

# COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY MEETING MINUTES

August 2, 2004  
9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Arizona Supreme Court  
Phone Conference: 602-542-9001  
Conference Room 119  
1501 W. Washington  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

---

---

## MEMBERS PRESENT

Louraine Arkfeld  
Kent Batty  
Michael Baumstark  
Christopher Cummiskey  
B. Robert Dorfman *via phone*  
Jeanne Hicks  
Michael Jeanes  
Donna Killoughey *via phone*  
Gary Krcmarik  
Martin Krizay *via phone*  
Ruth McGregor, *Chair*  
Jack Shomenta  
Sheldon Weisberg *via phone*

## GUESTS

John Barrett, *TAC*  
Janet Cornell, *CACC, TAC*  
Daniel Edwards, *TAC*  
Sue Hall, *Apache Superior Court*  
Carol Merfeld, *TAC*  
Gordon Mulleneaux, *CACC*  
Patricia Noland, *CACC*  
Michael Pollard, *CACC*  
Eloise Price, *TAC*  
Rick Rager, *TAC*  
Will Tagart, *TAC*

## MEMBERS ABSENT

Peter Eckerstrom  
Marcus Reinkensmeyer  
James Soto

## AOC STAFF

Jennifer Gilbertson, *ITD*  
William Earl, *ITD*  
Melinda Hardman, *CSD*  
Karl Heckart, *ITD*  
Stephanie Nolan, *ITD*  
Pamela Peet, *ITD*  
Robert Roll, *ITD*  
Janet Scheiderer, *CSD*

## WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

Commission Chair, Vice Chief Justice Ruth McGregor, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and performed roll call including those participating by phone. It was determined the Commission had a quorum.

Justice McGregor reminded members that the next meeting, to be held September 10<sup>th</sup>, is going to involve making funding decisions on expenditures by the Commission. She reminded members that a letter was sent to all Commission members from the Clerks Association regarding support for the iCIS conversion and requesting the establishment of a committee to work on implementation planning. This will be discussed further at the Commission's September 10<sup>th</sup> meeting. She also suggested that the Commission add to September's agenda, a discussion item of time limits of having matters added to the Commission's agenda, which often times, items end up being requested to be added at the last minute.

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the June 4, 2004 Commission on Technology meeting. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-04-01**

Justice McGregor introduced the Commission's newest member, Jack Shomenta. Jack gave a brief summary of his background with the courts and his involvement with IT projects.

**ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM EXCEPTION REQUEST: APACHE COUNTY CLERK OF THE COURT**

Apache County Clerk of the Court, Sue Hall, submitted a Project Investment Justification (PIJ) requesting an exception to the Enterprise Architecture Standard for an Electronic Document Management System (EDMS). Karl Heckart addressed the Commission on behalf of the Technical Advisory Council's (TAC) review of the PIJ. After review, TAC found no technical deficiencies within the standard. Karl noted that one issue of discussion is that of finances, the costs involved could be costly. Karl reviewed TAC's primary concerns:

- No integration with AZTEC. This means that there might eventually be duplicate or inconsistent records.
- SUPPORT: Apache County Clerk of the Court will be dependent on Pima Clerks Office for system support.
- TAC recommended that Pima and Apache draft an Internal-Governmental Agreement (IGA) for COT to review.

Sue Hall presented to the Commission a brief summary of the Apache PIJ and the reason for a request for an exception indicating Apache County Superior Court can not afford the standard system selected by the Commission. The Pima County Clerks office has offered to provide their "grand fathered" system to Apache County at no cost. Sue discussed possible alternatives with COT:

- Get COT's approval to move forward using Pima County Court's System with Pima as the vendor. The cost involved would only include the costs of hardware and licensing.
- Or; Apache utilize the OnBase standard EDMS.

Patricia Noland, Pima County Clerk of the Court, addressed the issue of Pima County's EDM system being integrated as a bolt-on to iCIS. She has discussed the issue with contract personal at iCIS and believes the Pima system will work as a bolt-on to iCIS. Patricia continued reasoning with COT as to why she supports this exception. The following is a few points of discussion:

- No technical deficiencies but a business issue. The system is ½ the initial cost of the standard EDMS.
- No licenses should be required.
- Less personal working with higher volumes.
- IGA better alternative than OSAM, vendor stability.
- Local and statewide impact considered. Pima system has been proven and in place for 3 years with no system failures. If exception denied, COT will need to consider addressing funding the standard.

Member discussion centered on cost differences of the required equipment between the contracted vendor, OSAM and Pima County. Karl noted that the standard is for the EDMS software and hardware for the software and not the equipment itself. OSAM's hardware is Kofax. The charge is the initial cost and ongoing cost.

Other issues of concern discussed are the policy issues. Does approval of the exception request set a precedent for any and all Clerks/Courts to move off the standard (any or all) based on costs and can or should Pima County Clerk of the Court take responsibility for supporting other counties with no monetary remuneration? Justice McGregor noted that the commission may fund counties to meet the standard using local JCEF funding and will be considered on case by case bases.

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the exception to the Enterprise Architecture Standard for Apache Superior Court provided that the Clerks office continues to enter and maintain the required data in the AZTEC system. The motion passed with four nay votes. TECH-04-02**

### **PROJECT INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION & STATE JCEF FUNDING REQUEST: TEMPE MUNICIPAL COURT**

Tempe Municipal Court needs to move off of their legacy case management system within the next two years due to lack of vendor support. The State is also in need of a new limited jurisdiction case management system to replace the aging AZTEC software. The proposed application, while built in and by Tempe Municipal Court will utilize Enterprise Architecture and have AOC participation to ensure flexibility and broad applicability to the courts across the State. The Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC) has reviewed and approved the proposal.

The requested funding for this initiative was set aside at the May COT meeting pending AJC budget approval and submittal of a PIJ from Tempe Municipal Court. Rick Rager of Tempe Municipal Court summarized for the Commission, Tempe's request outlined in the submitted PIJ. He noted corrections to the PIJ. The PIJ submitted noted the use of a Windows 2000 server in which Tempe intends to use a Windows 2003 server. Currently,

an unreleased version SQL exists that Tempe plans to eventually upgrade to once available. Rick pointed out the following in his summary to the Commission:

- Tempe plans to complete and implement the project in 18 to 24 months.
- The CMS encompasses a plug and play approach.
- The CMS will be built with functions that other courts need rather than the standard functions that only Tempe will use.
- Funding fewer than 1.9 million includes all cost with staffing.
- The acquisition of VB.NET programmers is the core of the \$250,000 request for funding.
- The CMS will have a built in calendaring module and will automate collections working with FARE.

Judge Mike Pollard, Co-Chair of CACC, spoke on behalf of COT about concerns that Tempe needs to comply with all needs of Limited Jurisdiction Courts. He is concerned with maintenance and foresees the courts eventually going down a path not intended by COT. He stressed the need of an outside agency to review the Tempe project and noted that quarterly reports are not sufficient enough. Karl Heckart mentioned key AOC staff are overlooking as they look at the business process issues. Mike, looking for specifics, requested the courts present milestones to CACC.

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the proposed project as a potential future CMS standard and allocate the requested \$250,000 for fiscal year 2005. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-04-03**

### **PROJECT PROGRESS REPORTING**

Karl Heckart presented to the Commission a more efficient mechanism for monitoring the projects the COT has sanctioned and is overseeing. The project progress reporting form will provide a snap shot of the progress and issues being faced by any of the COT monitored programs. The form has been reviewed and enhanced by the CACC. Karl stressed the forms use is to report milestones and the need of detailed presentations on major events.

Member discussion involved the request for more detail to be added to the form. It was noted that an actual vs. planned comparison with a reason for the variance was missing from the form.

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the proposed monitoring report and require Commission authorized projects to report status quarterly or at major funding milestones. The motion passed with one nay vote. TECH-04-04**

Commission member, Michael Jeanes, provided the Commission with an update to Maricopa County Courts study of Case Financial Systems (CFS). He stated that Maricopa County Courts will be in conjunction with funding from Maricopa County requesting funds from COT.

Justice McGregor stressed the need all funding request for fiscal year 2005 be submitted as soon as possible and noted a memo will be sent out as a reminder.

**CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

The meeting adjourned at 11:20 p.m.