

Corey R. Steel
State Court Administrator



Deborah A. Minardi
State Probation Administrator

COVID-19 and the Courts Response Committee

Executive Summary of COVID-19 Survey

Under the leadership of Chief Justice Michael Heavican, the newly created “COVID-19 and the Courts Response Committee” surveyed judges, clerks of the court and judicial administrators, chief probation officers, attorneys, and county sheriffs. The statewide survey conducted in December 2020 asked stakeholders of the Nebraska Judicial Branch questions regarding how the COVID-19 pandemic affected their roles and responsibilities with the court system, their work with each other, and their interaction with court users and clients.

The survey results indicated that when faced with the unexpected onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, the Nebraska Judicial Branch succeeded in creating a roadmap where there was no road. While not without its deficiencies, the Nebraska Judicial Branch was able to assist local courts in ensuring the courts remained open and justice was operational. The Nebraska Judicial Branch now has a unique opportunity to use our experiences to identify goals that will:

- Expand on our ability to be impartial, efficient, and accessible for the court user
- Act swiftly and justly to protect children and vulnerable adults
- Address community safety
- Be accountable to the public
- Strengthen communications

Our review of the survey responses identified three key points as to how survey participants believed the judicial system functioned during the pandemic. The review of the responses also informs the Nebraska Judicial Branch as to how we can strengthen our commitment to access to justice post-pandemic.

1. **The Supreme Court, Administrative Office of the Courts and Probation (AOCB), and trial courts could have provided more direction to ensure uniformity and consistency within the counties, judicial districts, and the state.** Many survey participants identified the lack of uniformity in court processes

and procedures and the implementation of protective health measures in the courtroom/clerk's office or probation office (e.g., PPE, use of technology to conduct court proceedings) as a significant challenge. Many commented this was the result of a lack of leadership and direction on multiple levels.

2. **The Supreme Court, Administrative Office of the Courts and Probation (AOCP), and trial courts could have better equipped courtrooms, clerk's offices and probation offices with the necessary technology and training to work remotely.** Those surveyed all experienced challenges with technology. However, they also adapted and learned how technology can provide efficiencies to court and probation proceedings and processes. Many survey participants identified providing court and probation users with access to the necessary technology, education on how to use the technology, and the lack of in-person assistance when using technology were challenges. Practically overnight, the judicial system transitioned from a system that was primarily a traditional, in-person process to a system that utilized remote technologies. This resulted in some court participants being concerned with the impact the increased use of technology has on vulnerable court and probation users and the meaning of "justice" in the traditional sense. However, the increased use of remote technology during the pandemic has also resulted in many embracing technologies that support court and probation services. Many survey participants expected to continue to use technology and encouraged its use post-pandemic, and many identified the need for additional technologies necessary to shape the way the court system works into the future.
3. **The Administrative Office of the Courts and Probation (AOCP) should modify the format, guidelines for completing, and the education provided to the local courts and probation offices that will support more comprehensive and adaptable Continuity of Operations Plans (COOPs) and Emergency Preparedness Plans (EPPs) being developed.** For the most part, many who participated in the survey appreciated the resources provided by the AOCP that ensured the courts remained open and the mission essential functions of the courts and probation continued (e.g., personal protective equipment, templates for developing a COOP and EPP). A continuity of operations plan and emergency preparedness plan establish policy and guidance ensuring mission essential functions continue and appropriately reallocate or relocate personnel and resources depending on the type of emergency. COOPs/EPPs should be functional and adaptable. They should be created by a guided process and should be a team effort – revisited and modified regularly. During the initial uncertainty of the COVID-19 pandemic, the AOCP asked the local courts and probation offices

to develop a response to a crisis in the midst of the crisis. Only in limited circumstances did the local courts, probation offices, and judicial districts collaborate with each other or with other justice stakeholders, to develop a comprehensive plan. Assisting the local courts and probation offices in reviewing their existing plans and providing them with facilitative guidance in the development of the plans should minimize or eliminate many of the challenges expressed by those who participated in the survey.

The survey responses point toward a number of ways where the Nebraska Judicial Branch can provide more uniformity and consistency and more direct technical assistance at the local and statewide levels. The Supreme Court and AOCP are committed to taking ownership of the responses critical of the court and probation system during the pandemic and developing strategies to address the challenges. We remain committed to providing further support of and expand on those recommendations that will promote greater access to the Nebraska Judicial Branch.

Survey Results Questions 1 – 7 (Same For All Participants)

| Q1. What are the most difficult problems you encountered or are encountering during this pandemic? Select all that apply | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|---|-----------------------------|-----------|
| | Adding to case backlog in the courts | Difficulty communicating with parties | Difficulty communicating with clients | Difficulty communicating with judges | Difficulty communicating with district court staff | Difficulty communicating with county court staff | Difficulty communicating with probation staff | Difficulty with communicating with probationers | Lack of technology training | Other |
| Attorney (N=575) | 58% (320) | 19% (105) | 31% (171) | 16% (89) | 12% (65) | 8% (47) | 5% (26) | 3% (14) | 27% (148) | 26% (142) |
| Clerks of the Court/Judicial Administrators (N=82) | 37% (27) | 29% (21) | 11% (8) | 6% (4) | 0% | 1% (1) | 0% | 4% (3) | 33% (24) | 37% (27) |
| Judges (N=66) | 80% (52) | 32% (21) | 0% | 2% (1) | 0% | 0% | 3% (2) | 2% (1) | 31% (20) | 31% (20) |
| Probation – Chief Probation Officers (N=12) | 50% (6) | 17% (2) | 25% (3) | 8% (1) | 0% | 0% | 0% | 42% (5) | 42% (5) | 50% (6) |
| Sheriffs (N=25) | 38% (8) | 10% (2) | 0% | 14% (3) | 10% (2) | 10% (2) | 5% (1) | 0% | 29% (6) | 67% (14) |
| Total Surveyed (N=760) | 54% | 20% | 24% | 13% | .09% | .07% | .04% | .03% | 27% | 28%* |

***Common Themes (Other):** 1) Lack of uniformity and consistency by judges, district court/county court, and judicial districts (e.g., use of technology, requiring in-person hearings, use of PPE). While there were comments directed at the Supreme Court and AOC and the lack of leadership in coordinating the response, comments could also be interpreted to be directed at the judges in the courthouse/judicial districts. 2) Technology challenges. 3) Health and safety of judges, court staff, attorneys, law enforcement, and parties.

Attorneys (Other): judges continuing to conduct hearings/jury trials when it is unsafe for jurors, witnesses, clients and attorneys, especially those who have high risk medical conditions; lack of uniformity and inconsistency between judges, district court/county court, and judicial districts (e.g., in person hearings and use of technology, communication about COVID, requiring PPE, rules); lack of, limited, or outdated technology; judges refusing to use technology, even when allowed or parties agree (instead of embracing technology they are continuing cases); lack of clarity of court rules and their application to using remote technology; lack of organization and consensus that would have resulted in more timely cancellation of trials (e.g., “general orders” from courts were only 30-45 days out, longer postponements would have been helpful); lack of training on how to take complex depositions (with many exhibits) by remote means; CLE/Dealing with CLE; difficulty with jails and communicating with clients in jail; confidentially communicating with clients during virtual hearings; conducting discovery; difficulty for clients to pay fees; getting notarized signatures; clients getting frustrated with lack of movement on their cases; getting permission from opposing parties to participate remotely

Clerks/Judicial Administrators (Other): Technology used by Douglas County District Court was initially challenging for judges, staff and attorneys; jury trials; getting information to parties so they could participate remotely; lack of adequate equipment and technology in the courtroom; technology issues and no assistance; difficulty communicating with public defenders office; difficulty communicating with SRLs; haven’t experienced any difficulties; lack of knowledge when inmates are transferred from facility to facility; staffing the office (e.g., keeping them healthy, rotating, having enough people in the office to do the work); adjusting/planning when judge gets COVID

Judges (Other): Extra administrative work to figure out a system that will work; lack of support generally from the AOC/Supreme Court (e.g., lack of assistance from administration in helping with staffing shortages; unified response from the judiciary; statewide plan for the courts); technology issue with the parties (not the lawyers); difficulty communication with attorneys; difficulty in assessing and implementing safeguards consistent with the different local courthouses and local health departments' DHMs; technology and technical difficulties; lack of technology in courts; lack of technology in the jails; finding consistency for attorneys within the building; getting attorneys to communicate with their clients

Probation Officers (Other): Courts scheduling detention hearings in February when the kids should not remain idle in detention; safety/health concerns (e.g., mask mandate, lack of resources, fear of the virus; HR matters pertaining to quarantines/doctor documentation); different areas responding differently; balancing duties of staff and clients while they are both overwhelmed in trying to figure out issues in clients' homes (e.g., online learning with no internet or laptop, increased domestic violence).

Sheriffs (Other): Technology (e.g., Compatible technology; setting up Zoom meetings, funding for offsite video equipment; judges/courts not using and still requiring defendants be transported for court proceedings); no problems encountered; lack of communication from the district court judges; additional manpower required to provide security off-site; safety/health concerns for staff exposure (e.g., jail; transporting prisoners who have tested positive; screening court participants)

| Q2. What efforts, if any, do you require in order to feel safe in being in/returning to a courtroom/court office? Select all that apply | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|------------------------------|--|---|--|---|---|--|-----------------------------|
| | Facility changes to ensure six feet of separation | Provision of PPE ... to court/probation employees | Physical/Plexiglass Barriers | Requirement that all court/probation employees wear face masks | Requirement that everyone ... wear face masks | Temperature checks ... entering the courtroom/probation office | Asking CDC health screening questions... enter the courtroom/probation office | Court/probation employee COVID-19 or antibody testing | COVID-19 vaccine is available for everyone | Increased facility cleaning |
| Attorney (N=575) | 58% (308) | 55% (293) | 34% (180) | 70% (374) | 82% (436) | 39% (205) | 31% (167) | 16% (87) | 41% (220) | 46% (245) |
| Clerks of the Court/Judicial Administrators (N=82) | 28% (22) | 51% (40) | 29% (23) | 32% (25) | 54% (42) | 27% (21) | 19% (15) | 18% (14) | 22% (17) | 56% (44) |
| Judges (N=66) | 54% (34) | 73% (46) | 37% (23) | 57% (36) | 76% (48) | 33% (21) | 22% (14) | 11% (7) | 29% (18) | 48 (30) |
| Probation – Chief Probation Officers (N=12) | 50% (6) | 83% (10) | 25% (3) | 67% (8) | 67% (8) | 33% (4) | 42% (5) | 25% (3) | 33% (4) | 50% (6) |
| Sheriffs (N=25) | 32% (8) | 36% (9) | 16% (4) | 32% (8) | 40% (10) | 16% (4) | 12% (3) | 8% (2) | 24% (6) | 28% (7) |
| Total Surveyed (N=760) | 50% (380) | 52% (398) | 31% (233) | 59% (451) | 72% (544) | 34% (255) | 27% (204) | 15% (113) | 35% (265) | 44% (332) |
| | Increase use of telephone and video hearings | Decrease paper.. electronic dockets/files (SRLs) | Other | | | | | | | |
| Attorney (N=575) | 64% (341) | 22% (115) | 10% (54) | | | | | | | |
| Clerks of the Court/Judicial Administrators (N=82) | 49% (38) | 23% (18) | 17% (13) | | | | | | | |
| Judges (N=66) | 83% (52) | 27% (17) | 14% (9) | | | | | | | |
| Probation – Chief Probation Officers (N=12) | 50% (6) | 33% (4) | 8% (1) | | | | | | | |
| Sheriffs (N=25) | 60% (15) | 4% (1) | 28% (7) | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Total Surveyed (N=760) | 59% (452) | 20% (155) | 11% (84)* | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

***Common Themes (Other):** 1) If court has specific rules related to PPE and other safety precautions (e.g., social distancing), then they should be applied consistently and uniformly. 2) Certain precautions should be implemented to protect the health and safety of those in the courtroom (e.g., prohibit “cattle call” court days, replace/refill PPE, air filtration system/air movement, continue to use telephone/videoconferencing).

Attorneys (Other): Public employees have done a great job rotating staff to minimize contact, but the same staff is seen not social distancing when not working; court rules that prohibit “cattle call” court days and allow only one hearing to be scheduled at a time; clear direction to litigants on the conducting of jury trial procedures when jury trials commence again; evidentiary hearings/trials should be live unless waived; small courtrooms don’t allow for separation; actually enforce mask policy and other safety precaution rules, some people in court not wearing masks/not wearing properly, replace/refill empty PPE, courtrooms full and the DHM aren’t being followed or implemented; please DO NOT mandate video hearings without the consent of all parties, especially in criminal cases; encourage and facilitate a “foam in/foam out” procedure like in hospitals; no reason not to have in-person hearings in our District Court as it is large enough for the 6’ of distancing; air filtration/air movement; consistency and mandatory statewide training for judges so they can use videoconferencing; regular communication from the Chief Justice; uniform rules, applied consistently; not concerned and feel safe; requiring defense attorneys to be physically with clients, but allow judge and prosecutor to appear in a separate location

Clerks/Judicial Administrators (Other): Uniform communication to SRLs that there is an option for telephone and video hearings might decrease unnecessary in person contacts by decreasing confusion over scheduling and appearances in court (i.e., clearer directions about court appearances); doing well, nothing

Judges (Other): For contested hearings, use larger courtrooms, doing well and feel safe; some courts refuse to get rid of paper filings, this is something that needs to be addressed by AOC; no one in the courtroom

Probation Officers (Other): Feel safe returning without any provisions

Sheriffs (Other): We feel safe; we have always dealt with illness in jails; continue to use telephone and video hearings

| Q3. Which specific challenges have you observed related to safety and security? Select all that apply | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|-----------|
| | Non co-operative individuals who access the courtroom/court office (e.g., not wanting to wear a mask, not complying with social distancing) | Limited access to the courts by vulnerable populations (e.g., SRLs, individuals who need protection orders, individuals with no access to technology) | Health of court or probation staff/ justice stakeholders (e.g., fatigue, burn out, anxiety, depression) | Frustration, aggression, or violence towards court or probation staff/ Justice stakeholders | Lack of leadership in ensuring COVID-19 prevention and measures were implemented | Other |
| Attorney (N=575) | 54% (252) | 35% (161) | 36% (168) | 8% (38) | 54% (252) | 19% (89) |
| Clerks of the Court/Judicial Administrators (N=82) | 35% (22) | 30% (19) | 52% (33) | 8% (5) | 11% (7) | 25% (16) |
| Judges (N=66) | 46% (28) | 38% (23) | 49% (30) | 13% (8) | 31% (19) | 18% (11) |
| Probation – Chief Probation Officers (N=12) | 25% (3) | 33% (4) | 100% (12) | 8% (1) | 8% (1) | 17% (2) |
| Sheriffs (N=25) | 42% (8) | 11% (2) | 32% (6) | 16% (3) | 21% (4) | 42% (8) |
| Total Surveyed (N=760) | 41% (313) | 28% (209) | 33% (249) | .07% (55) | 37% (283) | 17% (126) |

***Common Theme (Other):** 1) None of these issues; 2) lack of interest to use or availability of technology; and 3) lack of staff/maintaining adequate staffing levels

Attorneys (Other): Judges and court staff need to follow CDC guidelines and serve as an example (e.g., wear a mask, follow directed health measures, not put it on the attorney to ask the judge to please wear a mask); lack of interest by judges to allow telephonic and video conference hearings; lack of uniform rules between different courthouses and judicial districts (e.g., some courts have continued cases, others continue to have them, fractured response from judges and court as to safety requirements for appearances); unwillingness of judges to enforce the preventative measures (e.g., wearing of masks, crowded courtrooms, crowded galleries, not having staggered hearings, no social distancing); the governor not supporting the courts/recognizing the needs of the state; lack of concern for attorneys who must constantly be near clients during a court process; jails and DCS are unsafe to conduct contact visits, and facility management continue to require such visits in lieu of confidential video visits; clients refusing to use technology when they have the resource available; haven't experienced any of these; fatigue of everyone concerning safety measures, lack of technology and ability to use technology.

Clerks/Judicial Administrators (Other): None of the above; only had one juror that was non cooperative, dismissed; Even though all parties are appearing by videoconferencing or phone, those parties non-essential to the case like "STL" and foster parents won't appear using technology and insist on being in person; no appreciation for those who have gone to work every day or cover other courts due to employees self-quarantining or out ill; lack of adequate space; lack of technology so parties can participate remotely; attorneys not following court recommendations for disinfecting after hearings; lack of cooperation from other county offices whose staff choose not to wear masks.

Judges (Other): None of the above; Scheduling – need for more Webex capacity; unpredictability of pandemic and inconsistencies of the different counties and how they have handled it; lack of staffing resources (e.g., staff out with COVID-19, staff quarantining, hiring/retention); lack of clarity on “what is exposure and the protocol for returning to work; lack of leadership from other agencies/entities not within the court’s direct control.

Probation Officers (Other): Lack of leadership (nationally and in the state) taking the lead and not making the pandemic about politics; staff resistance (e.g. to office rotation, wearing masks, social distancing)

Sheriffs (Other): None of the above; frustration with lack of regular court schedule; maintaining manpower due to COVID-related quarantines; lack of consideration for officers who are interacting face-to-face with courtroom attendees

| Q4. Do you feel the Supreme Court/Administrative Office of the Courts and Probation was able to provide the necessary personal protective equipment (e.g., face masks, hand sanitizer, disinfectant wipes, gloves) and other resources so you and others felt safe being in a courtroom/court office? | | | |
|--|------------------|-----------|-----------------------|
| | Yes | No | Not applicable |
| Attorney (N=575) | 46% (241) | 29% (151) | 25% (132) |
| Clerks of the Court/Judicial Administrators (N=82) | 92% (71) | 1% (1) | 6% (5) |
| Judges (N=66) | 81% (52) | 14% (9) | 5% (3) |
| Probation – Chief Probation Officers (N=12) | 100% (12) | 0% | 0% |
| Sheriffs (N=25) | 60% (15) | 12% (3) | 28% (7) |
| Total Surveyed (N=760) | 51% (391) | 22% (164) | 19% (147) |

***Common Theme (Other):** 1) County provided PPE or provided own; and 2) When provided in some instances it wasn't enough, wasn't used or used properly, or was inadequate (e.g., cardboard facemask, hand sanitizer).

Attorneys (Other): Personal health prohibits risking self to exposure, so do not go to courthouse; PPE provides no protection if not used/worn or not used/worn properly, so better and consistent enforcement needed; need to do a better job of cleaning and sanitizing, including making it available for attorneys to use (e.g., wiping down courtroom doors and chairs, wipes available at counsel tables, putting personal items in tray that is not sanitized between use, lectern not cleaned between uses); PPE unavailable or not enough (e.g., only district court provide masks, not county court; no barriers at counsel table; courts encourage but don't provide we had to provide our own; Supreme Court failed to take into consideration that criminal defense attorneys cannot socially distance from their clients when appearing in court; unaware court provided (e.g., impression county provided, individual had to provide their own; didn't know provided to public); just because provided doesn't mean individual felt safe being in the courtroom; providing and not enforcing does nothing; clear face masks or shields should have been required; did a COVID trial and was pleased with the resources provided by the AOC and county health department; however this hasn't necessarily translated to other court proceedings; received cardboard masks

Clerks/Judicial Administrators (Other): Beyond supportive from providing equipment to ensure a successful jury trial; not at the beginning, took time, but believe they worked quickly as possible to provide; county commissioners/county provided; cardboard face masks aren't most effective

Judges (Other): facemasks (e.g., cardboard, useless); relied on the county; took care of ourselves; inadequate amount of hand sanitizer provided and unpleasant

Probation Officers (Other):

Sheriffs (Other): Provided own

| Q5. What have you observed has been helpful/useful as it relates to the communication from and the exchange of information by the Supreme Court/ Administrative Office of the Courts and Probation? | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---------------|
| | Decision making related to court related activities (e.g., orders, modified court/probation functions) | Contingency plans or a common operational picture (e.g., resources to develop EPPs, creating signage related to CDC guidelines) | Information handling and communication processes (e.g., website, emails, press releases/media, social media) | Other* |
| Attorney (N=575) | 71% (314) | 24.89 (110) | 56.79% (251) | 11.99% (53) |
| Clerks of the Court/Judicial Administrators (N=82) | 80.56% (58) | 55.56% (40) | 65.28% (40) | 6.94% (5) |
| Judges (N=66) | 60.42% (29) | 45.83% (22) | 64.58% (31) | 6.25% (3) |
| Probation – Chief Probation Officers (N=12) | 90.91% (10) | 54.55% (6) | 72.73% (8) | 9.09%(1) |
| Sheriffs (N=25) | 46.67% (7) | 33.33% (5) | 33.33% (5) | 20% (3) |
| Total Surveyed (N=760) | 55% (418) | 24% (183) | 44% (335) | .09% (65) |

***Common Theme (Other):** 1) Communication wasn't useful because was inconsistent, untimely or inaccessible (e.g., Supreme Court should not have left decision making to the local judges, court orders were not adequately circulated).

Attorneys (Other): The use of video hearings is important and very useful (if client has access to technology); willingness of judges to expedite hearings; There has been no adequate communication...every judge is acting like the king of their own castle due to the complete failure of leadership. There is no consistent rules, no consistent signage, there is no consistent communication (still don't know what the plan for jury trials that are scheduled in two weeks are), and Supreme Court has not been helpful because they left decision-making to the judges, which has been very inconsistent, and have done very little communication with attorneys; none of the above/haven't seen these utilized; willingness of court personnel to direct everything to virtual attendance, when at all possible; I have not found the communication either from the Supreme Court/AOCP to be timely or in touch with the day-to-day reality of the pandemic ("crime doesn't stop in an emergency" doesn't consider high risk populations having to be in court); I would like the Court to make clear that all of the requirements cannot and should not trump or interfere with a defendant's right to be physically in the court in front of a judge (judges almost demand the use of video services when client would prefer to be physically in the court): State court orders and local court orders were not circulated to all bar members; disseminating of these orders has been abysmal, heard about them by word-of-mouth; More detail as to what is being factored into the modification would have been helpful;

Clerks/Judicial Administrators (Other): The ability to see the orders implemented by courts around the state in one place on the website was very helpful; It would have been great to have a person with the CDC dedicated to answer quarantine questions. Fear for and about staff infection or contamination was really stressful; reaching out to smaller courts to aid them in this time (e.g., laptops, helping with Webex, etc.)

Judges (Other): Court needs laptops so they can telecommute.

Probation Officers (Other): There was no universal decision making and decisions made were focused on the courts. That is fine, but probation seemed to get the messages last, or be told information was coming and it took a week or more to unify a message. [It would] would be judges did as they determined without AOC approval.

Sheriffs (Other): No consistency, misleading/false information; district court has allowed video hearings with inmates.

| Q6. What have you observed has been a hindrance as it relates to the communication from and the exchange of information by the Supreme Court/ Administrative Office of the Courts and Probation? | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|-----------|
| | Decision making related to court related activities (e.g., orders, modified court/probation functions) | Contingency plans or a common operational picture (e.g., resources to develop EPPs, creating signage related to CDC guidelines) | Information handling and communication processes (e.g., website, emails, press releases/media, social media) | Other* |
| Attorney (N=575) | 53% (177) | 42% (141) | 39% (130) | 27% (92) |
| Clerks of the Court/Judicial Administrators (N=82) | 29% (10) | 23% (8) | 17% (6) | 57% (20) |
| Judges (N=66) | 62% (26) | 40% (17) | 17% (7) | 21% (9) |
| Probation – Chief Probation Officers (N=12) | 33% (2) | 67% (4) | 50% (3) | 17% (1) |
| Sheriffs (N=25) | 33% (3) | 56% (5) | 11% (1) | 44% (4) |
| Total Surveyed (N=760) | 29% (218) | 23% (175) | 19% (147) | 17% (126) |

***Common Theme (Other):** 1) Lack of consistency, clarity and uniformity (e.g., procedures, protocols, court operations, court orders, use of technology, directed health measures)

Attorneys (Other): There was an expectation that we would not slow down the “wheels of justice” that ran over my clients with rather little regard to the seriousness of the offense, the need to prosecute minor misdemeanors, infractions, and traffic matters in person (examination of the severity of offenses would have limited the number of individuals in the courthouse). Possibly an expansion of unsupervised probation via a mailing ticket program should have been looked into. We simply prosecute way more people than necessary; Some judges and attorneys needed to understand these orders applied to everyone and it wasn’t a choice if they wanted to follow the order; Court staff stating they have been advised by Supreme Court staff to not have jury trials but Supreme Court staff refusal to complete affidavit for purposes of speedy trial hearings; Lack of uniformity within the state on COVID protocols (i.e., governor, cities, counties, courts); Inconsistent application of technology to allow cases to proceed to the extent possible and resistance of judges to utilize technology; Vagueness – allowing individual judges to determine how to proceed provides for inconsistencies, sometimes in the same courthouse; In my experience, the Courts have done a good job in this respect. Each county has timely relayed information; Very little communication and direction, especially when it was only to “stay open”; Failure to sufficiently plan some reasonable time period ahead of change handling operations; did not seek input from criminal defense attorneys; Guidance was vague, for example requiring reporting any exposure to anyone with COVID without setting a time period for defining exposure; There is no consistency from courtroom to courtroom and no deference to court participants who prefer to appear in person; judges who are resistant to comply with conducting remote hearings; decisions regarding in person hearings are not uniform among courts or judges; Lack of meaningful acknowledgment to the pandemic, including judges who don’t follow the rules (decline to wear a mask or follow quarantine recommendations); Lack of funding for needed technology; Communication has been fine, but there has been no consistent follow-through – all courts handling business differently; The receipt of information has been consistent from the Court, but it has been bad decisions and sever lack of leadership in making critical decisions; The court orders on jury trials and process are not all that clear; I wish there was a central place to access all local and state COVID orders; Expectations for court are not the same as those for probation, and often times probation expectations are not sufficiently explained to probationers or attorneys or

probationers; People creating the orders are not in the trenches dealing with the daily grind of the court process – decisions makers able to isolate themselves (clients don't have technology so must come to the attorney's office); Last minute orders cancelling trials (stress on litigants, trial preparation difficult).

Clerks/Judicial Administrators (Other): There was difficulty getting the various courts operating out of the Douglas County facilities to form plans that incorporated all of the stakeholders (e.g., security, sheriffs, building commissions, public defender, county attorney, clerks, local governing body...local control understandable, but a suggestion moving forward for the overarching plan may be to have representatives from each stakeholder designated to communicate about issues of significance including closures, suspending trials, etc.; You have provided information as accurate as possible as circumstances have changed so quickly; Lack of consistency on how Court and/or Court procedures are/should be conducted. AOC should have expressed what it considered as necessary precautions to the County Board/Commissioners (for example, so plexiglass could have been included in the budget); The wide distance between staff as a result of the politicizing of issues created problems; Many issues were situational and needed to be addressed immediately and couldn't wait until we received procedures from AOC; Nothing and feel like the Courts have done a great job of continuing operations as allowed.

Judges (Other): Compared to surrounding states we have not done well on the issue of non-judicial days and granting courts some discretion; Lack of equipment; Vagueness of guidelines for staff and whether to halt proceedings, courts had to figure out what to do locally, lack of direction...other than stay open...result in courts issuing order that are not entirely consistent with each other; We were put on an island, subject to the scrutiny of the attorneys and the press, with little or no support, including told to continue as much as possible, but then urged in the fall to resume complying with progression standards

Probation Officers (Other): COVID requirements by the State or County or Supreme Court that may conflict with each other

Sheriffs (Other): The judge decides what rules apply in his/her courtroom; Probation is no longer on NCIS

| Q7. Was communication by any of the following present a challenge in conducting business during the pandemic? Select all that apply. | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|---|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| | Nebraska Supreme Court | Administrative Office of the Courts and Probation | Probation Administration | Local Judges | District Court Clerks | Clerk Magistrates | Local Probation Office |
| Attorney (N=575) | 39% (99) | 20% (51) | 8% (19) | 78% (197) | 25% (63) | 13% (33) | 12% (30) |
| Clerks of the Court/Judicial Administrators (N=82) | 33% (5) | 27% (4) | 7% (1) | 53% (8) | 0% | 0% | 13% (2) |
| Judges (N=66) | 82% (18) | 41% (9) | 9% (2) | 36% (8) | 0% | 0% | 5% (1) |
| Probation – Chief Probation Officers (N=12) | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% (1) | 0% | 0% |
| Sheriffs (N=25) | 40% (2) | 0% | 0% | 80% (4) | 40% (2) | 20% (1) | 40% (2) |
| Total Surveyed (N=760) | 16% (124) | .08% (64) | .03% (22) | 29% (217) | .09% (66) | .04% (34) | .05% (35) |

Is there anyone else where communication was a challenge? 1) bailiffs and court administration were also listed as difficult to communicate with/get in touch with; 2) local jails and Nebraska Department of Corrections (difficult to meet and review documents/discovery); 3) attorneys who practice in multiple districts/states and weren't aware of the orders/process in the local court; 4) local courthouse offices

***Common Theme (Explain why communication was a challenge):** 1) Inconsistent and non-uniform direction, rules and communication. Many attorneys also expressed frustration that communication from the court didn't go to the entire bar (e.g., email blast).

Explain why communication was a challenge

Attorneys: Inconsistent rules between different courts and judicial districts; judges don't understand if they set a trial via Zoom, it still represents an issue for the attorney to remain six feet from a client, while still being close enough to handle issues that pop up; helpful to have consistent policies and practices across the county and district court location, all had vastly different protocols and the Supreme Court should have directed the courts to be consistent; it is only a one way conversation from the top down; lack of guidance and decision making has been a problem; chief judges' orders are not followed; communication is fine, but enforcement is a problem; communication from the local judges needs to be timely and decisive; district court judges didn't know what to do because they were looking for direction from above; easier if there was more uniformity with local judges; inconsistent communication from clerks about attending (in person, remotely) and court staff unable to set-up remote hearings (county attorney has to do it and send out invites); everything seems political...need more objective analysis of the issue instead of subjective...some independence and objective analysis is necessary from the Judiciary; the courts have done a good job communicating with litigants, the guidance changed from time to time but that's not anyone's fault; didn't present a challenge; if people were turned away at the door for experiencing symptoms this wasn't always relayed to the appropriate courtroom nor were they provided an alternative way to participate (individual should have been given a number to contact once at the court, Zoom information shouldn't change as was sometimes the case when trying to adjust how client would appear, even the message between court staff and the judges staff was different); communicated the best they could but poor coordination between executive branch and judicial branch and mixed messaging has been a hindrance to universal regulations and planning; county and city attorneys are not available to actually resolve

situations in criminal defense matters; I am frustrated the appellate courts went to virtual, but didn't order any really ongoing precautions for trial court level proceedings, which inherently involve the most pro se litigants and exposure to attorneys and court staff...local judges were and remain hesitant to adopt appropriate safety measures; several sentencings continued because probation was unable to complete a PSI/chemical evaluation in time due to COVID restrictions in detention centers and failed to communicate before sentencing; each party defers to decisions on moving hearings to someone else without any leadership to create a untied plan throughout the state; Supreme Court orders were welcome, but inconsistently applied and interpreted...also reflected the absolute base amount of prevention; when decision were made and an order was signed it wasn't made know to the bar...had to travel by word of mouth...I feel like there should have been an email blast to all the attorneys at the local bar; why can't these orders be sent to us; bailiffs and court administration have been very difficult to communicate/reach; information from probation is not provided until a violation is filed and an attorney requests the information, even then the expectations seem to vary depending on the probationer; no communication issues, but getting the task the legal parties were working to accomplish; Lancaster County attorneys not going to court at all for the most part; the fact the people creating the orders are not in the trenches dealing with the daily grind of the court process, the decision makers are able to isolate and protect themselves but those that are in the courtroom everyday continue to be at great risk and place their clients at risk; it has been difficult to meaningfully communicate with incarcerated clients, reviewing the discovery and documents with them is difficult; no direct communication to bar, piecemeal or through the grapevine or private bar.

Clerks/Judicial Administrators: The ongoing challenge with court security and building security – the challenge posed has often been on of staffing (i.e., quarantines, exposures, illness and staggered schedules); Communication is great in our court; We never see a probation officer anymore. They don't pick up their information in their outbox...probationers complain that they cannot reach any probation officers; Attorneys who practice in multiple/states did not know what order each judicial district/judge/state had in place...lack of communication by attorneys in finding order specific to each court; District and County court judges should have routinely met and provide a sense of a unified response; The state leadership waited too long before making an appropriate decision and mandate, thus endangering the court staff members and judges; AOC could do a better job of following up with courts that are experiencing technology, staffing and operating issues when the court has notified the AOC of these types of problems; Communication for the Supreme Court has been good as well as district meetings keeping us up to speed, our presiding judge has done a great job connecting with all the 8th district; County Attorney's office was working remotely from home so we had to handle much of the communication by email, They did not have access to their technology which make it difficult to obtain the filings we needed; Nebraska Department of Corrections; Local courthouse offices.

Judges: Not all judges were on the same page so we maintained consistency as best we could; There has been communication but other states have given judges greater discretion; none of the foregoing entities have provided an impediment; An order from the Supreme Court addressing evictions would have been extremely helpful, the task of "each court figuring out what is best for it" was difficult, having no experience dealing with this, but we worked on the problem and got through it; We didn't set forth "rules" that were definite enough for mask wearing, in court proceedings, hiatus, quarantine protocols; very different viewpoints by judges on handling court operations within the district led to a few difficult exchanges.

Probation Officers: Judges who did not respond to emails, or calls, district court judges did a great job, two county court judges did okay, and one just never responded; Our court has done a really good job of communicating and conducting business, many of the video hearings should stay – it is much better for parents not to have to take time off work, drive downtown, etc. for a quick review hearing; Overall communication was good within the Courts and Probation – Administration and local level

Sheriffs: District court judges – mandating the appearance of defendants in jail being in court instead of using technology; no problem; There was nobody taking the leadership role, district court did one thing, county another thing and juvenile another thing.

Questionnaire on Gaps Related to COVID-19

ATTORNEYS

8. What are your professional roles in your work with the courts? Select all that apply.

- ☐ 68% Non-criminal counsel (e.g., civil, family, probate)
- ☐ 25% Criminal defense (private)
- ☐ 18% Criminal defense (public defender)
- ☐ 16% Guardian ad Litem
- ☐ 11% Prosecutor
- ☐ 5% Other (please specify)*

***Other (Please specify):** Agency/government; corporate; Judicial Clerk/Research Attorney; Mediator; Juvenile; Defense counsel; Transactional

9. Has your practice before the courts this year involved the use of remote technology in order to participate in court proceedings?

- ☐ 84% Yes
- ☐ 16% No

NOTE: A selection of Yes will take the responder to Q10. A selection of No or Unsure will take the responder to Q24.

10. What has been the most common form of remote proceedings with which you have been involved? (May only choose one.)

- ☐ 40% Fully remote using videoconferencing (all individuals offsite from the court)
- ☐ 33% Partially remote using videoconferencing (some individuals in-person, others remote)
- ☐ 14% Fully remote using telephonic conference (all individuals offsite from the court)
- ☐ 9% Partially remote using telephonic conferencing (some individuals in-person, others remote)
- ☐ 3% Remote, using either videoconferencing or telephonic conferencing, where the individuals are all present in the courthouse but are basically physically located in separate rooms

11. How frequently has your practice before the courts this year involved the use of remote technology in order to participate in court proceedings? (May only choose one.)

- ☐ 40% A great deal
- ☐ 31% A moderate amount
- ☐ 17% Occasionally
- ☐ 6% Somewhat rarely
- ☐ 6% Rarely

12. Which type of court proceedings have you been involved with while using remote technology? Select all that apply

- ☐ 39% Non-evidentiary hearings (all types)
- ☐ 37% Civil non-evidentiary proceedings (non-family law)
- ☐ 37% Plea hearings
- ☐ 33% Arraignments
- ☐ 32% Sentencing
- ☐ 31% Criminal pretrials
- ☐ 24% Civil evidentiary proceedings (non-family law)
- ☐ 22% Family law non-evidentiary proceedings (e.g., divorce, dissolution, custody, etc.)
- ☐ 20% Evidentiary hearings (all types)
- ☐ 18% Disposition hearings (juvenile)
- ☐ 17% Family law evidentiary proceeding (e.g., divorce, dissolution, custody, etc.)
- ☐ 15% Adjudication hearings (juvenile)
- ☐ 14% Guardianship/conservatorship hearings
- ☐ 13% Probation violation/revocation hearings
- ☐ 12% Child protection proceedings
- ☐ 11% Appellate oral arguments
- ☐ 9% Delinquency proceedings
- ☐ 8% Civil trials
- ☐ 7% Specialized docket treatment team meetings (i.e., problem-solving courts)
- ☐ 6% Specialized docket status review hearings
- ☐ 5% Traffic proceedings
- ☐ 5% Other (please specify)*
- ☐ 3% Civil protection order hearings
- ☐ 3% Adoptions
- ☐ 2% Post-conviction proceedings
- ☐ 1% Criminal bench trials

☐ 0.46% Criminal jury trials

***Other (please specify):** Administrative proceedings; probate; federal; mental health [board] hearings; DHHS team meetings in juvenile cases/juvenile team meetings; civil motions; bankruptcy court hearings; disciplinary hearings.

["The federal courts have been much more consistent with the use of remote technology and have been much more consistent in communication with attorneys. It's the Nebraska state court system that has been a mess."]

13. Typically, what type of device do you use to participate in remote proceedings?

- ☐ 57% Laptop computer
- ☐ 39% Desktop computer
- ☐ 19% Smartphone
- ☐ 14% Tablet (e.g., iPad)
- ☐ 4% Other (please specify)*

*** Other (please specify):** I have to be in person; office/landline phone; court's computer

14. How would you rate the overall quality of the remote proceedings with which you have been involved?

- ☐ 34% Very Good
- ☐ 31% Good
- ☐ 12% Excellent
- ☐ 17% Fair
- ☐ 6% Poor
- ☐ 1% Unsure

Please explain (optional): With telephone, you can't hear very well, you can't read body language or facial expressions (fight hard against doing evidentiary hearings by phone); technology issues; Already judges and attorneys appear to be out of touch and then remote makes it more difficult – actual physical presence of attorneys, judges and juries is critical to a long term acceptance of the rule of law; Evidentiary hearings can be challenging especially if technology isn't working (e.g., no way to verify defendant's identity if no video or refuse to turn on video, defendant visibly drunk/high, or using to avoid warrants); Non-evidentiary hearings are fine; Lancaster County has a great videoconference system and it would be nice if Douglas and Sarpy had the same; It is good when it works, but challenging when it doesn't (not equally available, bandwidth, lack of tech support, court staff unable to make it work); Issues with court initiating it in advance so attorney can join on time; I think it is disastrous for courtrooms that preserve the record with audio recording instead of court reporters; Huge time saver =

huge savings for the counties; Judges and county attorney allowed to be in a separate room but defense counsel and defendant must be together; difficult for defense counsel to privately meet with client; Zoom works better than Webex (quite a few comments about challenges attorneys have had with Webex, but a few also have had issues with Zoom, including mentioning it had been hacked); Federal Court – excellent/State court – Fair (averages out to good); Marking exhibits/evidence is challenging; [With remote hearings] it is easy for some judges and prosecutors to dismiss clients as “boxes on a screen, rather than seeing them as full human beings....especially when they are facing...jail or prison.

15. Generally, how easy has it been for you to connect and participate in remote proceedings?

- ☐ 50% Easy
- ☐ 24% Very easy
- ☐ 20% Neutral
- ☐ 5% Difficult
- ☐ 1% Very difficult
- ☐ 0.23% Unsure

Please explain (optional): Problems getting admitted into meetings, adjusting the settings, including the privacy; Zoom – no issues and Webex – more finicky; Technology is fine, but conducting remotely is the issue (e.g., challenges logging into, internet connection, having to stay logged in for an extended period of time waiting for case to be called, difficult to talk to other attorneys about cases while waiting); Court doesn’t have the technology to facilitate; Easy for me, but appears difficult for the judges or clients; Easy to connect, but difficult to maintain.

16. How would you rate the overall quality of instructions and technical support information provided to you by the court in order to connect and participate?

- ☐ 28% Good
- ☐ 23% Very Good
- ☐ 16% Fair
- ☐ 14% Poor
- ☐ 11% Excellent
- ☐ 8% Unsure

Please explain (optional): No instruction or support from the court; Received support/tech support from the provider (Zoom, Webex); The bailiffs could take better

care to be very clear when adding the hearing to Outlook as to what format the hearing is (e.g., in person, remote); Some bailiffs do not disclose until week or even day of whether the hearing will be in person or by remote and don't always share the link/access information in advance; There are no instructions and court/court staff is inadequate in providing technical support; Court staff has shown great patience in dealing with those who need instruction; Our county attorneys office does this and not the court staff; Judges should have mandatory training; I had two oral arguments in front of the Nebraska Supreme Court. Their support staff is tremendous (test run and tech support the day of); Webex more problematic than Zoom; Little or no instruction; The court staff has been very knowledgeable and helpful. At the county level, the judges providing their room codes on Zoom has been a great improvement in being able to do a virtual hearing; technical support provided by the county; Inmates ignored, not technical assistance, unsafe contact, no privacy at jail.

17. How satisfied are you that the use of remote technology to conduct court proceedings protects parties' procedural due process rights?

- ☐ 20.79% Very satisfied
- ☐ 39.49% Satisfied
- ☐ 22.66% Unsure
- ☐ 10.75% Dissatisfied
- ☐ 6.31% Very Dissatisfied

Please explain (optional): The sense of gravity is often lost amongst litigants, attorneys and sometimes seemingly judges when remote; Law administered by remote contact...will be destructive over time...have watched the civility and cooperation between attorneys decline as social interactions after work and at bar functions decreases...Look at the nasty aspects of social media interactions. It has become "safe" and "acceptable" to abuse those you don't see or know in person. It is critical that litigants understand the law is an expression of fellow citizens in real time and in person. Social media is has created devastating isolation and alienation; Remote hearings or OK for routine hearings, but not for trials; I am afraid clients cannot always hear what is going on or being said...corners get cut in remote proceedings because we are just trying to keep the wheels of justice turning; So much easier to hear everyone with video conferencing and you can see everyone and read non-verbal cues. Phone-only participation you only pickup half of what is being said; Do not do criminal trials on remote technology without first getting the consent of the defendant; For non-evidentiary hearings, videoconferencing technology is great for parties in rural area. But I have no faith that any attorney can meaningfully confront and cross-examine witnesses, consult with clients or conduct

voir dire (constitutional right to confront and cross-examine witness should always be done face-to face); Evidentiary hearings should be in person; The inability of the judge to see witnesses in person detrimentally impacts the ability to judge credibility; Clients are less likely to consult with their attorney during a remote hearing when they have questions about the procedure; There have been instances where the judge requires an out of custody defendant to appear remotely for purposes of sentencing and then is expected to turn themselves into the jail and this doesn't happen. There are also issues with in custody defendants who wish to have a trial and who cannot afford bond, and now have been sitting for times well outside of their speedy trial rights; Biggest concern is doing a trial remotely...do not feel comfortable that a witness may not be alone during testimony and may be being fed answers by parties that are out of the view of the video camera.

18. How satisfied are you that the use of remote technology to conduct court proceedings provides parties with access to justice?

- ☐ 42% Satisfied
- ☐ 22% Unsure
- ☐ 20% Very satisfied
- ☐ 11% Dissatisfied
- ☐ 5% Very Dissatisfied

Please explain (optional): When it works, I think it is sufficient. The problem is it doesn't always work; Very difficult to convey legal positions during a telephonic proceeding; Removes humanity from proceedings and dehumanizes litigants; Under the circumstances remote technology is a good thing. If it becomes the norm during health times it will be a terrible thing; Many pro se, indigent and elderly clients don't have the technology to access the courts in this way and they aren't being provided the guidance they need – access is the issue (e.g., how to submit evidence, how to present testimony without someone to swear them in, what to do if the court is running behind); It has allowed parties who have to isolate or quarantine to have the opportunity to still be heard; hearings are easier to schedule and more convenient for the parties; when distance is involved, video conferences reduces delays and continuances, can move more easily between conflicting court schedules – very efficient, let's keep doing these; Hard for inmates at DCCC to hear and think they can be confused when not in the courtroom, plus hard to have confidential conversations; I think remote technology has resulted in increased participation by unrepresented parties; Tough for court appointed attorneys especially with those who need interpreters to contact and discuss cases with clients; Remote hearings are more convenient for judges, attorneys and staff and may make it easier to get

into court, but it erodes the quality of representation because clients do not feel as comfortable interrupting proceedings and asking questions of the attorneys (even in a breakout room); Except when judge refuses to accept evidence presented via Zoom when both parties agree; In quick hearings, I think is has provided better access – allowing low income clients not to have to be present physically – the courts have continue to improve by adding tech stations outside of the courts in case clients do not have internet at home; It would be tremendously helpful if the Court issued clearer, more uniform guidance so procedures don't vary widely between judges/jurisdictions.

19. How satisfied are you that the use of remote technology to conduct court proceedings promotes public trust and confidence in the courts?

- ☐ 37% Satisfied
- ☐ 31% Unsure
- ☐ 15% Very satisfied
- ☐ 11% Dissatisfied
- ☐ 6% Very Dissatisfied

Please explain (optional): Makes litigants feel less heard and important; Appearing in the in a courtroom has a strong transformational impact on a criminal client and/or witnesses – cases seem to be less “serious” if they are conducted remotely through technology; With videoconferencing because everyone can see all the participants, this helps humanize the process somewhat – everyone’s name appears – in juvenile law there are so many participants it is difficult for parents and other parties to figure out who is who, but having the names lowers the learning curve; It doesn’t build trust; Remote nature can take away from the seriousness of the criminal offense by allowing someone to remain comfortable versus being in front of the judge; When clients and witnesses not present it can bring distrust that something is going on before or after the hearing; In some cases, people are probably getting a more fair case as there isn’t the ex parte communication that sometimes occurs at the courthouse; It would promote public trust and confidence in the courts if there was more leadership from the top; Actually more access because people don’t want to come into the courtrooms; My clients already feel significantly detached from the “system” and feel that the “system” is rigged against them – remote hearings feeds this skepticism and reinforces the belief that the courts make arbitrary, self-serving decisions; Communication barriers exist when you are not next to your client and not everyone has a computer or internet; The public (including family of the interested parties) have not had access to any of the hearings (including plea and sentencing) that occur remotely; It can be a good

system if the Court/Court Administration will get more involved – involvement so far has been lackluster.

20. How satisfied are you that the use of remote technology to conduct court proceedings promotes traditional dignity and seriousness otherwise experienced during in-person court proceedings?

- ☐ 39% Satisfied
- ☐ 24% Unsure
- ☐ 17% Dissatisfied
- ☐ 13% Very satisfied
- ☐ 8% Very Dissatisfied

Please explain (optional): My concern is judges who wish to conduct telephonic proceedings “off the record” and then only briefly on the record, because so much is lost and not part of the record; There may actually be more dignity and seriousness that with in-person proceedings because everyone can be seen at the same time – I am much more conscious of my facial expressions and body language; It doesn’t promote it – I have noises in the background, county attorney in shorts in their basement, judges sentencing people in jail when they aren’t even in the same room – feels like a videogame; Remote access is a double edged sword, saving many resources in some minor hearings. But if judges can choose Zoom as a default, defendants’ rights will suffer; Should not sanction trials unless criminal defendants have consented to remote technology; There are individuals who take advantage of the remote participation to be disrespectful and some feel free to behave inappropriately without believing there will be tangible consequences (while driving, dressed inappropriately, smoking, walking around with their phones, appearing in non-discreet locations, kids in background screaming); When defendant is sentenced for a serious offense and are facing many years of imprisonment, conducting sentencing remotely seems disrespectful to the defendant. They should be physically present. Also out of custody defendants who are expected to appear remotely, but do not have the means and we are expected to facilitate their appearance, which puts us in a risky situation – and if then then don’t appear a warrant is issued which is fundamentally unfair to the defendant; Attorneys and judges don’t appear to be paying attention (e.g., responding to emails, texting)

21. In which of the following ways has your law practice changed during the pandemic regarding the use of remote technology? Select all that apply.

- ☐ 93% Increased use of videoconferencing tools
- ☐ 61% Increased use of telephonic conferencing tools (i.e., voice only)
- ☐ 35% Increased use of document signing tools (e.g., DocuSign, PandaDoc, etc.)
- ☐ 35% Electronic filing for attorneys
- ☐ 28% Increased use of document sharing applications (e.g., Dropbox, Google Docs, etc.)
- ☐ 5% Other (please specify)*
- ☐ 4% There has been no significant change in my law practice
- ☐ 4% Form completion software (e.g., HotDocs, A2J Author, etc.)

***Other (please specify):** Lost revenue/fewer cases; Miss seeing colleagues at the courthouse and making deals in-person (especially when you see them after they may not responded to an email or phone call); Reduced contact with clients; Way more tracking down clients to get their signatures; Docket gets bloated when not having trials; Difficulty speaking with clients in jail; I find it very helpful. My clients love it. They feel closer and connected to me – less likely to have capias findings (juvenile court) and less likely to have state ask for detention on a whim (makes litigants more responsible); Ability for more attorneys to be able to remote in on the office-issued tablets; Thankful most courts have helped by allowing more written waivers of preliminary hearings or arraignments; mailing exhibits to court reporters before remote hearings (10-page printing limit in many courts should be lifted or modified to avoid paper handling/exchange); Some documents cannot be electronically filed with the courts; holding status hearings more commonly by Zoom; Videoconferencing has increased; There has not been a significant change due to a Judge's refusal to adapt to the pandemic; Inmate visits impacted because difficult to share discovery.

22. After the social distancing restrictions from the pandemic have subsided, to what extent do you anticipate the use of remote technologies you identified in the previous question will continue? (May only choose one.)

- ☐ 41% Use will likely decrease
- ☐ 31% Use will likely stay about the same
- ☐ 23% Use will likely increase
- ☐ 4% Unsure
- ☐ 1% Not applicable (there has been no significant change in my law practice)

23. Because of COVID-19, courts started holding many more hearings by videoconference or phone conference in order to keep everyone safe. Once the pandemic is over and it is once again safe to do business in person, do you think courts should continue to conduct some hearings by remote technology?

- ☐ 79% Yes
- ☐ 15% No
- ☐ 6% Unsure

NOTE: A selection of Yes will take the responder to Q24. A selection of No or Unsure will take the responder to Q25.

24. Which of the following types of proceedings do you think are suitable for the use of remote technology in the future? Select all that apply.

- ☐ 64% Civil non-evidentiary proceedings (non-family law)
- ☐ 61% Non-evidentiary hearings (all types)
- ☐ 46% Arraignments
- ☐ 43% Family law non-evidentiary proceedings (e.g., divorce, dissolution, custody, etc.)
- ☐ 42% Criminal pretrials
- ☐ 35% Plea hearings
- ☐ 29% Civil evidentiary proceedings (non-family law)
- ☐ 25% Guardianship/conservatorship hearings
- ☐ 22% Appellate oral arguments
- ☐ 22% Traffic proceedings
- ☐ 21% Specialized docket status review hearings
- ☐ 21% Disposition hearings (juvenile)
- ☐ 16% Specialized docket treatment team meetings (i.e., problem-solving courts)
- ☐ 16% Sentencing
- ☐ 15% Adjudication hearings (juvenile)
- ☐ 14% Civil protection order hearings
- ☐ 13% Probation violations/revocation hearings
- ☐ 13% Evidentiary hearings (all types)
- ☐ 12% Family law evidentiary proceeding (e.g., divorce, dissolution, custody, etc.)
- ☐ 12% Child protection proceedings
- ☐ 11% Adoptions
- ☐ 10% Post-conviction proceedings
- ☐ 10% Delinquency proceedings
- ☐ 9% Other (please specify)*
- ☐ 8% Civil trials

- ☐ 3% Criminal bench trials
- ☐ 1% Criminal jury trials

***Other (please specify):** Status hearing; status/scheduling conferences; Civil motions; Douglas County civil pretrial hearings; hearings in rural Nebraska that only have a judge one day per month; misdemeanor pleas and sentencing; criminal docket calls; parties should be able to participate electronically if stipulated in all types of hearings/trials, but only on the agreement of the parties; During adoptions for family members; eviction hearings; establishment of guardianship should be in person, but all other probate hearings could be by Webex; Detention and initial juvenile hearings; Pretrial hearings; Uncontested hearings of any kind or any hearing with consent from all parties; Lawyer-lawyer-judge meetings; Mental Health Board hearings; Motion practice; Juvenile team meetings; Almost never will I consent to an evidentiary hearing by remote technology.

25. Which of the following do you believe are the most significant benefits of using remote technology to conduct court proceedings? Select all that apply.

- ☐ 85% Elimination of travel time and expenses for counsel and the parties
- ☐ 66% More efficient to participate in hearings in different courts on the same day
- ☐ 53% Elimination of client transportation needs
- ☐ 50% Increased use of time-certain scheduling at the courts
- ☐ 29% Reduced failure of clients to appear
- ☐ 22% Remote setting less intimidating for clients
- ☐ 9% None (there are no significant benefits over traditional in-person proceedings)
- ☐ 4% Other (please specify)*
- ☐ 1% Unsure

***Other (Please specify):** While I believe that remote technology would ease the financial burden on clients, I don't know that this is a "benefit" to the court system, especially in criminal cases where one should be motivated to have to appear less by avoiding criminal charges in the first place; Safety of all parties during the COVID pandemic; Handling of routine hearings (scheduling conferences, simple motions) without expense of in-person appearance would be useful in civil practices; Social distancing to reduce chance of disease spread; No transportation of prisoners, increased safety for courts and community; Allows clients to slip out of work for a short hearing without transportation time; Some nursing home patients have physical limitation which Webex made easier for family appearances; Attorneys don't miss hearings/are not late as often now that Judges send out invites with their remote hearings; Docket moves more efficiently; Cattle call hearings should be eliminated when appearing remotely, but they have not been; Helpful in civil trials and family law, but more problematic in criminal cases; Less crowding in courtrooms.

26. Which of the following do you believe are the most significant drawbacks to using remote technology to conduct court proceedings? Select all that apply.

- ☐ 68% General technology issues experienced by others (e.g., access difficulties, unavailable or slow internet, limited data plans)
- ☐ 64% General quality of communication is degraded (lack of non-verbal cues, hard to hear and understand people, no face-to-face interaction)
- ☐ 41% Loss of a sense of seriousness of the proceedings
- ☐ 40% Potential for unidentified third parties to influence proceedings
- ☐ 38% General technology issues experienced by you (e.g., access difficulties, unavailable or slow internet, limited data plans)
- ☐ 33% Potential for violation of separation of witnesses
- ☐ 31% Adverse impacts on procedural due process
- ☐ 23% Too many distractions for participants in their remote locations
- ☐ 8% Other (please specify)*
- ☐ 5% None (there are no significant drawbacks to using remote technology)
- ☐ 4% Remote setting more intimidating for parties
- ☐ 2% Unsure

Other (Please specify): Waited longer for hearings – especially those in jail, because jail staff brings them in as they want and not by the judge’s request; Cattle call hearings take longer, because there is no ability to get a case called earlier; Significant problems with telephonic hearings; Difficult to confidentially confer with your client during a remote hearing, especially if client has a question; Feels too informal at times; Judges being able to unilaterally deciding to go remote without the consent of both attorneys; Harder to build working relationship with judge and other counsel because of lack of opportunity to talk; Not accessible by clients; Translators have to translate consecutively and not simultaneously; Court can’t observe the witness; Hard time selecting a jury or examining a witness without seeing their faces and body language; Increases hearing times; Limits the time for attorneys to discuss a case after the hearing or deposition – “soft litigation”; Lack of consistent rules around when and by whom it can be used; Availability of technology should be used by the Judicial Resources Commission as an excuse to cut judges from districts west of Omaha and Lincoln; Courts refusing to offer remote technology; Inconsistent implementation of the local rules (i.e., share exhibits prior to hearings, etc.)

27. Where it is available, how often do you use electronic filing to file documents with the courts?

- ☐ 71% Always
- ☐ 18% Often
- ☐ 5% Sometimes
- ☐ 3% Rarely
- ☐ 3% Never

If you answered with any word other than “always” please explain (optional):

- Probate
 - Have to take the actual will to the clerk of the court – can’t file it electronically
 - In the Douglas and Sarpy County Courts’ Probate Divisions, in-person filings always result in faster processing of the registrar’s administrative duties
 - File originals
- Some payments have to be made in person if interest due is an issue
- Makes no sense when I can easily walk to the courthouse to file my documents
- Easier to take to courthouse locally than to find staff to file electronic
- When not available (e.g., Mental health board)
- Prosecutor and office does not typically use e-filing
- Our county court refuses to accept certain types of e-filing (e.g., briefs, motions, proposed orders)
- Application for Court Appointed Fees
- Praecipe to subpoena trial witness that needs a check for witness fee attached
- Sometimes we file complicated matters that require in person explanations to court clerks because they need our advice on how to handle certain matters because they don’t know how to handle
- In forma pauperis filings
- Traffic cases are manually filed with the court
- I have to file a request for hearing form in person in Douglas county court when asking to dismiss a case, continue or a bond review

28. When you need information on a case, and it is available online, how often do you use the courts' online dockets to look up information?

- ☐ 67% Always
- ☐ 26% Often
- ☐ 4% Sometimes,
- ☐ 2% Rarely
- ☐ 1% Never

29. Would you support statutory change to allow more case types to be held using remote technology (i.e., jury trials, testimony from witnesses)?

- ☐ 52% Yes
- ☐ 48% No

If you answered "No" please explain: [138 responses with general answer being remote technology should not be used in evidentiary hearings, witness dependent proceedings, jury trials, specifically criminal jury trials, and only if all parties agree.] Proceedings are less meaningful, deprives my client of his or her right to be present; Cheapens the judicial process; Pandora's box in terms of legal issues; Not a good idea to hold evidentiary hearings and trials; Oppose remote jury trials unless all parties consent; Confrontation between case parties and/or witnesses needs to be conducted in courtroom; Legislation changing § 24-303 to permit use of remote technology in evidentiary hearings would only benefit the Court, but further separate indigent defendants from receiving justice. I have genuine concerns for trustworthiness of testimony arising from remote technology, ability to have confidential conversations, addressing issues of witness sequestration or testimony without the use of notes and/or other materials or individuals; No for criminal matters, so civil matters, perhaps; Any hearing that is witness dependent should be in person...

30. How else might courts consider using remote technology in the future long after the pandemic has subsided?

- Remote criminal depositions; Requiring parties to take depositions via video technology (discovery rules may need to be amended to encourage, not require)
- In counties where attorneys are paid as much for travel time as appearances (cost savings)
- In counties that are only served by a judge one day per month to allow more frequent service and better access to justice

- Juvenile detention hearings that are held every afternoon. It would ease the burden on the sheriff's office and make those hearings more efficient
- Allow for electronic exhibits and some type of screen sharing so all participants are looking at the exact same document
- Certain case types can be handled completely remote to improve access to justice – attorney in Douglas County may provide reduced fee services to resident in Red Willow County who needs a divorce, guardianship, etc but cannot access an attorney in Red Willow – attorney would need to know that there would be no order to travel to Red Willow for any reason.
- Any “in chambers” hearings/meetings without clients
- Juvenile Law
 - Juvenile court family team meetings
 - Team meetings – I also hope parents of juveniles are allowed to Zoom when appearing in person would create a hardship
 - Used more in juvenile cases to ensure additional parties (therapists, foster parents, etc) can participate in hearings
 - Juvenile review hearings
- Family Law
 - “informal steps such as status hearings, temporary hearings, and pretrials that do not require evidence
 - Some witnesses appear by video (counselors, teachers, and health professionals)
- Probate court guardianship proceedings in initial stages
- Transporting defendants from prison on things like an appeals
- Require electronic filing of evidence, similar to what is done in federal court
- Hearings when live testimony not required
- Basic motions/hearings
- Bond hearings for persons picked up on warrants
- Whatever long-term decision is made, they need to be uniform, not district by district or judge by judge
- The courts should not use technology after the pandemic is over
- Probation and caseworker meetings with families/attorneys. Contracted providers to be accountable for services/hours and progress notes
- E-filing
 - Standardize and mandate e-filing (this will require individual courts and clerks to give up the ability to modify certain things)
 - In forma pauperis e-filings in Douglas County probate court rather than requiring in-person filing with all fee waiver applications
 - Expand electronic filing to include documents submitted as evidence/exhibits

- Better implementation of electronic filing and access to records and exhibits
 - Encourage judges to accept e-filing (including proposed orders with the motion)
- Stipulated hearings
- All pre-trial civil hearings (file sharing applications are available for little to no cost in most cases for evidentiary hearings)
- Attorney only motions and non-testimonial proceedings
- First appearances in probation violation matters
- Bankruptcy court meetings of creditors so clients do not have to take off from work to attend a short meeting
- Secure link from courtroom to jails so defense attorneys can speak to their clients
- Find ways for SRLs without technology to participate in the process (e.g., libraries)
- Allow expert witnesses to testify remotely, will save travel costs for parties
- Judges using electronic docketing system as opposed to paper file system (like they do in federal court proceedings)
- Mediation in civil disputes
- Out of custody and/or out of state individuals to appear by video
- Helpful not to have to file a motion to have a remote hearing
- Any minor hearing where people's rights are not an issue – IE Motion to Compel, Discovery disputes, status conferences
- Automatic acceptance of documents filed
- Dedicated technology centers
- Continuing education requirements should be allowed to be all web based to eliminate increase time and expense
- Oral arguments
- Virtual hearings should be an exception and only after all parties have agreed (for example, cases where transportation is an issue)
- Allow discovery shared with inmates remotely (i.e., technology to review DVDs and review reports)

31. Is there anything else you would like the Supreme Court/Administrative Office of the Courts and Probation to consider that wasn't asked?

- Leadership/Uniformity
 - Admonish the judges who refuse to utilize technology
 - Admonish the judges who refuse to use PPE, apply uniformly and require people to remove masks
 - Uniform rules to create consistency in use of technology by judges
 - "Court told me Nebraska wrote the Pandemic Bench Book"; however, still have courtrooms with too many people in them and cattle calls – left to do what the individual trial judge wants to do with no leadership from the Court/Court Administrator (also shows a failure to protect own staff)
 - More guidance from Court and more uniformity and guidance by the local judges
 - Would like more information on why certain courts use Zoom and others Webex and the policy for allowing parties/clients to attend
 - Try not to just think of themselves...they act like officers in combat, treating the troops as barely essential.
 - The survey is well thought out and the fact that it is being conducted speaks well of the Court
 - Judges need to realize remote discovery can help but is not always the answer – judges need to realize this and demonstrate more patience during this period of time.
 - For my virtual hearings, judges was always in the courtroom, wearing a robe. I think this helps maintain the solemnity of the proceedings.
 - Federal court – more consistency, uniformity and direction than in state courts
 - Make sure that the district and county courts have the flexibility to address their local concerns – bottom up rather than top down
 - Make it mandatory for every court to at least provide access to videoconferencing
 - "I have a sense that some of these questions are designed to give a pat on the back to the Administrator's office. That has not yet been earned, in my opinion. The Court could do so much more."
- Technology
 - Technology support is needed for those who don't have computer skills
 - Training and support for court staff
 - Training for judges and attorneys
 - Cease consideration of any amendment to Neb. Rev. Stat. § 24-303 (judges will abuse this power; need to have consent of the parties)

- Standardize the technology used – some used Zoom, some used Webex – approved alternatives so lawyer would know what technology they needed to have and master
- Access to technology and bandwidth in rural areas
- Are all the Court of Appeals records (PSIs, BOEs, Transcripts) online yet? They need to be.
- Webex – requires the “host” to start the meeting. There should be a virtual waiting room option because as it stands now, I can’t communicate with the defense attorney while we wait for the judge to be ready. It also means you have to constantly click to join the hearing because you never know when the judge is ready.
- More staff need to be forced to use more video/phone (saves time for me and money for my client)
- A more secure software than Zoom should be identified and purchased (Zoom-bombing)
- Need to make remote technology more secure
- Updating older courtrooms and technologies to ensure better participation
- Loss of attorneys in rural areas – attorneys who can appear by technology are less likely to remain or relocate to rural Nebraska. Also likely to increase national firms providing legal services (result in the increased need to monitor for UPL).
- Remote technology will help rural areas with less attorneys available
- Helpful for court to fix its county court calendar listings. It is always slow and “buggy” and doesn’t update fast enough. There is also a benefit here with speedier trials and less FTA [failure to appear] by low income clients.
- ADA/True access for defendants/parties
 - Providing assistive devices to fully-participate when participation is modified
 - Difficult time hearing what is happening for attorneys, parties, judges
 - Don’t understand they can talk to their attorney (ask questions, understand legal process)
 - Emphasize how much more accessible the Courtroom can be to many people when given the opportunity to appear remote (great percentage of client turnout when don’t have to work about transportation or taking time off work)
- “Interpreters continue to be a problem, both in person and remote – state needs to help with interpreters
- Systemic racial discrimination within the court system

- Civil vs. Criminal
 - The prioritization of *all* criminal over all civil needs to be addressed. Low-level, non-violent crimes should not be given priority over all civil litigation – there are certain civil cases that involve seriously injured people who are having fair compensation for those serious injuries withheld – without civil jury trials, there is no incentive for insurance companies to what “fair compensation.”
 - Civil clients appreciate remote hearing because it reduces the travel and cost and prevents them from incurring fees associated with the attorney waiting in the courtroom.
- Self-Represented Litigants/Non-lawyer businesses
 - Need to determine how to provide access to tools need to participate remotely (laptops, hotspot with SRL subject to civil or criminal sanctions for misusing)
 - Non-lawyer accounts for filing (banks/others to respond to garnishments). Illinois allows.
 - Would be helpful for the entire garnishment process move to electronic from service to ACH payment/release
- Juvenile
 - Would have been nice for parties in 3A trials to use Zoom for witnesses
 - [Technology] is important for juvenile court – scheduling is easier, should encourage streamlining and cuts down on continuances/capiases
- CLE
 - Remote CLE carry over for 2020 and permit it for 2021
 - All CLEs should be allowed to be earned virtually and if your CLEs exceed the required amount they should be allowed to be carried over as if earned in person
- E-filing
 - We feel like we are doing much of the Clerk’s work and there are unreasonable delays by the clerk in processing and doing their administrative duties (e.g., Probate/Douglas County hearing had to be rescheduled because the clerk didn’t send the notice of hearing to the Daily Record, which delayed the hearing)
 - The entire e-filing /docket system needs to be re-done to be comparable to its peers. The system need to permit filing of briefs and evidence to enable more remote hearings to occur.
- Jury Trials/Trials/Sentencing
 - Remote appearances have some valid uses, if trials or evidentiary hearings are allowed to happen without defendant waiving that right, they will become the default and primary way they are held. This will

have devastating consequences for the esteem courts are held in and also for Due Process.

- Sentencing should be done in court (tone and ability to take into custody)
- Jails
 - Jails should more routinely use electronic monitoring. This would decrease the spread of COVID and allow more people to have work release.
 - Inmates need access to technology that will allow for more privacy when meet with attorney
 - Inmate population needs access to technology to review discovery; Difficult to go over discovery with incarcerated clients. Specifically in Douglas County. Unsure if there is a safe workaround that would allow defendants to examine police reports and documents for themselves, instead of me reading everything out loud and hard for them to prepare their case when they can't see anything.

CLERK OF THE COURT/COURT ADMINISTRATOR

8. Since March 2020, have you participated in court proceedings using remote technology?

- ☐ 91% Yes
- ☐ 9% No

NOTE: A selection of Yes took responder to Q9. A selection of No took the responder to Q20.

9. Which type of proceedings has your court presided over while using remote technology? Select all that apply.

- ☐ 71% Arraignments
- ☐ 65% Civil non-evidentiary proceedings (non-family law)
- ☐ 65% Criminal pretrials
- ☐ 61% Plea hearings
- ☐ 50% Sentencing
- ☐ 40% Non-evidentiary hearings (all types)
- ☐ 31% Family law non-evidentiary proceedings (e.g., divorce, dissolution, custody, etc.)
- ☐ 31% Guardianship/conservatorship hearings
- ☐ 27% Probation violation/revocation hearings
- ☐ 24% Family law evidentiary proceeding (e.g., divorce, dissolution, custody, etc.)
- ☐ 23% Civil evidentiary proceedings (non-family law)
- ☐ 23% Traffic proceedings
- ☐ 21% Adjudication hearings (juvenile)
- ☐ 18% Disposition hearings (juvenile)
- ☐ 18% Specialized docket status review hearings
- ☐ 16% Evidentiary hearings (all types)
- ☐ 15% Delinquency proceedings
- ☐ 15% Child protection proceedings
- ☐ 13% Other (please specify
- ☐ 11% Post-conviction proceedings
- ☐ 10% Civil protection order hearings
- ☐ 8% Civil trials
- ☐ 6% Criminal bench trials
- ☐ 6% Criminal jury trials
- ☐ 5% Specialized docket treatment team meetings (i.e., problem-solving courts)
- ☐ 2% Adoptions
- ☐ 0% Appellate oral arguments

10. Which type of remote services does your court currently offer? Select all that apply.

- ☐ 89% Telephonic conferencing (for any type of proceeding)
- ☐ 79% Videoconferencing (for any type of proceeding)
- ☐ 35% Electronic document signing tools (e.g., DocuSign, PandaDoc, etc.)
- ☐ 29% Text messaging notifications and/or reminders
- ☐ 21% Virtual remote interpretation
- ☐ 11% Remote mediation (parties and mediator meet via telephonic or video conference)
- ☐ 9% Other (please specify)*
- ☐ 6% Livestreaming of court proceedings
- ☐ 5% Increased use of document sharing applications (e.g., Dropbox, Google Docs, etc.)
- ☐ 5% Specialized docket remote status review hearings
- ☐ 3% Specialized docket remote treatment team meetings
- ☐ 2% Online self-scheduling allowing parties to schedule hearings
- ☐ 2% Unsure
- ☐ 0.00% Form completion software (e.g., HotDocs, A2J Author, etc.)

Other (please specify)*: Videoconferencing/Telephonic conferencing upon request; Our judges do not allow video conference and telephonic hearings when there is evidence; we have done a few Webex hearings, but are unable to do DOCKET at the same time due to lack of a second computer.

11. Which types of remote services should be available? Select all that apply.

- ☐ 71% Videoconferencing (for any type of proceeding)
- ☐ 64% Telephonic conferencing (for any type of proceeding)
- ☐ 49% Electronic filing for self-represented litigants
- ☐ 46% Electronic document signing tools (e.g., DocuSign, PandaDoc, etc.)
- ☐ 32% Virtual remote interpretation
- ☐ 31% Remote mediation (parties and mediator meet via telephonic or video conference)
- ☐ 29% Text messaging notifications and/or reminders
- ☐ 27% Increased use of document sharing applications (e.g., Dropbox, Google Docs, etc.)
- ☐ 24% Form completion software (e.g., HotDocs, A2J Author, etc.)
- ☐ 14% Specialized docket remote status review hearings
- ☐ 12% Livestreaming of court proceedings
- ☐ 10% Unsure

- ☐ 10% Specialized docket remote treatment team meetings
- ☐ 7% Other (please specify)*
- ☐ 5% Online self-scheduling allowing parties to schedule hearings

Other (please specify)*: Text messaging, but not from personal cell phones; we have the capability of live streaming court proceedings but have not had to use it as of yet

12. What has been the most common form of remote proceedings with which you have been involved? (May only answer one.)

- ☐ 39% Partially remote using videoconferencing (some individuals in-person, others remote)
- ☐ 31% Partially remote using telephonic conferencing (individuals in-person, other remote)
- ☐ 17% Fully remote using videoconferencing (all individuals offsite from the court)
- ☐ 7% Fully remote using telephonic conference (all individuals offsite from the court)
- ☐ 3% Other (please specify)
- ☐ 2% Remote, using either videoconferencing or telephonic conferencing, where the individuals are all present in the courthouse but are basically physically located in separate rooms

Other (please specify)*: We have some appear in person with some on conference line and some on video conference; partially remote using telephonic conferencing; most individuals remote with a few in person

13. How would you rate the overall quality of the remote proceedings with which your court has been involved?

- ☐ 37% Good
- ☐ 29% Very good
- ☐ 25% Fair
- ☐ 8% Excellent
- ☐ 2% Poor
- ☐ 0% Unsure

Please explain (optional): Once court proceedings are initiated are working well – there has been excellent feedback for those proceedings between the court and the corrections facility; the more individuals involved the more risk for problems with technology either by user error or lack of internet strength; quality is good as long as you can get it to work, Webex calls are frequently dropped by phone company; Have

had some problems with county equipment, difficult to get IT to fix it, all very busy; The bandwidth has been very good, and the sound system has done an excellent job transmitting the proceeding; Sometimes works, sometimes doesn't, very frustrating; video and audio quality sometimes poor.

14. Generally, how easy has it been for you and your court staff to coordinate, connect and participate in remote proceedings?

- ☐ 37% Good
- ☐ 33% Very Good
- ☐ 22% Fair
- ☐ 8% Excellent
- ☐ 0% Poor
- ☐ 0% Unsure

Please explain (optional): There have been challenges getting the initial applications up and running, because of the non-uniform availability of applications, users were working with Webex, Zoom, Google Meet and some other applications. As time went on free offerings needed to be converted to paid accounts which created another level of work. Users are still working with different applications; I have provided all the iPads personally; Judge's bailiff does this; Have had trouble with Webex since they updated their program. Does not work well with Outlook, or I am not knowledgeable enough; We have used Webex for a number of different case types and it has worked well; Connecting to other locations has been an issue because of their training;

15. How would you rate the adequacy of the training and other resources that have been made available to you by the Supreme Court/AOCP to help you conduct remote hearings?

- ☐ 31% Good
- ☐ 25% Very good
- ☐ 23% Fair
- ☐ 8% Poor
- ☐ 8% Unsure (Please explain.)
- ☐ 5% Excellent

Please explain (optional): Because of the unique IT support model in the 4th District Court, the Court did not benefit directly from the resources available to conduct remote hearings. The AOCP did provide video camera hardware for remote hearings

which assisted in facilitating remote hearings; We have had no training. Our court reporter took it over; Could use updates from time to time, especially if you have someone else from another court coming into your courtroom to do the videoconferencing; I need more knowledge on how all the technology works together. I don't really understand it; Biggest problem is the bandwidth, internet connection in courtroom; We have done it all ourselves.

16. How satisfied are you that the use of remote technology to conduct court proceedings protects parties' procedural due process rights?

- ☐ 70% Satisfied
- ☐ 20% Unsure
- ☐ 8% Very satisfied
- ☐ 2% Dissatisfied
- ☐ 0% Very Dissatisfied

Please explain (optional): There has been open and candid discussions with states' attorneys, public defenders and corrections staff regarding due process in facets of the criminal proceedings that are being conducted remotely; They are left out in limbo, especially when their attorneys aren't present with them; I think some legislation may need to be updated to accommodate the use of remote technology in court proceedings; Not all hearings are conducted with remote technology depending on the case type, and so far have not had any progression issues; Liberty Recorder and microphones have always been an issue for us.

17. How satisfied are you that the use of remote technology to conduct court proceedings provides parties with access to justice?

- ☐ 73% Satisfied
- ☐ 14% Unsure
- ☐ 11% Very satisfied
- ☐ 2% Dissatisfied
- ☐ 0% Very Dissatisfied

Please explain (optional): The availability of resources for many parties to utilize remote tech is a concern, as well as a uniform and easily accessible method of informing parties about the technology. The information access is exacerbated by the challenges that are present with the pandemic; I don't think public defenders' office is doing a very good job of keeping in contact with their clients.

18. How satisfied are you that the use of remote technology to conduct court proceedings promotes public trust and confidence in the courts?

- ☐ 64% Satisfied
- ☐ 31% Unsure
- ☐ 3% Very satisfied
- ☐ 2% Dissatisfied
- ☐ 0% Very Dissatisfied

Please explain (optional): The proceedings are well received and litigants and attorneys concerns are addressed on a case by case basis. The concern is that as the situation continues the backlog will pose its own challenges; I don't there is much thought put to this subject by the general public; I believe most litigants/attorneys are thankful that this is an option during the Pandemic; Depending on the connectivity of the hearing being conducted. If the technology works – then trust/confidence higher than when technology doesn't work.

19. How satisfied are you that the use of remote technology to conduct court proceedings promotes traditional dignity and seriousness otherwise experienced during in-person court proceedings?

- ☐ 35% Satisfied
- ☐ 35% Unsure
- ☐ 20% Dissatisfied
- ☐ 6% Very satisfied
- ☐ 3% Very Dissatisfied

Please explain (optional): The level of professionalism from all stakeholders has been outstanding; There is nothing in comparison than being in the courtroom. Whether you are the plaintiff or defendant it has a lasting effect; Defendant and juveniles have appeared on video with inappropriate (or no) dress; The proceedings may not be taken as seriously in a remote setting without the proper guidance of their attorney; SRK and drug court participants don't always conduct themselves appropriately; Proceedings are conducted by all parties in the same dignified matter as they always have. The hearings are treated just as if the party(s) were present in the courtroom; Remote proceedings in my opinion, are not the same as being in a courtroom setting to establish professionalism and seriousness for the reason that you are in the court system.

20. Once the pandemic is over and it is once again safe to do business in person, do you think courts should continue to conduct some proceedings by remote technology?

- ☐ 59% Yes
- ☐ 26% Unsure
- ☐ 15% No

21. Which of the following do you believe are the most significant benefits of using remote technology to conduct court proceedings? Select all that apply.

- ☐ 82% Elimination of travel time and expenses for counsel, parties and others
- ☐ 53% Fewer attorney scheduling conflicts
- ☐ 36% Reduced failure of parties to appear
- ☐ 26% Increased use of time-certain scheduling at the courts
- ☐ 19% Remote setting less intimidating for parties
- ☐ 14% Other (please specify)*
- ☐ 8% Unsure
- ☐ 7% None (there are no significant benefits over traditional in-person proceedings)

Other (please specify)*: Courts report the length of proceedings has shortened, the use of the time is more efficient, the parties are well prepared and organized; Helpful for attendees with lack of transportation especially in small or remote areas; Lessens the severity of the crime committee. Some parties go through court and complete their sentence without ever seeing anyone from the court or probation in person. I had one probationer say that it was like it didn't happen; I believe it reduces the chance of security issues; In rural areas, daily access to judges who may only be in that county 1 day a week for individuals incarcerated or juvenile detentions or allows for increased ability to schedule hearings in a more timely manner; I much prefer in person hearing/proceedings; It would be much easier for our jail to have prisoners appear using remote technology; Really wanted an option to check "NONE"

22. Which of the following do you believe are the most significant drawbacks to using remote technology to conduct court proceedings? Select all that apply.

- ☐ 84% General technology issues experienced by others (e.g., access difficulties, unavailable or slow internet, limited data plans)
- ☐ 78% General technology issues experienced by you (e.g., access difficulties, unavailable or slow internet, limited data plans)
- ☐ 66% General quality of communication is degraded (lack of non-verbal cues, hard to hear and understand people, no face-to-face interaction)

- ☐ 62% Loss of a sense of seriousness of the proceedings
- ☐ 38% Too many distractions for participants in their remote locations
- ☐ 22% Adverse impacts on procedural due process
- ☐ 19% Difficulty accessing office shared drive/dockets (e.g., VPN)
- ☐ 4% Remote setting more intimidating for parties
- ☐ 3% Unsure
- ☐ 0% None (there are no significant drawbacks to using remote technology)

23. How else might courts consider using remote technology in the future long after the pandemic has subsided?

- Developing alternate evening and/or weekend schedules that are not tied to the full staffing and security of a courthouse is something that might benefit access to the courts. Providing the public with open access to the proceedings without travel and security concerns could be considered. In jurisdictions that cover a large area, the ability of a Judge to hold hearings without travel is a consideration for flexibility for scheduling.
- Technology will be helpful if the courts are combined.
- Requiring all agencies to participate
- Providing non-attorneys the ability to e-file, including probation, jail staff, SRL – this would allow court staff the ability to track filings and speak to caseloads efficiently
- Continue with the remote technology as is. Perhaps getting the Dept. of Corrections on board with access to the inmates
- We have always used telephone conferencing in any one of the parties couldn't appear in person. This court has always tried to give the best service to the public and its stakeholders to hold their hearing accordingly as scheduled.
- We really need remote assistance for self-represented litigants
- That should be up to the Judges
- Provide laptops to staff so they can telecommute
- I think for bond settings and arraignments when the defendant is in custody would be more convenient for the jail. Hearings that are using held in chambers.
- Increase bandwidth – get technicians out to the courts on a scheduled court day to see first hand the issues that are occurring – remote passthrough authority needs to get worked out – depending on which IT tech you talk to you receive different directions. If you want staff and judges to work in different counties, make remote pass-through ability less cumbersome. Equipment that meets a court's needs (i.e., laptops that will copy digital recordings the external drives; updated digital software.

- Good use of Judge's time – no travel time, more available
- For criminal defendants that have issues traveling
- For NON-evidentiary hearings only – trials should not be held by video
- The quality of remote technology is very much dependent on the internet access/speed of all parties and the familiarity with the program being used. We found that most people do not use Webex and want to use Zoom or something they are familiar with.
- People with disabilities

24. Do you think the Supreme Court orders provided you with the direction necessary so that you were able to implement modified court operations?

- ☐ 93% Yes
- ☐ 7% No (please explain)

Please explain (optional): The general orders did provide the ability to adapt – the challenge in the 4th district was coordinating the many stakeholders operating in one location; Specific suggestions on exactly how to proceed would be helpful. We were left to find out on our own from scratch; County courts had direction, District courts were left to fend for themselves. One umbrella of instruction would have proved more effective; Operation Statements were fine. The point was clear we were going to remain open but would have again helped if local judges met and discussed the processes available; Not at first, felt very isolated and unsure what to do.

25. Do you think the AOC provided you with the direction and resources necessary so that you were able to implement modified court operations (e.g., guidance on developing an emergency preparedness plan, implementing ability for staff to telecommute, providing PPE, creating signage related to CDC guidelines)?

- ☐ 87% Yes
- ☐ 13% No

Please explain (optional): To an extent the EPP was helpful. PPE was provided as requested, signage was useful. There were challenges with video hearings; Yes and no, AOC has been awesome at providing PPE and tried to help with an EPP; however, having to start from scratch was difficult. Examples for guidance would have helped immensely; Not at first; As best as they could at the time and with the limited resources; I am very pleased with the help we were given from the AOC; Was overwhelming but was able to accomplish; only issue was lack of remote equipment; We were not able to telecommute because of lack of laptops

26. Is there anything else you would like the Supreme Court/AOCP to consider that wasn't asked?

- Suggestions for proposed rules and/or laws
- The judge's decision on whether to have live hearings, telephonic or video conferencing. We were to follow those instructions
- I feel the court offices are stretched too thin as far as staffing. People are having to travel between courts to cover for lack of staff due either to COVID or retirement/vacancies. This only increases the opportunities for spread between different courts. With all the new processes and considerations we are busier than ever, even if some caseload stats are down.
- I think the Supreme Court/AOCP has done a very good job anticipating the needs of litigants, attorneys and court staff. Thank you!
- The most important thing that was learned from the pandemic is that there are a lot of counties outside of Douglas, Sarpy and Lancaster that do NOT have the technology/or equipment to conduct Webex hearings on a regular basis. The AOCP needs to assist the courts financially to get the needed equipment etc. to do court hearings by Webex. The small counties do NOT have the necessary money to fund this.
- Consideration of people taking advantage of the COVID situation. People working from home or RTW status when it was not necessary
- More clear guidelines on what constitutes RTW, does someone have to be positive in your courthouse on percentage of cases etc.

JUDGES

8. Since March 2020, have you conducted court proceedings using remote technology?

- ☐ 100% Yes
- ☐ 0.00% No

**9. Which type of proceedings have you presided over while using remote technology?
Select all that apply.**

- ☐ 93% Plea hearings
- ☐ 82% Arraignments
- ☐ 82% Sentencing
- ☐ 75% Non-evidentiary hearings (all types)
- ☐ 74% Criminal pretrials
- ☐ 70% Civil non-evidentiary proceedings (non-family law)
- ☐ 56% Probation violation/revocation hearings
- ☐ 54% Family law non-evidentiary proceedings (e.g., divorce, dissolution, custody,
- ☐ 52% Civil evidentiary proceedings (non-family law)
- ☐ 43% Family law evidentiary proceeding (e.g., divorce, dissolution, custody, etc.)
- ☐ 39.34% Evidentiary hearings (all types)
- ☐ 33% Specialized docket treatment team meetings (i.e., problem-solving courts)
- ☐ 30% Civil protection order hearings
- ☐ 25% Child protection proceedings
- ☐ 23% Guardianship/conservatorship hearings
- ☐ 23% Specialized docket status review hearings
- ☐ 21% Civil trials
- ☐ 20% Delinquency proceedings
- ☐ 16% Post-conviction proceedings
- ☐ 15% Adjudication hearings (juvenile
- ☐ 13% Traffic proceedings
- ☐ 11% Adoptions
- ☐ 11% Appellate oral arguments
- ☐ 5% Criminal bench trials
- ☐ 5% Criminal jury trials
- ☐ 3% Other (please specify)*

***Other (please specify):** Criminal preliminary hearings; probate/estate/trust hearings

10. Which type of remote services does your court currently offer? Select all that apply.

- ☐ 93% Videoconferencing (for any type of proceeding)
- ☐ 90% Telephonic conferencing (for any type of proceeding)
- ☐ 44% Virtual remote interpretation
- ☐ 39% Electronic document signing tools (e.g., DocuSign, PandaDoc, etc.)
- ☐ 21% Text messaging notifications and/or reminders
- ☐ 18% Livestreaming of court proceedings
- ☐ 16% Increased use of document sharing applications (e.g., Dropbox, Google Docs, etc.)
- ☐ 16% Specialized docket remote treatment team meetings
- ☐ 16% Specialized docket remote status review hearings
- ☐ 13% Remote mediation (parties and mediator meet via telephonic or video conference)
- ☐ 5% Unsure
- ☐ 2% Form completion software (e.g., HotDocs, A2J Author, etc.)
- ☐ 2% Other (please specify)*
- ☐ 0% Online self-scheduling allowing parties to schedule hearings

***Other (please specify):** Email notifications and reminders

11. Which types of remote services should be available? Select all that apply.

- ☐ 87% Videoconferencing (for any type of proceeding)
- ☐ 85% Telephonic conferencing (for any type of proceeding)
- ☐ 68% Electronic document signing tools (e.g., DocuSign, PandaDoc, etc.)
- ☐ 60% Virtual remote interpretation
- ☐ 55% Electronic filing for self-represented litigants
- ☐ 55% Text messaging notifications and/or reminders
- ☐ 48% Remote mediation (parties and mediator meet via telephonic or video conference)
- ☐ 48% Increased use of document sharing applications (e.g., Dropbox, Google Docs, etc.)
- ☐ 43% Livestreaming of court proceedings
- ☐ 32% Specialized docket remote status review hearings
- ☐ 30% Specialized docket remote treatment team meetings
- ☐ 30% Form completion software (e.g., HotDocs, A2J Author, etc.)
- ☐ 20% Online self-scheduling allowing parties to schedule hearings
- ☐ 7% Unsure
- ☐ 3% Other (please specify)*

***Other (please specify):** Criminal evidentiary hearings except jury trials; Personally, I think district court proceedings should be held in person

12. What has been the most common form of remote proceedings with which you have been involved? (May only answer one.)

- ☐ 49% Partially remote using videoconferencing (some individuals in-person, others remote)
- ☐ 34% Fully remote using videoconferencing (all individuals offsite from the court)
- ☐ 80% Fully remote using telephonic conference (all individuals offsite from the court)
- ☐ 7% Partially remote using telephonic conferencing (individuals in-person, others remote)
- ☐ 2% Remote, using either videoconferencing or telephonic conferencing, where the individuals are all present in the courthouse but are basically physically located in separate rooms
- ☐ 0% Other (please specify)

13. Typically, what type of device do you use to participate in remote proceedings?

- ☐ 56% Laptop computer
- ☐ 18% Desktop computer
- ☐ 13% Regular telephone
- ☐ 7% Tablet (e.g., iPad)
- ☐ 7% Other (please specify)*
- ☐ 0% Smartphone

***Other (please specify):** Mobile cart equipped with monitor and software for Zoom and Webex; Webex camera in the courtroom; Large TV with Webex/WebCam and aux microphone; Televisions equipped with Webex technology.

14. How would you rate the overall quality of the remote proceedings with which you have been involved?

- ☐ 44% Very Good
- ☐ 33% Good
- ☐ 15% Fair
- ☐ 8% Excellent
- ☐ 0% Poor
- ☐ 0% Unsure

Please explain (optional): Majority of proceedings are with our jail with which we have a strong connection to see and hear; WE have used Teams over fast internet and it has worked very well overall, with challenges and best practices addressed as they arise; Sometimes audio, video or both break up or freeze. Problems with participant knowledge of software use (i.e., muting, how to get online); Sound is the biggest issue with microphone and speaker placement creating problems at time; My staff and the staff at corrections have been excellent in setting up hearings and trouble-shooting if there is any problem; The audio quality for Webex videoconferences is usually poor. Zoom videoconferences are usually non-problematic; The technology isn't always reliable, and internet speeds are slower in rural Nebraska; We had a new phone system installed that allows for the court to initiate a telephone conference call with as many individuals as are necessary for this type of court hearing we are having. There is a very good speaker system for this phone system that allows for us to make a very good audio record of the proceedings, and all of the participants are easy to hear; There are issues caused by the connections of those trying to attend, it can be difficult to hear/understand people-especially when they are wearing PPE; We have to use an audio workaround a lot of times to have participants connect through a telephone; Most common problem is internet connection; The AOC needs to step-up and work with counties to get up to date technology and then make current staff uses it. I've heard of some magistrates who refuse to adapt to available new technology; Lots of difficulties usually on the end of the attorney or party. Also lack of court staff training has led to difficulties; All parties need to use better microphones so the parties can hear each other. Our courtrooms are noisy-we need to have quiet surroundings when using remote technology; Hard to hear many of th parties; hard to keep a good record during remote hearings.

15. How would you rate the adequacy of the training and other resources that have been made available to you by the Supreme Court/AOCP to help you conduct remote hearings?

- ☐ 30% Good
- ☐ 28% Fair
- ☐ 15% Unsure
- ☐ 12% Poor
- ☐ 10% Very good
- ☐ 5% Excellent

Please explain (optional): Did not know there was training/resources available so have not used either; We have been able to rely on our administrator largely to

train everyone how to run the platform and shared best practices freely with regular staff and judge meetings; More training on various software would be helpful, how to schedule, send notices, etc.; The Zoom video application is more user friendly than the Webex; I was trained by other judges in my office, no SC/AOCP; Resources have generally been good, but training has been inadequate; Aside from what our court administrator has showed us, I am unaware of any other resources; We received no training whatsoever and learned it on our own; Have had minimal help with resources and no training. Need IT to be physically present to set-up courtroom. Have been given the run around by County IT and numerous delays.

16. How satisfied are you that the use of remote technology to conduct court proceedings protects parties' procedural due process rights?

- ☐ 57% Satisfied
- ☐ 23% Very satisfied
- ☐ 11% Unsure,
- ☐ 8% Dissatisfied,
- ☐ 0% Very Dissatisfied

Please explain (optional): If we encounter issues with sight and/or sound we discontinue and schedule in person; There are certain exceptions, for example, critical stages of criminal litigation must be in the courtroom or the right to be must be properly waived. We only conduct criminal jury trials in the courtrooms; Difficulty in attorney/client communications unless by separate phone call by between attorney and client while muted in group hearing. Getting documents to parties to review while preserving confidentiality; But I do not use for evidentiary hearings, trials or many sentencing; It's certainly better than no hearing at all; I think we are doing our best to ensure access to the courts while balancing personal safety. Some hearings are more difficult and don't lend themselves as well to a remote format. Judicial discretion must be used with each hearing to ensure we are operating fairly and impartially; BUT we need better technology in the courtroom to make it a better process to everyone; If the hearing issues could be resolved, I would have no problems with handling matters remotely

17. How satisfied are you that the use of remote technology to conduct court proceedings provides parties with access to justice?

- ☐ 44% Satisfied
- ☐ 33% Very satisfied
- ☐ 20% Unsure
- ☐ 2% Dissatisfied
- ☐ 2% Very Dissatisfied

Please explain (optional): For some the barriers are lower than requiring an appearance in the courthouse. I have had a hearing with people on break working at construction sites halfway across the state, from incarcerated settings, from their homes in other states, and from home right here in town while caring for family members. Presumably requiring those individuals to come to the courthouse would be more burdensome than a video hearing on their telephone. With regard to incarcerated individuals, they do not have to be strip searched and transported sometimes for hours to sit in a small cell before their ten minute hearing is called, then searched again before returning to population. That is better for them presumable; Web have had more parents participate in hearings since Zoom has been an option; For those who have the capacity and ability to appear remotely, it is excellent. However, we serve a lot of folks who are either not comfortable with technology or do not have access/capacity for technology. These folks tend to include a large portion of SLRs and older attorneys.

18. How satisfied are you that the use of remote technology to conduct court proceedings promotes public trust and confidence in the courts?

- ☐ 39% Unsure
- ☐ 36% Satisfied
- ☐ 18% Very satisfied
- ☐ 5% Dissatisfied
- ☐ 2% Very Dissatisfied

Please explain (optional): It depends how it is conducted. The technology is simply a tool. If hearings are broadcast for public viewing, they are more transparent in some ways than a courtroom where spectators have to come to a courthouse, go through metal detectors, and be viewed by law enforcement. With video, the public really can see what is going on with few barriers; Again, it works for those who have confidence in both their personal comfort in using tech and have access to quality tech resources. But there is a contingent who feels scared by the tech or believes the court and opposing counsel are in a position to “drop them” or somehow manipulate the forum against them.

19. How satisfied are you that the use of remote technology to conduct court proceedings promotes traditional dignity and seriousness otherwise experienced during in-person court proceedings?

- ☐ 30% Unsure
- ☐ 28% Dissatisfied
- ☐ 26% Satisfied
- ☐ 10% Very satisfied
- ☐ 7% Very Dissatisfied

Please explain (optional): Litigants and lawyers appeared casually dressed; The formal courtroom setting promotes dignity and seriousness in a way that remote technology can not. More intervention and communication is require of staff, counsel and the judges to promote the proper dignity and decorum by the public who typically view video meetings as less formal. But I believe it can be done; Litigants and attorneys do not seem to take hearings via video conferencing as seriously; Zoom-bombing and hacking are certainly a problem or potential problem; It works best when individual are like-minded and of like-ability. If there is a group that is civil toward one another and exercises decorum, it works slick. However, when folks get out of line and interrupt, freak out, or what have you, it is incredibly difficult to restore decorum; We have a lot of issues with drug court participants and even attorneys (attire, smoking a cigarette, etc.); I am at times concerned with the lack of decorum shown both by litigants and at times, attorneys. Usually a gentle reminder that we are conducting a court hearing solves the problem; It clearly is preferable to meeting in person. But, in difficult times such as this, it has worked and keeps people safe.

20. Once the COVID-19 pandemic is over and it is once again safe to do business in person, do you think courts should continue to conduct some proceedings by remote technology?

- ☐ 85% Yes
- ☐ 8% Unsure
- ☐ 7% No

NOTE: A selection of Yes took the responder to Q21. A selection of No or Unsure took take the responder to Q22.

21. Regardless of your subject matter jurisdiction, which of the following types of proceedings do you think are suitable for the use of remote technology in the future? Select all that apply.

- ☐ 82% Plea hearings
- ☐ 82% Civil non-evidentiary proceedings (non-family law)
- ☐ 82% Criminal pretrials
- ☐ 78% Arraignments
- ☐ 78% Non-evidentiary hearings (all types
- ☐ 69% Family law non-evidentiary proceedings (e.g., divorce, dissolution, custody, etc.)
- ☐ 65% Sentencing
- ☐ 45% Probation violation/revocation hearings

- ☐ 43% Appellate oral arguments
- ☐ 43% Post-conviction proceedings
- ☐ 41% Specialized docket treatment team meetings (i.e., problem-solving courts)
- ☐ 41% Civil evidentiary proceedings (non-family law)
- ☐ 39% Civil protection order hearings
- ☐ 37% Family law evidentiary proceeding (e.g., divorce, dissolution, custody, etc.)
- ☐ 33% Guardianship/conservatorship hearings
- ☐ 31% Specialized docket status review hearings
- ☐ 31% Traffic proceedings
- ☐ 27% Civil trials
- ☐ 24% Evidentiary hearings (all types)
- ☐ 24% Criminal bench trials
- ☐ 20% Disposition hearings (juvenile)
- ☐ 16% Delinquency proceedings
- ☐ 16% Child protection proceedings
- ☐ 16% Adjudication hearings (juvenile)
- ☐ 16% Delinquency proceedings
- ☐ 10% Adoptions
- ☐ 4% Other (please specify)*

***Other (please specify):** NOT jury trials; hearings, outside of trial, where the individual is in custody in a remote facility

22. Which of the following do you believe are the most significant benefits of using remote technology to conduct court proceedings? Select all that apply.

- ☐ 88% Elimination of travel time and expenses for counsel, parties and others
- ☐ 53% Fewer attorney scheduling conflicts
- ☐ 38% Increased use of time-certain scheduling
- ☐ 33% Reduced failure of parties to appear
- ☐ 27% Remote setting less intimidating for parties
- ☐ 13% None (there are no significant benefits over traditional in-person proceedings)
- ☐ 7% Other (please specify)*
- ☐ 0% Unsure

***Other (please specify):** Increased efficiency for all parties. Reduced reliability on physical space; Increase participation by interested parties at a distance; It improves access for persons with transportation problems or who have difficulty getting to the courthouse for any reason; Safety.

23. Which of the following do you believe are the most significant drawbacks to using remote technology to conduct court proceedings? Select all that apply.

- ☐ 80% General technology issues experienced by others (e.g., access difficulties, unavailable or slow internet, limited data plans)
- ☐ 76% Loss of a sense of seriousness of the proceedings
- ☐ 73% General quality of communication is degraded (lack of non-verbal cues, hard to hear and understand people, no face-to-face interaction)
- ☐ 71% General technology issues experienced by you (e.g., access difficulties, unavailable or slow internet, limited data plans)
- ☐ 56% Potential for unidentified third parties to influence proceedings
- ☐ 44% Too many distractions for participants in their remote locations
- ☐ 27% Potential for violation of separation of witnesses
- ☐ 22% Adverse impacts on procedural due process
- ☐ 12% Difficulty accessing office shared drive/dockets (e.g., VPN)
- ☐ 0% Remote setting more intimidating for parties
- ☐ 0% None (there are no significant drawbacks to using remote technology)
- ☐ 0% Unsure

24. How else might courts consider using remote technology in the future long after the pandemic has subsided?

- I think we have gone as far as we can. Remote proceedings do not work for testimony. One can't judge credibility.
- I believe remote technology increase access to the Courts and the process can become considerably easier for parties to schedule and pursue their claims.
- The courts should continue using remote technology whenever possible. Much progress has been made that would otherwise have taken years to accomplish, all the product of necessity, and it is here to stay. Remote technology quality and practices will improve and will be accepted more by each succeeding generation, which the numerous claims that in-person hearings are superior to continual reassessment and scrutiny.
- With interpreters
- Friends and family members to be able to watch adoption hearings.
- Group rights advisement
- Non-evidentiary hearings (e.g., bond hearings, criminal defendants incarcerated in remote facilities)
- Summary procedures
- Live feeds for educational purposes or distance parties who wish to observe
- Some temporary custody proceedings with advance evidence exchanges

- Pretrial conference
- Remote testimony from expert witnesses for pretrial hearings to cut down on scheduling conflicts
- Courts will lose their credibility and stature in our system of governance if everything is going to be done remotely.
- Eventually, I think courts could utilize remote access points across the state and within larger cities for litigants from other jurisdictions to use for certain hearings.
- With the exception of criminal jury trials the format works well.
- Committee meetings
- During storms/floods

25. Do you think the Supreme Court orders provided you with the direction necessary so that you were able to implement modified court operations?

- ☐ 63% Yes
- ☐ 37% No

Please explain (optional): The orders were fine, but the support from the SC was poor; There was not a lot of assistance necessary; The administrative orders were mildly helpful. But in the End the direction provided from the Supreme Court and the AOCF was to allow for ongoing access to the courts and court offices – but essentially, to figure it out on your own how to continue the day-to-day operations with local health official and public officials. Not sure that I have any real concrete solutions to how it may have been better. BUT, in the end, the direction provided from Lincoln was only mildly helpful; For the most part, my reading of the order could be paraphrased “you must stay open but it’s up to you to figure out how”; My staff and I implemented procedures and remote hearings before any guidance or discussions were had with the Supreme Court; It would have been nice to have more inform direction in HOW to handle certain situations consistently throughout the state; The Orders were fairly vague and left most of the decisions to the local courts; Every court faces its own challenges including geography, technology available etc. The orders allowed us flexibility to maintain court in a way that worked for us.

26. Do you think the AOC provided you with the direction and resources necessary so that you were able to implement modified court operations (e.g., guidance on developing an emergency preparedness plan, implementing ability for staff to telecommute, providing PPE, creating signage related to CDC guidelines)?

- ☐ 76% Yes
- ☐ 24% No

Please explain (optional): We were 100% on our own; There was not a lot of assistance necessary; A bit more specificity would have helped. It seemed to be a lot of “use your own judgment”; Resources yes, direction no; Some staff did not have computers necessary to telecommute

27. Is there anything else you would like the Supreme Court/AOC to consider that wasn't asked?

- The AOC has focused a lot of manpower that is peripheral to its mission that should be used directly.
- The conclusion that non-judicial days not be available due to the pandemic created a number of issues on those cases that required hearings/decisions within certain time frames.
- Good attention to problems in the trial courts during a very difficult time.
- Changing the states so that the Courts have the ability to conduct hearings via vide/phone conferencing over the objection of a party, when necessary, would be very helpful.
- I just really didn't feel that we were given many instructions/guidance as to how to operate. “Figure it out” was the general message I feel we received from the Court.
- Thank you for the support during this unprecedented time. We have all learned a lot about technology and how to be more flexible. I think in the future we can have more robust and thoughtful conversations regarding pandemic preparedness, remote access, technology, etc.
- I would like to be provide with microphones for counsel tables so attorneys don't have to approach to share by speakerphone on the bench.
- Not enough attention was paid to some courts (county courts/judges) who essentially discontinued court because of the pandemic. This was ignored and ultimately resulted in not only a backlog of cases but also a landslide of cases coming into the district court (see district 7 county judges)
- The remote counties definitely need more bandwidth to make remote hearings more useable. I realize this is something the Supreme Court has been working on.

CHIEF PROBATION OFFICERS

8. Since March 2020 who in your office has participated in court proceedings and other probation-related activities and services (e.g., regular meetings with probationers) using remote technology?

- ☐ 100% Both
- ☐ 0% Chief Probation officers
- ☐ 0% Probation Officers
- ☐ 0% Neither

NOTE: A selection of chief probation officer, probation officer or both took the responder to Q9. A selection of neither took the responder to Q18.

9. Which types of court proceeding or probation activity have you or your probation officers participated in that were conducted using remote technology? Select all that apply.

- ☐ 100% Group facilitations
- ☐ 100% Probation meetings with office staff
- ☐ 100% Substituting for home visits
- ☐ 92% Regular status meetings with adults and youth
- ☐ 83% Probation violation/revocations hearings
- ☐ 83% Meetings with judges
- ☐ 75% Dispositions (juvenile)
- ☐ 67% Adjudication hearings (juvenile)
- ☐ 67% Specialized Docket treatment team meetings
- ☐ 50% Sentencings
- ☐ 33% Specialized Docket status review hearings
- ☐ 8% Other (please specify)*

***Other (please specify):** Staffing with providers, meeting with parents, teachers, one-one sessions with staff, numerous stakeholder and reform meetings

10. Which type of remote services are currently *unavailable* to your office, but think it would be helpful to have? Select all that apply.

- ☐ 83% Online self-scheduling allowing clients to schedule meetings
- ☐ 75% Form completion software (e.g., HotDocs, A2J Author, etc.)
- ☐ 33% Text messaging notifications and/or reminders

- ☐ 33% Increased use of document sharing applications (e.g., Dropbox, Google Docs, etc.)
- ☐ 25% Virtual remote interpretation
- ☐ 25% Electronic document signing tools (e.g., DocuSign, PandaDoc, etc.)
- ☐ 8% Videoconferencing (for any type of activity)
- ☐ 8% Specialized docket remote treatment team meetings (i.e., problem-solving courts)
- ☐ 8% Specialized docket remote status review hearings
- ☐ 8% Unsure
- ☐ 0% Telephonic conferencing (for any activity)

Other (please specific or add a reason why you think a certain type of remote service would be helpful to have?)

- The “busy work” of having to drive places to get signatures is a waste of probation officers time – the electronic piece would be so much more efficient.
- We do a LOT of filling out forms that could all be auto populated by NPACS.
- Text reminders to youth and parents would be very helpful, they are used to [virtual meetings in] other areas – medical, dental, schools, therapists, businesses, etc.
- Having document sharing would be helpful vs having to read even more emails.

11. What has been the most common form of remote *court* proceeding with which your probation officers have been involved? (May only answer one.)

- ☐ 58% Partially remote using videoconferencing (some individuals in-person, others remote)
- ☐ 17% Fully remote using videoconferencing (all individuals offsite from the court).
- ☐ 8% Remote, using either videoconferencing or telephonic conferencing, where the individuals are all present in the courthouse but are basically physically located in separate rooms.
- ☐ 8% fully remote using telephonic conference (all individuals offsite from the court).
- ☐ 8% Other (please specify)*
- ☐ 0% Partially remote using telephonic conferencing (some individuals in-person, others remote).

***Other (please specify):** Fully remote March April May and June – resumed in person court July, August September, October – Remote November, December

12. Typically, what type of device do your probation officers use to participate in remote court proceedings or probation services/activities?

- ☐ 42% Laptop computer
- ☐ 25% Desktop computer
- ☐ 17% Other (please specify)*
- ☐ 8% Tablet (e.g., iPad)
- ☐ 8% Smartphone
- ☐ 0% Regular telephone

***Other (please specify):** Combination of laptop/desktop, tablet, and smartphone; JCBI officers – laptops and all other officers use smartphone or desktop PC

13. How would you rate the overall quality of the remote proceedings/services/activities with which your probation officers have been involved?

- ☐ 42% Very good
- ☐ 42% Good
- ☐ 8% Excellent
- ☐ 8% Fair
- ☐ 0% Poor
- ☐ 0% Unsure

Please explain (optional): Actually the range goes from very good to poor, but it depends on the officer and his skill with technology; Works but only problem is getting client to report to the office following a sentencing/deposition; our court has adapted well to remote hearing pieces – hearings run on time, the attorneys are more intentional and prepared, and the youth appreciate having more of a voice.

14. Generally, how easy has it been for your probation officers to connect and participate in remote proceedings/services/activities?

- ☐ 50% Very good
- ☐ 33% Good
- ☐ 17% Excellent
- ☐ 0% Fair
- ☐ 0% Poor
- ☐ 0% Unsure

Please explain (optional): Rural internet/cell towers are a bit problematic in places; bandwidth is a struggle

15. How would you rate the adequacy of the training and other resources that have been made available to help your probation officers participate in proceedings/services/activities?

- ☐ 33% Very good
- ☐ 33% Good
- ☐ 17% Fair
- ☐ 8% Poor
- ☐ 8% Unsure
- ☐ 0% Excellent

Please explain (optional): Getting the laptops for staff was the biggest issue for our district. We were not prepared to work remotely.

16. How satisfied are your probation officer are that the use of remote technology to conduct proceedings/services/activities promotes the traditional dignity and seriousness otherwise experienced when those activities are done in-person?

- ☐ 58% Satisfied
- ☐ 25% Unsure
- ☐ 17% Very satisfied
- ☐ 0% Dissatisfied
- ☐ 0% Very dissatisfied

Please explain (optional): Some clients do not have technology or internet or even a smartphone; Judges, attorneys and probation officers set the tone for the hearing; satisfied in the short-term, but for the long-term – youth need in person contact.

17. Taking into consideration how you answered the questions related to your probation officers participating in remote proceedings/services/activities, what challenges do clients have with participating in remotely?

- Matters take longer and reality is it is hard to work with people when they aren't in person – things get missed, supports needed, challenges not addressed, etc.

- Biggest challenge for clients
 - Inability to access Wi-Fi/internet
 - Not enough bandwidth
 - Tech support necessary to apply and work the technology
 - Don't want to use their data or not enough data
 - Tools/accessories they need (for example, headset so the conversations remain confidential, a private space, or a secure connection)
 - Don't have the technology (laptop, smartphone, computer)
- Clients need to be in office or court so they have more impactful interaction – “quality interactions” that are more likely with face-to-face interactions

18. Once the pandemic is over and it is once again safe to do business in person, do you think *courts* should continue to conduct some proceedings by remote technology?

- ☐ 83% Yes
- ☐ 8% No
- ☐ 8% Unsure

19. Once the pandemic is over and it is once again safe to do business in person, do you think *probation* should continue to conduct some services/activities by remote technology?

- ☐ 92% Yes
- ☐ 8% No
- ☐ 0% Unsure

20. Which of the following types of probation-related proceedings/services/activities do you think are suitable for the use of remote technology in the future?

- ☐ 67% Group facilitations
- ☐ 67% Probation meetings with office staff
- ☐ 42% Other (please specify)*
- ☐ 25% Regular status meetings with probationers/clients
- ☐ 25% Substituting for home visits
- ☐ 17% Adjudication hearings (juvenile)
- ☐ 17% Probation violation/revocations hearings
- ☐ 17% Dispositions (juvenile)

- ☐ 17% Specialized docket treatment team meetings (i.e., problem-solving courts)
- ☐ 17% Meeting with judges
- ☐ 8% Sentencings
- ☐ 0% Specialized Docket status review hearings

***Other (please specify):** All meetings or court hearings if needed or necessity is proven (works for hearings that need to be dealt with in a timely manner or for individuals who live in a different locations); Education and training for staff; Whatever meeting all are comfortable doing via tech

21. Which of the following do you believe are the most significant benefits of using remote technology to conduct probation services and activities? Select all that apply.

- ☐ 91% Elimination of travel time and expenses for counsel, parties and others
- ☐ 45% Increased use of time-certain scheduling at the courts
- ☐ 36% Fewer scheduling conflicts
- ☐ 36% Reduced failure of clients to appear
- ☐ 36% Remote setting less intimidating for clients
- ☐ 27% Other (please specify)*
- ☐ 0% None (there are no significant benefits over traditional in-person proceedings)
- ☐ 0% Unsure

***Other (please specify):** Clients have less time they have to miss work and juveniles have less time they miss school; Utilizing technology across county lines to expedited releases from jail; Travel time to see a client takes a great deal of time.

22. Which of the following do you believe are the most significant drawbacks to using remote technology to conduct probation services and activities? Select all that apply.

- ☐ 67% General technology issues experienced by you or your probation officers (e.g., access difficulties, unavailable or slow internet, limited data plans)
- ☐ 67% General quality of communication is degraded (lack of non-verbal cues, hard to hear and understand people, no face-to-face interaction)
- ☐ 50% General technology issues experienced by others (e.g., access difficulties, unavailable or slow internet, limited data plans)
- ☐ 50% Too many distractions for participants in their remote locations
- ☐ 50% Loss of sense of seriousness of the proceedings

- ☐ 25% Difficulty accessing office shared drive/dockets (e.g., VPN)
- ☐ 17% Adverse impacts on procedural due process
- ☐ 8% None (there are no significant benefits over traditional in-person proceedings)
- ☐ 0% Unsure
- ☐ 0% Other (please specify)

23. How else might probation consider using remote technology in the future long after the pandemic has subsided?

- Continue to have the ability to do virtual home visits, especially where clients may live over 40 miles from their supervising office.
- Each district would be able to virtually/remotely utilize each reporting centers' services no matter where the client is in the state so each client has equal access. (Our offices could be a "hub" for those needing access to treatment virtually for those individuals who don't have technology in their home)
- Ability to offer services virtually to juveniles to the extent we offer for our adults in our service centers.
- Statewide training being done via virtual platform – not all, but some could be trained this way, including certain weeks in NPOTS.
- Continued use for reporting center services/group programming
- Relapse classes, pretreatment classes or one-on-one appointments
- Rural juvenile intake
- Meetings to continue using remote technology
 - Trainings
 - Staff meetings, including Chiefs Meetings
 - Youth in placements out of the area
 - Parents at work
 - Schools

24. Do you think the Supreme Court orders provided you with the direction necessary so that you were able to implement modified court operations?

- ☐ 83% Yes
- ☐ 17% No

Please explain (optional): When this first happened and we all had to submit modified operation plans and never even seeing one or knowing what one looked like to complete was very difficult. After completing the first one you have an idea of how to do.

25. Do you think Probation Administration provided you with the direction and resources necessary so that you were able to implement modified court operations (e.g., guidance on developing an emergency preparedness plan; implementing ability for staff to telecommute; providing PPE; creating signage related to CDC guidelines; guidance on supervision strategies, drug testing protocols)?

- ☐ 83% Yes
- ☐ 17% No

Please explain (optional): Instructions were initially unclear and incomplete regarding expectations, use, the extent of the plan etc.

26. Is there anything else you would like the Supreme Court/AOCP/Probation Administration to consider that wasn't asked?

- Having training on how to do a modified operations plan would have been helpful and would be a good thing to train new probation/judicial staff on.
- The flexibility during this time related to work has been greatly appreciated.
- Biggest challenges has been continuing to be OHPs of youth. It seems this is a system issue, with several points causing backlog, with inability to move youth or place youth in a timely manner.
- Anything ACOP can do to increase our technology with forms that auto-populate, make a better case management system that eliminates busy work and using DocuSign or other electronic signatures would be helpful.
 - Teenagers, young adults and many "older adults" have been living on social media, FaceTime, Snapchat, etc. so they do grasp using technology for virtual interactions.
 - We spend a lot of time entering data, driving to get signatures and manually keeping spreadsheets for data not collected in NPACS.
- Interviewing/hiring for staff positions

SHERIFF/SHERIFF DEPUTY

8. Since March 2020 who in your office has participated in court proceedings using remote technology?

- ☐ 43% Both
- ☐ 43% Neither
- ☐ 9% Deputy sheriff
- ☐ 4% Sheriff

NOTE: A selection of sheriff, deputy sheriff or both will take the responder to Q9. A selection of neither will take the responder to Q18.

9. Which type of remote services is currently available for your office to use? Select all that apply.

- ☐ 100% Videoconferencing (for any type of proceeding or other type of meeting)
- ☐ 77% Telephonic conferencing (for any type of proceeding or other type of meeting)
- ☐ 31% Electronic document signing tools (e.g., DocuSign, PandaDoc, etc.)
- ☐ 31% Document sharing applications (e.g., Dropbox, Google Docs, etc.)
- ☐ 15% Other (please specify)*
- ☐ 8% Form completion software (e.g., HotDocs, A2J Author, etc.)
- ☐ 0% Unsure

***Other (please specify):** Need better equipment, mic, cameras and internet speed.

10. Which types of remote services should be available? Select all that apply.

- ☐ 77% Videoconferencing (for any type of proceeding or other type of meeting)
- ☐ 69% Electronic document signing tools (e.g., DocuSign, PandaDoc, etc.)
- ☐ 54% Telephonic conferencing (for any type of proceeding or other type of meeting)
- ☐ 54% Document sharing applications (e.g., Dropbox, Google Docs, etc.)
- ☐ 54% Form completion software (e.g., HotDocs, A2J Author, etc.)
- ☐ 38% Electronic filing for self-represented litigants
- ☐ 8% Unsure
- ☐ 8% Other (please specify)*

***Other (please specify):** Not applicable

11. What has been the most common form of remote proceedings with which you or your deputies have been involved? (May only answer one.)

- ☐ 42% Fully remote using videoconferencing (all individuals offsite from the court)
- ☐ 42% Partially remote using videoconferencing (some individuals in-person, others remote)
- ☐ 17% Partially remote using telephonic conferencing (individuals in-person, others Remote)
- ☐ 0% Remote, using either videoconferencing or telephonic conferencing, where the individuals are all present in the courthouse but are basically physically located in separate rooms
- ☐ 0% Fully remote using telephonic conference (all individuals offsite from the court)
- ☐ 0% Other (please specify)

12. Typically, what type of device do you or your deputies use to participate in remote proceedings?

- ☐ 62% Desktop computer
- ☐ 23% Laptop computer
- ☐ 8% Smartphone
- ☐ 8% Regular telephone
- ☐ 0% Tablet (e.g., iPad)
- ☐ 0% Other (please specify)

13. How would you rate the overall quality of the remote proceedings with which you or your deputies have been involved?

- ☐ 46% Very good
- ☐ 31% good
- ☐ 8% Excellent
- ☐ 8% Fair,
- ☐ 8% Poor,
- ☐ 0% Other (Please specify)

14. How satisfied are you or your deputies that the use of remote technology to conduct court proceedings protects parties' procedural due process rights?

- ☐ 46% Satisfied
- ☐ 23% Very satisfied
- ☐ 31% Unsure
- ☐ 0% Dissatisfied
- ☐ 0% Very Dissatisfied

15. How satisfied are you or your deputies that the use of remote technology to conduct court proceedings provides parties with access to justice?

- ☐ 46% Satisfied
- ☐ 31% Unsure
- ☐ 23% Very satisfied
- ☐ 0% Dissatisfied
- ☐ 0% Very Dissatisfied

16. How satisfied are you or your deputies that the use of remote technology to conduct court proceedings promotes public trust and confidence in the courts?

- ☐ 54% Satisfied
- ☐ 31% Unsure
- ☐ 15% Very satisfied
- ☐ 0% Dissatisfied
- ☐ 0% Very Dissatisfied

17. How satisfied are you or your deputies that the use of remote technology to conduct court proceedings promotes traditional dignity and seriousness otherwise experienced during in-person court proceedings?

- ☐ 45% Satisfied
- ☐ 36% Unsure
- ☐ 18% Very satisfied
- ☐ 0% Dissatisfied
- ☐ 0% Very Dissatisfied

18. Once the COVID-19 pandemic is over and it is once again safe to do business in person, do you think courts should continue to conduct some proceedings by remote technology?

- ☐ 86% Yes
- ☐ 14% No
- ☐ 0% Unsure

19. Which of the following do you believe are the most significant benefits of using remote technology to conduct court proceedings? Select all that apply.

- ☐ 81% Elimination of travel time and expenses for counsel, parties and others
- ☐ 48% Increased use of time-certain scheduling
- ☐ 43% Fewer scheduling conflicts
- ☐ 33% Reduced failure of parties to appear
- ☐ 33% Other (please specify)*
- ☐ 24% Remote setting less intimidating for parties
- ☐ 5% None (there are no significant benefits over traditional in-person proceedings)
- ☐ 0% Unsure

Other (Please specify): For some shorter proceedings, transporting defendants can be inefficient, expensive and dangerous (example given when gang members who are held in segregation have had to appear for a docket call and it takes “20” people several hours to transport for a 10 minute hearing); Assists with providing security and increased safety in the courtroom; There may be some benefits, but I would like to get back to traditional way of having court

20. Which of the following do you believe are the most significant drawbacks to using remote technology to conduct court proceedings? Select all that apply.

- ☐ 43% General technology issues experienced by others (e.g., access difficulties, unavailable or slow internet, limited data plans)
- ☐ 38% General technology issues experienced by you (e.g., access difficulties,
- ☐ 29% General quality of communication is degraded (lack of non-verbal cues, hard to hear and understand people, no face-to-face interaction)
- ☐ 29% Loss of a sense of seriousness of the proceedings
- ☐ 29% None (there are no significant drawbacks to using remote technology)
- ☐ 29% Potential for unidentified third parties to influence proceedings
- ☐ 19% Potential for violation of separation of witnesses

- ☐ 10% Too many distractions for participants in their remote locations
- ☐ 10% Unsure
- ☐ 5% Adverse impacts on procedural due process
- ☐ 0% Remote setting more intimidating for parties

21. How else might courts consider using remote technology in the future long after the pandemic has subsided?

- Being able to have access for warrants is important – so being able to email judges with this information or other means to make sure this continues.
- Continue to use remote technology from the jails (e.g., bonds, extraditions, arraignment/first appearance, preliminary hearings).

22. What processes or procedures have been implemented that are helpful to carrying out the duties of the sheriff's office during the pandemic (e.g., service of process, warrants, managing the jail, courthouse/courtroom security, testifying, transporting individuals)?

- County attorneys and judges – those offenses that were normally lodged were managed so the jail population didn't get too large and also make sure individuals who had COVID weren't lodged.
- Inmates and others who may have had to come to the courthouse using technology for court proceedings – this has "drastically" reduced staff time transporting prisoners to court, with no discernable adverse effect for defendants.
- Defense counsel seems to really like the ability to visit with their clients safely and securely via the methodologies available ("we have several").

23. What challenges do sheriffs/deputy sheriffs have in carrying out the duties of the sheriff's office during the pandemic (e.g., service of process, warrants, managing the jail, courthouse/courtroom security, testifying, transporting individuals)?

- Difficult to balance the extremes when political views may come into play.
- Wearing masks and being able to identify people in the courthouse/courts that are wearing mask or other face covering.
- Civil service, transporting individuals
- Our biggest issue has been the public – when people are losing all they have worked for, they get desperate, which results in safety issues.
- Lack of regular court schedule.
- Keeping sufficient staff working in the COVID environment when they and their families test positive and they are ill or quarantined; keeping prison population free from COVID.
- Social distancing –
 - In courthouse
 - Serving process
 - Taking people into custody
 - Transporting of inmates
- Trying to keep COVID out of the jail.
- Transports –
 - Transport officer having exposure when picking up a prisoner from a facility to find out the prisoner was COVID positive.
 - Constant “unnecessary” transportation of individuals for short or cancelled hearings or for a continuance (parties often know this is why the hearing is scheduled)
- Different jails had different regulations requiring use of PPE – often led to last minute transportation change of plans.
- Screening of new inmates after arrest.
- Tried to work with judges to time sentencing to limit the chances of introducing the virus into the jail.
- As far as court security and service of process the courts seemed rather indifferent.

24. Is there anything else you would like the Supreme Court/AOCP to consider that wasn't asked?

- Availability of electronic warrants in a timely manner. Deputies feel somewhat abandoned when trying to manage a situation when outside of normal business hours and someone needs to manage the investigation and also needs to handle the administrative issues.
- Put probation back on NCJIS
- When possible continue [to use technology]. This could limit the need for some unnecessary transports.
- Thank you for what you do and appreciate being included in this forum.