



**King County  
Department of Judicial Administration**

M. Janice Michels  
*Director and Superior Court Clerk*

516 Third Avenue Room E609  
Seattle, WA 98104-2386

(206) 296-9300 (206) 296-0100 TTY/TTD

## Superior Court Imaging System

Discussion Outline (updated March 8, 1994)  
prepared by Roger Winters, Records and Research Manager

- I. Objectives of imaging
  - A. create imaged storage and retrieval system for court case records
  - B. improve security against records loss or damage
  - C. make records available for users (court, bar, clerk staff, administrator, OAC, public) soon after filing (eliminate 5-day delay)
  - D. enable simultaneous access to documents & files
  - E. increase service to public (e.g., remote access to files and documents through terminals in libraries and other locations)
  - F. achieve regional and environmental savings (e.g., reduced traffic load due to electronic remote access to records)
  - G. enhance security of sealed records
  - H. save on physical space required to store court records
  - I. review and revise work flow and gain efficiencies within the Court and Clerk's Office systems
  - J. enable efficiencies in the legal system at large (e.g., enable electronic service on other parties, streamline production of appellate documentation)
  - K. facilitate savings by litigants (e.g., reduced document handling and delivery costs)
- II. Assumptions
  - A. Imaging document storage and retrieval technology and associated workflow redesign could be used in all Superior Courts in Washington State: we presume this will be the technology for the 21st Century court
  - B. The medium for filings in the court file would become electronic images of original documents (i.e., originally signed pleadings and papers)
  - C. Imaging storage and retrieval could also include other records of the Clerk and the Court (administrative, financial, etc.); it



might also include documents not retained permanently (e.g., exhibit documents)

- D. Design would be "open architecture" with "open systems" allowing expansion and ongoing updating of separate system components
- E. Superior Court Management Information System (SCOMIS) would likely be the basis for the index to imaged records; if so, SCOMIS must be interfaced with imaging
- F. Scanning and indexing documents are staff-intensive activities to which labor will have to be shifted. While scanning goes fast, it takes time to prepare documents (e.g., remove staples, stack documents, operate equipment). Indexing also takes time, but how much added time over present SCOMIS indexing is not known; system savings are assumed to be primarily realized in physical file/document maintenance and retrieval.

### III. Initiating imaging for Superior Courts

- A. King County Regional Justice Center (RJC) as imaging opportunity
  - 1. RJC, sited for Kent, to open in 1997
  - 2. System to be designed as facility is built (in collaboration with other counties and OAC)
  - 3. A pilot project to test imaging before the RJC is built would be advisable:
    - a. Avoid risks of opening a new facility with a new system not tested operationally. Pilot project builds experience with imaging in advance.
    - b. Other possible pilot projects: Superior Court sealed files and documents; Juvenile Court.
  - 4. Imaging system requirements have been discussed as the RJC design has been developed, in hopes of assuring no "barriers" to imaging are inadvertently built; funding for imaging is not part of RJC funding.
  - 5. ✓ Decision (3/26/93) made to plan RJC for hard-copy documents/systems, but to proceed with imaging planning
  - 6. ✓ Since initial meeting (4/9/93) with Kay Sparks of the Regional Justice Center planning office the concept of imaging has been kept in view
- B. Juvenile Court as imaging pilot project
  - 1. Rationale for Juvenile Court as pilot project:

- a. Juvenile system entails most, if not all, of the functions applicable to court and Clerk's Office at Regional Justice Center or Courthouse
  - b. Juvenile Court is located at a site away from the Courthouse, but part of the same system
  2. 1994 Budget proposal:
    - a. ✓ On 6/30/93, DJA submitted 1994 Budget proposal requesting funds to develop an imaging pilot project for Juvenile Court in 1994
    - b. ✓ As of August 1993, funding was not in 1994 Budget
  3. ✓ In November, 1993, pursuant to request from Councilmember Ron Sims, DJA submitted a draft cost estimate for installing imaging at Juvenile; proposal considered and rejected for Councilmanic technology bond due to lack of clear immediate paybacks.
  4. A 1995 cost estimate and Budget proposal is planned by Clerk's Office.
  - C. Consequences of imaging on Court "culture" must be addressed
    1. Will judges agree to work with a record available on terminal screens (hard copy only if printed from computer system) rather than hard copy files?<sup>1</sup>
    2. How might this affect assignment of judges to work at Juvenile Court or the RJC?
    3. Might a Supreme Court rule that authorizes images as an official form of the record and directing that judges and other officials work with images be required?
- IV. System Dimensions for King County
- A. Users of Superior Court imaged records
    1. 48 Superior Court judges (23 at RJC), 7 Commissioners, plus bailiffs, courtroom clerks (assume 2 or 3 workstations required per courtroom)
    2. Department of Judicial Administration (DJA)
    3. King County Prosecuting Attorney
    4. Superior Court Administrator

---

<sup>1</sup>Input received from Kim Anderson, System Manager, Division of Offender Programs, Department of Corrections, on 7/1/93, based on experience with an imaging pilot project they are installing, recommends that 20-inch monitors be used, as this better simulates having a sheet of paper in hand.

5. Court Reporters
6. Attorneys and General Public
  - a. Law firms and other users could purchase or lease workstations (read-only access) for their offices; only a limited number of firms regularly involved with Juvenile Court
  - b. Title companies (presently they examine documents as they flow through office; they'd profit from access to images on-screen); would not have interest in Juvenile
  - c. In public access area, provide read-only screens with networked printers for print-outs (self-service); for Juvenile, only offender records are open to public
  - d. Law Libraries could be equipped with terminals and printers; information "kiosks" for public access may also be used, located throughout County; for Juvenile, only offender records are open to public
7. Other Courts and Clerks: Downtown King County court will need access to files from Juvenile or RJC systems. Other courts with faxes could obtain faxed images, e.g., changes of venue.

B. Image volume estimates

1. DJA, King County's Superior Court Clerk, receives an average of 5,300 documents every day. This amounts to about 25,000 pages per day, or 6,250,000 images per year. Almost all documents are letter sized per court rule.
2. The volume of documents to be expected at the Regional Justice Center would be about 45% of the current total King County volume. Volume will begin low and build up to these levels after opening.
  - a. Decisions are pending on the extent to which existing cases/files will be transferred to the new facility when it is opened and the volume of transfers.
  - b. Files for cases transferred to RJC would need to be imaged on receipt. Special provision would be needed to handle these, as the documents will already be indexed in SCOMIS. Issue of how to handle "mixed" case file (hard copy plus images).

3. Volume projections are indicated here for 2% and 5% annual growth projections in the following table:

<u>King County Superior Court (Total)</u>						
Year	<u>2% Growth:</u>			<u>5% Growth:</u>		
	Docs./ Day	Pages/ Day	Images/ Year	Docs./ Day	Pages/ Day	Images/ Year
1993	5,300	24,733	6,208,067	5,300	24,733	6,208,067
1994	5,406	25,228	6,332,228	5,565	25,970	6,518,470
1995	5,514	25,733	6,458,873	5,843	27,269	6,844,394
1996	5,624	26,247	6,588,050	6,135	28,632	7,186,613
1997	5,737	26,772	6,719,811	6,442	30,064	7,545,944

<u>Regional Justice Center (45% of Total)</u>						
Year	<u>2% Growth:</u>			<u>5% Growth:</u>		
	Docs./ Day	Pages/ Day	Images/ Year	Docs./ Day	Pages/ Day	Images/ Year
1997	2,582	12,047	3,023,915	2,899	13,529	3,395,675
1998	2,633	12,288	3,084,393	3,044	14,205	3,565,458
1999	2,686	12,534	3,146,081	3,196	14,915	3,743,781
2000	2,740	12,785	3,209,003	3,356	15,661	3,930,918

C. Data storage requirements

1. Images, as graphic files, require a significantly larger amount of storage (disk) space than ordinary "text files" produced in computers. Storing and retrieving images, even with the latest technological achievements, requires substantial amounts of storage space. We want to explore both the requirements for storage of the magnitude of material in our system and alternatives.
2. One alternative might be to explore combining less space-intensive "text files" with image objects. It may be that a number of court documents can be stored on less disk space if, instead of an image of all the information, there is a combination of "ASCII text" for the body of the document and an electronically affixed "object" which is the image of a signature, fingerprints, illustration, etc. We have not encountered literature discussing this, but believe exploring it may make sense in imaging applications of this size. Besides, "text files" are readily manipulated and searchable by computers, whereas image files require Optical Character Recognition (OCR) software processing, for which there is always some amount of inaccuracy.

V. Workflow redesign: hard copy handling

- A. We assume that hard copy documents will be produced as presently, as original signature documents filed in person or by mail at the Clerk's Office
- B. Input of faxed images of documents
  1. Faxes of "original" hard copy documents

- a. Accepted per 1993 state fax filing rule, including requirement that "true original" be retained until 60 days following case completion
  - b. Image is marked prior to faxing as "Sent on \_\_\_\_\_ (date) via fax for filing in King County Superior Court" so the image can be recognized as having entered the system via fax, not via direct filing of an original-signature document
  - c. Could images be directly transferred into the system? For example, law firms with imaging systems might seek to "file" a document by faxing the image directly to DJA's imaging system with no hard copy involved. Analogous to present fax filing, this should be possible.
2. Faxes from fax boards in computers
- a. Would such documents be acceptable for court filings (lack of original signatures)? A generally-accepted method of "electronically signing" a document might open the door to direct image transfers from outside computers. Such a generally-accepted tool does not now exist.
  - b. Safeguards needed include a way to "sign" documents as originals; concern over possibility of "toner fraud" (alteration of copies/faxes of original documents when submitted in lieu of "true original")<sup>2</sup>
  - c. ✓ IBM consultants, meeting with John Sherman and Roger Winters on 7/20/93, encouraged efforts to include direct electronic filing where possible, as an "inevitable" part of future systems, acknowledging that issues of originality and authenticity of documents need to be addressed.
- C. Disposition of hard copy
1. We assume the Clerk will dispose of hard copy once image is recorded in optical system and a set period of time has elapsed

---

<sup>2</sup>EXAMPLE ALTERNATIVE: John Sherman of OAC reports that in Delaware there is a project known as "CLAD: Complex Litigation Automated Docket," which is an experiment with imaging that involves faxes. The project is funded by special fees levies on those cases which use the service. It involves court-administered "user IDs" for which attorneys are responsible; the IDs are used in lieu of signature on electronic documents for which there is no paper "original." Parties access documents through Lexis and Lexis rates are paid to examine documents via terminals. Some savings is involved: for example, service is achieved by faxing a note to other parties that a document has been filed through Lexis - other parties then access the document through Lexis.

2. Confidential hard copy would be disposed of by the County per accepted security processes; non-confidential documents disposed of through current recycling methods

D. "Mixed" or Transitional Court Files

1. We assume that many files, when imaging is initiated, will have hard copy documents already in the system, with newly filed documents imaged. How should this be handled? It might be clumsy for the court and other users to have to consult some documents in a hard copy file and others on-screen.
2. One alternative is to image all hard copy documents for a file at the time it is scheduled for a pre-defined type of proceeding, e.g., a trial. This might be prohibitively expensive, but if possible, it would assure that all the court record is available on the most convenient and accessible medium.
3. A variation on the above would be to scan the hard copy into a parallel system using hard disk technology, i.e., not placing the hard copy images into the storage/retrieval system, but still making them available as computerized images during the "active" period of the case. Following case completion, the hard disk space would be available for other matters, and the mixed file would proceed toward archiving, with a procedure in place to assure that the hard copy and computer-stored images are brought together at the time of microfilming.
4. Another alternative, probably cost-prohibitive, would be to print hard copy of all images on file in a "mixed" case, so that the traditional case file could be consulted during court proceedings such as trials.

VI. Workflow redesign: document intake and indexing

- A. Documents sorted and routed to data entry clerks who would perform the following processes:
  1. Determine method for image input:
    - a. Scan images of document into system using desk-top scanner, OR
    - b. Conduct mass image capture at the front end, after which workflow tracking and assignment would be done, OR
    - c. Both.
    - d. May also accept electronic images submitted by modem or fax to court's system.

2. Verify visually that image is readable, complete
  3. For new files, index new case file in SCOMIS based on receipt of initial paper
  4. Data entry of document indexing information using SCOMIS and imaging system software
    - a. The data entry may be manual, bar-code driven (reading bar codes embedded in documents), or via pointing device such as mouse
    - b. Could the indexing system read bar codes from documents and automatically docket them? If the first page of a document were to have clearly defined fields where key information is always found, and if barcodes were printed therein, this might be possible, saving labor and time. Issue of how to detect flaws or problems in an image needs to be addressed.
    - c. Document is indexed in SCOMIS docket (as presently) and is also assigned tracking codes to index it by location of images stored in [optical disk or other] storage/retrieval system
    - d. Increase automated data entry for more reliability (e.g., bar code reading, point-and-click transfer of data from imaging screen to SCOMIS screen)
    - e. Optical Character Recognition (OCR) could be used, facilitating data entry and indexing; this would require software and OCR indexing cover sheets which put information at certain locations for the machine to "read" and act on; OCR could be costly and time consuming for general use in Clerk's systems; OCR might be feasible if used on temporary basis, e.g., during "active" period (however defined) of a case
- B. Assignment of workflow route for document based on document type
1. Some documents require attention in Judgments section, where judgments are set up or altered, payments recorded, etc.; image will have to be routed and process steps tracked to assure these steps are taken.
    - a. John Sherman notes that workflow software usually includes tracking features; we should at least try to assure that tracking is included.
    - b. Workflow software should be capable of monitoring process steps and perhaps should be able to generate an automatic SCOMIS docket entry when a step is completed.

2. Some documents require the Clerk to take an action (e.g., send a notice, submit information to State); image will have to be routed to assure these loops are completed.
  3. Some documents will have a consequence for calendaring and/or scheduling of events in court; again, workflow routing will be necessary.
  4. How track that required actions have been taken? (Presently, clerks make notations or rubber stamp original documents to note actions have been taken.) Some imaging software allows for notations to be added to the image before the image is "burned" into the storage medium (disk).
  5. How would the system affect/be affected by the Judicial Accounting Service System (JASS), being implemented in 1994?
- C. Assign hard copy document to appropriate "final" destination/disposition:
1. Hard-copy "permanent" storage for certain document types (e.g., original wills)
  2. Disposal by recycling (with security for sensitive/sealed documents)
  3. Will there be an "interim storage" period during which hard copy documents could be retrieved if there is a problem? If so, how would documents be stored (date of receipt, case number)? Possible resolution could be retaining original documents for one year at a remote site for security backup, sorted by date of receipt.
- D. What procedure would be followed for "expungements" of documents? Would the Court allow for "virtual expungement," the deletion of the pointer (so no one would be able to locate the image on disk) or insist on "actual expungement" so the disk would be re-recorded without the "expunged" item(s) and then destroyed?
1. The State Archivist continues to propose that "virtual" expungement not be permitted. Upon order of expungement, per this approach, a disk would have to be re-recorded entirely except for the expunged material.
  2. John Sherman notes that with WORM (write-once, read-many) disks it should be possible to over-write the image, obliterating the image(s) being expunged.

VII. Workflow: recording images into the image storing system

- A. Once docketed, images would have to be recorded on WORM disks for storage and retrieval

1. Kim Anderson of DOC advises there should not be too much concern about how documents are recorded in the imaging system, as they will be readily retrievable even though images for a single case will be located on multiple disks. We do need to raise this issue, however, given the significant volume we expect in our systems: would there be long waits as images are retrieved from multiple disks?
- B. Presumably, images received each day are recorded sequentially on disks regardless of case file:
  1. Alternative might be to use different series of disks for receiving filings per case type (8 case types); this would reduce the universe of disks in which a particular document would be located
  2. John Sherman suggests that images could be reorganized nightly into case number sequence or some other sequence deemed more efficient; the computer can be planned to work all night to manage the data received during the work day.
  3. We may want to ask whether the system could be designed to sort images by case number and record them, insofar as possible, together on ultimate storage medium (e.g., the optical disk)
  4. Images of "sealed" documents might need special handling (remember, though that documents and files are often sealed after the fact); most sealing should be handled by password-protection or other security procedures
- C. Images are immediately retrievable at any workstation with authorization to call up the image; this saves the present 4-day to 5-day wait for a document to be in the file and accessible to users
- D. There should be an interim step where images are housed on enormous hard disks or on magnetic tape before eventually being "burned" into the optical disks. This might reduce the scattering of documents from a file throughout a large number of disks, since this will probably affect retrieval time, especially as the system grows in size. There will probably be a need for a regular reorganization of data in order to preserve acceptable response times.
  1. Note that the Department of Corrections may be planning an imaging system for prison records. There may be room for learning together here, since, like court records, prison records involve files which are built over a period of years.
- E. Will there be "security microfilming" of certain key documents (e.g., pro se divorce decrees)? Or should there be a redundant storage system (off-site) for this purpose?

- F. As John Sherman notes, there will need to be a decision on how much downtime the Court can tolerate. How important is a continuous fail-safe system? Can we tolerate being down some period per day, per week, or what? It will be necessary to specify for vendors that down time cannot exceed a certain maximum or there will be fines and penalties. John suggests the period be set at 1 day per month maximum. Vendor price will vary with the fail-safe period.
1. Kim Anderson of DOC advises, based on their experience, to anticipate significant periods of "down time" during the first 6 months of a new system. We may wish to maintain a dual system until kinks are worked out. DOC's system specifies it is not to exceed 3% down time per month.
- G. What is the back-up system for the images recorded on optical disk? Tape drives? Duplicate optical disks which, when filled, are stored off-site? How permanent will these back-up systems be? Will back-ups be incremental? Will there be "mirroring" back-ups or back-ups to digital/audio tape? [Kim Anderson of DOC advises their system is backed up to tape drive and stored in a local vault for retrieval in case of disaster.]

#### VIII. Workflow design: retrieval of images

- A. Cases should be retrievable on command from any workstation, by any number of simultaneous users
1. Kim Anderson of DOC advises that their imaging project workstations have 100 MB hard disks and 4 MB of RAM each. These run imaging plus offender based tracking system, plus e-mail. They use 386 PCs and recommend 486s.
- B. How are case images downloaded into local workstations? Are the "original" images retained in the storage/retrieval system? How much disk space is required to have a workstation hold a "typical" case file? (We consider average file as 65 documents with 4 2/3 pages per document, or 300± images.)
1. Note that installing 16MB of RAM in a workstation would give that workstation the ability to hold about 50 pages in memory for "instant" paging through documents.
  2. Software should be able to "pipeline," i.e., to make intelligent assumptions about the probability that a user will want to retrieve further images from the file and to assure that those images are coming.
- C. Case files needed for specific calendars could be automatically downloaded into the appropriate court workstations overnight in advance of the call of the calendar; calendars produced in SCOMIS may allow for this process to be more or less automated

- D. Need procedure to "seal" or "expunge" images once ordered by the court - could it be more-or-less instantaneous? (See expungement discussion above.)
- E. Need to have public workstations connected to printers for image print-outs (coin/card operated)
- F. Need procedures for retrieval of "hard copy" if retained (under what circumstances is hard copy to be accessed?)
- G. There would have to be interface with SCOMIS at all retrieval points, since SCOMIS is the basis for docketing and image indexing. People should be able to call up the docket and order images of desired documents from that screen.

IX. Workflow redesign: Archiving Procedures

- A. As presently, SCOMIS will determine when files are ready for archiving, applying existing procedures (X number of years with no SCOMIS activity)
- B. Archive-ready files will be listed and given to Clerk, who may remove specific files from the list (if Clerk believes case still active or will have ongoing demand for online access to the record)
- C. Once an archive run is approved, Copy Case (docket on SCOMIS) will be printed out or otherwise transferred to microfilmable images; this will either be purged (as now) from SCOMIS or moved off-line to magnetic tape
- D. So long as microfilming is the medium for archiving court files (as permanent-retention documents), at the time of archiving, document images would be transferred (hopefully by an automated process) to microfilm, using the same organizational scheme as at present (i.e., separate case types in various microfilm runs, sorted by terminal digit scheme)
- E. An Image Computer Output Microfilm (COM) system is needed. We would have to get agreement by the Archivist that the resolution level would be high enough for output from the image system to microfilm to be considered of archival quality.
- F. Once (if ever) optical disks (or similar storage/retrieval medium) recognized as archival medium, then files can be re-indexed as "archived" even though the images are retained on disks; disks could be moved off-line (removed from jukeboxes) once a certain percentage of records are "removed" to archive status, with remaining images re-recorded onto newer disks, with appropriate indexing updated
  - 1. There is pressure to make the optical disk the archival medium. John Sherman suggests there is reason to believe this will be the outcome: for example, there could be a

decision to standardize on something like TIFF for images. It is clear this will continue to be an area of debate. The Association of Information and Image Management (AIIM) and the Washington State Archivist continue at this writing to insist that only microfilm may be used for archiving.

X. Cost Justification

- A. Overall amount of RJC bond issue is \$174.5 million
- B. Cost factors will include cost of workstations (above and beyond what would have been obtained for basic computer network in system), scanners, jukeboxes, disks, tape backup systems, special environmental conditions, technicians to operate system. [Also need to consider maintenance contracts.]
- C. Experts warn that a large cost can be any extra indexing labor required. We should design system to minimize additional indexing data entry, building on existing SCOMIS indexing.
- D. Savings factors will be file maintenance and retrieval staff not needed, space not used by hard copy files, time savings (how quantify?) gained from immediate availability of documents (as opposed to 5-day wait), savings from multiple accessibility of documents (as opposed to one-person-at-a-time now), savings from waiting on file delivery (end delays in courtrooms waiting on file or documents), eliminate lost documents or files (no reconstruction costs, delays)
- E. New revenue will be gained from off-site terminals purchased by law firms and other users, copying costs (may recover costs through fees)
- F. Estimate by Chuck Carey of Pierce County (imaging expertise) is that cost might be \$1.5 to \$2 million to start up such an imaging system at the Regional Justice Center, less if the computer networks are in place or already planned. A Computer Output Microfilm (COM) system for archiving would cost between \$150,000 and \$200,000. Beyond startup costs would be ongoing system management and maintenance costs, which need to be determined.
- G. Per IBM representatives who visited with Roger Winters on 5/26/93, the DuPage County (Illinois) installation of imaging - similar court system - can help us to estimate potential costs. IBM willing to share cost information and to facilitate our conversations with DuPage officials to learn from their experience. Also, site visit to DuPage might be appropriate as planning progresses.
- H. In 1994 Work Plan, Roger Winters has proposed to develop cost justifications for King County Superior Court imaging pilot project(s) and/or RJC and/or overall system. Some help is available through ARMA (tape of cost justification seminar from October 1993 ARMA national conference has been purchased). Other help

available from vendors interested in helping King County develop these concepts.

#### XI. Potential funding

- A. How are imaging systems funded? (Question posed to IBM consultants meeting with John Sherman and Roger Winters on 7/20/93.)
1. Jurisdiction/company has adequate funds to invest in new technology and does so.
  2. "Start small." Jurisdiction begins with small-scale "pilot project" to demonstrate efficiencies of imaging and workflow redesign; larger system built based on success of pilot.
  3. Seek outside sponsorship. Sometimes large law firms, title companies, insurance companies, and other interested private entities will contribute funds to create a new system. Jurisdiction negotiates with sponsors/subscribers on future benefits they would receive from new systems (e.g., reduced costs for access until some dollar amount is recouped). This is based on reasoning that other entities stand to profit greatly from new technologies applied to court records systems and are able to invest in them when local governments lack immediate resources.
- B. Determine what costs covered in RJC bond issue can be shifted to apply to the imaging system; many pieces of this technology may already be planned for (e.g., personal computer networked workstations in all courtrooms, Prosecuting Attorney offices, and Clerk's Office; fiber optic cabling of building)
- C. Seek passage of state bill allowing surcharge on filings and certified copies to generate revenue for application to document/records management and preservation purposes; efforts to do this in 1993 were partially successful in educating people on the need, but fee increases were not proposed in the 1994 Legislature; it seemed unlikely such surcharges would generate adequate funds for imaging
- D. Dedicate part of the Auditor's records preservation fund for this project, as the fund is intended to support retention of County documents (including "permanent" retention court documents); a 1993 Prosecutor's opinion confirms that the main purpose of these funds remains the King County Records Program's optical system and then "historical" records from County offices
- E. Identify this project as state-wide in applicability and seek funding through OAC/JIS and/or special legislation to appropriate funds for development of more efficient systems for all courts; needs "champion" at state level, including possible new state funding to supplement available resources

XII. Associated Concept: Document Management (reduce images & reduce costs)

This is a theoretical discussion of an approach to attempt reduction of images to be managed and thereby costs. Adoption of these ideas will require wide participation and consensus building within the legal community.

- A. Presently any document may be filed by any party (or even non-party) by placing it in Clerk's Office with case number; Clerk files all documents received
- B. Limitation of images received, retained during life of case, or retained permanently would reduce images processed and lower archiving/microfilming costs
- C. Just as Court now manages caseflow by requiring observance of specified "milestone events" in the life of "typical" court cases, the Court might restrict what may be filed in "permanent" court files:
  1. Court could define what is the universe of "typical" or "expected" filings depending on a case type, limiting parties to that list of documents
  2. Court would allow other filings only by permission of a judge
  3. Court would ban filings of duplicates (e.g., attachments to other filed documents) and impose fines for duplicate filings
  4. Bar would have to participate in design of such a restricted system and limitations on filing may or may not be acceptable to practitioners
- D. Some filings might be tagged as "administrative" or "procedural" and would not be imaged or, if imaged would be marked with special codes and would not be retained when the file is archived for permanent retention
  1. Such documents could alternatively be retained in a temporary hard copy file or retained by parties only
  2. John Sherman notes that certain SCOMIS entries can serve as proof of the existence of certain administrative documents: for example, an entry that indicates "ALL PARTIES SERVED" could be considered verification that a Return of Service was filed on all parties and that the Clerk, having confirmed this, made the SCOMIS entry and appropriately eliminated the Returns from the file
  3. Clerk remains repository of "permanent" value documents; these should be marked for "permanent" retention at the point of indexing

4. Court can always command production of non-retained documents to enforce procedures or resolve disputes over authenticity of documents

XIII. Other issues:

- A. Change of Venue (IN): When a case is transferred into the imaging Court, the hard copy is scanned in and then recycled/disposed of per local rules
- B. Change of Venue (OUT): When a case is transferred from the imaging Court, hard copy is printed out and certified by the originating Court; images may then be re-indexed appropriately and are retained until eliminated (de-indexed) or archived and filmed
- C. Documents could be transferred by fax to other courts or Clerks' offices while retained on originating court's imaging system (once many counties use imaging, high-speed fax transfer of images possible; what about centralized state/regional juke box complexes?)
- D. Would this system be integrated with the Clerk's cash and accounting systems? If so, how include in the design?

XIV. Work Plan Steps

- A. ✓ Secure endorsement of concept from King County Superior Court judges (2/4/93)
- B. ✓ Consult with Pierce County regarding potential collaboration on design of imaging system; seek technical advice, expertise, help (3/18/93)
- C. ✓ Consult with Budget Office on project, identifying potential costs and issues (3/26/93)
- D. ✓ Learn from RJC planners how imaging might be considered for incorporation into the RJC construction (imaging was not part of the initial design considerations which were submitted in 1992) (4/9/93)
- E. ✓ Receive comments from John Sherman of OAC on this outline, incorporate his notes and suggestions (5/10/93)
- F. ✓ DJA proposes imaging system funding for 1994 Budget as pilot project to test concepts and demonstrate savings to be realized (6/30/93)
- G. ✓ In July/August, RJC committees working within Superior Court and DJA attempt to include requirements for imaging system in preliminary plans for Kent facility; central concept of multi-purpose computers throughout court and Clerk's Office is promoted (state-of-the-art PCs linked to SCOMIS, imaging, JASS, networks, legal research, etc., with password-determined access for each user)

- H. ✓ August 30, 1993, Roger Winters of DJA visited court with imaging in Washington County, Oregon (Hillsborough) per invitation from IBM representatives.
- I. ✓ During 1993, idea of consultant to assist in planning appropriate wiring for the RJC building to assure imaging can be added later, if not included in original design, was considered; information on imaging was shared with architects and we will maintain ongoing attention to imaging requirements
- J. ✓ In March 1993, this discussion paper was shared with OAC's new Records Management Committee which, composed of representatives from all court levels, will be reviewing records management issues and making policy recommendations
- K. Develop support for imaging with County Clerks, OAC, Bar Association, judges, Prosecutor, users (e.g., title companies), public
- L. In 1994 DJA Work Plan, we are committing to develop cost projections that will indicate whether the project is feasible for further development
- M. Determine who might be the "champion" for an imaging system in the RJC (Presiding Judge? County Executive? County Clerk? others?)
- N. Work with King County Purchasing Agency to develop work plan for building and issuing RFPs
- O. Identify Imaging Planning Committee charged with overall coordination of the project (representing Superior Court, Clerk's Office, Prosecutor, Facilities Management, OAC, others); Superior Court may field a "technology committee" which can take responsibility for this

RW:pc  
3/8/94 10:02am

