

# Court Security Standards Committee

---

Friday, March 24, 2017  
Conference Room 119 A/B, Arizona State Courts Building 1501  
West Washington Street  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

---

**Present:** Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Judge Kyle Bryson, Greg DeMerritt, Rolf Eckel, Sean Gibbs, Faye Guertin, Keith Kaplan, Judge Rob Krombeen, Tina Mattison, Commander Scott Slade, George Weisz

**Absent/Excused:** Mary Jane Abril, Richard Colwell, Joshua Halversen, Sheriff Scott Mascher, John Phelps, Sheriff William Pribil

**Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC):** Theresa Barrett, Dave Byers, Cathy Clarich, Kelly Gray, Misty Mosley-Helber, Donald Jacobson, David Svoboda

**AOC Staff:** Jennifer Albright, Sabrina Nash

---

**Welcome and Opening Remarks.** The March 24, 2017, meeting of Court Security Standards Committee (CSSC) was called to order at 10:01 a.m. by Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Chair.

Mr. Reinkensmeyer introduced and welcomed George Weisz to CSSC and asked members to introduce themselves.

## **Approval of Minutes from September 12, 2016**

The draft minutes from the September 12, 2016, meeting of the CSSC were presented for approval.

**Motion:** Judge Kyle Bryson moved to approve the September 12, 2016, minutes as presented.

**Seconded:** Rolf Eckel. **Vote:** Unanimous.

## **Extension of Committee Term and Committee Charge**

Mr. Reinkensmeyer noted that the administrative order extending the committee had no new charge for the committee. He suggested that the committee focus on the following: Provide guidance and assistance on resources and tools being developed related to implementation of the standards; assist with development and review of policies and procedures related to implementation; provide support and guidance to Education Services as they develop training; provide guidance and support for the development of the application and selection process for grant funding (if secured legislatively); support an amendment to the Arizona Code of Judicial Administration incorporating the standards into the Code; and assist with trainings and presentations as implementation of the Standards begins. The members of the Committee expressed unanimous support for the new charge.

Jennifer Albright updated CSSC about the "Implementing Arizona's Court Security Standards" webinars that were held March 7, 2017 and March 9, 2017. The webinars were hosted by Marcus Reinkensmeyer and Don Jacobson and were well received. It was reported that post-webinar feedback included suggestions such as: could the AOC provide a repository for information that the courts could access and additional webinars or training materials related to the various phases of implementation of the Security Standards. As a result of feedback, the "Resources" page on the CSSC website was updated to include general information sections for best practices, security related publications, other state materials and Arizona tools. Eventually these materials will be housed on

the statewide-accessible SharePoint site.

Don Jacobson mentioned that he has been receiving inquiries from courts for RFP assistance and stated that he would be reaching out to CSSC members to help provide samples of model RFPs for equipment, resources, and surplus security equipment. He also asked for information on shared contracts that the courts could use.

Mr. Reinkensmeyer observed that the Court Security Standards go into effect July 1, 2017, and that he hoped to codify the standards in the Arizona Code of Judicial Administration in the following year.

#### **Update on Adoption of Court Security Standards**

Mr. Reinkensmeyer discussed the three-tiered funding model for court security:

- Tier 1- the state is responsible for all training costs and COJET for judges and security personnel.
- Tier 2 – the AOC would provide one time state funding for building improvements such as cameras, bullet proof vests, and other preventative types of improvements.
- Tier 3 – local level funding of operational costs would continue.

He noted that there was legislation related court security funding is currently before the legislature. In an effort to be prepared for a passage of that funding, the AJC approved recommendation of a two percent filing fee increase in Justice and Superior courts for purposes of generating the monies for the legislative fund, if enacted.

Mr. Reinkensmeyer recounted the outreach that occurred, and continues to occur, between September 2016 and the present meeting to vet the Court security Standards and related recommendations. Mr. Reinkensmeyer reviewed the changes to the entryway screening standards and the exemption process that were made in conjunction with outreach and input from local courts and county managers, statewide, in preparation for seeking support from the Arizona Judicial Council and adoption by the Chief Justice.

How the exemption process will work was discussed generally. The Committee provided input for the Funding and Exception workgroup to take into consideration in working out the details of the process related to applying for grant monies or an exception.

#### **Implementation of Court Security Standards**

The Committee members were asked to review the draft court security assessment checklist and provide comments. The members were reminded the checklist is intended to be used as a resource to assist local courts with the process of determining where there are security gaps in relation to the Court Security Standards as well as for supporting requests for funding for security improvement and developing security policies and procedures (for a local security manual).

The Committee suggested that a small section be added to the checklist addressing personal security issues for judges and court staff. As well as there be some assessment of or training considered for managing various serial litigation tactics such as personal liens against judicial officers, fake tax liens, and domestic terrorism. Members Sean Gibbs and Scott Slade discussed Maricopa Superior Court procedures related to individual judicial officer security in relation to identified risks, threats, or concerns of risk based upon prior interactions and intelligence related to persons and cases on a docket on a given day.

It was shared that the Operational Review process will include a check of whether a security assessment has occurred and whether security policies and a security manual has been developed.

**Court Security Funding and Grant Process:** Mr. Reinkensmeyer and member, George Weisz, discussed several types of security-related funding available statewide and nationally. Jennifer Albright and Mr.

Reinkensmeyer provided an update on the outreach that has occurred with various entities and meetings that are being set with representatives from Arizona Department of Homeland Security, the Arizona Counter Terrorism Information Center (ACTIC), and the Phoenix UASI program.

#### **Discussion of Next Steps:**

**Workgroup Formation & Discussions:** Based on the agreed upon new charge of the Committee, three new workgroups were formed. The meeting included breakout sessions for each workgroup to review a few items and provide input to AOC staff related to those items. The new workgroups are:

- Funding and Exemptions
- Policies and Communications
- Training

#### **Workgroup Report-out**

- **Training:** It was recommended that there be a webinar or something to advise courts what the Assessment Checklist is and how to proceed with conducting Standards 23 and 25 involving training for new hires and 24 it was recommended a universal training occur and then pair that with training that is specific to the court location the person is being hired to work at. It was also recommended for judicial officers there be some one-on-one training related to security, personal and building procedures.
- **Policies and Communications:** The policy and communications workgroup continued to review the draft Security Assessment Checklist and provided additional feedback and suggestions for improvements and additions to the document.
- **Funding & Exceptions:** The Funding and Exceptions Workgroup worked with the AOC Caseflow Management team to generate the beginning of policy considerations for a security grant application process in the event that legislation creating such a fund was enacted by the legislature. The discussion included the best cycle for application submissions, the type of information and support related to an application, and use of an advisory group to review grant applications. Further, the workgroup suggested that the grant application process occur on the same cycle and overlap with the exception process.

#### **Good of the Order/Call to the Public:**

Mr. Reinkensmeyer thanked Judge Kyle Bryson for his assistance in presenting the Court Security Standards to the Presiding Judges and Arizona Judicial Council to get their consensus and approval of the standards.

**Announcements/Call to the Public:** No public comments

**Adjournment:** Meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.



# Court Security Standards Committee

---

Friday, June 9, 2017  
Conference Room 230, Arizona State Courts Building  
1501 West Washington Street  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

---

**Present:** Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Mary Jane Abril, Judge Kyle Bryson, Greg DeMerritt, Rolf Eckel, Sean Gibbs, Faye Guertin, Judge Rob Krombeen, Keith Kaplan, Tina Mattison, John Phelps, Commander Scott Slade, George Weisz

**Absent/Excused:** Richard Colwell, Joshua Halversen, Sheriff Scott Mascher

**Guests:** Donald Jacobson, Senior Court Consultant; Carrie Stubblefield, Arizona Counter Terrorism Information Center

**Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC):** Cathy Clarich, Manager, Caseflow Management Unit; David Svoboda, Caseflow Management Unit

**AOC Staff:** Theresa Barrett, Sabrina Nash

---

## I. REGULAR BUSINESS

**Welcome and Opening Remarks.** The June 9, 2017, meeting of Court Security Standards Committee (CSSC) was called to order at 10:03 a.m. by Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Chair.

Mr. Reinkensmeyer introduced and welcomed Detective Carrie Stubblefield of the Arizona Counter Terrorism Information Center (ACTIC) who will be presenting on their work. Mr. Reinkensmeyer then gave an overview of the agenda for the day. Mr. Reinkensmeyer shared additional outreach that he and Don Jacobson had made to groups such as the Limited Jurisdiction Courts Committee and the Arizona Magistrate's Association.

Mr. Reinkensmeyer shared that Timm Fautsko at the National Center for State Courts asked for and was provided materials related to the Committee's work to share with Minnesota and other states. In addition, Mr. Fautsko suggested that a proposal to present at the National Association of Court Managers mid-year conference be submitted. Mr. Reinkensmeyer and Judge Kyle Bryson will be developing that proposal.

Mr. Reinkensmeyer gave an update on the progress of the Texas judiciary in improving court security and adopting security standards. He noted the path Texas is taking differs from Arizona's path in that Texas' path is largely legislative.

Mr. Reinkensmeyer acknowledged member George Weisz as instrumental in connecting the AOC to organizations like ACTIC and Arizona Homeland Defense, who Mr. Reinkensmeyer and George Weisz will meet with in the week following this meeting.

### **Approval of Minutes from March 24, 2017**

The draft minutes from the March 24, 2017, meeting of the CSSC were presented for approval.

**Motion:** Rolf Eckel moved to approve the March 24, 2017, minutes as presented. **Seconded:** Scott Slade. **Vote:** Unanimous.

## II. Presentations and Updates

### Evaluation of Services of National Center for State Courts.

The National Center for State Courts is now conducting an evaluation of the services rendered by Timm Fautsko and other NCSC personnel who acted as consultants to this Committee. Members provided input on the quality of services provided. Topics included: written materials provided; information was presented in a non-biased, neutral, objective manner; Mr. Fautsko gave the committee a solid place to start from; information on what has and has not worked in other places was helpful. Mr. Reinkensmeyer asked if anyone had input on any gaps as well. No comments regarding gaps were shared.

### Resources Update.

Theresa Barrett shared updates on resource development and resources added to the Court Security Standards Committee website. Theresa directed members' attention to the website, pointing out the new logo that was procured for use on all AOC created Court Security Standards communications and resources. Theresa shared information about the various statewide memorandums that have been sent out detailing information about the effective date of the Security Standards and sharing of resources to assist local courts in implementing the Standards.

Theresa highlighted the Resource page, particularly the Arizona Tools page. Theresa also shared that eventually these resources will be located on a dedicated SharePoint site. Currently information is on the internet site so only information for public consumption will be posted. However, when the secure SharePoint site is complete, more sensitive information can be included.

### Presentation on Threat Assessment Services by the Arizona Counter Terrorism Information Center

Mr. Reinkensmeyer introduced the work of the Arizona Fusion Center and ACTIC. He then introduced Detective Carrie Stubblefield who presented on the services for conducting threat vulnerability assessments for state partners. Detective Stubblefield discussed two ways ACTIC can assist with threats and threat assessments. First, courts can report suspicious persons or activities that do not necessarily rise to the level of 911 calls. Second, she explained the Terrorism Liaison Officer (TLO) program, officer training, resources, and efforts made by these TLOs to partner with state and local agencies to provide threat vulnerability assessments. The program is request based, so the state agency contacts ACTIC to request a threat vulnerability assessment. She then discussed the step-by-step process of those threat assessments, from request to completion of the assessment and sharing of the report.

### **Discussion** – Discussion occurred on the following topics:

Recommend that in the TLO assessment process ensure that local or county law enforcement officers are involved since they often provide security for courts; Detective Stubblefield shared that once a request is made ACTIC reaches out to local first responder providers such as local and county police, federal partners, fire, EMS, etc. TLOs are not just law enforcement officers, but all types of first responders.

A question was asked on how courts can more effectively communicate with and receive information on local threats from ACTIC. The Detective went through several items, including databases that have portals courts could request access to that would facilitate that broader communication.

John Phelps noted that when ACTIC was formed it was envisioned that there would be a database that first responders could use to have information about the site once responding. Detective Stubblefield affirmed that there is such a database and that an improved database being developed will allow information to be received in-vehicle by first responders in route to a scene.

#### **Court Security Funding, Update.**

Mr. Reinkensmeyer recapped the adoption of a bill by the legislature and governor for security grant monies. The legislation authorizes the Judiciary to distribute up to \$750,000 annually for statewide Security specific JCEF grants for security improvements in local courts. The monies will be generated through a 2% increase to filing fees adopted by the Supreme Court.

#### **Court Security Funding, Grant Process.**

Mr. Reinkensmeyer introduced Cathy Clarich and David Svoboda of the Caseflow Management Unit. David is responsible with administering grants like JCEF and Fill the Gap. The goal is to develop a competitive process for grant awards.

David discussed the process for managing the funds, what it will look like, how applications will be vetted and how the grants will be disbursed. David explained the Funding and Exceptions Workgroup of the committee assisted in developing the structure presented today. David stated that the goal is to have an application advisory group to help rank the applications based on need and priority for approval. David indicated that ideally the group would not be employees of a court to avoid appearance of conflict and that panel members have some security background. He sought input from the committee on this idea.

Members discussed the benefits of an advisory panel. It was suggested that although members should be neutral and lack possible conflict, having knowledge of security needs of courts will be important because security needs are different for different entities.

It was asked how smaller counties will be able to be competitive with the larger counties with more courts. David shared that the workgroup helped with a draft matrix that would rank the applications based on project considering the implementation phase, need over number, and how to ensure the courts with the most need will be able to be considered competitively as the goal of the Standards is to bring up security levels in courts that have little.

Mary Jane Abril shared the workgroup's input on the various ways to rank or assess priorities.

Cathy Clarich shared that when the application process begins, a thought was to set a list of priorities and to announce applications were being accepted and that the priority for awards would be to a specific list of items. That approach was supported.

David walked through a draft application that was developed with the help of AOC staff and the Funding and Exceptions Workgroup. He sought input from the committee on several areas.

#### **Updates on Implementation Measures.**

Judge Bryson, Mary Jane Abril and Donald Jacobson along with Dean Nyhart (retired DPS officer) will present a plenary session at the annual Judicial Conference on security and safety in the courtroom focusing on philosophy and leadership followed by practical security advice for internal and external security for judges.

Don Jacobson shared the progress on a Security Assessment Checklist and Report and the draft of the model security procedures manual.

**Workgroup Breakouts and Report Out.**

The committee broke out into two workgroups (Funding and Exception and Policies and Communications) and those in the third group were asked to join one of the other two for the breakout session. The workgroups reported out the following:

Funding and Exceptions: The workgroup gave input on the grant application and the advisory panel make-up. Additional discussion was had on the ability to use equipment that other courts are phasing out, essentially a surplus list. That topic will be followed up on at a later date.

Policies and Communications: Discussion was had on how the county SEPCs were essential to communications and policy development. A discussion was held on how oversight and policy direction given at state level with the actual policies being developed locally. It was suggested a template for some of the policies and procedures for local courts be developed to aid in developing policies locally.

The workgroup also shared that it agreed that there should be some kind of statewide incident information and notification sharing system developed.

**Announcements/Call to the Public**

No public comments

**Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

# Court Security Standards Committee

---

Tuesday, November 14, 2017  
Conference Room 119 A/B, Arizona State Courts Building  
1501 West Washington Street  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

---

**Present:** Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Judge Kyle Bryson (telephonic), Greg DeMerritt, Rolf Eckel, Sean Gibbs, Faye Guertin, Judge Rob Krombeen, Tina Mattison, John Phelps, Commander Scott Slade

**Absent/Excused:** Mary Jane Abril, Joshua Halversen, Keith Kaplan, Sheriff Scott Mascher, George Weisz

**Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC):** Donald Jacobson, Senior Court Consultant; David Svoboda, Caseflow Management Unit; Jeff Schrade, Judicial Education Services

**AOC Staff:** Jennifer Albright, Sabrina Nash

---

## I. REGULAR BUSINESS

**Welcome and Opening Remarks.** The November 11, 2017, meeting of Court Security Standards Committee (CSSC) was called to order at 10:04 a.m. by Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Chair.

Mr. Reinkensmeyer gave an overview of the meeting, noting that the focus would be on implementation. Mr. Reinkensmeyer noted he hoped he would not only share updates, but hear from members about other items related to implementation around the state, especially as to ongoing security assessments at local courts.

### **Approval of Minutes from June 9, 2017**

The draft minutes from the June 9, 2017, meeting of the CSSC were presented for approval.

**Motion:** Rolf Eckel moved to approve the June 9, 2017, minutes as presented. **Seconded:** Rob Krombeen. **Vote:** Unanimous.

Mr. Reinkensmeyer shared a few noteworthy items related to court security topics in other states such as the Tennessee General Assembly giving the Judiciary a one-time grant of \$2 million for court security improvements for courts that needed help meeting the Tennessee Court Security Standards, the impact of severe budget cuts on security in an Illinois court, and the significant reduction in security incidents that resulted from implementation of security screening at a Wisconsin court.

## II. PRESENTATIONS AND UPDATES

### **Resource Update.**

Jennifer Albright, staff to the Committee, reviewed the resources that are on the Court Security Committee website, focusing on newly added resources. Ms. Albright shared with members the number and content of statewide memos that had been issued related to implementation of security standards. The memos will continue to be issued to keep local courts updated on various resources, timelines – such as deadlines for security grant applications – and other important and relevant information.

Ms. Albright also reviewed a draft document that provided information on how courts can search for existing open contracts with security-related vendors. The members provided input on the document and consensus was reached that the document should be added to the resources available on the website.

Ms. Albright also shared a revised format for a model court security manual. It was discussed that because of the number of Standards and the amount of content that could be placed in the model document, that rolling out the manual in phases coordinating with the three phases of implementation of the standards was a practical way to manage the content and get the resource into the hands of local courts.

#### **Updates on Presentations on Court Security Around the State.**

Judge Bryson spoke about the presentation at the annual Court Leadership Conference in October by Mary Jane Abril, Judge Rob Krombeen, Judge Kyle Bryson, Don Jacobson, Rolf Eckel and Commander Nyhart (ret.) of Department of Public Safety. The presentation was powerful and well received.

Members discussed continuing these types of presentations and trainings for court leadership. Marcus Reinkensmeyer fielded a question regarding what kind of training is provided in New Judges Orientation.

Marcus also shared information about the video recording of the presentation for the Blended Learning Conference. That recording is available through the JEC.

Marcus also shared information on presentations given on court security during the strategic agenda update session of the Court Leadership Conference and the Justice of the Peace Association conference.

#### **Presentation on Court Security Grant Funding – First Cycle Applications.**

Mr. David Svoboda of the Caseflow Management Unit discussed the number of applications and the timeline for review of applications for awarding of funds. First round of applications ended October 31, 2017. All but one or two applications were received in the last week of the open application period. There were a total of 28 applications from 11 counties representing municipal, justice and superior courts. Requests covered a wide array of items from large amounts and large items to small requests for small items.

Because requests total over \$900,000, awards will have to be selective because there is only \$200,000 to \$300,00 available for the first round of awards. The applications will be vetted using a panel of security experts coupled with a matrix created with help of the funding workgroup and feedback from the full Security Committee at previous meetings. Any request not fulfilled during this round will either be rolled over to the next application cycle or courts will be asked to re-apply. How that will work will be decided after award decisions are made.

Mr. Svoboda explained that Caseflow Management Unit staff are in the process of an initial review of applications which includes:

- Requesting any additional information or support missing from the applications such as cost justifications and itemized list for the project components and needs. (Mr. Svoboda explained that this competitive grant process is new to courts so there will be a learning curve for courts.)

- Ensuring that IT and the Commission on Technology were consulted and provided approval for any projects in the applications that would involve the court network to ensure that all cyber security requirements and policies are met
- Ordering the request against the security improvements listed as priorities during this cycle and against the matrix.

Mr. Svoboda explained that the applications will be reviewed by the advisory panel during the first week of December for assistance in further determining which requests will be fulfilled. Decisions and awards are expected to be announced before the end of the year.

Discussion was had on the timing of the second cycle of applications. The discussion centered on the second cycle and timing overlap with local courts' budget planning cycles.

#### **Discussion on Security Assessments.**

Mr. Reinkensmeyer shared information on the number of security assessment requests made of ACTIC. Members shared information about other assessment requests or completion of assessments in their jurisdictions. Some courts are using ACTIC from assessments, some are using local or county law enforcement to conduct the model assessment created by the Committee and others are using local court administrators and court security officers to conduct the model assessment. Members also shared information on progress on the creation and first meetings of local and county security and emergency preparedness committees (SEPCs).

#### **Discussion on Court Security Training Development.**

Jeff Schrade, from Judicial Education Services, discussed a preliminary outline of court security-related training programs. Mr. Schrade started by briefly summarizing additional trainings and presentations that occurred around the state. Mr. Schrade shared that planning for training focuses on three groups: judicial staff, judicial officers, and security professionals (employed by court, contracted, or law enforcement).

Mr. Schrade discussed direct service models (providing training and education directly to staff) versus technical assistance models (curriculum, localized support for presentation, train the trainer). He also discussed standardized curriculum versus localized, customized curriculum and how both are relevant to security training in Arizona.

There are approximately 7,000 court staff in approximately 180 court locations in Arizona. Most training occurs through the technical assistance model, organized through regional trainers. Large delivery occurs through the Blended Learning Conference. Mr. Schrade explained that for court staff, topics that were general enough to broadcast statewide in a standardized format would be delivered in that manner. However, he noted there were also many topics where Education Services would provide technical assistance for delivering customized training locally. Topics that would be relevant for these formats included, but were not limited to, active shooter, verbal judo, suspicious packages, bomb threats, personal safety, reacting to violence with courthouse, managing jurors and their safety. In addition, Mr. Schrade shared that portions of new employee orientation related to court security should be customized for local security policies.

Mr. Schrade then shared that there are about 650 judicial officers statewide. He noted there is the annual Judicial Conference which is the best place for standardized in-person programming which would be in addition to a security component at new judges' orientation programs. Mr. Schrade provided a list of topics that was compiled for judicial officers training on court security.

Mr. Schrade then went on to discuss training models for security professionals. He noted there was no standardized model of training in the state and there are a variety of types of court security officers from wholly contracted to wholly employed by the court and everything in between, which is a major factor in determining what kind of standardized training should be created. Moreover, the direct instruction model is the best model for delivering the training discussed in the Standards. Mr. Schrade noted that much of the training for security professionals requires individuals to travel to a centralized location from around the state. This factor will impact the training model that will be developed.

Mr. Schrade shared that talks regarding partnering with the Maricopa County Security Department training program were ongoing. At the same time discussions are being held about bolstering and standardizing that training should partnering be a viable option.

Mr. Schrade discussed that local training models to supplement a centralized security officer program are still being research and expected to be a part of the overall training program.

Mr. Schrade then discussed the final phase of developing training - standardized requirements for firearms training for locations where armed court security is present.

Discussion was had on various aspects of training of security professionals. Additional resources and ideas were generated for further consideration.

#### **Security Incident Reporting Form.**

Don Jacobson, Senior Court Consultant, provided a presentation of an online security incident reporting system that is in early development. The incident reporting system was demonstrated and was well received. Members provided feedback and suggestions for edits or improvements. Mr. Jacobson stated that the next version would be shared with a group from Maricopa County and a further update would be forthcoming at the next committee meeting.

#### **Workgroup Breakouts and Report Out.**

The committee broke out into two workgroups (Policies and Communications and training) and those in the third group were asked to join one of the other two for the breakout session. The workgroups reported out the following:

Training: The workgroup gave additional input on the training plans put forth by Mr. Schrade.

Policies and Communications: Discussion was had on an alternative to the current draft of the model court security manual. The workgroup proposed that staff to the Committee develop a template security plan based on the format and model of the Language Access Plans. It was suggested that this type of a document could be quickly filled in by courts that have little or no policies and procedures and ensure that a court can establish basic minimum policies and procedure that meet the requirements of the Court Security Standards, Phase I. The follow up materials could be shared with courts to enhance the template as additional resources are developed.

#### **Announcements/Call to the Public**

The next meeting of the Committee was noted as January 19, 2018.  
No public comments.

#### **Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.