JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE

June 27, 2025
10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
Online Zoom Meeting

Minutes

Members Present:
Justice Barbara A. Madsen, Chair
Judge John Hart, Vice-Chair
Judge Valerie Bouffiou
Ms. Mindy Breiner
Mr. Joseph Brusic
Mr. Derek Byrne
Mr. Donald Graham
Ms. Stephanie Kraft
Mr. Frank Maiocco
Chief Brad Moericke
Judge Robert Olson
Ms. Heidi Percy
Mr. Frankie Peters
Judge Allyson Zipp

Members Absent:
Judge David Mann
Ms. Paulette Revoir
Ms. Dawn Marie Rubio

AOC Staff Present:
Mr. Scott Ahlf
Ms. Kelley Ambergey-Richardson
Mr. Kevin Ammons
Mr. Robert Anteau
Mr. Kevin Cottingham
Mr. Rob Eby
Mr. Arsenio Escudero
Mr. Matthew Flack
Ms. Eunyoung Kim
Mr. Dexter Mejia
Ms. Michelle Pardee
Ms. Anya Prozora
Ms. Nancy Shattuck
Mr. Chris Stanley
Mr. James Wells
Ms. Tae Yoon

Guests Present:
Ms. Suzanne Elsner, Snohomish Co.
Ms. Michelle Enright, Stevens Co.
Ms. Pamela Hartman-Beyer, Clark Co.
Ms. Stephanie Keating, King Co.
Mr. Enrique Kuttemplon, King Co.
Mr. Allen Mills, Bluecrane
Judge Rebecca Robertson, King Co.

DRAFT

Call to Order & Approval of Meeting Minutes

Justice Barbara Madsen called the Judicial Information System Committee (JISC) meeting to order at 10:01 a.m. This meeting was held virtually on Zoom.

Justice Madsen asked if there were any changes or additions to be made to the April 25, 2025 meeting minutes. Hearing none, the meeting minutes were approved as written.

The Committee bid farewell to Mr. Frank Maiocco and Ms. Paulette Revoir, the members representing the Association of Washington Superior Court Administrators (AWSCA) and the District and Municipal Courts Management Association (DMCMA), respectively. Both members will be stepping down from their JISC positions at the end of July. Justice Madsen recognized Mr. Maiocco and Ms. Revoir and thanked them for all their work on the JISC over the last several years.

JIS Budget Update

Mr. Chris Stanley gave a JIS budget briefing. He explained how AOC balances the JIS account using a three-legged stool analogy, with the legs being the annual General Fund transfer from the Legislature, standard infraction fees, and AOC's underspend. Additionally, AOC also transfers its General Fund underspend at the end of the fiscal year. Should one of the 'stool legs' collapse, it could be potentially

catastrophic to the fund. Since instituting this method of balancing the account in conjunction with the annual fund transfer from the Legislature, the JIS account has remained cash-positive at the end of the fiscal year.

The JIS account is healthy for now. The 2025-27 biennial budget did cut $4 million a year, which cuts into the fund transfer at the end of the year. The amounts that AOC will transfer to the account will be less than in recent years, but the account will be all right for the next few years.

The recently released June revenue forecast reflects a loss of approximately $1 billion in the next two biennia (2025-27 and 2027-29). The forecast also projects $30 million to be left at the end of the 2025-27 biennium (out of a $77 billion budget). This is a very significant reduction. What that means for 2026 supplemental budget requests is that AOC will only be asking for the most necessary items (e.g.: items that would lead to a work stoppage without funding, or items that would cause immediate and considerable harm to the judicial system and/or users if not funded).

Mr. Stanley stated that this is likely to be the highwater mark, given the uncertainty that exists in the revenue stream; we are heavily dependent on trade, national economic indicators, etc., and the current state is rather precarious. Mr. Stanley then added that decision package requests are due by June 30, at which time the AOC budget team will begin their review. The AOC Executive Team will begin their review in August and will make recommendations to the JISC later that month and to the Board for Judicial Administration (BJA) in September. Budget requests will be reviewed by the Supreme Court Budget Committee in late September, and the full Court in October. The final budget request will then be sent to the Legislature.

Person Management Analysis Results Discussion

Mr. Dexter Mejia gave a summary recap on the Person Management Analysis results from Gartner Inc., who presented their analysis findings and recommendations at the previous JISC meeting on April 25, 2025. He briefly reviewed the effort's vision, goals, objectives, business and technical use cases, roadmap, proposed roadmap timeline, pros and cons, constraints and risks, and next steps.

Mr. Mejia then outlined potential options for how to proceed with the effort at this time. These included: determining the feasibility to begin an assessment of person matching routine (scheduling, resources, desired outcomes), person data issue and escalation processes (scheduling, resources, desired outcomes), and develop PBR training; developing a funding request for resources and IT investments for the supplemental or next biennium's budget process; developing ITGs to aid budget development requests; determine feasibility to de-scope or deprioritize other work to make room and make resources available; and delaying the effort for two years to allow time to complete CLJ-CMS implementation and for funding to be available.

Discussion followed. Mr. Mejia clarified that the Person Management effort would be a large-scale program with multiple projects including data governance and policy work, technological work, and continued data quality issue resolution. It would need to be prioritized as a high priority effort. Ms. Heidi Percy, Judge Valerie Bouffiou, and Judge Rebecca Robertson spoke to the criticality of this work to the trial courts, as the accuracy of criminal histories is vital for judicial officers to be able to conduct their

DRAFT

work on the bench. Other members noted the importance of engaging with the courts who have separate systems that handle person records, as well as their system vendors.

Justice Madsen asked Mr. Mejia and Mr. Kevin Ammons for their perspective on what next steps can be taken in light of the discussion. Mr. Mejia mentioned AOC will be working on education and awareness to help courts in the prevention of person record inaccuracies. Mr. Ammons noted that from the technical side, AOC will need to identify what the first body of work in this effort would be. Some of the work (such as updating person business rules) would not require an ITG, but others will require one, such as looking into a system that could be used to build golden records.

AOC will work with the courts on education and prevention, as well as work on policies and person business rules (PBRs), planning the practical steps that need to be taken to work towards a solution, and follow up with members for feedback on resourcing after they have discussed this matter with their respective associations.

Mr. Mejia will report back on this topic at the October JISC meeting.

ITG 1326 – Online Interpreter Scheduling

Mr. James Wells gave a summary recap on the analysis for Online Interpreter Scheduling (ITG 1326), which was presented to the JISC in February 2025. This ITG seeks to establish a statewide online court interpreter scheduling system that can be used by all courts, provide a standardized and efficient scheduling process, and that offers potential integration with other JIS applications. He also shared survey results on adoption rate and estimated cost. The estimated cost based on the analysis is $1.2 million and the project duration would be 18 months.

Mr. Ammons added that another separate ITG request has been submitted to integrate existing court interpreter systems using the Enterprise Integration Platform. That ITG will be brought before the JISC later this year.

Mr. Ammons then provided the Committee with the first of two decision points: whether or not to proceed with ITG 1326 – Online Interpreter Scheduling. He clarified that should the JISC authorize and prioritize this ITG, that does not guarantee AOC would request a budget decision package for it in the next biennium.

Justice Madsen asked if there was a motion to approve authorization of this ITG to implement an online interpreter scheduling system.

Motion: Judge Valerie Bouffiou

> I move to that the JISC instruct the AOC to continue its implementation of ITG 1326 – Online Interpreter Scheduling to establish a statewide online interpreter scheduling system.

Second: Mr. Frank Maiocco

DRAFT

Voting in Favor: Judge Valerie Bouffiou, Ms. Mindy Breiner, Mr. Joe Brusic, Mr. Derek Byrne, Mr. Donald Graham, Judge John Hart, Ms. Stephanie Kraft, Justice Barbara Madsen, Mr. Frank Maiocco, Chief Brad Moericke, Judge Robert Olson, Ms. Heidi Percy, Mr. Frankie Peters, Judge Allyson Zipp

Opposed: None.

Absent: Judge David Mann, Ms. Paulette Revoir, Ms. Dawn Marie Rubio

The motion passed.

Mr. Ammons then proffered the second decision point: to prioritize ITG 1326 with the existing ITG requests on the current JISC Priorities list. The Committee discussed placement ranking for the ITG.

Justice Madsen asked if there was a motion to prioritize ITG 1326.

Motion: Justice Barbara Madsen

I move that ITG Request 1326 be prioritized as JISC priority #6.

Second: Judge Robert Olson

Voting in Favor: Judge Valerie Bouffiou, Ms. Mindy Breiner, Mr. Joe Brusic, Mr. Derek Byrne, Mr. Donald Graham, Judge John Hart, Ms. Stephanie Kraft, Justice Barbara Madsen, Mr. Frank Maiocco, Chief Brad Moericke, Judge Robert Olson, Ms. Heidi Percy, Mr. Frankie Peters, Judge Allyson Zipp

Opposed: None.

Absent: Judge David Mann, Ms. Paulette Revoir, Ms. Dawn Marie Rubio

The motion passed. ITG 1326 will be added to the list as Priority #6.

Introduction of Draft JISC AI Guidelines

Mr. Ammons introduced AOC's proposed draft of the JISC Artificial Intelligence (AI) Guidelines. At the April JISC meeting, a presentation was given on AI guidance from both the BJA and the National Center for State Courts (NCSC). The Committee asked AOC to draft similar guidance relating to the Judicial Information System (JIS). The draft focuses heavily on the JIS applications and statewide data. The document begins with authorities from RCW and court rule and provides an overview of JIS and also of AI, including aspects of AI of which any user should be aware. The guidelines provide direction on complying with RCW and court rules and handling of restricted data and statewide data with AI; it also issues reminders that all AI products must be reviewed and verified by a human, who is ultimately responsible for proper use, and provides guidance on reporting security issues or confidentiality breaches.

DRAFT

Mr. Ammons asked that Committee members review the draft with their respective associations and provide feedback to AOC by the end of July 2025. AOC will incorporate the feedback and bring the revised document back to the August JISC meeting for review and decision.

Introduction to Updates to JIS Policies

Mr. Ammons gave an introductory presentation on updating the JIS Policies. The JIS General Policies contain ten policy subject areas, including: Software, Security, Use of Customer Services, and JIS Applications. The document was last revised by the JISC in June 2015. There are several other policy documents approved by the JISC that must also be revised.

Mr. Ammons then outlined AOC's proposed process for reviewing the policies. The existing policy documents will be split into separate documents for each subject area. A new policy organization structure and numbering system will be developed. AOC will draft proposed revisions to each policy area incorporating changes that have occurred over the last decade. Each JISC meeting, AOC will present two to three policy areas documents for feedback and approval. The first proposals will be presented at the August meeting.

JIS Priority Project #1 (ITG 102): Courts of Limited Jurisdiction – Case Management System (CLJ-CMS)

CLJ-CMS Project Update
No project update was given at this meeting.

Quality Assurance Assessment Report
Mr. Allen Mills, with the project's QA vendor Bluecrane, provided an overview of the May QA Assessment Report for the CLJ-CMS project. The full report can be found in the JISC meeting packet.

Data Dissemination Committee (DDC) Report

Judge Hart reported that the Data Dissemination Committee did not meet this month.

Meeting Wrap Up & Adjournment

Justice Madsen adjourned the meeting at 12:09 p.m.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be August 22, 2025, via Zoom from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Action Items

	Action Items	Owner	Status

DRAFT