

**COCLJ AUTOMATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING – MAY 14, 2010,
HELENA, MONTANA**

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chairperson Judge Larry Carver
Judge Gregory P. Mohr
Judge Johnny Seiffert
Karen Nelson, Administrator's Office
Lisa Mader, Court Administrator's Office
Sharon Skaggs, Yellowstone County Justice Court
Barbara Pepos, Richland Co. Justice Court-Sidney City Court
Sheri Bishop, Gallatin County Justice Court

MEMBERS PRESENT BY PHONE:

Thelma Keys-Nicol, Kalispell Municipal Court

MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Judge David Ortley
Jennifer Boschee

Meeting was called to Order by Chair Judge Larry Carver at 9:00 AM

APPROVAL OF MARCH 12, 2010 MINUTES:

Minutes were approved by the committee as submitted.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No one appeared to make public comment at this time.

CARVER UPDATE:

Carver met with Greg Noose, who was not able to make this meeting as he was headed to St. Louis; however, we have a draft of the Driver License Suspension form. Judge Carver said that some of the courts are going away from the Orders of Protection forms that were provided. Sheri Bishop agreed that her court was using the old forms, as their judges did not like the new ones. Judge Carver advised one of the reasons he heard was that the CJIN operators were unable to determine the Brady indicators on the new forms. He heard that the Petition is being used, but not the Order. Sheri Bishop said right now the new Order of Protection is just too confusing for their clerks and judges. They went back to the old Order so they knew what to check for Brady indicators. Judge Carver wanted more comment on this issue before the committee goes back to review the OOP forms. Judge Seiffert added that it does take time to get used to change, but he felt you just have to use the new forms and not go back to the old ones.

Karen added that until the courts use the Civil window, that process cannot be automated. Karen felt that if the Brady indicator became a Yes or No it might make the system work better, but if the Civil Order window is not used, there is no successful way to automate

the process. Judge Carver believes part of the reason is training of the CJIN workers, who are still going by the old training manual. Judge Carver said that he is not aware of any court having a problem with the Petition. Discussion then proceeded to the cards that are being made after the OOP is ordered. Joan Eliel has been handling this end of it and Karen is 90% sure that the photo is coming from the DL and they get their information from Law Enforcement. This information is available on the Attorney General's web site. Judge Carver wanted to know if the Brady indicator was on the card.

Judge Carver said at the Spring Judge's conference there was confusion among some of the attendees **between the Central Repository and CJIN**. It was suggested that a "Best Practices" letter or e-mail be sent out to all the courts explaining the differences here and how you access either one. Sheri Bishop asked what the issue was with CJIN. Judge Carver said a court can register and pay an amount to get a certified driving record from the Dept. of Motor Vehicles. Law Enforcement mainly accesses the CJIN records, although, some courts can access CJIN if they are willing to have a clerk certified in CJIN. Sharon Skaggs said there is a \$450.00 per year license fee to have one person certified in CJIN. Karen Nelson advised that the Central Repository only has the driving records that are adjudicated in Montana, but Driver Improvement may have records available from another state on the driving history. CJIN on the other hand would show criminal history, as well as any record of an Order of Protection or a Warrant pending. Lisa said they have a pamphlet explaining the Central Repository, although, it may need to be updated.

Sharon suggested this information **regarding the differences be presented at the Fall conference for clerks as well**. She is guessing that only 50% of the clerks know how to access the Central Repository. Judge Carver anticipates there may be between 10-15 new Judges attending the conference in the Fall. Barbara "Skip" Kohn, the Judge from Darby, retired recently as well. Judge Mohr said that 10 judges are leaving for sure. Judge Carver recommended that a **letter needs to go out to all the courts and the committee agreed**. Six new judges tested at the Spring Training.

Judge Carver has also visited with Don Denning, an auditor, and he has seen Full Court and likes what it does. One of the auditor's comments was that between $\frac{1}{4}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ of the courts are using the old peg-board system and the Full Court system. Therefore, they are issuing two receipts on the case, one from the peg board and one from Full Court. He suggested the Judges throw the peg board out. His second issue is that the receipt can be edited once it has been printed. Sharon said you can edit the Header, not the dollar amount. Lisa said that if you inadvertently put the money in as cash instead of a check, you can go back to that receipt and change it to check, in order to make the deposit work. If someone is handed a receipt for \$300.00 and then later on the clerk edits it to someone else's name that creates an auditing problem. The auditor wanted receipts voided, instead of edited. Judge Carver wanted to know if an ROA was recorded once a change was made. If that is the case, then the auditor can live with the changed receipt. Lisa said you cannot change entry date and time, user, the case, and the money amount.

Judge Mohr said that as long as the money is there in Full Court, the auditor should not be concerned. **The auditor wants to see why a receipt was changed**, even if the money was not an issue, because that could send up a red flag. Karen said that perhaps they **could add to the receipt window a drop down box if there is a change to a receipt**. She will also look back in the database to see if the changed receipt is recorded there. Lisa will find out if Full Court has built in receipt events. Judge Carver stated an auditor is always going to write him up, because he is a one person court and there is no possibility of one person handling the money and another person making the deposit. He knows that many courts in the State of Montana do not have more than one person in the office. Lisa said they got a phone call from the clerk in Dillon regarding the separation of duties issue. The Court Administrator's office is not able to give advice on every accounting issue, but they do tell people this is how most of the courts are handling that. Dillon wanted to know if the Court Administrator's office could tell their Treasurer to do this, and of course, they cannot. The auditor's job is to identify risk and report to the County Commissioners.

Judge Carver said he knows two auditors who want a time pay report and a Warrant report. The reason for this is when there is no recent activity on the time pay they want to see that a Warrant was issued, or some other type of action taken. Once they have that information, then they can advise the County Commissioners that the court is trying to collect the time pays. Of course, some courts would have the time pay turned over to collection, with a DL suspension. Judge Mohr said that it is the job of the prosecutor to collect the time pays; however, since most courts have done this part of the job forever it is unlikely they will get any help from the prosecutors. Judge Seiffert had to explain to his auditor that his time pay agreements are not account receivables, but fines and fees as a penalty owed to the people of the State of Montana. Judge Seiffert said that the Billings Municipal court will issue a Warrant for unpaid fines and fees, but after one year has gone by and the Warrant has not been served, they will dismiss the action. Sharon Skaggs said they do cancel their warrants after a year with no service, but do not write the amount due off, it is turned over to collections and the DL suspension stays.

DRIVER LICENSE SUSPENSION FORM:

The only thing added by Greg Noose was the check box for *Failed to Appear or Failed to Comply*. Use one or the other, not both. **Greg Noose needs to see the charge**, as States vary as to what charges they are willing to suspend on. Judge Mohr inquired if the top of the form should add **driving privilege suspension**, for out of State drivers due to the fact the Judge cannot suspend a DL from another state. In the Reinstatement part which this committee added: *"Determination of Indigence: In accordance with the standards set forth in MCA 47-1-111, the court has determined that the above named driver is indigent."* Greg Noose wants to know this right away when the person's DL is reinstated, not have his DL reinstated and then 2 weeks later get a form stating that the Defendant is Indigent. His Department has problems when they try to collect the reinstatement fee and then later on the Court determines the defendant is indigent. The statute this applies to is 61-5-218 MCA. Judge Mohr said obviously a problem with this is when the matter has been taken care of over the phone and the defendant is located two states away.

The fee to reinstate is a minimum of \$100, or if alcohol related \$200. Judge Carver said currently there is a problem with the 45 day suspension on a 2nd offense DUI, where the law states at the time of conviction, but some of the courts are filing the conviction 45 days later. This causes the Motor Vehicle Dept. problems when processing the case. Greg Noose has no problem with this form or the indigent determination made by the courts. Sharon states that when the Judge determines that the defendant is indigent, they just write *Rescind* on the form. Rescind means that Driver Improvement won't charge the fee. Sharon said they also use Rescind when it was sent in error. Right now too many courts are using their own forms and causing Driver Improvement problems. Judge Mohr believes that 61-5-218 is a defendant requirement, meaning that they must prove they are indigent. Judge Carver reiterated after the determination of indigence, Driver Improvement must be notified.

Judge Carver and Karen learned from Greg Noose that Driver Improvement is behind 2 months in handling DL suspensions, caused by their understaffing. Karen Nelson did not want to speak for Greg Noose but she felt that the box with Rescind was not how Greg Noose wanted to handle it anymore. There is no check box for in error. Karen Nelson said there should be a 4th box which says "**in error**". Judge Seiffert suggested possibly put Rescind with a notation of in error. Greg Noose suggested to Judge Carver that wording could be: *Determination of Indigence was made at the same time as the DL Reinstatement*. A 4th box of Rescind Order was suggested by Judge Mohr. Karen said that one form should be able to handle all of these issues.

Sharon said one problem of having the Determination of Indigence on this form may open the door for more defendants to request that determination. Their defendants actually receive a copy of this form. Karen noted the 2009 Legislature added this specifically for a court to make this determination. The committee discussed whether the Determination of Indigence should be removed from the form. Judge Carver believed that all these issues should be on one form to make it work for Driver Improvement. Judge Carver said he would talk to Greg Noose and advise him that the committee didn't believe it would be a big problem. Judge Seiffert liked the form to keep the box regarding "**Determination of Indigence**", as this creates accountability on the part of the Judge.

Judge Carver said that a 4th box saying **RESCIND ORDER, ISSUED IN ERROR** could be added. The **committee agreed to this suggestion**. Lisa said Greg Noose does not want both boxes of Failed to Appear and Failed to Comply to be checked on the same form. **If there is a case where the Defendant is charged with Failure to Appear and also Failed to Comply, then two separate forms should be sent to Driver Improvement.** Judge Carver said that once one form is developed, Greg Noose should not accept any other DL suspension form at Driver Improvement.

CITEPAY:

A demonstration of the CitePay portal was held with JSI. Mary Thomas, Bill and Ernie were at the JSI site. Ernie said they are pretty close on the contract with Karen Nelson.

Most of the work has been completed as per the minutes of the meeting on November 13th, 2009. The pieces regarding the over-the-counter payment are still being approved by the banking industry and the merchants, but is moving positively at this time. The demonstration shows what happens when a Defendant enters the site on the computer screen. Defendant finds the link on one of the court's local web sites. Mary Thomas then demonstrated entering the CitePay portal for on-line payments. The title says Montana, but Ernie felt the State should choose a name for the Montana CitePay system. There are instructions on the site as to what the defendant needs to enter to make the payment on CitePay. They either need their **case number and/or citation number and DOB handy**. Users cannot move forward on the site without clicking the blanks that need to be filled for the Montana site.

Judge Seiffert inquired regarding the agreement screen, which states **"agreeing to a designated plea"**, which the committee agreed had to be changed, because it was not a plea. Bill pointed out that defendants will know they are on a secure site with the "lock" icon. Judge Carver asked for a demonstration of a time pay payment. Judge Seiffert wondered if the initial page stated there will be a transaction fee. Ernie said that you cannot show a fee until the amount of payment is entered.

Judge Carver wants to see where the on-line payments show up when he wants to see them on Monday mornings. You would look under Full Court reports, use Financial and the E payment section and then you will look at E payments received report. You can print that report and see what has been received at CitePay.

Mary Thomas said if the Time Pay agreement is not filled out in Full Court, a court could use another setup where they just enter a minimum amount. The screen will show the Defendant the entire amount that he owes and the minimum payment he can make on-line. They can always pay more than the minimum amount on the case. The language here is that they agree to the terms and agreements on the web site. This will work with either a debit or credit card. The receipt will print the amount paid and the balance left. Mary's demo date is set to move the next payment out 30 days, but the courts decide on that setting.

Payments from CitePay will immediately be seen in the transactions list under epayments. Bill advised once the over-the-counter part of CitePay is installed, those payments will also appear on this report. Also, the entries are shown in the Full Court receipts report. Judge Seiffert did not want a clerk to be able to change the Header on any epayment receipt. Bill was making a note **that Montana did not want anyone to be able to change the receipt received through epayment.**

Mary demonstrated a case where there were 2 violations – one eligible for CitePay and one charge not eligible. Mary said one violation is speeding, which is bond forfeiture eligible, but the driving while suspended charge is a MUST APPEAR. Judge Carver asked if the Defendant needed a Citation # or Case #. Mary said they have to enter either the Citation # or the Case # to locate the case, and DOB must also be entered. Privacy issues were discussed with the rare possibility that same Citation numbers would pop up

with the same DOB. Judge Mohr said the individual entering the site knows the DOB, but Bill said no DOB is shown on the pick list. Karen Nelson said the Court is not providing the DOB, the person entering the site is. After the discussion, the committee decided there were no privacy issues.

Sheri inquired about the cases that were turned over to Collections and she wanted to know how CitePay dealt with this. Mary said when a case is in collections; they cannot make a payment on-line, but are referred to the Collections Agency. The Collections Module would automatically put that information on the Full Court case. Bill said that if courts do not use the Collections Module, you can go to the Agreement and enter Collect anywhere in the comment area. Another way is for Courts to use a special Case Status, which would be the prompt for Full Court to know the case is in Collections. **The Court always has control at the charge level to mark no e-payments will be accepted.** This can be done at the Party level in a situation where you wanted that person totally ineligible for on-line payments.

The language regarding the Collection Agency to contact is configured specific to the Court. This information configures whether a Court uses the Collections Module or not. What does the Court do when they work with two separate Collection Agencies? CitePay only shows one Collection Agency, so if a Court used more than one the message on CitePay would instruct the Defendant to contact the Court to receive their payment instructions. Mary advised that CitePay only pulls the cases from one specific court, not all the courts in the State of Montana.

Sheri inquired how CitePay would set up their payments, because payments on time pay in their Court are only payable on the 1st, 2nd, 3rd or 4th Monday every month. Bill said they have programmed something that would work for them. The functionality would move the payment date to a specific date in the next month. They also have the ability to link the payment to all the cases if there is one payment plan, which would move the payment date on all those cases. Enterprise has multiple time payment plans, which CitePay does support.

With the Priority Balance feature which is new, the defendant no longer sees the separate cases, but instead sees the entire balance due. This would work the same if restitution was due on one of the charges and the payment would be allocated properly behind the scenes. **Montana would need this feature turned on, because the Defendant only needs to know how to make his payment, balance due and next payment date.**

Overdue resets when a payment is received in CitePay and shows the payment was received by e-payments. Thelma wondered what would happen if a defendant is given an extension with the agreement they will make double payments the next month, but they go on CitePay and only make one payment? Thelma said technically it is not a valid payment and Overdue should not be reset. Bill said that Full Court only knows when a payment is received. Judge Carver believed the court can set the minimum payment they would receive from the defendant, therefore, not allowing a defendant to make only half of the payment on e-payments.

Mary went on to demonstrate a bail being posted on-line. This is a situation where the mother receives the phone call that her son/daughter is in jail and she is willing to post the bond. The Defendant would go to “*post bond for arrested person*”. They would find a drop down where they picked the city and jail where the person was held. The information needed is information on the person posting the bail and the other side for the person who is incarcerated. The Citation and/or case number is not a mandatory field, but could be entered if they have it. The language regarding a defendant’s mandatory appearance was shown on the site. The box had to be checked before the person could go on and post bond.

Some on the committee thought the site said the payment would be sent to the Jail, but Mary said the jail is notified that payment is made, but the payment goes to the Court. This payment is applied to an “unapplied receipt” on Full Court. Mary explained that if you look at the payment it gives the defendant name, facility where arrested and the comment field is also on the receipt. Any payment coming to the Court on bond goes to the unapplied receipt. Karen suggested that if the person posting bond says NO to the bond being posted used for fines and fees, this prints on the comment field of the receipt as well. Bill had that written down, so he could make that change.

Bill said they are working on the functionality which would match any payment called “unapplied receipt” to a case entered in Full Court. What this would prevent is unapplied creating a new case when there is already a case in Full Court. Ernie said this would be done on a future release.

Sheri commented they have a real problem with matching the bank statement to the e-payment report, because the bank statement collectively shows them as one deposit. She wondered if CitePay could delineate where that payment came from, instead of just a lump sum. Bill said the payment is made as a lump sum, but when electronic transfer is done, an itemized list is sent to the court. There is an ACH Deposit report that someone in the court receives. The ACH report shows each individual transaction that makes up the full amount. Mary said this is not in the Full Court system, but comes to the court in e-mail. Mary suggested that separate credit card deposits be turned on in the Court system, and then the list of individual receipts would come up.

Ernie explained where in a rare case the lump sum on the bank statement would not match the ACH report. This happens when someone disputes the credit card payment and the payment is not made. If that happens, the clerk would need to make the same notation that they do now when an NSF check is returned from the bank.

Judge Mohr asked how the court is going to know that someone bonded out from the jail. Judge Carver said when e-mail goes to the jail stating bond was received on CitePay, an e-mail should be sent to the Court at the same time. Bill said they have a request for this to send multiple e-mails when CitePay receives bail on someone held in Jail. Judge Carver inquired about the terminal for the in-court process of receiving credit card payments. Ernie said they are working on it, which includes all the encryption needed to

keep that credit card number from appearing anywhere. JSI is going through all the approvals now and the group they are working with is moving slowly. Karen said the contract with JSI authorizes only Direct Deposits/Payments, not withdrawals. Also, the committee asked for this change: *“Upon notification of termination from the Customer Court the Provider and Depository will comply with termination order within 10 business days”*. Originally, the contract stated within a reasonable time frame, so the 10 days was added.

Ernie said they would make a few tweaks that came out of this meeting and then they will work with the Court Administrator’s office on a test site. Sharon, Lisa and Claudia will work on the problem of the Yellowstone County Justice Court having 2 separate accounts. The 3 places that have CitePay now are Gallatin Justice Court, Bozeman Municipal Court and Lewis & Clark Justice Court. Judge Carver wanted CitePay to be installed in the Courts who have members on this committee. Ernie said they can do that; just advise them how and when. Ernie wanted the committee to provide them with the name for CitePay, so that it could be put on the banner. Idaho uses “Idaho Court Pay”.

KAREN NELSON UPDATE:

Lisa gave an update on the Bond Book. The committee each received a copy of the Bond Book. The Bond book is posted on the web site and the excel spreadsheet has been provided to two requesters who want to make changes to the Must Appear and Bond Amount columns. Lisa has not notified any other courts that the Bond Book is done, because it has not been installed in Full Court for the statute table. There are many columns that need to be updated, but right now these need to be pulled into a database for testing. There was one error which needed to be corrected: On Page 47, 61-6-301, 3rd offense, Owner permitting operation of vehicle without insurance, should be \$535.00.

Lisa has made her 2 primary goals to work on the Jury issues and the statute tables. She will send e-mail to all the courts when the Bond Schedule is complete. Judge Carver asked the committee to see Page 27, 28 and 29 which dealt with theft and all the subcategories. This is what the District Court and prosecutors wanted.

The Memorandum of Understanding and Request for Access to CitePay is what the Court Administrators office needs. The account is noted as a trust account on the Memo of understanding. Karen said in F. **Chargeback Fees**, it is very clear that the court can only return what has been put in the account in error, nothing else, including no chargeback fees, which Ernie agreed to. Karen said JSI will customize, maintain and install the CitePay portal as to the specifications of this committee. JSI will make all necessary changes at no cost to the court in the Citation Import process. Karen said this is in the agreement because CitePay will even work better for the Courts if the citation is already in Full Court. Karen also added that the customer court maintains sole ownership of the data provided in this project. The percentage for the fee to CitePay is 5%. The contract has not been signed by Lois yet, but there is no anticipated problem with it at this time. Participation in CitePay is totally voluntary to the courts.

Karen went on to state that there have been some problems with getting the information to the courts in the MHP project to import citations. The issue has been in the transfer process and technically this problem should not be occurring. They have been assured that MHP is working on the problem. Sharon advised that the importing of the MHP tickets is invaluable to them. She said it takes one person in her office from 1-2 hours per day. They also import the Yellowstone County Sheriff's office tickets. She said the information is more accurate when less people get involved in entering the information. There are no tickets to file once they are paid and closed. Most of the time the citations are imported the next day, which alleviates some of the overdue processing steps. She believes it is a win-win process for them.

Karen said Lisa and Marty and DOJ people talk behind the scenes to get the citations imported into the Yellowstone County Justice Court. Lisa explained that the MHP tickets are first transferred to the Department of Justice. If Marty does not see the data, then he must contact the DOJ. Lisa said in the beginning of this process, there was no issue with the transmittal of the information, but recently the problems have occurred. Lisa believes the problem exists from the DOJ to the FTP server, where Marty picks up the data. Judge Carver wanted to know if DOJ knows when something does not transfer. Marty checks daily to make sure the data is there. It worked, however, only 2 days out of 5 this week. Karen said it takes at least ½ hour to get the process going again.

Lisa said that the process of getting the citations into Full Court goes quickly. Once in Full Court, then Sharon's clerk goes into each case and images the citation. There are a few problems with the statute tables matching, which requires the clerk to go into the case and correct the statute. Karen said she does not know if DOJ imports the statute table, or if they manually enter it. Sharon said this is a major time saver for the Officers, who no longer have to come to the court and file their citations. She believes over all this is a great system.

Sharon said they get an audit sheet from the Highway Patrol which shows all the citations that should be imported into Full Court. There have been some minor discrepancies as in the case of an Officer getting one of his tickets in the next batch, instead of the current one imported. If the Court needs that citation right away, the Highway Patrol faxes over a copy. Lisa said the system does not allow you to double enter a citation. Major Butler has been very attentive as well as Sgt. Tenney. IT Staff at DOJ work on any problems as soon as they are contacted. Karen would certainly like to see this process work a couple of weeks without an intervention on the Court Administrator's part.

Karen added the MHP is getting their software which will allow for roadside payment by credit/debit card. Montana Interactive started this project about a year ago. Karen suggested she should write a Summary Report which states where the import project is right now and invite the MHP.

Karen also submitted a draft of the Overdue Processing Rules. The format was changed to itemize the type of violation or infraction that was discussed. This format is more readable. The changes were made that were discussed at the last meeting. Changes were

not made to the Billings Municipal court as discussed at the meeting, due to difficulty in scheduling. Right now, Billings Municipal court is receipting everything into unapplied. Judge Carver believes there needs to be an Attorney General's opinion regarding whether some of the municipal infractions will carry points on the defendant's records.

Karen wants Overdue Processing Rules to be all the same across the State of Montana. She has noticed that different courts have been operating under different rules, and this includes the grandfathered courts. Karen believes the transition will go well and they will go from court to court to make sure the transition is manageable. Lisa said they will use the Yellowstone County database to test the Overdue Processing Rules and new statute table.

Judge Carver wants to **make it clear in the minutes that every grandfathered court will be changed to the new Overdue Processing Rules.** Karen said with all the changes in the last 12 months most of the courts need an updated Overdue Processing program. Judge Carver wants all committee members to review these Overdue Processing Rules which will be discussed at the next meeting.

NEXT MEETING DATE:

Friday, July 9th, 2010 at 9:00 A.M.

Judge Mohr inquired about the Overdue Processing Rules for Municipal Infraction, which stated within 30 days. Appearance date is 14 days after the citation was issued. The minutes reflected that the fines and fees were due 30 days after the Admit. Judge Mohr believes that Judge Knisely needs to address this issue and he would talk with her.

EXPUNGEMENT OF CASE:

The committee received a sheet from the Help list in Full Court explaining how to expunge. If the case has any outstanding fines/fees, bonds or warrants, Full Court will not allow you to expunge the case. Lisa demonstrated how to expunge on Full Court. Expunging the case will remove all the defendant names from the case. All the charges, ROA, payments and hearing results are there but **defendant name changes to Expunge.** Once the case is expunged you will not be able to find it under the defendant name and in fact will not find it at all unless you have the case #. The Party record is not expunged, but under this case you will not find the defendant anywhere. Judge Carver said this should meet the criteria of the Supreme Court. Thelma said she has four cases where there is an Order to expunge, but she cannot expunge until the fines and fees have been paid. Thelma received a request from Driver Improvement Bureau to expunge someone's record. Judge Carver believed this can be found under 44-5-202 MCA in the statutes. Lisa said the case is **sealed** after it has been expunged. Judge Mohr said once the court has expunged the record, the court must shred the paperwork. **Judge Mohr and Judge Carver will present the committee with the court case that requires the shredding of the paper.** Judge Carver advised that if Driver Improvement receives an Order to expunge, they will expunge the record.

Judge Mohr talked to Judge Knisely and she agreed that she will contact the Court Administrator's office on Monday.

Judge Carver said at the next meeting they will discuss Overdue Processing Rules. Montana Highway Patrol should be invited to the next meeting as well. Also, Greg Noose should be invited to the next meeting, so that he can explain the auditing procedure to the Courts.

BANNER:

Courts On-Line Payment System

Montana Courts Payment System

Montana Courts On-Line Payment System AKA MCOPS

The committee agreed to the **Montana Courts On-Line Payment System.**

The link would be on the Montana Courts web site. The committee will be allowed to preview the banner.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 3:00 P.M.