

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

INTRODUCTION

The mission of the Washington State Administrative Office of the Courts is to advance the efficient and effective operation of the Washington State Judiciary.

The Washington State Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), operating under the direction of the Supreme Court, executes administrative policies and rules as applicable to the Washington judicial system, examines the operations of the court system, and makes recommendations for improvement. This court system includes the Supreme Court, Court of Appeals, superior courts (including juvenile departments), and the courts of limited jurisdiction (district and municipal courts).

The AOC operates within a framework atypical of other state agencies in Washington. In addition to Supreme Court review and approval, proposed services and systems to be developed by the AOC are reviewed by one or more of four policy boards: the Board for Judicial Administration (BJA), the Board for Court Education (BCE), the Court Management Council (CMC), and the Judicial Information System Committee (JISC). These committees and boards are the means by which the Washington court community builds consensus to guide the AOC's efforts.

The AOC functions in a unique and complex environment, necessitated by the agency's responsibility to remain responsive to changes mandated by the judicial, legislative, and executive branches of state government.

On behalf of the Supreme Court and the courts of the state of Washington, the AOC has prepared the following biennial budget request. The content and format of this budget request were developed to reflect the business environment within which Washington State courts and the AOC operate.

The AOC continues to focus its efforts and resources on two primary goals. The first goal is to improve the efficiency of court operations; the second goal is to improve the effectiveness of court operations.

The AOC intends to measure progress toward the attainment of these goals by:

- Increasing the number of interagency and intergovernmental electronic data exchange systems.
- Providing the information technology infrastructure that will allow users to file case information electronically.
- Improving the quality and availability of interpreting services and to reduce interpreter costs at the local level.

- Developing a strategic approach to improving court operations consistent with Unified Family Court principles.
- Providing policy level coordination and quality assurance to probation and detention programs.

Primary Functions Performed and Clients Served

The Administrative Office of the Courts was established by the Washington State Legislature in 1957 and operates under the direction and supervision of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, pursuant to Chapter 2.56 RCW.

The AOC is organized into the four functional areas described below.

ADMINISTRATION provides overall management of the AOC based on direction and guidance from the Supreme Court. Administration is engaged in the following functions and areas of support:

- Overall management of AOC operations.
- Representation of the judicial branch in matters involving the legislative and executive branches of state, federal, and local government.
- Coordination of the annual judicial conference.
- Active membership on state and national judicial policy boards and committees.
- Recruitment, employee training, and advisory services.

The **INFORMATION SYSTEMS DIVISION** supports court access to and use of automated information processing systems. Over 16,000 users access data on the Judicial Information System (JIS). Information from more than three-quarters of the cases filed in Washington State is recorded on the JIS. Major functions and support areas include:

- Maintenance of a statewide JIS person database.
- Development of new automated applications.
- Acquisition and maintenance of hardware and software necessary to support court applications.
- Support for, and improvement of, existing automated court applications.
- Consultation and training on the use of new and existing applications.
- Establishment of hardware and software standards.

The **JUDICIAL SERVICES DIVISION** provides comprehensive professional and technical support to the state's more than 200 courts and approximately 2,500 judicial officers and court staff. Major functions and support areas include:

- Court management analysis and technical assistance.
- Staff support to numerous boards, commissions, and committees.
- Liaisons to judicial and court management groups.
- Judicial education and training.
- Law-related education/information for schools and the public.
- Publication of court rules, procedures manuals, and bench book guides.

- Research and court management information reporting.

The **MANAGEMENT SERVICES DIVISION** provides services to employees of the Supreme Court, Court of Appeals, Law Library, and the AOC. Major functions and support areas include:

- Development and monitoring of biennial and supplemental budgets.
- Accounting of all expenditures.
- Processing of employee payroll and vendor payments.
- Securing competitive procurements, and amendments.
- Purchasing.
- Ensuring facility, safety, security, and maintenance.
- Contract Management.

In addition to these four primary areas of function, the AOC Courts provides coordination, support, and oversight of the funding for a variety of special programs including the Board for Court Education, the Gender and Justice Commission, and the Minority and Justice Commission.

Clients

The primary clients of the AOC are Washington's citizenry, its judicial officers and courts, and the court managers and employees associated with those courts. The AOC also provides services to a rapidly-widening circle of local and state agencies that are closely tied to the criminal and social problems currently being addressed by the courts. In addition, the AOC provides the JIS Link, a highly popular information service offering access (on a cost-recovery basis) to certain public record court case data contained in the Judicial Information System databases.

2013-15 Current Biennium Total

CL AQ Carry Forward Level	389.0	107,015	37,080	144,095
Total Carry Forward Level	389.0	107,015	37,080	144,095
Percent Change from Current Biennium				
M1 90 Maintenance Level Revenue				
Carry Forward plus Workload Changes	389.0	107,015	37,080	144,095
Percent Change from Current Biennium				
M2 AA JIS Maintenance Costs			1,159	1,159
M2 AB BOXI v4 Upgrade			773	773
M2 AC Mason County Superior Court Judge	1.0	236		236
M2 AD Technical Adjustment Technology		278		278
Total Maintenance Level	390.0	107,529	39,012	146,541
Percent Change from Current Biennium				
PL A1 Trial Court Language Access	0.5	5,070		5,070
PL A2 Employee Salary Adjustment				
PL A3 FJCIP Expansion		428		428
PL A4 JDAI Staff	2.0	302		302
PL A5 SC-CMS	24.5		12,598	12,598
PL A6 CLJ-CMS	11.0		4,429	4,429
PL A7 CLJ COTS Prep			1,297	1,297
PL A8 INH CLJ			1,440	1,440
PL A9 External Equipment Replacement			1,849	1,849
PL B1 Internal Equipment Replacement			516	516
PL B2 AC-CMS			313	313
Subtotal - Performance Level Changes	38.0	5,800	22,442	28,242
2015-17 Total Proposed Budget	428.0	113,329	61,454	174,783
Percent Change from Current Biennium				

M2 AA JIS Maintenance Costs

Funding is requested for ongoing costs of software and hardware maintenance for the Judicial Information System (JIS). Costs have increased substantially and the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) has not received full funding for software support.

M2 AB BOXI v4 Upgrade

Funding is requested to ensure continued support for Business Objects, a valuable business intelligence tool. This query tool is used to access data in the Enterprise Data Warehouse, the central judicial data repository, for reporting purposes and for the fulfillment of data dissemination requests. This tool is used by courts as well as by the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC).

M2 AC Mason County Superior Court Judge

Funding is requested for a new superior court judge in Mason County as approved by the legislature.

M2 AD Technical Adjustment Technology

Funding is requested to correct errors in the computations used to implement information technology savings.

PL A1 Trial Court Language Access

Funding is requested to extend a grant program to improve the quality and availability of interpreting services and to reduce interpreter costs at the local level. In addition, funding is requested to offset costs associated with on-demand telephonic interpretation to ensure that limited English proficiency is not a barrier to full participation in court services. The total increase reflects state resources to fund interpreter services in all criminal and civil cases at all levels of trial courts. This funding increase would achieve 100% funding over three biennia.

PL A2 Employee Salary Adjustment

Funding is requested to bring selected salaries to an appropriate level as determined by a salary survey.

PL A3 FJCIP Expansion

Funding is requested for expansion of the Family and Juvenile Court Improvement Program (FJCIP). This program, developed as a strategic approach to improving court operations consistent with Unified Family Court principles, is supported by a legislator who has requested an expansion plan for the FJCIP. The budget package includes funds to expand FJCIP into additional superior courts to promote best practices in family and juvenile court operations as requested by the legislator.

PL A4 JDAI Staff

Funding is requested for intervention programs and detention alternative initiative services to maximize juvenile court services and operations. Probation and detention programs require policy level coordination and quality assurance. The requested positions are 1 FTE for a data analyst and quality assurance specialist and 1 FTE for JDAI statewide coordinator.

The request is made on behalf of the Washington Association of Juvenile Court Administrators, the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative Statewide Steering Committee, and the Washington State Center for Court Research.

PL A5 SC-CMS

Funding is requested to continue implementation of the new commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) case management system for the superior courts. This funding will be used to complete Phase 2 (Solution Design & Development), Phase 3 (Pilot Court Deployment), Phase 4 (Early Adopter Deployment), and to begin Phase 5 (Statewide Rollout) of the project.

PL A6 CLJ-CMS

Funding is requested for development and implementation of the new case management system for courts of limited jurisdiction (CLJ). This project will replace the outdated AOC system (DISCIS) currently in use by the courts.

PL A7 CLJ COTS Prep

Funding is requested to prepare relevant systems for launch of the case management system for courts of limited jurisdiction (CLJ-CMS). This request is similar to the request for funding to prepare for the superior court case management system (SC-CMS) when the funding for that project was initially requested.

PL A8 INH CLJ

Funding is requested for the expansion, development and implementation of the information networking hub (INH) to support the proposed case management system for the courts of limited jurisdiction (CLJ-CMS). INH provide a comprehensive set of data exchanges that are bi-directional and in real time to meet the data sharing needs of the courts.

PL A9 External Equipment Replacement

Funding is requested to replace aged computer equipment at the Washington courts, as well as to provide information technology for judicial officers and court and clerks' office staff, thus ensuring equitable access to the Judicial Information System (JIS).

PL B1 Internal Equipment Replacement

Funding is requested to replace end-of-life equipment and to improve performance of heavily used JIS services.

PL B2 AC-CMS

Funding is requested to continue implementation of the new commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) case management system for the Appellate Courts Content Management System. Because of timing of implementation and payments, AOC has requested \$313,000 be reduced from the 13-15 budget and moved to 15-17.

Decision Package Revenue Detail

FINAL

11/19/2014

1:49:51PM

Page: 1

Budget Period: 2015-17
Agency: 055 Admin Office of the Courts
Version: B1 15-17 Budget Request
Package Program:
Budget Level: M1
Decision Package Code: 90
Decision Package Title: Maintenance Level Revenue

Last Updated: Oct 23 2014 9:32AM

Fiscal Year: 2016

Fund-Source

	Agency Level	Total
001-0405 Fines, Forfeits	83,060,000	83,060,000
11K-0405 Fines, Forfeits	7,300,000	7,300,000
12T-0405 Fines, Forfeits	1,300,000	1,300,000
16A-0425 Filing/Legal Svcs	6,000,000	6,000,000
543-0299 Other Licenses Permi	16,500,000	16,500,000
543-0440 Indirect Cost Reimb	3,000,000	3,000,000
Total	117,160,000	117,160,000

Fiscal Year: 2017

Fund-Source

	Agency Level	Total
001-0405 Fines, Forfeits	84,755,000	84,755,000
11K-0405 Fines, Forfeits	7,300,000	7,300,000
12T-0405 Fines, Forfeits	1,300,000	1,300,000
16A-0425 Filing/Legal Svcs	6,000,000	6,000,000
543-0299 Other Licenses Permi	16,500,000	16,500,000
543-0440 Indirect Cost Reimb	3,000,000	3,000,000
Total	118,855,000	118,855,000

Washington State Judicial Branch 2015-2017 BIENNIAL BUDGET REQUEST

Decision Package

Agency	Administrative Office of the Courts
Decision Package Title	JIS Software and Hardware Maintenance Costs
Budget Period	2015-2017 Biennial Budget
Budget Level	Maintenance Level

Agency Recommendation Summary Text

Funding is requested for ongoing costs of software and hardware maintenance for the Judicial Information System (JIS). Costs have increased substantially and the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) has not received full funding for software support.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
543-1 Judicial Information Systems Account	\$ 487,000	\$ 672,000	\$ 1,159,000
Staffing	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
FTEs (number of staff requested)	0	0	0

Package Description

Over the last two biennia, additional products have been added to the JIS software portfolio. These products must be supported through annual maintenance.

1. Computer Associates Clarity is a project management tool for JIS projects. New maintenance cost is \$61,000 per fiscal year.
2. DataStudio PureQuery is a high-performance data access platform that makes it easier to monitor, develop, optimize, secure, and manage data access to JIS data. New maintenance cost is \$11,000 per fiscal year.

3. Data Studio Developer provides a complete development and testing environment for building database objects, queries, database logic, and pureQuery applications. New maintenance cost is \$27,000 per fiscal year.
4. Rational Functional Tester Plus is a functional and regression testing solution bundle to test a variety of software applications including Java Web, .NET, and thick client technology-based applications. Total maintenance cost for Rational Suite is \$131,389 per fiscal year.

Hardware equipment purchased in prior years with multiple years of annual maintenance built into the purchase, now requires additional support.

A 5% to 15% increase per year in maintenance costs for both software and hardware maintenance is anticipated.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

This package contributes to the Judicial Branch Principle Policy Objective identified below.

Fair and Effective Administration of Justice in All Civil and Criminal Cases.

Washington courts will openly, fairly, efficiently and effectively administer justice in all criminal and civil cases, consistent with constitutional mandates and the judiciary's duty to maintain the highest level of public trust and confidence in the courts.

The mission of the Administrative Office of the Courts is to support the courts in the fair and effective administration of justice. This is done in part by providing centralized administration, fiscal services, and support for technology for Washington State courts and judicial branch agencies. Managing technology to ensure that information systems are current and data is both secure and available is a key component in the administration of justice.

Measure Detail

Impact on clients and service

The AOC cannot provide effective support for the judicial branch without modern infrastructure.

Impact on other state services

None

Relationship to Capital Budget

None

Required changes to existing Court Rule, Court Order, RCW, WAC, contract, or plan

None

Alternatives explored

Not Applicable

Distinction between one-time and ongoing costs and budget impacts in future biennia

The costs are ongoing as the demand for more software increases.

Effects of non-funding

Without maintenance, AOC will be required to remove some of the software currently used in the Judicial Branch.

Expenditure calculations and assumptions and FTE assumptions

Object Detail	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
Staff Costs	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Non-Staff Costs	\$ 487,000	\$ 672,000	\$ 1,159,000
Total Objects	\$ 487,000	\$ 672,000	\$ 1,159,000

Washington State Judicial Branch 2015-2017 BIENNIAL BUDGET REQUEST

Decision Package

Agency Administrative Office of the Courts

Decision Package Title Business Objects (BOXI) v4 Upgrade

Budget Period 2015-2017 Biennial Budget

Budget Level Maintenance Level

Agency Recommendation Summary Text

Funding is requested to ensure continued support for Business Objects, a valuable business intelligence tool. This query tool is used to access data in the Enterprise Data Warehouse, the central judicial data repository, for reporting purposes and for the fulfillment of data dissemination requests. This tool is used by courts as well as by the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC).

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
543-1 Judicial Information Systems	\$ 723,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 773,000
Staffing	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
FTEs (number of staff requested)	0	0	0

Package Description

Funding is requested to ensure continued support for Business Objects, a valuable query tool used to access data in the Enterprise Data Warehouse (the central judicial data repository). This tool is used by courts as well as by the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) for reporting purposes and to fulfill data dissemination requests.

In order to maintain and support the use of the court's query tool, implementation of an upgrade to Business Object version 4 is necessary. Support for the existing version 3.1 will end in December 2015.

This request covers both the increased software fee and the cost of a vendor to support installation of the upgrade with implementation and training.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

This package contributes to the Judicial Branch Principle Policy Objectives as identified below.

Fair and Effective Administration of Justice in All Civil and Criminal Cases.

Washington courts will openly, fairly, efficiently and effectively administer justice in all criminal and civil cases, consistent with constitutional mandates and the judiciary's duty to maintain the highest level of public trust and confidence in the courts.

All court levels need support for the technology which allows them to respond to decision makers quickly and effectively. Providing valuable tools that are state-of-the-art will maintain business continuity.

Accessibility. *Washington courts, court facilities and court systems will be open and accessible to all participants regardless of cultural, linguistic, ability-based or other characteristics that serve as access barriers.*

Business Objects, the business intelligence tool, makes more of the courts' data accessible for extraction, filtering, and reporting. Providing the ability for customers to view Judicial Information System (JIS) information through a user-friendly interface enhances the ability to evaluate, manage, and respond in a timely manner.

Commitment to Effective Court Management. *Washington courts will employ and maintain systems and practices that enhance effective court management.*

Properly functioning technology solutions allow courts to focus on implementing more efficient workflows, thereby reducing the time court users are in court or navigating the judicial system.

Appropriate Staffing and Support. *Washington courts will be appropriately staffed and effectively managed, and court personnel, court managers and court systems will be effectively supported.*

Implementing new and current versions of software eases the need for increasing resources for support of older versions. Managing technology solutions that are outdated and no longer follow industry drivers is not efficient. Keeping both the hardware and software infrastructure in a deprecated status in order to support the software introduces risk.

Measure Detail

Impact on clients and service

Improved features will be available for court customers to enhance their reporting capabilities and information delivery. Robust administrator-level functionality improves the security framework and audit traceability.

Impact on other state services

Judicial partners will benefit from more timely and accurate delivery of judicial information.

Relationship to Capital Budget

None

Required changes to existing Court Rule, Court Order, RCW, WAC, contract, or plan

None

Alternatives explored

No other alternatives were reviewed. The negative impact to customers to learn a new tool poses too great a risk.

Distinction between one-time and ongoing costs and budget impacts in future biennia

The license model for future Business Object platforms has been modified to a per seat basis by SAP. Once implemented, yearly maintenance will continue as an ongoing cost.

Effects of non-funding

The software will be unsupported and eventually will be difficult to administer with no resources available to troubleshoot in case of a critical stoppage. If courts are unable to effectively access their data for decision support, this could negatively impact court operations.

Expenditure calculations and assumptions and FTE assumptions

The costs for Business Objects Enterprise is \$414,000 with an additional \$45,000 required for Network/Server capacity and performance. \$264,000 is requested for implementation, consulting and training. Ongoing maintenance is \$50,000 per year for a total request of \$773,000.

Object Detail	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
Staff Costs	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Non-Staff Costs	\$ 723,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 773,000
Total Objects	\$ 723,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 773,000

Washington State Judicial Branch
2015-2017 BIENNIAL BUDGET REQUEST

Decision Package

Agency Administrative Office of the Courts

Decision Package Title Mason County Superior Court Judge

Budget Period 2015-2017 Biennial Budget

Budget Level Maintenance Level

Agency Recommendation Summary Text

Funding is requested for a new superior court judge in Mason County as approved by the legislature.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
001-1 General Fund State	\$ 118,000	\$ 118,000	\$ 236,000
Staffing	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
FTEs (number of staff requested)	1	1	1

Package Description

The Washington State Legislature recognized the need for an additional judge in the Mason County Superior Court and approved the position in the 2014 legislative session. However, funding was not provided at that time. This request is for funding for salaries and benefits to support the approved third superior court judge position for Mason County.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

This package contributes to the Judicial Branch Principle Policy Objective identified below.

Appropriate Staffing and Support. *Washington courts will be appropriately staffed and effectively managed, and court personnel, court managers and court systems will be effectively supported.*

The legislature has determined that an additional judge is needed in Mason County; therefore, funding is requested for the support of that position. The Administrative Office of the Courts pays 50% of the salary and 100% of the benefits for all superior court judges in the State of Washington.

Measure Detail

Impact on clients and service

None

Impact on other state services

None

Relationship to Capital Budget

None

Alternatives explored

Not Applicable

Distinction between one-time and ongoing costs and budget impacts in future biennia

The position is permanent and funding will be ongoing.

Effects of non-funding

The Administrative Office of the Courts would not have sufficient funding for the salary and benefits to support a third judge for Mason County Superior Court.

Expenditure calculations and assumptions and FTE assumptions

Object Detail	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
Staff Costs	\$ 118,000	\$ 118,000	\$ 236,000
Non-Staff Costs	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Total Objects	\$ 118,000	\$ 118,000	\$ 236,000

Washington State Judicial Branch 2015-2017 BIENNIAL BUDGET REQUEST

Decision Package

Agency Administrative Office of the Courts

Decision Package Title Technical Adjustment for Technology Savings

Budget Period 2015-2017 Biennial Budget

Budget Level Maintenance Level

Agency Recommendation Summary Text

Funding is requested to correct errors in the computations used to implement information technology savings.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
001-1 General Fund State	\$139,000	\$139,000	\$278,000
Staffing	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
FTEs (number of staff requested)			

Package Description

Funding is requested to correct errors in the computations used to implement information technology savings. The primary error was the assumption that the state general fund was the source of information technology (IT) expenditures. In fact, there were no state general fund IT expenditures. A secondary error that can be found throughout the computational documents appears to be an indiscriminate exclusion of reductions assigned to non-state general fund accounts. A number of non-state general fund accounts were randomly excluded from the reduction exercise including funds 081, 104 and 173 (sample of the non-state general fund accounts excluded). Further, 100% of the expenditures, regardless of fund source, for the Department of Transportation were excluded from the exercise. Also, it appears that AOC was penalized for following instructions regarding X and Y expenditure coding, many agencies chose not to code expenditures as instructed.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

Measure Detail

Impact on clients and service

Reductions to services provided to the trial courts such as delayed assistance with statewide court case management system questions and corrections.

Impact on other state services

None

Relationship to Capital Budget

None

Alternatives explored

Not Applicable

Distinction between one-time and ongoing costs and budget impacts in future biennia

Correction of the error will be ongoing.

Effects of non-funding

Service reductions will continue.

Expenditure calculations and assumptions and FTE assumptions

Object Detail	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
Staff Costs	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Non-Staff Costs	\$ 139,000	\$ 139,000	\$278,000
Total Objects	\$ 139,000	\$ 139,000	\$278,000

Washington State Judicial Branch 2015-2017 BIENNIAL BUDGET REQUEST

Decision Package

Agency Administrative Office of the Courts

Decision Package Title Trial Court Funding for Language Access
Criminal and Civil

Budget Period 2015-2017 Biennial Budget

Budget Level Policy Level

Agency Recommendation Summary Text

Funding is requested to extend a grant program to improve the quality and availability of interpreting services and to reduce interpreter costs at the local level. In addition, funding is requested to offset costs associated with on-demand telephonic interpretation to ensure that limited English proficiency is not a barrier to full participation in court services. The total increase reflects state resources to fund interpreter services in all criminal and civil cases at all levels of trial courts. This funding increase would achieve 100% funding over three biennia.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
001-1 General Fund State	\$ 1,146,000	\$ 3,924,000	\$ 5,070,000
Staffing	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
FTEs (number of staff requested)	.5	.5	.5

Package Description

Introduction

The administration of justice requires clear communication in the courtroom. Using properly credentialed interpreters is imperative in cases involving people who have hearing loss and need sign language interpreters or those who have limited English proficiency as a result of national origin.

State and federal laws require Washington courts to provide meaningful access to court

proceedings and court services for persons who have functional hearing loss or have limited English proficiency. Failure to provide clear, concise interpretation services denies these individuals that opportunity, leading to mistrust, confusion, administrative inefficiencies, additional costs caused by court hearing delays and continuances, and potentially incorrect judicial orders and verdicts.

According to the U.S. Census the number of foreign-born, limited English proficient (LEP) persons age 5 and older in Washington increased by 50.1% between 2000 and 2010 from 279,497 to 419,576. In addition to that population, the number of persons with hearing loss needing court interpreting services has grown, as evidenced by the increasing expense local jurisdictions have faced for sign language interpreting costs. This growth of demand within Washington has directly impacted local courts resources, and their ability to fund state and federal requirements to provide interpretation services.

Legal Obligations

RCW Chapters 2.42 and 2.43 prescribe the requirements for providing court interpreter services in Washington. RCW 2.42.120 requires courts to pay sign language interpreter costs for all court proceedings for parties, witnesses and parents of juveniles, court-ordered programs or activities, and communication with court-appointed counsel.

RCW 2.43.030 compels courts to "... use the services of only those language interpreters who have been certified by the Administrative Office of the Courts..." when appointing interpreters to assist LEP litigants and witnesses during legal proceedings. RCW 2.43.040 instructs courts to pay all interpreting costs in criminal cases, mental health commitment proceedings, and all other legal proceedings initiated by government agencies. It further requires courts to pay all interpreting costs in civil matters for LEP persons who are indigent.

Courts that are direct or indirect recipients of federal funding are obligated to meet higher standards of ensuring language access to the LEP public. These courts are required to take reasonable steps to meet standards established by Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, which taken together, have more expansive access requirements for ensuring language access. Under the DOJ standards for compliance with those statutes, state courts receiving federal financial assistance cannot allocate or otherwise charge the costs of interpreter services to the parties involved in the court proceeding, including civil cases, or make any type of indigent determinations that assess the ability of a party to contribute to the costs. Furthermore, to be consistent with DOJ language access requirements, courts must provide meaningful access to all court programs and activities, including court functions provided outside of the courtroom.

Meaningful access to all court programs and activities, both inside and outside the courtroom, is also required by the U.S. Department of Justice for indirect and direct recipients of federal funding. Non-compliance with federal standards may result in the withdrawal of federal funding. As stated by Thomas E. Perez, Assistant Attorney General, in an August 26, 2010 letter addressed to all chief justices and state court administrators:

"Some states provide language assistance only for courtroom proceedings, but the meaningful access requirement extends to court functions that are conducted outside the courtroom as well... Access to these points of public contact is essential to the fair administration of justice, especially for unrepresented LEP persons. DOJ expects courts to provide meaningful access

for LEP persons to such court operated or managed points of public contact in the judicial process, whether the contact at issue occurs inside or outside the courtroom."

Currently, courts regularly provide interpreting during legal proceedings, and in some instances the interpreters are available to interpret for litigants outside of the courtroom when interacting with staff. In rare situations, courts may have bilingual staff able to provide direct services in a language other than English. In most situations, however, customers call or come to court on an unscheduled basis, and the court has no advance warning when interpreting is needed for LEP persons. In these cases, courts frequently ask the LEP persons to return with friends or family members to act as interpreters. Since these family members are untrained and untested, it is questionable how accurately they understand and interpret the information, and whether their personal biases infuse the communication. Similarly, given the sensitive nature of why many people access the courts, persons (e.g. domestic violence victims) may face scrutiny or shame in asking acquaintances to serve as their interpreters.

The inability of many local courts to fully fund interpreter services creates a non-compliance atmosphere across the state that may result in the withdrawal of federal funds by the U.S. Department of Justice.

History of State Funding

The 2007 Legislature recognized the increased financial demand faced by local courts to ensure language access for Deaf and LEP communities, and allocated \$1.9 million to the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) for purposes of passing that funding to local courts to support language access costs and onetime funding for the development of limited English proficiency plans. This money was designed to be used in assisting courts develop and implement Language Access Plans, as well as offset 50% of interpreter expenses for qualifying courts. The AOC developed an effective program to improve the quality of interpreting, reduce costs at the local level, and improve compliance with state and federal requirements.

After nearly seven years of implementation, state funds transformed court interpreter services for those counties. Because reimbursement eligibility requires hiring credentialed court interpreters and paying them fair market rates, the Washington courts and communities have received higher quality interpreting services. Participating courts submit data on their interpreter usage to the AOC, which helps identify language needs, actual costs, and geographic trends. The 50% cost-sharing requirement has encouraged participating courts to implement cost-saving and quality-ensuring practices such as web-based scheduling, multi-court payment policies, grouping of interpreter cases, and sharing of staff interpreters.

Funding Levels

In 2007 the Washington Judiciary asked the Legislature to provide 50% reimbursement for the cost of court interpreters statewide. In response the Legislature appropriated \$1.9 million biannually in pass-through money to the courts. This money was designed to be used in assisting courts develop and implement Language Access Plans (LAPs) as a condition of receiving funding, as well as offset 50% of interpreter expenses for those courts with LAPs. Due to the extraordinary fiscal environment in 2009 and 2011, the onetime LAP funding was eliminated, and the reimbursement funds dropped to \$1,221,004 biannually. This represented a decrease of 21% in reimbursement funding for participating local trial courts that met the reimbursement requirements. The funding is only sufficient for fifty-two superior, district and municipal courts representing ten counties. While the program has continued in light of those

cuts, the funding only lasts approximately seven months per fiscal year. Funding is clearly insufficient to expand into additional trial courts necessary to maintain compliance with federal statutes and regulations as well as meet current local funding requirements under the current allocation scheme.

Funding for telephonic interpreting services has never been provided to courts. This request is to obtain state funding to offset 50% of the local cost for contracted telephonic interpreting services for non-courtroom interactions. The State of Washington administers contracts with national telephonic interpreting companies, and all trial courts are eligible to obtain services at these rates. Participant courts will enter into contracts with the Administrative Office of the Courts for reimbursement of telephonic interpreting costs for court interactions outside of courtroom proceedings. Courts will submit appropriate invoices to the AOC Court Interpreter Program detailing their telephonic interpreting usage, and qualifying expenses will be reimbursed at 50%. Data will be submitted electronically, so that the AOC can track statewide trends for telephonic interpreting based on court location and language.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

This package contribute to the Judicial Branch Principle Policy Objectives identified below.

Fair and Effective Administration of Justice in All Civil and Criminal Cases.

Washington courts will openly, fairly, efficiently and effectively administer justice in all criminal and civil cases, consistent with constitutional mandates and the judiciary's duty to maintain the highest level of public trust and confidence in the courts.

Judicial officers cannot effectively preside over proceedings involving Deaf or limited English proficient (LEP) parties, witnesses or participants without being able to accurately communicate with them. Public trust and confidence in the courts begins, at a minimum, with the public being able to effectively access and participate in the judicial process. Such participation is not possible for individuals with hearing loss that need sign language interpretation and for LEP individuals without quality interpretation services. Full access to court services and effective management of court cases require communication between litigants and court staff outside of the courtroom.

Accessibility. *Washington courts, court facilities and court systems will be open and accessible to all participants regardless of cultural, linguistic, ability-based or other characteristics that serve as access barriers.*

Court proceedings and court services are not accessible to Deaf persons or LEP persons who are not provided with meaningful access using interpreting services. In addition, those individuals who interact with court staff for civil and criminal matters, such as child support matters, domestic violence protection forms and services, making payment plans for victim restitution or court fines, and/or housing evictions, are often unable to fully understand what is required due to inability of many courts to afford using quality interpreting services at those court services access points.

Commitment to Effective Court Management. *Washington courts will employ and maintain systems and practices that enhance effective court management.*

Efficient and effective court interpreter management requires implementation of practices and policies which save money, yet ensure high quality language access. Courts involved with the state reimbursement program have taken substantial steps to modify their interpreter scheduling and payment practices to achieve better economies of scale, sharing of resources, and collaborating with neighboring courts.

On-demand telephonic interpreting services will assist court staff in more effectively serving the LEP public, and processing their cases. Interpretation from objective language experts will avoid confusion or misunderstandings, and ensure that parties are informed of their rights and responsibilities.

Measure Detail

Impact on clients and service

With the availability of State funding, nearly all local and county courts will be able to provide court interpreting services and will more easily be able to afford the higher costs associated with credentialed court interpreters, especially if the market cost for those services are extraordinary due to language resource scarcity or location.

Access to higher quality interpreters will improve the accuracy of communication in the courtroom and for other court services. It would also create a more seamless integration of access to court functions and court services outside the courtroom for those with language barriers.

Impact on other state services

None

Relationship to Capital Budget

None

Required changes to existing Court Rule, Court Order, RCW, WAC, contract, or plan

Changes are required to RCW 2.43.040 (2), (3) and (5).

Alternatives explored

There are no local funding alternatives that would not require state support to be in compliance with state judicial policy objectives and federal statutory requirements as regards language access obligations. With limited budgets, local courts must prioritize for which hearing types they will provide interpreters at court expense. Therefore, some courts continue to charge litigants for interpreter expenses in non-indigent civil matters as is allowed by RCW 2.43 language, which jeopardizes the state's federal funding compliance for court programs.

Distinction between one-time and ongoing costs and budget impacts in future biennia

Court interpreter funding will be an ongoing cost, fluctuating based on immigration trends in the Washington population.

Effects of non-funding

Prior to program implementation, courts paid lower hourly rates for interpreting services. As a result of this program participant courts are paying higher hourly interpreter rates for credentialed interpreters in order to receive higher quality services. While those courts are spending less local money because of the State's contribution, the rates paid by those courts have greatly impacted courts not participating in the program because interpreters now expect all trial courts to pay the same higher rates. Courts not in receipt of state funding are forced to either pay the higher hourly rates in order to ensure interpreting services, or risk losing interpreters to the program participant courts who pay higher amounts. Most Washington trial courts have increased their interpreter fees without increased revenues, thereby reducing funds for other court services. As previously noted, the current funding level only lasts for a portion of the fiscal period for the majority of participating courts. When the funding is used up, those courts often resort to using non-credentialed interpreters that charge less, which defeats the judicial policy purpose of ensuring meaningful access through the use of quality services based on a quality threshold.

Courts will continue to provide interpreting services when possible, but prioritization of resources will remain focused on courtroom proceedings. The absence of structure for ensuring interpretation in non-courtroom services will run afoul of both state and federal requirements. Additionally, US DOJ and King County Superior Court have mutually agreed on ways to satisfy federal expectations to provide interpreters for non-indigent civil litigants and is likely that the agreement will serve as a baseline for compliance for other Washington courts in any future DOJ action. Full state funding will address the US DOJ mandate.

Expenditure calculations and assumptions and FTE assumptions

Interpreter Cost Data:

While the AOC has court interpreter data from a variety of courts, it does not have full data on actual court interpreter expenditures for all Superior, District and Municipal trial courts. To estimate costs, it is necessary to categorize court jurisdictions as urban county, rural county and rural county with a city, because typically courts must pay higher costs for interpreter services when interpreters do not live nearby. Most credentialed (certified or registered) court interpreters live in cities.

To calculate a measure of projected expenditures, the estimate includes a ratio of proceedings covered by current statute to those civil proceedings that would be added. According to 2011 case load data, approximately one-third more superior court proceedings would be added due to the removal of the indigency criteria. By applying that ratio to the total reported spending from case load data on criminal interpretation (\$4,905,417), it is possible to derive an estimate for spending on civil proceedings and to come up with a statewide estimate total for interpreter services ($\$4,905,417 \times 133\% = \$6,524,276$).

The state expenditure cost for one-half of the criminal and civil interpreter costs is \$3,262,138 per year.

As the survey figures represent 2010 cost and 2011 case load data, the most conservative approach to estimating the biennial expenditure for FY 2015-17 is to use the annual figure using superior court-based case load data. This amounts to at least \$6.524 million per biennium. The figure can be further refined in order to be more accurate due to the increase in interpreter rates and caseloads across the state since the 2011 survey.

Telephonic Interpreting cost data:

The average per minute cost with these companies is \$.90, and may vary based on the language. In the majority of requested languages, the companies will connect the requester with an interpreter upon demand.

Currently there are approximately 15,200 cases in Washington courts which have an interpreter assigned to them. It is estimated that each litigant for each case will have an average of nine encounters at non-courtroom related operations, such as calling the court with questions, setting up payment plans, completing forms or other paperwork, meeting with facilitators, etc. These conversations typically last 5 minutes, but when are interpreted, take at least twice the amount of time. The anticipated full annual cost for telephonic interpreting is \$1,231,200:

15,200 cases x 9 encounters x 10 minutes x \$.90/minute = \$1,231,200.

Managing the court interpreter reimbursement program at current levels requires a significant amount of staff time. Funding for an additional .5 FTE is requested as a Range 62 (annual salary and benefits \$46,529) to serve as a project manager to coordinate funding distribution and oversee deliverables. The project manager will develop and monitor contracts, evaluate and verify data that is reported, audit participating courts to ensure accuracy in reported numbers, and provide technical support to participating courts. Expansion of the state grants to local court jurisdictions requires additional staff. The expectation is that it will take a few months to fully implement the programs, therefore, full funding will not be reached until fiscal year 2017.

The Washington State Interpreter Commission will determine the funding allocation between telephonic interpreting and cost reimbursement for civil proceedings

Object Detail	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
Staff Costs	\$ 46,000	\$ 46,000	\$ 92,000
Non-Staff Costs	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 3,878,000	\$ 4,978,000
Total Objects	\$ 1,146,000	\$ 3,924,000	\$ 5,070,000

Washington State Judicial Branch 2015-2017 BIENNIAL BUDGET REQUEST

Decision Package

Agency Administrative Office of the Courts

Decision Package Title Employee Salary Adjustment

Budget Period 2015-2017 Biennial Budget

Budget Level Policy Level

Agency Recommendation Summary Text

Funding is requested to bring selected salaries to an appropriate level as determined by a salary survey.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
01-1 General Fund State 543-1 Judicial Information Systems Account	\$ TBD	\$ TBD	\$ TBD
Staffing	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
FTEs (number of staff requested)	0	0	0

Package Description

Budget reductions sustained by the Administrative Office of the Courts have made staff salary increases impossible over the past several years.

A compensation survey will be carried out to contrast judicial branch staff salaries with salaries of comparable public and private sector positions. Funding is requested to bring selected salaries to an appropriate level as determined by the survey.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

This package contributes to the Judicial Branch Principle Policy Objectives as identified below.

Appropriate Staffing and Support. *Washington courts will be appropriately staffed and effectively managed, and court personnel, court managers and court systems will be effectively supported.*

The Administrative Office of the Courts is staffed by a skilled workforce. Many of the employees are now paid at a rate below salaries paid in equivalent positions elsewhere. The Administrative Office of the Courts requests funding to bring selected salaries to an appropriate level, supporting valued staff and improving the ability of the AOC to recruit and retain skilled employees.

Measure Detail

Impact on clients and service

None

Impact on other state services

None

Relationship to Capital Budget

None

Required changes to existing Court Rule, Court Order, RCW, WAC, contract, or plan

None

Alternatives explored

None

Distinction between one-time and ongoing costs and budget impacts in future biennia

These costs are ongoing in nature.

Effects of non-funding

Further delaying salary increases will make recruitment and retention of qualified staff more difficult.

Expenditure calculations and assumptions and FTE assumptions

Object Detail	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
Staff Costs	\$ TBD	\$ TBD	\$ TBD
Non-Staff Costs	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Total Objects	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0

Washington State Judicial Branch 2015-2017 BIENNIAL BUDGET REQUEST

Decision Package

Agency Administrative Office of the Courts

Decision Package Title Family and Juvenile Court Improvement Plan Expansion

Budget Period 2015-2017 Biennial Budget

Budget Level Policy Level

Agency Recommendation Summary Text

Funding is requested for expansion of the Family and Juvenile Court Improvement Program (FJCIP). This program, developed as a strategic approach to improving court operations consistent with Unified Family Court principles, is supported by a legislator who has requested an expansion plan for the FJCIP. The budget package includes funds to expand FJCIP into additional superior courts to promote best practices in family and juvenile court operations as requested by the legislator.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
001-1 General Fund State	\$ 146,000	\$ 282,000	\$ 428,000
Staffing	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
FTEs (number of staff requested)	0	0	0

Package Description

The Family and Juvenile Court Improvement Plan, RCW 2.56.030, coordinates courts' efforts on Superior/Family and Juvenile cases, to strategically implement principles of Unified Family Court (UFC) which were adopted as best practices by the Board for Judicial Administration in 2005. FJCIP funding and framework for superior courts exist in thirteen counties to implement enhancements to their family and juvenile court operations that are consistent with UFC principles, including longer judicial rotations. The FJCIP allows flexible implementation centered on core elements including stable leadership, education, and case management support. The statewide plan promotes a system of local improvements, but is limited to courts who were selected for FJCIP funding. The demonstrated successes in FJCIP courts is a result of appointing judicial leaders to create actionable plans to enhance court operations. The coordinators work

closely with the assigned chief judge to implement local court improvements associated with UFC best practices.

FJCIP is a product of a partnership between the judicial and legislative branches of government. The courts developed FJCIP as a strategic approach to improving court operations consistent with the legislature who provided funding. The budget package includes funds to expand FJCIP into additional superior courts to promote best practices in family and juvenile court operations as requested by the legislature.

FJCIP courts have initiated and sustained court operational improvements as a result of FJCIP which have demonstrated favorable outcomes. The program sustained a reduction in funding (19.3% or \$309,000 in 2009). As a result, funding for ancillary support such as education was eliminated, and all funding was dedicated to maintaining adequate staffing levels for FJCIP courts. That funding prioritization worked, and the programs continued to operate without significant interruption.

The legislature has requested an FJCIP expansion strategy to encourage local improvement consistent with UFC principles in additional jurisdictions. The existing pilots have demonstrated positive outcomes associated with cases managed by FJCIP (see attached report from Dependency Time Standard Report). FJCIP provides funding for system improvement in selected courts because state FJCIP funding pays for staff to coordinate and implement the identified improvement projects. FJCIP is not a program where best practices or strategies can be adopted in courts that do not have coordinator support. Therefore, expansion of FJCIP relies on additional state resources.

The conservative expansion plan is to fund up to four FTEs in the 2015-2017 budget. The division of the FTEs can either be assigned to between four courts and eight courts depending on if the workload justifies a full FTE or .5 FTE. The AOC team has used research, in particular the Annual Dependency Time Standard Report, to identify counties that have lower compliance with mandatory dependency deadlines, to prioritize funding for county expansion of FJCIP.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

Measure Detail

Impact on clients and service

None

Impact on other state services

None

Relationship to Capital Budget

None

Required changes to existing Court Rule, Court Order, RCW, WAC, contract, or plan

Additional FJCIP contracts will need to be executed to accommodate the additional courts selected to receive state funding.

Alternatives explored

Not applicable

Distinction between one-time and ongoing costs and budget impacts in future biennia

Costs will be ongoing.

Effects of non-funding

If this budget package is not funded, and assuming the program does not receive reductions, the thirteen FJCIP courts will continue to sustain improvements to court processes in the capacity they do now. There are basic court management or coordination efforts that can impact the quality of case processing that are consistent with UFC principles. These modifications have happened to a large extent by using court leadership and innovation that does not require additional funding. These enhancements will be maintained at their current level as long as salaries are adequate to keep staff with experience and expertise.

FJCIP provides a framework for the chief judge to exercise court leadership and direct modifications to court operations to improve services and support to the court, staff, and the public.

If existing FJCIP courts are under-funded and expansion of FJCIP is not realized, the result will be a continued political effort to propose legislation or to modify the constitution that would adjust the structure of superior court, or courts of general jurisdiction. Efforts are currently underway to make family and juvenile court a specific court type, administered and funded separate from superior court operations. This alternative has significant policy and funding implications for the state and local governments. The justification for this type of radical change is to improve case processing of family and juvenile cases, consistent with Unified Family Court principles which are also the foundation of FJCIP court plans. A better investment strategy for the state to accomplish improvement goals to family and juvenile court operations is to expand FJCIP funding rather than create a completely independent and more costly separation of case types that would require an entirely separate administration.

Effects of not funding FJCIP expansion is a more expensive alternative.

Expenditure calculations and assumptions and FTE assumptions

The funding requested will expand FJCIP by three coordinators, which adds between three and eight courts in 2015-2017. The AOC determines the appropriate level of case coordinator the court is eligible for (half or full) depending on the number of judges and case filings.

The amount requested is based on an equivalent state salary and benefit package for a range 62 (monthly top step in range \$93,059).

Object Detail	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
Staff Costs	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Non-Staff Costs	\$ 146,000	\$ 282,000	\$ 428,000
Total Objects	\$ 146,000	\$ 282,000	\$ 428,000

Washington State Judicial Branch 2015-2017 BIENNIAL BUDGET REQUEST

Decision Package

Agency Administrative Office of the Courts

Decision Package Title Juvenile Court and Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) Staff

Budget Period 2015-2017 Biennial Budget

Budget Level Policy Level

Agency Recommendation Summary Text

Funding is requested for intervention programs and detention alternative initiative services to maximize juvenile court services and operations. Probation and detention programs require policy level coordination and quality assurance. The requested positions are 1 FTE for a data analyst and quality assurance specialist and 1 FTE for JDAI statewide coordinator.

The request is made on behalf of the Washington Association of Juvenile Court Administrators, the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative Statewide Steering Committee, and the Washington State Center for Court Research.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
001-1 General Fund State	\$ 110,000	\$ 192,000	\$ 302,000
Staffing	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
FTEs (number of staff requested)	2	2	2

Package Description

NEED

Data and Research Specialist (1 FTE)
 Since 2000, Washington State juvenile courts have entered data on risk and needs of juvenile offenders into an assessment database. All youth who receive intervention services through juvenile court undergo a risk and needs assessment (Washington State Juvenile Court Risk Assessment). The Risk Assessment software collects and populates the database through an

external vendor. The entire assessment process to manage juvenile offenders includes static risk assessment, dynamic needs assessment, case management strategies, case plans, assignment to evidence based interventions, and measurement of recidivism and other outcomes. While a sophisticated data collection process exists for probation, similar data collections systems and infrastructure for detention centers does not exist.

The Washington State Center for Court Research lacks sustainability to support the juvenile courts to extract relevant data and conduct analysis to influence public policy, funding, and court oversight of programs, the assessment, and staff. Detailed juvenile court probation program data generated in Washington is nationally recognized but absent adequate research support, the data sources continue to grow without a proportional growth in the courts' ability to make informed choices about reforms aimed at targeting services to court involved youth and their families. Systematic data related to detention and alternative programs does not exist. The lack of assigned research and data analysis to support juvenile court probation and detention services limits effectiveness.

The legislature requires annual reporting of data by each juvenile court for probation services (CJAA report/Block Grant Report as defined in RCW 13.40). Absent support from the Washington State Center for Court Research, detailed outcome reporting is not available. The AOC also has a statutory obligation, as defined in RCW 2.56.030, to collect and compile statistical data and make reports of court business.

Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) (1 FTE)

JDAI reflects a series of statewide reform principles that guide use of secure juvenile detention which include detention risk assessment and alternatives to juvenile detention. The mission of JDAI is to eliminate inappropriate or unnecessary use of secure confinement for juveniles and redirect resources to fund alternatives to secure confinement without risking safety of families or the public. The objective of the statewide steering committee is to promote implementation of eight JDAI principles to improve detention screening, usage, alternatives to detention, and measure impacts on youth of minority populations. Washington juvenile courts do not have a standard data collection system for detention. The ten individual courts that are identified as "JDAI pilots" have created internal systems to screen offenders and collect detention data.

These pilot courts are supported by the statewide coordinator. The interest in JDAI is growing, but as the coordinator position is currently designed, JDAI is unable to expand. Because of this limitation, courts who are not identified as JDAI courts do not have screening tools or detention data. There is no statewide effort to collectively show detention use and alternatives in juvenile court. Aside from advocating for data system upgrades, policy level analysis that promote implementation of JDAI principles would be the responsibility of the JDAI coordinator and research staff team.

SOLUTION

Statewide support and promotion of probation and detention reform efforts require dedicated staff attention with an equal focus on data and policy. Lesser levels of program support will result in no advancement of best practices for detention reform and an actual decrease in probation research support (time limited funding source). Absent dedicated research and policy staff for probation and detention, the performance of juvenile court operations will continue to be undocumented and disjointed.

COMPARISON

Data and Research (1 FTE)

The Research Associate will maintain critical evaluation and reporting requirements mandated but not funded by the Legislature related to juvenile offender management systems (detention, assessment, and services). Currently, a .5 research associate is being funded from resources from the Washington State Association of Juvenile Court Administrators (WAJCA) and the Executive Branch (JRA). This is a temporary accommodation to meet the statutory demands of the legislature. Funding the position via this agreement is absolutely not sustainable. Funding for this position is coming from funds that otherwise support direct evidenced-based services to system youth. Development of detention data on a statewide basis has not been done to date. Investment in data development and reporting will inform budgeting, create alternatives to secure detention, and reinvest in programs.

JDAI (1 FTE)

Advancing JDAI as a statewide initiative benefits all courts who use detention. If funded, the research and policy analyst would be responsible to promote best practices within the courts and developing strategies and systems to easier manage data that can be used to evaluate detention practices.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

This package contributes to the Judicial Branch Principle Policy Objectives as identified below.

Fair and Effective Administration of Justice in All Civil and Criminal Cases.

Washington courts will openly, fairly, efficiently and effectively administer justice in all criminal and civil cases, consistent with constitutional mandates and the judiciary's duty to maintain the highest level of public trust and confidence in the courts.

Juvenile probation and detention service, based on proven best practices, improves fair and efficient administration of justice. The most important element of probation services and detention (based on JDAI principles) is for youth in the juvenile justice system to be placed in programs and assigned to levels of confinement consistent with their risk level. These goals can only be accomplished with policy support and outcome measures. Courts do not want probation or detention systems to assign youth to programs if they pose a risk to the youth.

Accessibility. *Washington courts, court facilities and court systems will be open and accessible to all participants regardless of cultural, linguistic, ability-based or other characteristics that serve as access barriers.*

Probation programs and secure detention are used regularly, based on objective and subjective determination of risk. Probation assessment assigns youth to evidence based programs and JDAI strategies include assessment that objectively informs the court on the need for secure confinement. These assessments greatly influence the path of intervention for youth and need uniform application across juvenile courts. Assessment tools objectively evaluate the youth and provide additional detail for decision makers. While the Washington Risk Assessment unifies the standard for probation services, use of some or all JDAI principles and strategies will standardize detention screening practices across all juvenile courts.

Commitment to Effective Court Management. *Washington courts will employ and maintain systems and practices that enhance effective court management.*

The wellbeing of youth in the juvenile justice system can be defined by various practices for probation and detention managed by Washington's juvenile courts.

Data and Research Specialist

Correct application of risk assessment tools enhance effective court management by directing resources to populations that are most in need of supervision, services, and alternatives to formal confinement.

JDAI

Confinement will be necessary to provide protection to victims, youth, families, and the public in general. However, the juvenile justice system has developed and validated tools to inform courts on appropriate application of confinement, a system that has been heavily relied upon. Formal confinement is the most expensive option available to a court. Stakeholders from counties and state are equally interested in attending to the wellbeing of youth in our system while at the same time have proven strategies to provide alternatives to secure confinement. If implemented, detention reform consistent with JDAI will promote strategies to improve court management of juvenile offenders.

Appropriate Staffing and Support. *Washington courts will be appropriately staffed and effectively managed, and court personnel, court managers and court systems will be effectively supported.*

Local court operations will be better managed if probation and detention system enhancements are staffed and supported at the statewide level. The requested positions are critical if improvements, consistent with probation quality assurance and JDAI principles, are to be applied statewide. Currently there is no complete picture of juvenile detention usage across the State. The mandates of the current JDAI sites is burdensome and not reasonable for some courts to adopt. Once the policy and research analyst position is funded, critical infrastructure to support JDAI can be built, data systems altered, assessment tools consolidated. Once these accomplishments are done, all courts in Washington State can make adjustments to align their practices with JDAI principles without falling prey to the roadblocks that currently exist.

Measure Detail

Impact on clients and service

Trial courts serve the public, and juvenile court services include probation and detention programs. The youth and families are directed to juvenile court because of law violating behavior. Various interventions and restrictions are applied to youth in an attempt to reduce anti-social behavior and promote pro-social behavior. The outcome of these various strategies and programs is measured, data analyzed, and then used to sustain programs and interventions that show an impact at stopping re-offending behavior. The requested positions are critical to continual measurement of effectiveness and continual improvement, which is the hallmark of the juvenile court continuum of intervention.

The JDAI statewide steering committee promotes principles and strategies in courts that are not currently identified as JDAI sites, while creating mechanisms to ease the process so all courts make efforts to adopt JDAI strategies. The JDAI principles outline detention practices that courts support, but workload associated with adopting JDAI practices has caused reforms to be unattainable to many courts. The steering committee will rely on the research and policy analyst position to address these potential barriers on behalf of juvenile courts.

Clients of JDAI also include juvenile courts, administrators and detention managers. The work of the steering committee will impact the interest that juvenile courts, the detention centers, and the county executive branch have to implement detention enhancements consistent with JDAI.

Lastly, direct clients of JDAI are the youth and children served across the state by juvenile court services. The wellbeing of youth in the juvenile justice system are directly impacted by judicial

decisions made about confinement. The more alternatives that are created and sanctioned as part of JDAI, the more appropriate orders can be made while minimizing disruption to a family or school, which might in fact be protective factors for a youth.

Impact on other state services

N/A

Relationship to Capital Budget

N/A

Required changes to existing Court Rule, Court Order ,RCW, WAC, contract, or plan

N/A

Alternatives explored

The current agreement to fund .5 FTE for probation research specialist is temporary and not sustainable. Funding for the position otherwise would be spent to provide services to youth and families.

The JDAI statewide steering committee was populated and organized in mid-2013. Prior to this request for 2.0 FTE, there had not been an organized effort to collect and analyze statewide data for the purposes of detention reform.

Distinction between one-time and ongoing costs and budget impacts in future biennia

The funding request is for 2 FTE that will have ongoing responsibilities to the AOC, statewide steering committee, and local courts. The need for staff funding is ongoing.

Effects of non-funding

If the positions are not filled, the juvenile court systems of probation and detention will have reduced effectiveness. To date, the probation system has yielded local and state savings. The JDAI principles are spreading throughout the state, but lack cohesion and data collection. The ability to promote best practices for probation and detention requires data, quality assurance, and outcome measurement. Juvenile courts' ability to provide targeted and effective interventions requires these positions. If they are not funded, juvenile courts risk not complying with data and reporting standards mandated by the state. Furthermore, JDAI courts will continue to operate in isolation, additional courts will not meet JDAI standards, and recruitment for a new statewide coordinator will not be fully funded. There will be no centralized data collection process or statewide understanding of detention needs. Under the current structure, some courts have advanced their practices but those improvements will not be duplicated across other juvenile courts if dedicated research and policy staff resources are not assigned.

Expenditure calculations and assumptions and FTE assumptions

The estimated cost of 1 FTE coordinator and policy analyst and 1 FTE at Center for Court Research is included as an estimate. The coordinator/policy analyst FTE is calculated as the equivalent of a range 62 employee at AOC (\$93,059 salary and benefits at the top step annually).

The estimate for the research specialist FTE is calculated as a range 65 (\$98,550 salary and benefits annually). It is assumed they will not be hired until midway in FY 2016.

The responsibilities of these positions are equal parts research and policy analysis. There are also front end responsibilities to work with the current AOC data applications to modify or use in order to implement a reliable system of detention data collection. Once the current system is altered to allow data entry, the research analyst will be able to communicate with local courts and other stakeholders (steering committee and legislature) about statewide impact of detention usage.

Object Detail	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
Staff Costs	\$ 110,000	\$ 192,000	\$ 302,000
Non-Staff Costs	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Total Objects	\$ 110,000	\$ 192,000	\$ 302,000

Washington State Judicial Branch 2015-2017 BIENNIAL BUDGET REQUEST

Decision Package

Agency Administrative Office of the Courts

Decision Package Title Superior Court Case Management System

Budget Period 2015-2017 Biennial Budget

Budget Level Policy Level

Agency Recommendation Summary Text

Funding is requested to continue implementation of the new commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) case management system for the superior courts. This funding will be used to complete Phase 2 (Solution Design & Development), Phase 3 (Pilot Court Deployment), Phase 4 (Early Adopter Deployment), and to begin Phase 5 (Statewide Rollout) of the project.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
543-1 Judicial Information Systems Account	\$ 6,080,000	\$ 6,518,000	\$ 12,598,000
Staffing	FY 2014	FY 2015	Total
FTEs (number of staff requested)	24	25	24.5

Package Description

This request is supported by the Judicial Information System Committee (JISC), Superior Court Judges Association (SCJA), Association of Washington Superior Court Administrators (AWSCA), Washington State Association of County Clerks (WSACC), and the Administrative Office of the Courts.

Under the direction of the JISC, the Superior Court Case Management System (SC-CMS) project has procured a COTS solution and is currently implementing the selected solution to support the business functions of state superior courts and county clerks in 37 of the 39 superior courts in the state. This request is a continuation of decision packages approved in 2011-2013 and 2013-2015.

Specifically, the SC-CMS will support calendaring and caseflow management functions, along with tracking of participant/party information, case records and relevant disposition services functions in support of judicial decision-making, scheduling, and case management.

Current Project Status

The contract with selected vendor, Tyler Technologies, Inc., was executed on July 25, 2013, with official project kick off on September 12, 2013. SC-CMS is working with staff from the superior courts, the county clerks' offices, Tyler, and AOC toward Pilot Go-Live, with Thurston and Lewis counties scheduled as the first to participate in the spring of 2015.

Proposed Solution

Development work continues to integrate INH (Information Networking Hub) and COTS Preparation projects with legacy systems. Business Process review continues with the pilot courts and county clerks' offices to ensure greater understanding of process impacts.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

This package contributes to the Judicial Branch Principle Policy Objectives as identified below.

Fair and Effective Administration of Justice in All Civil and Criminal Cases.

Washington courts will openly, fairly, efficiently and effectively administer justice in all criminal and civil cases, consistent with constitutional mandates and the judiciary's duty to maintain the highest level of public trust and confidence in the courts.

Managing technology to ensure that systems used by Washington State courts are current and the data is secure and available is key to maintaining the highest level of public trust and confidence in the courts. It has been observed by the Chief Justice that, "essentially, the Judicial Information System (JIS) equals justice".

Accessibility. *Washington courts, court facilities and court systems will be open and accessible to all participants regardless of cultural, linguistic, ability-based or other characteristics that serve as access barriers.*

With more than one court filing for every three citizens in Washington, vast numbers of people are served by our courts. The SC-CMS project will assist in making Washington court data available to all, whether to a judge during a trial or to the public by removing the need to travel physically to a court location for information. SC-CMS in particular will increase access to court information, reduce delays, and enhance efficiency in the courts.

Commitment to Effective Court Management. *Washington courts will employ and maintain systems and practices that enhance effective court management.*

The Administrative Office of the Courts has built, as part of the SC-CMS project, a new Court Business Office (CBO) which will conduct a significant review of court operations. In addition to providing services to courts implementing the new system, the CBO identifies ways in which all courts may benefit from shared processes and information.

Measure Detail

Impact on clients and services

In addition to serving as the statewide court case management system, the existing Judicial Information System (JIS) provides essential information to several state agencies, local law

enforcement agencies, prosecutors, criminal justice partners, and the public. The JIS is also responsible for accurately tracking, recording and distributing over \$240 million per year in state and local revenues (excluding restitution and other "trust" monies).

Implementation of a new Superior Court calendaring and case management system will provide:

- Enhanced data sharing capabilities.
- Cost avoidance through the elimination of redundant data entry.
- Error reduction through training, standardization of business practices, and value-limited data entry fields.
- Flexibility to meet new and emerging business needs
- Improved tracking and analysis capabilities.

Impact on other state services

Other state programs will benefit through AOC's enhanced efficiency and effectiveness. The AOC and courts exchange information and provide essential information to the Washington State Patrol, Department of Corrections, Office of the Secretary of State, Sentencing Guidelines Commission, Department of Licensing, local law enforcement agencies, Federal government, prosecutors and defense attorneys.

Relationship to Capital Budget

None

Required changes to existing Court Rule, Court Order, RCW, WAC, contract, or plan

None

Alternatives explored

Several significant alternatives were explored within the SC-CMS feasibility study completed by Management Technologies Group (MTG) in January 2012. The four alternatives were:

1. Use of the Pierce County Legal Information Network Exchange (LINX) application as an SC-CMS statewide.
2. Acquisition of a commercial application focused on calendaring, scheduling, and caseflow management for the superior courts.
3. Acquisition and central implementation of a full featured commercial application providing calendaring, scheduling, case flow management, and other record keeping functions for the superior courts.
4. Acquisition and local implementation of a full featured commercial application providing calendaring, scheduling, caseflow management, and other record keeping functions for the superior courts.

As a result of the feasibility study, MTG recommended option 3.

Distinction between one-time and ongoing costs and budget impacts in future biennia

Costs noted in this request will continue into future biennia. Both one-time and ongoing costs are identified in the cost study on which this decision package request is based.

Effects of non-funding

- Delay or elimination in productivity gains made by replacing legacy software.
- Loss of operations with the risk of a 37-year-old mainframe system collapsing.
- Additional functionality, such as new or modified case types, would not be incorporated into the legacy system.
- Sentence and disposition information would remain at the case level.
- Human resource scheduling would remain a manual effort.
- Maintenance costs will continue to increase.
- Individual courts will pursue stand-alone systems, thereby further fragmenting the system and increasing costs statewide.

Expenditure calculations and assumptions and FTE assumptions

The cost calculations and assumptions began with the model of the recommended alternative provided in the feasibility study consultant MTG. Working with Tyler, the identified approach to meet the needs for a successful statewide rollout has been evaluated and include minor corrections in the project FTE resources needed; ongoing maintenance level costs and cost adjustments to reflect accelerated implementation as a result of the withdrawal of King County.

Category	FY 16	FY 17	Total
Contract Costs	\$2,764,000	\$3,092,000	\$5,856,000
Staff Costs	\$2,428,000	\$2,538,000	\$4,966,000
Local Implementation Costs	\$632,000	\$632,000	\$1,264,000
Equip & G/S Costs	\$256,000	\$256,000	\$512,000
Total Non-Contract Costs	\$3,316,000	\$3,426,000	\$6,742,000
Total 15-17 SC-CMS Request	\$6,080,000	\$6,518,000	\$12,598,000

Object Detail	FY 2014	FY 2015	Total
Staff Costs	\$ 2,428,000	\$ 2,538,000	\$ 4,966,000
Non-Staff Costs	\$ 3,652,000	\$ 3,980,000	\$ 7,632,000
Total Objects	\$ 6,080,000	\$ 6,518,000	\$ 12,598,000

Washington State Judicial Branch 2015-2017 BIENNIAL BUDGET REQUEST

Decision Package

Agency Administrative Office of the Courts

Decision Package Title Courts of Limited Jurisdiction
Case Management System

Budget Period 2015-2017 Biennial Budget

Budget Level Policy Level

Agency Recommendation Summary Text

Funding is requested for development and implementation of the new case management system for courts of limited jurisdiction (CLJ). This project will replace the outdated AOC system (DISCIS) currently in use by the courts.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
543-1 JIS Account	\$ 1,289,000	\$ 3,140,000	\$4,429,000
Staffing	FY 2014	FY 2015	Total
FTEs (number of staff requested)	11	11	11

Package Description

The project is expected to be similar in size and scope to the superior court case management system (SC-CMS) project. During the 2015-2017 biennium, the project is expected to accomplish the following:

- End of requirements gathering
- Procurement (draft RFP through vendor kick-off)
- Vendor selection
- Fit analysis
- Configuration
- Training
- Beginning of Implementation phase

The attached staffing spreadsheet has been drafted by the project manager, requesting 19 FTEs at a salary cost of \$5M. As with SC-CMS, these positions are above and beyond the Administrative Office of the Courts' Information Services and Judicial Services Divisions' non-dedicated staff who will be working on the project.

Also including in the estimate is \$600,000 for vendor costs and \$100,000 for computer equipment including servers. This estimate is based largely on information gathered from the start-up of the SC-CMS project. Other costs are still to be determined with input from the SC-CMS team.

Commercial off the shelf (COTS) Prep refers to the costs needed to update existing Judicial Information System (JIS) services and processes to accommodate the new CLJ-CMS. COTS Prep costs will be requested in a separate decision package.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

This package contributes to the Judicial Branch Principle Policy Objectives identified below.

Fair and Effective Administration of Justice in All Civil and Criminal Cases.

Washington courts will openly, fairly, efficiently and effectively administer justice in all criminal and civil cases, consistent with constitutional mandates and the judiciary's duty to maintain the highest level of public trust and confidence in the courts.

The current CLJ Management Information System (DISCIS) was implemented in the 1980s and is obsolete. While it does what it was designed to do and was considered state-of-the-art technology at the time, court business and technology needs have evolved. The goal of the CLJ-CMS is to provide a number of desired functions to address the business needs of the courts by providing improved capabilities through data management, access, and distribution; more robust calendar management and statistical reporting capabilities; enhanced business process automation and management; and improved service to partners and the public.

Accessibility. *Washington courts, court facilities and court systems will be open and accessible to all participants regardless of cultural, linguistic, ability-based or other characteristics that serve as access barriers.*

With more than one court filing for every three citizens in Washington, vast numbers of people are served by our courts. The SC-CMS project will assist in making Washington court data available to all, whether to a judge during a trial or to the public by removing the need to travel physically to a court location for information. SC-CMS in particular will increase access to court information, reduce delays, and enhance efficiency in the courts.

Measure Detail

Impact on clients and service

In addition to serving as the statewide court case management system, the existing Judicial Information System (JIS) provides essential information to several state agencies, local law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, criminal justice partners, and the public. The JIS is also responsible for accurately tracking, recording and distributing over \$240 million per year in state and local revenues (excluding restitution and other "trust" monies).

Implementation of a new calendaring and case management system in courts of limited jurisdiction will provide:

- Enhanced data sharing capabilities.
- Cost avoidance through the elimination of redundant data entry.
- Error reduction through training, standardization of business practices, and value-limited data entry fields.
- Flexibility to meet new and emerging business needs
- Improved tracking and analysis capabilities.

Impact on other state services

Other state programs will benefit through enhanced efficiency and effectiveness. AOC and courts exchange information and depend on the systems of other agencies. We provide essential information to the Washington State Patrol, Department of Corrections, Office of the Secretary of State, Sentencing Guidelines Commission, Department of Licensing, local law enforcement agencies, Federal government, prosecutors and defense attorneys.

Relationship to Capital Budget

None

Required changes to existing Court Rule, Court Order, RCW, WAC, contract, or plan

None

Alternatives explored

Not applicable

Distinction between one-time and ongoing costs and budget impacts in future biennia

Costs identified in this request will continue into future biennia.

Effects of non-funding

- Delay or elimination in productivity gains made by replacing legacy software.
- Loss of operations with the risk of old mainframe system issues
- Additional functionality would not be incorporated into the legacy system.
- Maintenance costs will continue to increase.
- Individual courts will pursue stand-alone systems, thereby further fragmenting the system and increasing costs statewide.

Expenditure calculations and assumptions and FTE assumptions

Cost calculations and assumptions are based on working assumptions from the SC-CMS project which is about three (3) years ahead of the CLJ-CMS project. Project management has developed a staffing plan with the contract costs based on AOC's experience with the SC-CMS vendor (Tyler Technologies, Inc.). There is no commitment that Tyler will be the chosen vendor for the CLJ-CMS procurement.

Object Detail	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
Staff Costs	\$ 1,214,000	\$ 1,240,000	\$2,454,000
Non-Staff Costs	\$ 75,000	\$ 1,900,000	\$1,975,000
Total Objects	\$ 1,289,000	\$ 3,140,000	\$4,429,000

Washington State Judicial Branch 2015-2017 BIENNIAL BUDGET REQUEST

Decision Package

Agency Administrative Office of the Courts

Decision Package Title COTS Prep-Courts of Limited Jurisdiction (CLJ)

Budget Period 2015-2017 Biennial Budget

Budget Level Policy Level

Agency Recommendation Summary Text

Funding is requested to prepare relevant systems for launch of the case management system for courts of limited jurisdiction (CLJ-CMS). This request is similar to the request for funding to prepare for the superior court case management system (SC-CMS) when the funding for that project was initially requested.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
543-1 Judicial Information Systems Account	\$ 563,000	\$ 734,000	\$ 1,297,000
Staffing	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
FTEs (number of staff requested)	0	0	0

Package Description

Modernization of the case management system for courts of limited jurisdiction will entail significant changes to existing applications, services, interfaces, and data bases. The following systems, activities, and agencies will likely be impacted by the new CLJ-CMS.

- Tracking of vehicle related violations
- Integration with Odyssey, the SC-CMS program (if CLJ is on different platform)
- Network support and capacity
- Infrastructure updates
- Electronic Ticket Processing access to DISCIS screens
- eTicketing
- Juvenile and Corrections System (JCS)

- Public web access
- JIS Link
- Department of Licensing - FTA, person record updates
- JABS - Displays CLJ case data
- Washington State Patrol disposition
- SCDX/INH
- Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Office of the Secretary of State
- State Auditor's Office
- Department of Corrections – Legal Financial Obligations billing data
- Washington State Bar Association
- Department of Health - Probate and state filing
- Data sent to other various data collection agencies

Funding will cover costs for preparation of infrastructure and applications prior to installation of a commercial, off-the-shelf (COTS) system. Included will be impact analysis, development of solution alternatives and recommendations, and testing of significant changes. It is likely that existing systems and applications need to be modified (for example, through mandated IT Governance request) to meet the customer needs while the project is in progress. Any approved changes will be communicated in a timely manner to the project manager for impact analysis before implementing such changes in production.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

This package contribute to the Judicial Branch Principle Policy Objectives identified below.

Commitment to Effective Court Management. *Washington courts will employ and maintain systems and practices that enhance effective court management.*

Using current technology to ensure that systems used by Washington State courts are efficient and the data is secure and available is key to effective court management.

Measure Detail

Impact on clients and service

CLJ-CMS will increase access to court information, reduce delays, and enhance efficiency in the courts.

Impact on other state services

Other state programs will benefit through AOC's enhanced efficiency and effectiveness. The AOC and courts exchange information and provide essential information to the Washington State Patrol, Department of Corrections, Office of the Secretary of State, Sentencing Guidelines Commission, Department of Licensing, local law enforcement agencies, Federal government, prosecutors and defense attorneys.

Relationship to Capital Budget

None

Required changes to existing Court Rule, Court Order, RCW, WAC, contract, or plan

None

Alternatives explored

Present systems are outdated and costly to maintain.

Distinction between one-time and ongoing costs and budget impacts in future biennia

Costs will continue in ensuing biennia.

Effects of non-funding

- Delay or elimination in productivity gains made by replacing legacy software.
- Additional functionality, such as new or modified case types, would not be incorporated into the legacy system.
- Sentence and disposition information would remain at the case level.
- Human resource scheduling would remain a manual effort.
- Maintenance costs will continue to increase.
- Individual courts will pursue stand-alone systems, thereby further fragmenting the system and increasing costs statewide.

Expenditure calculations and assumptions and FTE assumptions

Costs shown are based on amounts determined through development of the SC-CMS project. It is expected that contract programmers will be brought in to study, update and retrofit systems and services as necessary.

Object Detail	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
Staff Costs	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Non-Staff Costs	\$ 563,000	\$ 734,000	\$1,297,000
Total Objects	\$ 563,000	\$ 734,000	\$1,297,000

Washington State Judicial Branch 2015-2017 BIENNIAL BUDGET REQUEST

Decision Package

Agency Administrative Office of the Courts

Decision Package Title Information Networking Hub Statewide Data For Courts of Limited Jurisdiction

Budget Period 2015-2017 Biennial Budget

Budget Level Policy Level

Agency Recommendation Summary Text

Funding is requested for the expansion, development and implementation of the information networking hub (INH) to support the proposed case management system for the courts of limited jurisdiction (CLJ-CMS). INH provide a comprehensive set of data exchanges that are bi-directional and in real time to meet the data sharing needs of the courts.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
543-1 Judicial Information Systems Account	\$ 720,000	\$ 720,000	\$ 1,440,000
Staffing	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
FTEs (number of staff requested)	0	0	0

Package Description

The first phase of the Information Networking Hub provided bi-directional data sharing between the Legacy Judicial Information System (JIS) and the new Superior Court Case management System (Odyssey) so that non-converted courts would continue to receive statewide information. This strategy was employed to reduce risk to the Odyssey implementation.

The INH now needs to migrate current bi-directional data sharing to a unified statewide data repository that can be used for all courts and case management systems. This new method will support the existing JIS, Odyssey, and local case management systems operated by other counties and cities (Pierce County LINX, Seattle Municipal, Spokane Municipal, King County, etc.). Once in place, the new statewide repository will be used in the courts and by the public,

and will be the new information source for the JIS Link (a paid subscription service).

Funding is requested to address changes to the information networking hub (INH) necessary as a result of the CLJ case management system. The INH is currently being built to support the superior courts case management system. Impacts from the additional CLJ system will include the need to build our more data exchange services and possibly to retrofit some of the current services being provided.

Other new case-related services will be needed. These services, which differ from those required by the superior courts, are related to CLJ warrants, sentencing, proceedings, accounting, infractions, and parking. At a minimum, new services for CLJ case filing and those supporting CLJ case functionality and CLJ related accounting will be needed. Between 20 and 30 new services will be needed to handle CLJ cases and accounting, and an additional 20+ of the existing services involving person and case will require modification.

AOC can re-use most of the existing person services and even some of the case services as is, however, there may be the need to rework a number of services to handle variances between Odyssey and other systems.

The INH will unify the current data architecture, allowing for the exchange of data across disparate court information systems, while providing a single central data repository for storing statewide shared justice data. INH will provide a comprehensive set of bi-directional real time data exchanges for the CLJs.

We increased the number to fund both the work we need to do on the IN H services and middleware and to develop a solution to remove the temporary data replication fix we are putting in place to handle the gap between Odyssey and SCOMIS/JIS. Some funding is for new service development, existing services modifications, middleware and EDR updates, and integration work. Other funding was added to remove the data replication, which has been strongly recommended by Tyler.

In the case of CLJs the vendor selection will influence the need for the scale of INH work. Said another way, if the current superior court COTS provider is not selected there will be additional work for ISO above and beyond what would need to be done if the current vendor is selected.

INH is being built for the SC-CMS. INH will also need to provide a comprehensive set of data exchanges that are bi-directional and real time to meet the data sharing needs of the CLJ courts. These data exchanges will improve standardization of business and technology processes and data quality through the use of the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) standards. By providing access to real time justice information across the state, judicial decision-making will be improved.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

This package contribute to the Judicial Branch Principle Policy Objectives identified below.

Commitment to Effective Court Management. *Washington courts will employ and maintain systems and practices that enhance effective court management.*

Using current technology to ensure that systems used by Washington State courts are efficient and the data is secure and available is key to effective court management.

Measure Detail

Impact on clients and service

The INH will provide the justice community a statewide repository of shared justice information and business services that will provide access to higher quality data in a timelier manner that will result in better decision making capability and resource efficiencies by court staff and judges across the state.

Impact on other state services

None

Relationship to Capital Budget

Required changes to existing Court Rule, Court Order, RCW, WAC, contract, or plan

RCWs that have specific language that require usage of JIS will require modification, or as an alternative, the new data repository will be defined as being 'JIS'.

Alternatives explored

Direct point to point data exchanges between systems was considered and the INH was determined to be significantly less costly to implement and maintain.

Distinction between one-time and ongoing costs and budget impacts in future biennia

Costs will continue in ensuing biennia.

Effects of non-funding

Delay or elimination in productivity gains, data quality improvements and cost savings made by implementing INH business services and statewide repository.

Expenditure calculations and assumptions and FTE assumptions

Object Detail	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
Staff Costs	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Non-Staff Costs	\$ 720,000	\$ 720,000	\$ 1,440,000
Total Objects	\$ 720,000	\$ 720,000	\$ 1,440,000

Washington State Judicial Branch 2015-2017 BIENNIAL BUDGET REQUEST

Decision Package

Agency Administrative Office of the Courts

Decision Package Title External Equipment Replacement

Budget Period 2015-2017 Biennial Budget

Budget Level Policy Level

Agency Recommendation Summary Text

Funding is requested to replace aged computer equipment at the Washington courts, as well as to provide information technology for judicial officers and court and clerks' office staff, thus ensuring equitable access to the Judicial Information System (JIS).

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
543-1 Judicial Information Systems Account	\$ 920,000	\$ 929,000	\$ 1,849,000
Staffing	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
FTEs (number of staff requested)	0	0	0

Package Description

Funds are sought to replace aged computer equipment in Washington courts presently using the JIS by providing 100% of the information technology needed by judicial officers and 75% for court and clerk staff, a ratio that balances access to JIS with local computer applications.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

This package contributes to the Judicial Branch Principle Policy Objectives as identified below.

Fair and Effective Administration of Justice in All Civil and Criminal Cases.
Washington courts will openly, fairly, efficiently and effectively administer justice in all criminal and

civil cases, consistent with constitutional mandates and the judiciary's duty to maintain the highest level of public trust and confidence in the courts.

The mission of the Administrative Office of the Courts is to support the courts in the fair and effective administration of justice, providing centralized administration, fiscal services, and technology support for all of the courts, trial and appellate. Managing technology to ensure that information systems are current and the data is secure and available is a key to continuing to maintaining the 'right to justice' in all cases.

Appropriate Staffing and Support. *Washington courts will be appropriately staffed and effectively managed, and court personnel, court managers and court systems will be effectively supported.*

Without modern infrastructure and the most current technology, the courts cannot be managed effectively.

Measure Detail

Impact on clients and service

Use of the Judicial Information System (JIS) by all court levels, their judges, and other criminal justice agencies continues to increase. During the past twenty years, the JIS has grown from 2,500 users to over 16,000 users, or 540%, and the volume of data stored in the JIS databases has also increased by 9% per year.

The AOC is responsible for providing computer equipment to the state (Supreme Court and Court of Appeals), county clerks, county courts (superior and district) and city (municipal) courts. Judicial Information System Policy 1.2.1 calls for a 5-year replacement cycle for computers and other information technology equipment supplied by the AOC.

Because AOC replaces computer equipment on a cyclical basis, funding needs are periodic and short-term in nature. Accordingly, replacement monies are not part of the carry-forward or maintenance budget levels, and funding must be requested for each cycle. The AOC collaborates with the courts to share responsibility for providing equipment based on an equitable ratio approved by the JISC that reflects the percent of time personal computers are used for JIS versus local applications, such as document management systems and office programs.

Impact on other state services

None

Relationship to Capital Budget

None

Required changes to existing Court Rule, Court Order, RCW, WAC, contract, or plan

None

Alternatives explored

Not Applicable

Distinction between one-time and ongoing costs and budget impacts in future biennia

These are ongoing costs.

Effects of non-funding

AOC would be in violation of Judicial Information System Policy 1.2.1 that calls for a 5-year replacement cycle for computers and other information technology equipment supplied by the AOC.

Expenditure calculations and assumptions and FTE assumptions

Pricing per unit is as follows. Pricing includes shipping, sales tax, and 3 years of vendor warranty.

Fiscal Year 2016			
Number	Description	Unit Price	Total
720	Computers	\$1250	\$900,000
15	Laptops	\$1325	\$ 19,875
Total (rounded)			\$920,000

Fiscal Year 2017			
Number	Description	Unit Price	Total
495	Computers	\$1,250	\$618,750
40	Laptops	\$1,325	\$ 53,000
60	Cash Drawers	\$ 475	\$ 28,500
200	Receipt Printers	\$ 675	\$135,000
80	Slip Printers	\$1,175	\$ 94,000
Total (rounded)			\$929,000

Object Detail	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
Staff Costs	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Non-Staff Costs	\$ 920,000	\$ 929,000	\$ 1,849,000
Total Objects	\$ 920,000	\$ 929,000	\$ 1,849,000

Washington State Judicial Branch 2015-2017 BIENNIAL BUDGET REQUEST

Decision Package

Agency Administrative Office of the Courts

Decision Package Title Internal Equipment Replacement

Budget Period 2015-2017 Biennial Budget

Budget Level Policy Level

Agency Recommendation Summary Text

Funding is requested to replace end-of-life equipment and to improve performance of heavily used JIS services.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
543-1 Judicial Information Systems Account	\$ 516,000	\$ 0	\$ 516,000
Staffing	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
FTEs (number of staff requested)	0	0	0

Package Description

Use of the Judicial Information System (JIS) by all court levels, their judges, and other criminal justice agencies continues to increase. During the past 20 years the JIS has grown from 2,500 users to over 16,000 users, an increase of over 540%. The volume of data stored in the JIS databases has generally increased 9% per year, and more recently 15% per year including eTicketing data. These increases in both user and data volumes require expansion of current software and hardware, and necessitates the need to employ newer, more technologically advanced hardware and software.

Server Consolidation and Virtualization: Consolidating the servers will allow us to reduce the physical number of servers we maintain, requiring less cooling, power, and space. With virtualized servers, standard servers are built and easily duplicated which will speed server deployment. Virtualization improves the Disaster Recovery process as the hardware dependencies of the servers are eliminated. By taking advantage of server virtualization, we will

be able to improve the efficiency of servers. Cost of this equipment and software licenses is \$200,000.

Switch Replacement: The Network Switches installed at the AOC, Supreme Court, and Court of Appeals have reached end of life and need replacement. These switches provide connectivity from the users' Personal Computer to the Network and are physically required in each location. Cost of this equipment and support licenses is \$260,000.

Wireless Access Point Replacements: The Wireless Access Points installed at the AOC, Supreme Courts, and Court of Appeals have reached end of life and are no longer supported by the vendor. We are unable to apply updates to the controllers as they do not support the access points. These access points are physically required at each location. Cost of this equipment and support licenses is \$56,000.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

This package contributes to the Judicial Branch Principle Policy Objectives as identified below.

Fair and Effective Administration of Justice in All Civil and Criminal Cases.

Washington courts will openly, fairly, efficiently and effectively administer justice in all criminal and civil cases, consistent with constitutional mandates and the judiciary's duty to maintain the highest level of public trust and confidence in the courts.

The mission of the Administrative Office of the Courts is to support the courts in the fair and effective administration of justice, providing centralized administration, fiscal services, and technology support for all of the courts, trial and appellate. Managing technology to ensure that information systems are current and the data is secure and available is key to effective court management.

Appropriate Staffing and Support.

Washington courts will be appropriately staffed and effectively managed, and court personnel, court managers and court systems will be effectively supported.

Without modern infrastructure and the most current technology, the courts cannot be managed effectively.

Measure Detail

Impact on clients and service

Use of the Judicial Information System (JIS) by all court levels, their judges, and other criminal justice agencies continues to increase. During the past 20 years, the JIS has grown from 2,500 to over 16,000 users, or 540%. The volume of data stored in the JIS databases has also increased by 9% per year.

The AOC is responsible for providing computer equipment to the state (Supreme Court and Court of Appeals), county clerks, county courts (superior and district) and city (municipal) courts. Judicial Information System Policy 1.2.1 calls for a 5-year replacement cycle for computers and other information technology equipment supplied by the AOC.

Because AOC replaces computer equipment on a cyclical basis, funding needs are periodic and short-term in nature. Accordingly, replacement monies are not part of our carry-forward or maintenance budget levels, and funding must be requested for each cycle. The AOC collaborates with the courts to share responsibility for providing equipment based on an equitable ratio approved by the JISC that reflects the percent of time personal computers are used for JIS versus local applications, such as document management systems and office programs.

Impact on other state services

None

Relationship to Capital Budget

None

Required changes to existing Court Rule, Court Order, RCW, WAC, contract, or plan

None

Alternatives explored

Not Applicable

Distinction between one-time and ongoing costs and budget impacts in future biennia

Costs are ongoing and funding will be requested in future biennia.

Effects of non-funding

Aged equipment is no longer supported by the vendors and outages cannot be repaired.

Expenditure calculations and assumptions and FTE assumptions

Object Detail	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
Staff Costs	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Non-Staff Costs	\$ 516,000	\$ 0	\$ 516,000
Total Objects	\$ 516,000	\$ 0	\$ 516,000

Washington State Judicial Branch
2015-2017 BIENNIAL BUDGET REQUEST

Decision Package

Agency Administrative Office of the Courts

Decision Package Title Appellate Courts Content Management System

Budget Period 2015-2017 Biennial Budget

Budget Level Policy Level

Agency Recommendation Summary Text

Funding is requested to continue implementation of the new commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) case management system for the Appellate Courts Content Management System. Because of timing of implementation and payments, AOC has requested \$313,000 be reduced from the 13-15 budget and moved to 15-17.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
543-1 Judicial Information Systems Account	\$ 313,000	\$ 0	\$ 313,000
Staffing	FY 2014	FY 2015	Total
FTEs (number of staff requested)	0	0	0

Package Description

Funding is requested to continue implementation of the new commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) case management system for the Appellate Courts Content Management System. Because of timing of implementation and payments, AOC has requested \$313,000 be reduced from the 13-15 budget and moved to 15-17.

This request is supported by the Washington Supreme Court, Court of Appeals, the Judicial Information Systems Committee (JISC), and the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC).

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

This package contributes to the Judicial Branch Principle Policy Objectives as noted below.

Fair and Effective Administration of Justice in All Civil and Criminal Cases.

Washington courts will openly, fairly, efficiently and effectively administer justice in all criminal and civil cases, consistent with constitutional mandates and the judiciary's duty to maintain the highest level of public trust and confidence in the courts

All court levels need support for the technology which allows them to maintain smooth operations and thus foster public confidence. The ECMS will allow both appellate courts to streamline operations thereby enhancing the effective and efficient administration of justice.

Commitment to Effective Court Management. *Washington courts will employ and maintain systems and practices that enhance effective court management.*

Appellate court ECMS will improve the court operations by replacing what today is essentially a manual workflow for documents. It will ensure that there are consistent practices between the three divisions of the Court of Appeals and improve data and information flow.

Measure Detail

Impact on clients and services

Implementation of a new ECMS will provide:

- Improved tracking and analysis capabilities.
- Enhanced data sharing capabilities.
- Cost avoidance through the elimination of redundant data entry.
- Flexibility to meet new and emerging business needs.
- Error reduction through training, standardization of business practices, and value-limited data entry fields.

Impact on other state services

None

Relationship to Capital Budget

None

Required changes to existing Court Rule, Court Order, RCW, WAC, contract, or plan

None

Alternatives explored

There were no other alternatives considered.

Distinction between one-time and ongoing costs and budget impacts in future biennia

These are one-time costs although there will be some maintenance costs in future biennia.

Effects of non-funding

- Delay or elimination in productivity gains made by replacing legacy software.
- All of the work completed in 13-15 will be for nothing.

Expenditure calculations and assumptions and FTE assumptions

Object Detail	FY 2016	FY 2016	Total
Staff Costs	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Non-Staff Costs	\$ 313,000	\$ 0	\$ 313,000
Total Objects	\$ 313,000	\$ 0	\$ 313,000