

**COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY
MEETING MINUTES**

June 2, 2005
10:00 a.m. – 1:30 p.m.
&
June 3, 2005
9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Arizona Supreme Court

Conference Room 345 A/B
Administrative Office of the Courts
1501 W. Washington St.
Phoenix, AZ 85007

MEMBERS PRESENT

Louraine Arkfeld
Kent Batty (*Gregg Obuch proxy*)
Michael Baumstark
Rebecca White Berch, *Chair*
Christopher Cummiskey (*Chris Muir proxy*)
B. Robert Dorfman
Peter Eckerstrom
Jeanne Hicks
Roger Klingler
Gary Krcmarik (*Donald Jacobson proxy*)
Marcus Reinkensmeyer
Jack Shomenta
James Soto
Nicole Waldron
Sheldon Weisberg (*Phil Urry proxy*)

MEMBERS ABSENT

Steven Correll
Carole Hubbs
Donna Killoughey
Martin Krizay
Michael Jeanes

GUESTS

Mohyeddin Abdulaziz, *TAC*
Odette Apodaca, *Pinal Clerk's Office*
Isaac Barrera, *Yuma Superior*
John Barrett, *TAC*
Ron Beguin, *CACC*
Eric Ciminski, *TAC*
Janet Cornell, *TAC/CACC*
Dave Davis, *TAC/ CACC*
John L. King, *TAC*
Carey Meister, *TAC*
Gordon Mulleneaux, *CACC*
Ruth McGregor, *chair emeritus*
Patricia Noland, *CACC*
Danny Pugh, *Tempe Muni Court*
Michael Pollard, *CACC*
Eloise Price, *TAC*
Will Tagart, *TAC*
Carla Tack, *Tempe Muni Court*
Myrtle Young, *PACC*

AOC STAFF

Joe Blaszcak, *ITD*
Stewart Bruner, *ITD*
Elaine Cadman, *ITD*
Bobbie Chinsky, *JJSD*
William Earl, *ITD*
Jennifer Gilbertson, *ITD*
Gary Graham, *ITD*
Jim Ham, *ITD*
Melinda Hardman, *CSD*
Karl Heckart, *ITD/TAC*
Paul Hrisho, *ITD*
Tim Lawler, *ITD*
Adele May, *ITD*
Stephanie Nolan, *ITD*
Pam Peet, *ITD*
Robert Roll, *ITD*
Janet Scheiderer, *Court Svcs*
Amy Wood, *Court Svcs*

DAY 1 -- WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Justice Rebecca White Berch, newly appointed Chair, called the Commission on Technology (COT) meeting to order at 1:05 p.m., welcoming members and guests. Vice Chief Justice Ruth V. McGregor, the former chair, delivered opening remarks concerning the recent changeover in the chair position and the importance of always having the vice chief justice chair the commission because of its significance to AJC and the role automation plays for courts in the State. She thanked members for their time commitment and willingness to “give to the system.” Justice Berch then had members introduce themselves in some detail. Members and guests were then called on to introduce themselves.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the January 7, 2005, Commission on Technology meeting. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 05-06.

Justice Berch stated the objectives for the day-and-a-half planning meeting and previewed the agenda items. She expressed concern that funds must be accumulated to be able to implement the case management systems (CMSs) currently in development.

2005-2010 BRANCH PLAN ALIGNMENT, INITIATIVES, TRENDS

Karl Heckart, CIO for the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), walked the Commission through a listing of potential IT initiatives related to the top-level initiatives contained in the new branch plan, *Good to Great: A Strategic Agenda for Arizona's Courts 2005-2010*. He pointed out that certain projects contemplated by the Commission in past planning sessions could wait no longer for a decision to be made. He then illustrated the point by describing trend areas gathered from IT plans. Karl updated members on what had transpired with various projects on last year's priority list. He then introduced a strategy for dividing projects into categories based on their importance/impact (**High/Medium/Low**) and predicted timing of implementation (**Short-/Medium-/Long-term**). He recast items remaining from last year's priority list into the categories shown below:

- **H-S** -- Code Standardization and Penalty Enforcement Program
- **H-M** -- Integration
- **H-L** -- New Case/Financial Management System for Trial Courts and JOLTSaz
- **M-S** -- Electronic Document Management, Adult Probation System (APETS) Rollout, Internet Public Interactive Service, Audio and Video Court Records, and Electronic Signatures
- **M-M** -- Electronic Filing, Technical Training, and Interactive Jury
- **M-L** -- Enterprise Architecture and Process Standardization

Karl answered questions from members about his timing predictions concerning CMS development and integration activities. Members chose to defer any motion to approve the priorities list until updates had been presented by the CMS development teams later in the meeting.

ELECTRONIC COURTS

Karl Heckart explained how courts are planning to maximize opportunities to better use and re-use digital information. He stated that culture and resistance to change are the hold-up rather than the e-courts technology itself. He proposed working together in the Branch to build on what we have today in an evolutionary approach having three parallel phases: 1) Court to court, leveraging the electronic appeal process; 2) leveraging prosecutors' information using the new Arizona Disposition Reporting System already in process; and 3) form-based attorney/public e-filing using standardized, interactive, statewide forms as the foundation to build upon.

Members questioned the interrelationships among the three parallel threads and what outcome Karl expected from the discussion. Public member Jack Shomonta, reminded members that change is difficult, even when it's kept within the court family, and not to expect significant change on any timetable without documentation of process improvement, careful coordination, and wise development for success.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to create an e-court subcommittee to drive and coordinate the statewide evolution of e-filing. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 05-07

MOTION: AOC will develop a project plan to expand interactive electronic forms statewide, using the Maricopa County approach. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 05-08

Volunteers for the e-court committee were asked to submit their names to Stewart Bruner, COT Staff.

SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATES

Judge Michael Pollard, co-chair of the Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC), provided a certificate of appreciation to Vice Chief Justice McGregor on behalf of CACC before summarizing the subcommittee's role in monitoring four ongoing automation projects of statewide importance. He described the end-of-phase form now being used to control funding disbursements related to the achievement of agreed milestones. He also praised the dedication of CACC members as they meet monthly and oversee demonstrations of the developing Pima AGAVE and Tempe CMSs. Judge Pollard also listed in his presentation the names of attendees at the various demonstrations held to date.

Mr. Gregg Obuch provided the background, current status, and plans for completion on the Pima AGAVE CMS project. He listed near-term items that will be complete by July 15, 2005, at which point the larger project plan will become more clear and detailed funding needs can be determined. Until then, he estimated the project would require an additional \$199,000.00 of State JCEF funding for FY06 and an additional \$199,000.00 for FY07. He also requested that the AOC provide an additional full-time resource to participate in the training, reporting, implementation, and documentation tasks of the project to better prepare for expansion from Pima to other general jurisdiction courts. He predicted that the Pima County Criminal Bench would be implemented in December of 2005.

Mr. Danny Pugh, senior programmer for Tempe Municipal Court, updated members on progress being made on the Tempe CMS project. He walked members through the Arizona Traffic Ticket Complaint (ATTC) entry screens and the data conversion process, as well as case/party search and inquiry screens. He detailed the project's four-month plan within the larger project plan and said the September 6, 2006, go-live date shared previously is currently being reassessed. The project anticipates needing additional funds for AOC retained resources, Visible consultant billings, and a VB.NET programmer, totaling \$250,000.00 for FY06.

Mr. Dave Davis presented the status of Maricopa County's Limited Jurisdiction iCIS CMS work. He stated that he expected development to complete by June 30, 2005, in support of the consolidation of three separate courts into the Northwest Regional Consolidated Court in mid-September. This is a change from the previous plan, which had the CMS implementation occurring after the three courts had been relocated to the new facility. Members were also shown the search screen and the iCIS interface.

Mr. Gordon Mulleneaux reported on the four development phases of the Maricopa Clerk's new integrated financial information system: 1) limited jurisdiction court financials, 2) new cash receipting/trust system, 3) module to process juvenile payments, and 4) enhancement of the juvenile module to process adult payments. Gordon requested disbursement of previously approved Phase 2 monies once all Phase 1 activities are verified complete.

Ms. Janet Scheiderer, Director of AOC's Court Services Division, shared the history and impact of court automation efforts through the years, especially the drawbacks of not having common codes and having redundant codes among courts. She reminded members of Motion TECH 03-18 from the September 2003 meeting giving a direction and timeline for code standardization activities. The urgency only increases as the new CMSs approach implementation. She requested that a data standards committee be established pro-actively with representation from various functional groups and jurisdictions as well as a new AOC resource to staff the committee. She also proposed a lockdown of codes at the local level in the new CMSs but did not preclude having a local table/state table approach. Members were reticent to consider any proposals beyond creation and staffing of the code standardization committee without seeing further details, documented processes, and service request commitments from the committee at the September COT meeting. Further discussion of position descriptions and future staffing costs were deferred to the funding discussion on Day 2.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to establish a data standards oversight committee responsible for formulating policies for initiating new codes and approving code-related decisions over time. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 05-09

Ms. Myrtle Young, chair of the Probation Automation Coordinating Committee (PACC) provided members with an overview of activities in probation-related automation for both adult and juvenile justice: APETS, e-JOLTS, and JOLTSaz. All three application development areas presented their individual current progress, plans for completion, challenges, and lessons learned. Jennifer Gilbertson showed the APETS client transfer screen and "My Caseload" screen, among others, and stated that APETS now holds over 4 million contact records for approximately 150,000 clients. John Barrett presented the

iCIS visual interface for e-JOLTS as well as inquiry and data entry screens. He stated that the Maricopa County application is expected to be complete in December 2005, best case. Jim Ham showed the flexibility of the programming environment for the JOLTS application by displaying modules developed in-house, developed by another group but ported into the application, and purchased from a third party and integrated into one application.

Due to time constraints, the TAC Update was deferred to June 3, 2005.

Day 1 of the COT strategic planning meeting adjourned Thursday, June 2, 2005, at 5:10 p.m.

DAY 2 – WELCOME AND PLAN

The meeting resumed at exactly 9:00 a.m. on Friday, June 3, 2005, with Justice Berch calling the Commission to order. Judge Arkfeld, chair of the Commission prior to Vice Chief Justice McGregor's tenure, presented a plaque to Vice Chief Justice McGregor to show COT's appreciation her for her long-time service as chair.

Justice Berch stated that the strategy for getting back on track with the agenda was to wrap up loose items from Day 1 and then carry on with the agenda for Day 2. The tabled motion to approve the priorities for FY2006 would be reconsidered following the TAC update and detail for the requested code standardization position would be provided in the financial decisions agenda item.

TAC UPDATE

Mr. Karl Heckart quickly walked members through a list of technology-related things TAC feels need to be addressed in the next year or two, many of which had been covered in his Day 1 presentations. Areas included Architecture Enhancements, Integration, CMSs, and e-Court. At the end of his brief presentation, he revisited the strategic initiatives priority list he proposed during Day 1. Members reviewed it and raised questions about the expected durations of the CMS projects. Karl responded that the new CMS development involved both completion for local use and the necessary modifications and rollout for statewide use, adding at least two years to the project beyond completion of local development.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to accept the FY06 priorities and timing for information technology strategic initiatives as presented. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 05-10

JCEF AND TCPF FUNDING: STATUS AND PROJECTIONS

Mr. Kevin Kluge, AOC's budget officer, reviewed the financial status of both the Judicial Collections Enhancement Fund (JCEF) and the Traffic Case Processing Fund (TCPF). He provided the FY05 balance, short-term request amounts, and available balances remaining. He also provided a four-year cash flow projection based on an annual growth rate of 1.3 percent for JCEF and 0 percent for TCPF, noting that legislative transfers totaling \$2.466M were being requested for reimbursement using general fund monies. Without a reversal of the past transfers, the funds will continue deficit spending and insufficient funds will exist to implement the new CMSs statewide.

Karl Heckart followed Mr. Kluge's presentation of the numbers with some ideas for reducing or shifting costs. He estimated the future spike in costs related to implementing the CMSs to be approximately \$7M over a 3-to-4-year period, beginning when the local versions have implemented. He reminded members that the e-Court evolution discussed on Day 1 will also have future costs associated but that those cannot yet be quantified sufficiently. He also warned that continued requests for increased bandwidth from rural courts could add \$2M in ongoing annual costs if all communications lines were upgraded to T1 capacity.

FUTURE DEPLOMENT AND SUPPORT PHILOSOPHY

Karl Heckart began by reviewing the historical support models: ACAP (centralized) and Large Volume (decentralized). He described changes in the IT environment since the models were initiated, especially the rapidly increasing local emphasis on IT development and support including EDMS installations and integration projects. He presented a pyramid split into three sections to illustrate items contained in operational funding, applications funding, and innovation funding categories and their associated aggregate costs.

Karl then discussed the implications of the State's exiting each of the various categories shown on the pyramid. He also contemplated changing the chargeback model and increasing the subscription rate. Apart from recovering the monies lost in the legislative sweeps, the cost reduction/cost recovery solutions are all very complex and have ramifications on courts of various sizes and locations to varying extents. There were too many items for COT to reduce into a funding/operating direction in this meeting. Karl recommended that a subcommittee be formed to deal with the funding-related complexities and make recommendations to COT.

MOTION: It was moved and seconded that a temporary subcommittee be formed to identify funding options and analyze cost model alternatives in order to make a recommendation to COT at its September 2005 meeting. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 05-11

The chair then asked for volunteers representing diverse backgrounds and constituencies willing to serve through the end of the 2006 legislative session to submit their names to Karl Heckart.

FINANCIAL AND TACTICAL DECISIONS

Karl Heckart reminded members of the steps and timeline for funding decisions – COT allocates but AJC approves – and the need for COT to present a set of requests at the AJC annual meeting on June 20. He summarized costs in several areas:

- Current IT Operations and Support;
- Ongoing Commitments to Projects -- Pima AGAVE, Tempe CMS, and iFIS; and
- Proposed initiatives – Interactive Forms, additional monies requested by the CMS development efforts, the upcoming CMS implementation cost spike, 1 FTE development support of CMSs at AOC, Coconino integration enhancements to AZTEC, 1 FTE staff for new code standardization committee.

Karl summarized the financial situation as follows: \$2.847M in total spending authority exists but only \$1.550M in funds are available (accounting for deficits in out years) while

\$745.9K in new spending is being requested, of which \$140.9K is ongoing funding. In light of all that was presented, the following motions were made:

MOTION: It was moved and seconded to fund ongoing operations and previous commitments made to strategic projects. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 05-12

MOTION: It was moved and seconded to approve the request by Flagstaff Municipal Court on behalf of its Coconino justice partners for \$50,000.00 in state JCEF to fund enhancements to AZTEC related to further integration efforts. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 05-13

MOTION: It was moved and seconded to request of AJC and reserve additional State JCEF funds for the CMS development projects (\$199K for Pima AGAVE and \$250K for Tempe CMS) but to withhold any disbursement until full project plans identify the remaining milestone deliverables used to allocate funding. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 05-14

Tempe and Pima representatives assured members they were comfortable with the restrictive language of the motion before the vote occurred.

MOTION: It was moved and seconded to request that AJC fund the requested support personnel related to quality assurance, mentoring, and engineering reviews at AOC in support of the ongoing development and future expansion of the statewide CMSs. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 05-15

MOTION: It was moved and seconded to request of AJC and reserve \$50K for expansion of the Maricopa interactive forms project statewide, but to withhold any disbursement until options and plans are presented to COT. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 05-16

MOTION: It was moved and seconded to recommend that AJC fund the single requested staff person for the recently approved code standardization committee as an AOC position having statewide impact. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 05-17

Local JCEF Requests – Stewart Bruner, COT staff, addressed members concerning two requests for local JCEF that exceeded the \$250K threshold requiring COT approval, per ACJA 1-109. He informed members that the Phoenix EDMS replacement JPIJ had been received months ago, described a move to the state-standard EDMS product, On Base, and was thoroughly reviewed by AOC staff who recommended approval. He said the Maricopa County Hotsite JPIJ, on the other hand, had just been received at the meeting therefore staff had no time to review its details. He could not recommend approval and discouraged the practice of simply “dropping” a JPIJ at a COT meeting and expecting approval. Will Tagart, from the Office of the Clerk of the Superior Court in Maricopa County, provided a brief overview of the project and funding request, then answered members’ questions.

MOTION: It was moved and seconded to approve the request and funding for the Maricopa County server refresh and hot-site-related equipment, contingent upon COT staff review with no issues surfaced. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 05-18

MOTION: It was moved and seconded to approve the Phoenix Municipal Court's proposed project as a replacement of the electronic document management system for closed records and to approve the use of the requested \$409,500 in local JCEF. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 05-19

Vice Chief Justice McGregor congratulated the Phoenix Court staff for their thoroughness in preparing the JPIJ and recommended it as a model for other courts having projects to present to COT for approval.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PLANS

Karl Heckart presented members with a process description of how plans were gathered and summarized. He sympathized with those who did the hard work to complete the plans, but wants them to understand that it's a very necessary two-way communication activity for the courts and AOC. He noted that the AOC will be convening meetings to discuss what works and what needs improvement with the planning process. Karl pointed out that general approval of IT Plans does not constitute approval of specific projects that may require additional information and clarification. Further, where concern was raised, staff will communicate to the court the issues raised via a letter to the presiding judge and, in some cases, a face-to-face meeting. He then briefly summarized each Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2006-2008 submitted by county courts and appellate courts.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Apache County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2006-2008, with a concern raised for development of a new court financials system and "late adopter" projections for all statewide projects. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-05-20

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Cochise County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2006-2008. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-05-21

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Coconino County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2006-2008. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-05-22

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Gila County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2006-2008, with a concern raised about the submittal of electronic records on appeal which would expand the e-Blueback pilot beyond Pima County. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-05-23

- MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve Graham County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2006-2008. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-05-24
- MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve Greenlee County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2006-2008. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-05-25
- MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve La Paz County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2006-2008. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-05-26
- MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve Maricopa County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan including Maricopa Municipal Court Plans for FY 2006-2008, with a concern raised for the timing of migration to the .NET standard. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-05-27
- MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve Mohave County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2006-2008, with concerns raised for the pursuit of e-filing, e-forms, and e-signatures; using a collections program outside of FARE, which requires an exception form AJC; and the investigation of an alternative CMS. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-05-28
- MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve Navajo County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2006-2008. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-05-29
- MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve Pima County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2006-2008. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-05-30

A question was raised about representation of intellectual property ownership related to the MEEDS system. AOC needs to investigate the relationship between Maricopa County and SmartBridge Technologies, Inc., to allay confusion in the field.

A question was raised in relation to whether form-based filing was subject to the restrictions of Rule 124. Karl answered that the forms are for paper filing at the moment and the project must return to COT before it switches to e-filing.

- MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve Pinal County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2006-2008, with concern for obtaining software to perform functions AZTEC doesn't do such as receivables tracking. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-05-31

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Santa Cruz County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2006-2008. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-05-32

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Yavapai County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2006-2008, with concerns raised for collecting online payments, e-filing, and e-signature remaining in synch with statewide efforts and investigating use of JOLTSaz calendar for all case types. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-05-33

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Yuma County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2006-2008, with concern raised for the statement that EA Standards constrain development, keeping courts from selecting the best solutions. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-05-34

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the Court of Appeals', Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2006-2008, with concern raised for a lack of planning to migrate from WordPerfect to Word, the state standard word processing program. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-05-35

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the Arizona Supreme Court Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2006-2008. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-05-36

REQUESTING EXCEPTIONS TO ARCHITECTURAL STANDARDS

Stewart Bruner presented the finished document to be used for requesting one-time exceptions to architectural standards based on the Judicial Project Investment Justification (JPIJ), as approved by TAC. Stewart detailed the evolution of the document and why it was returned to TAC from COT's January meeting. He asked that it now be approved for use.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed document for requesting one-time exceptions to approved architectural standards for use. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 05-37

CALL TO THE PUBLICJustice Berch concluded the meeting after making a call to the public and verifying that members had no further items to discuss. She declared the July 7 and 8 meeting no longer necessary and directed members to remove it from their schedules.

The next meeting scheduled for the COT is the FY06 kickoff on September 9, 2005, at the Judicial Education Center located at 541 E. Van Buren St., Suite #B-4, Phoenix, Arizona.

The meeting adjourned at 1:13 p.m.