not funding this package?
Delay or elimination of the INH will eliminate the productivity gains, improved data access and quality to be derived by implementing a capability to provide common data exchanges and a central statewide data repository requested by the court community and judicial partners.

What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?
None

Expenditure Calculations and Assumptions

(Rationale for costs shown)

Object Detail	FY2014	FY2015	Total
Staff Costs	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0
Non-Staff Costs	$850,000	$650,000	$1,500,000
Total Objects	**$850,000**	**$650,000**	**$1,500,000**

WASHINGTON STATE JUDICIAL BRANCH
2013-2015 BIENNIAL BUDGET REQUEST
Preliminary Decision Package

Agency: **Administrative Office of the Courts**

Decision Package Title: **Internal Equipment Replacement**

Budget Period: **2013-2015 Biennium**

Recommendation Summary Text

Funding is requested to replace aged computer equipment and to improve performance of heavily used JIS services.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures		**FY 2014**		**FY 2015**		**Total**
Total Cost		**$ 2,138,000**		**$ 0**		**$ 2,138,000**
Staffing		**FY 2012**		**FY 2013**		**Total**
FTEs		0		0		0

Package Description:

Funding is requested to replace aged computer equipment and to improve performance of heavily used JIS services.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement:

Use of the Judicial Information System (JIS) by all court levels, their judges, and other criminal justice agencies continues to increase. During the past eighteen (18) years, the JIS has grown from 2,500 users to over 16,000 users (an increase of over 540%) and the volume of data stored in the JIS databases has increased 7% per year, and more recently 15% per year (with the eTticketing data). These increases in both user and data volumes not only require that current software and hardware be expanded but it also necessitates the need to employ newer, more technologically advanced, hardware and software.

Server Consolidation and Virtualization: Consolidating the servers will allow us to reduce the physical number of servers we maintain, requiring less cooling, power, and space. With virtualized servers, standard servers could be built and easily duplicated which will speed up server deployment. Virtualization improves the Disaster Recovery process as the hardware dependencies of the servers are eliminated. By taking

advantage of server virtualization, we will be able to improve the efficiency of our data center. Cost of this equipment and software licenses is $220,000.

Storage System Upgrade: The current storage system is turning 7 years old and is well beyond its technological prime. The amount of data on the JIS systems and local area networks is continuing to grow at a rate of 7% per year and court-user's demands for speedier access continues. The newer technologies will allow us to meet these requirements. Cost of this equipment is $920,000.

Word Processing Updates: Our current versions of Office software does not allow us to leverage the new collaboration tools being offered. Additionally our current version falls out of mainstream support this year, and by 2013 we will be two versions behind. Upgrading to current software versions will allow us to take advantage of the new features and tools allowing us to achieve greater efficiencies. Cost of this upgrade is $340,000.

Cooling System Replacement: The last remaining 30 year old cooling system in the data center has reached end of life and needs to be replaced. We will replace and install a 20 ton cooling system. The indoor portion of the replacement system is upsized to meet energy code requirements and includes the following options: seismic frame, economizer, centrifugal blower with variable frequency drive, infrared humidifier, three stage stainless steel re-heat, two variable capacity digital scroll compressors, stainless steel drain pan, iCOM control with large display, disconnect, smoke detector, condensate pump and leak sensors. Cost of this equipment $186,000.

VPN Router Replacement: The routers servicing the various JIS courts not connected to county networks need to be replaced as they are five years old, and have reached end of life based on the life span recommended by the vendor. We were able to recoup $400,000 annual savings when we migrated these circuits from DIS to private VPN's, and now it is our responsibility to upgrade these devices. Cost of this equipment is $472,000.

Cost Summary

Item	Cost
Server Consolidation and Virtualization	$220,000
Storage System Upgrade	$920,000
Word Processing Updates	$340,000
Cooling System Upgrade	$186,000
VPN Router Replacement	$472,000
Total	$2,138,000

WASHINGTON STATE JUDICIAL BRANCH
2013-2015 BIENNIAL BUDGET REQUEST
Preliminary Decision Package

Agency: **Administrative Office of the Courts**

Decision Package Title: **External Equipment Replacement & Expansion**

Budget Period: **2013-2015 Biennium**

Recommendation Summary Text

Funds are sought to replace aged computer equipment at the courts and bring the supply level to 75% of the information technology hardware need.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures		**FY 2014**		**FY 2015**		**Total**
Total Cost		**$663,150**		**$534,950**		**$1,198,100**
Staffing		**FY 2014**		**FY 2015**		**Total**
FTEs		**0**		**0**		**0**

Package Description:

Funds are sought to replace aged computer equipment at the JIS courts and bring the supply level to 75% of the information technology hardware need.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement:

Use of the Judicial Information System (JIS) by all court levels, their judges, and other criminal justice agencies continues to increase. During the past eighteen (18) years, the JIS has grown from 2,500 users to over 16,000 users, or 540%, and the volume of data stored in the JIS databases has also increased by 7% per year.

The AOC is responsible for providing computer equipment to the state (Supreme Court and Court of Appeals), county (superior and district) and city (municipal) courts. Judicial Information System Policy 1.2.1 calls for a 5-year replacement cycle for computers and other information technology equipment supplied by the AOC.

Because AOC replaces computer equipment on a cyclical basis, funding needs are periodic and short-term in nature. Accordingly, replacement monies are not part of our carry-forward or maintenance budget levels, and funding must be requested for each cycle. The AOC collaborates with the courts to share responsibility for providing equipment based on an equitable ratio approved by the JISC that reflects the percent of

time personal computers are used for JIS versus local applications, such as document management systems and office programs.

Expenditure Calculations and Assumptions

Pricing per unit is as follows. Pricing includes shipping, sales tax, and 3 years of vendor warranty.

FY14	#	Price	Total FY14
Computers	456	1025	$467,400
Laptops	176	1100	$193,600
Impact Printers	0	2500	$0
Laser Printers	5	250	$1,250
Receipt Printers	2	450	$900
Slip Printers	0	950	$0
Total			**$663,150**

FY15	#	Price	Total FY15
Computers	500	1025	$512,500
Laptops	0	1100	$0
Impact Printers	0	2500	$0
Laser Printers	88	250	$22,000
Receipt Printers	1	450	$450
Slip Printers	0	950	$0
Total			**$534,950**

WASHINGTON STATE JUDICIAL BRANCH
2013-2015 BIENNIAL BUDGET REQUEST
Preliminary Decision Package

Agency **Administrative Office of the Courts**
(Please choose one judicial branch agency from the dropdown list.)

Decision Package Title: **On-going System Support for the new Appellate Courts Electronic Document Management System (EDMS)**

Budget Period: **2013-2015 Biennial Budget Request**

Budget Level **Maintenance Level**
(Please choose policy or maintenance level from the dropdown list.)

Agency Recommendation Summary Text
(100 words or less)
This is a request for funds to obtain the necessary FTE(s) to provide on-going system support for the new Commercial Off The Shelf (COTS) Electronic Document Management System (EDMS) that will be purchased and implemented in the current 11-13 biennium for the Appellate Courts. This new system introduces a new technology into ISD that we currently do not have the knowledge, expertise, or staff availability to support. Where AOC has previously been required to provide very little support to the Appellate Courts; this new statewide system will require a much higher level of training and support from both the Judicial Services Division (JSD) as well as the Information Services Division (ISD).

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures		**FY 2014**		**FY 2015**		**Total**
Estimated sum of all costs		**$ 195,593**		**$ 191,093**		**$ 386,686**
Staffing		**FY 2014**		**FY 2015**		**Total**
FTEs (estimated number of staff requested)		1.0		1.0		1.0

*** Dollar amounts should not be entered in the row titled "FTEs." Please enter only the percentage of staff time being requested. 1.0 is one full time staff person, 0.5 is one half-time staff person, etc.**

Package Description

Organizations supporting this request
The Washington State Supreme Court, the three Courts of Appeal divisions (Seattle, Tacoma, and Spokane), the Judicial Information Systems Committee

(JISC), and the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC). AOC is the IT support organization for the Appellate Courts in Washington state.

Background
This is a request for funds to provide ongoing support for a new application developed as a result of the IT Governance process. The new application, Electronic Document Management System (EDMS) for the Appellate Courts, will require additional maintenance, licensing, and operational support expenses. The support will ensure that the software is kept up to date, document workflows are modified as needed, and support personnel are in place to keep the system running and interfaced as needed with existing Appellate Court system (ACORDS).

Current situation
EDMS for Appellate Courts was approved by the IT Governance process through the JISC and is being developed during the 2011-2013 biennium.

Proposed solution
Provide incremental ISD staff support to perform system administration, workflow development and configuration, coordinate system updates, and system support management for the new EDMS system. Based on the requirements for the Appellate Courts, it is estimated that one (1) full time equivalent will be sufficient to handle the workload.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

Reason for change
New Commercial Off the Shelf (COTS) software and hardware is being installed for the Appellate Courts (Courts of Appeal and the Supreme Court of Washington) for the electronic storage of Court Case documents. Centralized system support will be required to maintain this new application and to provide Court level support for developing reports and EDMS automated workflows.

Impact on clients and services?
This is a new COTS application and will need a level of support from ISD in terms of maintenance and operations. There may be a very small impact to AOC JSD Customer Service desk incidents. There are only four (4) Appellate Courts and there is already a certain level of staff in place to support their IT needs.

Impact on other state programs?
None.

What alternatives were explored and why was this alternative chosen?
There were no other alternatives considered. AOC ISD typically provides in-house staff support for supported applications and systems.

What are the consequences of not funding this package?

The investment made in the EDMS system will not be efficiently leveraged to capture the gains from the new system.

What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?

Expenditure Calculations and Assumptions

(Rationale for costs shown)

Object Detail	FY2014	FY2015	Total
Staff Costs	$127,093	$127,093	$254,186
Non-Staff Costs	$68,500	$64,000	$132,000
Total Objects	**$195,593**	**$191,093**	**$386,686**

WASHINGTON STATE JUDICIAL BRANCH
2013-2015 BIENNIAL BUDGET REQUEST
Preliminary Decision Package

Agency **Administrative Office of the Courts**
(Please choose one judicial branch agency from the dropdown list.)

Decision Package Title: **Feasibility Study for Case Management System (CMS) for the Courts of Limited Jurisdiction (CLJ)**

Budget Period: **2013-2015 Biennial Budget Request**

Budget Level **Policy Level**
(Please choose policy or maintenance level from the dropdown list.)

Agency Recommendation Summary Text
(100 words or less)
This is a request for funds to conduct a formal Feasibility Study on the needs and business requirements for purchasing a new Case Management System for the Courts of Limited Jurisdiction to replace their current District Court Information System (DISCIS) that was developed in 1990.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures		**FY 2014**		**FY 2015**		**Total**
Estimated sum of all costs		**$**		**$ 200,000**		**$ 200,000**
Staffing		**FY 2014**		**FY 2015**		**Total**
FTEs (estimated number of staff requested)						

*** Dollar amounts should not be entered in the row titled "FTEs." Please enter only the percentage of staff time being requested. 1.0 is one full time staff person, 0.5 is one half-time staff person, etc.**

Package Description

Organizations supporting this request
The Courts of Limited Jurisdiction Court Level User Group (CLG CLUG) submitted the request for a new case management system to replace JIS (ITG #102). The request was initiated in July 2011. In that same month it was endorsed in the IT Governance process by the District and Municipal Court Management Association.

Because of the size and complexity of the request, AOC is recommending that a feasibility study be conducted. It was estimated that the feasibility study would

engage an outside consulting firm to conduct the study. This mirrors the approach used in the Superior Court Case Management System.
The JISC authorized the request at their December 2, 2011 meeting and prioritized along with the other authorized projects.

Background
Similar to the Superior Courts, the Courts of Limited Jurisdiction are requesting a modern and reliable case management system.

A new system needs to be provided with the functionality to support the Courts of Limited Jurisdiction (CLJ). The majority of district and municipal courts in the state do not have the ability to purchase their own case management systems and need a common system that can be used by all of the courts. The new case management system would be beneficial to all courts.

Current situation
CLJs are using a system that is over 20 years old. It is difficult to maintain and update, and lacks the flexibility of modern architecture.

Proposed solution
AOC would conduct a feasibility study to determine if one or more of the existing vendors in this market space is mature enough and can meet the business needs of the CLJ courts. This study would be based on the same model used for ITG 002 – Superior Court Case Management System Feasibility Study. High level requirements will be gathered to provide vendors information on the CLJ business needs. The high level requirements will also be used to establish scope for an implementation project. Work that has been done in previous case management system efforts, including the current Superior Court Case Management System effort, will be leveraged in support of this feasibility study. The information obtained during this feasibility study could then be used to support procurement of a system, if the JISC decides to proceed with a system replacement. AOC ISD will utilize existing staff levels to complete this phase of the project (feasibility study).

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

Reason for change
This change is being requested by the Washington CLJ court community and is supported by the JISC.

Impact on clients and services?
Service improvements for courts and Washington state citizens.

Impact on other state programs?
Some state programs may need to modify their data exchange services to meet the needs of our new system (e.g., DOL, DSHS).

What alternatives were explored and why was this alternative chosen?
This is a request for a large scale feasibility study to explore the alternatives available to replace the current system.

What are the consequences of not funding this package?
Delay or elimination in productivity gains made by implementing customer business change requests in software.

What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?

Expenditure Calculations and Assumptions
(Rationale for costs shown)

Object Detail	**FY2014**	**FY2015**	**Total**
Staff Costs	$	$	$
Non-Staff Costs	$	$200,000	$200,000
Total Objects	**$**	**$200,000**	**$200,000**