JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE

February 22nd, 2018
10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.
AOC Office, SeaTac WA

Minutes

Members Present:
Chief Justice Mary Fairhurst, Chair - Skype
Judge Scott Ahlf
Mr. Larry Barker
Judge John Hart – Phone
Judge J. Robert Leach
Mr. Frank Maiocco
Ms. Barb Miner
Chief Brad Moericke
Ms. Brooke Powell
Ms. Paulette Revoir
Ms. Dawn Marie Rubio
Judge David Svaren
Mr. Bob Taylor
Mr. Jon Tunheim – Phone
Ms. Margaret Yetter

Members Absent:
Judge Jeanette Dalton
Mr. Rich Johnson

AOC Staff Present:
Mr. Kevin Ammons
Ms. Vicky Cullinane
Mr. Keith Curry
Ms. Vonnie Diseth
Mr. Curtis Dunn
Mr. Brian Elvin
Mr. Mike Keeling
Ms. Keturah Knutson - Phone
Mr. Dennis Longnecker
Mr. Dirk Marler
Ms. Uma Nalluri-Marsh
Mr. Dexter Mejia
Ms. Dory Nicpon - Phone
Mr. Ramsey Radwan
Mr. Mike Walsh
Mr. Kumar Yajamanam

Guests Present:
Latricia Kinlow
Kim Walden
Rebeca Dawn
Beth Baldwin
Michael Maga
Paul Filosi
Sarterus Rowe
Terry Price
Tammie Ownbey
Clint Casebolt
Jeffrey Jahns
Enrique Kuttemplon

DRAFT

Call to Order

Judge J. Robert Leach, JISC vice chair and filling in for Chief Justice Mary Fairhurst, called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. and introductions were made. Chief Justice Fairhurst will be joining the meeting at a later time. Judge Leach introduced Ms. Dawn Marie Rubio to the Committee and Ms. Rubio spoke to some of her background and experience prior to joining the Washington State Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) as State Court Administrator.

October 26, 2018 Meeting Minutes

Judge Leach asked if there were any changes to be made to the October 26, 2018 meeting minutes. Hearing none, Judge Leach deemed the minutes approved. When Chief Justice Fairhurst joined the meeting via Skype she gave tribute to Ms. Lynne Campeau.

JIS Budget Update

Mr. Ramsey Radwan reported on the 17-19 budget using the green sheet, which is a snapshot of select projects with projected expenditures through January 2019. Mr. Radwan explained it is generally a month late due to when the fiscal month cut off is. This allows all the accruals, expenditures and encumbrances to be accounted for prior to the projections. Mr. Radwan stated everything was okay with no red light issues at the moment. He has been working with legislative staff regarding how much money is going to be left in the JIS account. Mr. Radwan drew the Committee's attention to the bottom left-hand corner of the green sheet showing approximately $8.6 million at this point. He stated it might go up a bit but doubted it would go down as all anticipated expenditures are built into the projected amount, as shown in the fourth column to the right. Mr. Radwan explained this is critical for the biennial and supplemental budgets because it is advantageous to have the fund balance move over into the next biennium. This allows the Legislature to use those funds to fund projects for the 19-21 biennium. Mr. Radwan explained there have been a number of small unexpected expenditures taken from the $8.6 million, but not large amounts, with $50,000 as the largest foreseen expenditure. In speaking of the Legislature, Mr. Radwan remarked that during the reduction years, they would reach in and take money out of the account frequently, currently to the tune of $26 million. During the current biennium the Legislature has provided $1.2 million in general fund monies. Mr. Radwan stated it is his hope they understand the importance of the funding, see how successful AOC has been as a state organization with IT projects, and leave the money as is. He stated he believes this will occur in the Governor's budget request as there was no sweep of any funds.

Mr. Radwan reported on the 19-21 biennial budget and supplemental budget. He explained in odd years AOC has a small supplemental budget because AOC submits it. The Legislature starts reviewing it in odd years and generally does not finish on time. AOC does not ask for new funding or new programs, but instead generally asks for increased workload expenditures. Mr. Radwan works with the legislative staff, and the staff will recommend to the Legislature than they approve a set amount of money for the supplemental budget. The Legislature will then know how much additional funding will come out of the various accounts, general fund, JIS and all the other accounts, and subsequently will then add it into the next biennial budget. Mr. Radwan alerted the Committee the Legislature never passes the supplemental budget prior to the biennial budget; rather it is done concurrently. As to the supplemental budget, Mr. Radwan believes the outlook is good for AOC. On the biennial budget (effective July 1st, 2019), it is a little more in the gray area. Mr. Radwan stated they had worked with staff and talked with a number of legislators concerning the budget. As usual, what they are doing is trying to minimize the impact on the state general fund so it can be used for what they believe are their priorities, such as mental health and other such issues. So again, it goes back to the green sheet. As long as there are funds moving over from the biennium and it does not impact our operations or projects adversely (currently it is not), they will roll over and that is a positive for our project request. Mr. Radwan stated this is about the amount he had projected approximately nine months ago; while it has gone down a couple hundred thousand dollars, it is not a substantial amount. Mr. Radwan believes the numbers are pretty set, and his next steps will be to take a look at revenue at the end of February. If it looks like it is trending up, he will circle back to staff and let them know the fund balance is going up. In addition, he will let them know we think the available funds will be bigger and ask them to take a look

at that as well. Mr. Radwan alerted the Committee the budgets will not be dropped until March 21st or 22nd, as the Economic and Revenue forecast counsel will be issuing their forecast on March 20th. The Legislature builds the budgets and holds them until the forecast comes out. At that time, they will increase or decrease the amounts they want to appropriate accordingly.

External Equipment Replacement Policy

Mr. Radwan reported on the external equipment replacement policy and reminded the Committee of the discussion held at the October 26, 2018 JISC Meeting, where all decision points were tabled until the February 22nd JISC meeting. The first topic asked if this body should consider approving the purchase of a laptop for court or clerk staff with the funding that has been budgeted. It was generally discussed as a feasible option as long as the amount was within the $790 budgeted desktop amount and the laptops met AOC's specifications. The second topic was in regards to the ability of courts and clerk staff to lease equipment. At the October JISC meeting, the Committee approved Mr. Radwan's request to investigate if leasing was even an option if being paid with state funding. Mr. Radwan reported he found it is not a problem, and there are no substantial legal issues involved. Mr. Radwan listed the issues he did find, the first being that the state cannot prepay. So for a 2-3 year lease, the state cannot prepay the lease, but only reimburse based upon invoices received from the court, county, city or entity paying for the lease.

Judge Leach then asked if someone negotiated a lease that did not have installment payments but one lump sum payment for the right to use a piece of equipment for a number of years, would that be considered a prepay? Mr. Radwan said it could be reimbursed once the city, county, clerk etc. received the bill, paid it, and then submitted for reimbursement. Mr. Radwan then clarified it would only be reimbursable if it was within the city, county, or clerk's office equipment replacement cycle. As an example, right now in the current biennium, AOC has funds budgeted for the purchase of information technology equipment, not for the lease of information technology equipment. A normal lease is 3-5 years for technology equipment, and AOC cannot implement the lease program during the current biennium because AOC only as funding for the purchase of equipment. While the reimbursement will be the same amount, the funding is not in the next biennium's budget. Therefore, if a court was to sign a lease agreement and there is a payment of $100 during the current biennium, that would be fine as there is money in the budget. However, there is not money in the budget for the next two years because the money is budgeted for a purchase. This would also happen in the next biennium if the lease program was to be implemented in the next biennium. There is enough money for year one and year two of a three year cycle but there would be no money for year three. Mr. Radwan stated this is the reason he would like the lease program to start in the 21-23 biennium so we can get the cycle down, develop the budgets, and AOC has time to receive the information from cities, counties, courts, and clerks' offices. Then, once the budgets are developed, AOC can go to the Legislature and give them accurate information, letting them know there will be three to five lease payments during this period. This could result in a possible reduced expenditure in the first two years, but will still have three, four, and possibly five years, depending on the leases. This information would be needed to let the Legislature know to not take the money because they are for leases. Judge Leach asked Mr. Radwan to assume someone was in the cycle to have a purchase this year for $790 and instead they were to

sign a lease with a single lump payment or a lease term. Would they be able to be reimbursed up to the $790 available for purchases? Mr. Radwan replied he did not see a problem as long as the total amount is what is budgeted and there are no future payments. Mr. Radwan asked Mr. Dennis Longnecker, ISD Infrastructure Manager, if he saw an issue. Mr. Longnecker replied the only problem he has is the JISC does a five year replacement cycle. There is an issue with doing a lease for three years and then no money for the next two years. Mr. Radwan agreed with Mr. Longnecker that it would be an issue. Mr. Radwan stated that financially, it would be all right as long as the lump sum payment occurs in this biennium for the amount budgeted, and the city, county or clerk's office knows nothing will happen in the next biennium and will not happen for another five years, regardless if the city, county or clerk's office implements a new lease due to the five year replacement cycle, not a three year replacement cycle. As long as the merchandise is received prior to June 30, 2019, and the state receives an invoice, then it would be okay in that situation.

Mr. Taylor asked what the lesser total is, to be paid this year or next year. Mr. Radwan stated that it would be up to the city or county and not up to AOC. Judge Leach added that this would be a lease between a local entity and vendor with the state not being a party to the transaction. Mr. Radwan agreed, and it would be AOC reimbursing the leaser for an expenditure. Ms. Yetter asked if it is for this biennium, and money has been budgeted right now to a court, then is there a reason why they could not be reimbursed right now for the money that was already budgeted for their court if they have already expended it on a lease. Mr. Radwan stated as long as it is within the budgeted amount, the correct time frame of July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019, and there is no expectation there will be lease payments available in the future, then it could be done. Ms. Yetter confirmed that yes, it would be just for that allotted amount of money. Judge. Leach added it would be the same receiving the $790 once every five years, whether a court is leasing or buying. Ms. Yetter agreed, stating this would be the same as for a court that does not lease, if she gets reimbursed for whatever equipment now and she then chooses to buy more equipment two months later, then she would not be expecting more money. She would only be expecting the funded amount for this biennium regardless of whether or not it was leased or purchased, as long as she could show she had expended the funds and then receive reimbursement for the allocated amount of funds for her court. Mr. Radwan concurred. Judge Leach asked if it required the JISC to do anything to change the policy. Mr. Radwan replied he did not think so, but deferred to Mr. Longnecker. Mr. Longnecker stated that currently when the equipment replacement is done, instructions are given to the courts to not buy the equipment before this document is signed. So if somebody has leased for the last three years and expects to be reimbursed for the last three years, he does not think that is possible. Judge Leach asked if it must be a new lease. Mr. Radwan added it must be a new agreement and not three years but within the fiscal period with one year being July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019.

Judge Svaren asked whether it would be acceptable to change the previously proposed motion from:

> I move to modify the AOC practice, pursuant to JIS General Policy 1, to allow courts and county clerks' offices to be reimbursed in the current biennium, up to the current budgetary allowance of $790 for the purchase of replacement laptops for court staff.

To:

DRAFT

> I move to modify the AOC practice, pursuant to JIS General Policy 1, to allow courts and county clerks' offices to be reimbursed in the current biennium, up to the current budgetary allowance of $790 for the purchase ***or lump sum lease*** of replacement laptops for court staff.

Judge Ahlf added, in looking at the minutes from the October 26, 2018 JISC meeting, that language is somewhat there already. If you look at the motion by Ms. Miner and the motion to amend by Ms. Campeau adding "*or lease"* to the original motion, it appears that would cover this. Ms. Diseth stated there is a timing issue, thus the reason the motions have been separated into two. Judge Svaren agreed, adding that he was looking at the first motion dealing with the lump sum lease concept and wanted to make sure "lump sum lease" is the proper language to convey the idea that this is a one-time upfront payment for the term of the lease. He then asked, if for the purposes of accounting, is lump sum lease the correct language? Mr. Radwan agreed that it would be acceptable with the addition of "in the current biennium" to the end of the motion. It was then pointed out "the current biennium" was already in the motion. At this time, Judge Svaren made the motion with the additional language "or lump sum lease".

Motion: Judge Svaren

> I move to modify the AOC practice, pursuant to JIS General Policy 1, to allow courts and county clerks' offices to be reimbursed in the current biennium, up to the current budgetary allowance of $790 for the purchase ***or lump sum lease*** of replacement laptops for court staff.

Second: Judge Ahlf

Ms. Yetter asked why the words 'lump sum' would be added and not just 'lease'. Mr. Radwan explained it was to manage expectations that there are no ongoing payments, but it is a onetime payment, not a two year, three year etc. Judge Leach clarified that he believed what Ms. Yetter was asking was: say one had a lease that was three years and $790 a year and you would like to get reimbursed for year one but understand that year two and three are on your dime. Ms. Yetter agreed and stated she felt it was very clear you are only getting the amount that has been allocated for your court. She stated she didn't feel there has ever been any anticipation of getting anything beyond that. Ms. Yetter added she felt if it reads 'lump sum', it kind of ties to whenever that lump sum is, as opposed to saying this is the amount I paid for the lease for this year that qualifies during the current biennium for the dollar amount that is allocated. She stated she felt it should just be the word 'lease' added instead of 'lump sum'. Judge Leach replied that maybe it should be "lease payment incurred and paid during the current biennium". Mr. Radwan replied he would prefer "current fiscal year" because that is what is being looked at right now. Judge Leach asked Ms. Yetter if changing the previous motion to "the purchase or lease payment made during the current fiscal year for replacement laptops for court staff" would be sufficient. Ms. Yetter replied in the affirmative, asking if that would be for the time period of July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019. Mr. Radwan confirmed this. At this time, Judge Svaren amended his motion with the second accepting the amendment.

DRAFT

Motion: Judge Svaren

I move to modify the AOC practice, pursuant to JIS General Policy 1, to allow courts and county clerks' offices to be reimbursed in the current biennium, up to the current budgetary allowance of $790 for the purchase **or lease payment made during the current fiscal year** for replacement laptops for court staff.

Second: Judge Ahlf

Voting in Favor: Judge Scott K. Ahlf, Mr. Larry Barker, Judge John Hart, Judge J. Robert Leach, Mr. Frank Maiocco, Ms. Barb Miner, Chief Brad Moericke, Ms. Brooke Powell, Ms. Paulette Revoir, Ms. Dawn Marie Rubio, Judge David Svaren, Mr. Bob Taylor, Mr. Jon Tunheim, Ms. Margaret Yetter

Opposed: None

Absent: Chief Justice Mary Fairhurst (Chair), Judge Jeanette Dalton, Mr. Rich Johnson

The first motion passed as amended.

Judge Leach asked if there were any questions regarding the second motion. Ms. Yetter asked if the second motion was needed after the amendments made to the first motion. Ms. Miner agreed; she thought the amendments covered the second motion. Mr. Radwan replied he would feel more comfortable leaving the second motion as it is specifically for the 21-23 biennium so the Committee will not need to have this conversation again in August or September. Mr. Radwan added the first amendment has taken care of this year. However, he stated he would not like to have to tell courts "Sorry, we do not have budget funds because you signed a lease agreement." Therefore, due to budgetary issues he would like to wait to implement the policy until the 21-23 biennium. Judge Leach stated he believes we just agreed that if someone submitted an invoice showing they had expended up to $790 in the current fiscal year for an equipment lease, then they could be reimbursed with the understanding they would not be reimbursed for any other payments due under that lease for the next five years. Mr. Radwan stated that is correct. Judge Leach then asked how the second motion changes this. Mr. Radwan stated the second motion changes it if someone signs a lease on July 7th. That is not an upfront payment; that is a periodic payment whether it is annual or quarterly. Mr. Radwan stated we have to get that into the budget and into the cycle. It was asked, doesn't that become the current biennium as referenced in number one? Mr. Radwan replied that we are in the current biennium right now. Judge Leach clarified that what Mr. Radwan is attempting to say is say you sign a lease that is $200 dollars a year for three years. You submit your request in the fiscal year 21-23 and you can get $200 each of those three years because it is built into the budget process. It then would not cover just the single year but allow you to stretch your right to reimbursement over an extended period of time, giving you more flexibility. In addition, motion one does not cover this but is a one time reimbursement. Ms. Yetter stated her understanding is that whenever AOC says you are on cycle to be reimbursed, that is the policy and that is the money that is allocated for each court and leasing would not change that. Judge Leach agreed, stating that leasing would change this and the reason it would is the money is only there for that two year cycle. Mr. Radwan is suggesting for those in the cycle for equipment

DRAFT

reimbursement starting in 21-23, you would be able to receive reimbursement for longer than those two years on your lease provided you do not exceed $790 for the entire duration of the lease. Mr. Radwan replied that was correct and starting in calendar year 2020, AOC will start building the budget for 21-23. At that point the courts and clerks' office will let AOC know they would like to start leasing so it can be built into the budget. Mr. Radwan reiterated that there are two payments in 21-23 and then one or more in the ensuing biennium. Mr. Radwan stated he does not want to open up the lease in this biennium due to the Legislature and how they operate. Instead, he wants to ensure that he can point and say 'there are legal obligations at the courts for lease payments so we can stretch those three-five payments over multiple biennia for fiscal years. Judge Leach stated in other words, you do not have to spend your $790 in that fiscal year in order to get it. It is just some more budgeting flexibility for the local court and actually helps courts and clerks without taking anything away from what was given in the first motion.

At this time Judge Ahlf moved to approve the second motion.

Motion: Judge Ahlf

Beginning in the 2021-2023 biennium, I move to modify the AOC practice, pursuant to JIS General Policy 1, to allow courts and county clerks' offices to be reimbursed for purchased or leased laptops at that biennium's desktop rate.

Second: Ms. Yetter

Voting in Favor: Judge Scott K. Ahlf, Mr. Larry Barker, Judge John Hart, Judge J. Robert Leach, Mr. Frank Maiocco, Ms. Barb Miner, Chief Brad Moericke, Ms. Brooke Powell, Ms. Paulette Revoir, Ms. Dawn Marie Rubio, Judge David Svaren, Mr. Bob Taylor, Mr. Jon Tunheim, Ms. Margaret Yetter

Opposed: None

Absent: Chief Justice Mary Fairhurst (Chair), Judge Jeanette Dalton, Mr. Rich Johnson

The second motion was passed as written.

Legislative Update

Ms. Dory Nicpon presented the Legislative update by stating as of the preparation of this report, over 1,800 bills have been introduced. In addition to the review undertaken separately by each level of court, a small team within the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) screens all bill introductions and identifies bills that require analysis and tracking. As of the preparation of this report, AOC was actively tracking nearly 600 bills, many of which are lengthy and contemplate significant changes in public policy.

The introduction of so many bills is consistent with anytime:

DRAFT

1) One political party has a significant majority in both legislative branch chambers;

2) The legislature has many newly-elected members;

3) There is a positive revenue forecast; and

4) There is a long (odd-numbered year) legislative session.

Judicial Branch Legislative Priorities

Court Technology Projects: The judicial branch is successfully implementing major modernization projects for all court levels and needs continued funding to deliver the projects and support them after delivery. STATUS: AOC staff continue to engage with members and staff from the House Appropriations Committee and the Senate Ways and Means Committee to ensure the decision packages submitted are understood and supported.

Language Access/Interpreter Services: Courts need adequate funding for qualified interpreters to maximize courthouse efficiency and ensure access to justice for individuals who are deaf, hearing impaired, or who have limited English proficiency. STATUS: Judicial officers who chaired or participated in the BJA Interpreter Task Force, and AOC staff, have been meeting with members regarding the decision package submission. BJA's Program Manager has also facilitated letters of support to members from judicial partners, advocates, and other constituencies.

Education for Judges and Court Staff: Adequate funding is needed for timely and relevant training of judicial officers and court personnel. Such training provides information about implicit bias, cultural competence, and best practices in court operations, and changes that impact the judiciary. STATUS: Judicial officers who chaired or participated in the BJA Interpreter Task Force, and AOC staff, have been meeting with members regarding the decision package submission. BJA's Program Manager has also facilitated letters of support to members from judicial partners, advocates, and other constituencies.

Family and Juvenile Court Improvement: Early father identification and staff oversight of dependency cases improves outcomes for children and families. Funding is needed to expand the proven strategies of the FJCIP courts. STATUS: AOC staff continue to engage with members and staff from the House Appropriations Committee and the Senate Ways and Means Committee to ensure the decision package submitted is understood and supported, as well as leverage partnerships with the Department of Children, Youth, and Families to garner support for the decision package.

Guardianship Services: With growing populations of seniors and vulnerable individuals, funding is needed for additional public guardians and creation of a regional guardianship monitoring program to support courts in their oversight of guardians. Statutory amendment is needed to adjust the services offered by public guardians. STATUS: The House Civil Rights and Judiciary Committee convened a public hearing on HB 1329 (Concerning the methods of services provided by the office of public guardianship.) on January 30. As of the preparation of this report, this bill is schedule for executive session on February 8.

DRAFT

Courthouse Security: Funding and coordination is needed to ensure everyone visiting a courthouse can do so in a safe and secure environment. STATUS: AOC staff have discussed this as a next Task Force within the BJA.

Domestic Violence Data: A statutory refinement to domestic violence definitions is needed to facilitate more specific data collection and to distinguish between intimate partner violence and non-intimate partner violence in order to improve risk assessments. STATUS: The House Public Safety Committee held a work session on the report developed by the domestic violence work groups convened pursuant to HB 1163 (2017), which addressed this definition change need. After a public hearing on HB 1517 (Concerning domestic violence.), Representative Goodman included the definition split in the substitute version of HB 1517.

Traffic Fine Consolidation and Relicensing Program: Judicial support and implementation is needed for a program proposed by the Attorney General to consolidate fines that an individual has incurred in multiple jurisdictions and restore driving privileges.

STATUS: At the request of the Office of the Attorney General, HB 1489/SB 5575 (Traffic LFO consolidation.) has been introduced in each chamber of the legislature and contemplates that AOC will created a program.

Superior Court Judge Positions: Statutory adjustment is needed for an additional superior court judge in Clark County and an additional superior court judge in the tri-county judicial district for Ferry, Pend Oreille, and Stevens Counties. STATUS: The Senate Law and Justice Committee had a public hearing on SB 5450 on January 29 and passed a substitute version out of committee on January 31. The substitute version stripped the additional superior court position for Clark County from the bill. Statements during executive action suggested this was because Clark County's local match may not be supported by their local legislative authority. AOC staff have outreached again to secure budget commitments from Clark, Ferry, Stevens, and Pend Oreille Counties as further support for the bill.

Other Legislative Discussions

Uniform Guardianship, Conservatorship, and Protective Arrangements Act (UGCPAA): There appears to be legislative interest in Washington's adoption of the UGCPAA. Reacting to certain of the concerns expressed in the House Civil Rights and Judiciary Committee, the Senate Law and Justice Committee conducted a public hearing on a substitute version.

New Hope Act: Representative Drew Hansen sponsored a bill called the New Hope Act (HB 1041), which: 1) modifies the process for an offender to receive a certificate of discharge once the offender has completed supervision, met all sentencing requirements, and paid all restitution; and 2) expands the circumstances in which an offender may have a conviction vacated.

Mental/Behavioral Health: Several recent committee work sessions and public policy discussions concern mental and behavioral health issues, increasing demand for mental health services and the Trueblood settlement.

DRAFT

Technology Assisted Forms (TAF Project)

Ms. Laurie Garber, NW Justice Project TAF PM, presented the update on the Technology Assisted Forms (TAF) Project along with Mr. Jim Bamberger, Director of Office of Civil Legal Aid (OCLA). Mr. Bamberger reminded the committee of the last time he was before this committee approximately five years ago. At that time he spoke to the implementation of the Access to Justice (ATJ) board pro se plan. This plan outlined a series of initiatives designed to provide infrastructure support and enhanced capacity for unrepresented litigants to navigate to court systems with the initial primary focus of the family law court system. At that time the plan outlined a sequential set of steps. Step one was to plain language family law forms to convert them from legalese to plain language. Step two was to automate the family law forms so that they could work in the manner of a TurboTax enterprise where you are asked a series of questions, you answer the questions and the system automatically selects the forms and populates the forms allowing one to print them out. At some point the desire is to let one electronically file them in the appropriate court. Down the road, Mr. Bamberger stated, is the expectation that once those steps are undertaken and completed the expectation would be to provide opportunities, in the courthouses themselves, for family law self-help centers to enable one to download the forms, print the forms and receive hands on assistance to allow them to move forward and complete the task. Mr. Bamberger stated they were informed at that time that the AOC, JISC does not have the band width to automate the system nor do they expect to have the bandwidth in the foreseeable future due to SC-CMS, CLJ-CMS and the Expedited Data Exchange (EDE) projects and others in the pipeline. At that time Mr. Bamberger stated it was asked for permission for them to go ahead and start the project and entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with AOC pursuant to which they were authorized to go forward on the condition they did not go and get technology funding rather general funds were sought and secured from the state legislature and other resources. Mr. Bamberger alerted the committee they did indeed secure some state general fund monies and federal funds and have started to initiate the project last July and have started to move the family law automation project forward. At this time Mr. Bamberger introduced Ms. Laurie Garber the TAF Project Manager (PM) from the Northwest Justice Project. Ms. Garber presented the TAF Project Summary and presented a PowerPoint presentation on the forms available in the meeting materials available on the JISC meeting materials website.

Access to Justice Update

Mr. Terry Price, new ATJ Liaison, introduced himself and stated he was presenting the final Access to Justice (ATJ) Technology Principles; he was assisted by Mr. Sart Rowe. Mr. Price started by going over a brief history since the last JISC meeting in October 2018. Mr. Price reminded the Committee ATJ had originally presented the principles as rules. He then drew the Committee's attention to the packet containing the ATJ letter withdrawing their original position and instead requesting they be presented as principles, not rules. The charge from the previous JISC meeting was for ATJ to go out and ensure all judicial stakeholders were aware of the principles. Since that time, Mr. Price stated that the ATJ held a highly advertised webinar on January 25th. Individual conversations on the principles were held with the Board for Judicial Administration (BJA), District Municipal Court Judges Association (DMCJA), as well as county clerks. Mr. Price stated that last Friday, the ATJ board approved the

principles as contained in the JISC packet. He also stated they are being brought back to the JISC not for a decision today, but for a future decision; if agreed upon, it is his hope that the ATJ and JISC may present the principles together to the Supreme Court. Mr. Price alerted the Committee that the technology principles currently on the court website are so outdated they predate the smartphone and are approximately fifteen years old.

Mr. Price stated he would be remiss if he did not state the biggest area of disagreement between the ATJ Technology Committee and some other stakeholders has to do with the use of "must" versus "should". Should the principles say "must" or should they say "should," and what is the correct level at which they should be aimed? Mr. Price said he reread the current principles online and said the word "must" is used four times and the word "shall" is used eight times for a total of twelve "must" or "shall" statements. He stated ATJ's current principles contain fourteen of these statements, plus one "must not". Ideally, the JISC would be fine with this, and both parties would go to the Supreme Court to present the principles. The other possibility is the JISC would not be satisfied with the fourteen "musts" in the new principles and would want to wordsmith them from "must" to "shall"; then there would be disagreement, making it difficult to present to the Supreme Court. Mr. Price stated he wanted to propose a last option where he feels both parties can come to a middle ground. The difference between the current principles and those the ATJ is presenting today is the current principles on the website have a preamble and have comments to the preamble. So one possible area of middle ground, if one did not like the way the principles are drafted now, is to have a preamble and place the technology principles in the right context for people who are reading them. Mr. Price stated that the preamble--particularly the comments in the preamble--is wonderful language, saying access to justice is a fundamental right. This already exists on the website, and it sets the expectation that the principles are not to be read in a way that requires funding. Mr. Price stated there is concern that people might read this and say, "You did not supply any of these things, so therefore we can sue you and get damages". So there is already language on the court website that places them in the right context. When considering them, Mr. Price encourages the Committee to look at the current technology principles, then decide whether you feel comfortable approving the principles as is. He would then report back to the ATJ Committee.

Judge Leach asked Mr. Price what ATJ's perception is of the legal force of these principles if adopted. Are they rule of law, something aspirational, or something in-between? Mr. Price replied he did not think they were something in between but are aspirational, and further stated he believed that by making them principles, they are aspirational. Judge Leach replied that having the preamble would re-enforce that by making it clear there is no enforceable private cause of action based upon the adoption of the principles. Mr. Price replied yes, stating that he could stand by that. Ms. Diseth asked if there was any action to be taken today or would it come back later. Judge Leach stated it may and as he understood Mr. Price's presentation, the ATJ is going to ask the JISC to join with them in sending a request to the Supreme Court to adopt the principles. At that point, the JISC will need to decide if they would like to join in with the request or suggest changes. In the interim, there can be similar dialogue, about AOC's view of the principles, as there has been so far. Judge Leach ask if it was correct that the JISC has not received the request to join with ATJ and present to the Supreme Court. Mr. Price confirmed this, and added that he did not know the mechanism. Judge Leach stated he would suggest a letter from

Mr. Price to the chair of the JISC, Chief Justice Fairhurst, making the request, which would trigger the JISC decision. Judge Leach asked Chief Justice Fairhurst if that would be the case or if she would like something different. Chief Justice Fairhurst replied that is correct. Mr. Price should go ahead and write something to the JISC on what ATJ's suggested next steps are, whether it be to bring back the principles to the JISC, take them to the court, or whatever ATJ is suggesting and this would trigger a response from the JISC. Mr. Price replied that they would send a letter.

SECTOR/JINDEX Feasibility Study

Mr. Dirk Marler presented an update the SECTOR/JINDEX Feasibility Study. It is a system that has become mission critical, especially for CLJ courts but is widely unknown. The system is a combination of two systems. The first is the Statewide Electronic Collision and Ticketing Online Records system (SECTOR), which is the electronic process for creating traffic tickets as well as creating and submitting lengthy and detailed collision reports by law enforcement officers. The other part of the system is referred to as the Justice Information Network Data Exchange (JINDEX), which is housed at the state agency referred WaTech. Mr. Marler described JINDEX as the messaging hub; when the tickets are created out in the field, they are uploaded to a server at Washington State Patrol (WSP). After that, the agency or entity responsible for the tickets needs to be identified--which is the function that JINDEX performs. Together, these systems perform the functions of the original statewide eFiling system for courts and other entities in Washington State. Mr. Marler gave a brief history on the filing of electronic tickets starting in 2003. Mr. Marler alerted the Committee the system processed 827,667 eTickets and 110,881 paper tickets in 2018 alone. While there are outliers with some agencies unable to file electronically and certain violation types still being filed via paper filing, withstanding those circumstances, approximately 80% of all filings are done electronically. Another outlier for paper filing is when the system is down, law enforcement officers (LEO) are required to write paper tickets with carbon copies. Paper tickets also tend to be more expensive as tickets books must be printed, kept on hand, and reprinted when the Legislature updates the law. Mr. Marler noted the benefits of SECTOR/JINDEX, pointing out the reduction of backlog and staff on hand to process the paper tickets, as well as a large improvement in the time it takes LEO's to write tickets by the side of the road, including filing time. In addition, early studies by the Traffic Safety Commission showed a massive reduction in court processing time of individual tickets when filed electronically versus paper filing. With over 800,000 tickets written each year, quite a lot of time is saved for each court or agency that uses electronic filing. Furthermore, Mr. Marler stated over the years, they have enhanced the Judicial Access Browser System (JABS) to help judges conduct a paperless bench for hearings on these cases where dockets of 100 people a session are not uncommon. The efficiencies implemented via electronic filing occurred simultaneously as the recession in Washington State, helping CLJ courts deal with the reduction in staff through the reduction in filing paperwork reduction.

Mr. Marler spoke to the complexity of the ecosystem involving a large number of players, including local and state law enforcement, as well as multiple state agencies all working together to ensure the success of the system. Since the original application was built twelve years ago, the world has changed. More state agencies would like to take advantage of the technology and there is an explosion of LEO's that would rather use the electronic technology than paper tickets. In addition, there are

DRAFT

different processes and document types that LEO's and others would like to use, while the technology is custom built, home grown, and twelve years old with a limited and fragmented support system. Also, there is a backlog of requests from law enforcement and others for improvements and enhancements to make the system work more effectively and efficiently. AOC is receiving constant pressure to add other types of documents and processes so even more filings can be done electronically. On the backend side, WSP and WaTech are having difficulty keeping up with the technology and keeping the lights on. This leads to more and more problems with tickets not being appropriately filed or not filed in a timely manner, as well as system outages from maintenance or from a breakdown. All these issues are starting to contribute to inefficiencies, both in the court as well as for law enforcement. Currently, the status quo is not acceptable and will not be able to meet the needs of any participants in the future, and a solution must be identified in order to sustain this type of system as it is mission critical for all stakeholders.

Mr. Marler stated he and other stakeholders are members of a statewide committee that is steering the SECTOR/JINDEX feasibility study, made possible by a grant from the Washington State Traffic Safety Commission in conjunction with an outside consultant. Currently, the committee is looking at the options for updating, modernizing or replacing the ecosystem of both SECTOR and JINDEX. Mr. Marler drew the Committee's attention to the timeline slide in the packet, alerting them they will have a recommendation in the near future. Mr. Marler stated he was here today to make the JIS Committee aware of the system's existence and how critical it is to the work being done, especially at CLJ courts. It has been an under-the-radar system but once the recommendations are received, there will likely be an impact on JIS systems. There is the possibility requests could come back to this group for the judicial branch to support a decision package or funding model. At a minimum, if the application is being replaced, there will be a change to a court rule because GR 30 refers specifically to SECTOR and JINDEX. Also, there may be other impacts on other AOC systems that will require the JIS Committee's input in decision making.

JIS Priority Project #1 (ITG2): SC-CMS Project Update

Chief Justice Fairhurst spoke briefly to the ending of the project and to the continuing operations of the new Superior Courts Case Management System (SC-CMS), Odyssey. Mr. Keith Curry, Mr. Dexter Mejia from the Court Business Office, and Mr. Paul Filosi, the Client Success Account Manager from Tyler Technologies, presented the final update on the SC-CMS project. Mr. Curry provided status on project closeout activities including access to public and confidential documents in link only counties, review of RFP requirements, and the final close out report from Tyler. In addition, Mr. Mejia discussed Odyssey stabilization activities including eService tickets, ongoing training, and the impact assessment and planning for the Odyssey 2018 new release. Mr. Curry discussed the IT Governance process and how legislative changes, court rule, required technology changes, and Clerk and Court requests would be handled. Mr. Filosi discussed the Tyler Technologies methodologies around ticket processing and system enhancement requests.

JIS Priority Project #1 (ITG102): CLJ-CMS Project Update

Mr. Michael Walsh presented the project update on the Courts of Limited Jurisdiction Case Management System (CLJ-CMS) project. The project is currently conducting a Solution Option Analysis by hiring a consultant to match the needs of the CLJs with potential options available in the Courts/Probation case management market space. Gartner Inc. was awarded the contract through a competitive bidding process. The analysis will be separated into three broad categories: COTS Best-of Breed, JIS Modernization, and Other Solutions not included in the first two. Work started in January and is expected to be completed in April. Gartner consulting services will include an in-depth examination of the three options, a side-by-side comparison of the options, and a recommendation to the CLJ-CMS Project Steering Committee. The Steering Committee will review the products of the consulting engagement and provide a recommendation to the JISC going forward.

JISC Rule 13 Request

Mr. Ramsey Radwan needed to leave the JISC meeting early and Judge Leach asked Mr. Radwan to give his thoughts on the JISC Rule 13. Mr. Radwan stated one of his concerns was if this body agrees and approves, that not all of the costs and considerations have been taken into account at the local level when making these decisions. Due to this, AOC and the state will be required to expend some level of resources in the future, whether it is existing staff, cash or both. These will be unplanned expenditures to help those courts finish the project, implement the project, and build the data exchanges that are necessary. Mr. Radwan reminded the Committee the funding in the JIS account is not going up but is going down, with costs increasing across the board creating much more pressure than in the past on AOC staff resources as well as financial resources. Mr. Radwan said this gives him great concern when a decision is made for a court to move forward on a local system, particularly on the cash side, without taking into account the policy issues. A decision made now may look great fiscally, but perhaps in three years something happens at the local level, and AOC may not have the resources to help the local entity finish the local project, implement the local project, or build the data exchanges necessary to do that. Mr. Radwan stated AOC does not like to say no and does not want to say no, but AOC and the state may be in a position where they will have to say no with regard to helping the local entity complete the project. While information technology projects are extremely important to everyone at the table and everyone in the state, AOC would hate to be in a position to have to say no or have to take resources from a previously approved project.

Mr. Radwan stated he would like to go on record that this will cost money; a lot of planning needs to be done if these projects continue. In addition, he stated he feels it needs to be vetted over a longer period of time, taking into account the information contained in the report, 'Local CMS Implementation Responsibilities and Considerations', contained in the JISC packet and posted to the JISC meeting materials website for public consumption. With everything getting more expensive and the mounting pressure on all funding sources, Mr. Radwan stated he would be loath to get into another cut situation when the current economy slows down, which he believes it will. When that happens. AOC, the State, and JISC are put in a position to have to say no to a local entity or have to move resources from a previously approved project, or you will have to wait for two years for AOC to request the funding with a possibility of not getting the funding even after the two year wait. Mr. Radwan ended by stating this

causes him a lot of nervousness when moving into these kind of unknowns without well-thought out, well-planned and well-reasoned decision making.

Ms. Vonnie Diseth continued where Mr. Radwan left off earlier in the meeting. Ms. Diseth pointed to the packet containing JISC Rule 13 regarding CLJ courts. She explained it requires any local court that would like to implement their own case management system (CMS) must provide the JISC with written notice ninety days prior to commencing on the project for review and approval. She then drew the Committee's attention to the letter received toward the end of November 2018 from Judge Jeffrey Jahns, presiding judge for Kitsap County District Court, also in attendance. The letter stated that Kitsap County District Court would like to purchase and install their own automated CMS with Journal Technologies Incorporated (JTI). Ms. Diseth stated the decision point being presented is for the JISC to discuss, and to decide if they will give their approval. Ms. Diseth pointed out the motion states "approval subject to Kitsap County District Court's agreement to comply with the JIS standards for alternative electronic records." Ms. Diseth alerted the Committee of the tie-in with the data standards document the CLJ-CMS Project Steering Committee asked AOC to compile, which identifies what is involved when a court takes on an implementation of its own CMS. The concern of the Steering Committee and AOC is the decisions are made without full understanding and knowledge of what the court is required to do once the decision is made to implement on their own CMS. Ms. Diseth stated there are a lot of processes behind the scenes that AOC does for courts and they may not be aware of what those things are. Furthermore, when a court leaves the JIS system, all those application system responsibilities currently undertaken by AOC are now the local court's responsibility to ensure they are done.

This was the purpose of putting together the "Local CMS Implementation Responsibilities and Considerations" document, with the hope it will receive wide distribution so courts will read and come to the table and dialogue with the full knowledge of their responsibility and awareness of what is required. As an example, Ms. Diseth pointed to the legislative update where Ms. Nicpon spoke to the thousands of legislative proposals that AOC analyzes for impacts to the JIS system. As AOC does not analyze legislative proposals for local courts on their own CMS, each court who has implemented their own CMS would need to take on this added role to ensure their compliance with any and all legislative changes. In addition, Ms. Diseth spoke to the technical staff a local court needs to have on hand to make their own connection to the Enterprise Data Repository (EDR), which enables the court to share their date statewide as is required in the JIS standards and approved by the JISC. Ms. Diseth pointed out there are a few hundred data elements in the JIS standards that have to be shared throughout the state. In addition, AOC has been working with King County District Court (KCDC) and King County Clerk's Office (KCCO) for the last four years on those very same data standards, showing that it is a complex and challenging project and not an easy process. Reminding the Committee of Mr. Radwan's previous presentation, Ms. Diseth stated the concern is if and when the JISC gives their approval and down the line a court has funding issues or does not have capabilities to fulfill the expectations, what will happen at that juncture? Ms. Diseth stated this was the purpose of the creation of the responsibilities and considerations document. Ms. Powell asked if some Juvenile courts have had the discussion on whether to implement their own case management system, if the responsibilities and considerations document is recommended for them as well. She expressed her desire to share the

document with Juvenile courts if the same elements still apply. Ms. Diseth stated the same elements do apply to Juvenile courts the same as CLJ courts and noted it is a public document open to all.

At this time, Judge Leach asked Judge Jahns to update the Committee on the court's desire to implement their own case management system and the reasons why they believe it is their best course of action. Judge Jahns started by stating ten years prior, their jail came to them and stated they were not going to transport twenty to twenty-five people through the court's hallway in handcuffs for custody hearings every day. They requested the court to find an alternative due to the amount of resources expended and the security issues involved. At the time, Bremerton Municipal Court was working with the court on the same problem and a video courtroom was created in the jail. This created an issue of how to get documents from the physical courtroom to the jail. The court asked the Kitsap County Information Services division for options to get documents to the jail and then back again. After some research, IS recommended SharePoint. While not meant for courts, a case file folder could be created, electronic documents could be placed in the folder with limited programming capabilities for programs. Most important for Kitsap at the time, the jail, individuals, the prosecutor, and the judge could all activate the document to make changes and sign with an electronic pen. At the time, it was a cheap option to manage the courts documents. IS informed the courts while it was a workable solution, it was also a short term solution. This is because with 20-25 users opening and closing documents and creating folders, there will be problems. The software was not designed for this type of usage as it is a document generation product and not a case management product. Judge Jahns stated JIS was their CMS; nothing had changed and it was still used for calendaring and the like. Judge Jahns stated SharePoint started to be used for all Kitsap County documents for in-custody and out-of-custody, with the lawyers being trained so all cases files are electronic files via SharePoint folders.

Three years ago, seven years into using SharePoint, IS came to the courts and stated their serious concern that the courts were now a power user. As SharePoint crashes escalated, IS was expending more and more resources solely for the courts, taking up time and resources for the IS division, and there were many other county departments that would like to use IS support services. Judge Jahns stated around this time AOC had created the CLJ Court User Work Group (CUWG) and their administrator was excited to be included. At that time the courts asked the county to wait for a bit to see where things would go. Fast forward to January 2018, things did not appear moving at a pace that would work for Kitsap courts with respect to JIS. In June at the DMCJA Spring Conference, Judge Jahns stated they were told that everybody was working on it, but it is not going to happen very fast. Judge Jahns stated when he got back, he talked with Kitsap IS and let them know of the delay and efforts to wait until the state system is ready to go is not going to be as timely as once thought. IS held internal discussions and reconvened with the courts. Kitsap IS stated SharePoint is going to collapse and they did not know when, and they did not think they could keep it going. At that time, IS asked the courts to look at options to buy their own system, and the IS was going to put it in their budget. Judge Jahns stated IS told the courts they did not want it in the courts' budget because they would like the commissioners to know currently they cannot support the courts, and if SharePoint collapses all case files will be lost. Judge Jahns stated Kitsap IS than asked for $600,000 to $700,000 for the courts to buy a system for District Court that is a case management document generation system to replace SharePoint.

Judge Jahns stated that is why they are before the JISC today. Their commissioners heard the courts, have fully funded the project, and they are ready to go. He stated it looks like they will be signing a contract with JTI in the next couple of weeks and they are looking at implementing towards the end of 2019. Mr. Clint Casebolt, the Kitsap County Court Administrator, alerted Judge Jahns that they needed to alert the JISC committee as they would be going live in seven to eleven months. He stated he was aware that whatever Kitsap decides to implement will need to work with JIS through the exchange. He also stated he knew this would take AOC resources in order to make sure Kitsap's implementation integrates with AOC or they could keep doing duplicate entries like they do now. Judge Jahns stated in SharePoint they do duplicate entries for all their documents; JIS staff have been doing so for the last ten years due to the fact they had no choice. Judge Jahns further stated those were the options. If they cannot make their system work with JIS, they will have to keep doing the JIS double entries and do their CMS separately. The best possible outcome would be Kitsap County's new system working with AOC's to reduce the duplicate entries and staff resources. Judge Jahns finished up by stating that is why he is here before the Committee today. They can no longer wait and they are going forward and buying their own CMS and he is letting the JISC know because he is aware it impacts AOC and they will have to make some decisions as well. Judge Jahns stated he was very thankful to King County whom had been extremely helpful for their advice on expectations and what Kitsap County will be getting into. He also stated he believed they were number two on AOC's priorities list after King County. Judge Leach responded they would be number three after Seattle Municipal Court, who had previously announced their intent for their own CMS.

Judge Leach asked if anyone had any comments or questions for Judge Jahns or Ms. Diseth. Ms. Diseth asked Judge Jahns if Kitsap County had been working with King County. Mr. Enrique Kuttemplon, IT Services Delivery Director with King County District Court, responded that they have been meeting with Kitsap County when they had questions. Ms. Diseth asked if they will be using the same configuration from JTI as King County is in the process of currently implementing. Mr. Casebolt replied that everything they've heard from Journal thus far, with a few exceptions for the specifics of their court, has pointed to Kitsap using the KCDC configuration. He stated, for obvious reasons, the more closely they can align with what King County is doing, the better; Kitsap County was all in and that was their plan. Ms. Diseth asked if they had received the implementation responsibilities and considerations document and would Kitsap County be willing to meet to talk through the aspects brought up in the document. Mr. Casebolt stated they had reviewed the document and that was the bases for submitting their letter when they did, which stated their intent to implement their own CMS. Ms. Diseth stated she would like to have a face-to-face meeting to talk about aspects of CMS implementation. Judge Leach asked if it would affect Kitsap County's timeline if the JISC were to postpone voting on their request until the April JISC, in order for Kitsap County and AOC to meet and discuss the various aspects of implementation. Kitsap County stated it would not affect their timeline. Judge Leach proceeded to ask the Committee if anyone is against postponing the vote until the April 26th JISC meeting to allow Kitsap County and AOC time to meet. Hearing none Judge Leach ask if there was a motion stating such.

Motion: Judge Ahlf

I move to table the vote until the 26th of April.

Second: Mr. Moericke

Voting in Favor: Judge Scott K. Ahlf, Mr. Larry Barker, Chief Justice Mary Fairhurst (Chair), Judge John Hart, Judge J. Robert Leach, Mr. Frank Maiocco, Ms. Barb Miner, Chief Brad Moericke, Ms. Brooke Powell, Ms. Paulette Revoir, Ms. Dawn Marie Rubio, Judge David Svaren, Mr. Bob Taylor, Mr. Jon Tunheim, Ms. Margaret Yetter

Opposed: None

Absent: Judge Jeanette Dalton, Mr. Rich Johnson

The motion was passed.

AOC Expedited Data Exchange (EDE) Pilot Implementation Project Update

Judge Donna Tucker presented the update for King County District Court. Judge Tucker stated King County continues to work on phase one, launched last October with their eProbation module, which is all of their civil cases other than protective type orders and civil cases of less than $100,000. As time goes on, they continue to adjust and fine tune with things going very well. The second civil phase, consisting of criminal small civil type cases was anticipated on being up and running this quarter, but with a few complications it will go live in March. It is now anticipated to launch in the second quarter of 2019. Judge Tucker mentioned several of the successful stages leading up to the final phase two implantation, including the successful conversion of 2.4 million cases and person data from JIS to eCourt. Next, Judge Tucker highlighted the conversion of 11.5 million documents from their legacy electronic document management system to eCourt resulting in all files now being available in eCourt. Judge Tucker stated they have sent 2,700 cases and person data to the Enterprise Data Repository (EDR), completed 90% configuration of Civil Phase Two and infraction functionality with both being ready for end to end testing. Criminal cases are running behind at moment and several interfaces are still in the development and configuration phase. The snow in February delayed the clerk training and has been moved from February to March, while the judges' individual training has been ongoing and moving forward.

Judge Tucker noted one issue delaying Phase Two has been the integration of eCourt and eProbation so the probation office does not have to enter the same information the clerks enter and back and forth. While eProbation has been running since October 2017, this is a new process and JTI has not integrated their two products in the past. That and some King County preparation issues leading up to the integration have resulted in the delay. Judge Tucker stated she has seen some demos and is pleased with the progress and happy they stuck with the integration.

Ms. Barb Miner presented the King County Clerk's Office (KCCO) update. Ms. Miner pointed to the written report contained in the materials and asked if there were any questions. Hearing none, Judge Leach moved to the next presentation.

DRAFT

Mr. Kumar Yajamanam presented the update on the Expedited Data Exchange (EDE) Project. Mr. Yajamanam reviewed the status and defects for KCCO's integration to the EDR, as contained in the meeting materials. He concluded by emphasizing that the EDE program continues to work to mitigate any potential impacts to the statewide system.

Data Dissemination Committee Report (DDC)

Judge Leach reported on the Data Dissemination Committee (DDC) meeting held directly before the JISC. Two access for records requests were presented at the meeting, the first being the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP). WSIPP requested access to type 7 cases so they can prepare reports in response to recent legislation. The request was approved. The second request was from the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC). Their request was for access to JABS. They want one place they can look to get daily information about criminal history in order to process requests to purchase firearms. This request was also approved. In addition, the DDC reviewed and approved updates to the DDC manual. Amendments to the AOC Data Agreements were reviewed and approved as well.

Board for Judicial Administration Report (BJA)

Judge Leach reminded the Committee that the BJA minutes are contained in the JISC packet behind Tab 13.

Adjournment

Judge Leach adjourned the meeting at 1:50pm.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be April 26th, 2019, at the AOC SeaTac Facility from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Action Items

	Action Items	Owner	Status

DRAFT