

# COURT SECURITY STANDARDS COMMITTEE

Monday, September 12, 2016 – 10:00 a.m.

Arizona State Courts Building, 1501 W. Washington – Conference Room 119 A/B

Conference Call: 602-452-3288 Access Code: 8993

[WebEx Link](#)   [CSSC Homepage](#)

---

## AGENDA

---

- 10:00 a.m. Call to Order/Welcome and Introductory Remarks *Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Chair*
- 10:15 a.m. Approval of Minutes, July 26, 2016, meeting *Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Chair*  
 **Formal Action/Request**
- 10:20 a.m. Discussion and Feedback from Presentations to Standing Committees *Marcus Reinkensmeyer  
Jennifer Albright*
- 11:00 a.m. Court Security Funding Strategies and Legislative Proposals *Marcus Reinkensmeyer*
  - Court Diversion Fee
  - County Library Fund
  - Local Court Enhancement Fee

---

### 11:30 Lunch

---

- 12:00 p.m. Review of Draft Final Report *All*
  - Discussion on language and edits
  - Discussion of comments; notes; and data inclusion
  - Discussion of any final additions or deletions **Formal Action/Request**
- 1:30 p.m. Discussion of Next Steps *All*
- 1:55 p.m. Announcements/Call to the Public *Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Chair*
- 2:00 p.m. Adjournment *Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Chair*

**Next Meetings:** At this time there is no other meeting of this Committee scheduled.

---

---

*All times are approximate. The Chair reserves the right to set the order of the agenda. For any item on the agenda, the Committee may vote to go into executive session as permitted by Arizona Code of Judicial Administration § 1-202. Please contact Jennifer Albright, staff to the Court Security Standards Committee, at (602) 452-3453, with any questions concerning this agenda. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as auxiliary aids or materials in alternative formats, by contacting Sabrina Nash at (602) 452-3849. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange for the accommodation.*



COURT SECURITY STANDARDS COMMITTEE (CSSC)

DRAFT MINUTES

July 26, 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, Faye Guertin through her proxy Carla Boatner, Richard Colwell, Greg DeMeritt, Rolf Eckel, Joshua Halversen, Keith Kaplan, Judge Rob Krombeen, Tina Mattison, John Phelps, Captain Scott Slade

**Absent:** Sean Gibbs, Sheriff William Pribil, Sheriff Scott Mascher

**Guests:** Earle Lloyd, Superior Court in Maricopa County, Security Office

**Administrative Office of Courts (AOC) Guest:** Jeff Schrade

**AOC Staff:** Jennifer Albright

---

**Call to Order/Welcome and Introductions**

Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. Mr. Reinkensmeyer welcomed Ms. Carla Boatner, proxy for Faye Guertin, and asked members to introduce themselves to Ms. Boatner. The Chair then outlined the plan of action for today's meeting. He stated that he had some suggestions for consideration regarding a statewide court security fund and some additional recommendations related to funding at the end of the draft report for discussion. The Chair thanked Pima County for all the help that they have provided and acknowledged that Jennifer Albright has been hard at work on the draft report and is looking for additional resources for the report's appendices such as checklists and other tools.

**Approval of Minutes**

Marcus Reinkensmeyer noted that Jennifer Albright had a comment regarding the draft minutes and asked Jennifer to clarify. Jennifer stated that after discussing the draft minutes and the draft report with a member she noted absence of a recommended addition to the training related security standards in the draft minutes. Ms. Albright noted she made an addition under the heading Courthouse Security in the minutes. That edition reads: *"Recommend that AOC have approved training curriculum for court security officers and basic minimum standards for any private security companies that provide court security; provision for exemption if court security officer is AZ POST certified; consider grandfathering current security officers based on prior training and experience."*

**Motion to approve minutes:** Judge Bryson moved to approve the June 27, 2016, minutes as amended by Jennifer Albright. **Seconded:** Judge Krombeen **Vote:** unanimous

Prior to delving into the agenda items, Mr. Reinkensmeyer shared a couple of news items related to court security around the country:

**Navajo County, Arizona** – Mr. Reinkensmeyer recounted the shooting on the front steps of the courthouse just after court had closed. The National Center for State Courts went to Navajo County to debrief the staff on what happened and to provide suggestions on court security.

**Berrien County, Michigan** – Two bailiffs were killed and a sheriff's deputy was wounded by an inmate being transported from jail who was handcuffed in front and able to get ahold of the gun of one of the bailiffs. The inmate was later killed by a sheriff's deputy.

**Coconino County, Arizona** – Judge Krombeen discussed a difficult order of protection incident that happened in his court involving a retired police officer who was ordered to surrender his firearms. The defendant requested a hearing regarding the surrendering of his firearms and when the hearing was over the judge instructed the bailiff to escort the plaintiff and her sister to their vehicle before releasing the defendant. When the bailiff escorted the women to their vehicle he looked into the defendant's vehicle and noticed a couple of rifles in the backseat of the defendant's truck. The police were called and the defendant was detained in the courtroom, it turns out the rifles were pellet guns.

Mr. Keith Kaplan commented that after the incident in Berrien County, Michigan there was some local discussion on the reality that you can secure the court from weapons brought in from outside the court; however, you can't secure the court from weapons worn by armed security or law enforcement personnel in the court. He stated that the incident is something to keep in mind when the committee considered its proposed standard on armed security or law enforcement officers in court buildings.

### **Court Security Funding Strategies**

Marcus Reinkensmeyer outlined a funding proposal for a statewide court security fund and asked for the committee's input. If the committee approves the proposal, it will be submitted to the legislative liaison for approval to vet with the legislature. Mr. Reinkensmeyer noted if the legislative proposal to create a statewide security fund was adopted, it would be the middle tier of a three tier court security funding structure. The three tiers were discussed.

Mr. Reinkensmeyer provided two examples of how existing funding sources might be used to fund the proposed statewide security fund. Neither of the examples would divert monies from existing projects or require new fees to be assessed.

One member suggested that the funding recommendation, as it would appear in the Committee's final report, should provide some guidance on the distribution structure of fund monies. It was suggested a formula be used that put small and large counties on equal footing.

Discussion was also had on the various types of funding available that could possibly be used to fund court security such as: local JSEF, Fill the Gap, and other funds to be researched.

The Committee reached consensus on the security fund recommendation and supported a legislative proposal related to creation and funding of the fund.

### **Review of Draft Standards**

Marcus Reinkensmeyer asked the committee to vote regarding the direction of the draft report and allowing Jennifer Albright leeway in making edits to the report after the committee reviewed and discussed it during the remainder of the meeting. He explained the necessity of this being done so that a revised draft report could be taken to each of the standing committees for their input and support. The report would then be fine-tuned with any comments or suggestions from the standing committees and presented at the Committee's September 12<sup>th</sup> meeting for review and approval prior to being presented to the Arizona Judicial Council and Presiding Judges for their input and support in October.

### **Review and Discussion of Draft Report**

The chair deferred to Jennifer Albright to go through the draft report section by section, focusing heavily on the draft security standards. Ms. Albright moved through each standard asking members to provide edits, comments, or other feedback. Ms. Albright either made edits on a working draft projected for the members to see or made notes on the recommended edits when there were more in depth. Once members indicated they had no, or no additional edits or feedback, then the next proposed standard was be addressed. In summary, the edits and recommendations were focused on language choice and organization.

The members did have in-depth discussion on the standards involving: court security assessments and the structure of those assessments; armed security and armed court employees in the court and training requirements for anyone who was armed in the court, whether court security of court employees; and possible addition of a standard requiring courts to conduct background checks on vendors and contractors or have such persons escorted through the court if not back ground checked.

After the members moved through all of the proposed standards, additional comment and feedback on the related recommendations section of the draft report were sought.

After discussion concluded on the draft report, the Chair moved for a motion on the draft report.

**Motion:** Judge Bryson moved to support the court security standards with the refinements discussed. **Seconded:** Greg Demeritt **Vote:** Unanimous.

### **Announcements/Call to the Public**

No public in attendance

### **Next Committee Meeting:**

September 12, 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 2:34 p.m.





# Ensuring Secure, Open, and Publicly Accessible Courts

Report and Recommendations of the Court  
Security Standards Committee, September 2016





## Table of Contents

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	1
Creation and Charge of Committee .....	1
Abbreviated Committee Recommendations.....	2
<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	3
Court Security Today .....	3
<b>COURT SECURITY SURVEY</b> .....	5
Survey Methodology.....	5
Survey Development & Testing.....	5
Summary of Survey Results.....	6
<b>COURT SECURITY STANDARDS</b> .....	9
Preamble .....	9
Proposed Court Security Standards.....	10
Governance and Administration.....	10
Entryway Screening .....	14
In-Custody Defendants.....	17
Facilities, Alarms, and Equipment.....	18
Training.....	20
<b>RELATED RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	23
<b>GLOSSARY</b> .....	25
<b>APPENDICES</b> .....	27
Appendix A .....	27
Court Security Resources.....	27
Surveys.....	27
State Court Security Plans, Manuals, and Standards .....	27



Appendix B.....29  
    Sample Emails from Court Security Survey Distribution.....29  
Appendix C .....31  
    Arizona Court Security Survey.....31

DRAFT



## *Court Security Standards Committee*

Chair – **Mr. Marcus Reinkensmeyer**, Director of Court Services, AOC

### **MEMBERS**

**Ms. Mary Jane Abril**

Court Security Manager  
Superior Court in Pima County

**Honorable Kyle Bryson**

Presiding Judge  
Superior Court in Pima County

**Mr. Richard Colwell**

Chief Deputy Clerk  
Superior Court in Yuma County

**Mr. Greg DeMeritt**

Chief Deputy Clerk  
Superior Court in Pima County

**Mr. C. Rolf Eckel**

Court Administrator  
Superior Court in Yavapai County

**Mr. Sean Gibbs**

Director  
Judicial Branch Security Dept.,  
Maricopa County

**Ms. Faye Guertin**

Deputy Court Administrator  
Chandler Municipal Court

**Mr. Joshua Halversen**

Court Administrator  
Superior Court in Graham County

**Mr. Keith Kaplan**

Assistant Court Administrator  
Phoenix Municipal Court

**Honorable Robert Krombeen**

Judge  
Williams Justice & Municipal Courts

**Mr. Scott Mascher**

Sheriff  
Yavapai County Sheriff's Office

**Ms. Tina Mattison**

Deputy Court Administrator  
Juvenile Court in Pima County

**Mr. John Phelps**

Executive Director  
State Bar of Arizona

**Mr. William Pribil**

Sheriff  
Coconino Sheriff's Office

**Mr. Scott Slade**

Captain  
Judicial Branch Security Dept.,  
Maricopa County

**AOC Staff**

**Ms. Jennifer R. Albright**

Senior Court Policy Analyst  
Court Services Division

**Ms. Sabrina Nash**

Administrative Assistant  
Court Services Division

**Mr. Jeff Schrade**

Director  
Court Services Division



**National Center for State Courts**

Mr. Timothy Fautsko  
Court Security Consultant  
Glendale, Colorado

Mr. Steven V. Berson  
Court Security Consultant  
Denver, Colorado

Mr. Kent Kelley  
Senior Program Specialist  
Denver, Colorado

**Additional Resources**

**Mr. Earle Lloyd**  
Captain  
Judicial Branch Security Dept.,  
Maricopa County

DRAFT



# Ensuring Secure, Open, and Publicly Accessible Courts

Report and Recommendations of the Court Security  
Standards Committee, September 2016

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Creation and Charge of Committee

**O**n November 25, 2015, Chief Justice Scott Bales issued Administrative Order 2015-104 establishing the Court Security Standards Committee. The administrative order directed the committee to: (a) develop and conduct a survey of court security measures in Arizona, (b) develop recommendations on standards for courthouse and courtroom security, and (c) develop recommendations on security officer training. The administrative order further directed the committee to file a final report and make recommendations to the Arizona Judicial Council (AJC) by September 30, 2016.

National Center for State Courts (NCSC) consultants Timothy Fautsko, Steven Berson, and Kent Kelley assisted the committee in its work. Based on Mr. Fautsko's recommendations, the committee established four (4) work-groups: perimeter, courthouse, courtroom, and training. The work group division was based, in part, on data reflecting where security incidents occurred in relation to the courthouse as demonstrated in *Status of Court Security in State*

## Secure and Open Courts



Court security addresses the need to prevent disturbances and acts of violence that can impeded the administration of justice as mandated by the Constitution of the State of Arizona.



Courts.<sup>1</sup> Work-groups were essential for digesting large amounts of information related to court security measures and best practices as well as creating initial drafts of survey questions and the standards themselves. The report that follows consists of 30 court security standards and additional recommendations related to implementation of security standards, supporting structures to ensure continuous court security improvement, and funding proposals for the AJC's review and consideration.

## Abbreviated Committee Recommendations

The committee's proposed court security standards and additional recommendations are set forth in detail in the body of the committee's final report. Following is an abbreviated list of the standards and recommendations.

- ❖ Adopt the proposed court security standards as mandatory standards for Arizona courts with a three-year implementation period. The standards address the following:
  - Governance and administration of court security, including policies and procedures, supporting committee structures, and planning;
  - Entryway screening;
  - Equipment, including metal detectors, duress alarms, and video cameras;
  - Protocols for prisoner transport and remand of litigants into custody;
  - Facilities, including courtroom security measures such as fortified benches, public service counter barriers, locking door protocols, window coverings, and courtroom sweeps;
  - Perimeter security such as lighting, signage, and protection of critical areas;
  - Training for judges, court personnel, and court security officers.
- ❖ Establish a statewide security fund that will be available to local courts for one-time outlays for security equipment and security system improvements.
- ❖ Provide dedicated state-level Administrative Office of Courts (AOC) staff support for coordination of court security assessments, technical assistance, court security incident reporting, and statewide training.
- ❖ Include a mechanism for assessing court compliance with the proposed court security standards, particularly standards related to training, certification requirements, and testing of equipment.

---

<sup>1</sup> Timothy Fautsko, Steven V. Berson, & Steven K. Swensen, *Status of Court Security in State Courts: A National Perspective* (June 2013).




- ❖ Establish statewide security funds that will be available to local courts for one-time outlays for security equipment and security system improvements.

## INTRODUCTION

### Court Security Today


Increasingly, court security is at the forefront of issues faced by every judicial branch in the United States. A March 11, 2005, security incident at the Fulton County Courthouse in Atlanta, Georgia, resulted in the deaths of a judge and a court reporter, shot in a courtroom, and the deaths of a sheriff's deputy and a U.S. Customs agent after the inmate fled the courthouse. That incident is often cited as the turning point for state courts and the issue of court security. However, ten years later, national and local data reflect not only an increase in security threats and violent incidents but also indicates that there continues to be limited funding available from state and local governments for security staffing, security plans, and security equipment.<sup>2</sup> Tragically, even as this committee was working toward its recommendations and drafting this report, the Superior Court of Navajo County in Holbrook, Arizona, experienced a shooting incident in front of the courthouse that left two family court litigants dead and one other injured.



<sup>2</sup> Timm Fautsko, Steve Berson, & Steve Swensen, *Courthouse Security Incidents Trending Upward: The Challenges Facing State Courts Today*, Future Trends in State Courts, 2012 at pp. 102-106.



In 2013, incident data gathered by the Center for Judicial and Executive Security (CJES) reflected, “the number of security threats and violent incidents in court buildings has increased dramatically in recent years.”<sup>3</sup> The CJES Court-Targeted Acts of Violence (CTAV) study also examined where incidents took place. A subset of that data focusing on location of incidents from 2005 to 2012 revealed that the location of most incidents coincides with the locations where adverse parties and parties and victims are co-located.<sup>4</sup>



*The Status of Court Security*, an NCSC report, included national and local data from 225 court security assessment reports, data on security incidents gathered by CJES, a comprehensive web survey of state, local, tribal, and territorial courts, and a telephonic survey of court security directors. The report ultimately recommended the following future directions to improve court security in the United States:

1. accepting the challenge that doing nothing is not an option;
2. understanding that local, state, regional, and national communication and collaboration are key for success;
3. providing additional funding to improve staffing and equipment is essential; and
- 4 coordinating and supporting state court security programs is a definite need that must be answered.<sup>5</sup>

National studies and reports are not the only source of information and data related to the state of court security. Increasingly, state judiciaries and local courts are conducting security

<sup>3</sup> Fautsko, *Status of Court Security In State Courts, A National Perspective*, at p. 7. See also CJES May 31, 2010 study on Court-Targeted Acts of Violence; Fautsko *Courthouse Security Incidents Trending Upward: The Challenges Facing State Courts Today*, at pp. 102-106.

<sup>4</sup> Fautsko, *Status of Court Security In State Courts, A National Perspective*, Figure 4-2, pp. 4-6.

<sup>5</sup> Fautsko, *Status of Court Security In State Courts, A National Perspective*, at pp. v-vi.



assessments, convening court security committees to study court security needs at the local level, and addressing funding needs associated with increased court security. One need only to peruse the internet to see examples of court security standards implemented by state and local courts around the country, news reports of security incidents, and information on the continued issue of lack of funding to provide adequate security staff and security equipment. It is against this backdrop that the Arizona Supreme Court's Court Security Standards Committee was created and against which it conducted its work.

## COURT SECURITY SURVEY

### Survey Methodology

The committee – charged with developing and conducting a survey - focused on two question types. The first assessed what security measures were in place in Arizona courts and the second asked how those surveyed felt about those security measures. Arizona's significant differences in population county to county necessitated demographic questions that allowed analysis of data based on court type, population center, and whether a court was located in a single-use or multi-use site. Analyzing response data against demographic data also provided the committee the opportunity to analyze the potential impact of proposed standards on courts.

The survey was distributed to all court levels in the Arizona judiciary: appellate, superior, justice, and municipal courts. The audience for the survey included judges and other judicial officers, court administrators, clerks of court and office staff, chief probation officers, and court security personnel and law enforcement.

Survey's were sent via email using a pre-survey email, a follow-up email 24 hours later containing the link to the survey, and a reminder email 48 hours before the survey closed. Presiding judges, court administrators, clerk of court, and chief probation officers were asked to distribute the survey. Examples of survey distribution emails are located in Appendix B.

### Survey Development & Testing

Survey development involved a three-prong approach. First, committee members received and reviewed a number of resources including national reports on court security, questions used in other court security surveys, best practices for court security, other states' court




security standards, a summary of the state of court security in the United States, national surveys, and data on security incidents and threats across several decades. (See Appendix A.) Next, the work groups met during breakout sessions over the course of several meetings to develop lists of security measures and policies that the survey should assess. Finally, once the committee determined it had developed sufficient lists of topics and specific security measures to assess in the survey, committee staff developed a list of survey questions and NCSC staff developed a draft survey. Several rounds of drafting and editing occurred before the committee determined the survey was ready for testing.

Committee staff, NCSC staff, and selected court staff conducted tests of the survey. The first test revealed the survey took too long to complete. After additional revisions related to scope, language consistency, and conciseness, the committee approved and retested the survey. Based on the feedback received, final edits to the survey were made and the survey was approved for distribution. (See Appendix C for survey.)

### Summary of Survey Results<sup>6</sup>

The survey was opened by 929 recipients and completed by 830 respondents with partial replies of varying lengths. The number of respondents roughly corresponded to the relative population of each individual county. Every county provided at least seven (7) responses, resulting



in representative data. Nearly 20% of respondents were judges, while 8% of respondents were court administrators. More than 800 respondents worked in courts where security was provided by court employed court security or law enforcement officers. Approximately 32% of respondents

<sup>6</sup> Unless otherwise specified all references to data and survey results are from the Arizona Court Security Survey conducted by the Court Security Standards Committee in 2016.



worked in courts where a private security company provided court security and approximately 8.5% of respondents worked in courts with no security at all.

The community of respondents agreed that every proposed security measure included in the survey was either extremely important or very important. The category “unimportant” was never used by more than 2.43% of respondents regardless of the security measure proposed.

Although survey data revealed that respondents agreed on the importance of security measures in the court, it also demonstrated that a high rate of respondents “did not know” if those security measures were in place at their courts. One exception was to respondent’s knowledge of entryway screening. Survey results demonstrated that the majority of respondents were aware of the types of entryway screening that was used in the courts in which they worked. Although analysis of the data on entryway screening for the public demonstrated some type of metal detection device was used in courts where 85.5% of respondents worked, respondents working in rural courts (population 5,001 to 25,000) were the least likely to have any type of entryway screening (52.2% no metal detector; 65.7% no x-ray screening).

The committee used survey data to evaluate the impact of each standard on courts, taking into consideration fiscal impact, architectural considerations, and whether the proposed standard was focused on a security measure that would deter, detect, or otherwise reduce the most likely of security threats and incidents. The committee also used the data on court employees’ knowledge base in drafting its recommended standards on security training. Survey results for the question on whether respondents had been trained in the prior 18 months on various security measure and topics revealed that for most of the topics listed, less than 50% of respondents had received any training. This data was not surprising in light of the percentage of “don’t know” responses to many of the questions on whether security measures were in place in the respondents’ court. However, during the time covered by the training related questions, the AOC had instituted a required cyber security training as part of annual COJET training requirements and had recently disseminated an online active shooter training, also COJET credit approved. That 71.74% of respondents had completed the cyber security training and 52.81% of respondents completed the active shooter training indicated training is a key component to ensuring continuous court security improvement.





Comparison of population data to several common security measures revealed that certain security measures are present in the majority of courts, regardless of population or type of court:

- alarmed doors at entrances and exits,
- security cameras in publicly accessible areas,
- protective barriers at public transaction counters,
- employee offices can be locked from the inside,
- posted notice that firearms are prohibited, and
- assigned security personnel for transport and control of in-custody defendants.

Regardless of location or court type, the majority of court employees lack awareness of the following security measures, or their court lacks the following security measures:

- sheltering in place policies or procedures,
- lockdown policies and procedures,
- evacuation route information and procedures,
- regular sweeps of courtrooms,
- barriers to protect against vehicular assaults on the court building,
- bullet-resistant covering on windows and doors, and
- bullet-resistant materials at courtroom benches or courtroom clerk stations

Additional supporting data is included in the section of the report that contains the proposed court security standards.





## COURT SECURITY STANDARDS

### Preamble

Through its research and discussion, the committee concluded that court security could be maintained only through an ongoing process of continuous improvement. (See Figure 1.<sup>7</sup>) For a comprehensive approach, oversight of court security should also include business continuity planning and encompass emergency preparedness.

Proposed Standard 1 calls for the formation of standing local and county court security and emergency preparedness committees<sup>8</sup> (“SEPC”). Composed of representatives of the court, law enforcement, first responders, and other stakeholders, these committees provide policy direction and planning recommendations on all facets of court security and emergency preparedness.

Specifically, as envisioned, the SEPCs conduct risk assessment, develop policies and procedures, establish deterrence measures, and conduct debriefing of security incidents in three interrelated spheres: (1) court operations, (2) facilities and equipment, and (3) training and communication. The efficacy of security policies and practices should be evaluated through periodic drills and audits. This ongoing process will provide SEPCs and judicial leadership with valuable feedback and actionable recommendations to maximize court security.

### Continuous Improvement



*“Security is not a one time achievement.*

*It is a serious and continuous goal and requires constant vigilance.”*

Steps to Best Practices  
for Court Security,  
NCSC, January 2013

---

<sup>7</sup> Continuous improvement framework adopted in part from: Marcus Reinkensmeyer, *Court Security and Business Continuity in Lean Times: A Collaborative Approach*, Future Trends in State Court Security, 2011.

<sup>8</sup> Security committees are the number one foundational item in the National Center for State Courts. See, Nathan W. Hall, et. al. *Steps to Best Practices for Court Building Security*, p. 3-7 (2016).




Figure 1

## Proposed Court Security Standards

Several of the following proposed court security standards include comments that provide explanatory information, exceptions to the standard, or other important recommendations for consideration. The proposed standards may also include reference to survey data from the Arizona Court Security Survey or reference to other resources in support of the proposed standard.

### Governance and Administration

**1. Court Security and Emergency Preparedness Committees.** The presiding judge of the county must establish a court security and emergency preparedness committee (county SEPC) chaired by the presiding judge of the county or a designee.<sup>9</sup> The county SEPC shall consist of a representative cross-section of each local SEPC in the county. The presiding judge may appoint other members as deemed necessary. The committee shall meet at least twice a year.

The function of each county SEPC includes, but is not limited to, setting goals for implementation of court security standards adopted by the Arizona Supreme Court, review of

<sup>9</sup> See AO-2005-32, Presiding Judges Authority (establishing duties over court security and facilities).



local court security plans and self-assessments, coordination of security needs countywide, and ensuring continuous court security improvement.

Additionally, each court building or court complex shall have a court security and emergency preparedness committee (local SEPC) that meets at least quarterly. The chairperson of the local SEPC shall be the presiding judge of the court or a designee and the chairperson shall appoint members of the local SEPC. Local SEPCs shall include at least one representative from law enforcement and a first responder.<sup>10</sup> Local SEPCs shall meet at least quarterly.

The functions of each local SEPC include, but are not limited to, implementation of court security standards adopted by the Arizona Supreme Court within each court building or court complex; development and allocation of resources necessary for security needs; and coordination of security self-assessments, security drills, and testing of security equipment.

Comment: The committee recognizes that the make-up of SEPCs should be based on the needs of the varied geographical size and population of each county as well as the structure of each county's court system. Survey results indicate 57.8% of respondent court employees work in courts co-located in buildings with other agencies or entities. The likelihood that a security incident would impact other agencies or entities co-located with a court is therefore relatively high. The role other agencies or businesses may play in court safety and security is an important aspect of security and emergency preparedness planning that requires inclusion of representatives from those other agencies or entities. Therefore, the committee highly recommends that courts co-located in spaces with other agencies or businesses include a representative of those other agencies or businesses on the local SEPC.

“A court building security committee, meeting regularly and empowered to exercise oversight and sustain matters related to security within the court building, is a prerequisite to enable the court and its stakeholders to properly assess and address the myriad of security challenges facing court and stakeholder leadership.”

- Hall, *Steps to Best Practices for Court Building Security*

---

<sup>10</sup> First Responders as used here refers to medical and emergency personnel such as fire, rescue, or paramedic.



**2. Court Security Manual.** The Arizona AOC shall develop and promulgate a court security manual addressing the basic tenets of court safety and security. The manual shall include court security standards, security assessment tools, security incident and threat reporting forms, personal security tips for judges and court personnel, and templates for written policies on evacuations, hostage situations, sheltering in place, and bomb threats. The manual should also include practical tools, checklists, and templates for use by local courts. Each court shall add additional security related information unique to the needs and security plans of the court.

Comment: Because 57.8% of respondents work in courts co-located in buildings with other agencies or entities, the committee recommends courts invite those co-located in the building to participate in security manual training or receive a copy of the manual as appropriate.

**3. Court Security Self-Assessment.** Courts shall conduct a court security self-assessment at least

*Nearly 61% of respondents worked in courts with written court security policies and procedures and approximately 97% of respondents indicated written policies and procedures were important, very important, or extremely important.*

every three years.<sup>11</sup> The local SEPC shall conduct the self-assessment using a security assessment template or checklist and summarize the assessment in a report.<sup>12</sup> However, court security assessments may be conducted by an outside team with members who have knowledge of court security best practices or who are not employed by the court being assessed. Reports of court security self-assessments shall be shared with local and county SEPCs for use in developing plans for security improvement and for resource justification.

Recommendation: The committee recommends that a court security coordinator be hired within the AOC that would coordinate or assist in court security self-assessments and assessment reports.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Security assessments and security assessment reports shall not be open to the public pursuant to Rule 123(e)(4) (2016), Arizona Rules of Supreme Court.

<sup>12</sup> See Court Security Guide, 2005, pp. 6-8, National Association for Court Management. Committee members reviewed the detailed Court Security Assessment tool used by Pima County and its corresponding report template.

<sup>13</sup> See Related Recommendations section of this report.



**4. Response to a Negative Event.**<sup>14</sup> Court staff shall be trained on how to react to and report negative events. Each court shall have access to an emergency phone number or access and contact information for a control center operated by law enforcement.

**5. Incident and Threat Reporting.**<sup>15</sup> The court administrator or lead clerk shall report all significant threats made against a court, a judge, a court employee, or a designee and all major incidents that occur within the courthouse or its perimeter. The AOC shall establish a process for reporting incidents and threats and shall develop guidelines for defining criteria for what is a major incident or significant threat.

*Threat and incident reporting is of paramount importance to the safety of judges, court employees, and the public who visit the court building.*

Recommendation: The committee recommends two levels of incident reporting: (a) contemporaneous reporting of major security threats and incidents to be defined by the AOC, and (b) annual reporting of security incident data by courthouse. Information from the first type of incident report shall be securely shared with court security and law enforcement officials in real time. The second form of incident reporting should include reports to local and county SEPCs and the AOC.<sup>16</sup>

The second type of report should serve as a basis for determining areas for security improvement and should provide resource and funding request justification from local funding authorities. Moreover, these reports should be required as part of funding requests from the statewide court security fund.<sup>17</sup> This standard follows the national best practice of maintaining records of all threats and incidents for use in local decision-making related to security measures and funding.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> See the Glossary for definition of 'negative event'.

<sup>15</sup> See the Glossary for definition of 'incident' and 'threat'.

<sup>16</sup> Incident and threat reports are confidential and not open to the public pursuant to Rule 123(e)(4) (2016), Arizona Rules of the Supreme Court.

<sup>17</sup> See Related Recommendations section of this report.

<sup>18</sup> See Hall, et. al. *Steps to Best Practices for Court Building Security*, pp. 9-10.




## Entryway Screening

### 6. Entryway Screening.

**(a) Entrances.** Each court shall establish one main entrance through which the public can enter the court building. Additional entryways for the public are allowed if the additional entryways are staffed and use entryway screening of at least one hand held metal detector (magnetometer). Additional entrances may be established to comply with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards; however, appropriate screening of individuals using such entrances is required.

**(b) Screening Devices.** Courts shall establish and maintain entryway screening of all visitors to courthouse facilities, using walk through or handheld metal detectors (magnetometers). For enhanced security, courts may also choose to use x-ray (fluoroscope) machines in conjunction with metal detector screening.

Courts that do not have a walk through or handheld metal detector at the time these standards are initially adopted shall obtain at least one hand held device for use in the event of a high risk event<sup>19</sup> until such time as full time entryway screening of all visitors can be accomplished. Full



entryway screening of all visitors to the courthouse facilities by trained court or security personnel shall be implemented within the time set by the Arizona Supreme Court.

**(c) Prohibited Item Signage.** Each court building shall have signage posted at each entrance stating that all persons are subject to search by security personnel and that firearms and dangerous weapons are prohibited pursuant to A.R.S. § 13-3102 (2016). Each court shall provide secure lockers at the entryway for storage of firearms pursuant to A.R.S. § 13-3102.01.<sup>20</sup> Law

<sup>19</sup> High risk event is defined in the Glossary.

<sup>20</sup> See Ariz. Rev. Stat. § 13-3102(A)(10) and Ariz. Rev. Stat. § 13-3102.01 (both current through 2016).



enforcement who come to the court for personal business<sup>21</sup> rather than professional business shall be required to store their firearms in secure lockers the same as other persons.<sup>22</sup> (See Standard 8, Armed Court Personnel in Courthouses for when law enforcement may carry a firearm in a court building.)

**(d) Screening Device Training and Calibration.** Court personnel or security personnel who conduct entryway screening shall be trained and receive refresher training on the operation of the devices that they use. Each court shall ensure that regular calibration and testing of metal detectors and x-ray machines occur.

**(e) Prohibited items.** Courts shall develop a list of items prohibited in the court building.<sup>23</sup> The list shall be a part of the local materials in the court security manual and all employees shall be trained on what are prohibited items.

*Eighty-two percent of respondents work in courts where signage is posted indicating firearms are prohibited in the court.*

Policies and procedures shall be developed for the confiscation, handling, and disposition of prohibited items found during entryway screening. Courts shall track the types and amount of contraband detected through screening and maintain monthly reports reflecting that information.

**7. Court Employee Screening.** In jurisdictions that do not conduct full entryway screening of all employees, each court must develop a policy on, and carry out, random court employee screening upon entry to the courthouse.

Comment: Unfortunately workplace violence is all too common. It is the risk of work place violence that can be mitigated through periodic employee screening for prohibited items.

---

<sup>21</sup> E.g. party to a legal matter, witness in a legal proceeding in a capacity other than official law enforcement duties, or an observer of a legal proceeding where not involved in an official law enforcement capacity.

<sup>22</sup> See Arizona Supreme Court AO 2005-32 and A.R.S. § 38-1113(C)(2) et. seq. (current through 2016).

<sup>23</sup> See Arizona Supreme Court AO 2005-32 establishing authority for presiding judge of county over court security including prohibiting or regulating possession of weapons of potential weapons in the court; e.g. Superior Court for Pima County AO 2014-05 list of items prohibited in the Superior Court of Pima County; Arizona Supreme Court AO 1998-0008, list of prohibited items in the Arizona Supreme Court



**8. Armed Court Personnel in Courthouses.** The presiding judge of the county shall determine whether court security officers may carry firearms in the courthouse for the purpose of maintaining court security.<sup>24</sup> Required training as approved and provided by the AOC must be completed prior to actively carrying a firearm in the courthouse.<sup>25</sup> Moreover, courts with armed court security shall develop protocols for court security officer involved shootings.

Presiding judges shall establish written policies on the carrying of firearms for personal safety by judicial officers or other court staff. Specifically, the policy shall address the following points: who may carry a firearm, the process for registering or otherwise notifying the court and court security of the status of being armed, the process for confirming training requirements, type of firearm and ammunition that can be carried in the court building; and the conformance with all applicable state and local statutes and ordinances.<sup>26</sup>

Comment: The committee recommends that courts adopt a policy prohibiting law enforcement officers from carrying firearms in the courthouse unless the officers are appearing for official business, providing court security, or responding to an emergency.<sup>27</sup> The committee further recommends all law enforcement officers who are allowed to carry firearms in the courthouse shall be required to go through a sworn registration procedure so that court security is aware of the officers' location in the courthouse and the official purpose for which they are present. As a general guiding principal, in policy formulation, law enforcement officers should not be permitted to carry weapons in the courthouse when they are present for personal business or in

---

<sup>24</sup> See Arizona Supreme Court AO-2005-32, Presiding Judges Authority (establishing duties of court security). Cf. Arizona Supreme Court AO 98-0008 (weapons in the Arizona State Courts Building); Superior Court of Pima County AO 2014-05 (weapons in Pima County Superior Court).

<sup>25</sup> This training requirement does not apply to law enforcement meeting the training requirements of A.R.S. § 38-1113 (current through 2016) or sheriff's officers who are present pursuant to A.R.S. § 11-411 (current through 2016).

<sup>26</sup> Ariz. Rev. Stat. § 13-3102(D) (judges carrying firearms in conformance with orders of presiding judge not subject to offense of misconduct involving weapons). Until such time as AOC adopts training standards, judges and other court staff authorized to carry firearms shall meet the requirements of A.R.S. § 13-3102(D) (current through 2016).

<sup>27</sup> See A.R.S. § 38-1113(C)(2) et. seq. (authority to prohibit officers from carrying firearm unless appearing in official capacity or providing security or responding to an emergency).



a personal capacity, such as a party to a case or witness or observer to a case where they were not acting in an official law enforcement capacity.<sup>28</sup>

**In-Custody Defendants**


**9. Entrance for In-Custody Defendants.** Courts shall ensure in-custody defendants are brought into and leave the court building through an entrance separated from any public entrance to the courthouse.

*Eighty-one percent of respondents work in courts that currently have an entrance for in-custody defendants that is separate from the public entrance(s). Ninety-three percent of respondents found this security measure to be extremely or very important.*

Comment: Courts that cannot meet this standard because of the architectural construction of a building shall have written procedures for ensuring that in-custody defendants are segregated from the public when entering and exiting the court to ensure the safety of all.

**10. In-Custody Defendants; Transport and Control.** In-custody defendants must be transported, controlled, and monitored at all times by appropriately trained court security personnel or law enforcement officer(s).

**11. In-Custody Defendants; Protocols for Taking Individuals into Custody.** Courts shall have written protocols for taking individuals into custody and securing individuals into custody for transport to a detention facility. Courts should make every effort to alert security personnel or law enforcement responsible for transporting detainees in advance if it is anticipated a litigant will be taken into the immediate custody of a county jail or correctional facility or otherwise taken into custody.



<sup>28</sup> See A.R.S. § 38-1113(C)(2) et. seq.; Arizona Supreme Court AO 2005-32.




**Facilities, Alarms, and Equipment**

**12. Duress Alarms.**

(a) *At Public Transaction Counters.* Courts are required to have at least one active and monitored duress alarm “panic button” behind each public transaction counter.

(b) *In the Courtroom.* Courts are required to have active and monitored duress alarm “panic buttons” at the judges’ or other judicial officers’ benches and at the courtroom clerks’ stations.

(c) *Training on and Testing of Duress Alarms.* The court administrator, lead clerk, or a designee shall physically show all employees working in a court building the location of duress alarm “panic buttons” and how and when to use them. The court administrator, lead clerk, or a designee shall ensure testing of duress alarm systems occurs at least quarterly and that such testing is documented. Reports of duress alarm system testing shall be reported to local and county SEPCs and certified annually to the AOC.



**13. Locking Protocols.**

(a) *Locked Courtrooms.* Courts shall keep public doors to courtrooms locked at all times when a courtroom is not in use. Courts shall install or obtain a type of locking mechanism that will allow the courtroom to be locked from the inside to allow for the ability to shelter in place, but will also allow emergency exit, such as crash bars, one way door handles, alarmed doors, or remote locks.

(b) *Locked Jury Deliberation Rooms.* Courts shall keep jury deliberation rooms locked when not in use, unless jury deliberation rooms are behind secured areas.

**14. Courtroom Sweeps.** Bailiffs or designees of the presiding judge or court administrator, shall ensure sweeps of courtrooms and hearing rooms are conducted at least daily. Reports of courtroom sweeps shall be provided to the presiding judge, the court administrator, or a designee.



**15. Secured Access to Non-Public Areas.** Areas of the court not open to the public shall be electronic card-key or hard-key controlled. The court administrator, the lead clerk, or a designee shall ensure that doors remain locked at all times and are not propped open.

**16. Security Cameras.** Courts shall have video cameras in areas including, but not limited to, entryways and common public areas.

**17. Exterior Lighting.** Each court location shall have exterior lighting at building entrances and exits.

Comment: The committee recommends that where a court facility includes parking areas, such parking areas also have exterior lighting.

*Eighty-eight percent of respondents work in courts that have exterior lighting, and the response was uniform across population and court type. However, only 38% of courts have barriers or other materials to protect court building from attack by vehicular assault.*

**18. Protection of Critical Locations.** Where appropriate, courts shall ensure sufficient set back areas between the court facility and vehicle accessible areas. Courts shall prevent unauthorized vehicular access to critical areas with obstacles such as, but not limited to, bollards or natural landscapes.

Comment: Courts that cannot meet this standard because of the architectural construction of a building shall have written procedures for ensuring monitoring of areas where vehicle accessibility is within what would otherwise be the set back area.

**19. Window Coverings.** Court windows shall have coverings to prevent views from the outside into the court building. Window coverings must allow visibility from inside to the outside.

**20. Creation of Barriers at Public Transaction Counters.** Clerk transaction counters and public service windows shall have a barrier between the public customers and court staff. The type and manner of barrier shall be a local decision, based upon evaluation of each courts' design and operations.

**21. Bullet-Resistant Material in Courtrooms.** Courtroom benches and staff work areas in courtrooms shall be reinforced with bullet-resistant material.



**22. Data Centers and Electronic Equipment.** Court facilities shall maintain separate, secure electronic key-card or hard-key controlled, limited access areas for computer data centers, network equipment, video recording systems, and other critical electronic equipment. Courts shall maintain remote, off-site disaster recovery “hot sites” pursuant to ACJA § 1-507.

### Training

**23. New Hire Security Training Requirements.** All court employees, including judges, shall participate in and complete, whether in person or online, a course in court security. That course should address general security principals, the court security manual, personal safety on the job, emergency preparedness including what to do in a negative event, evacuation routes, and sheltering in place protocols.<sup>29</sup>

“Every single person who works on a court building has the potential to materially enhance the safety and security of his or her work environment, to be the “eyes and ears” of a workforce constantly alert to risks and threats. Judges and court staff that have been well trained on well-publicized policies and procedures provide the best means for this eyes and ears function to be effectively discharged.”

- Hall, *Steps to Best Practices for Court Building Security*.

Comment: The committee recognizes that judges are subject to a separate orientation program pursuant to ACJA § 1-302 and that court security is generally addressed in that program. However, the committee emphasizes that court security is not a one-size-fits-all topic. As such, court security training provided to newly hired employees, including judges, should not be limited to a one-size-fits-all course that provides generalized content only. Each court will have its own policies and procedures on court security topics such as, but not exclusively: who provides security, what evacuations routes are, how to respond to negative events, who to report security threats and incidents to, and courtroom and courthouse lockdown procedures. In order for effective training to occur, each new employee, including judges, needs to receive training specific to the courthouse they will be working in. Therefore, the committee recommends that the

---

<sup>29</sup> The Committee notes ACJA § 1-302(J)(2) requires new hire orientation for all staff within 90 days of hire. The Committee recommends that an amendment be made to § 1-302(J)(2) reducing this time frame to within 30 days of hire.



AOC develop new orientation training on court security that has statewide applicability but that the AOC also work with local courts to develop guidelines for training specific to local courts.

**24. Annual Security Training Requirements.** All employees of the Arizona Judicial branch including judicial officers,<sup>30</sup> shall be required to complete a court security course annually as part of the COJET core curriculum.

Comment: The committee notes the current annual requirement of one COJET-accredited course related to cyber security for all court personnel and judges.<sup>31</sup> The committee recommends a separate and distinct requirement for all judges and court personnel to complete one COJET-accredited course on court security each year. The committee recommends that statewide training courses and resources be offered by the AOC Education Services Division to complement local court training which may also be accredited to fulfill the annual COJET requirement. The committee recommends that the security training courses be different each year and recommends development of a series of security-related trainings to be offered on a rotational basis.

**25. In-Service Court Security Officer Training.** Court security officers employed by a court must receive annual training including, but not limited to:

- use of force training;<sup>32</sup>
- metal detection devices and x-ray machines, as applicable to what officers use at their court;
- de-escalation and defensive tactics;
- active shooter;
- incident reporting;
- policies and procedures on the handling of prohibited items; and
- emergency preparedness.

---

<sup>30</sup> The committee notes the annual training requirements for judges set forth in the Arizona Code of Judicial Administration (ACJA). However, judges should receive the same amount of training as other employees because they are an integral part of security in the courts and they face similar security risks as other court employees. The committee recommends the ACJA be amended to include specific court security requirements for judges in keeping with the training structure set forth in the ACJA.

<sup>31</sup> See ACJA § 1-302(H)(1).

<sup>32</sup> The committee recommends that use of force regulations that are similar to ACJA § 6-112 be adopted for court security officers, excluding law enforcement whom the committee recognizes are governed by separate specific use of force laws and regulations.



**26. Contract Court Security Training.** Private contract court security officers shall be subject to the minimum court security training standards established by the AOC for in-house court security officers.

**27. Security Officer Equipment Belt Training.** Court security officers shall restrict equipment belt tools to items for which they are trained in the use of and where applicable, certified in the use of. Security officers shall restrict equipment belt tools to items approved by the court security officer-training program adopted by the AOC or otherwise designated by the AOC.

**28. Courtroom and Jury Deliberation Room Sweep Training.** Any court employee assigned to conduct daily courtroom and jury deliberation room sweeps shall be trained on how to conduct such sweeps, identification of suspicious items or conditions, protocols for reporting suspicious items or conditions, and securing of the courtroom or jury deliberation room if a suspicious item or condition is identified.

**29. Court Security Officer Training.** Court security officers shall be trained in accordance with a court security officer training program developed by the AOC Education Services Division. The Committee makes the following recommendations related to court security officer training:

- A security training workgroup should be developed to collaborate with the AOC Education Services Division to determine the specific training curriculum and annual training hours necessary for an effective, security officer training, education, and certification program.
- Trainers be approved by the AOC or AZ POST certified.
- There be a method for grandfathering current security officers if prior training or job experience meets the training requirements of any court security officer training program adopted or approved by the AOC.
- Court security officers, including contracted private court security, be readily identifiable via clothing or some type of marking on their clothing.

**30. Firearms Training.** Any person who provides court security to a court, excluding POST certified law enforcement officers, shall complete training in the use of firearms as designated by the AOC before being allowed to carry a firearm within the court.

Comment: The committee recommends that any person, whether court security armed for court security purposes or judges or other court employees authorized to carry a firearm for personal



security, complete training similar to that established for Arizona probation officers in A.C.J.A. § 6-113. The committee further recommends that firearms standards be adopted for armed court security, excluding POST certified law enforcement officers, that are similar to the standards in ACJA § 6-113. The committee recommends that the AOC Education Services Division develop such training and standards.<sup>33</sup>

## RELATED RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee considered a number of related measures to ensure a continued focus on court security and an ongoing program of security system improvements. To this end, the committee respectfully offers the following recommendations:

1. Given the additional resources and high degree of planning included in the implementation of proposed court security enhancements, the committee recommends a three year implementation period for the proposed court security standards.
2. Establish a statewide security fund available to local courts for one-time outlays for security equipment and security system improvements. Security system improvements entail, but are not limited to, security system screening equipment, panic alarms, public transaction counter barriers, bullet resistant courtroom benches, electronic door locks or similar locking mechanisms, video cameras, and communication systems. Specifically, the committee recommends expansion of spending authority for some current state and local fees for use toward security enhancements (e.g., court diversion fee; county law library fund; other funding sources to be identified). The committee also recommends that statewide security funds be distributed to local courts based upon need in relation to ability to implement the proposed court security standards. Under this model, the trial courts will continue to pursue local funding for court security personnel and ongoing operations.

---

<sup>33</sup> The committee notes A.R.S. § 13-3102(D) provides for judges to be held to the standard for those who obtain a concealed carry permit. However, the committee strongly encourages that all persons authorized to carry a firearm in a court, excluding law enforcement who have separate training standards, be trained and held to a uniform standard.



3. Provide dedicated state level (AOC) staff support for coordination of court security assessments, technical assistance, and training. AOC staff should also assist in oversight of compliance with any court security standards adopted by the Arizona Supreme Court. The committee notes that a staff member dedicated to court security would allow for court security to be pursued in an active rather than reactive manner. Core duties of AOC staff should include, but not be limited to:

- Develop statewide court security manual and accompanying resources
- Assist with creation of county and local SEPCs
- Coordinate court security assessments and post-assessment reports
- Administer an incident reporting system
- Develop compliance reporting systems for standards requiring reports and certifications.

4. Include a method for assessment of or accountability for compliance with the proposed court security standards, particularly standards that require training, certification, and testing.

5. Maintain the Court Security Standards Committee or a subset of this body to promote timely implementation of the proposed court security standards, address emergency preparedness policies and procedures, and statewide information sharing and coordination of a systemic court security program. Such a committee could also assist the AOC Education Services Division on development of court security training curriculum and programs.



## GLOSSARY

The following definitions govern the meaning of terms within the standards proposed by the Court Security Standards Committee.

**Standard** - A court security standard is 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 and the law enforcement officers and court security officers that protect them.

**Guideline** - A court security guideline is a policy or measure that is recommended 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 and the law enforcement officers and court security officers that protect them.

**Incident** - An incident is an action or communication that causes or threatens to cause personal injury, property damage, or disruption of courthouse proceedings

**Hierarchy of seriousness of incident** - In descending order: (1) incident against persons, (2) incident against property, (3) threats without violence

**High risk event** – This type of event can occur at any time and often arises with little notice to a court. The following characteristics are commonly associated with high risk events: multiple victims involved in the matter, incidents involving female victims and multiple offenders, homicides that involve intimate partners and family relationships, celebrated or featured articles or media coverage are associated with the matter, demonstrations may occur before, during, or after hearings or otherwise be associated with the events of the case.<sup>34</sup>

**Negative event** - A negative event is an event that has potential to, or does cause interruption of court operations or poses a risk to the safety and security of those in and around a court facility. Negative events may include, but are not limited to, threats, such as threats to

---

<sup>34</sup> See National Association for Court Management, *Court Security Guide* p.24. June 2005



the physical safety of someone on or associated with a court, bomb threats, or suspicious or unattended packages; security incidents such as physical violence, active shooter, hostage taking; and other incidents such as cyber attacks, medical emergencies, fires, severe weather, or power outages.

**Threat** - A statement of an intention to inflict pain, injury, damage, or other hostile action on someone (court employee) or an institution (court building) in retribution for something done or not done now or in the future. A threat is synonymous with a threatening remark, warning, or ultimatum such as a menace to a person or institution. A threat can be a person or a thing likely to cause damage or danger.

DRAFT



## APPENDICES

### Appendix A

#### *Court Security Resources*

Court Security Guide, June 2005, National Association for Court Management.

Business Continuity Management Mini Guide, June 2006, National Association for Court Management.

CCJ/COSCA Court Security Handbook: Ten Essential Elements for Court Security and Emergency Preparedness, June 2010.

Preparing for the Unthinkable: A Report to the Arizona Judicial Council, December 2003, Arizona Supreme Court Committee on Court Security and Emergency Preparedness.

Timothy F. Fautsko, Steven K. Berson, and Steven K. Swensen, *Status of Court Security in State Courts: A National Perspective*, June 2013.

Fred L. Cheesman, II & William Rafferty, *Courthouse Security Survey Pilot Project: Results and Proposed National Sampling Plan*, December 18, 2009.

Nathan W. Hall, et. al. *Steps to Best Practices for Court Building Security*, July 2016, National Center for State Courts.

Timm Fautsko, Steve Berson, and Steve Swensen, *Courthouse Security Incidents Trending Upward: The Challenges Facing State Courts Today*, Future Trends in State Courts, pp. 102-106, 2012.

Timothy F. Fautsko and Steven V. Berson, *Courthouse Violence in 2010-2012: Lessons Learned*, A Final Report, 2013.

Marcus Reinkensmeyer, *Court Security and Business Continuity in Lean Budget Times: A Collaborative Systems Approach*, Future Trends in State Courts, pp. 87-93, 2011.

#### *Surveys*

National Center for State Courts for the Bureau of Justice Assistance, *Status of Court Security in State Courts*, Web Survey Instrument.

Minnesota Judicial Branch, *Minnesota Courthouse Security Survey* by National center for State Courts.

#### *State Court Security Plans, Manuals, and Standards*

State of Minnesota, Conference of Chief Judges, *Court security Manual*.

[http://www.9-11summit.org/materials9-](http://www.9-11summit.org/materials9-11/911/acrobat/27/p3&c10emergencypreparednessplans/minnesotactsecuritymanual.pdf)

[11/911/acrobat/27/p3&c10emergencypreparednessplans/minnesotactsecuritymanual.pdf](http://www.9-11summit.org/materials9-11/911/acrobat/27/p3&c10emergencypreparednessplans/minnesotactsecuritymanual.pdf)



Michigan State Court Administrative Office, Court Security Guidelines, July 3, 2002.

[http://courts.mi.gov/Administration/SCAO/Resources/Documents/standards/cs\\_stds.pdf](http://courts.mi.gov/Administration/SCAO/Resources/Documents/standards/cs_stds.pdf)

Georgia Standards for the Security of Courthouses and Other Court Facilities, Revised June 2012.

[www.cscj.org/files/download/courthouse\\_security\\_standards\\_final.pdf](http://www.cscj.org/files/download/courthouse_security_standards_final.pdf)

Washington State Courthouse Public Safety Standards 2009, by the Board for Judicial Administration, Court Security Committee. <https://www.courts.wa.gov/newsinfo/content/pdf/securitystandards.pdf>

Ohio Court Security Standards, Ohio Supreme Court Advisory Committee on Court Security and Emergency Preparedness. <https://www.supremecourt.ohio.gov/courtSecurity/appC.pdf>

Colorado Courthouse Security resource Guide, Colorado State Court Administrator's Office, April 2008.

[https://www.courts.state.co.us/userfiles/File/Administration/Financial\\_Services/Court\\_Security\\_Resource\\_Guide.pdf](https://www.courts.state.co.us/userfiles/File/Administration/Financial_Services/Court_Security_Resource_Guide.pdf)

Court Security and Emergency Preparedness Policy and Procedure Manual for the Arkansas Judicial Branch, Arkansas Supreme Court Committee on Security and Emergency Preparedness within the Arkansas Administrative Office of Courts, 2013.

<https://courts.arkansas.gov/system/files/State%20Policy%20and%20Procedure%20Manual%202013.pdf>



## Appendix B

### Sample Emails from Court Security Survey Distribution

The following is an example of the pre-survey email:

Dear Presiding Judges:

Court security has been identified as a high priority initiative and the Supreme Court established a Court Security Standards Committee to recommend court security standards for Arizona courts. In order to develop these recommendations, the Committee seeks your assistance in (1) completing a survey and (2) distributing the survey to the judges within your court (including judges located in other physical locations) and to other judicial officers.

The survey was created by the Committee with assistance from the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) and seeks to discover what security measures are in place in your building and what you believe are the most important security measures. Your court's participation in the survey will help the Committee to develop recommendations that are meaningful for Arizona courts, large and small, rural and metropolitan.

The survey **will be sent to you within 24 hours** and will take less than 10 minutes to complete. Please complete the survey at your earliest convenience, and no later than **Friday, May 6, 2016**, and forward the message containing the survey to the other judges and judicial officers in your court.

Court Administrators and Court Clerks will receive the survey as well and will assist with distribution to other court employees. *However*, if your court does not have a court administrator or clerk, the Committee would appreciate your help in distributing the survey to court employees as well as judges and judicial officers.

Thank you for your assistance in this endeavor,

The following is an example of the email distributing the survey:

Dear Presiding Judges:

In an email yesterday, the Court Security Standards Committee asked for your assistance (1) completing a survey and (2) distributing the survey to the judges within your court (including judges located in other physical locations) and to other judicial officers. This is the link for the survey:

[Court Security Survey](#)

Please complete the survey no later than **Friday, May 6, 2016**, and forward the message containing the survey to the other judges and judicial officers in your court.

Thank you for your assistance in this endeavor,



The following is an example of the reminder email:

Dear Judges, Clerk of Court, Court Administrator, Court Security, and Probation Chief:

In an email last week, the Court Security Standards Committee asked for your assistance (1) completing a survey and (2) distributing the survey to other judges, security personnel and staff within your court. It is important that each level of court (LJ and GJ) and each court location for those courts with multiple locations be represented in the survey results. It is also important that the survey reach someone who provides security for your court.

The Committee recognizes the time involved in taking the survey and forwarding it to others and sincerely thanks you for your willingness to participate.

If you have not had an opportunity to take the survey, this is the link:

[Court Security Survey](#)

The survey should be completed by **Friday, May 6, 2016**.

Again, thank you for your assistance,

DRAFT



Appendix C  
Arizona Court Security Survey

**Arizona Court Security Survey**



Dear Respondent,

In an effort to improve safety and security in our court buildings, the Supreme Court has established the Court Security Standards Committee to recommend standards and guidelines for court security. Standards are those security measures that would be required to be in place in every court building; guidelines are those security measures that would be recommended to be in place in every court building.

As an important step in this process, the Committee is conducting this survey to discover two things: 1) What is currently in place in the way of security measures?; and 2) What do you believe are the most important measures to have in place in your court building?

Please complete this survey and submit your answers by Friday, May 6, 2016.

Thank you,

Marcus Reinkensmeyer,  
Chair, Court Security Standards Committee



## Arizona Court Security Survey

- **Please Note:** If you have responsibility for multiple court building locations, please answer this survey for the location at which you spend the most of your time working.
- As feasible, users should access the survey on a computer, not on a cell phone or mobile device. If you use a cell phone or mobile device, some of you may experience input issues.
- You must provide answers to all of the questions before you can proceed to the next page.

### 1. Position Title

- Judge
- Other Judicial Officer (e.g., Hearing Officer, Commissioner)
- Judicial or Courtroom Support Staff
- Court Clerk
- Clerk's Office Staff
- Court Administrator
- Probation
- Other Court Staff
- Law Enforcement Officer
- Court Security Officer (Non-Sheriff Deputy / Non-Police Officer)
- Employee of another agency sharing building with court
- Other

### 2. County (select from dropdown menu)

### 3. Population

- Urban (population 200,001+)
- Suburban (population 100,001-200,000)
- Small Suburban (population 25,001-100,000)
- Rural (population 5,001-25,000)
- Small Rural (population 5,000 or under)



4. Type of court building

- Single use (court only)
- Multiple use (shared with other agency/entity)

5. Court Type

- Appellate Court
- Superior Court
- Justice Court
- Municipal / City Court

6. Who provides security for your court building (mark all that apply)?

- Court-employed security officers
- Sheriff's office
- Police department
- Private security company
- Don't know
- Have no security officers
- Other



**Arizona Court Security Survey**

7. Do you have the following security measures around the perimeter of your court building?

	Yes	No	Don't Know
Security officer(s) regularly patrol around perimeter of court building	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Security cameras outside located around perimeter	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Alarmed doors, entrances, and exits	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Secured or monitored parking areas for judges	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Secured or monitored parking areas for court staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Entrance for in-custody defendants separate from public entrance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Exterior building lighting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Barriers to protect against vehicular assault on building	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ballistic-resistant glass on doors and windows	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Window coverings to prevent views from outside into courtrooms, chambers, or offices	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ensuring Secure, Open, and Publicly Accessible Courts



8. How important do you think it is for the the following security measures to be in place around the perimeter of your court building?

	Extremely Important (5)	Very Important (4)	Important (3)	Somewhat Important (2)	Unimportant (1)
Security officer(s) regularly patrol around perimeter of court building	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Security cameras outside located around perimeter	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Alarmed doors, entrances, and exits	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Secured or monitored parking areas for judges	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Secured or monitored parking areas for court staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Entrance for in-custody defendants separate from public entrance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Exterior building lighting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Barriers to protect against vehicular assault on building	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ballistic-resistant glass on doors and windows	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Window coverings to prevent views from outside into courtrooms, chambers or offices	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



**Arizona Court Security Survey**

9. Do you have the following security measures inside your Court Building?

	Yes	No	Don't Know
Active security committee	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Written security policies and procedures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Security command center area	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Security cameras in publicly accessible areas	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Screening station for public that includes a metal detector	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Screening station for public that includes an X-ray machine	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Screening station for public that includes a hand wand	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Weapons screening for employees (including random screening)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Screening station for employees that includes a metal detector	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Screening station for employees that includes an X-ray machine	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Screening station for employees that includes a hand wand	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Regular security officer patrols inside the court building	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Security for after-hour access	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Security committee keeping track of incidents and contraband	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## Ensuring Secure, Open, and Publicly Accessible Courts



	Yes	No	Don't Know		
Duress alarms at public transaction counters	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
Protective barrier at public transaction counters	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
Policy or procedure for package and mail screening	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
Building orientation procedures for first responders	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
Employee offices can be locked from the inside	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
Policy or procedure for sheltering in place	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
Posted notice that firearms prohibited in courthouse or courtroom	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
Policy or procedures for reporting and evaluating threats and/or incidents	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
10. How important do you think it is for the the following security measures to be in place in your Court Building?					
	Extremely Important (5)	Very Important (4)	Important (3)	Somewhat Important (2)	Unimportant (1)
Active security committee	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Written security policies and procedures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Security command center area	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Security cameras in publicly accessible areas	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Entry-way weapons screening for the public	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Weapons screening for employees (including random screening)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Regular security officer patrols inside the court building	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## Ensuring Secure, Open, and Publicly Accessible Courts



	Extremely Important (5)	Very Important (4)	Important (3)	Somewhat Important (2)	Unimportant (1)
Security for after-hour access	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Security committee keeping track of incidents and contraband	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Duress alarms at public transaction counters	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Protective barrier at public transaction counters	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Policy or procedure for package and mail screening	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Building orientation procedures for first responders	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Employee offices can be locked from the inside.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Policy or procedure for sheltering in place	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Posted notice that firearms prohibited in courthouse or courtroom	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Policy or procedures for reporting and evaluating threats and/or incidents	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



11. Do you have the following security measures for your courtroom?

	Yes	No	Don't Know
Assigned armed security personnel presence in courtroom	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased security for high profile cases	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Assigned security personnel for transport and control of in-custody defendants	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Decorum instructions/orders	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Posted rules about cell phone use, including pictures and recording	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Posted information on evacuation routes or procedures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Posted information on lockdown procedures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Posted information on shelter in place	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ballistic-resistant material on bench/clerk stations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Duress alarms: On bench	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Duress alarms: At clerk station	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Duress alarms: In chambers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Duress alarms: In jury deliberation rooms	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Secured jury deliberation rooms	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Regular "sweeps" of courtroom	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Keeping courtroom doors locked when courtroom not in use.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



12. How important do you think it is for the the following security measures to be in place for your courtroom?

	Extremely Important (5)	Very Important (4)	Important (3)	Somewhat Important (2)	Unimportant (1)
Assigned armed security personnel presence in courtroom	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased security for high profile cases	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Assigned security personnel for transport and control of in-custody defendants	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Decorum instructions/orders	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Posted rules about cell phone use, including pictures and recording	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Posted information on evacuation routes or procedures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Posted information on lockdown procedures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Posted information on sheltering in place	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ballistic-resistant material on bench/clerk stations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Duress alarms: On bench	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Duress alarms: At clerk station	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Duress alarms: In chambers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Duress alarms: In jury deliberation rooms	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Secured jury deliberation rooms	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Regular "sweeps" of courtroom	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Keeping courtroom doors locked when courtroom not in use	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



**Arizona Court Security Survey**

13. Have you been trained since January 2015 on the following topics/areas?

	Yes	No	Don't Recall
Written court security policies and procedures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Annual training on court security	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Threats against judges/judicial officers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Active shooter/sheltering in place	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hostage-taking	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Communications: Phone tree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Communications: Incident reporting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Communications: Whose directions to follow if security incident occurs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Use of duress alarms/testing of alarms	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Items prohibited from the court building	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Safety at home/to and from work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mental health identification	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
De-escalation tactics	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Suspicious package	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cybersecurity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



14. How important do you think it is for the following security measures to be in place in training programs?

	Extremely Important (5)	Very Important (4)	Important (3)	Somewhat Important (2)	Unimportant (1)
Written court security policies and procedures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Annual training on court security	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Security training as part of new hire orientation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Security training as part of employee transfer from another court	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Threats against judges/judicial officers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Active shooter/sheltering in place	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hostage-taking	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Communications: Phone tree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Communications: Incident reporting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Communications: Whose directions to follow if security incident occurs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Use of duress alarms/testing of alarms	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Items prohibited from the court building	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Safety at home/to and from work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mental health identification	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
De-escalation tactics	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Suspicious package	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cybersecurity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



**Arizona Court Security Survey**

15. How important do you think it is to have security standards and guidelines in every court building?

- Standards are those security measures that are readily achievable and would be required to be in place in every court building.
- Guidelines are those security measures that may take longer to achieve and would be recommended to be in place in every court building.

	Extremely Important (5)	Very Important (4)	Important (3)	Somewhat Important (2)	Unimportant (1)
Security standards	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Security guidelines	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

16. What do you think is a reasonable time frame (in number of years) for implementing security standards and guidelines?

- Standards are those security measures that are readily achievable and would be required to be in place in every court building.
- Guidelines are those security measures that may take longer to achieve and would be recommended to be in place in every court building.

	One year	Two years	Three years	Four years	Five years
Security standards	<input type="radio"/>				
Security guidelines	<input type="radio"/>				

17. When was the last time you had a practice evacuation of your court building (e.g., fire drill)?

- Within the last year
- Within the last two years
- Within the last five years
- Can't recall the last time



18. When was the last time you had an evacuation of your court building because of an actual emergency?

- Within the last year
- Within the last two years
- Within the last five years
- Can't recall the last time





---

# Ensuring Secure, Open, and Publicly Accessible Courts

Report and Recommendations of the Court Security Standards Committee

© 2016 Arizona Supreme Court

September 12, 2016