

**COURT SECURITY STANDARDS COMMITTEE (CSSC)**

**DRAFT MINUTES**

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.