

**COCLJ AUTOMATION & ACCOUNTING ADVISORY
COMMITTEE MEETING – January 23rd, 2014
HELENA, MONTANA**

MEMBERS PRESENT

Chairperson Judge Larry Carver
Judge Gregory P. Mohr
Judge Audrey Barger
Judge Linda Budeski
Lisa Mader, Montana Supreme Court Administrator's Office
Claudia Anderson, Montana Supreme Court Administrator's Office
Thelma Keys-Nicol, Kalispell Municipal Court
Barbara Pepos, Richland Co. Justice Court-Sidney City Court
Tina Schmaus, Missoula Municipal Court
Jackie Schara, President of Montana Justice, City and Municipal Court Clerk's Assoc.
Sharon Skaggs, Yellowstone County Justice Court Administrator

PUBLIC COMMENT:

No one was present for public comment.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Jackie Schara made a motion to approve the minutes of October 17th, 2013, seconded by Judge Budeski. Committee approved the minutes as presented.

CARVER UPDATE:

Judge Larry Herman, who retired effective December 31st, 2013, had been the chair of the Bond Book committee for many years. Judge Carver is now the Chair of that committee, with a co-chair of Judge Mohr and the new member is Kent Sipe, County Attorney from Roundup. Last week the committee met in Billings with Claudia present. Judge Carver said the Bond Book has been updated with all the legislative changes and errors were corrected. Claudia will be getting it together and out to the various agencies for their comments. It should be ready for distribution by the Spring School.

CLAUDIA UPDATE:

Claudia commented they have been working on the new FullCourt update and installed it in the Flathead County District Court on December 11th. They have not had any issues so far. Two weeks later it was installed in the Yellowstone County Justice Court and Sharon has not had any issues either. They have also been working at setting up Yellowstone County Justice Court with CitePay-Bond at the Jail. She will comment on this later in the meeting.

Grant Schneider, a new trainer was hired December 30th. He was previously an adjunct instructor at Helena Community College. He has much to learn, but is coming along well. She sent Grant down to work with Chad for a couple days in Missoula and they went into the Missoula County Justice Court where new scanners had been installed.

Claudia said as far as Smart Cop, they have been working to add it in Roosevelt County, Wolf Point and Culbertson. A modification needed to be made with Smart Cop in adding the Officer Agency and the Court name associated with citations. Lincoln County and Roosevelt County have two Justice Courts, therefore causing issues when Smart Cop is employed. Judge Mohr believes there will be one Justice Court in Lincoln County and it will be Libby. County Commissioners made a decision to close the court in Eureka. Smart Cop needed \$9,000.00 to make this modification which Lisa was unwilling to pay. Tom Butler with the Highway Patrol approved the modification in December. As soon as this is done, the above courts will be added, although, Eureka may be up in the air for now.

Claudia did not ask for a specific printout of Roadside Payments this past month, but she commented the usage is increasing, although, she is not sure why Yellowstone County Justice Court does not see an increase in Roadside Payments. Judge Mohr said Richland County, Dawson County and Custer County are all doing well receiving Roadside Payments.

Next week her staff will begin the process of standardizing ROA codes for the Courts. Tina added that Colonel Butler asked if he could have a few minutes during the Spring Clerk's Conference in Helena in April. He specifically wants to hear from the clerks as to how everything is going throughout the State.

CitePay-Jail Update:

Chad has been working with the Yellowstone County Justice Court in setting up CitePay at the Jail. A couple of issues cropped up from the JSI side of the project and Claudia has had discussions with Bill from JSI on this. When Claudia was in Billings, the Warrant Lookup part gave her some errors. She had communication with Bill from JSI and he upgraded the CitePay application and he wanted to get on the E-Payment service to verify their code is correct. After this they performed an update to CitePay to make sure the balances were correct, and CitePay recognized the Warrants. Sharon commented they can bring the Warrants up by case #, but not by name and DOB. Claudia said it worked well when they tried it on their test database. Therefore, they will continue to work on this project. Claudia showed the committee the laminated instruction sheet they have made up for the jail to follow.

Sharon discussed with Chad the need for the courts to be notified immediately once bond has been posted at the jail. This would be done by e-mail and the courts would then know to cancel the warrant. The notification to CJIN to take the Warrant out would be done in the same manner as if they bonded out through a bondsman. The Officer makes sure there is a hit in the system and if the warrant is served, it is removed from CJIN. The committee looked at the CitePay screen and noted if you pick "post bond for someone", then you must pick the appropriate detention center where they are being held. Judge Carver said this method of payment would only take place once a defendant is under arrest.

Barb noted May 16, 2013 minutes reflected the receipt will print who posted the bond and the amount, as well as the jail facility defendant was in. Jail personnel go into the CitePay program and mark the Warrant as payable. Once this is done, anyone can go to CitePay and post the bond. Claudia demonstrated the CitePay feature when there is no case in FullCourt, such as in a case of someone arrested on new charges. An unapplied receipt is made available for this transaction, which can then be moved once the case is entered into the FullCourt program. Sharon believes the Court will need the capability of accepting bond in CitePay as well. Chad setup a password for Sharon to access the bond portion of CitePay.

A discussion was held regarding the CJIN printout and if there is a Case # or Ticket # on it. Although, some of the dispatchers may enter the ticket # in Misc., not all of them do this. It was decided **warrants need to have the Case #'s** on them, not just the ticket #. In other words, the TK number for tickets or the CR number, if the case is a complaint filed by the County Attorney's office. Judge Carver said in some instances the jail will not know the Case Number, but Claudia explained they can search by name and DOB. Once the jailer locates the person and the warrant, then they check allow for CitePay. If the Defendant has a credit card on him, he can post the bond right there beside the jailer. Judge Carver said he agrees with Jackie when a dispatcher enters a Warrant in CJIN, they also enter the case number on the warrant form. Jackie said they can enter the Case # in the Misc. field in CJIN.

Lisa said they would talk to Jennifer Viets and Mike Rishetti and find out if the case numbers could go into CJIN at entry of the Warrant. Barb noted their Court would need to add the Case # onto the Warrant document, as right now just the actual Citation number prints. Sharon said this needs to be added to the spring clerk's training, to make sure all Courts have the Case Numbers shown on the Warrant document.

LISA MADER UPDATE:

Lisa reported they are fully staffed again. They hired a new audio-video technician and he started on December 30th and January 6th they filled the 2 technical vacancies. Lisa said they are, however, still missing the administrative help desk person when Anne retired. They are changing that position into more administrative, with that person doing the inventory, ordering and helping with the phones. They hope to be interviewing for this position in late January or February.

Lisa will be working on the FullCourt Enterprise budget process here shortly for the upcoming legislative session in 2015. They are also adding courtroom technology to the budget, which includes scanners for the Limited Jurisdiction courts and to upgrade technology in the courtrooms. The large District Courts have public access terminals, but many of the smaller District Courts do not. Having that technology moving forward with e-filing will become necessary, because there will not be a paper file to show you, it can be viewed electronically. The proposal will include a terminal for every District Court. If the Limited Courts are on the same connection, they will be added to the public terminal. For example, District Court in Missoula has a public access terminal and the Missoula Justice Court recently asked to have an icon added to the terminal for access to

their court. Every court around the State will be looked at to add the terminals. The main 3 items of funding in the request will be the 3 one-time funding positions, which they will request as permanent positions, the FullCourt Enterprise proposal and then the technology proposal she just explained. The FullCourt Enterprise proposal and technology proposal will go in under HB 10, which is the long range information technology bill. Because their proposal is small compared to other agencies on this bill, she is confident of a favorable outcome. They will be discussing this with Ron Baldwin, the State CIO on February 6th.

Regarding the question of adding Citrix courts to CitePay, she advised they do not own the citrix servers; it is done through the Department of Administration. Therefore, they have limited access to the connection. They would have to install an individual service on every court. They are not sure the CitePay server can run all of them. Lisa has seen requests come through to add CitePay, but right now Tammy has been working with the DOA as they are moving the citrix servers from one environment to another and there have been problems. Tammy was testing it yesterday and it did look better, so she will work with them to get CitePay added to the 3 citrix courts who requested it. Lisa said there are between 25-30 courts on citrix.

Judge Carver asked about Choteau County where they were going to consolidate Ft. Benton City Court with Choteau County. Lisa said the City declined to do that. They will put the court on a local ISP making it much easier to work with and more economical. Instead of the \$4500 a month, they can take it down to a local ISP for \$30.00 a month. Because they are on citrix, the judge will be able to get to it from her Justice Court, but the City would not allow her to hold court in the County Building. Judge Carver will visit with the Judge in Choteau County and follow up on the details.

In regard to adding courts to electronic motor vehicle reporting, some unexpected entries showed up. They are currently looking at cases that should not have been reported and cleaning up the process. Lisa and Claudia are looking at bringing in the Richland County Justice Court and Sidney City Court for electronic reporting, due to the volume of activity in that area.

E-Filing Update:

Lois will be attending the meeting to give an e-filing presentation. Lisa gave an update to the District Court council on Friday and explained the benefits, such as 24/7 filing, how Judges handling multi jurisdictions have access to their cases and documents. It is web based to allow access outside the courtroom to parties and their attorneys and there will be less paper to go through on the Bench.

In March 2013 they started working with a vendor to identify the system functionality for Phase 1. These will be prosecutor initiated case types which are criminal, juvenile, abuse and neglect, developmental disability and involuntary commitment. From an IT perspective we did find a vendor with the high level components for the work flows on those cases. In July 2013 the E-filing advisory committee which was previously the RFP committee approved the pilot sites. Those are the 4th Judicial District which is Missoula

and Mineral Counties – all level of Courts, the Yellowstone County Justice Court and the 10th Judicial District, which are Fergus, Petroleum and Judith Basin Counties. Then, the 5th Judicial Courts – Madison, Beaverhead and Jefferson were added.

Since approval of this plan, they have been talking about e-filing and getting the exposure to as many stakeholders across the State as they can. In October they went to the 4th Judicial District and had a large kickoff meeting with about 40 people in attendance, such as prosecutors, court personnel from all courts, youth court, public defenders and judges. They have been working with case category groups. In other words, these groups help define the work flows and functionality of the program. They are documenting the comments and discussions and any decisions made from these group meetings. The information will be put into reports and eventually the E-filing committee that Judge Carver and Sharon are on will take those discussion points and define the rules.

Also, in October they worked with the Appellate working group that included Justice Baker. In November, they worked with the criminal case working group made up of about 12 members and in December they gave a presentation to the County Attorney's Association. Their meeting was held in Billings and they had numerous questions. Although, they did not get through the entire presentation, the exposure to e-filing was put out there. In January they saw the juvenile case working group and discussed e-filing with the District Court council. This last Friday they did a presentation in the 10th Judicial group. On January 30th, they will work with the abuse and neglect working group. Lisa said they will do a meet and greet with Yellowstone County here soon.

There is a misconception which they are trying to dispel that e-filing is e-mailing. It is not and this is one of the reasons they went to the 10th Judicial District last week. The last Legislature put a new rule in for the District Courts where they can charge for e-mail filing and County Attorneys were saying they are being charged for e-mail, not understanding the difference between e-mail and e-filing. E-filing is a set of work flows and data elements and you upload the documents. You are not charged in the prosecutor initiated phase of e-filing.

In regard to time frames, there was a lag in getting the contract signed, instead of January, it was completed in March. Since then they have seen about an 8 week change in the e-filing time table, due to some overlooked functionality, which the various working groups brought up. These were not part of the core LT Court Tech built. They are Montana specific modifications which changed the timeline. They are looking at go-live production for the Appellate Court sometime in March, testing with the District and Limited Jurisdiction courts in April and May and go live pilot in the 4th Judicial District sometime in June or July. They will follow this up with the 10th Judicial District in the fall of 2014.

There are multiple parts in each of the case types along with all of the integration needed. This will make it a very incremental implementation rollout. Lisa said it is moving along and they got to see a live Montana modified specific e-filing on January 21st from the vendor. That was a big milestone for this huge project.

Judge Carver added there is a distinction from the general jurisdiction and limited and what some refer to as the “trial courts”. For this project, the trial courts include municipal, justice courts, city courts and the District Courts. He wanted everyone to keep this in mind, because they always had a distinction between limited-general and trial, with some Supreme Court decisions even referring to the District Courts as trial courts, but when you see trial courts, remember that means us. There was also a written decision which came up regarding the difference between e-filing and e-mailing. Lisa said it was a definition paper where they contacted the District Court automation chair and asked her opinion of the law. They also went to Nancy Sweeney, who is the District Court Clerk in Lewis & Clark County and their legislative representative and they asked her opinion. Basically, they both came back and replied those 2 laws are not relevant to e-filing. One of the first questions which came up out of the 10th Judicial presentation was will there be a charge to the prosecutors for using e-filing and the answer was no. In Phase 1 there are no prosecutorial charges.

The 10th Judicial District meeting was well attended with about 15 people. They were glad to be involved in the process and the public defenders wanted to register now. The presentation was about an hour long, with questions and answers following. Judge Carver said sometime following that meeting, a discussion took place about accessing the District Court calendar. Lisa said at the County Attorney’s meeting, someone kept bringing up public access to this information and they had to keep answering e-filing was not designed for public access.

E-filing Presentation:

Lois Schlyer attended the meeting to present the e-filing project. First, Lois explained this project is keeping the record electronic from end to end, with paper on demand. Therefore, an attorney can create a document on his computer in his office and then file the document electronically, without going to the Court. A print button is available if a paper printout is needed, but the official record is electronic.

Benefits of electronic filing are secure 24/7 filing from any location. Access to the electronic file can be made by all the attorneys involved at the same time, with the Judge as well. Judges with multi-jurisdictions will be able to access their cases from anywhere in the State. This will reduce the storage issues with paper files.

Right now, paper comes in and the clerks in the courts must enter the case into the case management system. E-filing will provide drop down boxes which will standardize the filing of cases. This will mean the entire state will be standardized for case types. E-filing will prevent the loss of records due to catastrophic events, such as flood or fire.

Back in 1995, the statutory requirement for electronic filing was established by our Legislature. In 1995, the “www”, worldwide web became accessible to everyone. From 2007-2013 Lois noted there were people in the courts working very hard to make this project a reality. This is a statewide initiative, all courts, all case types and all filers. Lois said most other states create e-filing in one level of their court system. But, the

State of Montana is including all courts in their project. Judge Carver said we are the first state in the country to do this. E-filing will be voluntary, meaning they will not force any court or e-filer to use the e-filing system. This is not a public access system in any manner.

Pilot projects will be in the Supreme Court, some District Courts and some Limited Jurisdiction courts. They are beginning with prosecutorial filings and criminal appeals. They took this route because it will be government to government filings. There are no filing fees involved. Criminal appeals have a standard government to government filing. Phase II will bring in civil filings with fees and attorney represented. Lisa said the case will be created in the case management through the e-filing program. Eventually when they move to Phase II, the cases will be filed, with the filing fees going into the financial records in the case management systems.

A login will be required through the e-pass Montana account, or active directory. Attorneys will need to register and enter their Montana Bar ID. Attorneys and Judges will be able to allow access to their support staff to have a login and password, therefore, not sharing the attorney or judge passwords. What they have done in the case search function is limit the case search to specific parties on the case. The reason for this is to limit access, as no one will be allowed to search all the documents throughout the State. If you are a Judge on a case anywhere in the State, you will be able to access it. This is a web based system with hyperlinks and once the case has come up at the bottom of the Search screen, you just click on what you want to view.

All the e-filers will see the Home Page. On this screen, there are “port lets” where you pick what you want to do, look at a case, create a case, view your filings, and see the filings received. If there are filings which have been rejected, this will show up on the home page and pending filings will be shown as well.

Electronic legal service: Registered e-filers agree to e-service on any case electronically filed. E-filing does not change any service laws. This is considered secondary service as my registering as an e-filer compels me to accept electronic service where permitted by rule or law on any case that is electronically filed. If an attorney is not a registered e-filer, you will need to enter how service will be completed. The e-filing system will create an e-filing certificate of service document. There is a function where notification to a victim can be documented without entering the victim address. Primary service is explained as personal service of the document. Secondary service would be the type of service you may get via mail. Any document which gives a court jurisdiction is often considered primary service.

Lois went on to explain the fee functionality of the service, which will come up in the second Phase of e-filing. There is the ability to request fee waivers. The fee filing will interface with CitePay, which is a PCA compliant payment processor. CitePay was picked as the processor because it will go into the case management system and take care of the financial records. CitePay will have the ability to accept e-wallets, which is beneficial in the case of a firm doing numerous civil filings. The clerk window will list

the pending electronic filings, providing information about them. This would include who the filers are, what kind of filing it is, and is a payment necessary. The e-filer will be providing all the information which enters into the clerk queue. The clerk will have availability to match a party who is already in the case management system.

Thelma inquired as to the address given in the e-filing. Lisa said the e-filer has a screen where he will enter address, date of birth, phone number and other identifier information. The clerk review window is designed for FullCourt users. You can seal the document, or seal the ROA. There is a direct link to the document if you need to view it. This window will also bring in the statute if there is one on the case. Lisa said the only issue left to deal with is a local ordinance, as the attorneys will only be dealing with the State statute table at the present. When the filing is allowed, there will be a document filed stamp added with the date the e-filer filed it. The e-filer will get notification once the clerk has filed the document and will also be notified if a filing is rejected. If a clerk rejects a filing, a drop down box will give a list of reasons to do so and the clerk will pick one.

When they looked at the judge review window, they kept it in the e-filing system. The benefit to the judge is the capability to see all the filings no matter what part of the state they are in, as long as they are the judge on the case. There is an icon which draws attention to the filings marked as emergency. Judges can write in the internal comment field for their judicial assistants, especially in the case of the Supreme Court judges who have law clerks at their disposal. If a judge chose not to use the proposed order in the filing, he may ask his judicial assistant to prepare another one and it can be e-filed to the case. A document can be uploaded and electronically signed.

Lisa commented the core screen was developed for all judges, although, there may be some options to the District Court judges that are not necessary for the Limited Jurisdiction Judges. These are processes which will need to be developed. Lois explained the subject matter groups which were created. They cannot make statewide decisions based solely on a pilot court. Their groups are appellate, criminal, juvenile, and next week they have abuse and neglect and Lois is putting together a developmental disability and involuntary commitment group meeting. It was through the criminal group they learned victim addresses cannot be viewed; therefore, the vendor will need to modify the program.

Also each subject matter expert group is given access to the temporary rules. At the appellate meeting one of the Justices recommended following the guidelines on electronic signatures the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals has adopted. Even though, they are doing everything possible in the beginning to make this project implementation a success, they will surely have to deal with issues no one has thought of. The results from the pilots will go to the Commission on Technology and with the pilots they should be able to identify any gaps. Their goal is to have a fine tuned, good, robust system that supports the needs of all of the people that interact with the court and court personnel as well. Lisa added this is a huge project and it is not her goal to rush it in the courts. Her goal is to do it correctly. Judge Carver added e-filing will not be made mandatory, so expect some attorneys to file electronically and some by paper. Although, Lisa is hoping further

down the road e-filing will be mandatory. Lois said they do expect a court somewhere in the State to make a local rule to file electronically.

Sharon commented after a 3 day weekend, the judges needed to see 21 prisoners. It took 3 clerks to get the paperwork from the county attorney's office ready in order for the prisoners to be seen. All this took place after 2 PM, which made for a very stressful afternoon. Lisa commented the next time they present in front of the county attorney's group, they intend on bringing along a clerk and/or judge to help explain the advantages of e-filing.

Driver's License Suspension Form:

Judge Carver said Greg Noose is working on adding a check box on the DL Suspension form, which allows a Judge to pull the suspension due to loss of jurisdiction. Judge Carver wanted this expanded because he had a case where the driver was suspended, but the circumstance was the defendant had been hospitalized for an extended period of time and did not get his mail. He did not want to use the rescind box, as the procedure had been followed, but he did not want to see the defendant pay a fee, because his excuse was valid. Once completed the form will be e-mailed out to the committee members for our approval. The judge's name will be removed from the top and only the court name will appear.

Greg Noose wanted everyone to know if a suspension takes place on a 61 code violation, it is a nationwide suspension. This, however, is not true on the 45 codes. He puts it in the system, but some states will not honor the suspension. We will probably hear discussion about clarifying the deferred commercial driver language in the statute. Greg Noose said the intent of the statute was no deferrals on commercial drivers. Judge Mohr said there is a difference between deferred and "masked". Judge Mohr would like to see the proposed language for the statute on commercial drivers.

Fish, Wildlife & Parks:

Judge Carver reported after talking with FWP, by June 1st, 2014 they will have 40 out of their 80 officers on Smart Cop. Mike Korn was the one who reported on this. Lisa said their process of receiving e-citations is already in place with the MHP up and running. Greg, one of her developers, talked to Mike Anderson from FWP and he reported they would have 4 wardens up on Smart Cop and in the beginning they will simply print out the citations and hand deliver these to the courts.

Betty from FWP provided Judge Carver with a printout listing the various ways they receive suspension notices. It is very important to them the ticket is received, along with the suspension form. They cannot suspend someone based on the suspension form alone. Their preferred method with the suspension form is to hand it to the officer. Then their officer will mail it, along with his copy of the citation. Once Smart Cop is up and running for FWP, an officer will be able to check someone's record. Judge Carver does not regularly see a FWP officer; therefore, he e-mails the suspension form to Helena. Now, he will also e-mail a copy of the citation. That way he has an ROA with the date it was done. Judge Mohr explained if a court does a bond forfeiture, because the defendant

did not appear in front of them and the statute has a mandatory suspension of privileges, then it is up to the Dept. of Fish, Wildlife & Parks to notify the defendant of the suspension. Judge Carver will take a look at the FWP Bond Book and see if they have a section of "Must Appear" statutes. The Hunter Remedial education program is still not working properly, but they told Judge Carver they are working on it.

FullCourt Enterprise:

On Friday of last week, Beth asked Lisa to give the District Court council an update on Enterprise. Last Monday, January 13th, JSI represented by Ernie, Jim and Tessa, came to Helena for the purpose of the budget proposal. Their proposal was very thorough and it ended up being a long day. Included are a benefit statement, an executive summary statement, what the current environment is and what the future environment will look like. They include a customization plan for all the modifications which need to be made for Montana. When JSI was here in 2012, the procedure was too rushed and they could not go to the legislature with a proposal. This time the analysis was done thoroughly, with committees meeting with JSI and looking at Enterprise ahead of time.

The transition plan, provided we get the funding, is to start the project in July 2015. They anticipate it will take one year to develop from the start to the pilot phase. They are asking for a commitment from the automation committee members that involves JSI coming to Montana one week out of every month, and spending 2 days with the District Court members and 2 days with this committee. They will take all the feedback we give them and their team will work on it. The next month they will bring back what they have done and work on some new requirements. That is 2 days of every month in Helena for one year.

Judge Carver asked how we will give input to something we have not seen. Lisa said we will see the program as it is being developed. What they are going to do is take all of the Montana specific requirements, break them into separate areas. JSI will come to Helena and we will all look at the first area. They will develop what they learn from us and bring us another piece to look at. It took JSI about 3 weeks to discuss this with their developers and come up with a plan. Ernie thought this would take 3 days, but it actually took 3 weeks.

Lisa believes if we handle the Enterprise project in this manner at the end of the year we should have a product ready to put in a pilot court. Judge Carver wanted to go to each of the members and ask if they could commit to this. Sharon thought this was a great plan and, there would be someone from her staff willing to work with us on the project. Lisa said she realizes some members may need to attend via Vision Net. Jackie may have a scheduling problem in her office, due to the other clerk normally having a Friday off and right now Jackie is gone from the office once a month on Fridays to attend meetings. Jackie has Wednesdays off and the other clerk has Fridays off, because they work 4--10 hour shifts. Lisa said she realizes not every member may be able to attend every month. Judge Carver said the project will cost \$1.7 Million and is well worth putting the work in to get it done right. Lisa said spending time together working on this project will also provide the added benefit of having help when it comes to developing Best Practices

guides. All committee members agreed this is a good idea and they would do their best to make it work. Lisa said if the funding is approved, they will sign a fully funded contract for the year of development.

Judge Carver said the program would be fully developed by June of 2016 and it may take another year to be deployed to all the courts. Lisa wants to make sure everyone knows this is a commitment and if members change, the new members know the commitment was made and must be carried out. Lisa added the core for Enterprise is solid right now and she is confident they will be able to customize it within a reasonable time frame. They will be working with Oracle 12C, which means JSI will not be building the database, as Oracle has already done it. Lisa said with the detail in the proposal, she is confident they can get the support they need. Included in this proposal is jury as well, so Lisa and her staff will not need to maintain separate jury databases. An appeal process will also be built into Enterprise. Having integration with CJIN would certainly be helpful to everyone involved in entering warrants and orders of protection.

Lisa said the funding will cover the project, customization and 4 years of maintenance. After that a sustainable plan will need to be put in place and funded. They will be required to go back to the legislature each session with contract increases which is to be expected.

Clerk's Spring Conference:

Tina thought it would be a great idea to kick off the spring conference talking about Enterprise. The Clerk's Association talked about paying for Tessa to come to Helena, but it was decided the project is too far off at this point. Tina feels someone from the committee should come and discuss Enterprise, making all the clerks aware of this project. Tina asked Lisa if she would come and kickoff the conference with the OCA's commitment to Enterprise. Lisa agreed and right now they probably do not need to bring Tessa to Helena.

Lisa said in the past the workers felt they were going too fast in getting new functionality out to the courts. She does not want to be that kind of IT Director. She wants to get things done, but do them right the first time. Jackie agreed it would be good for the clerks to hear from Lisa and the plans we have. Judge Carver will talk to the president of the Montana Magistrates Association regarding helping out financially with the clerk's conference and Sharon suggested asking for their help in paying for the Conference Room, which would be \$600.00.

Judge Carver mentioned he, Judge Mohr and Professor Tonen are trying to get the MJI Institute going again. This is where judges can go to the Law School and take courses for the summer. Many of the new judges would benefit by learning civil procedure, criminal procedure and constitutional law. What they did was attend two weeks at the Law School, then go back home to finish studying, returning to the Law School to finish. Judge Carver said they are looking at funding this project because it was so beneficial to the current judges.

Statistics:

Lisa provided some stats which were pulled from the Limited Jurisdiction courts. There was a decrease in the cases filed. When looking at 2012 and 2013, Lisa noticed a 16,000 case decrease in traffic cases. Lisa contacted the Montana Highway Patrol and their tickets remained pretty steady in 2012 and 2013. Lisa noted the Billings Muni court was down 3,193 in traffic cases, Cascade County Justice Court down 1,060 in traffic cases and Missoula Municipal court down 3,420 traffic cases from 2012. She wanted everyone to know she did go into a couple of separate court databases and make sure there was not an error in these statistics. Overall the cases are down about 8% from the previous year.

DMV Reporting:

When the Billings Municipal Court was implemented in Billings, there was a problem with the reporting of the convictions to the DMV in Helena. In fact the officers were telling defendants nothing was going to be reported. Now, there has been an adjustment to the Municipal Infraction table and the dispositions are now being reported. Some of the convictions reported are older than 3 years and some of those where the defendants were told they would never appear on their record. He wanted the committee's opinion as to how far back they should go in entering these on the driving records. Greg Noose recommended going back 1 year and adding those to the records, but not going back any further. Claudia said back in the beginning, Karen Nelson, Judge Knisely, Judge Mohr and Claudia all discussed the fact these violations would be reportable. Unfortunately, officers gave the wrong information out to the defendants.

Judge Mohr said the committee should not make the decision on reporting these. The committee agreed this decision should come from Greg Noose and his department.

Next Meeting Date:

March 20th, 2014

June 19th, 2014

August 14th, 2014

October 16th, 2014

Meeting adjourned.