

**COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY  
MEETING MINUTES**

**January 7, 2005**  
10:00 a.m. – 1:30 p.m.

**Arizona Supreme Court**

Conference Room 119 A/B  
Administrative Office of the Courts  
1501 W. Washington  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

---

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Louraine Arkfeld  
Kent Batty  
Michael Baumstark, *Acting Chair*  
Christopher Cummiskey  
B. Robert Dorfman  
Peter Eckerstrom  
Michael Jeanes  
Roger Klingler  
Gary Krcmarik  
Martin Krizay  
Ruth McGregor, *Chair*  
Marcus Reinkensmeyer  
Jack Shomenta  
Nicole Waldron

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Steven Correll  
Jeanne Hicks  
Carole Hubbs  
Donna Killoughey  
James Soto  
Sheldon Weisberg

**GUESTS**

John Barrett, *TAC*  
Tom Brady, *CACC*  
Eric Ciminski, *TAC*  
Janet Cornell, *TAC/CACC*  
Donald Jacobson, *CACC*  
John L. King, *TAC*  
Carol Merfeld, *TAC*  
Gregg Obuch, *CACC/TAC*  
Michael Pollard, *CACC*  
Eloise Price, *TAC*  
Rick Rager, *CCAC*

**AOC STAFF**

Tom Aughterton, *PIO*  
Michelle Anderson, *APSD*  
Stewart Bruner, *ITD*  
Dave Byers, *Administrative Office*  
Bobbie Chinsky, *JJSD*  
Elizabeth Eells, *JJSD*  
Jim Ham, *ITD*  
Melinda Hardman, *CSD*  
Karl Heckart, *ITD/TAC*  
Tim Lawler, *ITD*  
Nikolee Nelsen, *APSD*  
Stephanie Nolan, *ITD*  
Pam Peet, *ITD*  
Robert Roll, *ITD*

## **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Mike Baumstark, Acting Chair, called the Commission on Technology (COT) meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. He welcomed members and the public, informing them that Justice McGregor would take over the chair upon her arrival. He introduced new members Nicole Waldron and Roger Klingler as well as new COT staff member Stewart Bruner who replaced Maureen Haggerty. Stewart provided some brief background information about himself. Commission members present at the table as well as guests around the room then introduced themselves.

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the November 5, 2004, Commission on Technology meeting. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 05-01.**

## **2005-2010 BRANCH PLAN REVIEW**

Tom Aughterton, PIO for the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), talked the Commission through a set of slides detailing the development and review of the draft Judicial Branch Strategic Plan update that corresponds with the upcoming change in chief justice. In addition to comments from individuals being solicited at [info@supreme.sp.state.az.us](mailto:info@supreme.sp.state.az.us), each Arizona Judicial Council (AJC) committee is being asked to review the draft document and provide input by early March 2005. Mike Baumstark asked members for their suggestions about how best to review and comment on the document, leading to the development of the following motion by the Commission:

**MOTION: Louraine Arkfeld, Nicole Waldron, Marcus Reinkensmeyer, and Jack Shomonta are directed to act as an ad hoc group representing COT in reviewing the draft of the Strategic Agenda for Arizona's Courts 2005-2010. The ad hoc group is charged with reviewing the document, commenting on its content, and returning a consolidated set of comments agreed on by the group to AJC for its consideration no later than the end of the first week in February 2005. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 05-02**

The members commended AJC for including them in the review process prior to publication since so many business goals in the draft document involve automation.

## **SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATES**

Michael Pollard, co-chair of the Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC), explained the subcommittee's role in monitoring important automation projects and the positive strides being made. He noted minor changes to the forms on which major projects file their progress monthly to align them more with the type of information GITA collects from executive branch agencies to perform its oversight role. He also pointed out that CACC is attempting to meet more frequently to monitor the two major development projects currently underway, Pima Agave and Tempe CMS.

Martin Krizay, representing the Probation Automation Coordinating Committee (PACC), briefly described two guideline documents recently developed by the subcommittee, a JOLTS data sharing policy and an adult/juvenile policy for responding to research

requests. He explained that PACC's intent in presenting them was not for final approval but for informing the Commission of their use. PACC plans to put the guidelines for data sharing and research into use for a year to allow bugs to be worked out before returning to COT to seek any codification in the Arizona Code of Judicial Administration (ACJA). Martin also shared that adult probation is developing data sharing policies as part of its effort to draft a comprehensive manual.

Bobbie Chinsky, Elizabeth Eells and Michelle Anderson from AOC answered members' questions regarding the one-year wait, specifics of the requests that triggered the development of policies, the relationship of the policies to Rule 123, and how bulk requests would be treated.

Mike Baumstark pointed out that to have any authority outside of the Judicial Code, the interim documents would need the approval of both Dave Byers and the data managers in the counties. He felt a higher-level AOC policy must contemplate all requests for data regardless of subject area. Karl Heckart added that documents like these appear at COT because the Commission acts as the logical reporting point when IT discovers a challenge that affects other AOC disciplines.

**MOTION: AOC Information Technology Division (ITD) is directed to review all policies and guidelines related to Rule 123 and consider expansion to other AOC areas, returning a general policy to the Commission for review and approval. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 05-03**

### **PRINCIPLES FOR GRANTING EXCEPTIONS TO ARCHITECTURAL STANDARDS**

Karl Heckart, Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) chair, presented TAC's preliminary recommendations regarding one-time exceptions to standards. Karl described how the Judicial Project Investment Justification (JPIJ) is too onerous a document for requesting a one-time exception for the application of a standard, rather than asking that the standard as a whole be reconsidered. He cited Scottsdale City Court's recent exception JPIJ as the trigger for change.

After TAC brainstormed a list of principles underlying requests for exceptions, AOC created an exception request document to simplify the requirements for those requesting only a one-time exception. The document still brings the key issues to light, but does so in a simpler manner than the JPIJ, reducing the number of hoops to jump through for an exception to be requested.

Karl answered members' questions about specific wording in the document and how extensively the document had been reviewed by TAC members.

**MOTION: AOC Information Technology Division is directed to return the proposed exception request document to TAC for their approval prior to resubmittal to the Commission. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 05-04**

### **REQUEST FOR EXCEPTION TO EDMS STANDARD**

Janet Cornell, Scottsdale City Court Administrator, asked the Commission to grant a one-time exception for the use of the City-standard electronic document management system (EDMS), Hummingbird, rather than the state-standard OnBase. Members weighed the implications of the decision for local government integration versus integration with the state courts and determined that the local efficiency and savings outweighed the statewide integration challenges. Janet assured the Commission that support will be provided by Scottsdale's resources, necessary interoperability with State systems will be built and that the Hummingbird system supports the State's minimum standard for passing images (TIFF).

**MOTION: Scottsdale City Court is granted an exception to Arizona Code of Judicial Administration 1-501, Court Automation Standards, to use Hummingbird, the city's EDMS solution, rather than OnBase, the State's standard solution, based on reduced total operating cost, reduced risk in implementation, and benefits from local integration to the court. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 05-05**

### **CLARIFICATION ABOUT ATTENDING BY PHONE**

Vice Chief Justice Ruth McGregor, Chair, briefly reminded members that the telephone is not used as a regular method of attending Commission meetings unless a particular meeting itself is designated a phone conference beforehand. She stated that room exists for future discussion.

### **INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PLAN**

Stewart Bruner, Manager of IT Strategic Planning at AOC, presented slides detailing the proposed approach to creating the Information Technology Strategic Plan FY2006-2008. He shared input he received from stakeholders concerning the length and value of the plan template as well as the planning process, along with proposed key milestones and their associated dates. He explained the late start being made this year due to Maureen's retirement and asked members to weigh the desire for change against the need to deliver plan summaries for COT review at the May meeting. Members concurred with TAC's recommendations that the process should simply replicate last year's and that the template should continue to be used (with minimal updates for Statewide initiatives and projects). Stewart will add language suggested by members to widen the planning process by encouraging courts to seek input from other justice partners.

### **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Justice McGregor concluded the meeting after making a call to the public and verifying that members had any no further items to discuss.

The next meeting scheduled for the COT is March 4, 2005, in Conference Room 119 A/B of the Arizona State Courts Building.

The meeting adjourned at 12:45 p.m.