

Pima County Superior Court FARE Implementation Status Report

Status Report Date:

September 13, 2017

Distribution:

- ❖ Pima County: Patricia M., Allen W., Sean A., Susan C., and Ron O.
- ❖ AOC: Steve H., Candace A, Brittany P., and Laura R. and Shared Pima County/FARE webpage*

Discussion Points/Decisions:

- A conference call was held on September 13th and present on the call were: Pima County – Sean, Christine, Susan, Cas, Patricia M.; AOC – Steve H. and Laura R.
- The group discussed progress since the last conference call.
 - Christine and Patricia have reviewed the charge file Sean sent them. Patricia forwarded it to Steve. Steve talked with the group about a couple of issues that he saw that could be fixed with programming – SSN in the wrong format, charges with blank dispos and a possible issue with their case charge code (like F1) not translating correctly for the AOC’s Data Warehouse tables’ format (CF1). Sean will look into these issues.
 - Patricia reviewed the updated FARE Implementation Plan’s Strategic Decisions section.
 - #1 – Payment Reconciliation – done
 - #2 – Minimum balance programming – done
 - #3 - FARE referral limit programming – done
 - #4 – 19% fee displayed in AGAVE – deadline of 12/31/2017
 - #5 – FARE Website Access linkage – deadline of 6/30/2018
 - #6 – Public Access test file – 25% completed
 - #7 – FARE Notices/court letterhead – 90% completed
 - #8 – FARE Court Profile form - done
 - #9 – FARE Charge table – 90% completed
 - #10 – Addresses – to and from FARE – 80% completed
 - Steve reported he has sent the FARE Program’s Chargeback documentation to Patricia and Susan. He also researched Susan’s question about chargebacks with restitution involved. Steve spoke with Mohave Superior and staff at the AOC’s Court Operations Unit. They both commented that this situation would be very rare. The FARE vendor, which coordinates chargebacks for FARE cases, had never heard of that situation happening either. Court Operations staff said the once the restitution check was disbursed to the victim, it could not be taken back. The court’s funding authority (i.e. county or city) would need to provide money to the court for the amount disbursed and then when the next payment is made, use the money to reimburse the funding authority. Susan said they already have a similar process in place as this sometimes occurs on probation cases.
 - Cas reported he continues to work on the business requirements and has no questions or issues at this time.
 - Patricia asked when there would be more testing and Steve said once the 19% fee is put into place (display in CMS, calculation in automation, etc.) then testing would proceed.

*Located at <http://www.azcourts.gov/courtservices/Consolidated-Collections-Unit/FARE/AOCFARE/AOCFARE-PIMA-COUNTY-SUPERIOR-COURT>