

## COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY

### MINUTES

Friday, November 2, 2001

9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

State Courts Building  
Training Room A&B  
1501 West Washington, Phoenix, Arizona

#### MEMBERS PRESENT:

Judge Louraine Arkfeld  
Lisa Royal (for Kent Batty)  
Michael Baumstark  
Julie Carlson  
Ron Beguin (for Judge Robert Dorfman)  
Diane Drain  
Gordon Griller  
Joseph Howard  
Michael Jeanes  
Judge John Kennedy  
Gary Kremerik  
Martin Drizay  
Justice Ruth McGregor  
Clark Munger  
Judge Gary Pope  
Judge Edward Voss

#### MEMBERS ABSENT:

Henry Alvarez  
Kenneth Harris

#### AOC STAFF:

Gary Graham  
Karl Heckart  
Maureen Haggerty  
Paul Hrisho

Tim Lawler  
Janet Scherderer

#### GUESTS:

Mohyeddin Abdulaziz, Court of Appeals  
John Barrett, Maricopa County Superior Court  
Tom Brady, Tempe Municipal Court  
Barbara Broderick, Maricopa Adult Probation  
Eric Ciminski, Graham County  
Janet Cornell, Maricopa County Office of CIO  
Dave Davis, Maricopa Justice Courts  
Joy Dillehay, Santa Cruz County Superior Court  
Arno Hall, Navajo County Superior Court  
Carol Merfeld, Pima County Superior Court  
Gregg Obuck, Pima County Superior Court  
Kelly Parker, Maricopa Superior Court  
Mike Pollard, Tucson City Court  
Eloise Price, Gila County  
Will Tagart, Maricopa Superior Court Clerk's Office  
Cherie Townsend, Maricopa Juvenile Probation  
Richard Tozer, La Paz Superior Court

## **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Justice Ruth McGregor called the meeting of the Commission on Technology to order on November 2, 2001 at 9:30 a.m. Justice McGregor welcomed those present and introductions were made.

**MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the September 6, 2001, Commission on Technology meeting. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-01-74.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **Gun Check/Mental Health Records**

Justice McGregor reported on a tabled item. At the last meeting, the COT passed a motion (TECH-01-070) to table discussion of the legislative proposal for mental-health-related gun checks pending Arizona Judicial Council review. The AJC voted not to support the proposed legislation. Discussion did not result in any COT action.

### **Project Dependency Matrix**

As requested in the September meeting, Karl Heckart reported on the strategic project interdependencies. He distributed the Project Dependency Matrix and responded to questions.

### **Changing Databases Cost**

Karl Heckart reported on the cost for changing databases. As a result of corporate mergers, both databases under consideration are now IBM products. He noted that pricing is based on estimates provided in June and were discounted. We are awaiting current pricing estimates.

Overall, considering conversion costs, there is some cost savings if both ACAP and Maricopa Superior migrate to an alternative database for the case management systems. Central Repository migration is more complex and was not estimated. No decisions resulted as further study is needed.

## **RURAL-BASED COUNTIES: PANEL PRESENTATION OF AUTOMATION STATUS AND TRENDS**

A panel of representatives from courts in Apache, Gila, Graham, Greenlee, La Paz, Navajo and Santa Cruz counties presented information about their respective counties' trends, needs and plans regarding automation.

Eloise Price introduced the presentation for the rural-based county courts. She noted that technology has high priority in the rural-based courts because of the distance the public must travel to attend court. Then representatives from each county court presented need and trends within their counties.

- Sue Hall presented the Apache County courts' perspective. She noted a need for more local training and improved network speed.
- For Gila County, Paul Kosierowski, Chief Probation Officer, presented. He described an innovative probation drug testing program as well as discussed the need for more public access capability and a plan for more collections efforts.
- For Graham County, Eric Ciminski, AZTEC Field Trainer presented. He outlined the courts' partnership with Graham County automation where they have provided wireless networks, laptops in Sheriff cars and document imaging for the Superior Court.
- For La Paz County, Richard Tozer, Superior Court Administrator reported some automation needs, including more training, the desire for the APETS system, and the need for an information technology specialist within the court. La Paz County noted their use of video conferencing. He also noted that it was vital to continue supporting the small counties in automation and keep systems uniform throughout the state.
- For Navajo County, Arno Hall, Superior Court Administrator, expressed appreciation for the state resources provided to date in automation. He outlined their need for training and continued improvements to AZTEC. He noted that the courts would like web based calendars, self-help centers in their courts, and the ability to collect fines which can help funding.
- For Santa Cruz County courts, Joy Dillehay, AZTEC Field Trainer, noted that in the past twenty years, Santa Cruz has tripled the court staff and judges. The county now has AZTEC, JOLTS, Jury Plus, and Self-Service capabilities. Santa Cruz would like the ability for digital records of hearings, more use of video conferencing for training, the ability for tickets to be paid on Internet.

### **METROPOLITAN COUNTIES: PANEL PRESENTATION OF AUTOMATION STATUS AND TRENDS**

Maricopa and Pima Counties presented their unique needs and automation trends as courts in large metropolitan areas. Representatives included Barbara Broderick, Maricopa County Adult Probation; Michael Jeanes, Maricopa County Clerk of the Court; Cherie Townsend, Maricopa County Juvenile Probation Services; Gordon Griller, Maricopa County Superior Court Administrator; John Barrett, Chief Technology Officer in Maricopa Superior Court; Greg Obuck, Information Technology Director of Pima Superior Court's Research & Planning Services; Judge Michael Pollard, Tucson Municipal Court.

The panel named several positives and problems that have come out of automation. Some of the positives mentioned were better communication, integration (e.g. pre-trial data sharing electronically, providing law enforcement access), the Adult Probation Enterprise Tracking System (APETS), including

its integration with RFR; with JOLTS, a program of virtual office probation officers; and the Maricopa eCourt Room and new jury system.

They also outlined some problems they have been encountered. One important one is data integrity – data is sometimes incorrect. There was concern about Internet public access and the potential for the invasion of privacy and the misinterpretation or misuse of court data. The need for even more systems to be able to interact with each other was noted.

The panel also presented the Commission with some advice on what was needed. Those suggestions included: make adult probation automation a greater priority; use a “carrot and not a stick” to encourage participation in state initiatives; continue with the state and local entities working together so systems can be shared; adopt developing national standards on public access; standardize work and adopt national standards when available; make long-term decisions; be flexible and ready to change priorities; make justice integration a priority.

### **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

There were no respondents.

### **NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting is schedule for January 11, 2001 from 9:30-2:30 at the Arizona State Courts Building, Conference Room 230.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 1:15 p.m.