

**COCLJ AUTOMATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING – APRIL 20TH, 2012
HELENA, MONTANA**

MEMBERS PRESENT

Chairperson Judge Larry Carver
Judge Linda Budeski
Lisa Mader, Montana Supreme Court Administrator's Office
Claudia Anderson, Montana Supreme Court Administrator's Office
Barbara Pepos, Richland Co. Justice Court-Sidney City Court
Thelma Keys-Nicol, Kalispell Municipal Court
Tina Schmaus, Missoula Municipal Court
Judge Gregory P. Mohr
Judge Audrey Barger

PUBLIC COMMENT:

No one was present for public comment.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Judge Audrey Barger made a motion to accept the minutes of February 10th, 2012 as written, seconded by Judge Linda Budeski. Committee voted and approved the minutes.

CARVER UPDATE

Sharon advised there will be a flight from Billings to Helena again and, therefore, Judge Carver will schedule the meetings from 9:00 AM to 2:30 PM, to accommodate those flying in and out.

Judge Carver introduced the newest member to the committee, Tina Schmaus from Missoula.

Electronic filing system for Montana Courts

The RFP committee is chaired by Ed Smith from the Supreme Court and Judge Carver and Sharon Skaggs are members. They are taking bids for the statewide electronic filing system. This will start with electronic filing of criminal cases from the prosecutor's offices and will continue on to civil filing. Very helpful when courts receive 40 filings with one filing fees check from a collection agency. The final RFP was approved and it has been sent out. Lisa advised the RFP went to state procurement and in fact they just sent her e-mail they have questions to be answered. This should not slow the process because Karen Nelson has made herself available to answer the questions and Lisa believes it will go out today.

Lisa explained the RFP will go out and the next step is a Pre-Proposal conference call, where vendors can call in or show up in Helena. If they continue with their bid, they will need to submit their questions in writing and the deadline for receipt of the written questions is May 7th, 2012. Lisa said the evaluations will take place sometime in June and July is when the contract award should take place. In this procedure 3 vendors will be contacted to give a demonstration of their product which is open to the public.

Lisa said they have grant money which must be spent by 9-30-2012, and this is NCHIP funding for the prosecutor part of the project. Judge Mohr asked when the program will be up and running. Lisa said it depends on the implementation plans from the chosen vendor and there will be design meetings involved. Lisa's take on it is it will take about a year to get through the design and development phase, also to get the hardware in place. Then the pilot sites will be chosen and installed. There will be 2 Limited Jurisdiction courts picked, 2 District Courts picked and the appellate court used for the pilot. This should be done in about a year after the contract has been awarded.

Lisa continued the 1st phase in itself is a big phase, because all the rules must be put in place and coded for each case type. Judge Mohr inquired about the procurement office for the State. Lisa replied they are the State Procurement Bureau. Judge Carver said their rules are pretty specific, such as members of the committee cannot have discussions during the procurement process. Judge Carver stated each bid will be many pages long and the committee member must evaluate and score it. Once that is done, then the committee meets as a group for discussions, which is also a public meeting.

Lisa added they got together with JSI and CTrack (vendor for the appellate court) and asked them to come up with figures to implement the project if they were not chosen as the vendor. That figure was set aside and not included in the RFP. What is included in the RFP is just slightly under \$1.2 million. Further there are funds available for the next 6 years, which is \$100,000 each year. This is a program dealing with child welfare and abuse cases. Therefore, Judge Carver said what we are dealing with is a piece of software that will integrate with FullCourt or CTrack software. This program would allow the filing from the prosecutor's desk or the collection agency desk, but limits what information they are allowed to get out of the system. Lisa said part of the reason for the 1st phase to be the prosecutor filing is it is a government to government exchange. They are confident the infrastructure is in place in those offices. One of the requirements is to have access to the internet and not every agency, pro se litigant, or entity out there has access to the internet. Judge Carver has set aside an entire week to go through the RFP.

Bond Book

Judge Carver said there have been many discussions over the past few months regarding the medical marijuana law, Aggravated DUI and Fish, Wildlife & Parks. It is important to know the bond book is the statute table. Lisa commented she has always done the Bond Book, but the project must be handed off to Claudia, and, unfortunately, both have been fully engaged in other projects. Plus, there is the developer side of it. Marty knew how to push those changes out to the courts, but the new developers are not quite there. This table is also used by Smart Cop, by the DMV for dispositions and is used in the 2 pilot District Courts for the criminal history records system. When changes are made to the Bond Book there is an impact downstream.

Judge Carver said one issue showing up was the Aggravated DUI and the fact that felony was not added in the Bond Book. Unfortunately, when a District Court clerk gets a felony Aggravated DUI, she is unable to file it. Claudia said she has a thick file with proposed changes and corrections to go through. Judge Carver added in breaking down

the medical marijuana statute; there are 15 elements in it. This is similar to the situation with Theft, which included many elements. Judge Carver agreed it is a huge process, including getting everyone to agree on the changes. Lisa said the committee deciding the statutes has only Limited Jurisdiction Judges on it, but it is used by District Courts and County Attorneys, therefore, she suggests expanding the group. This will make it harder to come to a consensus, but without all the stakeholders at the table, items can be missed. For example, breaking down the theft statute came about due to a District Court need.

Discussion about where the municipal infractions fit in is they are handled on a court by court basis, similar to local ordinances. However, Claudia commented this takes away from a standard, with so many databases being different. Judge Mohr brought up the fact Ennis and Fairview inquired about municipal infractions and if the state surcharges still applied, which Judge Mohr commented they still must be collected.

This project is ongoing with someone requesting a change or correction on a weekly basis which must be decided on a timely basis. Lisa commented everyone looks to the Court Administrator's office for the statute table. By far, their statute table is the most substantial listing out there.

Website Forms

The Law Library contacted Judge Carver about the forms on the web site. First of all, any forms or changes to forms must be approved by the Commission on Courts of Ltd. Jurisdiction. Judge Carver agreed the forms need to be updated. Lisa does not feel it is our job to do this. Lisa said the Self-Represented litigation group is working with Montana Legal Services to get these forms updated. This is not a technology issue, but a content issue. The IT division does not handle content. In addition, there is a project ongoing to change the Court Web Site. All these forms will fall in conjunction with the redesign of the web site. Beth agreed with Lisa this is not a technology issue. The above mentioned group will work on the changes and approval through the proper channels. If Lisa receives requests for changes, she will forward them to the Self-Represented group.

Ravalli County Website

The committee looked at the Ravalli County Website, which Judge Carver felt was very well designed. There are links to forms and information which are very good. They also included a page where someone can see the points that may appear on their driving record. Lisa noted these web sites are designed by the local IT departments in those counties. Judge Barger commented her county contracted with a web site developer and she was able to put what she wanted on it from her department. She has a link to obtaining one's driving record, for example. There are questions answered as well, such as what do you do when your driver's license is suspended.

Tina added Missoula uses a product called Civic Plus, which is a program with a variety of modules. It is user friendly, in that every department sets up their own web page. It has a feature called Notify Me, where an attorney can go to the link, log in and receive a copy of the calendar. They can add videos or forms. Tina said they want to develop a video of "*What happens when you go to Court?*". The clerks currently spend time

explaining the procedure to defendants. Tina added it is easy to edit the site and keep it up to date.

Lisa advised Kevin Cook is the Court Administrator's web site coordinator and he is currently working with the company that has been contracted to redo the web site. Lisa was successful in getting the CitePay link on the Court's web site. It is under "*How do I pay my citation on line?*" Judge Mohr suggested having a link to the individual county web sites on the state web site.

LISA MADER UPDATE

Andy Hazen, the technician in Glasgow, is leaving his post. He took care of the Eastern part of the State. Lisa advised they are posting his position right away and hope to get someone hired from that part of the State. It is hard to have someone stationed in Helena and on the road all the time.

Highway Patrol import

They have made progress with the Culbertson and Fergus County issue, in not being able to deliver the citations and text files to them electronically. One of the new developers has been working on new coding to be able to deliver that information to the state's file transfer service, it is tested and ready to begin automating. He started working on it yesterday, running into one issue and is working with Microsoft to solve it. Once it is tested to make sure there are no more issues, Claudia will begin the process of training the courts with an entire different set of instructions. Also, they will keep in touch with Highway Patrol who will let the officers know when it is up and running.

Regarding the motor vehicle reporting, there is no progress to report yet, partly because of District Court activities, a major process with jury coming up, and the roadside payment process. Lisa is still dealing with the enhancement issue and she has new code in place to test the fix and is in the process of getting those environments set up. Part of the project depends on the Department of Administration; therefore, it is not her staff. Motor vehicle reporting is still running, but Lisa requested an enhancement as to how the process works on their end. The way it was coded created some problems with the validation process. We validate on State NCIC codes and there is some issue with that. Statewide, only 12 courts report electronically to the Dept. of Motor Vehicles.

Tina said one of the problems is the error reporting. Claudia said they cannot decipher the error messages. Lisa said the problem will be corrected once this has been tested and is working properly. Tina reported the DMV has been very good to work with. Missoula Municipal court has just started overdue processing. They were one of the original installs of overdue processing and never completely implemented it.

At the last meeting Lisa was going to make contact with the Citrix Courts, unfortunately, this remains on the to-do-list.

Enterprise

JSI was just in Helena Tuesday and Wednesday of this week and discussed Enterprise. They were originally scheduled in March, but one of their team members had a family emergency. The goal of the meeting was to secure cost estimates of the hardware coding from JSI services, which will be necessary to deploy FullCourt Enterprise. When they get back to us with that information, Lisa will be developing a proposal for the next Legislative session to go into HB 10, which is the IT initiative bill.

In one of the minutes, Judge Carver said they paid for Enterprise. What they paid for was the licensing rights, or the right to use Enterprise. That gave us the right to either use Enterprise licensing or statewide V5 licensing. That part has indeed been paid for. But what was not secured in that same legislative session was the hardware costs for infrastructure. It is a completely different deployment plan. In addition, Montana customization must be made to the application, the database itself, and the services required getting the coding and implementing it. It is a big project when you think about programs such as CitePay, motor vehicle reporting and the central repository. This is a completely different database structure, therefore, causing a different repository to replicate all these new schemas to.

Lisa said the State has a \$100,000 credit with them for the customization, but that in no way will cover everything. It will hinge on what the cost comes back as, will the legislature even approve it and will the Chief approve of it. Lisa inquired the committee as to what the immediate need is for Enterprise, as V5 is working well in the courts. Lisa is not entirely sure it is the time to move to Enterprise. Sharon asked when they would stop supporting V5. Lisa said for the majority of their customers, it is still V5. They have a handful of courts with Enterprise and the largest is Winnebago County.

Lisa added the database structure which would be needed in order to move to Enterprise has never been coded. Montana would be the first. Lisa is not willing to pay for all the customizations because they are the first one, but she is being told we would not take the full brunt of the customization, because this is the direction they are moving toward. Lisa said her department does not have the resources to get two major projects such as e-filing and Enterprise done simultaneously.

Judge Carver inquired if the licenses for Enterprise will expire and Lisa replied, yes it does, but they would renegotiate that. Therefore, Judge Carver said we paid for a product that we are not using. Lisa replied before, they paid for every single FullCourt license that was out there. The cost was \$2950.00 per license and a maintenance fee of \$540 every year on each of the licenses. Every time a court would call and advise they have a new employee, the Court Administrator's office could not budget for that. Karen Nelson tried to get funding in 2005 which was not approved, but went back to the legislature in 2007 and the funding was approved. What they did was negotiate a statewide licensing authority to have an unlimited number of licenses, minus the licenses that were already secured. This gave them the authority to have licenses in either V5 or Enterprise statewide. Nothing beyond that was secured. The \$100,000 credit was probably from grant money and Karen wanted it there when they were ready to work on the coding. The

state is in its 5th year of the 10 year contract and it will have to be renewed. They pay \$330,000 per year for the maintenance and about every two years it is customary in the IT world to see a 5% increase. Lisa is comfortable with the contract, but it is the hardware and infrastructure, database coding and conversion of data, which all require JSI services.

Judge Carver asked when would Lisa know if we would move to Enterprise? Lisa will work on budgeting all next week and she must be able to pull the proposal altogether. She should know within the next couple of weeks if the Chief says yes, go to the legislature with a request for that amount of money.

Lisa feels this project needs to move along, but realistically, no way can they get two major projects up and running on the resources they have. Judge Carver asked Lisa how solid does JSI look at this time. He has heard of programs being implemented and the company has closed their doors, leaving the entities with a program not supported. He learned this had happened to the State of Pennsylvania. Lisa believes the company is moving forward. They are coding an e-filing product for Idaho and in Kansas. They are pushing Enterprise as well. She does not believe they are going away soon. But, just recently the same thing happened with their juvenile probation application.

Tina asked a question in regard to Enterprise, in that it is a web-based program, as opposed to all the hardware that we have now. She would welcome a web-based program to get out of the City IT policy and procedures situation. If she wants to purchase an Ithaca printer, they want her to run it by the City IT people. This printer will not be networked to anything. It is hard to work for two technical bosses.

What Lisa is contemplating is putting in regional servers. The server would be located in the area where the strongest infrastructure is. There would be a single database, but multiple schemas. There would be 8 servers across the state, as opposed to 200 servers. The servers would take care of all the courts in that particular district, including the District Courts. Every server will have a global statute table. However, along came a change that allowed courts to change their bond amounts from the recommended bond amount to the court specific bond amount. And, the *must appear* was something the courts could choose. Lisa explained further they will have a global statute table, but underneath this for every court will be fields which may need to be defined for the local rules. Managing and maintaining all of this is the part that JSI has never done. But, they told Lisa they did it in V5 for one court, but have not done it in Enterprise. They advised Lisa this is the direction they are headed. Claudia said as users no one will know the difference, but from their end it is a huge project.

Thelma inquired if that would be a time saver, which Claudia said changing 22 districts with 8 or 9 servers is easier than the 200 tables out there. But, Claudia is worried about the co-mingling of data. Lisa knows how important this decision could be. Two things she worries about are that JSI has never done this before and the resources issue. She said the application is ready, but the application must change to meet the database structure. Claudia would like to see JSI try the application out on a court somewhere else,

as compared to the entire State of Montana. Lisa said to at least have some numbers on the table is a step forward. She said they did this exact procedure two years ago, with nobody making any decisions. JSI did provide a test environment, but Claudia said it was not ready.

Judge Carver asked if the proposal to the legislature would be specific to new software. Lisa said the request would be for the hardware and infrastructure, for the application customization and database coding, and for the JSI services on all of those. This would include training the trainers, training the developers, and training the technicians, plus the conversion of data. The first 10 courts installed with FullCourt are still slightly different; therefore, JSI would have to help us through that. They would come with us during the first week for the first 2 installations in the Limited Jurisdiction courts and the first two District Court installs. Judge Carver said the legislature will have to be convinced that we need a new program, either because the old one is not working, or it is ending. They must be convinced this new program is a necessity and we have to be committed to that. If they get the sense we think it would be nice, the legislature is not going to fund it.

Lisa said Public Health and Human Services is approaching the legislature with a massive IT request. This is to replace the Cap system they now have. This will be a huge request in dollars versus our request which is much less. Thelma said how do you convince the legislature we need Enterprise when some members of the committee are not sure. Judge Barger commented if you do not move forward, you can risk being left behind, especially when it comes to technology. There is a danger in not moving forward and finding out there is no support for the current system. Claudia said we do have a very stable product right now. District Courts were just recently moved onto Full Court and were not entirely happy with that. Claudia said they have added CitePay, the imports and they are moving to road side payments. To her, they are moving at the speed of light with technology, which has created a ton of work in the background, which the users do not see. Ernie from JSI did make a comment regarding how much has been done in the past 10 years. E-filing will be coming in Phase 1, Phase 2 and Phase 3.

Lisa will ask the question to JSI regarding support to V5. Claudia added it is not a situation of going to Enterprise, but we do not want to rush into it. Even though the courts have been hearing about Enterprise for 5 years, the IT division needs to do what is right. Sharon wondered where the point is after adding all these products that JSI is not going to support V5 anymore. Tina asked if JSI has a succession plan, which is industry standard. Judge Carver commented he misunderstood the comment that Enterprise had been purchased, when in reality it was license fees for V5 or Enterprise that had been purchased.

Lisa added she remembers when JSI said they were not going to be making any more changes to V5, but wanted to move to Enterprise. However, over time they realized their customers are not moving as fast to Enterprise as they would like, therefore, have changed their attitude about V5. Lisa said everyone knows that V5 is still being supported by JSI. She believes the question, however, needs to be asked. She also said if they do not go to the legislature for funding this session, they will absolutely go the next

session. Provided current staff stays in their positions, they will have a very seasoned staff and be further down the road on this project. The e-filing project will be up and running by then. Lisa is going to the legislature with a staffing proposal as well. So much of this hinges on the legislature and the resources. Claudia added JSI advised them they were still writing code to cleanup issues in the courts that have gone to Enterprise.

Sharon added she is not advocating for Enterprise, but there are projects which were put on hold with the idea of moving to Enterprise. Judge Carver said one of those projects was overdue processing, because it would be completely different in Enterprise. His experience is going to the legislature and requesting funding and receiving that funding are two different things. Judge Mohr explained his experience as to the budget process and will there be surplus funds available. Also, parties may be divided as to how they want to see the money spent. Judge Carver complimented Lisa for explaining all of this to the committee members, so they understand more fully what is going on.

Judge Mohr does not feel that Montana is JSI's biggest customer and Lisa thought that Kansas was. She will speak to their IT director as well. She is under the impression that Kansas is moving towards V5 E-filing right now. Lisa said they would present this to the legislature as we are fully invested with JSI right now and this is their next product. We would be converting data from a JSI product to another JSI product. She knows there are significant benefits to Enterprise for the District Court judges because it is data sharing. For example, a District Judge with 7 counties would be able to see the calendar for all his cases. She cannot at this time articulate the huge benefit to the Limited Jurisdiction Courts. Claudia said it will require more standardization for one thing.

CitePay Bond at Jail

Lisa anticipates receiving a test revision of that code sometime in May. Obviously, they will have to work through training and test extensively. She added it will require a revision to FullCourt code and CitePay code, which they are struggling with right now. Claudia would not be reluctant to go to Enterprise if they received solid updates right now to V5.

For discussion at the next meeting will be the issue of MHP collecting bonds on Warrants at the stop. Also, Lisa would like to discuss at the next meeting the request from the State Highway Traffic Safety Bureau regarding receiving statistics. The minutes of 3-27-2008 discussed this type of request and it was decided the information would be available through the Central Repository, but no further work was done at that time.

CLAUDIA UPDATE

MVD New Forms

The Notice of Suspension form discussed at the last meeting was changed as per committee request. No training has been done on this form to date.

Roadside Payments

Claudia said they are getting close to starting Roadside Payments in Park County and Richland County. Judith Basin and Hill County have more paperwork to do before they are ready. After she talked to the DOJ, she learned they were not going to implement it until after May 1st. Our side of the project is ready to go, but Smart Cop wanted a security enhancement, which may not be done yet. Training materials have been developed as well.

Claudia said it is important to call these credit card payments. They do not work the same as CitePay. The roadside payments will be receipted into the case as credit card payments. The court will receive an e-mail stating the court has a payment, followed by the 2nd e-mail, which lets the court know when the money was deposited into their bank account. The e-mails will look differently, with one saying Payments and the other Deposits. Sharon said in Yellowstone County they receive between 20-30 roadside payments a month. Lisa thought it was less than that. Judge Barger does expect to receive them in her court, as her Highway Patrolmen are very receptive to the idea. Claudia would like to receive a copy of the e-mail in the beginning, so she can see how it is working and how often it is used. In January, she only saw 3 credit card payments for Yellowstone County.

Priority List-Status

Lisa reported the priority list was: Repository issues, which still exists, expanding the electronic reporting of dispositions to the MVD, Roadside payments and the 24-7 form. The 24/7 form has been developed and approved, and the developers will work on getting this rolled out.

MANS forms-electronic transfer

Lisa is working with people in the Dept of Justice criminal records system. They keep track of the criminal records, both Misd. and Felony. We currently have two courts, Lewis & Clark County District Court and Missoula County District Court that are electronically exchanging case information with the criminal records system, in order for them to update those cases with court dispositions. The problem they ran into is they do not get all the information they need. It all goes back to the Mans process. Of all the Mans forms processed and sent into the criminal records system, they only get somewhere around 50% of the dispositions and this includes those coming from District Court and the Limited Jurisdiction courts. The problems stem from training.

In October at the Fall Conference, the Dept. of Justice plans on providing some Mans form training. They have also submitted an NCHIP 2012 grant to work on the Mans process and training. The purpose of the grant would be to find out where the breakdown is, figure out how to fix it and put out the training material. The grant awards have not been put out yet. One of the ideas discussed in the past was getting the dispositions from the central repository. This would mean they would not have to fax forms out to the courts to get the information they need. We think this will make the work go better on their end. Lisa is working on the project with her developers.

Claudia wanted to bring this issue up, because their training material has not been updated since 1999. Lisa did receive a list of maintainable charges from the DOJ. The Dept. of Justice thought it may be beneficial to do a score card of the court dispositions. This way a court could look and see if they have a major problem. Tina noted her court may not get a very good score, because of training issues. Judge Mohr said Richland County/Sidney City court should do well, because we have jailers who are really on top of this. Judge Carver said he receives a Mans form anytime someone is booked into the jail and if the jailers do not know the charge, they charge civil contempt under 3-10.

Lisa believes there is a breakdown all the way around on this issue. Again, the purpose of the grant is to figure out the problems and do something about them. Providing training and training materials should certainly help. The Mans form begins in the detention center, so if someone is not booked in, there is no Mans form to send. Lisa said the statistic of their only receiving 50% of dispositions from the court, means they have received the Mans form with the fingerprints. Judge Carver will get in touch with Eleanor from DOJ and get her scheduled for the Fall Conference for an hour each with the Judges and then the Clerks. Training, however, needs to be done all around.

MHP Import citations-CFR violations

An issue came up in Lewis & Clark County where the Highway Patrol is writing CFR violations. The Dept. of Transportation tickets do have a place for ARM and CFR violations. MHP has been writing the generic statute of 61-10-154 and then write in the note somewhere it is CFR. The Lewis & Clark county attorney believes they need to put what the CFR is. In the bond book they are listed as 391.1 as an example, when they should start out with 49. Judge Mohr has seen a couple DOT tickets come in with the 61-10-154 code, but not the CFR. Lisa said when it comes to MHP; she does not believe it should be a court issue. She believes it is a highway patrol citation form issue.

Judge Carver brought the Dept. of Transportation citation to the committee, because at some point they will report electronically. Lisa said their forms are entirely different. Smart Cop will deal with this when they are ready to come aboard. Judge Carver said the county attorney's problem was 61-10-154 states the State of Montana recognizes the federal regulations and will enforce them. It is not a violation in and of itself. Lisa will let the committee know what Bruce with Smart Cop has to say about the issue.

Systems and Application policy

This was discussed at a previous meeting due to a request from Judge Snowberger and the Citrix court issues. Lisa has started work on this policy, but it is not complete at this time. The policy would state who has authority to get into a court's FullCourt program.

Accounting rules and procedures

The committee had passed the accounting rules and procedures; however, Judge Carver did not draft the letter to the courts yet. Therefore, the letter still needs to be drafted and sent out to the committee members.

CitePay-questions-status update

At the last clerk's conference, attendees were advised to contact the Court Administrator's office if they wanted CitePay. They have been contacted by some courts. Unfortunately, they ran into some issues with CitePay. Claudia put a message up on List serv explaining why they have not installed more CitePay sites. Lisa said they have a new release that is, hopefully, solid and can be deployed. Claudia stated the last release from JSI had a major problem in it. Judge Barger said she had a "bug", when a State Representative got a speeding ticket in her county. She had paid it on CitePay, but it went to another county. Judge Barger issued a Warrant for her Arrest for not paying the ticket. CitePay made the mistake by sending it to the wrong county and Judge Barger was not notified of this. Claudia requested all information pertaining to this issue, because she is tracking everything that happens in CitePay. Claudia informed the committee the last update had a large financial hole in it and she could not work with it. Last afternoon at 3:30 PM, they received their 7th update.

Thelma inquired about a performance clause in the JSI contract. Lisa said the past contract had no performance clause. However, should they receive the e-filing contract, there is a performance clause written in it. If we move forward on Enterprise, Lisa will write an addendum to that contract to add the performance clause. Lisa has spoken to JSI about the update issues.

Tina reported having worked with software issues in the past and different companies, there definitely can be errors. The developers are not the end users of the program. She was also with DPHHS when they received a bad program. Tina believes it is very common to have problems with software meeting all the specifications of the users and working properly. These are very complex systems. Claudia said every time something is added, in this case CitePay, there is more opportunity for an error. Judge Carver said the #1 call he gets is in regard to the Citation number. He wishes you did put in the prefix to the number, such as 510A, because most people try to enter it that way. Lisa said for the committee's FYI, JSI has not completed coding for CitePay in Enterprise.

Claudia said the new release was only to change a few V codes for reporting purposes, such as Aggravated DUI and an issue District Court had in paying their jurors. The bugs have come from the updates. Lisa explained they are not regression testing, which means they do not go back and test the old update; they just test the new update. Claudia said they test thoroughly once they get a release and give JSI every screen shot of what they found, so JSI knows exactly what is wrong. Lisa added this is why when a new release does go out; it only goes out to Court X and Court Y for a month, to make sure there are no other issues showing up. Unfortunately, Claudia said this is why it takes a long time to get a new release pushed out to the courts.

Terminals for CitePay

Lisa said if the court wants a terminal, it does require a new version of FullCourt. We just talked about the latest release. It took the Court Administrator's office a long time to get all the courts on the same version of FullCourt. The other question was does the terminal have the same terminology as on the web site and the answer is no. The

machine is basically just there for the credit card swipe. The clerk will have to read the information from CitePay to the defendant. The other question dealt with what is recorded on the receipt as to how the money was accepted and Lisa said because the clerk must open the case, the receipt records her as accepting the payment. FullCourt prints the receipt, not the terminal itself. The machines are primarily plug_and_play to get the computer to recognize it. There is software that needs to be installed which JSI can do remotely, or they can teach the trainers. The trainers can install it remotely as well. The terminals come with all the software that is needed. Regarding the support issue that Judge Mohr brought up, there is no ongoing support cost. The support is all with JSI. The other contracts with the terminal are sub-licenses. There is no cost for software updates. Lisa also got the name of a court and contact person in Virginia and they are using these terminals extensively.

FullCourt Training-Webinar-Status

District Court will get their list of jurors the 1st week in May. The Webinar was created so that a District Court could go to their side and the Limited Jurisdiction Courts can go to their side. Claudia said this year they are still going to help the courts with their lists, but the trainers will train with the video. This will let the courts get familiar with the video. The video goes into how to make groups and how to make panels. As soon as Mike makes his finishing touches to the video, it will then be available on Share Point.

List Serv

Judge Carver advised not all the judges are on List Serv. Judge Carver did use List Serv to let the judges know there would be a traveling lab at the school on Monday. Judge Fagenstrom, who is on the Commission on Courts of Ltd. Jurisdiction, sent a letter advising you are on a public forum and understand the problem a Federal Judge had, which was in the news lately. Justice Cotter will be at the Judge's conference and her topic deals with ethics and will address List Serv, Facebook and Twitter issues. Lisa met with her and printed out some of the e-mails, in order for her to better understand how to address this topic.

Traveling Lab

Claudia reported the traveling lab is set to run Monday of the Judge's conference. The hours are 11:00 AM to 5:00 PM with 3 trainers. A new trainer Mike Richetti will be there, along with Shari Bishop, Cindy, and Claudia. She has had calls from judges already excited about it. A couple judges wanted to bring their clerks, but this is for Judges only. At the fall conference, the traveling lab will be set up for the judges on their registration day and the following day will be set up for the clerks. There are 10 computers at the lab.

Kalispell Municipal infractions-status

Lisa said these are large drive-by projects. When Marty was here he took care of many of the changes, but they may have to make the decision to do it manually. Thelma understood the staffing issues and current ongoing projects and they will get to it when able to do so. Thelma said they are currently handling the tickets manually.

Claudia said the main project for May is Jury. The update is something they will continue to work on. Roadside payments for the pilot courts must be worked on.

New Business

Judge Linda Budeski had a question about Bond Revocation. Her clerks brought up the issue that there is no way to handle a Bond Revocation in FullCourt. FullCourt handles a bond revocation as a forfeiture. Judge Budeski said this is a situation where the bail bond has been revoked and the bondsman does not want to do anything about it. Judge Carver said you could do a minute entry in FullCourt when you revoke someone's bond, due to their failure to follow conditions of release. Sharon said you can put it in the comments in the bond window. Then they issue a Warrant for the defendant. Lisa cautioned if there was a change in the bond window on this issue, that change may not appear in Enterprise. When this committee worked on the ROA, one is listed for Bond Revocation – BNDREV.

Statute 87-6-217

Montana Code Annotated 2011

[Previous Section](#) [MCA Contents](#) [Part Contents](#) [Search](#) [Help](#) [Next Section](#)

87-6-217. Shooting at simulated wildlife. (1) A person may not discharge a firearm or other hunting implement at a simulated wildlife decoy in violation of any state statute or commission rule regulating the hunting of the wildlife being simulated when the decoy is being used by a certified peace officer.

(2) A person convicted of a violation of this section is subject to the same penalty as prescribed for the state statute or commission rule violated during the attempted hunting of the actual wildlife being simulated. In addition, the person shall pay restitution of \$50 to the department for the repair of damages to simulated wildlife decoys.

History: En. Sec. 18, Ch. 258, L. 2011.

Provided by Montana Legislative Services

<>

Judge Carver said in the Bond Book this statute is listed and below it is listed the restitution for Decoy Repair. What they want to write for instance is the defendant broke a commission rule while shooting at simulated wildlife. Or in some instances, they were shooting off a roadway, while shooting at the simulated wildlife. None of the issues cover the fact that 87-6-217 states "any state statute". How do we build a Bond Book which ties this statute to shooting off a roadway, because if the 87-6-217 is not there, they do not receive the \$50 restitution for repair of the simulated wildlife? Judge Mohr suggested they write the original violation and request restitution. Judge Mohr also suggested they write two violations, one shooting off roadway and one for shooting at simulated wildlife. Fish, Wildlife & Parks wanted Judge Carver to eliminate the

categories below the simulated wildlife statute. Lisa said FullCourt cannot be changed to what Fish, Wildlife & Parks is asking. Judge Carver added there is certainly a difference between shooting a simulated decoy and a real animal. He will probably go back to Fish, Wildlife & Parks and give them the suggestion to have the legislature fix it. It would state any violation of shooting at simulated wildlife includes the restitution of \$50.00. Then the new penalty would be added to the statutes.

Thelma presented a scenario of a judge doing the telephonic warrant; apparently the court must have the electronic version of it and the transcript. These electronic versions get e-mailed to her and she wants to know if there is any way to save it to the case in FullCourt. Lisa said there is no way to do that. This law is located under 46-5-222, which states the recording must be retained in the court record. Judge Barger said her officers bring her a CD and she keeps that in the file folder. Judge Carver recommends scanning the search warrant and transcription in to FullCourt and putting the CD in the file folder. Sharon suggested putting the e-mail with the electronic version in her Outlook, copy the folder and reference it to the images.

Agenda for Next Meeting

Discuss DUI Data request
Accounting and Procedures letter
CitePay code for bond at the jail
Greg Noose – 24/7 forms for DMV
Roadside Payments pilot recap
Lisa will give Enterprise update
Imaging – Rules

Next Meeting Date

August 16th, 2012

Minutes submitted by member, Barb Pepos