

**COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY  
MEETING MINUTES**

**June 7, 2007**

9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

**June 8, 2007**

9:00 a.m. – 3:30 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  
Rebecca Berch, *Chair*  
Robert Brutinel  
Christopher Cumiskey (*Dr. Max Ivey, proxy*)  
Peter Eckerstrom  
John Gemmill (*Phil Urry, proxy*)  
Michael Jeanes  
Roger Klingler  
Gary Krcmarik  
Martin Krizay  
Sheri Newman  
Catherine O'Grady  
Marcus Reinkensmeyer  
John Rezzo  
Roxanne Song Ong

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Jessica Blazina  
Mark Candioto

## GUESTS

Elizabeth Hegedos-Berthold, *CSA*  
Tom Brady, *Public*  
Cathy Clarich, *CACC*  
Janet Cornell, *CACC*  
Phillip Ellis, *Pima Superior*  
Jason Epel, *PCCJC*  
Beverly Frame, *Yuma Clerk*  
Donald Jacobson, *CACC*  
Dr. Max Ivey, *GITA*  
Tim Lawler, *Phoenix Muni Court*  
Rich McHattie, *Maricopa Clerk's Office*  
Rona Newton, *PACC*  
Gregg Obuch, *CACC*  
Michael Pollard, *CACC*  
Rick Rager, *TAC, CACC*  
Kyle Rimel, *TAC*  
Lisa Royal, *PCCJC*  
Jim Scorza, *Phoenix Muni Court*  
David Stevens, *TAC*  
Carl Ward, *Maricopa Clerk's Office*  
Myrtle Young, *PACC*

## AOC STAFF

Carol Ashton, *CSD*  
Stewart Bruner, *ITD*  
Jennifer Gilbertson, *PACC*  
Gary Graham, *ITD*  
Karl Heckart, *ITD/TAC*  
Patrick McGrath, *CSD*  
Stephanie Nolan, *ITD*  
John Overholtz, *CSD*  
Pamela Peet, *ITD*  
Janet Scheiderer, *CSD*

## **DAY 1 -- WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS**

Vice Chief Justice Rebecca Berch, Chair, called the Commission on Technology (COT) meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. after staff confirmed that a quorum existed. She welcomed members and the public present, then introduced Judge Roxanne Song Ong from Phoenix Municipal Court, who was recently appointed to complete the term of retired judge Bob Dorfman. Justice Berch asked members to introduce themselves. She called members' attention to a meeting overview graphic and described in general the related flow of activities anticipated over the two-day meeting.

Justice Berch also provided members with a brief update on several items of interest including:

- Audience participation through the public comment process;
- Fire and evacuation procedures;
- The possibility of the Commission's entering into executive session to discuss details of an open procurement and the procedures to be followed; and
- Addition of a communications planning requirement to the project management methodology approved in 1999, in response to an Auditor General recommendation. She declared the project management methodology to be in effect for projects above \$250K or statewide in scope.

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the March 2, 2007, Commission on Technology meeting. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 07-08.**

### **e-COURT UPDATE**

Due to a schedule conflict, Justice Andrew Hurwitz, chair of the e-Court subcommittee, presented out of sequence with the other subcommittee chairs. He reminded members of the burning need for a case management system decision before highlighting the condition of the key projects being overseen at each level of court, including:

- General Jurisdiction – EDMS at every superior court and proof of the multi-vendor concept in Maricopa Superior. Justice Hurwitz alerted members to some upcoming decisions that must be made related to the multi-vendor model.
- Limited Jurisdiction – Electronic citation fast track and standardizing public forms content in preparation for an interactive forms approach for filers.
- Appellate Level – e-Record on Appeal, EDMS implementations and integration with the case management system, as well as necessary rules changes.

He briefly shared some challenges on the horizon, especially regarding proof of the multi-vendor concept, and wrapped up with a reminder that constraints in current rules should not be used as an excuse for inaction.

Karl Heckart presented the subject of criminal filing or justice integration. He provided a brief history of efforts to increase the accuracy of criminal history data nationwide and the hopes for the new Arizona Disposition Reporting System (ADRS) as the engine for justice integration in the state. ADRS will eventually need to be able to intelligently route both data and documents through the criminal justice process. AOC is working on an agreement with Maricopa County to adopt its justice web interface (JWI) technology to automatically collect criminal data from various sources and make it available in a single consolidated view at the level where it belongs. Karl reported that DPS' interest in electronic processes is steadily increasing.

## **ADDITIONAL CONTEXT FOR PLANNING ACTIVITIES**

Karl Heckart continued with a general explanation of where automation stands today in the judiciary as the backdrop for the decision the Commission must make later in the day. He refreshed members' memories about AZTEC being declared unable to meet second generation automation requirements, Pima Superior Court's request to adapt iCIS to a new technology set to replace the aging Wang system, and Tempe's similar need to update its case management system from the same era. Funding was shared between the local court and the state. He emphasized that, as development progressed, the Commission reserved the right to decide whether the candidate systems would be made statewide. Now each candidate system will be coming into production at its "home court" within the next fiscal year.

He challenged members that decisions need to be made and funding set aside consistent with those decisions to get statewide case management systems.

## **GENERAL JURISDICTION CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS ASSESSMENT**

Renny Rapiet, staff to the GJ CMS Proposal Core Evaluation Team, reviewed the hard work undertaken to provide COT with a look at the vendor option, from a survey of states already using vendor systems to letting the eventual request for proposal as COT directed. He described in detail the constitution of the various evaluation work groups, numbering around 50 people, including the business team, technical team, AOC specialists, and court user group who tested various aspects of the vendors' systems as input into the decision process of the core team to arrive at a recommendation. He further detailed what items or areas each subteam evaluated and how each provided input to the core team. Renny then shared the evaluation criteria: product evaluation 40%; vendor reliability 35%, and price 25%.

The chair asked members to approve the process followed by the AOC team to arrive at the RFP and the selection criteria. She mentioned that the process may have taken place over a very short period of time, but was nonetheless very thorough.

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the process pursued in development of RFP and evaluation of bids. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 07-09**

Justice Berch reminded all present that details of an open procurement are protected by law from public release. Because COT meetings are public, an executive session could become necessary to prevent breaching confidentiality. Only Commission members and members of the core evaluation team will be involved in the executive session.

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to convene an executive session in order to review details of the core evaluation team's recommendation. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 07-10**

Upon return from the executive session, the chair asked if any member would be interested in phrasing a motion consistent with publicly disclosable information regarding the best fit vendor system.

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to accept the evaluation team's recommendation regarding the best fit vendor. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 07-11**

Having evaluated the "buy" option, attention turned to the "build" and "borrow" options. Renny Rapiet described the evaluation efforts that have occurred for iCIS and AGAVE in an attempt to provide members with a true, side-by-side comparison of the three possible systems. He provided functional fit numbers from the "to be" state as self-assessed by developers, the results of limited AOC validation testing done on each system, the pro and con statements collected from various evaluators, and next steps to pursue. He showed a timeline for implementing iCIS ending in early 2012 and a timeline for AGAVE ending in early 2011. He also reviewed detailed costs associated with enabling AGAVE to achieve 100% of the functional requirements in the matrix at an estimated price of \$2.9M, based on level of effort times a vendor hourly rate. Karl Heckart then addressed the Commission regarding the other projects dependent on this one for direction and the need to free their developers' hands by making a decision.

Discussion focused on differences in evaluation activities among the three systems, especially the user testing performed. Renny described in detail the various parts of systems evaluators were provided access to or had demonstrated for them on specific days. Mike Baumstark explained that the procurement process necessitated that RFP evaluators only compare the specific software being evaluated for purchase. Michael Jeanes circulated a letter from the clerk's association stating its position and requesting that more evaluation be done before selecting a system. Members questioned the need to do anything at all at present or whether a hybrid approach could be followed that pursued two options simultaneously with the vendor option being considered provisionally. Discussion revealed that putting off the decision to attempt to obtain more information would not appreciably change the data in any way. The chair introduced some perspective by stating today's task was not a final decision but rather a recommendation to AJC.

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to recommend to AJC contracting with a vendor to supply and maintain a general jurisdiction case management system. The motion passed with one nay vote (Kent Batty abstaining). TECH 07-12**

In explaining his second of the motion, GITA Director and State CIO Chris Cummiskey provided a succinct set of criteria for predicting the success of a major automation project and that he clearly saw a distinction between the vendor option and the build/borrow option. Items mentioned were an enterprise approach across the state, well defined functionality, reliability, time to implementation, maintenance and sustainability over time, and consideration of overall cost.

### **LIMITED JURISDICTION CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM ASSESSMENT**

Renny described the attempt to follow in the footsteps of the general jurisdiction effort to evaluate functionality for the limited jurisdiction system. A matrix has been created, items have been divided into categories of criticality, and the entire thing validated. Tempe has scored itself to the matrix and an effort is underway to locate a pilot municipal court to validate the requirements in the matrix, much as Yavapai did for the GJ matrix.

As a second step, a justice court needs to validate the requirements and potentially pilot the candidate system.

Karl Heckart then explained the need to set aside funds to get the transition ball rolling, particularly because the timeline of activities is so lengthy. He stated that not doing so would set back the adoption of a statewide system another year, since it would be next May or June before funds could again be requested. He mentioned a long list of existing or developing systems that must be integrated with the new CMS. Staff explained that more than the usual vote of confidence in the Tempe CMS was in order; funds for beginning transition activities need to be set aside.

Judge Pollard, the chair of CACC, was called upon for an opinion about the reservation of funds. He stated that it is time to move forward and the Commission ought to authorize the next steps.

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to reserve funds to follow the outlined adaptation and implementation steps, directing AOC to define the detailed costs to put development teams in place during FY08. The motion passed unanimously (Louraine Arkfeld abstaining). TECH 07-13**

#### **ANNOUNCEMENT OF RECESS**

Justice Berch recapped the major decisions made up to this point in the meeting. Though ahead of schedule, no items from the following day's agenda could be moved forward due to public meeting requirements and the dates/times on the posted agenda.

Day 1 of the COT strategic planning meeting adjourned Thursday, June 7, 2007, at 1:45 p.m.

## **DAY 2 – CALL TO ORDER**

Justice Berch called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and introduced the upcoming topics for the meeting.

## **STRATEGIC PROJECTS REVIEW**

### **Probation Automation Coordinating Committee (PACC)**

Rona Newton, the incoming chair of PACC, presented a brief overview of accomplishments and upcoming items. Jennifer Gilbertson then provided details about APETS and displayed a couple of screens. Dave Stevens did the same for Maricopa iCIS-Juvenile. Maricopa and AOC IT are currently working to ensure data feeds from their legacy JOLTS to the statewide JOLTS data warehouse will continue with iCIS-Juvenile once their implementation occurs. Jennifer again took the floor for JOLTSaz and legacy JOLTS updates. Legacy JOLTS is considered frozen but not locked from legislative or critical changes. Rona then summarized recent work in probation automation.

Between presentations, Mike Baumstark recognized Michael Jeanes for winning the Distinguished Service Award for the Administration of Justice. The award will be presented at the upcoming Judicial Conference.

### **Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)**

After showing a humorous video regarding user confusion brought on by the change from scrolls to books, Karl Heckart, chair of TAC, warned members of sweeping changes in the upcoming years. He addressed members concerning several key items on the near horizon.

- A refresh of ACAP PCs, which will include a rollout of the Microsoft Vista operating system and replacement of WordPerfect with Word.
- Breach notification by courts that have had personally identifiable information compromised in some way. Karl circulated a very preliminary AOC policy for members to see. More work will be done to create a model policy for COT to approve for courts' use.
- Infrastructure protection and business continuity have been major topics of discussion at TAC. Karl suggested that materials be included with IT plans in the upcoming cycle to enable AOC to survey just how large the exposure is in rural courts. Urban representatives pointed out that the problem is not confined to rural counties or non-metropolitan areas.
- A workable roadmap for e-filing with phases including appellate e-filing, creating a front door for collecting and routing filings, superior court criminal, appellate civil, and superior court civil. He mentioned a parallel effort related to limited jurisdiction forms. Karl walked members through the filing process as he envisions it, employing an enterprise service bus and a centralized data store. He listed challenges to the vision as AJIN bandwidth, EDMS backup/recovery capability, multi-vendor vs. free filing decisions, interaction of the filing system with the CMS, and appropriate public access to filed documents.

### **Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC)**

Judge Michael Pollard, chair of CACC, briefly discussed the reinvigoration of the project management methodology from the chair's opening comments and the addition of a

requirement for communications planning. He then introduced reports from three ongoing projects and the code standardization subcommittee.

- AGAVE – Phillip Ellis, project manager for AGAVE, reiterated the scope of the development effort as replicating function of CrimWeb, e-Ledger, and CACTIS. Those items are provided in AGAVE 2.0, on schedule for delivery in late January 2008. He introduced an added phase to address probate and non-judicial scheduling functionality, the first of multiple enhancements going forward as he continues to keep a strong cap on the scope. He requested a visit by COT staff to review the financial milestone for payment following the April 30 implementation date.
- Tempe CMS – Rick Rager, project manager, stated Tempe’s planned implementation date of January 28, 2008, at a projected cost of \$1.28M total. He announced a demonstration of the system to be held July 19 in Tempe and asked interested parties to RSVP. He emphasized how much collaboration is going into development. The project’s technical focus has been on the new workgroup queuing feature, consolidating payment functions, and “instant” financials. His concerns include complicated financials making slow progress, the order of protection module from AOC, batch processing interfaces, dependencies with outside systems, data migration progress, and reporting using the architectural standard package. Rick requested that TAC consider his alternative reporting package, MS Reporting Services, currently a watch list item, for standardization.
- Maricopa Clerk’s Integrated Financial Information System – Rich McHattie provided a quick update on the slippage of the juvenile financials portion of the project. The current best guess for an implementation date is late July. No anticipated date was given for the completion of the project as a whole.
- Code Standardization – John Overholtz from AOC shared the names of data standards committee members and gave a brief history of their past year of effort. He stated his encouragement that the group was willing to enact the standard for the current CMS and not put off the inevitable until the new one arrives. On the limited jurisdiction side, the group is focused on getting Tempe the necessary codes for completing system development. The group is soon publishing a reference manual of code and event tables.

### **STRATEGIC PROJECTS PRIORITIZATION**

Karl Heckart, AOC ITD Director, reviewed strategic initiatives developed over the years in some detail. He added a set of transformational initiatives: GJ CMS, LJ CMS, e-Filing, Infrastructure Upgrades, Justice Integration, and Probation. These items lead in turn to a transformation of the workplace beyond an electronic court to a virtual or location free court. He displayed proposed changes to the 2007 list and priorities for members’ comment. The list included some new items (data center, business continuity, PC refresh); refinements to existing items (e-citation, ADRS, form-based filing), removal of some previous ones (APETS rollout, audio/video court records), and some changes in priority. Last year’s prioritization scheme continues with Impact or Importance being high, medium, or low and Timing being next fiscal year (high), 2 to 3 years (medium), or beyond 3 years (low).

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the 2008-2010 strategic project priorities as presented. The motion passed unanimously.**  
**TECH 07-14**

Being ahead of schedule, the chair decided to move the review of automation plans ahead in the agenda.

### **INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PLANS**

Stewart Bruner presented members with some key point regarding how the individual plans were gathered and summarized, since the process mimicked last year's. He highlighted several court technology trends gleaned from analyzing the plans, including data stored outside of AZTEC posing a risk since it will not be converted to the new CMS, increased entanglement of court and county or city computing resources, and the desire of rural courts to have dedicated local support and development resources. He shared several universal accomplishments that were not being included on the county-by-county review in the interest of time: rolling out APETS, preparing for interactive juror operations, remote court reporting, expanding web-based information and services, implementing new divisions and specialty courts, as well as increasing bandwidth to improve data transfer.

Stewart described his presentation, reminding members that full details and accomplishments of individual plans exist in the summaries distributed in members' packets. He also pointed out that general approval of an IT plan does not constitute approval of specific projects that may require additional information and clarification. Further, where concern was raised, staff will send a letter to the presiding judge of the court, detailing the concerns. He then briefly summarized each Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2008-2010 submitted by county courts and the state appellate courts.

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Apache County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2008-2010, with a concern raised for various production data residing in MS-Access rather than AZTEC which will not be converted into the new CMS and the current exception CMS posing a support risk following Pima's adoption of the new AGAVE system. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-07-15**

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Cochise County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2008-2010, with a concern raised for court form and financial data residing outside AZTEC which will not be converted into the new CMS. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-07-16**

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Coconino County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2008-2010, with a concern raised for court data residing outside AZTEC which will not be converted into the new CMS. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-07-17**

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Gila County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2008-2010, with a concern raised about the superior court calendar and financial information residing outside AZTEC which will not be converted into**

**the new CMS and the need to rewrite the collector program for record on appeal to comply with .NET architecture and use the state-standard transport method going forward. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-07-18**

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Graham County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2008-2010, with a concern noted that LaserFiche is not a full-featured EDMS suitable for supporting e-court activities, since it does not capture metadata. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-07-19**

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Greenlee County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2008-2010. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-07-20**

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve La Paz County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2008-2010. The motion passed unanimously (Sheri Newman abstaining). TECH-07-21**

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Maricopa County Courts' Consolidated Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2008-2010, with concerns noted for the planned development of a jury management application apart from the state standard requiring an exception to ACJA §1-501, for various municipal court case management systems identified as "end of life" but having no replacement plans, and for various production data residing in MS-Access posing a business risk to municipal courts. The motion passed unanimously (Marcus Reinkensmeyer and Michael Jeanes abstaining). TECH-07-22**

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Mohave County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2008-2010, with concerns raised for superior court calendar data residing outside AZTEC which will not be converted into the new CMS, possible redundancy of the county data warehouse effort with statewide efforts, and the need to obtain an exception for use of any middleware other than MQ. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-07-23**

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Navajo County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2008-2010, with a concern noted for caseflow and collections data residing in MS-Access, posing a business risk. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-07-24**

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Pima County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2008-2010, with concerns noted for PCCJC's lack of a replacement plan for its "end-of-life" CMS and justice integration using other than the state-**

standard transport method. The motion passed unanimously (Kent Batty abstaining). TECH-07-25

**MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve Pinal County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2008-2010, with concerns raised for financial data residing outside AZTEC which will not be converted into the new CMS, justice integration using other than the state-standard transport method, and the need to rewrite the collector program for record on appeal to comply with .NET architecture and use the state-standard transport method going forward. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-07-26

**MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve Santa Cruz County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2008-2010, with concerns raised for the risk posed by having production data residing in MS-Access and the need to obtain COT approval for the upcoming record on appeal e-filing project. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-07-27

**MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve Yavapai County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2008-2010, with a concern raised regarding the need to coordinate local workflow and e-filing efforts with statewide efforts. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-07-28

**MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve Yuma County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2008-2010, with concerns raised for continued late submittal of the strategic plan, data residing outside AZTEC in numerous applications which will not be converted into the new CMS, and integration of a docket display system with AZTEC. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-07-29

**MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve the State Appellate Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2008-2010, with a concern that continued use of disparate automation systems makes true integration a challenge. The motion passed unanimously (Justice Berch noted her interest for the record before voting; Peter Eckerstrom and Phil Urry abstained). TECH-07-30

In discussion of the motion, Judge Eckerstrom asked for clarification about the concern regarding disparate automation systems, out of concern that Division Two's history of successful court automation projects was not being taken into account.

### **OPERATIONAL AND FINANCIAL REVIEW**

Kevin Kluge, AOC's Chief Financial Officer, updated members on the financial status of the Judicial Collections Enhancement Fund (JCEF) and Traffic Case Processing Fund (TCPF). He provided the starting fund balance and described the impact of prior year revertments and the expiration of the time payment fee increase (from \$20 to \$12) during the plan period. He projected a structural deficit (expenses exceeding revenues) for the fund in FY11, under the current assumptions. Mike Baumstark provided more detail on

the fate of the bill to extend the time payment fee. Passage of the bill would alleviate the projected deficit, as would several other approaches discussed. While \$10.2M exists for operations and projects, Kevin explained that current spending authority will only allow disbursement of \$8.4M, less than the projected amounts needed; a change will be required from the Joint Legislative Budget Office (JLBC).

### **FINANCIAL AND TACTICAL DECISIONS**

Karl Heckart set the stage for the funding requests being made. He divided projects into three categories: statewide, leveraged from one court too many, and purely local. Karl mapped the projects on the agenda into the various categories. He asked members to take into account how the funds requested would be leveraged from a statewide perspective. He also requested, due to scarcity of funds, that all projects make their requests before members voted on any specific request. The following items requesting funds were described to members:

- Ongoing Budgets and Continuation of Previously Approved Projects -- \$801K including ADRS, AGAVE, Vista Rollout, and Maricopa iFIS.
- AZTEC Replacement – Total cost \$18M to \$20M. This project will sweep all currently available project funds over the next three years, so other sources must be identified.
- New Data Center in Support of AZTEC Replacement – Total cost \$1.9M, FY08 cost \$500K. Karl described the options explored before arriving at the proposed approach.
- GJ CMS Rollout -- \$4.8M and 19 new positions.
- LJ CMS Rollout -- \$1.192M for hardware, staff space allocation, and travel.
- Electronic Filing -- \$151K to begin criminal filing at the Supreme Court and make the system available to Division One. Includes support for placing standard limited jurisdiction form data online at AOC, too.
- Multi-Clerk Minute Entry/Distribution -- \$333,066 to develop and implement an EDMS-based minute system for 11 superior court clerks, some having MEEDS and some not. Staff explained the recommendation of disapproval.
- Pima Superior Court BLAZE 1.0 -- \$422K to add probate and non-judicial tracking functions beyond AGAVE 2.0. Staff explained the recommendation of disapproval.
- Field Trainer Fund Re-allocation – In preparation for the upcoming wave of technology changes, Janet Scheiderer requested permission to address issues in four counties that have no long-term ability to afford a field trainer by some creative means that will necessitate re-allocation of the per-county funds. There would be no net cost to the field trainer line item or the fund as a whole.
- Coconino Clerk EDMS Implementation -- \$59,183 as a shared cost with local JCEF to implement the state-standard document management system as directed in last years IT Strategic Plan approval from COT.
- PCCJC IT Stabilization -- \$249,637.11 in local JCEF to undertake an infrastructure stabilization process in the wake of the court's choosing not to use Maricopa's iCIS CMS for justice courts, as approved last year. Staff explained concern that the scope could easily widen to encompass case management system

development and recommended that CACC monitor the project and that it be required to follow the project management methodology.

Representatives for the various items briefly addressed the Commission with salient details that would warrant approval of the requested funds. Mike Baumstark mentioned that all approvals of funding are predicated on AJC's direction on the CMS path to pursue, AJC approval of budget, and JLBC's approval of increased spending authority.

**MOTION:** It was moved and seconded to continue existing project commitments in the amount of \$801K. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 07-31

**MOTION:** It was moved and seconded to authorize funding in the amount of \$4.862M associated with GJ CMS development and adoption activities. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 07-32

**MOTION:** It was moved and seconded to authorize funding in the amount of \$1.192M associated with LJ CMS development and adoption. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 07-33

**MOTION:** It was moved and seconded to authorize funding in the amount of \$151K to begin development and support of a statewide electronic filing system. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 07-34

**MOTION:** It was moved and seconded to authorize funding in the amount of \$500K for construction of a new data center to support statewide systems. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 07-35

**MOTION:** It was moved and seconded to authorize changes in the allocation of field trainer funding as presented. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 07-36

**MOTION:** It was moved, amended, and seconded to reserve funds in the amount of \$333,066.00 for the multi-clerk minute entry project but not to disburse any funds until fit with the potential vendor system can be determined at the September COT meeting, in executive session, if necessary. The amended motion passed unanimously. TECH 07-37

**MOTION:** It was moved and seconded to approve funding in the amount of \$59,183.00 for implementation of state-standard EDMS by the Clerk of the Superior Court in Coconino County. The motion passed unanimously (Gary Kremarik abstaining). TECH 07-38

**MOTION:** It was moved, amended, and seconded to reserve funds in the amount of \$422,000.00 for the AGAVE enhancement project but not to disburse any funds until a more detailed project plan containing funding milestones is submitted. The amended motion passed with eight aye and three nay votes (Kent Batty abstaining). TECH 07-39

**MOTION:** It was moved and seconded to require AGAVE to work with AOC technical staff to review the potential vendor system to determine

**whether a module would provide the desired functionality and report back at the September COT meeting. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 07-40**

**MOTION: It was moved and seconded to approve the requested funding for the ePCCJC technology stabilization project, directing that the project management methodology be followed and that CACC monitor the project. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 07-41**

**CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

After verifying that no further business existed for members, Justice Berch made a call to the public. No members of the public responded. Justice Berch thanked members for a very productive two-day session.

**The next COT meeting is scheduled for September 7, 2007, in Conference Room 119 A/B of the Arizona State Courts Building.**

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.