

**COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY
e-COURT SUBCOMMITTEE
LIMITED JURISDICTION COURTS SUBTEAM
MEETING SUMMARY**

June 9, 2006
1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

Conference Call 602-542-9001
State Courts Building Room 230

MEMBERS PRESENT

Dennis Lusk, *Apache Junction Justice, Chair*
George Anagnost, *Peoria Muni*
Louraine Arkfeld, *Tempe Muni*
Melanie Cluff, *Scottsdale Muni*
Joan Harphant, *Tucson Muni*
Donald Jacobson, *Flagstaff Muni*
James Montgomery, *Yuma County Justice*
John Ore, *University Lakes Justice (Maricopa)*
Judy Thompson-Ng, *Oro Valley Muni*
David Widmaier, *Navajo County Justice, JP's Association representative.*

MEMBERS ABSENT

Jose Luis Castillo, *Pima Justice*
John Kennedy, *Dewey/Humboldt JP and Muni*

GUESTS

Andrew Hurwitz, *Supreme Court*

AOC STAFF

Stewart Bruner, *ITD*

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

Stewart Bruner welcomed members to the call at about 1:35 p.m. and reviewed the names of those present. To place in context this team's activities, he reviewed the committee and subcommittee structure from the Arizona Judicial Council through the Commission on Technology (COT) to the e-Court subcommittee and shared the focus of each. Stewart also mentioned that two other subteams are being formed to address e-filing at other levels of court.

Justice Andrew Hurwitz then provided more detail concerning the goals the e-Court subcommittee has for this team in contributing their best thoughts to craft a vision for a comprehensive electronic court system in Arizona. He stated that he's looking for a roadmap, the problems, and a timeline to take back to COT. He mentioned that guiding principles have been finalized by COT and directed Stewart to mail those to members.

INITIAL DISCUSSION

Judge Dennis Lusk then summarized his expectations for the team as "think, discuss, and get points and issues out on the table." He outlined three suggested "way stations" on the e-filing roadmap: 1) ability to e-file, 2) incentive to e-file, and finally 3) mandated e-filing. A question was raised about having membership outside the Branch. The decision was to solidify our internal approach first while continuing a dialog with ACJC, law enforcement, MVD, etc. Judge Lusk described how that dialog is occurring at present.

REVIEW OF PROJECTS UNDERWAY

Stewart discussed where the limited jurisdiction court level is headed with technology and what he has learned from recent IT strategic plan inputs about e-court-related projects underway around the state (with help from members who were closer to the project happenings), including

- Electronic case initiation
- Form-based filing – fillable and interactive
- Data bus integration strategy
- Electronic case documents
- Subscription/notification service
- Forcible detainer – “bulk case filings”
- The second wave of automation

DISCUSSION AND BRAINSTORMING

The following comments and ideas were generated in a brainstorming session facilitated by Judge Lusk.

1. Why not just emulate the federal model that uses PACER?
2. Develop a prototype system that’s truly marketable (a la *e-bay*)...put buyers and sellers together and facilitate the transfer of money. The model ought to piggyback on a business concept.
3. Focus on electronic citations since the clearest business case exists for those. Expand beyond local law enforcement to DPS. A statewide contract for handhelds is a must. The incentive for law enforcement adoption is court payment for the devices. A barrier is that muni police officers cite charges in the county, too. So devices must be able to address multiple jurisdictions.
4. Expand the paradigm beyond handheld citations to enable multiple entities to ship data to LJ courts, including those that submit Form IV criminal long forms. Develop an open interface and format with a published specification so that multiple agencies can move data to the court. A barrier is funding to help data providers configure their system to output in the format that meets the court requirements.
5. Operate using the “data bus” concept. Whatever agency collects the data originally is required to submit it into the supply chain in digital format only. Eliminate all re-keying. CJ could adopt a court rule requiring all input to be digital.
6. General barrier: Each court has different requirements of the use of fields in the ATTC. Some have notes fields that don’t print but are shipped to the case management system.
7. General barrier: A civil case is a civil case except: small claims, forcible detainer, feed liens, orders of protection, injunctions against harassment.
8. Look at Project PASSPORT as a microcosm of a statewide system used by LJ courts.
9. Contact Mary Horvath in John Barrett’s office to look at the way the Maricopa multiple vendor e-filing system works.

BARRIERS

Members brainstormed some barriers outside of the specific ideas above, including

1. Lack of funding for a statewide approach.
2. Existing systems.

3. Inability to collect payment or fees and penalties.
4. “Retrogrouches” in various jurisdictions who hate technology in principle.
5. Isolated jurisdictions that have no technology (like the reservation).

NEXT STEPS

Judge Ore suggested creating a matrix of case types applicable to LJ courts and filling in what pilot projects are underway where by case type to see how much coverage already exists for the brainstormed ideas. The team needs to meet within a month or so in order to remain on track for delivering recommendations to COT. July 14 was contemplated as a likely date among those remaining on the call. Unfortunately, staff and the chair will not be available that day! Staff will poll members for another July date.

Our next meeting, another conference call, will focus further on the brainstormed ideas, barriers, and timelines.

After verifying that subteam members had no further business to discuss, Judge Lusk adjourned the meeting at about 3:05 p.m.