

Court Security Standards Committee (CSSC)

January 12, 2016
10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.
Conference Room 119 A/B
1501 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Present: Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Mary Jane Abril, Greg DeMerritt, Sheriff Scott Mascher, Commander Scott Slade, Richard Colwell, Robert Hughes, Judge Kyle Bryson, Tina Mattison, Keith Kaplan, John Phelps, Sheriff William Pribil, Faye Guertin, Judge Robert Krombeen, Joshua Halversen, Rolf Eckel.

Presenters/Guests: Timm Fautsko, National Center for State Courts (NCSC)

Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) Attendees: Dave Byers, Mike Baumstark

Staff: Jennifer Albright (AOC), Sabrina Nash (AOC), Theresa Barrett (AOC)

Call to Order/Welcome and Introductions

With a quorum present, the January 12, 2016, meeting of CSSC was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Chair. Mr. Reinkensmeyer introduced Timm Faustko from the National Center for State Courts (NCSC), who will be working with the committee to meet the goals of the administrative order. Committee members then introduced themselves and provided a brief bio. Mr. Reinkensmeyer then asked Theresa Barrett, Mike Baumstark and Dave Byers to introduce themselves.

Mr. Byers addressed committee members regarding the direction of court security and outlined some of the challenges facing the committee, such as creating standards that are applicable to both rural and urban courts, whether there should be guidelines or standards, and the manner of funding any increased security measure. He also discussed issues of armed versus unarmed security, bomb threats, and the creation of a lawyer bypass program to help expedite lawyers who move from courthouse to courthouse, as well as the certification and training of court security staff.

Review of AO 2015-104

Marcus Reinkensmeyer summarized the scope of work for the committee as outlined in the Administration Order:

- Develop and conduct a survey on court security provisions
- Develop recommendations on standards for courthouse and courtroom security and officer training
- Submit a final report by September 30, 2016

- Report recommendations to the Arizona Judicial Council (AJC) by the AJC's October 2016 meeting

Status of Court Security in the USA

Timm Fautsko, NCSC, spoke about several recent security incidents in courts throughout the country. He suggested that in planning court security these questions should be considered:

- Who is coming into the courthouse?
- How are they getting in (entryway points)?
- What is being brought into the courthouse?
- Keep track of contraband brought into the courthouse, as this information could be useful in planning trainings and could help with funding requests.
- Keep track of incidents to share with court security, and use this information in training staff to increase security awareness.

Mr. Fautsko shared statistics from a recent national survey: security measures that courts did and did not have; targeted acts of violence; and reported issues impacting court security such as scare funding, lack of training, and need for additional staff. Mr. Fautsko encouraged the committee to work towards court security standards that would be easily achievable by both metropolitan and rural courts, and to have security manuals that are succinct. He stated that communication, collaboration, and training (including security drills) are the best tools to increase court security.

Questions were raised during Mr. Fautsko's presentation including:

- Should court officers, law enforcement, and judges should be armed while in the courthouse.
- How to handle the possibility violence will be perpetuated by an employee and not someone coming into court as a litigant or as a member of the public.

Review of Publications & Materials

Marcus Reinkensmeyer deferred the review of publications to committee members' discretion and had Ms. Jennifer Albright show members how to navigate the Court Security Standards Committee webpage. Ms. Albright demonstrated how to access the information and materials made available through the website.

Discussion: Benchmarking Security Standards

What Other States Do/NCSC Best Practices/What Do We Want to Do

Timm Fautsko explained the best practices for keeping courts safe is collaboration and communication. He stated that the most successful and safe court systems in this country have a security team comprised of the presiding judge, court administrator, clerk, court security – whether employed by court or provided by local law enforcement, and often other stakeholders that work together to develop, test, and improve court security policies and protocols. He also presented information on three categories of security measure and their relative importance to overall security. Mr. Fautsko then opened the floor for discussion on what the committee wants to do. Suggestions from the committee were:

- Developing standards that would be adaptable from urban to rural courts
- Creating procedural guidance for court staff on how to deal with irate visitors to the court

- Assessing the culture of the each court and that particular court's security needs
- Requiring each court to have an active security committee
- Creating tiered security guidelines that courts could use to build up security over time
- Address the increased risk specialty courts (Mental Health, Drug and Veterans Court) bring to the courthouse.
- Develop a list of questions to survey the courts on current measures and concerns; then develop guidelines based on what the courts perceive to be the greatest need.
- Create a baseline of standard training for courts that can be expanded as resources need or in proportion to the needs of the court.
- Develop funding strategies, such as: ask legislature for funding or increase/add fees to support court security? Earmark enhancement funds?

Web-Based Survey Best Practices

Marcus Reinkensmeyer and Timm Fautsko, presented research based practices to get good results from a web-based survey. These some of the practices include:

- Be succinct and specific with your questions
- Multiple choice or yes/no questions work best
- Consider your audience and possibly have two sets of questions: what do they have, what do they need?

The projected timeline for the web-based survey is to have a rough draft for review at the February 22, 2016 meeting, and after review and revision send the survey in March 2016.

Breakout: Small Working Group Discussions

The committee went into small workgroups to develop suggested topics for a survey on court security in the state. The groups were divided as follows:

Courthouse Security (Rolf Eckel)

Keith Kaplan, Joshua Halversen, Richard Colwell

Courtroom Security (Honorable Kyle Bryson)

Sheriff Mascher, Judge Krombeen, Tina Mattison

Courthouse Perimeter Security (John F. Phelps)

Sheriff Pribil, Greg DeMerritt

Court Security Training (Faye Guertin)

Robert Hughes, Sheriff Slade, Mary Jane Abril

Small Group Report Back

A spokesperson for each workgroup reported back to the committee a list of items discussed. The list included:

Courthouse Security:

Determine what security measure each court has?

Segregate by court type urban versus rural.

What do the people who work in and frequent the court feel are most important security measures?

Does each court have an active security committee?

Courtroom Security:

Courtroom populations – protocol for attorneys/judges/staff to notify court of a potentially volatile client, witness or litigant
Entrances into the courtroom – seating in the gallery; decorum orders
Exit or escape routes – rally points and designated contact person for communications
Duress/Incident alerts and reporting
Securing and locking of courtroom
Juror access – control for egress and ingress
In custody defendants: circulation patterns, location in courtroom
Armed personnel in courtroom

Courthouse Perimeter Security:

Definition of perimeter
Identification of threats from perimeter
Number of doors and windows; alarmed doors and windows
Line of sight; cameras or other manner of observing
Controlled access for vendors

Court Security Training:

When are employees trained on security measures
What is provided in training; How often is training
Court Security Officer Academy; what specific training do court security personnel receive
Mandatory defense tactics for armed security
Mental Health Training for all employees; de-escalation and defensive tactics
Use of force standards for court security personnel
Protocols for evacuation, lockdown, active shooter, other emergencies

Good of the Order/Call to the Public

There was no response to the call to the public.
Marcus Reinkensmeyer thanked committee members for their participation in this committee.

Next Committee Meeting Date

Monday, February 22, 2016
10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.
Arizona State Courts Building, Conference Room 119 A/B
1501 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Adjourned at 1:57 p.m.

Court Security Standards Committee (CSSC)

February 22, 2016

10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Conference Room 119 A/B

1501 West Washington Street

Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Present: Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Mary Jane Abril, Judge Kyle Bryson, Richard Colwell, Greg DeMerritt, Rolf Eckel, Faye Guertin, Robert Hughes, Keith Kaplan, Judge Robert Krombeen, Earle Lloyd (proxy for Commander Scott Slade), Sheriff Scott Mascher, Tina Mattison, John Phelps, Sheriff William Pribil

Absent: Robert Hughes, Joshua Halversen

Administrative Office of Courts (AOC) Guests: Theresa Barrett, Jeff Schrade

AOC Staff: Jennifer Albright, Sabrina Nash

Call to Order/Welcome and Introductions

Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. and asked Committee members to introduce themselves to each other for the benefit of members on the phone. After introductions were made, Mr. Reinkensmeyer shared a few interesting news items related to court security around the country. Highlights included:

- **Rogers County, Oklahoma** -A ten dollar fee per civil case to help with the cost of security and screening, authorized by statute, was approved. The fee will provide funding for improved and increased court security.
- **Harris County, Texas** -A new law was recently passed allowing the public to carry concealed weapons into most county offices, i.e. County Assessor, Treasurer, and the Board of Supervisors, but not the court. All of these offices share the same building. The passing of this law necessitated changes in where court security checkpoints were located - removing from the main entrance and moving to areas closer to location of courtrooms, the installation of more panic buttons and better communication with the Sheriff's Office.
- **Calhoun County, Florida** - A judge was recently threatened and because court is held in a shared facility, the other tenants in the building did not want to inconvenience their visitors by screening all visitors to the building. Screening was instituted outside the courtroom to meet the concerns regarding screening persons not in the building for court business.

Approval of Minutes from January 12, 2016

Motion: Mr. Phelps moved to approve the January 12, 2016, minutes as presented. **Seconded:** Judge Bryson **Vote:** Unanimous.

Rules of Business/Proxy Form

Marcus Reinkensmeyer explained the purpose of the proxy form is to allow committee members to designate a proxy to represent them at meetings they themselves cannot attend due to scheduling conflicts. The proxy form identifies in writing who will be attending in the members absence and the duties and authority associated with the role of proxy.

Motion: Judge Bryson moved to approve the proxy form. **Seconded:** Mr. Phelps **Vote:** Unanimous.

Web-Based Survey Best Practices

Jennifer Albright, Senior Policy Analyst, AOC, talked about best practices for web-based surveys. Things to consider are:

- Audience - Stakeholders are more likely to respond when they have a vested interest in the subject of the survey and the results. Identify audience.
- Content - Development of questions to get desired information; keep the survey from being too long and time consuming for respondents.
- Consistency - Use consistent language in both the survey and message to stakeholders.
- Goal - For the Committee, the goal is to evaluate what courts have and what they need. Questions should be specific to that goal.
- Organization - Questions should be organized in a manner that is easy to follow and logical.

Review of Draft Survey Questions

Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Chair, asked the committee if they thought the survey should go out to stakeholders via a message from the Committee or the Chief Justice. It was suggested by judges on the Committee that the survey should come from the Chief Justice. Mr. Reinkensmeyer then asked committee members to review the sample surveys and provide input. Discussion ensued with suggestions as follows:

- **Survey Introduction** - **Question 1** - add "other" to position title and ask respondent to identify their position. **Question 4** - add municipal court to the list of court types. **Questions 1 and 5** - change the list of various law enforcement agencies to be law enforcement officer (LEO), to cover them all. It was suggested the survey ask respondents to designate if they are in-house court staff, transport staff, or probation officer. **Question 5** - Add "no security" to the list of options.
- **Perimeter of the Court Building** - add an open comment box at the end of each survey question, add questions related to the first four items listed in the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) recommended additional topics.
- **In the Court Building** - change the word magnetometer to metal detector, change security command/control room to security command/control area, add monitoring of security cameras and duress alarms, secured interior doors, and the first four items in the NCSC list of recommended additional topics.
- **Courtroom** - add courtroom protocol on firearms and cellphones in the courtroom, questions regarding lock down policy/procedure, shelter in place, facility orientation and training for key responders, first responder knowledge of building layout, locked courtroom doors, and sweeps of courtrooms. It was suggested that the survey group duress alarm questions in a single question.
- **Training** - add questions regarding how often training is received, whether use of force training is provided, staff training on building evacuation, active shooter and internal communication during emergency.

Discussion then concluded with comments regarding prospective survey participants and how best to distribute the survey to those participants.

Breakout: Small Working Group Discussions on policy development

The Committee went into small workgroups to discuss policy development for court security related to their work group topic areas. Mr. Reinkensmeyer asked the committee to consider policies that would be designated as standards versus policies better suited for guidelines. The Committee was also asked to consider policies that are known best practices for court security. The workgroups were divided as follows:

- Courthouse Security
- Courtroom Security
- Courthouse Perimeter Security
- Court Security Training

Small Group Report Back

The spokesperson for each workgroup reported back to the Committee their thoughts. Highlights included:

- **Courthouse Security Workgroup** - This workgroup discussed how to differentiate between large and small courts and the role court size plays in making recommendations for court security guidelines and standards. The workgroup reported that standards for all courts should include: a security committee, a policy or procedure manual, and an annual security checklist. It discussed the possibility of assessing a court security fee to be used to purchase security equipment and fund training for courts. Guidelines for smaller courts included replacing glass with ballistic glass, locking doors, conducting random employee screenings, separating in-custody defendants from judges and the general public, and screening packages. Guidelines for larger courts included the additional items of screening all public visitors entering the courthouse, adding duress alarms and cameras, monitoring of duress alarms and cameras, and armed security officers.
- **Courtroom Security Workgroup** - This workgroup discussed increasing security awareness, duress alarms and testing with staff and the bench, courtroom evacuation, establishing of courtroom decorum orders, ballistic resistance material for the bench, courtroom assessment for improvised weapons, and locking courtroom doors to shelter in place.
- **Courthouse Perimeter Security Workgroup** - This workgroup also discussed differentiating between large and small courts, as well as creating a security checklist specific to the perimeter or defining the perimeter and reviewing it annually, instituting perimeter sweeps, and creating a way to identify high profile cases that may require heightened security measures. This workgroup indicated it considered security threats that were most probable versus least probable in its discussion of whether a measure should be a standard or a guideline.
- **Court Security Training Workgroup** - This workgroup debated mandatory training for rural courts versus metropolitan courts. They also discussed the pros and cons of armed versus unarmed security personnel; the need for training to be reviewed annually; when training should occur; mandatory security orientation for judges, security officers and court staff; the possibility of traveling security trainers and train-the-trainer approaches to help with training; annual re-training of security personnel

on x-ray machines, hand wands and metal detectors; and the mandatory screening for all armed personnel including background checks, drug screening, and psychological evaluations.

Good of the Order/Call to the Public

Jennifer Albright outlined the process for updating the survey based on comments received from committee members. Once the survey is updated, she will send it to a sample group of respondents that will include the Committee members, for feedback.

Ms. Albright will also send out an email to committee members regarding meeting dates in April and May.

Next Committee Meeting Date:

Tuesday, March 22, 2016

10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Arizona State Court Building, Conference Room 119

1501 West Washington Street

Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Adjourned at 2:01 p.m.

COURT SECURITY STANDARDS COMMITTEE (CSSC)

March 22, 2016

10:00 a.m. - 2 p.m.

Conference Room 119 A/B

1501 W. Washington Street

Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Present: Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Mary Jane Abril, Judge Kyle Bryson, Greg DeMerritt, Rolf Eckel, Faye Guertin, Joshua Halversen, Keith Kaplan, Judge Robert Krombeen, Commander Scott Slade, Sheriff Scott Mascher, Tina Mattison, Sheriff William Pribil

Absent: Richard Colwell, John Phelps

Guests: Timm Fautsko, National Center State Courts (NCSC); Earle Lloyd, Maricopa Superior Court Marshall's Office

Administrative Office of Courts (AOC) Guest: Theresa Barrett

AOC Staff: Jennifer Albright, Sabrina Nash

Call to Order/Welcome and Introductions

Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m. and introduced Timm Fautsko of the NCSC. Mr. Reinkensmeyer inquired as to whether any members were on the phone. Mr. Reinkensmeyer then shared a couple of interesting news items related to court security around the country:

- **State of Texas** - Following a shooting of a judge, investigation revealed court security had received two reports of threats against an unnamed judge. The threats were from a person that was a defendant in two separate matters before two separate judges. One of those judges was the victim. No judge was told of the threats. In response to the shooting the Texas Supreme Court completed a large survey of judges and staff. Thirty-eight percent of judges surveyed reported that they feared for their safety in the courtroom and forty-two percent expressed concern about their safety at home.
- **Vermont** - Some Vermont courts have very good security and others do not. Four judges are lobbying the legislature for a standard minimum security at all courthouses. The proposal sought one fulltime security person at each courthouse. The proposal required funding of 1.8 million to hire 35 new court security staff.

Timm Fautsko, NCSC, shared his experiences with the courts in both Texas and Vermont and stated that communication is the key to court security.

Approval of Minutes, February 22, 2016, meeting

Motion to approve minutes: Judge Bryson moved to approve the February 22, 2016, minutes as presented. **Seconded:** Commander Slade **Vote:** unanimous

Review of Draft Survey and Testing Results

Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Chair, stated that he wanted the committee's input to finalize and shorten the length of the survey. Testing revealed the survey took approximately 20 minutes or longer to complete. It was agreed this time needed to be significantly reduced. The committee considered the audience for the survey. The range of distribution was from 200 to 9200 participants. Jennifer Albright thanked the committee for being beta testers along with a select few persons outside the committee. She then proceeded to lead the committee through the survey questions and noted the following:

1. **Position Title** – At the last meeting the committee asked that the term “law enforcement officer” be used instead of listing sheriff, deputy, policeman, and DPS individually. In the process of making that edit “court security officer (non-law enforcement)” was inadvertently deleted and will be added back in. Another job position reviewed was “employee of another agency sharing building with court.” It was decided to keep that title. There was discussion regarding adding probation officers (juvenile and adult), and attorneys to the survey. The committee agreed to add probation officers but not attorneys. Tim Fautsko, NCSC, who is assisting with the creation of the survey, advised that the committee may want to gather information from those respondents whose input will directly impact standards, guidelines and training.
2. **Location, County** – Renamed “county” with a drop down box listing all fifteen Arizona counties.
3. **City** – The list of cities would be over 100. The committee discussed various alternatives to listing 100 cities. Two options were to have a drop down list of “rural, suburban, metropolitan” or to have a drop down of population ranges. The committee recommended using population ranges.
4. **Type of Court Building** – No recommended changes
5. **Court Type** – A recommendation was made to change “Justice of the Peace court” to Justice Court and add Municipal/City court.
6. **Who provides security for your court building** – Suggestions were made to add “no security” and “don’t know” to the response selections.

Jennifer shared comments she received regarding the length of the survey, the use of the Likert scale, specifically use of numbers only, words only, or a combination of numbers and words. The committee agreed numbers and words would be best. The discussion then focused on comments received on the “Do you have” questions (7, 10, 13):

- **Do you have the following security measures around the perimeter of your court building?** – Added the question “Secured or monitored parking areas for court staff.”
- **Do you have the following security measures in your court building?** – Questions were received on the need for detailed employee screening questions (entryway weapons screening, screening station for employees includes: metal detector, X-ray machine, hand wand). Committee members discussed the importance of the information provided by the answers. Discussion also focused on whether employees are randomly screened or visually screened upon entering the courthouse and whether employees enter through the main courthouse entrance or through an employee entrance.
- **Do you have the following security measures for your courtroom?** – Regarding the “rules in place” questions a comment was received on whether the rules were written or rules of practice? Comments were also made about “are officers in the courtroom armed”

are officers armed in all criminal, mental health, civil, veterans, drug and family courtrooms? A recommendation was made to remove the word “all” from questions on the survey.

- **Screening mail and packages?** Suggestion was made to change the language to “policies and procedures for screening mail and packages.”
- **The “How Effective are/How Well Do [security measures] Work...” questions involved the following discussion:**

Jennifer discussed that this line of questions may not lead to useful data because there was not a baseline which the results could be compared to. She suggested the committee might want to have a recommendation of a follow-up survey in six months to a year to determine if standards and guidelines established by the committee’s work are effective and in use. Jennifer also discussed an issue that came up with the survey regarding questions that asked “how well do you think the following security measures currently work in your court building/court/courtroom?” Respondents felt that they had to answer the questions even if they’d answered “didn’t know” or they didn’t have the security measures in place. Discussion took place regarding this issue and the committee decided to remove the “how well” questions 8, 11, 14 and 17 from the survey.

Discussion of Survey Audience and Distribution

Marcus Reinkensmeyer began the discussion on the survey’s audience and distribution of the survey by mentioning that Timm Fautsko had suggested a phased distribution of the survey. Marcus outlined the envisioned phased distribution as follows:

Phase 1 - both superior and limited jurisdiction court administrators, presiding judges or judge of the court for standalone courts, county clerks of the court and chief adult and juvenile probation officers.

Phase 2 - remaining judges, clerks line staff, other court line staff, probation officers, law enforcement officers and other building occupants.

Discussion took place among committee members regarding the phased survey audience, random samples, the distribution of the survey and upcoming meetings (Presiding Judges, AZ Courts Association) where the survey could be unveiled.

Standards versus Guidelines

Timm Fautsko, NCSC, reviewed the charge of the committee as outlined in the Administrative Order and suggested that the committee consider how they are defining “standards” and “guidelines.” He outlined a few standards and guidelines developed by the state of Ohio:

- Establish a court security committee
- Create security policy and procedure manual
- Determine who is subject to security search
- Minimum number of court security officers
- Weapons in court facilities
- Prisoner transport
- Duress alarms for judges and court staff
- Restricted access to offices
- Onsite security personnel
- Incident reporting policy/system
- Design of court facilities with security in mind

Mr. Fautsko stated that National Center for State Courts will complete an anonymous search around the country on mandatory court security standards using the NCSC listserv and would provide the results to the Committee for review.

Discussion ensued regarding the definition of standards and guidelines, which states have best practices for standards, funding for standards, development of security committee (by county vs statewide), and the monitoring of implementation of standards within an established timeline.

Small Group Discussions: Review of Framework of Standards and Guidelines Document

Marcus Reinkensmeyer explained to the committee that he asked Jennifer Albright to draft a framework for the development of proposed standards and guidelines for review by the committee. Jennifer provided background on how she developed that framework. The committee then reviewed the framework in their work groups and made suggested edits to be integrated before the next meeting.

Announcements/Call to the Public

No members of the public were present

Next Committee Meeting Date:

Monday, May 16, 2016

10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Arizona State Courts Building, Conference Room 119 A/B

1501 West Washington Street

Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Adjourned at 1:52 p.m.

COURT SECURITY STANDARDS COMMITTEE (CSSC)

May 16, 2016

10:00 a.m. - 2 p.m.

Conference Room 119 A/B

1501 W. Washington Street

Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Present: Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Mary Jane Abril, Richard Colwell, Greg DeMerritt, Rolf Eckel, Faye Guertin, Keith Kaplan, Judge Robert Krombeen, Sheriff Scott Mascher, Tina Mattison, John Phelps, Sheriff William Pribil, Commander Scott Slade

Telephonic: Joshua Halversen

Absent: Judge Kyle Bryson, Sean Gibbs

Guests: Timm Fautsko, National Center State Courts (NCSC); Earle Lloyd, Maricopa Superior Court Marshall's Office

Administrative Office of Courts (AOC) Guest: Dave Byers, Jeff Schrade

AOC Staff: Jennifer Albright, Sabrina Nash

Call to Order/Welcome and Introductions

Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. Mr. Reinkensmeyer inquired as to whether any members were on the phone. Marcus noted that Mr. Sean Gibbs, Security Director for Maricopa County Superior Court, is a newly appointed member of the Court Security Standards Committee. Unfortunately, Mr. Gibbs was unable to make the meeting. Mr. Reinkensmeyer then shared a few interesting news items related to court security around the country:

- **DeKalb County, Georgia** - A defendant was remanded into custody during a hearing for a non-violent offense. While handcuffed he broke free, made his way through an adjacent administrative building and out onto the street. In retrospect, it was determined that the court building never went into lockdown to prevent the defendant's escape or to protect the safety of the court staff. This security breach raised concerns in light of the escape of an in-custody individual that killed two court personnel in the recent past in a nearby court.
- **Payson Arizona** - Judge Dorothy Little, Associate Presiding Judge, has had a number of threats directed at her in her courtroom and through the clerk's office. There is no security at her court, so she made a request for a JSEF grant to employ a part-time bailiff to be in court when there is a full docket.
- **Nogales Arizona** - A magistrate who shares facilities with City Hall and the police department has had a number of security issues arise. The judge related that lack of security screening, no bailiff in attendance, no secure parking, and no bullet-proof bench make her and the court extremely vulnerable.

Approval of Minutes, March 22, 2016, meeting

Motion to approve minutes: Tina Mattison moved to approve the March 22, 2016, minutes as presented. **Seconded:** Commander Pribil **Vote:** unanimous

Review of Preliminary Survey Results

Marcus Reinkensmeyer provided a preliminary review of the survey process and discussed how Jennifer Albright sent out pre-mailings to let court staff know the survey was coming. The survey was routed through presiding judges, court administrators, court clerks, chief probation officers, and others. Mr. Reinkensmeyer stated that the response to the survey was good with the exception of the Division II Appellate Court in Tucson, and Jennifer Albright was going to follow up with them. Mr. Reinkensmeyer noted that 929 respondents opened the survey and 830 respondents actually completed the survey.

Timm Fautsko, National Center State Courts (NCSC), reiterated how important the information received from the survey is in developing standards. He stated that the most important information from the survey would be what the courts felt they needed. Mr. Fautsko noted, among other items, survey results show the courts need for training was uniformly high across all courts and types of court personnel.

Discussion took place regarding the ability to breakdown the survey data to specifically highlight the concerns of the different courts (rural v. metropolitan), how many courts have no security, and whether achievable standards can be developed for each court. Jennifer Albright indicated that the information could be delineated by how many of each court type responded, what the breakdown is of who responded from the courts i.e. how many judges, clerks, and other court staff. Jennifer noted that the results would then be compared among the different courts and court populations (rural v. metropolitan), security v. no security.

Developing Standards

Timm Fautsko, NCSC, defined a standard as "A policy or measure that is required to be in place in order to improve the general state of security in a court building and to ensure the personal safety and security of the public, judges, judicial officers, court staff, city and county employees, law enforcement officers and court security staff." He then went on to state that a court security standard must meet the following criteria:

- Readily achievable - not too expensive, will not take longer than one year to implement, is not too politically controversial to implement;
- Have a compelling justification for making it a requirement, duress alarms for example;
- Supported by one or more web based servers

Mr. Fautsko then stated that when the Committee broke into workgroups, they would be tasked with developing at least one proposed standard. The workgroups were asked to consider whether the standard(s) selected met the criteria he had discussed. The workgroups were asked to carefully draft standards and then reconvene to present what they developed to the full committee.

Discussion occurred regarding the implementation of standards and whether development should hinge on financial ability to meet the standard. A couple of suggestions were made on how to implement standards without additional financing and options for creating funding for future security standards. The timeline for implementing security standards and the possibility

of phased standards was also discussed. Mr. Dave Byers, AOC, talked to the committee regarding the need for funding and how the Committee's input could help assess how much funding would be needed to implement the security standards they developed. He also suggested that any local court security committees should be established at the county level to reduce the number of meetings that judges, sheriffs, and law enforcement officers would need to attend monthly.

Small Group Work: Developing Standards

Ms. Jennifer Albright, AOC, explained that she emailed committee members several documents and she created a packet for each workgroup with those same documents which include the survey data, an overview of the data created by the NCSC consultants, and recommended standards created by Tim Faustko and Steve Berson. She outlined how she envisioned the workgroups would debate each item and asked the workgroups to focus on the standards for their individual workgroup.

The committee then broke out into their workgroups to work on drafting of security standards for the courtroom, court house, court perimeter and security training for court security officers and court staff.

Small Group Report Back and Discussion of Standards

After lunch the committee regrouped and the four workgroups reported on their standards:

- **Court security committee:**
 - Each court or court building is required to have a court security committee that meets at least quarterly
 - The chair of the committee would be the presiding judge or designee
 - The chairperson shall appoint members to the committee to include a local first responder and member of law enforcement
 - Each county shall establish a county court security committee chaired by the Superior Court presiding judge or designee and a representative from each court's security committee and other members as appointed by the presiding judge.
 - The county security committee would meet at least biannually
 - The function of the committee would be to help implement standards as designated by the Court Security Standards Committee and to work towards resource needs and continuous court security improvement
- **Education/Training:**
 - Cyber security currently mandated statewide via COJET
 - Standard of training for all new court hires shall include information on de-escalation, mental illnesses, the different aspects of security both internal and external, active shooter, hostage-taking and sheltering in place
 - Offer online and in person training on active shooter and hostage-taking
 - Uniformity of information and timeliness of training of judges, court staff, and first responders
 - Centralized communication system – when an incident is happening who notifies court staff, judges, and first responders of the incident
 - Firearm training for court security officers and anyone else authorized to carry firearms
- **Courtrooms:**

- Monitored duress alarms for the bench, chambers
- Access control of ingress/egress areas of the courtroom such as deliberation room, judge's chambers
- Locked courtrooms when not in use
- Assign security personnel for the transportation and control of defendant in custody and protocol for taking defendant into custody
- Increase security for high profile cases
- Routine courtroom security sweeps, can be done by trained court staff
- Posted signage for courtrooms that outlines what is allowed in courtrooms, what to do in case of an emergency and decorum standards
- Ballistic material for the bench starting with new construction or remodels and phased in retrofit of ballistic material in older courtrooms
- **Perimeter of Building:**
 - Separate entrance in courtroom for in-custody defendants escorted by detention staff or have procedures in place to keep public out of the courtroom until in-custody defendants have been secured
 - Alarmed entrances and exits into the court for public and employee entrances – public access shall be monitored and employee entrances are locked or have electronic access
 - Courts required to have exterior lighting at entrances and exits around the court building, including routes to and from parking areas
 - Courts shall be required to have window coverings that prevent views into the court building but doesn't restrict views to the outside
 - Parking shall be monitored and secured if possible

Announcements/Call to the Public

No members of the public were present

Next Committee Meeting Date:

Monday, June 27, 2016

10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Arizona State Court Building, Conference Room 119 A/B

1501 West Washington Street

Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Adjourned at 2:27 p.m.

Court Security Standards Committee

Monday, September 12, 2016
Conference Room 119 A/B, 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 by proxy Carla Boatner, Judge Krombeen, Keith Kaplan, Tina Mattison, Sheriff William Pribil, John Phelps, Commander Scott Slade

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

Guests: J Earle Lloyd, Superior Court in Maricopa County, Security Office; Donald Jacobson, Flagstaff Municipal Court; Dean Nyhart, Arizona Department of Public Safety (retired)

Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC): Amy Love, Jeff Schrade, Mike Baumstark

AOC Staff: Jennifer Albright, Sabrina Nash

I. REGULAR BUSINESS

Welcome and Opening Remarks. The September 12, 2016, 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 Don Jacobson, Flagstaff Municipal Court. Mr. Jacobson has been hired as a part-time senior consultant to work in part with this committee on implementing the standards and on education and information outreach to courts. Mr. Jacobson introduced his guest Dean Nyhart (retired from the Arizona Department of Public Safety). Mr. Jacobson stated that Mr. Nyhart has a wealth of experience and knowledge dealing with court security and will be a valuable resource. Mr. Reinkensmeyer then introduced Amy Love, Deputy Director for Legislative Relations, who will be helping with funding proposals for court security in the coming legislative session.

Approval of Minutes from July 26 2016

The draft minutes from the July 26, 2016, meeting of the CSSC were presented for approval.

Motion: Sheriff Pribil moved to approve the July 26, 2016, minutes as presented. **Seconded:** Tina Mattison. **Vote:** Unanimous.

Discussion and Feedback from Presentation to Standing Committees. Mr. Reinkensmeyer stated that the court security standards have been presented to a number of committees for input. Ms. Albright outlined the responses received by the following committees she visited:

- **Committee on Juvenile Courts (COJC)** - took no action on request to support the court security standards. The committee was supportive of the standards, but had concerns regarding the capital outlay to implement the standards in courts that had no security at all. There was a question regarding the training on courtroom sweeps and the impact the training and duties could have on job titles.
- **Limited Jurisdiction Courts Committee (LJC)** – LJC was supportive of the standards overall, but had concerns similar to the ones expressed by the Committee on Juvenile Courts in relation to

funding. LJC's focus was on the standards being mandatory and the three-year implementation plan. The concern was that LJ courts with no security staff or entryway screening would need a greater amount of funding in order to hire a security officer and purchase screening equipment than those LJ courts that had already hired in security officers and purchased screening devices. There was a concern the three year implementation period for those courts with no security office or screening may be too short due to budgetary constraints. Mr. Jerry Landau was also at the LJC meeting to present the legislative proposals for the next year and LJC voted to support the court security funding legislative proposals with a request that an additional proposal allowing removal of the surcharge on local court enhancement fees which would allow the courts to keep the money locally for court security funding.

- **Limited Jurisdiction Court Administrators Association (LJCAA)** – Ms. Albright noted that before her presentation to the LJCAA a representative from Holbrook was present to talk about the shooting incident that happened in Holbrook, what was learned from the incident and what the court learned from Mr. Tim Fautsko, Court Security Consultant, National Center for State Courts, about security measures that were and were not in place. Ms. Albright stated that after the administrator from Holbrook spoke the LJCAA members were very attentive and supportive of the court security standards and the legislative funding proposal. Their concerns mirrored the concerns regarding funding for courts with no security.
- **Committee on Superior Court (COSC)** – Mr. Reinkensmeyer stated that COSC met last Friday and voted to support the recommendations. Judge Gurtler, Mohave County Superior Court, was concerned about the three-year timeline in response to the new courthouse being built in Mohave County and needs of the limited jurisdiction courts. He suggested that each county come up with their own plan for implementing the security standards and time certain for full implementation. Judge Warner, Maricopa County Superior Court, was concerned about possible impacts on the Maricopa County courts. Mr. Reinkensmeyer noted that COSC also supported the court security funding proposals. Mr. Reinkensmeyer announced that an email to help determine the initial financial impact on the courts would go out to superior court administrators to learn more details about courts without security or security personnel and about courts that are co-located with other entities.

Court Security Funding Strategies and Legislative Proposals.

Amy Love, Deputy Director for Legislative Relations, talked about the two court security funding proposals. Ms. Love stated that the local law library fund balances are down and she is not certain that the statute's current language would cover the use of these monies for court security enhancements and statutes should be clarified to allow use of monies for court security. She stated that the defensive driving diversion fund has 10.4 million dollars earmarked for the DPS Crime Lab and has not yet reached that goal. It is anticipated that there may be \$300,000 to \$600,000 in the fund for court security use after the DPS crime lab allotment, however it may be difficult to get the extra funds dedicated to court security as normally the excess goes into the state's General Fund. Mr. Reinkensmeyer reminded committee members of the proposed three-tiered court security funding:

- All security training would be funded by the state
- One time equipment expenditures would require courts to apply for funding at the state level
- Court operational costs and staffing expenditures would be locally funded

Discussion – Are county law library funds available to limited jurisdiction courts? What is the protocol for requesting funds and how will decisions be made on the disbursement of funds at the state level? What types of equipment will be covered and how much money will be allotted for equipment purchases?

Review of Final Report Draft

Mr. Reinkensmeyer led the committee through the draft report section by section, focusing on omissions, edits, wordsmithing, comments or other feedback. Ms. Albright either made edits on the projected working draft for the members to see or made notes on the recommended in-depth edits that would be made and distributed to the committee for another review. The members discussed the standards in-depth.

Discussion – Discussion occurred regarding: the confidentiality of court security manuals, definition of a significant threat, reservations on allowing court employees to arm themselves for personal safety reasons at presiding judge’s discretion, need for a waiver and a process for requesting the waiver, armed court personnel in the courthouse, court security training requirements (staff and officers), subject matter or training, and logistics of firearms training. Once members indicated there were no additional edits or feedback, Mr. Reinkensmeyer called for a motion on the draft report.

Motion: Commander Scott Slade moved to approve the report draft as written with noted amendments. **Seconded:** John Phelps **Vote:** Unanimous approval.

Mike Baumstark and Marcus Reinkensmeyer thanked the committee for their exemplary work in developing the proposed court security standards.

Announcements/Call to the Public

No public comments

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

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.

Court Security Standards Committee

Friday, January 19, 2018; 10:00 a.m.
Conference Room 119 A/B, Arizona State Courts Building
1501 West Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Present: Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Mary Jane Abril, Judge Kyle Bryson, Greg DeMeritt, Rolf Eckel, Sean Gibbs, Keith Kaplan, Judge Rob Krombeen (phone), Scott Slade

Absent/Excused: Faye (Guertin) Robarge, Joshua Halversen, Tina Mattison, John Phelps, George Weisz

Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC): Cathy Clarich, Donald Jacobson, Jeff Schrade

AOC Staff: Jennifer Albright

Welcome and Opening Remarks. The January 19, 2018, meeting of Court Security Standards Committee (CSSC) was called to order at 10:04 a.m. by Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Chair.

Approval of Minutes from November 14, 2017

The draft minutes from the November 14, 2017, meeting of the CSSC were presented for approval.

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

Around the County

Mr. Reinkensmeyer shared a few examples of security incidents and successful improvements as well as challenges related to security around the country.

Updates from Around the State

Following Mr. Reinkensmeyer's discussion of examples from around the country, members shared updates. Mr. Kaplan shared an event that occurred in the last year at Phoenix Municipal Court. Judge Bryson shared an article related to a judge who was shot by a sniper. That article will be shared with members. Several members shared information about security implementation efforts in their local courts, as well as involvement in assisting other local courts with implementation efforts.

Danny Cordova, the chief of security for the State Courts Building, was present and shared that there have been inquiries regarding security concerns for Foster Care Review Board meetings that occur outside of courts. He inquired whether the Committee had advice on how local courts and the FCRB might address the issues they are facing. The members discussed recommendations. It was suggested that if any advisory document was created, other court-ordered events be considered and covered by that document. Items like parenting time events, conciliation court, court-ordered mediation, etc. were discussed.

Resources Update

Jennifer Albright updated the committee on resources recently added to the CSSC website. It was noted that the guides on locating open contracts for court security-related materials and services were posted to the website after edits were made, as recommended by the members at the November meeting.

Ms. Albright then presented the committee with the latest draft of the Court Security Plan Template. The committee went through the template page by page and discussed the content. Edits, both substantive and editorial were suggested, discussed and agreed upon. Members agreed after the edits were made, the template would be ready for distribution.

Updates from Around the State

Mr. Reinkensmeyer asked members to discuss any updates, matters they have assisted in, around the state in relation to implementation of the Security Standards. Several members shared security implementation efforts within their local courts, as well as involvement in assisting other local courts with implementation efforts.

Court Security Improvements Grant Update

Cathy Clarich, Manager of the Caseflow Management Unit, gave a presentation on the outcome of the first cycle of court security improvements grants that were awarded. Ms. Clarich provided an overview document demonstrating the types of grants awarded and the total amount awarded statewide (over \$318,000), as well as a break-down of the types of requests that were granted versus those denied. A total of 28 request packets were received. Some were for single court locations; other's included requests for multiple court locations.

As the requests exceeded the funds available, requests for items that will be part of the third phase of implementation, such as metal detectors and x-ray machines were not granted. Requests to upgrade equipment were considered, but not always fully granted, in light of other requests where courts had no such equipment. In addition, when a partial grant was made to a local court, it was based upon the portion of the request that the grant advisory panel indicated would be the most impactful in improving security at the court.

Ms. Clarich also shared what was learned during the first grant cycle and improvements that had been made to the process based on the experiences of the first cycle.

Ms. Clarich shared how important the grant advisory panel was in providing input critical to making decisions on grant awards. She then discussed the second cycle of grant applications, which is currently underway. Applications are due February 28, 2018. Courts that submitted during the first cycle can re-certify their prior request by a simple form for any portion of their request that was not granted.

Update on Court Security Training Development

Jeff Schrade provided updates on the progress of planning and curriculum development for court security training as follows:

Court Staff: Mr. Schrade referenced his prior presentation to the committee regarding use of multiple avenues of training for court staff. He referenced the use of local training coordinators and the use of security training modules that could be customized for local courts. He indicated that training coordinators will assist not just with delivery, but also with curriculum development. Annual COJET training that is generalized will continue to be a part of the training available for court staff.

Judicial Officers: Mr. Schrade discussed updates to New Judges orientation to include training on court security and judicial leadership in court security. In addition, he shared that there will continue to be training modules at the annual Judicial College. Mr. Schrade shared that materials available on the AJIN Wendell website are being moved to SharePoint and that training on access to those materials will be ongoing.

Court Security Officers: Mr. Schrade shared that this is the most complex part of court security training development. He shared that a partnership agreement had been reached with the Maricopa Judicial Branch Security Department to provide statewide training to local court security officers. The Maricopa academy will act as a centralized academy location. Work is beginning to identify the best way to structure that partnership and to ensure that access to the academy meets the unique needs of court security officers and courts statewide. Mr. Schrade indicated that a workgroup will be formed to aid in the development of the security officer training program.

Update on the Online Incident Report Form

Don Jacobson provided an update and a quick visual demonstration of the online Security Incident Report form on SharePoint that is under development. He shared that representatives from Pima County and Maricopa County were given a demonstration and provided some initial feedback to AOC IT staff in December. Next steps will be to get a version of the template available to members of this committee for testing.

Discussion ensued on the ultimate purpose of the form and how the report form would and would not integrate with the security reporting programs and policies in place in counties like Maricopa and Pima. Concerns were voiced that mandatory reporting of all incidents overreaches the Security Standards. Daily operations that involve security should not be required to be reported. Those include items like escorts, medical responses, routine screening incidents, etc.

It was pointed out that the Standards indicate the limited types of matters that are to be reported in the form. Discussion also included the likelihood, if the use of the form was mandatory, that Tier III courts that are not required to have security officers will have staff that has the training, expertise, or ability to make use of the report form. Also, what types of training would be given to those non-security trained persons about report writing, confidentiality, and other aspects of report writing.

Other discussion topics included legal ramifications if the SharePoint template does not clearly delineate between addition of materials to a report as an investigation continues and changes to it. In addition, concerns about the time it will take for officers to input reports into two systems were discussed.

Good of the Order/Call to the Public:

The next meeting of the Court Security Standards Committee is Friday, March 9, 2018 at the State Court Building, Phoenix Arizona at 10:00 a.m.

No public comments were received.

Adjournment:

Meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Court Security Standards Committee

Friday, March 9, 2018; 10:00 a.m.
Conference Room 119 A/B, Arizona State Courts Building
1501 West Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Present: Marcus Reinkensmeyer, chair, Mary Jane Abril, Judge Kyle Bryson, Greg DeMeritt, Rolf Eckel, Judge Rob Krombeen, Tina Mattison, Faye (Guertin) Robarge, Scott Slade, George Weisz

Absent/Excused: Sean Gibbs, Joshua Halversen, Keith Kaplan, John Phelps

Supreme Court Guests: Chief Justice Scott Bales

Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC): Mike Baumstark, Dave Byers, Cathy Clarich, Donald Jacobson, Jeff Schrade

AOC Staff: Jennifer Albright

Welcome and Opening Remarks. The March 9, 2018, meeting of Court Security Standards Committee (CSSC) was called to order at 10:02 a.m. by Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Chair.

Approval of Minutes from January 19, 2018

The draft minutes from the January 19, 2018, meeting of the CSSC were presented for approval.

Motion: Judge Bryson moved to approve the minutes as presented. **Seconded:** Scott Slade.
Vote: Unanimous.

Comments from the Chief Justice:

Arizona Supreme Court Chief Justice, Scott Bales thanked the membership for their hard work over the last few years. The Chief Justice noted that he felt the accomplishments that emanated from the committee's work were among the top accomplishments that occurred during his tenure as Chief Justice. Chief Justice Bales noted that the committee's recommendations for statewide mandatory court security standards were the third time such recommendations were made, and applauded the hard work of the committee members and AOC staff that led to the adoption and implementation of the recommendations. Chief Justice Bales shared how important he believes it is for the public to know that courts are truly a safe space for them – as well as how impactful it is on employees of the court to have a safe working environment – and that access to justice is dependent, in part, on a safe and secure court environment.

Court Security Around the Country

Mr. Reinkensmeyer shared a few examples of security incidents and security improvements, as well as challenges related to security around the country. One item discussed by the committee members was how courts in DuPage County, Illinois, had adopted a new contract with the county sheriff's office to allow for court security officers, as opposed to full sheriff's officers, to provide court security. Establishing different categories of sheriff's department employees was an effective means of providing court security at a cost savings to the judiciary and is used in many counties in Illinois.

Tina Mattison shared that Orange County, California, had a similar court security employee category within their sheriff's office and that those court security officers had a very specific training program they went through, considering the unique security needs of courts.

Rolf Eckel asked members their thoughts on the use of sheriff's office employees versus court-employed security officers or contract security companies. Discussion was had on experiences of courts who used sheriff's officers and problems that arose because some of the officers assigned to the court were there because of some other disciplinary issues or investigation into disciplinary complaints. Members also discussed the issues regarding those types of officers lack of willingness to work with the court and court management to carry out the court's security policies.

Another item that involved some discussion was legislation in Minnesota and California that require courts to have specific emergency preparedness and disaster recovery plans in place. The legislation includes requiring courts to have a designated alternative location for court proceedings and for court operations to be carried out, specific communications systems to inform employees and the public of the changed locations, authority to extend deadlines and to have additional time to resolve matters considering major disruptions. At the request of members, AOC staff will research these items of legislation in those states and circulate them to members.

Updates from Around the State

Following Mr. Reinkensmeyer's discussion of examples from around the country, he shared with members that beginning in July 2018, operational reviews will include two items related to court security. The first will be to check that a court has conducted a security assessment within the last 3 years and the second will be to check that the court has a court security plan/manual. Mr. Reinkensmeyer noted that additional items may be added to the operational review in the future as implementation of the Court Security Standards continues to roll out over the next two fiscal years.

A member from Maricopa County Superior Court shared the work that has been undertaken in relation to the removal of security bypass for certain persons who regularly visit the courts. Maricopa County Attorney's Office employees are among the first of four groups that ultimately will lose the ability to bypass security screening. The process has been very involved and has required a great deal of communication, data collection, planning and adjustment. New signage has been created, new doors put in place in some locations, where other doors have been restricted or closed, and staffing adjustments have also been made. Complaint cards, for persons who have complaints about the process, have also been created and will be made available.

The first phase of bypass removal is set to begin April 2, 2018. The new process will be evaluated within 120 days. The results of that review will determine whether any additional adjustments need to be made and the timing of when removal of screening bypass for others will occur.

Judge Bryson shared that he and Marcus Reinkensmeyer will be leading a 90-minute breakout session at the annual Judicial Conference in June 2018 on court security. He noted that the content of the training will focus on the "here and now" of implementation of the Court Security Standards, the standards that are to be implemented in the second phase (Fiscal year 2018-19), and what future implementation efforts are expected.

Judge Bryson also shared efforts he has undertaken to assist limited jurisdiction courts in Pima County with implementing the Court Security Standards. He noted that as presiding judge he meets quarterly with the local LJ court presiding judges. He shared that two LJ courts approached him about creating a shared court security plan in light of their limited hours of court hearings, their limited resources, and all around small size of each court. He also noted that there was at least one

person in each LJ court that expressed a sincere desire to be a part of the County Security and Emergency Planning Committee (SEPC) – and that the interest was much greater than expected. This interest level led to the creation of a steering committee to help determine the best structure for the County SEPC. Judge Bryson noted that this interest demonstrates how deeply local courts are embracing the Security Standards.

Judge Krombeen shared that Coconino County Superior Court issued an Administrative Order on the requirements for applying for a Security Grant. The goal of the Administrative Order is to allow the Presiding Judge and County SEPC to help the courts coordinate their requests. This will be a great help in resource sharing and helping courts with the most pressing needs.

Judge Krombeen shared that he hosted a Verbal Defense and Influence (aka Verbal Judo) training for court and judicial personnel in the Williams Courthouse. Judge Krombeen stated that the training was well received and he hopes to expand the training across the county, and perhaps across the state. He also shared with the committee information about PATC (Public Agency Training Council) and training they offer. One training program he referenced was a Courtroom and Threat Assessment training class. He suggested that the AOC Judicial Education Department consider looking into the training and suggested sponsoring a training event on the topic by PATC. He also mentioned another subject area he thought might be useful – a judicial officer firearm proficiency class since courts that allow judicial officers to carry handguns also must ensure that the judicial officers meet proficiency requirements.

Discussion then turned to the TLO threat assessment program offered by the Arizona Counter Terrorism Information Center. It was noted that there has been a long period of time between when requests were made and when the requesting courts received the pre-assessment questionnaires that are required to be completed. Only one court reported having the assessment walk-through occur, but that court was still awaiting a final report from the TLO program.

Faye Robarge (Guertin) suggested that the AOC share with local courts that the questionnaire that must be completed includes hundreds of questions, is best completed when done online, but only one person will be given secure access to the online form. The questionnaire requires information that court administration or court security directors will not necessarily know. County or City administration and facilities management officials will be needed to complete the questionnaire. It was suggested that courts plan to coordinate with facilities personnel, city or county personnel, and court personnel to complete the form.

Members shared other approaches to tackling court security assessments, often using the model self-assessment tool the committee created and has made available to local courts. Yavapai County has a team that is going court to court to help conduct the self-assessment. Maricopa Superior Court similarly has a team of four court security personnel dedicating a couple days a week to completing the security assessments for all of the county court facilities in Maricopa County.

Resources Update

Jennifer Albright updated the committee on resources recently added to the CSSC website. It was noted that the Court Security Plan Template is now available. Ms. Albright also shared drafts of model policies, such as a prohibited item policy and weapons in the court administrative order, that will be added to the Security Plan Template packet in coming weeks.

Court Security Improvements Grant Update

Cathy Clarich, Manager of the Caseflow Management Unit, gave a presentation on the second cycle

of Court Security Grant applications. Ms. Clarich noted that the second cycle of applications were due February 28 and a total of 40 applications were received. The total amount of the requests for the second cycle is \$1.8 million which exceeds available funding.

Ms. Clarich shared that many grant requests are for updates to existing equipment or for security screening equipment, such as walk-through magnetometers and x-ray machines. The latter items were not included in the list of priority items noted for the current cycle, but rather were phase three items. As such, these items are less likely to be part of awards in the second cycle, but will become items that are eligible in the next year's cycle. This led to a discussion on how courts might be able to obtain these types of big ticket items from one another as courts upgrade equipment. It was asked that the AOC research ways by which courts with screening equipment in good working order who obtain newer equipment can communicate the availability of the old equipment and transfer, within procurement code requirements, that older equipment to another court. Several examples were shared of how local courts in the state have similarly acquired equipment from TSA, sheriff's departments and local law enforcement officers, and the U.S. Military.

Ms. Clarich also noted that there were several requests from probation offices that were not located within a court facility. Members were asked to clarify whether the Standards, as adopted, applied to those types of probation offices, thus making them eligible for grant monies. The committee reaffirmed that ultimately stand-alone probation offices are not included in the Court Security Standards as adopted. Finally, Ms. Clarich asked members for recommendations for a third member for the grant advisory board. She noted the time commitment involves 2 half days a year.

Update on Court Security Training Development

Jeff Schrade provided updates on the progress of planning and curriculum development for court security training as follows:

Mr. Schrade shared that in addition to the breakout session noted earlier by Judge Bryson, there will be an interactive personal security session at the Judicial Conference. He also shared that planning for inclusion of security training at the annual fall Leadership Conference is also underway.

Mr. Schrade announced that a workgroup is being formed (formal invitations have been made and replies are being awaited) to help with the development of a standardized curriculum for court security officer training. Mr. Schrade shared that he has continued to work with the head of the Maricopa County Judicial Branch Security Academy on creation of a partnership where statewide security officers will attend training at the Maricopa Academy. Mr. Schrade shared that the Maricopa course offerings were vetted and a week of topics that were general enough to be applicable statewide were identified. Those courses will be part of what the workgroup reviews and provides input on.

Other items still being vetted include the timing of the courses and plans for the costs for having security officers from around the state attend the week of courses in Maricopa County. He noted that data collection, likely via a survey and follow-up discussions, will occur to identify the number of persons that might attend within a given year and from what locations around the state. Whether the same training will be offered in the same path for court-employed security officers and contract security officers is also still being explored.

Update on the Online Incident Report Form

Jennifer Albright shared that two weeks prior all members were emailed regarding testing of

Incident Report Form. Three members tested the form. Ms. Albright shared what feedback had already been received and asked for additional input.

Comments included:

- A member from Maricopa noted that their newest version of their internal report form had many overlaps, which would help with information sharing between the two systems.
- Members who were charged with completing court security incident reports in their courts noted there needed to be a signature of supervisor box and an ability of the supervisor to lock the report so no future edits/additional/etc. could be made. Incidents reports are like police reports. They are created by line officers, reviewed by supervisors and signed after all follow-up investigation is completed. The reports have to be 'locked' to prevent changes late after the incident was fully reviewed/investigated, otherwise when legal proceedings occur in relation to the incident, there are issues with whether the report was accurate, falsified, altered for nefarious reasons, etc.
- Those members reminded us that we have to build a system that takes into account the legal use and ramifications of the reports and that understands that these are documents are used in legal proceedings and thus are subject to all the challenges of any kind of evidence.
- A reminder was also made that most courts will not have security staff yet, and that in the future, many courts, as Tier III courts will not have security staff, but they will be required to enter incidents in the database. Those courts and that staff will not have any experience or training on how to report an incident, particularly in light of creating a record that may be used later in a legal proceeding. The need for education and training was reiterated.

No additional input was provided by members.

Future Plans for Enhanced Court Security: Dave Byers, Executive Director of the AOC, took a few minutes to thank the members for their hard work and the progress they had made over the course of the committee's tenure. Marcus Reinkensmeyer shared thoughts on the path forward, post-committee, as the committee would formally end March 31, 2018. Mr. Byers shared additional insights on plans to ensure that court security remained a high priority and that continued improvement across the state occurred. As an example, Mr. Byers, noted that the AOC was looking at the authority of court security officers and whether any legislation or other action was needed to ensure that they have the authority to carry out the Court Security Standards and to deal with the types of contraband, incidents, and other security-related matters officers encounter daily.

Good of the Order/Call to the Public:

No public comments were received.

Adjournment:

Meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.