

**Minutes
Public Service and Trust Commission
December 11, 2007**

The Public Service and Trust Commission met at the Marriott-Hartford Rocky Hill located at 100 Corporate Boulevard, Rocky Hill, CT on December 11, 2007 at 3:00 p.m.

Those in attendance: Hon. Alexandra DiPentima (Chair), Magistrate Sandra Sosnoff Baird, Hon. Robert E. Beach, Jr., Hon. John D. Boland, Joseph F. Camilleri, William H. Carbone, Hon. Patrick L. Carroll, III, Atty. Joseph D. D'Alesio, Hon. Nina F. Elgo, Atty. Melissa Farley, Hon. Roland D. Fasano, Hon. James T. Graham, Ms. Lisa Holden, Atty. Norman K. Janes, Hon. Clarence J. Jones, Atty. Kevin T. Kane, Justice Joette Katz, Caren Kittredge, Hon. Douglas C. Mintz, Atty. Joseph Mirrione, Atty. William H. Prout, Jr., Hon. Barbara M. Quinn, Hon. Antonio C. Robaina, Atty. Kenneth B. Rubin, Hon. William B. Rush, Atty. Michael T. Ryan, Atty. Mary Sommer Sandak, Hon. Dan Shaban, Hon. Joseph Shortall, Thomas A. Siconolfi, Atty. Carolyn Signorelli, Atty. Toni M. Smith-Rosario, Atty. Robert Stillman, Hon. Hillary B. Strackbein, Atty. Frederic Ury, Atty. Dawne G. Westbrook, Alex Wood, and Atty. Jennifer Zito.

- I. The meeting was called to order by Judge DiPentima at 3:10 p.m.
- II. The next agenda item was the approval of the minutes from the meeting of October 30, 2007. Upon motion and second, the minutes were unanimously approved.
- III. The next agenda item was the presentation of the results of the survey. Jerry C. Lindsley of the Center for Research & Public Policy, the organization that conducted the transactional survey, briefly reviewed the background on the survey and the methodology used. Then he presented a summary of the survey with highlights of particular results. A copy of the full report is being provided to Attorney Farley, and members of the Commission may obtain a copy from her. The comprehensive telephone survey was done between November 19th and November 24th, and the results include responses from 500 completed interviews with users drawn from the eight categories: family, juvenile, housing, small claims, motor vehicle, civil, criminal, and jurors. Mr. Lindsley reported a 72% completion rate, indicating a high level of interest in the subject matter of the survey on the part of those contacted. Some of the highlights include a satisfaction index of 81.7%. This index is a measurement device created, in this instance, by averaging the mean positive ratings for three categories: court process/treatment, court system operations, and court personnel, with each category being given equal weight. According to Mr. Lindsley, the range of a satisfaction index can be from 40% to 92%. Most corporations would strive for a satisfaction index in the high 80's. He also discussed survey results on strengths, weaknesses, expectations, discrimination, and communication, and suggested ways in which the survey could be used. He offered to run reports in specific areas, for example running a report on the responses from users of the civil system to the satisfaction questions to ascertain what they were happy with and what they were not happy with. He will provide information on the number of survey respondents drawn from the juvenile area and clarify information regarding jurors' initiating contact with the court system.

If there are any additional questions, email Attorney Farley and she will direct them to Mr. Lindsley.

- IV. The next item was a summary of the public hearings that were held on Monday, December 3rd in Hartford and on Thursday, December 6th in Bridgeport. Judge DiPentima thanked commission members for being at the hearings, saying it was helpful that they were there to listen to the members of the public. She reported that about twenty different people testified at the two hearings, and they have raised some issues for the Commission to consider in developing the strategic plan. Expedited transcripts have been ordered and will be provided

to Commission members upon request. Any written comments given to the Commission at the hearings are also available. Attorney Farley will have copies of transcripts or written comments. All of this information along with the survey and the information from the focus groups will be provided to the committees so that all commission members will have access to it.

- V. The next agenda item was a review of the results of the focus groups by Attorney D'Alesio. About 87 focus groups were identified, and 80 focus groups, encompassing about 1,000 people, have been completed. Focus groups with several other groups are being scheduled. If there are any other people that should be contacted to arrange a focus group, for example business people/representatives of corporations whose court experience would not have been covered by the transactional survey or public hearings, commission members may contact Judge DiPentima.
- VI. The next agenda item was the formation and charges of the committees. Judge DiPentima explained that the steering committee along with Judge Carroll and Justice Katz had spent a full day organizing the information obtained from the focus groups. There were over eight hundred trends identified by the focus groups, which the steering committee grouped into progressively smaller categories, ultimately ending up with five categories that will form the basis for the five committees of the commission. The five categories are: Access, Accountability, Changing Demographics, Collaboration, and Delivery of Services. Judge DiPentima provided a summary of each of the areas along with some highlights of the points that were most important to the people who attended the focus groups.

She then explained that commission members would be selecting their top two choices for a committee assignment, and she would then assign people to work on each of the five committees and appoint co-chairs. Each committee will be supported by staff. Much of the committee's work will occur in January and February, and the next full meeting of the Commission will be in March, when each committee will have identified an outcome goal and strategies. Judge DiPentima spoke briefly about the challenge of the committee in identifying an outcome goal that is reasonable, measurable, and in keeping with the information and values that have come from the focus groups, surveys, and public hearings. The outcome goal of each committee will have multiple strategies and activities. A committee on vision, mission, and values will later be formed to review the Judicial Branch mission statement and develop a vision statement in light of the values.

Judge DiPentima reiterated that this process is a dynamic one, with additional information being provided to the committees as it comes in. Some items may be implemented immediately without waiting for the full report of a committee or the commission.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.