

**APPROVED MINUTES  
JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE  
BUSINESS MEETING  
January 26, 2007, 9:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.  
Amsterdam Room, SeaTac Airport, SeaTac, WA**

**Members Present:**

Justice Bobbe Bridge, Chair  
Judge C. Kenneth Grosse, Vice Chair  
Chief Robert Berg  
Ms. Cathleen M. Grindle  
Judge James R. Heller  
Mr. William Holmes  
Mr. N. F. Jackson  
Mr. Richard Johnson  
Mr. Mark Lampson  
Judge Clifford L. Stilz  
Mr. N. A. "Butch" Stussy  
Ms. Yolande Williams  
Ms. Siri Woods  
Judge Thomas J. Wynne

**Staff Present:**

Mr. Tim Bates  
Ms. Suzanne Hellman  
Mr. Dirk Marler  
Mr. Manuel Najarro  
Mr. Farrell Presnell  
Mr. Ramsey Radwan  
Mr. Andrew Simpson  
Ms. Kathie Smalley  
Ms. Jayme Taylor

**Guests Present:**

Ms. Barb Brown, Seattle Municipal Court  
Mr. Donald J. Horowitz, Access to Justice Board  
Ms. Barb Miner, King County Clerk

**Members Absent:**

Mr. Gregory Banks  
Judge Glenna Hall  
Judge Michael Trickey, Ex-Officio

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. Justice Bridge wished everyone a happy new year, and introductions were made.

**Motion:** It was moved, seconded, and unanimously passed to approve the October 27, 2006 meeting minutes as written.

**UPDATES**

**Executive Committee**

Justice Bridge reported the JIS Executive Committee met December 8, 2006, with Barb Miner in attendance. The topic of discussion was the data exchange component of the JIS Roadmap--what it would be and how to get there.

Tim Bates directed members to the Data Exchange Strategy handout in the meeting packet. Mr. Bates reported the AOC has entered into a proof of concept test with Whatcom County to test the first of two generic data exchanges. What the test pointed out is that two exchanges are not enough, so the AOC will accelerate getting all the currently defined generic exchanges built and ready for implementation by the end of April or the first part of May. The AOC will continue to work with Whatcom County on

testing, and as soon as the data exchanges are working, any court will be able to utilize them.

Mr. Bates further explained that a fact-gathering process has been built into the testing to see how easily and effectively court IT staff could utilize the generic exchanges. This information will provide the AOC with a roadmap for courts that request the data exchanges to let them know what the court will need to do, validate that the exchanges are working properly, and confirm the AOC is using the proper technology. Mr. Bates stated monthly updates on the exchanges will be provided.

Twenty-two generic data exchanges have so far been identified, Mr. Bates said. He added that nineteen "custom" exchanges have been requested by various courts, but the Data Management Steering Committee (informal name for combined Data Exchange and Information Access) cannot yet determine feasibility of, or set priorities on the custom exchanges until there is more knowledge on what it means to build and support a custom exchange. (That knowledge will come from the Whatcom County collaboration mentioned above).

Siri Woods asked if the various county IT departments would have to do things differently for each exchange, or if there was something they could be working on now to prepare for the upcoming exchanges. Mr. Bates stated there would be constructed a framework of a common set of error messages and error handling routines, rules, and security procedures. This is what is being validated with Whatcom County now (and all that can be done in anticipation at this time). All courts will need to have this framework in place prior to using any of the exchanges. They will be published and available on the Washington Courts Web page as soon as they are validated.

In response to the question asking how the 22 generic exchanges were selected, Mr. Bates stated the Data Exchange Steering Committee provided them. Mr. Bates explained there are actually only 11 exchanges, and the other 11 exchanges are different combinations of the 11 original exchanges. Committee members asked that they be provided with a list of the 22 exchanges.

Siri Woods stated the Data Exchange Steering Committee is meeting January 31, 2007, and that perhaps N. F. Jackson should get involved with that committee since his court is testing the generic exchanges. Justice Bridge concurred that was a good idea.

Yolande Williams asked Mr. Bates if the courts would be given some guidelines on the cost/benefit analysis mentioned in the Data Exchange Strategy document. Mr. Bates indicated the AOC would be using the generic exchanges now being implemented and validated with Whatcom County as the basis for the cost/benefit analysis to be provided to the courts.

Justice Bridge stated she received a letter from Bruce Eklund announcing his retirement effective February 28, 2007, and commended Bruce for all his hard work over the past year as Chair of the Data Exchange Steering Committee. A new chair will need to be appointed, but the JIS Committee needs to consider the proposal to merge the Data Exchange and Information Access Steering Committees before making that decision.

## **PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO GR 30 - ELECTRONIC FILING**

Justice Bridge asked the committee if there were any questions about the proposed changes to GR 30. Don Horowitz indicated Judge Yu had asked him to attend this meeting to answer questions in her absence. A short discussion followed.

**Motion:** It was moved, seconded, and unanimously passed that the words "and electronically file" follow the word "scan" in paragraphs 2(C)(i) and 2(E).

**Motion:** It was moved, seconded, and unanimously passed that the words "signing attorney of record or judicial officer" be replaced with the word "signator" in paragraph 2(E)(ii).

**Motion:** It was moved, seconded, and unanimously passed to approve the proposed changes to GR 30 as amended.

## **CORE CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (CMS) STEERING COMMITTEE**

Justice Bridge expressed her gratitude to Cathy Grindle and the Core CMS Steering Committee for their hard work on this project.

Cathy Grindle stated that for the last nine months committee members, court representatives from the entire state at all court levels, AOC staff, and representatives from the National Center for State Courts have been participating in the project. Ms. Grindle indicated the committee and participants contributed thousands of hours collecting requirements, presenting the requirements to focus groups, merging the requirements into a logical presentation, and conducting validation workshops to produce high-level baseline requirements for the Washington courts at all court levels. More than 200 court employees attended the validation workshops held in King, Benton, Stevens, Thurston, and Spokane Counties.

Ms. Grindle indicated there were some concerns that Seattle Municipal Court's (SMC) requirements were not addressed in the statewide requirements. Meetings were held in December and January with SMC to review the two sets of requirements and found that only a handful of the SMC requirements were not covered. The Core CMS Steering Committee met January 5, 2007 where several different options were discussed. Yolande Williams, who was invited to the January 5 meeting, stressed that SMC would need a gap analysis of the requirements for budgetary purposes.

The three options presented to the Committee were (1) to perform the gap analysis after a vendor was selected, (2) to perform a gap analysis after the Proof of Concept, and (3) to perform a gap analysis in conjunction with the Proof of Concept. Ms. Grindle stated the committee selected Option 1 because of concerns the scoring and grading of the responses to the RFP could be tainted if a gap analysis was performed before a vendor was selected.

Cathy Grindle then stated it is the recommendation of the Core CMS Steering Committee to change the focus of the RFP--rather than release an RFP solely for a vendor, it be released focusing on an integrator. The reasoning in this approach is that while the vendor(s) may have a solid package for a case management system, they probably do not have the professional services required for data conversion, training, and other aspects of the project which do not involve the software itself. The integrator would be the primary contractor on the RFP.

The issue of including Seattle Municipal Court requirements in the RFP was raised. Yolande Williams stated it is the intent of Seattle Municipal Court to identify two or three discrete functions where there's a high level of automation, refine those functions, and submit them to be included in the RFP.

After a lengthy discussion, Judge Grosse made the following motion:

**Motion:** To approve the recommendation of the Core Case Management System Steering Committee, subject to the following proviso: that if Seattle Municipal Court makes available to the steering committee by February 1 a description of no more than three discrete areas of functionality, for a more detailed analysis and/or example of the high-level requirements set forth in the document, and those three discrete areas of functionality are in a format compatible with the document, the steering committee will make every effort to include them.

After further discussion, the motion was amended as follows:

**Amended Motion:** To approve the recommendation of the Core Case Management System Steering Committee, subject to the following proviso: that if Seattle Municipal Court makes available to the steering committee by Thursday, February 1, no more than three discrete areas of functionality, for a more detailed analysis and/or example of the high-level requirements set forth in the document, and those three discrete areas of functionality are in a format compatible with the document, the steering committee will include them in the document.

The amended motion was seconded and unanimously passed.

Judge Stilz called for a round of applause for Cathy, the Core CMS Steering Committee, and AOC staff for all their hard work on the RFP.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

Tim Bates indicated the committee needs to prepare for protests after the selection of an apparently successful bidder. Mr. Bates stated 30 days have been built into the schedule for resolving protests. The AOC is suggesting the JIS Committee may want to appoint a temporary subcommittee to have the final review of answers to any protests arising from the RFP indicating the need for some neutral body to give the final "yes" or "no" to the answers.

Butch Stussy asked how the AOC has handled protests to previous RFPs. Mr. Radwan indicated the Court Administrator has reviewed and approved all responses in the past.

In response to N. F. Jackson's question about what types of protests might arise, Farrell Presnell answered protests might include mathematical errors, failure to follow procedures, or conflict of interest and bias on the part of an evaluator.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the committee that if Mr. Stussy was comfortable with how things have been handled in the past, his office should continue to review the responses to protests.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 10:57 a.m.