JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE

April 27, 2018
10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.
AOC Office, SeaTac WA

Minutes

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

Members Absent:
Judge Jeanette Dalton

AOC Staff Present:
Mr. Kevin Ammons - Phone
Ms. Tammy Anderson - Phone
Ms. Vicky Cullinane
Ms. Vonnie Diseth
Mr. Brian Elvin
Mr. Mike Keeling
Ms. Keturah Knutson - Phone
Mr. Dirk Marler
Mr. Ramsey Radwan
Mr. Kumar Yajamanam - Phone

Guests Present:
Mr. Mark Allen
Ms. Sonya Kraski
Ms. Linda Myhre-Enlow
Mr. Othniel Palomino
Mr. Sart Rowe – Phone
Ms. Tawni Sharp
Mr. Scott Weber – Phone

DRAFT

Call to Order

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

March 3, 2017 Meeting Minutes

Chief Justice Fairhurst asked if there were any changes to be made to the March 3, 2017 meeting minutes. Hearing none, Chief Justice Fairhurst deemed the minutes approved.

IT Governance Update

Ms. Cullinane presented the update on the IT Governance (ITG) process and decision point. Ms. Cullinane alerted the committee that it has been approximately five years since the committee has been asked to approve an ITG request, so some newer committee members may not be familiar with the process. As such, Ms. Cullinane provided background information on ITG requests and the approval process. The ITG process was created to have a formal structure for the decisions regarding monies and staff time spent on IT projects. With approval of the JISC, stakeholders were brought together from the court community to develop the process. The process is tracked and transparent through the Inside Courts website, including a mirror website on the public Washington Courts website. Ms. Cullinane directed the committee to the presentation for the location on where to find the ITG homepage on the Courts website. From the homepage, people can input ITG requests and view their request's status, in addition to viewing any other ITG request that has been submitted. Ms. Cullinane explained the various ways to view ITG requests organized by endorsing group, court level user group (CLUG), and by status.

Ms. Cullinane gave a brief overview of how the ITG process works, stating that anyone is able to put in an ITG request. Someone from the court community is able to go directly to the ITG website and click on 'Initiate a Request,' which brings up a fillable form to initiate the request. The person filling out the request determines who the most appropriate endorsing group is, as there are endorsing groups representing each of the court community associations, as well as sub-committees of the JISC (e.g., the Codes Committee). Once a request goes to the endorsing group, the members discuss and decide if it is a good idea. If they think it is a good request, they move it on to the next step, which is analysis. Historically, analysis has resided only at AOC. However, if the request is in relation to an off-the-shelf product, the analysis process will have to include the vendor as well. Once the analysis is complete, it goes back to the endorsing group. Once it knows the estimated cost of the request, the endorsing group evaluates the request in relation to the cost. If the endorsing group still approves of the request, they then confirm the endorsement and it proceeds to the CLUGs.

Ms. Cullinane directed the committee to the IT Governance Process Flow (page 8 of the presentation). The CLUGs are representatives from each of the associations at that court level. Once the endorsed request has been presented before a specific CLUG, they have to agree as a group that it is a good idea and prioritize it on their specific list (something each group has). Some of the requests on the lists rise to the level of the JISC while others do not. Whether it rises to the level of the JISC or not is governed by the decision matrix in the presentation. The project classifications fall under one of three categories: Enhancements, New Projects, and Replacement. Each category has a dollar-level threshold for approvals, starting with the lowest level approval of the AOC CIO, then the State Court Administrator, and finally, at the highest dollar amount, the JISC. (Specific dollar amounts can be seen in the ITG Budget Process Presentation.)

Ms. Cullinane stated that there are three stages the committee will need to go through in order to make an official decision. Ms. Cullinane continued explaining how the ITG process fits into the budgeting process, stating that anything that is large enough to go into a budget request is large enough to be taken to the JISC. Ms. Cullinane pointed out that the request before the committee today is large enough that it needs to be approved by the JISC and needs to be included in a budget request. The way the process works is a request must make its way through the ITG process, must then be approved by the JISC, and then must be included in the next budget decision package. The amount included in the budget request is derived from the analysis step (as shown in Step 3 on page 12 of the presentation).

For the current request, there is a two-step process the committee needs to complete. First, approval is needed of ITG request 252 Appellate Electronic Court Records. If approved, then step two is to place it on the priority list. Ms. Cullinane directed the committee to the copy of the request, the analysis and the AC-ECMS Strategic Plan, which was attached to the request.

Chief Justice Fairhurst asked if there were any questions from the committee. Ms. Powell stated what she was hearing was the first step is the ITG request, and the second step is the budget request, or do they happen at the same time? Ms. Cullinane replied, normally the request would make its way through the ITG process and then be put into the budget request. However, in this case both are on the same agenda, so today will be a three step process: to approve the request, prioritize it for ITG purposes (solely for the purpose of prioritization, not necessarily expending money at this time), and the third

DRAFT

step will be to prioritize it for budgetary purposes. Normally, this would be done sequentially, but not necessarily the same meeting. Chief Justice Fairhurst clarified this would presume the committee worked through all the steps, but if not, then it would not all be done in the same meeting. Ms. Miner stated it was just a coincidence that the budget requests were coming to the committee on the same day as the committee is approving a new request, and additionally a new request could come in at any JISC meeting. Judge Leach further expounded that the reason the committee is seeing multiple requests at the same time is due to where we are in the budget cycle. If all of the issues were not brought before the JISC now, then it would require waiting until the next budget cycle or at least the Legislative session.

With no other questions or comments, Judge Leach made a motion to approve ITG Request 252. Chief Justice Fairhurst clarified for the committee that this is the approval of the request only, not the prioritization or budget approval.

Motion: Judge J. Robert Leach

I move for the approval of ITG Request 252.

Second: Mr. Rich Johnson

Voting in Favor: Chief Justice Mary Fairhurst (Chair), Mr. Larry Barker, Ms. Lynne Campeau, Ms. Callie Dietz, Judge John Hart, Mr. Rich Johnson, Judge J. Robert Leach, Mr. Frank Maiocco, Judge G. Scott Marinella, Ms. Barb Miner, Chief Brad Moericke, Ms. Brooke Powell, Ms. Paulette Revoir, Judge David Svaren, Mr. Bob Taylor, Mr. Jon Tunheim

Opposed: None

Absent: Judge Jeanette Dalton

The motion was passed as moved.

With the motion passed, Ms. Cullinane advised the committee that the next step is prioritization. Ms. Cullinane turned the committee's attention to the JISC IT Governance Priorities tab in the packet. While the priorities list has been in each JISC packet, the last time the committee prioritized requests was in 2012. As a review, Ms. Cullinane noted the April 2018 ITG Status Report in the last tab of the packet shows the list of priorities as the committee would have seen it last. The list shows the #1 and #3 requests are currently active and in progress, which means they cannot be re-prioritized, according to the JISC's ITG Policy. Request #2 is the Appellate Court ECMS, for which the original project scope has been completed; as such it will be taken off the priorities list. The list also shows active or authorized requests that are not currently being worked on, in addition to withdrawn or closed requests for various reasons. Drawing the committee's attention back to tab two, Ms. Cullinane advised the committee that it is now their duty to prioritize the new ITG 252 request in relation to requests already on the list. However, the only competing priorities will be ITG 27 and ITG 62, as they are the only other requests that have been authorized but not started. Ms. Cullinane alerted the committee the supporting materials for those requests are contained in the JISC packet.

Ms. Cullinane offered to do a brief explanation of the competing requests, and Chief Justice Fairhurst asked the committee's preference. Ms. Miner interjected concerning ITG 27, and asked if the request was still relevant with Seattle Municipal Court moving to a new system and connecting to the Enterprise Data Repository (EDR). Ms. Cullinane responded yes. The request itself is for the data exchange, not

DRAFT

the methodology. While the methodology would be different now from how it was analyzed in the supporting material, because now it would use the EDR, the substance of a data exchange is still valid. This would not have been the case if Seattle Municipal Court had joined the statewide rollout, which they recently decided not to do. Ms. Diseth added in one of AOC's 2019-2021 budget requests they will be asking for two new connections to the EDR. The first would be Odyssey and the second is another court system which could be Seattle Municipal Court or Pierce County Superior Court. Ms. Diseth stated that she had spoken with Seattle Municipal Court recently, and it is their intent to be ready to connect by that time. Furthermore, Ms. Cullinane stated when the CLJ CLUG met, they reviewed all requests and felt it was important to keep this request on the list as it had been made many years ago, and it is important to the limited jurisdiction courts to share information at a greater level than is currently received from Seattle Municipal Court. Therefore, the CLJ CLUG felt that ITG 27 needs to be kept on the priority list, as it is an important request to courts of limited jurisdiction.

Ms. Cullinane gave a brief history on the ITG 62 Automate Courts DCXT Table Entries. She explained how it dealt with transferring the responsibility of updating the BARS codes each time there is a law change that effects the fraction split, from the local court to AOC. The original request was for both superior and CLJ courts. However, since superior courts will almost all soon be on Odyssey, and in Odyssey the function must be done by AOC, the request is now only relevant for CLJ courts. There is still a need for this and CLJ courts have reiterated the need many times. Ms. Campeau added it is a very high priority for their court level. It is a considerable amount of work, and most people are not able to see how tedious the work actually is unless they have done the work themselves. Ms. Campeau stated it is fraught with errors, and a lot of rural courts do not have the knowledge or expertise to even start the process, with many courts making grave errors, which results in the JIS losing money.

Another question was posed as to whether this is a process that the committee will have to go through every time a request comes in. Ms. Cullinane responded that every time there is an ITG request that is large enough to need to come before the JISC for the final decision on whether it should be done or not, then yes. It is a two-step process. Approve and then prioritize. However, just because it is on the list does not mean it is done tomorrow or next year. This is not about the timing, but about the business importance. The JISC decides where this request falls as it relates to business importance to the courts. That is what this part of the decision is about. Chief Justice Fairhurst followed up, stating that once money is committed and a project is underway, it cannot get reprioritized and it is ongoing. Any projects that are approved but not started are all subject to reprioritization. Chief Justice Fairhurst reminded the committee one of the reasons the JISC has not seen ITG requests in a number of years is due to the number of large projects already in play. Smaller requests come in at the lower level and are approved by Ms. Dietz and Ms. Diseth, but it has been a while since large-scale projects have reached the approval level of the JISC.

Discussion was held on the effect of approved projects that have not begun when new requests are approved. During the course of discussion, Ms. Diseth pointed out that the members in attendance are indeed advocates for their respective user group requests. She also explained that sometimes the technical skill required to do the work affects the order in which requests are completed, depending on what it is and what technical skill is needed. For example, a project identified as #5 may start ahead of a project identified as #3. This could be solely for the reason that the resources needed for #3 are being currently used elsewhere. Meanwhile, the technical expertise and resources for #5 may be available and are not being used on another project. Mr. Johnson agreed with Ms. Diseth and stated that he looks at the JISC as a representative body. Members are here to represent the requests that have been prioritized for each member's specific court level. It would be incumbent on him to come and advocate for appellate issues and others for their specific areas as part of their role on the JISC. Concerning prioritization, Mr. Johnson stated he remembered the discussion on priority #4. He stated he agreed with Ms. Campeau's comments and believed it should go forward. He stated the appellate

DRAFT

representatives did not anticipate bumping anyone's priorities and he is not advocating for the appellate request to be placed above the CLJ-CMS or SC-CMS project, or even #3 and #4 if they are timely and can be done. He stated that the appellate representatives just want to be on the list of priorities at this time. Mr. Taylor asked for clarification concerning requests that relate to a project that is complete, and where the money comes from, and if an ITG requests are needed for those. Ms. Diseth responded that ongoing maintenance is a completely different subject and does not come into play with ITG requests. Chief Justice Fairhurst clarified further that a project which has been implemented has to be maintained. If a new request comes in that could arguably be said to be an enhancement or different from maintenance, then it starts to become a gray area. There are other projects waiting their turn or looking to move forward. There could be room for discussion if a group is not satisfied with what AOC considers maintenance, then it might need to come back to the JISC for a discussion on how it moves forward. Chief Justice Fairhurst cautioned on how the expectations of AOC ongoing support could actually be new or additional features beyond the original scope of an approved project.

Ms. Cullinane advised the committee the next step was to prioritize the new request, ITG 252, At the same time, the reprioritize the existing requests that are not in progress, specifically ITG requests 27 and 62 (or Priorities #3 and #4 respectively). After further discussion on the JISC IT Governance Priorities list, Judge Leach presented a motion concerning the prioritization of the ITG requests.

Motion: Judge J. Robert Leach

I move to flip the positions of ITG 27 and 62, and add ITG 252 as #5 on the JISC ITG Priorities list.

Second: Judge Svaren

Discussion was held after Judge Svaren seconded the motion. Ms. Miner stated ITG 27 Priority #3 (Expanded Seattle Municipal Court Case Data Transfer) is not currently timely, with her belief that it does not need to be worked on for a period of three to four years. Ms. Diseth added it would also depend on funding being received in a decision package. Discussion was held on whether the work done in ITG 27 was needed for the EDE project, to which the answer was no.

A friendly amendment was proffered with agreement from Judge Leach and Judge Svaren, amending the priorities as reflected below:

Priority 3 – ITG 62, Priority 4 – ITG 252, Priority 5 – ITG 27

Voting in Favor: Chief Justice Mary Fairhurst, Chair, Mr. Larry Barker, Ms. Lynne Campeau, Ms. Callie Dietz, Judge John Hart, Mr. Rich Johnson, Judge J. Robert Leach, Mr. Frank Maiocco, Judge G. Scott Marinella, Ms. Barb Miner, Chief Brad Moericke, Ms. Brooke Powell, Ms. Paulette Revoir, Judge David Svaren, Mr. Bob Taylor, Mr. Jon Tunheim

Opposed: None

Absent: Judge Jeanette Dalton

The motion was passed as amended.

JIS Budget Update

DRAFT

Mr. Ramsey Radwan reported on the 17-19 budget, using the green sheet which is a snapshot of expenditures and projections to-date. Mr. Radwan stated that he will be changing the title of one of the columns as there have been questions concerning the amounts when the numbers change. Ms. Campeau stated, looking at the last meeting's budget report, the CLJ-CMS project showed approximately $4.5 million expended, however, the current green sheet reflects only $1.8 million expended. She asked for clarification. Mr. Radwan stated that is what he meant about changes to the column titles. The column needs to be changed to "forecast expenditures." Prior to the staffing decisions that were made, the forecast CLJ-CMS staffing expenditures went through June 30, 2019. This had the effect of making the estimated expenditures higher. When the decision was made to reduce staffing on CLJ-CMS, those expenditures went down. The figure on this report shows actual expenditures to-date, the same as at the previous JISC, plus a month's worth. However, the projected expenditures today are much less because of the reduced staff. It was asked if these are projected expenditures and not actual expenditures. Mr. Radwan replied it includes actual and projected. Chief Justice Fairhurst asked for clarification as to which column is which. Mr. Radwan explained the middle column, Expended, is actual plus forecasted expenditures and is the column which will received the title change. It was clarified that the numbers on the green sheet are current through June 30, 2019.

Mr. Radwan proceeded to report on the Expedited Data Exchange (EDE), stating that the entire budget of $4.33 million will be expended between July 1, 2017 and June 30, 2019. SC-CMS will more than likely expend the full $12 million, but is currently showing $10.7 million expended due to Mr. Radwan holding off on some projections. SC-CMS funds not expended will go back into the JIS account, as usual. Reporting on the CLJ-CMS project, Mr. Radwan said the projected expenditures have changed substantially (as stated previously). Mr. Radwan reported the CLJ-CMS project had an initial budget of $10 million for the 29-30 projected staff, vendor contract estimates, QA contract estimates, assistant AG costs, travel costs, as well as a number of other costs. Those projected costs have been stripped out due to the currently delay in the project. Mr. Radwan alerted the committee that he did not know when the project would be at a point where he would be able to forecast those expenditures. Mr. Radwan stated that generally, everything other than expenditures to-date through March 31, 2018, plus staff costs, are represented in the $1.8 million, as depicted on the green sheet today. Mr. Radwan cautioned the committee that did not mean the money was gone. It just has not been forecast yet because he does not know when that will occur. The numbers do not include a vendor, statewide travel, AG costs, etc. He is waiting for accurate information to be able to forecast accurate numbers.

Mr. Radwan was asked how does what he just covered relate to the $14 million requested. Mr. Radwan replied that the $14 million dollars will be for the 2019-2021 biennial budget request. It is being requested with the assumption that things will not remain stagnant but will pick up. Currently, there are unknowns between now and June 30, 2019. Those costs are not known, other than the staffing costs for existing staff. When the decision package was developed, the assumption was that AOC will start at the existing staffing levels, increase those staffing levels, and include vendor costs, AG costs, QA costs, travel costs, and others. Ms. Miner asked if AOC would then add the unspent $8 million plus the $14 million and that is what AOC will have available for the project? Mr. Radwan replied, that is not the case. He reminded the committee that every dollar not spent at the end of a biennium goes back into the JIS account.

DRAFT

Mr. Radwan stated that he is currently working on fund balances. This looks toward the future at projected "normal" revenues and makes an assumption they will be X amount of dollars. If he thinks revenue will increase, he will add a factor for that and then add a factor for fund balance. The amounts of unspent funds have an impact on the fund balance. Due to it being a proprietary account, unlike the General Fund, different accounting principles need to be applied, making Mr. Radwan hesitant to speak to the fund balance at the moment. Judge Leach asked Mr. Radwan if the $8 million dollars is not spent for the CLJ project, is that dollar amount included in the $14 million being requested. Mr. Radwan replied that the $14.5 million being requested is the estimated expenditures that AOC projects they will spend on the CLJ-CMS project for the 19-21 biennium. The $8 million unexpended monies are solely what AOC will not spend in the 17-19 biennium, and should not be added together to calculate expenditure levels. Judge Leach stated that the committee is trying to figure out if they will have enough money to pay for the CLJ Project in the next biennium. Does that mean the project needs roughly $6 million in new money, as there is already $8 million in the account that could be looked to for a total of $14 million, or should that calculation be ignored? Mr. Radwan alerted the committee that they should ignore that, and he would speak to total resources in the account momentarily.

Ms. Campeau expressed her confusion as she stated CLJ courts and the District and Municipal Court Judges Association (DMCJA) were told that the money would be preserved for the project. Mr. Radwan replied that it is preserved, and it goes back into the JIS account. However, it is not dollar-for-dollar because of the accounting complexities of the JIS account itself. An example of this is when equipment is bought, AOC has to depreciate it. Mr. Radwan stated that he is not able to say off the top of his head what the depreciation expense for the 17-19 biennium will do to impact that. Furthermore, it is not that the monies are going somewhere else. It is that there are generally accepted accounting principles that must be applied to those dollars. These impact the amount available in the account as a whole, not just the $8 million. Further clarifying, he stated that whatever is left goes back into the account and will be adjusted due to generally accepted accounting principles for the entire account.

Chief Justice Fairhurst asked if the following analogy is correct. Having been allocated in this biennium, it does not in essence become a dedicated account that sticks with CLJ-CMS. It just returns to the JIS account and CLJ-CMS has priority going forward and would get the money. They are not now up to $22 million but still only need the forecasted $14 million, and that is still what the project would receive. Chief Justice Fairhurst stated she felt this is where there was some confusion in the past when some thought they had SC-CMS money and it was not spent. Therefore, some thought the pot contained the new money plus what was had before and not spent. However, this is not the case. A project gets what it needs and if it is not needed now, everything will be done so the monies are in the fund so when they are needed. Chief Justice Fairhurst clarified that this would be subject to the legislature sweeping, or the legislature imposing unexpected projects, etc. The $8 million not spent now is not dedicated to CLJ-CMS, but it is not being used for other things; it will just be in the account. Whatever CLJ-CMS can use and do, which is projected to be $14 million for the next biennium—that is what will be. Mr. Radwan and the committee agreed, and stated they comprehended the explanation given by Chief Justice Fairhurst. Discussion was held, led by Ms. Miner on the distinction in county-based projects versus state-based projects. County-based projects get a set amount of money and are able to keep the money from year to year. This enables them to enter contracts with some vendors, as they know the monies will always be there.

DRAFT

Another point, Mr. Radwan stated, is that the legislature zeros out every information technology project at the end of each biennium, but not ongoing maintenance. This is why AOC is required to always request the monies needed for projects each biennium. Once a project is underway, the expectation is the legislature will continue to fund it. One challenge for AOC is that those who do not normally contract with the state do not understand that projects do not have a dedicated amount for the entire project.

Mr. Radwan continued, stating that prior to discussing the 19-21 budget request, he wanted to touch on three things—the graph in the handout, the current budget, and cost savings with potential revenue—in order to put some context before getting to the list and prioritizing it. Mr. Radwan drew the committee's attention to the graph showing that traffic infractions (filed by year) have gone down 33% since 2009. These are actual filings being submitted by law enforcement. Looking into these numbers, AOC has seen this is a pattern that is happening nationally, whether it is traffic infractions or civil filings, generally these are all on the downward trend. In 2017, Washington State Patrol (WSP) had a 20% vacancy rate, meaning 117 troopers were not on the road. This invariably impacts the number of infractions being given. In addition, in the past WSP leadership has emphasized safety. This includes working on getting people to slow down and not use their cell phones while driving. More recently, WSP has had a different emphasis, and that impacts the number of filings issued. Mr. Radwan stated it is his opinion the WSP vacancies and an emphasis on things other than writing traffic infractions is having an impact on filings. The point to take away is filings are down 33%, which is a substantial amount. Looking at the top ten courts and looking at the filings in those courts from 2009-2017 shows a reduction of approximately $3 million dollars. Chief Justice Fairhurst asked why while fewer infractions have been filed, the overall collection appears to be close to the same. Chief Justice Fairhurst asked if this is due to an increase in the amounts of the infractions. Mr. Radwan replied that was correct. Chief Justice Fairhurst what it would be like if there were a higher number of infractions with the increase in the infraction amounts? Mr. Radwan stated that if that were the case, AOC could easily add items to the priority list. Judge Leach pointed out that the numbers were not adjusted for inflation, so there is an inflationary loss as well.

Next Mr. Radwan pointed to the JIS revenue, not including fund balance, which is about $45 million. Just to keep the lights on today, AOC will expend 73% of biennial revenue. This does not include new projects, but does include items such as the mainframe, Mr. Mike Keeling's group (Applications and Operations), Mr. Dennis Longnecker's group (Infrastructure), in addition to all groups to maintain ongoing operations, which consumes 73% of JIS revenue. In the budget request, there are a couple of items that will increase ongoing costs. If those costs are added into Mr. Radwan's analysis, the 73% is raised to around 84%. Mr. Radwan stressed that this is a large chunk taken out of revenue for maintenance with no new items added.

Discussion continued on fund balance levels in relation to one-time projects. Mr. Johnson stated that this is a critical mass for the committee, especially the amount needed to keep the lights on. As he looked at the requests the committee will be considering, he asked how much of this is new people, how many of the people that were on SCOMIS are now over working in Odyssey, and how does that impact the costs to keep the lights on? He stated that if seventy-five percent of income is used to pay the rent, then AOC probably has too expensive of a house. Mr. Johnson asked if those things have been looked into—the relationship for the cost to keep the lights on versus new staff being brought in. He added that when those are added together there is not enough money. Mr. Radwan indicated that

DRAFT

those questions would be addressed momentarily when he goes through the budget requests. Judge Leach asked if Mr. Radwan had an impression as to whether the maintenance costs are increasing at a greater rate than revenue, and will there be a point when maintenance costs exceed revenue. Mr. Radwan replied he would look into that and get back to the committee. Mr. Radwan said it could be possible to get to that point with infraction revenue decreasing, pressure from House Bill 1783 (Legal Financial Obligations), and there will more than likely be other bills that impact revenues as well.

Moving on to cost savings, the committee needs to consider them for the future. The first item in that area is external equipment replacement. This was voted on several years ago by the JISC, and uses JIS account funds to purchase laptops, desktops, printers, and other small equipment. The equipment purchases are on a five-year cycle; every fifth year courts and county clerks receive new equipment. While not as expensive as it used to be, Mr. Radwan stated that AOC expends approximately $1-$2 million per biennium on these purchases. Mr. Radwan is working with Infrastructure staff to look at the impacts of moving to a seven-year cycle. Infrastructure does not see any issues with extending the use of current laptops or desktops an additional two years. Mr. Radwan stated that he would be bringing this back to the next JISC meeting for a decision on a six- or seven-year equipment replacement cycle. This would impact the amount of funds requested in the current cycle by approximately $1.6 million.

Another cost saving measure Mr. Radwan brought up to the committee was whether AOC should fund equipment replacement for non-JIS and Odyssey courts. After the five-year cycle was agreed to by the committee around 2007-2009, the JISC equalized the amount of equipment being purchased through equipment replacement for the superior courts and limited jurisdiction courts. At that time, Seattle Municipal was added in as well. Mr. Radwan stated he believes the committee needs to consider not buying equipment for those courts that are not participating in the new case management systems in superior courts and courts of limited jurisdiction. Mr. Radwan stated he believed the JISC's original equipment replacement decision was based on the fact that there were no computers on desks when DISCIS and SCOMIS came out, leading to the need to purchase them. Now computers are ubiquitous, therefore the enticement to have courts use the system has diminished and the cost is substantial. This will not be a decision for today, but something to consider for the future.

The third cost saving measure is about the $1.9 million costs associated with internal equipment replacement. There is an option to use certificates of participation to cover approximately $1.6 million of the costs. Mr. Radwan explained that the certificates are a financing instrument run through the State Treasurer's Office. Currently, the financing is only available for hardware. How it works is that AOC would give the State Treasurer the list of internal equipment for approval. Then after approval from the State Treasurer, AOC is would be able to buy the equipment and be reimbursed by the State Treasurer. Repayment is made by easy semi-annual payments back to the Treasurer. Mr. Radwan explained that this a low down payment, low-interest finance option that has been done before. If this is something the JISC would approve, it would reduce AOC's cash flow expenditure for the 19-21 biennium by $1 million. This would have the effect of having a healthier current cash flow while spreading out the $1.9 million with a small amount of interest. Mr. Radwan summed up the three cost saving features and reiterated that he is working on wedging the level of requests and ongoing operations into a pretty small revenue and fund balance equation.

DRAFT

Next, Mr. Radwan advised the committee that there are around $7 million in requests he feels have a good chance of being pushed into State General Fund requests. This is not a cost reduction, but an alternative financing methodology where AOC asks the legislature to fund three projects from the General Fund. Mr. Radwan reminded the committee the last legislative session, AOC was given $2.65 million from the General Fund to help balance the account. The legislature is aware that the account revenue is shrinking and that it has taken $30 million out of the Fund over the last twelve years or so. In addition, they are aware that we have successfully implemented a statewide case management system, which no executive or legislative branch has done in a number of years. While a couple of the requests on the list may be moved to General Fund, they still need to be prioritized in the event the legislature does not move them to General Fund. Then the JISC will know all of the priorities. One minor complication in switching some requests from the JIS account to the General Fund is that it moves the request, to an extent, from the JISC into the Board for Judicial Administration (BJA) prioritization process. At that point, those requests are competing internally with other state general fund priorities. If the JISC moves some requests from JIS to General Fund, then they would be presented to the BJA and acted upon by the BJA. Mr. Radwan advised it has been his experience that the BJA and Supreme Court have been very supportive and hands-off, so he does not see an issue with that at this time. Mr. Radwan stated he believed that if the JISC moves forward with some of the ideas he laid out, then AOC would be closer to $2.5 million in the red rather than the current $6 million, bringing the fund many steps closer to being balanced. However, these are rough estimates and should not be taken as set in stone.

Mr. Radwan then drew the committee's attention to the priorities list, beginning with Odyssey continuing operations support and Odyssey maintenance (second page). Mr. Radwan indicated these requests are mandatory in nature. Odyssey maintenance is the cost AOC has to pay to keep Odyssey turned on. These costs include licensing and maintenance costs. Odyssey continuing operations support includes eight FTEs—partial funding for which AOC received in 2016—that were permanent FTEs in the budget. However, the legislature did not fully fund those FTEs; therefore, this request is about a quarter of the cost of the eight FTEs for two years. Mr. Radwan summed up these two requests as mandatory. These are existing staff that were approved by the legislature as permanent, but were not fully funded.

Returning to the first page, Mr. Radwan went through the list of priorities, in no particular order. For the record the priorities were listed as:

- CLJ-CMS – this would include a staggered hiring of FTEs, vendor costs, attorney costs, travel, equipment, etc.
- AC-ECMS – this request is for Phase 2, to make the system fully electronic, with 4 FTEs that will eventually go to zero. This request can be made from the General Fund.
- SC-CMS Ongoing Operations – This is the ISD portion, split off from the Court Business Office Division, and would move the funds to maintenance in perpetuity for technical staff.
- Odyssey Business & Training Support – Court Business Office Division staff that is tied to the ISD portion of SC-CMS ongoing operations. This request would be made from the General Fund, including workflow changes on the business side of operations.

DRAFT

- EDE Operations & Maintenance – This should actually be titled EDR, not EDE. This is being looked at currently with some FTEs already in the budget. This request is also a candidate for being put in the General Fund, the reason being that the EDR will push data out to other state partners.
- EDR Future Integrations – This request is for ensuring Odyssey gets into the EDR and is the cost to pay for vendor time
- Internal Equipment Replacement – This request will be made using certificates, as discussed earlier.
- External Equipment Replacement – This request is being reviewed for changing to a seven-year cycle for replacing courts' and clerks' equipment.
- Odyssey Continuing Operations – As discussed earlier, this is a request for funds for support staff for Odyssey's transition from a project to operational status
- Odyssey Maintenance – As discussed earlier, this is the request for semi-annual maintenance and support payments to Tyler for the Odyssey system.

Discussion followed Mr. Radwan's breakdown of AOC's list of items for prioritization. Ms. Miner expressed interest in adding a budget request for more IT hours from Tyler. Ms. Miner stated there were a number of items either broken, not finished, or missing from Odyssey that need attention. Ms. Miner stated she did not yet have a good sense of the dollar amount needed. It is her understanding that Tyler hours have been used up for the SC-CMS project. This would add more hours for additional "in-scope" work. Judge Leach asked if Ms. Miner had a dollar amount she wanted to propose. Ms. Miner stated she had sent an email previously with a request for 5000 hours. She stated she received feedback that it would need to be part of an ITG request, but her position is the work is in-scope and should be covered under the current project. Discussion was held as to whether budget request paperwork was submitted on time. Judge Leach asked Ms. Miner how she proposes the committee continue without a dollar amount. Ms. Miner requested a place-holder for hours and referred to Ms. Sonya Kraski for follow up. Ms. Kraski stated she did not believe it was the role or responsibility of the clerks to price the hours. It is her position that these issues have been reported to AOC, and AOC should be aware of them. Ms. Kraski said there are a number of things not working with Odyssey that continue to impede her job. She said it is her expectation that things will work as they should, and the impetus falls on AOC to ensure they do. Ms. Kraski mentioned an issue, for example, that they have to manually enter unclaimed property. Ms. Diseth replied that hours for things like that are included in the maintenance agreement with Tyler. She added that the list of items sent by the clerks to AOC was supposed to be discussed at an April 10, 2018 SC-CMS Steering Committee meeting. Due to time conflicts, no one was available, so the meeting had to be cancelled. Ms. Diseth stated that, although the steering committee had not been able to review the list, it appeared at a high level that many of the issues could be addressed between normal configuration changes, and normal maintenance and operation that AOC staff could do. Without analysis, it is hard to say whether these are issues that AOC staff can work on, or if Tyler needs to be engaged.

Ms. Miner said an email listing the issues had been sent to Ms. Diseth and Mr. Radwan describing the issues. She said she knew the list included more than things that are not working correctly or broken in Odyssey. She also assumes there will be other things that come up as the result of the last two implementations. In addition, at some point the SC-CMS Steering Committee is going to want to review

DRAFT

the scope of the contract to see what else is left to be done. She said her request is not only for things already known on the list, but also to take into account those other things that may pop up months from now. Ms. Miner stated she had done some math over the break and for 5,000 hours at $250 an hour, her request would be about $1 million. She stated it was a rough estimate, but an amount she thought could be worked with. Ms. Kraski clarified that the list sent to AOC was a summary of outstanding issues that have already been submitted via e-service tickets. She reiterated that she thought it was important for resources to be allocated to address the outstanding issues, so the clerks can effectively do their jobs.

Mr. Radwan responded that both the timing and unknown nature of the costs for submitting this request to the legislature does not bode well for the AOC or the branch. He stated his concerns are that (1) he knew these are important items, and (2) he did not know if those are maintenance type items or enhancement type items. These factors make a difference in the discussion with Tyler about whether something is a fix to an issue under the current contract, or we agree this is outside of the scope of the current project. Not knowing the answers to these types of questions shows the legislature that the request is not well-defined. The legislature may look upon it as not a well-thought-out request, and that could have impacts on the rest of AOC's requests that have a higher priority. In addition, we have not had the discussions with the vendor to fully investigate the issues, even to classify them. Mr. Radwan said while AOC had received the list, it is his belief that budget requests come fully vetted, as opposed to a list that hasn't yet been vetted and written into a decision package.

Ms. Miner replied that she and the clerks have all the desire in the world to work with AOC on this issue, and had they known the budget process started so early this year, they would have started work back in November. However, she stated, she was absolutely vested in making sure there is detail before this information goes before the legislature and she believes there is time for that work to be done. Judge Leach asked Ms. Miner what she thought the clerks' timeline was for getting this work done. Ms. Miner stated she hoped the vetting would be done by June or July. Ms. Diseth replied that for AOC, the first two weeks of June will be dedicated to the largest Odyssey implementation that has been done thus far, with twelve counties going live at one time. Following that, the SC-CMS team will be handling the support issues that arise from the go-live and AOC would be unable to commit the team during this time due to lack of bandwidth. Chief Justice Fairhurst added that she believed Ms. Diseth would be talking about SC-CMS in the next agenda item. It seemed to her some of the issues identified are on AOC's list of work to be done within the project. Once those are identified, then some would be resolved and others not, but the list would be trimmed down at that point. Given that there are two big rollouts coming, it is her opinion we should figure out where the problems are, and identify if there are any big problems from the next two rollouts and make a commitment to put those in the supplemental. Ms. Miner said that would be too late for them. The missing functionality needs to be there prior to 2020. Chief Justice Fairhurst said she hoped the functionality would be covered by AOC, but she would let Ms. Diseth speak to that. Ms. Miner replied while that would be great, they do not believe that. They know that Tyler is in mid-process on some of the issues and/or tried them and it didn't work. They know that some of them are in the Tyler bucket, therefore if they wait until the supplemental, then some things will not be started until 2020. This is why they are looking for an amount for Tyler in the upcoming budget process.

DRAFT

Mr. Johnson said he was hearing a couple different components to the discussion: (1) there is certain bandwidth within AOC, and (2) there is a lot of money on the table to support the project. Given the total scope of funds on the table, Mr. Johnson wondered if there could be some salary savings on staffing and redirecting some hours. He felt there should be some play in the numbers with the hours that are covered under maintenance, plus some cost savings on the timing of some of the big ticket items, saving enough that a budget request would not be necessary. Those that are mission-critical get put at the top and get taken care of out of existing resources, and develop the supplemental request to support the others. Ms. Diseth responded that part of what she wanted to say is that it does come down to the technical capacity of the team and the objectives of the SC-CMS project. Currently, they are totally focused on getting Odyssey implemented in the courts over the next six to nine months. When courts go live, they are focused on stabilizing, making adjustments, and fixing issues with the implementation. Some of the items mentioned, as Ms. Kraski pointed out, may have been there since implementation. But when the project is complete in the end of December, then the team can focus on issues that remain. AOC will be able to work with Tyler and figure out what needs to be addressed through Tyler hours, but AOC will not necessarily have the ability to do that until the rollouts are complete. If the team has time in between and can review these issues, that would be great, but until that time, Ms. Diseth said AOC does not have that luxury. Ms. Miner agreed that there will be some AOC staff on board and they are busy with go-lives, so the issues have not received attention. Ms. Miner said her concern is having Tyler hours because not all of the issues will be fixed by AOC staff. Ms. Miner stated she knows some are Tyler-related and only wants an increment of their hours to be defined as they know AOC cannot fix all issues.

Motion: Ms. Barb Miner

I move to add to the priority list an Odyssey allotment of hours with an estimated placeholder of $800,000.

Second: Judge David Svaren

Voting in Favor: Chief Justice Mary Fairhurst, Chair, Ms. Lynne Campeau, Mr. Rich Johnson, Mr. Frank Maiocco, Ms. Barb Miner, Ms. Brooke Powell, Judge David Svaren, Mr. Bob Taylor

Opposed: Judge G. Scott Marinella, Mr. Larry Barker,

Abstained: Judge J. Robert Leach, Judge John Hart, Chief Brad Moericke

Absent: Judge Jeanette Dalton, Mr. Jon Tunheim, Ms. Callie Dietz, Ms. Paulette Revoir

The motion was passed as moved and added to the budget prioritization ballot.

A motion was then made on the budget item list.

Motion: Judge David Svaren

I move that the eleven items be the budget request to be prioritized.

Second: Ms. Barb Miner

DRAFT

Voting in Favor: Chief Justice Mary Fairhurst, Chair, Mr. Larry Barker, Ms. Lynne Campeau, Judge John Hart, Mr. Rich Johnson, Judge J. Robert Leach, Mr. Frank Maiocco, Judge G. Scott Marinella, Ms. Barb Miner, Chief Brad Moericke, Ms. Brooke Powell, Ms. Paulette Revoir, Judge David Svaren, Mr. Bob Taylor

Opposed: None

Absent: Judge Jeanette Dalton, Ms. Callie Dietz, Mr. Jon Tunheim

A short discussion was held on the process for prioritization and then the committee took the time to mark their priorities 1 through 11.

JISC prioritization results:

1. CLJ-CMS
2. SC-CMS Ongoing Operations
3. Odyssey Continuing Operations Support
4. Odyssey Business & Training Support
5. Odyssey Maintenance
6. EDE Operations & Maintenance
7. AC-ECMS
8. EDR Future Integrations
9. Internal Equipment Replacement
10. SC-CMS $800,000 Placeholder
11. External Equipment Replacement

Mr. Elvin and Ms. Cullinane tallied the votes while the meeting continued and relayed the results to the committee.

CIO Report

Ms. Diseth then presented her CIO Report to the committee.

Superior Court Case Management System (SC-CMS) Project
The Project Manager for the SC-CMS Project, Ms. Maribeth Sapinoso, took a promotional opportunity at the Department of Labor and Industries (L&I) as their new Deputy CIO. Her last day with AOC was April 15th. Effective April 16th, Mr. Keith Curry assumed the project management role held by Ms. Sapinoso. Mr. Curry has been the Deputy Project Manager on the SC-CMS project for many years. Ms. Uma Nalluri-Marsh will step up to assume the Deputy Project Manager role previously held by Mr. Curry. Ms. Nalluri-Marsh has also been with the SC-CMS project for many years and is also a graduate of the IPMA LeaderPath Program. Ms. Nalluri-Marsh will be taking on dual roles as the Deputy Project Manager while continuing to retain the duties in her current role as the Integrations Technical Lead on the SC-CMS project. Ms. Diseth expressed feeling very fortunate to have both Mr. Curry and Ms. Nalluri-Marsh taking the reins to bring the SC-CMS implementation of Odyssey across the finish line.

The SC-CMS project team is currently on track for Event 7 Go-Live on June 3, 2018. This will be the largest implementation at one time: twelve counties going live in eastern Washington with a total user

DRAFT

count of 447. The project team has conducted on-site planning meetings for the go-live event with all of the counties. In addition, they have conducted the kick-off meetings and demonstrations of Odyssey Case Manager with both Event 8 counties (Clark and Spokane). The team is on track with Spokane's integrations.

Courts of Limited Jurisdiction Case Management System (CLJ-CMS) Project – Next Steps Update

Over the past month, AOC made some necessary staffing reductions to preserve the funding that will be needed to complete the project. This became necessary because the CLJ-CMS project is not at the point where we expected to be at this time. Some staff who met the qualifications were moved into available positions at AOC; others who came from the executive branch were able to return to their former agencies. We continue to have a core project team in place to do the work that is needed to keep the project moving forward. The Chief Justice, AOC, and the Project Steering Committee are committed to finding a solution that will meet the needs of all stakeholders.

The CLJ-CMS Project Steering Committee has agreed on the following near term next steps:

- The project team is in the process of collecting the "lessons learned" from everyone involved in the original RFP process, and will present that information to the Project Steering Committee in the near future. The purpose of that exercise is to ensure we make the necessary changes to the process to improve the likelihood of achieving a successful outcome in the future.
- Meanwhile, the Project Steering Committee is in the process of identifying the most important features, from the courts perspective, that will drive the project's next steps going forward.
- We anticipate taking at least three to six months to perform the analysis to fully evaluate all possible options before making any decisions on how best to proceed.

Expedited Data Exchange (EDE) Project

The INH Expedited Data Exchange (EDE) Program continues to address issues related to schedule impacts. No new go-live date has been given, at this time, for when the King County Clerk's Office will implement their new system. AOC continues to work closely with King County District Court for their planned August 2018 implementation date. AOC is continuing development on all aspects of the Program, including the EDR, application modifications, and data exchanges with partner agencies. AOC is working closely with Washington State Patrol (WSP) and the Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS), who are beginning to test AOC's new WSP Disposition data exchange and the DSHS Background Check Unit data exchanges. These are the first partner agencies testing data exchanges sourced from the EDR. Data integration from JIS to the EDR has completed all project work and has been transitioned to maintenance. Lastly, the first changes to JABS to allow it to source King County data from the EDR are in testing at AOC.

DRIVES DOL/AOC Interface Modification Project

As previously reported to the JISC, the Department of Licensing (DOL) is replacing their Driver's Record System on September 4, 2018. Their project is known as DRIVES. AOC is modifying several key interfaces to accommodate DOL's new system. 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 to court users on October 31, 2017, explaining the

DRAFT

upcoming changes so courts have time to assess the changes they may need to make to their current business processes. Development work has begun in DISCIS, Electronic Ticketing, JABS, and Odyssey to change how these systems consume DOL services. Development will begin soon on JCS. DOL completed their development in early April and are now focusing on their internal testing as well as testing with AOC. Testing will complete in early August.

Data Dissemination Committee Report (DDC)

Judge Leach reported on the Data Dissemination Committee (DDC), which met this morning with a full agenda. Judge Leach reported on the requests per the agenda in the JISC packet.

The DDC received a request from the Heritage Family Law firm for JABS access. Judge Leach said the requestor did not attend. He also said the requestor twisted parts of the governing rules to try and argue that he was entitled to JABS access. However, he is not part of any group included in the definitions as being entitled to access. The DDC unanimously denied the request.

Casanova Powell Consulting requested drivers' license numbers that it already has. The requestor would like the drivers' license numbers included in the responsive files so she can ensure correct identification and matching on her end. AOC is prohibited from releasing drivers' license numbers; therefore, it needs to come before the DDC to allow AOC to release that information back to her. This request was unanimously approved, as AOC was providing the requestor information she already had.

The third request concerned JIS-LINK access changes for the Caseload Forecast Council and the DSHS Child Study and Treatment Center. Their ability to access information will disappear with the changes to JIS-LINK. In order to allow them to access the same information, the DDC unanimously agreed to give them level 20 access.

The next two agenda items involved agreements the committee is reviewing because additional language is being added. This review has not been completed so they were continued to the next meeting's agenda.

Judge Leach alerted the JISC that the DDC will be presenting on sealing and expunging court records at the Fall Judicial Conference. Originally, the request was to speak only on expunging records, but the fall conference organizers asked that it be expanded to include sealing issues as well. This issue arose as AOC became aware that some courts are expunging records beyond their authority to expunge. The DDC is working on the outline of substantive material and have identified three speakers, including a CLJ administrator, a clerk from superior court, with Judge Leach presenting on the substantive law. In addition, the DDC is hoping to have a representative of the press to speak on the importance of public access to records and what inappropriate expunging does to impair that ability.

Board for Judicial Administration Report (BJA)

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.

DRAFT

Adjournment

Chief Justice Fairhurst wrapped up the meeting while waiting for the prioritization results to be tallied. During the wait, she requested that Ms. Diseth speak briefly on the 2018 Certification of the Disaster Recovery Plan, behind Tab 7. Chief Justice Fairhurst adjourned the meeting at 1:23 pm, alerting the committee that the prioritization results would be sent after the meeting in addition to being listed in the meeting minutes.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be June 22, 2018, at the AOC SeaTac Facility from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Action Items

	Action Items	Owner	Status

DRAFT