

**MINUTES**  
**Juvenile Access Pilot Program Advisory Board**  
**January 7, 2010 Meeting**

Present: Judge Quinn, Sarah Eagan, Anne Louise Blanchard, Stacey Gerber, Judge Keller, Marilou Giovannucci, Nancy Porter, Cynthia Cunningham, Elizabeth Duryea, Justine Rakich-Kelly, Chris Rapillo, Carolyn Signorelli, Bryan Morris, Sue Pearlman, Deborah Fuller, Christine Krause

1. Judge Quinn convened the meeting at approximately 10:10 a.m. The minutes of the 10/29/09 meeting were approved.
2. Review of Survey – Christine Krause

Christine Krause attended the meeting to present her comments on the draft survey and to take questions. An extensive discussion of the draft survey ensued, which included the following points:

- Should everyone in court be asked to identify themselves? It was pointed out that if an e-mail survey was to be used, someone at the court would have to obtain e-mail addresses from all the participants.
- Someone will have to enter all the e-mail addresses of the participants; probably best for that to be done at CPS. For the paper survey, give the survey and envelope to the person who will fill it out; they will return it to the clerk's office and someone there will have to enter it into the online utility.
- There is value in getting the survey filled out and returned right after the proceeding – while everyone is still there.
- In terms of timing, the single biggest obstacle would be getting sole source approval for Survey Monkey.

It was decided that the further review of the survey by the whole group is not necessary, but that the chairs, Judge Keller, and Marilou Giovannucci would look at it once it is revised. The Judicial Branch participants will meet internally to work out the details of implementation.

3. Other Business

Discussion of the revised language received from the Rules Committee this morning: Judge Quinn shared the language she received from the Rules Committee and stated that since a discussion of the revised language was not on the agenda, the Board cannot vote on it today. Another meeting will have to be scheduled to take a vote.

The discussion focused on the definition of “trial proceeding” and the fact that it excludes agreements, miscellaneous other motions and collateral issues that are critical to understanding the nature of the proceeding.

Another issue is that the written motion is too restrictive; there must be some ability to make an oral motion, and 5 days is too long.

These are the major concerns about the language; it will be e-mailed to the rest of the Board and allow other members time to comment.

4. The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:00 p.m.