

Court Security Standards Committee (CSSC)

DRAFT MINUTES

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.