

COURT SECURITY STANDARDS COMMITTEE (CSSC)

DRAFT MINUTES

June 27, 2016

10:00 a.m. – 3 p.m.

Conference Room 119 A/B

1501 W. Washington Street

Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Present: Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Mary Jane Abril, Judge Kyle Bryson, Richard Colwell, Greg DeMerritt, Rolf Eckel, Sean Gibbs, Faye Guertin, Judge Ron Krombeen, Tina Mattison, Sheriff William Pribil, Commander Scott Slade,

Telephonic: Keith Kaplan

Absent: Joshua Halverson, Sheriff Scott Masher, Scott Phelps

Guests: Earle Lloyd, Superior Court in Maricopa County, Marshall's Office

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

AOC Staff: Jennifer Albright, Sabrina Nash

Call to Order/Welcome and Introductions

Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m. Mr. Reinkensmeyer welcomed Mr. Sean Gibbs who is the new director of Security for the Superior Court in Maricopa County.

Jennifer Albright announced that the July 15 meeting was moved to July 26 and there would be no August meeting. The next scheduled committee meeting is Monday, September 12, 2016.

Approval of Minutes

Motion to approve minutes: Judge Bryson moved to approve the May 16, 2016, minutes as presented. **Seconded:** Sheriff Pribil **Vote:** unanimous

Presentation on Pima County Court Security Audit

Judge Kyle Bryson and Mary Jane Abril gave a presentation on series of recent court security audits of courts located in Pima County. Judge Bryson prefaced his presentation by stating that his interest in court security stems from a January 2013 incident when local attorney Mark Hummels was shot and killed. That incident and a few others that occurred near that time acted as a confluence of events to bring court security to the forefront of his work as Presiding Judge. As such, he developed a plan to ensure the safety of the courts and court staff and put into motion audits of court safety and security.

Mary Jane Abril explained that she created a checklist of twenty-four safety issues that she examines when performing court security audits. She has audited five courts: South Tucson, Ajo, Marana, and Sahaurita city courts. Ms. Abril met with the court administrator or designee of

each court to inform them that her purpose was to focus on what they are doing well and what they could improve on. The audits have three components: interview the court administrator or designee, conduct the audit with checklist, and provide the presiding judge (Judge Bryson) with a written report and photographs for them to share with the judge of that court to discuss findings and areas of concern/improvement. Ms. Abril identified the top seven security issues that she encountered during court audits:

- Lack of courtroom security protocols – either not having one at all or not having a protocol for high risk trials
- Court security procedures – screening measures, reporting protocol (how to notify a judge if the judge was threatened by a litigant)
- Emergency management planning – only one court audited had an emergency management plan (managing the incident as it is unfolding in front of us)
- Alarms and camera systems - access to cameras and alarms (in house versus outside monitoring)
- Key control – no key control system in place or if the court did not have an inventory or audit of keys assigned to employees who had left the court.
- Safes/vaults –no policy for the safety and security of deposits
- IT security – often the city or county managed IT security and the courts were not involved in that process, leaving the courts with limited access and knowledge of the IT security related to the court computer systems, records databases, etc.

Judge Bryson indicated that Ms. Abril has been instrumental the handling of the audits and that the courts have been cooperative and receptive of the audits. The courts that were audited found the audits to be positive and helpful in raising awareness of security needs and provided assistance in seeking funds for improved court security from funding bodies.

Review of Additional Survey Data

Jennifer Albright stated that she had a conversation with the National Center on how best to get the information that the committee requested on court size and population and the decision was to breakdown the survey information based on what the courts have, level of court and population. This will provide a better indication of what the courts have in relation to creating standards and guidelines.

Review of Draft Standards and Draft Report and Recommendations

Marcus Reinkensmeyer identified the first three parts of the draft report and recommendations of the Committee:

1. Introduction – inclusion of the administrative order, scope of the Committee’s charge and a summary of survey development and results
2. Definitions – an explanation of words/phrases
3. Court Security Standards – the detailed standards proposed by the Committee

The committee reviewed the twenty-two proposed standards for clarity of language, enhancements, and deficits. Additional items for consideration and definition included:

- In event of building evacuation (fire/bomb threat) how far away should evacuees be from the court?
- Incident reporting - statewide ACIC/NCIC database available to all courts and law enforcement

- Definition of armed court personnel (firearms, pepper spray, tasers)
- Judges parking (location, lighting, security; future discussion in security planning)
- Situational/Personal security awareness training for judges and court staff
- Written protocol for monitoring and/or releasing of video footage
- Standard for random employee screening upon entrance of the courthouse

Small Group Work

The committee broke into workgroups to review and refine proposed standards related to their work group assignments as well as determine if any additional standards should be proposed.

Small Group Reports

A summary of topics reported to the full Committee by the work groups includes:

Training

Standardized AOC approved new hire and annual training for court and judicial employees

Standardized training for armed/unarmed court security personnel (may be determined by how many court security officers are needed among the 161 courts)

Use of standard training tools

Create an AOC approved list of standardized trainers as a reference for the courts

Courthouse Security

Refined language regarding who provides in-custody transport of defendants

Refined language regarding multiple entry ways and when multiple entryways are permissible

Recommended random employee screening based on best practices suitable for court size

Recommended language that "courts shall/should have security cameras at entryway, public common areas and exterior of court."

Recommend electronic key card or hard key access for all non-public areas

Recommended IT wiring closets shall be closed/secured at all times

Courthouse Perimeter Security

Parking - no cost effective solution was reached

Refined language that perimeter cameras should/shall be recorded for intelligence or investigative purposes

Additional recommendations for consideration:

Funding

Security audits

Announcements/Call to the Public

No public in attendance

Next Committee Meeting Date:

July 26, 2016, 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Arizona State Court Building, Conference Room 119 A/B

Adjourned at 2:34 p.m.