

**COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY
MEETING MINUTES**

June 5, 2008

1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

June 6, 2007

9:00 a.m. – 3:15 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 (*Rick Rager, proxy*)
Kent Batty
Michael Baumstark
Rebecca Berch, *Chair*
Robert Brutinel
Christopher Cumiskey (*Max Ivey, proxy*)
Peter Eckerstrom (*Garye Vasquez, proxy*)
John Gemmill (*Phil Urry, proxy on Friday*)
Michael Jeanes (*Richard McHattie, proxy*)
Roger Klingler
Gary Krcmarik
Martin Krizay
Beth Lewallen (*Elizabeth Hegedus-Berthold, proxy*)
Sheri Newman
Catherine O'Grady
Marcus Reinkensmeyer
John Rezzo
Roxanne Song Ong

MEMBERS ABSENT

GUESTS

Janet Cornell, *Scottsdale Muni*
Cathy Clarich, *CACC*
Phillip Ellis, *Pima Superior Court*
Jennifer Gilbertson, *Phoenix Muni*
Margaret Guidero, *CACC*
Sue Hall, *Apache COSC*
Rick Hutton, *Maricopa COSC*
Deb Jackson, *Maricopa County OET*
Mark Jensen, *Maricopa COSC*
Cary Meister, *TAC*
Gordon Mulleneaux, *CACC*
Michael Pollard, *CACC*
Kyle Rimel, *TAC*
Lisa Royal, *PCCJC*
Jim Scorza, *CACC*
David Stevens, *CACC/TAC/PACC*
Mark Stodola, *Tempe Muni*
Peter Swann, *Maricopa Superior*
Phil Urry, *COA Division 1*

AOC STAFF

Stewart Bruner, *ITD*
Michael Donnelly, *ITD*
William Earl, *ITD*
Gary Graham, *ITD*
Melinda Hardman, *CSD*
Karl Heckart, *ITD/TAC*
Keith Kaplan, *CSD*
Adele May, *ITD*
Patrick McGrath, *CSD*
Stephanie Nolan, *ITD*
Pamela Peet, *ITD*
Jim Price, *ITD*
Renny Rapier, *ITD*
Carla Tack, *CSD*

DAY 1 -- WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

Vice Chief Justice Rebecca Berch, Chair, called the Commission on Technology (COT) meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. after staff confirmed that a quorum existed. She welcomed members and the public present, then reviewed the names of the proxies for those not able to attend. She also reviewed the status of various members who are being newly appointed or re-appointed as of July 1. Justice Berch asked members to introduce themselves for the record.

She provided members with brief updates on several items of interest:

- Audience participation through the public comment process.
- Follow-up to an Auditor General recommendation. She unveiled a new project acceptance and agreement form to be used to monitor progress on COT-approved IT initiatives. Use of the form addresses an issue remaining from the audit.
- A report on the budget. Staff has worked diligently to preserve the necessary resources to accomplish priority projects. The legislature has not yet acted on the time payment fee reversion, which would have an annual \$1.5M impact to state JCEF and \$1.5M impact to local JCEF. A projected filing fee increase statewide would offset fund sweeps that have already taken place.
- Court Automation Coordinating Committee's (CACCC's) efforts to keep members apprised of the status of the projects they monitor, including a general health metric and recent e-mails regarding projects in "red" status.

She then called members' attention to the minutes from the previous COT meeting.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the January 4, 2008, Commission on Technology meeting. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 08-02

PLANNING GOALS AND AGENDA REVIEW

Justice Berch gave a general overview of the two-day meeting.

JUDICIAL BRANCH E-FILING DIRECTION

Justice Berch began the e-filing discussion by emphasizing COT's functions of overseeing and prioritizing technology projects. Along the way, members are responsible to check the progress being made toward the goals. She summarized the upcoming discussion as revolving around expanding the authority under e-Filing Principle 1 to examine other options for e-filing, since progress toward statewide implementation remains slow. She referred to a letter of concern submitted by Patti Noland, Clerk of the Superior Court in Pima County.

Chief Justice Ruth McGregor addressed the Commission and recalled her long membership on COT and the number of important policy decisions the Committee is called upon to make. She emphasized the importance of electronic case filing to the Branch and reviewed other courts' experiences with e-filing. She stated that the time is now right for e-filing to move beyond the pilot stage in Arizona and expounded four main directives to that end: 1) We cannot create a fragmented system that leaves some courts behind due to their location or volume. Whatever system is adopted must be a statewide system. 2) e-Filing must apply to all types of cases, including those for which no filing fees exist. 3) Arizona must use a court-powered and court-managed system. No

vendor must own or control court documents. 4) Whatever solution we choose must be a first-class system, capable of supplying all the services that court users need, including case initiation and service of process. She likened the eventual e-filing system decision to the case management system decision made a year ago.

Michael Jeanes, who could not be present for the meeting, asked that Judge Peter Swann address the Commission on behalf of the e-filing pilot project operating in Maricopa County. Judge Swann reviewed his experience and urged that e-filing be made mandatory sometime in 2009 for attorney civil filings at Maricopa Superior Court. He feels the Bar has embraced e-filing and that cultural momentum exists for mandating e-filing in civil cases. He expressed his willingness to adapt to any eventual statewide e-filing system and encouraged COT to move forward with e-filing as expeditiously as possible.

Justice Andrew Hurwitz, chair of the e-Court Subcommittee, agreed that Maricopa Superior Court's pilot program has been a resounding success overall, especially in creating the court-side elements of an e-filing system. He confirmed that the Court is committed to move at roughly the same pace as Maricopa's timeline for expansion of the current pipeline and ability to support a dramatically increased filing load. Justice Hurwitz reviewed the development of the multi-vendor filing model by the e-Court subcommittee. He described a conflict between vendor willingness to expand coverage and court operation of a free e-filing public portal, resolution of which will likely require the Court to mandate e-filing for civil cases. He asked for permission to gather information on an alternative approach that would speed statewide e-filing. He requested that representatives of all court functions and groups affected be involved in creating the requirements and evaluating proposals for the expanded approach.

Karl Heckart then focused on the benefits that e-filing brings to courts and court users. He used recent statistics about filings to illustrate the impact on the rural courts of letting the urban courts go their own way. He reminded members of the business continuity implications on courts brought on by any paperless system. He described the various components of an e-filing system, the manner in which court and vendor systems operate, and various issues related to their operation. These filing systems are typically designed for a single court rather than for an enterprise of courts. He cautioned members that Arizona stands on the precipice of creating a bifurcated e-filing system; once the larger counties make significant investments in their own systems, a single, statewide, e-filing direction will be precluded and the complexity filers experience will increase dramatically.

Karl walked members through a hybrid technical solution meeting the Chief Justice's four principles that would be researched if permission were granted. He made no guarantee that any vendor would meet all the requirements or charge a fair price for doing so, but his conclusion was that it's worth a look. Funding is an issue. Karl pointed out that nothing is free in the world of technology and that "free" filing is actually filing paid for by someone else's budget and provided funding options used in various implementations to date. He then detailed a timeline and strategy for getting vendor options on the table for COT and AJC to consider.

Members wrestled with whether to postpone a decision as requested by the clerks, potential implications of the model Karl proposed on Maricopa and Pima pilots, and the process of constructing a request for proposal.

MOTION: It was moved and seconded to recommend exploring expanded options for statewide e-filing in accordance with the Chief Justice's direction and recommend that AJC be asked to authorize a multi-disciplinary team to assist in creating an RFP and evaluating proposals. The motion passed with two nay votes. TECH 08-03

IT STRATEGIC PLANNING PERSPECTIVES

Karl Heckart reviewed major technology initiatives underway and recent examples of progress being made on specific projects contained within each of them. He raised a couple of issues that COT must address in the next year:

- Improved project management on technology projects and
- The line between integration and technology independence for local courts.

Karl focused on the business risk to courts posed by operating local technology with minimal or nonexistent local support. He mentioned an idea to obtain a third-party audit team to help courts assess and recover from local issues outside of AOC's purview.

OPERATIONAL AND FINANCIAL REVIEW

Terri McHaney, AOC's Budget Manager, updated members on the financial status of the Judicial Collections Enhancement Fund (JCEF) and Traffic Case Processing Fund (TCPF). She compared the current year projection to the actual revenues collected. Year-to-year increases in revenues now average 4.3 percent, though only 3.5 percent was used for FY09 projections to provide a margin of safety. Projections were also based on the reduction of the time payment fee from \$20 to \$12 in FY10 and beyond, reducing State JCEF by about \$1.5M and local JCEF by \$1.5M, with a consumer price index increase of 3.9% factored in. The Legislature has also swept \$1M out of JCEF so far in this fiscal year. Terri briefly reviewed commitments to previously approved items being carried forward and the implications of approving additional projects on the budget and spending cap.

Combining all the items mentioned leaves a \$7.2M deficit at the end of FY12, significantly slowing the adoption of a new limited jurisdiction case management system due to lack of funding. Terri then presented projections based on obtaining the continuation of the higher time payment fee as well as the proposed increase in filing fees, yielding a positive \$1.7M balance at the end of FY12, enabling the limited jurisdiction (LJ) case management system (CMS) costs to be covered on the "best case" timeline identified by the project.

A member requested that Terri provide another projection for the condition in which the time payment fee was held at \$20 but the proposed fee increase was not approved. Before the second day of the meeting, Terri provided that projection: a \$3.6M deficit in FY 2012.

STRATEGIC PROJECTS REVIEW/UPDATES

Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC)

Judge Michael Pollard, chair of CACC, thanked staff and members for heavy lifting in the project oversight arena. He briefly discussed the response to CACC's vote of "red" on the Pima County Consolidated Justice Courts (PCCJC) technology stabilization project alluded to in the chair's opening comments. He then refreshed the memories of members regarding the objective, cost, and schedule for each project as its representative came forward.

- PCCJC Stabilization – Lisa Royal, PCCJC Court Administrator, briefed members on the specific tasks currently being performed to stabilize and improve the reliability of the court's technology environment. A vendor is now under contract to complete the porting of the current CMS database to a "newer" server by June 15. Another contractor familiar with the Maricopa system from which it was made is on pace to complete missing system documentation by the end of August. Lisa stated that she is looking forward to ultimately obtaining the statewide LJ CMS to address the long-term risk.
- Pima AGAVE CMS – Phillip Ellis, AGAVE Project Manager, recapped results of a recent user application review. He detailed several of the 21 issues that surfaced in the review and subsequent meetings, including the conversion process, restructuring the environment and communications of technical personnel, and the project schedule. He explained why the development timeline needs to be extended to December 2008.

MOTION: It was moved and seconded to extend AGAVE's development timeline to December 2008. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 08-04

- Code Standardization – Patrick McGrath from AOC Court Services Division acknowledged the early effort of clerks to standardize the event and activity codes used in the state. He described the accomplishments of the code standardization team over the past year, mostly in the general jurisdiction area and in support of the new CMS. He introduced Keith Kaplan who recently replaced Carrie Stoneburner as the data standards lead at the AOC. Patrick described the strategy of the LJ team as paralleling that of the general jurisdiction (GJ) team, only with 140 more courts to map. He explained how old codes would be brought into the new CMS but made inactive. He also described the role of the work group to add new standard codes and new tables.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF RECESS/PLAN FOR DAY 2

Justice Berch recapped the major decisions made up to this point in the meeting. She requested that members review the text of a proposed administrative order (AO) included in their packets, in preparation for discussion at the beginning of Day 2.

Day 1 of the COT strategic planning meeting adjourned Thursday, June 5, 2008, at 4:40 p.m.

DAY 2 – CALL TO ORDER

Justice Berch called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. and introduced the upcoming topics for the meeting.

LANGUAGE OF A PERSONAL INFORMATION PROTECTION AND NOTIFICATION POLICY

The chair reviewed the salient points of a proposed policy responding to the statute for protection of personally identifying information held by or used by courts. Members suggested that a one-page protocol be created and that a maximum time period for reporting any loss be prescribed (24 hours was the suggested period). The expression “solely responsible” led to confusion about the specific parties to be notified and to perform the notification, yielding discussion. Staff will revisit and clarify the language. Members also cautioned against adding provisions beyond those specified in the statute. Justice Berch asked if members could approve of the general content with the clarifications mentioned, understanding that the chief justice would most likely reword anything submitted to her before issuing it.

MOTION: It was moved and seconded to recommend that the Chief Justice include the language regarding protection of personal information presented in any policy directive issued to courts, with the changes in content resulting from discussion during the meeting. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 08-05

STRATEGIC PROJECTS REVIEW/UPDATES (continued)

Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC)

Judge Pollard again introduced each of the remaining projects being monitored by CACC, providing the objective, timeline, and financial details for each.

- AJACS GJ CMS – Project Manager Renny Rapier complimented the GJ CMS team for continually working long hours. He described the load testing performed on the system in Virginia, which demonstrated the capability of handling the volume of all courts in the state. Renny described the portable, self-contained training lab being prepared for use around the state. He also described the thought process behind revising the dates for the cutover from AZTEC to AJACS in Yuma and La Paz. Yuma is now scheduled for July 14 and La Paz for July 28. He praised the pilot courts for their commitment and flexibility. The schedule for Mohave and Cochise Counties, whose general jurisdiction courts are also being implemented this year, was moved slightly, as well. Implementation dates in 2009 remain unchanged. He shared the latest information about data conversion and integration efforts. Renny spoke briefly about the financial health of the project before Sheri Newman and Mike Baumstark interjected their positive perceptions of the project team and progress being made.
- Tempe CMS – Rick Rager, project manager for Tempe CMS, echoed Judge Pollard in thanking other courts for tangible assistance they have provided to the project – most notably from Mesa and Tucson. Rick shared a list of concerns but emphasized that none would cause implementation in his court to slip from the projected September 2, 2008, date: hardware procurement lead-time, completion of the financials, forms and triggers, visual extenders, SSRS versus Crystal, and training of users. Rick distributed a handout containing the high-level features of the new CMS.
- Maricopa Clerk’s Office iFIS –Gordon Mulleneaux, management sponsor for the integrated financial information system project, described reasons for the delay in completion of the cash receipting system to October 27, 2008, and showed the

output of the system from the State's perspective: \$1.8M per year on average. He updated members on the RFR system replacement and the interim dates already met by the project. No firm completion date will be available until business analysis efforts complete in October. Gordon will then return to COT for another update. **MOTION: It was moved and seconded to extend the development timeline for the Cash Receipting System and the RFR Replacement project to October 31, 2008, with the condition that COT be provided a further project update after October. The motion passed unanimously (Marcus Reinkensmeyer and Rich McHattie abstaining). TECH 08-06**

Probation Automation Coordinating Committee (PACC)

Bob Macon, the new staff member for PACC, presented a brief overview of the four probation-related automation systems used in the State. He then provided details about recent activities for legacy JOLTS and APETS before describing development efforts on JOLTSaz. He spoke briefly about the promise of a statewide identifier as well as the manner of integrating data through a new enterprise service bus. David Stevens recapped the history of probation automaton in Maricopa County and provided updates on their juvenile and adult probation systems with screen shots. He also shared details about the various lessons learned from the implementation of the new Juvenile system. Future tasks include moving to new architecture and integrating with the JOLTSaz repository.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

Karl Heckart, TAC Chair, provided an update on the PC refresh progress and described various improvements enabled by the new software on the PCs. He mentioned some of the challenges related to the new Vista operating system and why the decision was made not to place Windows XP in the field for the next four years. He gave members a brief overview of the newly completed data center and offered a tour at the conclusion of the meeting. Karl stated TAC's commitment to clarify standards and procedures in support of "scan and shred" activities desired by clerks; a TAC subteam working this summer will deliver recommendations to COT and LJC.

Karl introduced the two-year update to the enterprise architecture (EA) standards table and reviewed the various lifecycle designations used: Retirement, Containment, Mainstream, and Watch List. He summarized TAC's recent work on the content and explained the considerations for moving software versions or releases from one category to the next in the lifecycle. He reminded members that items in the retirement category require a replacement plan while items in the containment category may still have their current use expanded or enhanced, though risk exists that the item will soon be marked as retirement, so substantive investment is not prudent.

MOTION: It was moved and seconded to approve the two-year update to the Enterprise Architecture table, as recommended by TAC.

Members discussed the definition of "containment" in the document versus Karl's explanation and requested that wording be added to explicitly state that subsequent investment is allowed without an exception. An amendment was made to the motion.

AMENDED MOTION: It was moved and seconded to approve the two-year update to the Enterprise Architecture table, as recommended by TAC, with

additional language to clarify the definition of “containment,” as discussed. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 08-07

STRATEGIC TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS PRIORITIZATION

Karl Heckart displayed last year’s priorities chart with proposed changes marked. He described his rationale for each proposed change in priority as well as for the removal of items that are complete or substantially complete. Items removed included the new data center, PC refresh, and interactive jury. Items having their time to delivery decreased included JOLTSaz and electronic filing. Items having their time to delivery increased included business continuity, standard form data/fill/file, and technical training. Other items maintained their priority and delivery timeframe from last year. Confusion existed regarding the scope of the business continuity project and the speed with which items need to be completed. The role of court administrators in completing the survey described last year was also discussed. Ultimately, the proposed change in timeframe for the project from short- to medium-term was accepted.

MOTION: It was moved and seconded to approve the 2009-2011 strategic project priorities as presented. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 08-08

FINANCIAL AND TACTICAL DECISIONS

Karl Heckart set the stage for the funding requests being made by explaining the process of proposing and obtaining JCEF approval from AJC in years when no specific numbers exist from the legislature. COT’s request will involve allocating a pool of money contingent upon sufficient finances being available. Specific projects requesting funds in FY09 were presented and discussed (all projects made their requests before members voted on any specific request):

- LJ CMS Rollout -- \$533,688 is a best estimate for funds needing to be reserved for hardware, staff, development efforts, and travel. More definitive detail will be shared at the time the decision is made regarding the selection of the statewide system among the possibilities.
- Defensive Driving -- \$123,220 is requested to create a clearinghouse for completion notices at the Supreme Court by January 1, 2009, to meet the requirements of legislation. A subsequent phase will address the financial interaction between the schools and the courts.
- Free Training PCs – \$30,000. This project will enable up to five PCs housed in a dedicated training facility and used solely for training court employees in a county to have their associated ACAP subscription fee waived.
- Apache Clerk EDMS Implementation – Sue Hall addressed members with a request for \$43,199 to implement the state-standard document management system using the same vendor as other clerks. Costs will be shared between local and State JCEF.

Karl mapped the new projects into three categories for members’ reference: statewide, leveraged from one court to many, and purely local.

MOTION: It was moved and seconded to fund operation of existing statewide systems and previously authorized projects. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 08-09

- MOTION:** It was moved and seconded to approve the LJ CMS project and reserve funding in the amount of \$533,668. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 08-10
- MOTION:** It was moved and seconded to approve the defensive driving project and associated funding in the amount of \$123,220. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 08-11
- MOTION:** It was moved and seconded to authorize the AOC to offer training PCs at no charge with funding to offset the cost in the amount of \$30,000. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 08-12
- MOTION:** It was moved and seconded to approve funding in the amount of \$43,199.00 for implementation of the state-standard EDMS by the Clerk of the Superior Court in Apache County. The motion passed unanimously. TECH 08-13

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PLANS

Stewart Bruner reminded members of how the individual plans were gathered and summarized, since the process mimicked last year's. He focused attention on several key trends gleaned from his analysis of the plans, including

- increasing desire to digitize, especially among limited jurisdiction courts;
- increased reliance on the network for communications of all types;
- pent up demand for functionality promised by the new CMS, especially workflow, minute distribution, and complex financials;
- local data stored outside of AZTEC in MS-Access or other applications (still),
- increased local focus on training; and
- increased number of services provided on the Web and increased reliance on vendors for collecting payments over the Web apart from FARE.

He also called attention to a few very old case management systems around the state and stated his concerns about lack of detailed replacement plans in light of what has transpired at PCCJC. Stewart then launched into his county-by-county strategic plan summarization, 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. Members briefly discussed the letter sent by the COT chair to each presiding judge following the review and COT's motion.

- MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve Apache County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2009-2011, with a concern raised for various production data residing in MS-Access rather than AZTEC, making conversion to the new CMS very difficult. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-08-14
- MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve Cochise County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2009-2011, with concerns raised for court form and financial data residing outside AZTEC necessitating local CMS conversion efforts not shown in the

plan, expanding the OSAM minute distribution solution, and the desire for online payment in Family Court creating another external payment interface. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-08-15

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Coconino County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2009-2011, with a concern raised for calendar data residing outside AZTEC posing a Vista and CMS conversion risk. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-08-16

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Gila County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2009-2011, with a concern raised about the superior court calendar and financial information residing outside AZTEC which will necessitate local CMS conversion not shown in the plan. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-08-17

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Graham County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2009-2011, with a concern noted for court form and calendar data outside of AZTEC necessitating local CMS conversion efforts not shown in the plan. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-08-18

Members also requested that the letter express support for moving the county to OnBase.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Greenlee County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2009-2011, with concerns noted for Jury+ not yet being upgraded to enable web interaction and a homegrown probation payment tracking program that necessitates a local CMS conversion effort not shown in the plan. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-08-19

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve La Paz County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2009-2011, with concerns noted for lack of limited jurisdiction court participation in the planning process and lack of local technology support. The motion passed unanimously (Sheri Newman abstaining). TECH-08-20

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Maricopa County Courts' Consolidated Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2009-2011, with concerns noted for a municipal court case management system identified as "end of life" but having no replacement plan, a municipal court case management system planned for rewrite to new technology without having obtained COT approval, various production data residing in MS-Access posing a business risk to municipal courts, and the current plans for reduction in force at ICJIS affecting justice integration projects. The motion passed unanimously (Marcus Reinkensmeyer abstaining). TECH-08-21

- MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve Mohave County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2009-2011. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-08-22
- MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve Navajo County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2009-2011, with a concern noted for caseload and collections data residing in MS-Access posing a business risk. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-08-23
- MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve Pima County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2009-2011, with concerns noted for lack of CMS stability at PCCJC, demand for online payments at limited jurisdiction courts possibly conflicting with FARE, and desire for local e-filing solutions in superior court and two municipal courts. The motion passed unanimously (Kent Batty abstaining). TECH-08-24
- MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve Pinal County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2009-2011, with a concern raised for numerous superior court automated functions outside AZTEC which will complicate CMS conversion efforts. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-08-25
- MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve Santa Cruz County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2009-2011, with a concern raised for possible production data residing in MS-Access posing business risk. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-08-26
- MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve Yavapai County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2009-2011, with concerns raised for possible production data residing in MS-Access at Juvenile and Drug Courts posing business risk and the advanced age of the Prescott Consolidated Courts' CMS with no replacement plan identified. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-08-27
- MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve Yuma County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2009-2011, with concerns raised for online payment processing systems involving multiple vendors at several courts and pursuit of an EDMS other than OnBase at an LJ court, which requires an exception from COT. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-08-28
- MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve the State Appellate Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2009-2011, with a concern that continued use of disparate automation systems

makes true integration a challenge. The motion passed unanimously (Garye Vasquez abstaining). TECH-08-29

In response to a member's question, staff clarified that the letter for the state appellate courts is delivered to the chief justice.

CALL TO THE PUBLIC

After verifying that no further business existed from members, Justice Berch made a call to the public. No members of the public responded. Members were also reminded about the data center tour at the conclusion of the meeting.

The next COT meeting is scheduled for September 5, 2008, in Conference Room 345 A/B of the Arizona State Courts Building.

The meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m.