

**COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY
e-COURT SUBCOMMITTEE
MEETING SUMMARY**

**February 23, 2007
1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.**

Conference Call 602-452-3931

MEMBERS PRESENT

Andrew Hurwitz, *Chair*
Robert Brutinel, *General Jurisdiction*
Karl Heckart, *AOC*
Donald Jacobson, *Court Administrators*
Michael Jeanes, *Clerks*
Dennis Lusk, *Limited Jurisdiction*
Sheri Newman, *Clerks*

MEMBERS ABSENT

Donna Killoughey, *State Bar*

GUESTS

Diane Drain, *State Bar*
Robert DuComb, *State Bar*
Rich McHattie, *Maricopa COSC*

AOC STAFF

Stewart Bruner, *ITD*

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Justice Hurwitz welcomed members to the call at about 1:35 p.m. and reviewed the objective for the meeting. He also desired to discuss in detail an issue raised by the State Bar with implementation of the multi-provider model in Maricopa.

LIMITED JURISDICTION SUBTEAM

Goal One: Create web-enabled forms that feed case data into case management systems and documents into document management systems. Judge Dennis Lusk reported slow progress being made by volunteer associations (JPs and Magistrates) on the effort to standardize form data. The hope had been that the initial efforts would be evaluated by the end of February, but a lack of participation caused the timeline to lag far behind that date. Justice Hurwitz suggested that formal appointments by the Court might help secure commitments from members. Karl Heckart pointed out that AOC cannot possibly deal with a projected 80 to 100 forms at once, so phased delivery would be acceptable. The important item is to arrive at an initial delivery date to promote budget planning for next year, since AOC offered to maintain and host the forms centrally.

Goal Two: Enable electronic citations statewide to prevent re-keying citation data. Judge Lusk reported that progress with implementing standardized XML code on the vendor handhelds is progressing slower than expected. The ultimate goal is to define a fast track for LJ courts and law enforcement to purchase handhelds off a state contract and implement an AZTEC-compatible integration strategy in cooperation with local law enforcement. Discussion with DPS to create a statewide contract for handhelds has not gone favorably. Don Jacobson informed members that Flagstaff is currently negotiating

a contract with the handheld vendor, APS, which will be available to other municipalities and courts.

GENERAL JURISDICTION SUBTEAM

Judge Bob Brutinel reported satisfactory progress with the Yavapai e-ROA pilot and stated that issues are getting worked out as encountered with no “showstoppers.” He mentioned expanding into e-transcripts with hardcopy to follow as a way of starting a type of e-filing and workflow. Karl Heckart reviewed the progress of AGAVE and the Commission on Technology’s (COT’s) recent direction to pursue two additional CMS options: complete an RFP for a vendor system and speed the porting of iCIS to .NET. He reported that all three options have about the same length of timeline from today through rollout.

The Clerk of the Superior Court in Maricopa County, Michael Jeanes, reported the background of an issue raised by the state Bar’s Solo and Small Practice panel. He briefly described several pilot projects underway that explore various filing paradigms, from single provider to court-operated portal to multi-vendor outsourcing. He reviewed the various advantages and disadvantages to the court and to various user communities of each approach. All remain solidly in the pilot category, meaning it’s not yet apparent which approach will win out in the end, though any changes to the e-court principles are at the discretion of COT. He stated that the need to provide vendor-based filing boils down to an issue of funding – the court does not have sufficient funds to build and operate its own e-filing system including necessary support to lawyers and the public, nor is it likely to obtain any fee increase to support that activity. This key item differentiates Arizona from the Feds, who paid to develop their own custom system. Justice Hurwitz pointed out that filing paper is not a cost-free proposition and that the approach needs to change in a way that encourages electronic filers and discourages paper filers so that the benefits to the courts’ backoffice processes may be realized.

Bob DuComb and Diane Drain, representing small/solo legal practitioners, emphasized that the Bar is not adverse to e-filing, per se, but raised concerns about “forcing the use of vendors.” Justice Hurwitz volunteered to meet with the State Bar Board of Governors, and to include the vice chief if necessary, to better communicate the general direction the court is heading with e-filing, the reasons why, and to address fears before they grow. Bar representatives felt having a current practitioner on the e-Court Subcommittee would help them feel better connected. e-Courts will request a name from incoming president Dan McAuliffe. Bar representatives stated that involving the vendors and the court in dialog with their members would also help reduce current confusion and resulting stress. e-Court members suggested an e-filing information session be held at the upcoming State Bar convention. Diane Drain will check on the feasibility of that idea.

APPELLATE LEVEL SUBTEAM

Goal One: Transfer records on appeal electronically from superior courts to appellate courts. e-ROA with Yavapai is working successfully and the Cochise/e-Blueback pilot is currently in the testing phase. Once these two pilots complete successfully and necessary responses to lessons learned and rules changes are in place, the plan is to open the floodgate by deeming e-ROA to be “in production.”

Goal Two: Enable e-filing at the appellate court level. Justice Hurwitz reviewed the Supreme Court's e-Distribution project progress. A rule change is in process to allow submittal of one original and one electronic copy in place of the requirement for one original and eight paper copies. The goal is to reduce the scanning load on the clerk's office. Summary agendas are presently published in electronic form only and a plan exists to move all agendas to "e-only" as judge adoption increases.

CRIMINAL FILING

Justice Hurwitz briefly described his experience opening the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission's (ACJC's) strategic planning meeting in December where he urged cooperation rather than competition among those in the justice community. Karl summarized ACJC's effort to obtain \$24 million to carry out the strategic plan and to sustain the automation already developed using past grant money. The latest approach involves obtaining a sponsor for several smaller projects on the roadmap to completing the vision incrementally rather than all at once. Karl has been addressing a senate subcommittee on ACJC's behalf. The key long-term issue involves DPS vision of itself not as the glue that holds the criminal justice system together, but as the owner of the criminal history records that result from the justice process. There is talk of a three Branch meeting on that subject.

Work continues on the Arizona Disposition Reporting System (ADRS) Phase 2. Yavapai Superior Court is anticipated to be a pilot site for the AZTEC tie-in to that environment. Maricopa ICJIS is also appearing to be interested in moving into ADRS.

CONCLUSION: THE NEXT MEETING

There is easily time for another meeting prior to the COT annual meeting. Stewart will circulate some potential dates and times to try to find one that accommodates the greatest number of members. The focus of the meeting will be creation of the input for the e-Court Subcommittee annual update.

After verifying that subcommittee members had no further business to discuss, Justice Hurwitz adjourned the meeting at 3:20 p.m.