JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE

December 1, 2017
10:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.
AOC Office, SeaTac WA

Minutes

Members Present:
Chief Justice Mary Fairhurst, Chair
Mr. Larry Barker
Ms. Lynne Campeau - Phone
Judge Jeanette Dalton - Phone
Ms. Callie Dietz – Phone
Judge John Hart
Judge J. Robert Leach
Mr. Frank Maiocco
Judge G. Scott Marinella
Ms. Barb Miner
Chief Brad Moericke - Phone
Ms. Brooke Powell
Ms. Paulette Revoir - Phone
Judge David Svaren
Mr. Bob Taylor
Mr. Jon Tunheim - Phone

Members Absent:
Mr. Rich Johnson

AOC Staff Present:
Mr. Kevin Ammons
Ms. Kathy Bradley
Ms. Vicky Cullinane
Ms. Vonnie Diseth
Mr. Brian Elvin
Mr. Brady Horenstein
Mr. Mike Keeling
Ms. Keturah Knutson
Mr. Dirk Marler
Mr. Ramsey Radwan
Mr. Mike Walsh
Ms. Aimee Vance
Mr. Kumar Yajamanam

Guests Present:
Mr. Fred Jarrett
Mr. Sart Rowe
Mr. Tom Boatright
Judge Donna Tucker
Mr. Othniel Palomino
Mr. Mike Katell – Phone

DRAFT

Call to Order

Chief Justice Fairhurst called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. and introductions were made.

October 27, 2017 Meeting Minutes

Chief Justice Fairhurst advised the Committee she had submitted edits to the minutes with the updates sent to the JISC Listserv. Chief Justice Fairhurst asked if there were any additional changes to the October 27, 2017 meeting minutes. Hearing none, Chief Justice Fairhurst deemed them approved.

JIS Budget Update

Mr. Ramsey Radwan reported on the 17-19 budget, presenting the green sheet which contains the budget for identified projects, expenditures, and forecast of expenditures. Mr. Radwan advised the Committee the large variance in the CLJ-CMS project is due to contract and staffing under expenditures, as a contract has not been executed. Staffing, while a little behind schedule is still going

according to plan. Mr. Radwan reported, from a budget perspective, the SC-CMS and EDE projects are proceeding as expected.

Mr. Radwan then turned the Committee's attention to the blue sheet which is the depiction of the State General Fund budget request items that were prioritized by the BJA**.** It is now being brought to the JISC, for informational purposes, due to the EDE General Fund request at the bottom of the sheet. Mr. Radwan then proceeded to give a refresher on the biennial budget process and where the budget currently stands. Discussion was held regarding BJA prioritization. Mr. Radwan clarified that this request was for general funds, not JIS funds.

Mr. Brady Horenstein added that a meeting is being scheduled with the leadership of the SCJA, DMCJA, Chief Justice Fairhurst, and AOC staff to help ensure all stakeholders are on the same page concerning strategy and messaging regarding the request.

JIS Priority Project #4 (ITG 102): CLJ-CMS Project Update

Ms. Vonnie Diseth reported on the CLJ-CMS project update. On November 20, 2017, after failing to reach a contract agreement with Journal Technologies Inc., (JTI), the JISC approved the Project Steering Committee's recommendation to end the contract negotiation process. On November 21st, JTI was notified of AOC's decision to terminate contract negotiations. On November 30th, the Project Steering Committee met to discuss next steps. At that meeting, the Project Steering Committee decided to pursue further discussions with the second ranked vendor Tyler Technologies for the purpose of being able to freely ask clarifying questions regarding their product's functionality and how it would meet the CLJ-CMS business requirements, to identify any perceived gaps in functionality, and to clarify any concerns. Preparations and scheduling are underway for a face-to-face meeting with Tyler in January. All RFP evaluators (Tiers I and II) as well as the Project Steering Committee members will be invited to participate in the two- to three-day meeting with Tyler. It was agreed that this was an important first step as the Project Steering Committee continues to review and discuss all available options.

AOC Expedited Data Exchange (EDE) Pilot Implementation Project Update

Mr. Kevin Ammons presented the update on the Expedited Data Exchange (EDE) Project. Mr. Ammons began by stating that this update was focused on the readiness of the Expedited Data Exchange Program for King County Clerk's Office's (KCCO) planned January implementation of their new case management system. He emphasized that while there would be impacts to courts and data partners, the program continued to work to mitigate and minimize those impacts.

Mr. Ammons then went through an application-by-application review of the integration status and readiness for the go-live. As part of the presentation, Mr. Ammons demonstrated some of the integration functionality that was being developed for the Juvenile Court System (JCS). He also identified the applications that were likely to experience the most significant impacts: partner Data Exchanges, JABS, and ACORDS.

After discussion, Mr. Ammons then presented information on the EDE Project's plan for communicating changes and events to stakeholders statewide.

DRAFT

Following the presentation, questions were asked. In response to the question when the King County Portal would be available and how it would be accessed, Ms. Barb Miner responded that the King County District Court's (KCDC) portal was presently available while KCCO's portal was almost ready but currently contains no data. Ms. Miner described it as an off-the-shelf component of the eCourt product, which is now being configured to King County specifications. A question was asked as to the information available in the portal, specifically case type 7s. Ms. Miner replied case type 7s will not be on the public portal. Ms. Miner advised that they are working on a different way for those who are authorized to access case type 7 files. In response to a question about the timeframe for when case type 7 files would be accessible, Ms. Miner replied there would be something in place by January 2, 2018.

Ms. Miner explained that they had learned from watching the Odyssey implementation and were working on ensuring better communication and sharing of information. Ms. Miner gave as an example their sharing of data with the Washington State Patrol (WSP). When it became clear there was not going to be an electronic option, KCCO contacted the WSP and asked if they could use some of the same mechanisms the counties used during their roll out. Ms. Miner stated she found the WSP very open to this as an option and found the WSP a very willing partner with KCCO sending a report with the data elements.

In addition, Ms. Miner said there will not be a gap in data as with the Odyssey courts. The original plan of moving data from the current database to the new database, the EDR, required mitigation when they realized the old data would be erased. Anytime something was updated the old information would be erased, which would be a best practice and the preferred method. However, in order to help mitigate and continue to provide access to all parties, Ms. Miner stated KCCO will be keeping their old information in place. Therefore, if one was to look on December 31st and view what is in JABS then look again on January 5th, the same information will be there. The new information will not, as the JABS part is not ready, but the data will still be there. This was explained as a way to mitigate and help those viewing the data. In addition, there will be messages in JABS alerting viewers of the need to go to the King County Portal to see new information. Chief Justice Fairhurst clarified, stating that viewers would know the data in JABS is effective up to December 31st but information after that date would need to be viewed in the King County Portal. It was pointed out that this is effective for cases that are closed, but for cases not closed one would need to be aware of the two separate portals in order to view full and complete information. It was clarified that when King County has finished their portion of JABS, the old view will effectively go away, and all information will be viewed in one location. Ms. Miner reminded the Committee that the JABS portion will be available in May. In response, Mr. Ammons stated it would be six months after AOC received the data. Ms. Miner continued, stating some pieces will be ready early and will be rolled out when those sections are complete, with the first data set available approximately March of 2018. Ms. Miner spoke to the ACORDS work-around, stating—in her opinion—it is a really good solution. While a lot of the mitigation requires King County taking on extra work, it is still a worthwhile process to ensure there are no gaps.

Mr. Bob Taylor asked whether the public portion of the portal has a registration process for portal users. Ms. Miner stated a user ID and password will not be necessary. Mr. Othniel Palomino spoke to the differences between KCDC and KCCO. Mr. Palomino stated the District Court does have a registration process, including different levels of visibility depending on whether or not the viewer is an attorney.

The question was asked how this will be publicized to the portal users. Mr. Palomino explained while it is only a small number of civil attorneys that are impacted, they will be alerted via a listserv, already in place. Concerning KCDC, Mr. Palomino explained none of the data contained in Limited Civil is currently covered by JABS, so there is not a JABS or public safety issue in KCDC's initial rollout. Those individuals not needing attorney level visibility are able to do a simple search and view the outcome of the case. This can be done without signing up or registering. If greater visibility is needed then they would need to sign up and register; currently this would cover civil cases that were started with a summons or a complaint.

Judge J. Robert Leach asked if there was a process by which pro se litigants are able to access documents, at the attorney level, for their own case. Mr. Palomino replied affirmatively that there is a process in place. Pro se litigants can call into the call center and they will be given the same level of visibility an attorney has. In addition, this visibility would be limited solely to the case they are involved in. This access would be permanent to the records as they relate to their specific case.

Ms. Paulette Revoir asked a question regarding JABS and the public portal, specifically to judges accessing the public portal and whether or not they would have the same information that would otherwise be available to them in JABS. Ms. Miner replied it would be the same information but only information specific to King County, not statewide. Chief Justice Fairhurst stated that during the interim, judges would need to look in two places in order to have the whole picture. This will only be the case until the system is fully synced and one will be looking at complete information thru JABS, which will be reading from the EDR. Ms. Miner agreed and stated it was her understanding that at that time, JABS would contain all civil cases. Mr. Ammons responded if JABS has a well identified person on a civil case (protection orders etc.), JABS shows this information. JABS checks, before it displays the case, to see if there is a well identified person. If JABS does not find a well identified person then JABS does not show the information. Mr. Ammons stated the idea that JABS should start showing all civil cases has been around for a while. Mr. Ammons also stated it would be fairly easy to do as it would only entail removing the last logic step of not showing information if there is not a well identified person. However, that is a decision that has not been made and is not related to the EDE.

Mr. Frank Maiocco asked a question for clarification, saying he understood the District Court has very limited information that is not public safety related. As there is a gap in the various schedules, specifically a six-month period when judges and staff are looking at both JABS and the eCourt portal, at some point will there also be a third place to check. For instance, domestic violence cases that come through the District Court. In terms of sequencing, the understanding is there are two places to check as of January 2nd and at what point will there be three due to new phases. Mr. Palomino responded it would depend on the JABS schedule or if the rollout marks are missed. If JABS starts to roll out as planned, KCDC's information will start going into the EDR as well. If this does not happen, the only information affecting public safety for the next rollout will be civil protection orders. Therefore, if someone were looking for civil protection orders at that point, one would have to look in three places. This would only be until a full view of JABS has been implemented. Chief Justice Fairhurst asks for clarification from Mr. Palomino, asking at the moment if the schedule was aligned, as far as that piece is concerned. Mr. Palomino replied in the affirmative, adding that it is also a function of how much of JABS will be ready at that time as well.

Ms. Miner asked if those on JIS-Link will have better customer service then others, specifically referring to those who will receive KCCO data earlier then judges and courts. Ms. Miner referred to the slide presented by Mr. Ammons showing yellow with a March 2018 implementation. Mr. Ammons responded in the affirmative, however, even though it is yellow, the current versions of JIS Link continue to work. The vast majority of King County cases on January 2nd will be the cases from JIS SCOMIS so one will still see that data through the existing application, as will JABS users. As new cases are filed they will not be available in the old JIS Link. However, the old JIS Link will continue working and continue running. JIS Link itself will still be dependent on the same processes as before. First, it has to get the standard queries, and second, it has to get the KC data available. When those two things are complete then JIS Link will be ready. Mr. Ammons stated that JIS Link is easier to work on then JABS, which is due to it being a public view of the data and only one view. JABS, on the other hand, has different access level views with half of the test cases being security cases. If the tester logs in as X profile can they see X data only? If they can see Y data and they are not supposed to, it is a defect and it goes back for development. JIS Link is all public access information. For security test cases the process is much simpler and entails only whether or not it is showing data it is supposed to show, based on confidentiality. The effect of this is JIS Link will be available faster than JABS. It will only have those case types that were available before; furthermore, no new case types will be added.

Ms. Brooke Powell then inquired about warrants, stating this is something that has come up in earlier JCS conversations. Ms. Powell asked to be walked through how one would be able to know if there is a warrant. She is concerned about a possible lag in information flow with WSP. While she is able to access WSP information in the event of a lag, what would be the process to ensure a warrant is not missed? Ms. Miner responded that that type of data, specifically Washington State Criminal Information Center (WASIC) data, is not impacted. Law enforcement currently use WASIC to access protection orders, warrants, etc. All of that is a direct line of paperwork between WASIC and King County. That process will continue outside of all other processes, thus no impact. Warrants will be available, and protection orders will be available without impact. Chief Justice Fairhurst clarified as to her understanding that as of January 2nd, WSP will be receiving information from King County and receiving information from AOC from the other systems. Therefore, courts and other people, in going to WSP, will get the full picture because the information is being provided from these various sources to WSP. Ms. Miner replied that WASIC is used by a select number of people with special credentials. Chief Justice Fairhurst replied, that in thinking about public safety and also thinking about the people that do have access to WSP, then WSP should be able to have all the information it currently has even though it will be getting it from a variety of sources. Ms. Miner confirmed this.

Mr. Ammons stated that he had some clarification where much like DOL, we have multiple data exchanges with WSP with “we” being the courts in general. What Ms. Miner is saying is things like warrants are reported separately and do not come through AOC to report out. If a warrant is issued on the case and you look at the case management system (CMS), other courts can see those as part of the case history. The part that is going to be affected, as mentioned by Mr. Boatright earlier, is WSP disposition which does process through the state for JIS courts. Mr. Ammons explained *disposition* as a case that has had a final result and found guilty or not guilty. That is the information reported to WSP and then used for background checks by different agencies. According to Mr. Boatright, there is an expected lag of two-three weeks. Chief Justice Fairhurst asked Mr. Boatright if his information was

coming directly from WSP. Mr. Boatright replied he worked with Ms. Miner to understand the conceptual mitigation efforts, paper form, which is not in place and has not been yet tested. Mr. Boatright then stated he met with WSP and worked with their CIO and Leadership Team in an attempt to get an understanding of the process. Outside of any imperfections in the system, Mr. Boatright explained WSP anticipates a two-week lag of the information manually inputted into their system. Ms. Miner stated WSP reported to King County, although there is an electronic connect, much of the current data is not loaded electronically and requires manual entry. Ms. Miner stated WSP was not "alarmed" in any way and happy to help in this mitigation until the two systems are linked.

Chief Justice Fairhurst asked where the responsibility lies once WSP has received the information during the lag. Would it be WSP's issue and not the courts if something is not entered and someone gets hurt? Ms. Miner replied the way the reviews go there are certain rules around who gets to see certain things. Arrests are reported to WSP, and then the next thing they get is resolution of a case. It is very challenging at times to match an arrest with the resolution of a case. Thus, that is why there is the need for Process Control Numbers (PCN's). Consequently, there is a period of time when a case is assumed to be in process, but does not have a resolution, but some users are unable to see this. Those users will not be able to see the information until the case is finished and will not be able to see the insider information someone involved with the case would see. For instance, if someone is charged with something serious but the case has not been resolved, then those able to see that information would include police, jails and juvenile corrections. Ms. Miner stated her Clerk's office receives a lot of inquiries on those kind of cases, specifically when they can see the case is existing but are unable to see a resolution. This type of exchange was described by Ms. Miner as normal where they or the prosecutor will be contacted, as one cannot always tell if a case was filed—filed in KCDC, filed in King County Superior Court or Seattle Municipal Court. For those doing gun background checks, King County is the receiving entity for those inquiries. King County then attempts to track down the information and respond if there are charges or not, charged in Seattle Municipal Court and so on. This process ensures inquiring parties receive the information whether it is still in process or resolved. Furthermore, they would still be able to receive information on cases without a PCN number and not flagged in the system. In response to Ms. Miner's reply, Chief Justice Fairhurst clarified that one should see what WSP has and it would behoove them to see what King County has in addition to checking the state system.

Mr. Kumar Yajamanam advised that at the moment the mitigation is the best case scenario. A lot of the things being rolled out are new, such as the EDR, eCourt, and the conversions, so a big factor to keep in mind is the data quality will be unknown for an amount of time. Data coming into the EDR will have gone through the conversion paths, however, the quality of that data is still going to be unknown for a period of time. Chief Justice Fairhurst asked if this was due to not having enough time for testing. Mr. Yajamanam responded it was primarily due to the testing, and also there have been bugs to fix. In addition, there are phases on each side of the projects that build on the other and all factor into the delays.

Ms. Powell spoke to the communication needed during the rollout and asked Ms. Miner if they would be ready for a flood of phone calls on the portal, and how is King County preparing for the front end of the project? Ms. Miner explained that is part of the communication plan. Currently, there is a communication professional working with them and they have a robust plan to disseminate information,

DRAFT

including on King County Clerk's portal, KCDC's portal, as well as a place to ask questions on the website with an evolving Q & A section. It will not be static but organic as information is changing all the time. There will also be a separate place for court employees to access information and receive help. Mr. Fred Jarrett stated one of the challenges their team has faced is communication. He stated they have done a good job over the last few months in starting to bring the communication plan together. Ms. Miner replied KCDC, KCCO and AOC have been working very hard together for the past three years. Just like any project there are disruptions, setbacks with ups and downs, but everyone has worked very hard to bring all the pieces together.

Ms. Miner stated it is pretty likely KCCO will be changing their January 2nd go-live date. While KCCO does not know what it will be, their concern is the data migration and confidence in the migration. KCCO will be meeting with their vendor the Tuesday following the JISC meeting, and if there is not an increase in activity then it is more likely than not the January 2nd go-live date will be pushed back. Chief Justice Fairhurst commented that she and Mr. Jarrett have regular meetings as project executive sponsors, and stated it was very helpful for Ms. Miner to share that those discussions are taking place, and the Committee will wait to hear what the result is. While AOC is continuing to work on the project, some of their mitigations will necessarily have to change if KCCO's go-live date is moved from January 2nd to a date in the future, and having that information is appreciated. Chief Justice Fairhurst thanked AOC for taking on the project and expressed how excited she will be once the EDE is in place due to the benefits to all parties involved.

Ms. Diseth asked Ms. Miner if the decision on keeping or moving the January 2nd go-live date for KCCO would be made at the EDE Project Steering Committee meeting on Friday. Ms. Miner said she hoped that would be the case but it would also be dependent on communication with the vendor. Mr. Jarrett and Chief Justice Fairhurst expressed their appreciation for the teamwork of all the parties involved, and wanted to recognize this as a major milestone in the project.

CIO Report

Superior Court Case Management System (SC-CMS) Project

The SC-CMS Project team had another successful Go-Live (Event 6) on October 29th with seven more counties (Clallam, Island, Jefferson, Kitsap, San Juan, Skagit, and Whatcom) now live on Odyssey. The project team and Odyssey courts ride-along staff were dispersed to those counties for two weeks to provide on-site support. One observation worth noting is that the counties whose Clerks, Court Administrators, and staff were fully engaged in preparing for the new system long before their actual implementations were the most successful. Attitude and preparation makes a world of difference in the success of adapting to their new case management system.

This implementation is noteworthy because it was the largest implementation to date in regard to total user count (211 court users). Three counties chose to retain their current DMS systems (Clallam, Jefferson, and San Juan). The "Link-Only" option for document management has now been implemented with all three different DMS vendors (Liberty, OnBase, and LaserFiche). Five counties are now using the "Link-Only" option.

The project team is now meeting with the Event 7 counties to begin planning for their implementations. The team is also continuing discussions with Spokane County to address their implementation needs.

DOL Drives Project

As reported at the last JISC meeting, the Department of Licensing (DOL) is replacing their Driver's Record System on September 4, 2018. Their project is known as DRIVES. When DOL's new system is implemented, the Abstract of Driving Record (ADR) will no longer display in DISCIS, and batch printing of ADRs will no longer be available. AOC sent out the first communication (a.k.a. Release Note) to court users on October 31st explaining the upcoming changes so that the courts have time to assess the changes that they may need to make to their current business processes.

AOC has completed design workshops with DOL and the initial testing of the five DOL services from DOL. We have completed high-level internal designs. Development on the Proof of Concept for the AOC legacy web services (new version of the ADR) will begin this month (December). The same information will be available in the new version.

The bulk of the development work is in DISCIS. Development on JABS and JCS will be deferred until the EDE changes are completed. Changes to Odyssey will be minimal. Testing with DOL is scheduled to begin in March 2018.

Chief Justice Fairhurst commented that during the last BJA meeting both Mr. Frank Maiocco and Ms. Barb Christiansen expressed how well the SC-CMS rollout was conducted in their county. They both wished to express their gratitude to AOC. In addition, Ms. Christiansen sent a list of observations and suggestions going forward which AOC is currently reviewing. Mr. Maiocco added he previously had some growing concerns about how well resourced the go-live event was and how it was going to look and feel. Mr. Maiocco stated he felt it went far better than he would have anticipated with the support both AOC and Tyler provided during his go-live event and the two weeks following, exceeded his expectations. He felt the staff were highly skilled and experts on all pieces of the technology. The ride-along staff were high-quality, very approachable, and worked well with the judges in bringing Judge Edition on board. While they are still learning the various features that increase their efficiency, in his opinion it was a very good start.

Data Dissemination Committee Report (DDC)

Judge Leach reported on the Data Dissemination Committee (DDC). Judge Leach stated the Committee considered a data request fee increase presented by Mr. Radwan. This would be for requests to the Data Warehouse staff and to Washington State Center for Court Research (WSCCR). Mr. Radwan requested the Committee to approve an increase from $85 to $129 as the minimum charge for request to the Data Warehouse, which was unanimously approved. Mr. Radwan also advised the DDC the fee for requests to WSCCR will increase to $131, with the difference between the two reflecting the wages paid to the two staff.

In addition, the DDC received a report on the status of expunged cases displaying in Odyssey. There is inadequate staff at the time but the DDC will receive another report when the Committee meets on March 2nd. The DDC has offered to provide training to the Superior Court Judges Association (SCJA)

the District and Municipal Court Judges Association (DMCJA) on when it is appropriate to expunge cases. The offer was to provide a speaker at the spring conference, with the association responding it would be a more appropriate topic at the fall conference. This information has been communicated to Justice Stephens, the chair of the fall conference.

The DDC also received a report concerning access to JIS printing and the status of the current work being done. Another report was provided to the Committee showing no work has been done on a bail bond recovery agent's request for access that was lost due to information in JIS-Link. Currently, there has not been staff to work on this due to workload but another update is expected on March 2nd.

Lastly, Judge Leach reported on a Violence Against Women's Act workgroup responding to a request from Legal Voice. The workgroup met and agreed the request Legal Voice made was beyond the authority of the DDC and the JISC. Judge Leach reported he is preparing a report, which he will present to the JISC. His report will request the JISC forward the report to the Supreme Court so they can take whatever action they deem necessary. This is the process is being followed as the Supreme Court is the only entity that has the authority to respond to Legal Voice's request.

Chief Justice Fairhurst requested Judge Leach expound on what the issues are involving JIS printing. Judge Leach replied that some people are accessing JIS-Link to print calendars and other information. Some of the printing is done appropriately and some is being done inappropriately. Work is being done to limit the access to the calendars as some of the people printing them have the ability to modify the calendars. The proposed solution is to give them the ability to download the calendar and print it locally rather than access it and print it directly from JIS-Link. Recently the AOC found, during an AOC audit, one jurisdiction was letting individuals do things they were not supposed to be doing, including letting unauthorized persons gain access. The AOC audit disclosed this and reinforces the need for auditing use of the system. In addition, as a result of the audit, AOC was made aware of practices it did not know were occurring. Fellow DDC member Judge G. Scott Marinella added the DDC discussed the need to rework some of the agreements in place for users involving confidentiality. This could entail looking at whether each and every user needed the restricted use document and not doing it en masse. It was reported the DDC will be looking into this before their next meeting. Judge Leach stated that currently the contracts AOC has with different users requires the agency itself to represent that all have been made aware of proper procedure, but do not require individually signed confidentiality agreements from the each user. Doing this would give a two-tier protection involving confidentiality.

Mr. Sart Rowe, from the Access to Justice Board (ATJ), asked for clarification concerning the request by Legal Voice. He asked if the request was completely out of scope for the DDC and JISC, making the Supreme Court the only entity that could respond to the request. Judge Leach responded affirmatively, as it would require internet information to be accessible in a manner that is inconsistent with some of the General Rules without modification. As the Supreme Court is the only entity able to modify those rules, the request will be forwarded to them. Judge Leach further expounded that Legal Voice had requested that certain data not be available on the internet, however that is inconsistent with GR 13. Discussion was held on the preparation and the proper venue for requests such as these.

Board for Judicial Administration Report (BJA)

DRAFT

Chief Justice Fairhurst turned the Committee's attention to the BJA minutes in the JISC packet. The BJA and JISC reciprocally provide the minutes of their meetings so both committees are aware of the other's activities. Chief Justice Fairhurst stated she would be happy to answer any questions JISC members have.

Adjournment

Chief Justice Fairhurst reminded the Committee the next meeting will be taking place on March 2, 2018 and declared the meeting adjourned at 12:27pm.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be March 2, 2017, at the AOC SeaTac Facility from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Action Items

	Action Items	Owner	Status

DRAFT