

Funding and Exceptions Workgroup
Minutes, March 24, 2017 breakout meeting.

Workgroup members present: Keith Kaplan, George Weisz
AOC Staff: Cathy Clarich, Caseflow management Unit Manager; David Svoboda, Misty Moseley-Helbert
Members not present: John Phelps, Mary Jane Abril

There is a legislative bill pending in the legislature that would create a Court security Fund that would be available for local courts to use for one-time outlays for facilities, equipment and training necessary to meet the Court Security Standards. If the legislation passes the Arizona Judicial Council has approved a 2% increase to filing fees that would generate funds that would be deposited into the Court security Fund.

If the Court Security Fund legislation passes, the Caseflow Management Unit will be responsible for the receipt and processing of requests/applications for Court Security Fund monies. Per Cathy Clarich, manager of the Unit, input is sought on the process and procedure for requesting and awarding grants.

During the breakout session it was agreed that 4 items would be considered by the Workgroup at this time.

1. Should there be specific submission period for requests (or applications) for monies from the Security Fund.

- The initial thoughts on this question are yes, there should be a specific period or a “due date” for submitting requests for Security Fund monies.
- Input on why a submission period should be designated include:
 - + allows for all courts to be considered equally at one time for funds since the amount of funds are not infinite
 - + because the structure of the phased implementation period is on a fiscal year, and because courts are being required to conduct a security assessment, and the results of that assessment will be reported to local and county SEPCs (Security Committees), it is expected strategic planning related to implementing and seeking funding will need to be developed in each court and each county. A submission period would tie nicely into that infrastructure.
 - + courts will have to seek funding for implementing the Standards and having a submission period that aligns with budget cycles will allow for courts to detail efforts to seek local funding and the need for Fund monies
 - + There will also be a process for courts to seek an exception to the Security Standards and creating a submission period that aligns with that process will allow for there to be a larger picture of the needs of courts across the state.

Workgroup input: What are your thoughts on whether there should be a submission period/deadline.

2. & 3. The Workgroup discussed a second and third question that eventually became merged. The second question was whether there should be preference for or some guidance on whether to place priority on requests for Security Fund monies that involve the Standards that are currently being implemented (meaning if it is year 1 of the implementation period, should year one related needs take priority over years 3 related requests.)

The third question was whether Standards to be implemented in year 2 (Standards 12 through 22) should be ranked or weighted in some manner.

After discussion on both questions, consensus developed that the Standards should be weighted in some manner taking into account the phased implementation approach.

Addendum: During the report out period it was learned, and the Committee as a whole agreed that the sections of the Template Court Security Assessment checklist should also be weighted. As such weighting of the standards in generally will at some point overlap with discussions on the weighting of sections in the Assessment Checklist.

This Workgroup is asked to discuss and begin to provide input related to weighting the Standards, keeping on mind the phased implementation approach.

4. The final question for input on at this time is related to an application process for courts seeking Security Fund monies. **The question posed to this Workgroup is what kind of content should be part of the application?**

Some initial thoughts included:

- Letters or some statement from the PJ of the court/county supporting the request. Or a signature attesting to support for the request.
- Documentation on requests from local funding authority for funds to secure the security feature/measure/equipment/etc. and the results of that request.
- Information from the Security Assessment Report documenting the need for monies and how the monies will go toward meeting the Standards.
- This item also was discussed in terms of a possible Security Strategic Plan that accompanies the request so demonstrate the needs of a court and planned action to move toward full implementation.
- It was also discussed that this process could overlap with the exception request process so that the same or similar information was part of the exception request, allowing courts to be granted an exception if funding is not secured locally or through award of Security Fund monies.