

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
FOR BENTON AND FRANKLIN COUNTIES**

7122 W. Okanogan Place, Building A, Kennewick, WA 99336

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE
BRUCE A. SPANNER

BENTON COUNTY JUSTICE CENTER
FRANKLIN COUNTY COURTHOUSE
TELEPHONE (509) 736-3071
FAX (509) 736-3057

January 5, 2015

Mr. Ronald R. Carpenter
Clerk of the Supreme Court
Washington State Supreme Court
415 12th Ave SW
PO Box 40929
Olympia, WA 98504-0929

Dear Mr. Carpenter:

I am writing to express my support for adoption of the proposed amendments to JISC Rule 13. As the representative of the Superior Court Judges Association, I have been active in the Superior Court Case Management System project. Initially, I helped develop business requirements for the procurement. I then reviewed the responses to the requests for proposal and evaluated the software demonstrations. For the last 24 months, I have been a member of the Court Users Work Group. We are charged with the responsibility of working with the vendor to customize and configure the case management application. I have extensive knowledge of case management systems.

The proposed amendments to JISC Rule 13 are critical to future of judicial information. The JIS Data Standards for Alternative Court Record Systems, recently adopted by the JISC, are designed to ensure that the statewide system will continue to have necessary data from courts with independent systems. However, without an enforcement mechanism, there is nothing that gives courts with independent systems the incentive to comply with the data standards. That is why the proposed amendments to JISC Rule 13 are so important.

Shared court data is crucial to public safety for all Washington courts and our justice partners to continue to have access to statewide judicial information. Every day our court depends on access to information from other courts. Pierce County Superior Court already has a separate case management system, and King County plans to implement a separate system. Without a requirement for those courts to uniformly capture data for the statewide system, we will lose critical information that judges and staff in other courts need to do their jobs every day.

Another reason to support the proposed amendments recently came to my attention at the December meeting of the Court Users Work Group. In a word, it is data conversion and replication. The best way to explain my concern is to describe an issue that has arisen in the implementation of Odyssey as the Superior Court Case Management System. AOC staff discovered that person data in SCOMIS is created and maintained in a manner that is fundamentally different than person data in Odyssey. Alternate names in SCOMIS (aka's and fka's) require the creation of a new record for each. The records are then linked together. In Odyssey only one record is created for any given person. Alternate names are then added to that record. These systems were obviously not built to the same standards. The inconsistency will create challenges in the conversion of data from SCOMIS to Odyssey.

Data replication will be more challenging. Unfortunately, Odyssey cannot be installed in every county at once. It is inescapable that there will be a period of several years when some of the courts will be using Odyssey, while the rest will be using SCOMIS. Data will be replicated between the systems. That is, as data is added or modified in Odyssey, it must be copied to SCOMIS, and visa versa. Because of system incompatibility, some of the replication cannot be automated. Users will be referred to the AOC Help Desk. It is inevitable that a new case management system will be implemented for district and municipal courts. Obviously, the conversion and replication processes would be greatly simplified if all local systems must comply with the same standards.

We have an opportunity to truly modernize case management. It is frustrating to watch as factions seek to undermine progress. The proposed amendments do not affect any court's ability to employ independent systems. Rather, the proposed amendments simply create performance standards for data collection, structure and dissemination. Under the proposed rule, courts can have their own systems, so long as the system can record and export data as required by the JIS Data Standards for Alternative Court Record Systems.

I encourage you to adopt the amendments to JISC Rule 13, as proposed.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Bruce A. Spanner
Superior Court Judge
Benton and Franklin Counties

Tracy, Mary

From: OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK
Sent: Monday, January 05, 2015 9:39 AM
To: Tracy, Mary
Subject: FW: Comments on JISC Rukle 13
Attachments: JISC Rule 13 Comments 1-5-2015.doc

Here you go.

From: Bruce Spanner [mailto:Bruce.Spanner@co.benton.wa.us]
Sent: Monday, January 05, 2015 9:38 AM
To: OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK
Subject: Comments on JISC Rukle 13

Please accept the attached comments on the proposed amendments to JISC Rule 13. A hard copy will follow in the mail. Please call with questions.

Bruce A. Spanner
Benton-Franklin Counties Superior Court Judge
7122 W Okanogan Pl, Bldg. A
Kennewick, WA 99336
509-736-3071